

THE BIBLE, RACE AND CULTURE.

BY Arnold Kennedy.

INTRODUCTION.

Some Christians are vaguely aware that there are differences in the way that God treats various races in the Bible. When they ponder it, they find a crisis in belief. This paper is written as a response to questions from seekers after Truth who have a genuine doctrinal crisis in their understanding as to what "*The Sovereignty of God*" really means, when God says of Israel, "*You only have I known of all the families of the earth*"-[Amos 3:2]. The exclusiveness of Israel typified by the word "only" is consistent. They have seen that there is a unity between both Testaments especially in regard to God being sovereign in choosing Israel. They have seen that the whole Bible is essentially the "*Drama of God's People*". They have become aware that the word 'redemption' can only apply to Israel as a race, and that no statement to the contrary can be found in Scripture. Immediately there is a conflict between this and the traditional teachings that "*all the world*", "*every*" and "*whosoever*" means every race of earth. There is a crisis in belief between these two convictions. We will quote just three Scriptures establishing the link between both Testaments in regard to Israel. The emphasised words show the limited application.

Acts 3:22 *Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you.*

Acts 13:32 *And we declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children*

Rom. 15:8 *Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers.*

From here we can go on to look at the crisis in belief. The first thing raised in peoples' minds are those instances where there is a change in behaviour, and what appears to be a move of God, in those races which obviously are not of the Israel nations. True, we have in Scripture, statements about certain races, such as "*Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated*" found in both Testaments, but as a general statement about all other non-Israel races together, we cannot find positive indication about them. If we go back to the Scripture in Amos above, we can see a statement that does not indicate that the other races, not being addressed, are being judged in the same way as Israel:

Amos 3:2 *Hear this word that the LORD hath spoken against you, O children of Israel, against the whole family which I brought up from the land of Egypt, saying, You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities. Can two walk together, except they be agreed?*

"Known" is in the perfect tense which means the action was completed in the past and cannot be added to. These are the same people who are described as being "foreknown" in the New Testament.

The normal reaction expressed by people when they are presented with God being sovereign in choosing Israel, are usually something like:

1. "*Everyone else then is going to hell*", or
2. "*The Negro cannot have a soul*", or
3. "*God would not do that*".

But these are all presumptions. The Book of Amos that has been quoted confirms judgements upon certain other races based upon their treatment of Israel. There are judgements upon certain mixed races, e.g. Zech. 14:21, "*And in that day there shall be no more the Canaanite in the house of the LORD of hosts*". But there is a balance of races about which we can find no direct reference. At the end of the age we find a New Jerusalem with only the remnant of Israel on the inside, but there are still other races outside.

The purpose of this paper is to highlight the fact that the Bible does not support the popular "*Brotherhood of Man*" concept. We will look at 'race' from the non-Biblical viewpoint, and then from the Biblical viewpoint. After this we will show examples from Scripture to demonstrate that God treats races differently, in both Testaments. Connected doctrinal issues are then looked into briefly.

THE POPULAR RACIAL-EQUALITY VIEW.

The popular argument that all races are equal in God's sight goes like this-[From an Internet source].

"The Bible addresses the idea of racial and cultural divisions in terms of "partiality." Partiality means showing undue favour for one person or group over another. The books of the law warn against

showing partiality in legal decisions (Leviticus 19:15; Deuteronomy 1: 17; 16:19). The Bible's prohibitions against this type of judgement are based on God's own character; for He does not show partiality toward any person (2 Chron. 19:7), and He will not allow those who follow Him to judge others on the basis of external factors such as wealth, cultural background, or ethnic identity.

This view of impartiality was the foundation of the Great Commission. The book of Acts speaks of Peter's discovery that Christ had intended the Gospel for all men, regardless of race or culture. As he was trying to be faithful to the practice of exclusion taught by the Pharisees, Peter was shown a vision of "wild beasts, creeping things, and birds of the air," which traditional Judaism had declared unclean. When Peter refused to "kill and eat," God said to him, "What God has cleansed you must not call common" (10:15). This was yet another epiphany for the headstrong apostle. Luke writes, "Then Peter opened his mouth and said: 'In truth I Perceive that God shows no partiality. But in every nation whoever fears Him and works righteousness is accepted by Him'" (Acts 10:34-35). And later Paul confirms that message: "For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus" (Galatians 3:27-28).

The apostle James later warned that any attempt to show partiality or judgement against those of other races and cultures, particularly because of economic status, was inconsistent with the teachings of Christ (James 2:1). James declared partiality is a sin (2:9). Paul also warned the Ephesians who held slaves to be fair in their dealings with their servants, for God Himself is impartial and, for those who are in Christ Jesus, the master is no better than the slave and the employer no greater than the employee (6:9)

Some of the questions that have to be answered here are:

1. If the Bible references here are all addressed to equality amongst Israelites, how could this be extended to include all other races?
2. If God's prohibition against racial discrimination is based upon His character, how could God determine that Israel that should exterminate some other races?
3. If the "Great Commission" was directed to all races rather than to "all men" of Israel, why were the disciples and apostles told not to go, "but to the lost sheep of the House of Israel"?-[Matt 10:6] Why did Jesus say, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel".- [Matt 15:24]- and not to other races?
4. In Peter's vision, in the 28th verse of Acts 10, why are the words, "another nation" [or *allophulos* =another tribe of the same sort] changed to mean a race of a different sort?
5. Where in prophecy are the two parties in Acts 10:15 other than the House of Israel and the House of Judah?
6. In Acts 10:34, Israel was dispersed amongst "every nation", why then is the limiting, "The word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ: (he is Lord of all" ignored and extended to all other races?
7. In the phrase, "*there is neither Jew [Judean] nor Greek*", how does "Jew" come to mean all Israel and "Greek" come to mean every other race on earth?
8. In James 2:9, where is there any suggestion that other ethnic cultures are included since "partiality in the law" can only refer to Israel who alone were given that covenant Law?

RACE.

When we use the word "race" we usually think of people who are different from others, mostly because of obvious appearance/genetic distinctions. But there are many ideas about what we mean by the word 'race'. Dictionaries do not agree whether it is a matter of ancestry or whether it is a matter of culture and environment. Christians too are capable of saying, and believing, quite different things about 'race' at the same time:

1. That all people are of one race because of the popular teaching that all people originate from Adam.

This is where the idea comes from that all races and cultures are the same in God's sight. This is the subject which we will be examining. From this teaching comes the expressions, "*The human race*" and "*Adam's race*". What many Christians are ignorant of, and are not taught, is that God separated the *sons of Adam*, and why He set boundaries between the races.

Deut. 32:8. "*When He separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the Children of Israel*".

We will look at the popular argument about the equality of races in the next section.

2. That there is a 'chosen race', and from this they have invented the expression, "*The Jewish Race*".

The latter expression would then mean that the "Jews" are somehow different from the rest of the Human Race, even if they are part of it. If we agree that there is a chosen race, then we must agree that all other races are 'un-chosen'. But, Jewish written authorities agree that there is no such thing as a "Jewish" race as a genetic lineage. When we replace the word "Jewish" with "Israelite" we will be approaching the real Biblical position.

3. That there is a radical and racial separation between "Israel" and what is usually called "The Church".

Although the proponents will declare that they are not 'racist', they effectively are just that by making the separation. They try to get over their problem by saying that God treats different peoples differently in different dispensations through history. Here, Dispensationalism joins with the Covenant Theology of Calvinism in seeking to draw a sharp distinction between the law and the gospel, and insists upon a complete disjuncture between God's workings with Israel and His workings with "The Church". They must have awful problems when it comes to 'identity' because the Bible connects both the Law and Grace to Israel, and to Israel only.

4. That the "*Seed of Abraham*" are those of any race who have faith and belief in Jesus Christ..

They have to ignore two things:

[a] That in Galatians 3:16 *Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ*, that "Christ" here is a verbal adjective indicating that it is the seed of Abraham itself that is anointed.

[b] That the promises made to Abraham were confirmed to Isaac and Jacob as well, as a lineage, and that Jesus made it a matter of belief and faith within these people. These are whom He said He was sent to, saying, "*I was not sent but to the lost sheep of the House of Israel.*"-[Matt.15:24]. But who believes Jesus today about this?

5. That the "*seed of Abraham*" is racial, as a family of "*the stock of Abraham*"-[Acts 13:26].

This is the only view that shows Scripture to be consistent through both Testaments. Here the '*elect*' is confined to Israel. [Isaiah 45:4 *For Jacob my servant's sake, and Israel mine elect*]. Israel's redemption from the curse of the broken Law is through the New Covenant which is made with the House of Judah and the House of Israel only-[Heb.8:8 as prophesied in Jer. 31:31].

Christians will switch from one idea to one of the other ideas to support a particular doctrine, and it seems never to occur to them what they are doing. They can invent doctrines to try to cover a particular view. Clergy come to the point where they have to say, "*There are many explanations*", and then they become experts at trying to explain things away. But, it bothers very few of them and professing Christians do not seem to think things through. The 'race' issue seems to be too difficult or contradictory, or otherwise they may say, because of what they have been taught, that it does not matter anyway. But it does matter and God makes this clear. Our part is to believe what God says. Then everything clarifies and becomes consistent. . If God was not consistent in what He says, then His Word would not be worth consideration. When we take a high view of Scripture and base our beliefs upon its accuracy, that we find it to be a Rock that is rock-solid. It is some traditional teachings and some translations that create the problems and conflicts. This paper is written by a Christian for Christians to help those who have genuine confusion, and for those who want to "*dig deep*" and know "*the certainty of those things*".

THE NON-BIBLICAL VIEWPOINT ON 'RACE'.

Webster's Universal Dictionary gives the origin of the word 'race' and uses the word 'blood', saying, "*A group of individuals possessing certain physical characteristics in common, and regarded as being of one blood and sprung from the same original stock*". With a definition like this would be valid to say that different races are of different blood. The word '*stock*' conveys the idea in the historic understanding.

But today, in modern usage, this meaning is denied because it is considered to be politically incorrect to suggest that there are meaningful genetic differences between peoples of differing colours and origins. Most modern dictionaries confirm that there has been this modern change in meaning. For instance, from the Grollier Electronic Publishing we find:

"The overwhelming bulk of scientific opinion in both the social and the biological sciences, however, now rejects the notion that large human populations, such as the so-called white, black and yellow races, behave differently because of their physical appearance, or that they can be said to be genetically superior or inferior to one another. Genetic differences between population groups do

exist, of course. None of these group differences, however, has yet been shown to affect personality, intelligence, or indeed, any ability that significantly relates to social behaviour”.

This is trying to say that the genetic differences do not relate to behaviour or performance. This would then mean that the poor attainment and the relatively more flagitious mind found in some groups is a matter of culture. Say this was so in the case of the 'Maori' as a group culture, then why have an agenda to impose such a culture upon another group through education, etc? Speaking of attainment, when racehorses are bred, we would not expect superior performance from mating a high performing horse with another horse which has no history or expectation of good performance. Nor would we mate a good horse with a donkey and expect to win races with the offspring. If the horse genus has genetic differences, is it unreasonable to suspect that the human genus likewise may have varying genetic differences and attainments? Connection between genetic differences and intelligence has always been an emotive matter. We say that a person born with Down's syndrome has a genetic defect from conception and yet we have no trouble in relating intelligence difference to genetics here. The science of genetics is all about inherited differences between both individuals and populations. There is a huge difference between equal opportunity and equal endowment! But, in the Bible the issue involves spirit endowment and this endowment is from conception. This factor does not change with environment. This dictionary goes on to say, *“In common usage, race is a socially defined term”*. This partially contradicts the underlined portion in the quote above where genetic differences are admitted, but what is not admitted is that genetic differences have connection with traditional behaviour patterns within one shared physical environment.

So, within the modern dictionaries we find contradictions. The above article goes on to speak about “hybridisation” and “gene flow”, and that races can be classified on a geographical basis, namely the Ethiopian, the Palaearctic and the Oriental, and then goes on to say:

“Recent evidence indicates how far apart these populations have become in their genetic endowments”.

“Blood groups show a striking split into Eastern and Western branches”.

“Populations through adaptation to local different environments are called races”.

These are contradictory claims! So again, on the one hand it is said that racial differences are genetic, and on the other hand some say that they are environmental. It is sometimes claimed that the phenotype expression of a genotype depends upon the environment in which the genotype develops.

In New Zealand, we have Case Law in *The Crown v. King-Ansell*, which went through to the Court of Appeal [C.A.176/78] where judgement was made on matters of race and ethnicity. Here the complex nature of the subject is presented, but for anyone wanting to understand the modern view of race and ethnicity more fully, the book, *“Who Are The Jews”* by Christian Borg published by Veritas Publishing Pty. Ltd, and obtainable from P.O.Box 4389, Auckland, is recommended, because it gives a transcript of the actual case. It is good reading and shows how the historical and traditional meanings given to 'race' are now denied. We will now go on to see what modern Jewish authorities have to say.

FROM THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA JUDAICA, 1971, [Under 'Race, Theory of'].

“Nowadays, although anthropologists differ over the exact number and subdivisions of the races of humanity, most are agreed that the characteristics which distinguish races are limited to physical features. This conclusion is, however, of comparatively recent date”.

and

“On this subject, the Talmud states, ‘for the sake of peace among creatures, the descent of all men is traced back to one individual, so that one may not say to his neighbour, “my father is greater than yours” [Sanh.4:5]. Belief in a common descent from Adam was taken over by Christianity, and became one of the fundamentals of the Christian principle of equality of all men before God”.

Two important things to note here are the mention of a “*comparatively recent date*”, and “*was taken over by Christianity*”. Both of these statements indicate that both ideas were not the original beliefs. The “*fundamentals of the Christian principle of the equality of all men before God*” is not the Biblical concept, as we will show.

COMMENT ON DICTIONARY DEFINITIONS AND THE INTERNATIONAL COVENANTS.

Looking at the definitions within these dictionaries, we can conclude that there are inconsistencies, if not deliberate changes as well. On the one hand, 'race' is said to be a matter of origins and genealogical line, whilst on the other hand it is social, cultural and the product of environment. 'Culture' and 'race' do tend to coincide, we all know.

The International Covenants On Human Rights speaks primarily of a person having "*civil and political rights*" as well as "*economic, social and cultural rights*", and that "*all peoples have the right to self determination*", and adds that "*by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their social and cultural development*". It treats, "*every member of the human family, everywhere*", as being the same making no provision at all for genealogical lines as Scripture does. Indeed, if race is just social and cultural, then any persons could "*freely pursue*" what race they wanted to become and then be classed as being of that race. This seems to be agreed to in ILO Convention No. 169. Origins and 'family' have no longer have historical meaning under the International Covenants.

The New Zealand Human Rights Act, 1993, provides for a Race Relations Commissioner, but it is unable to give a definition of what 'race' is. In this area this Act prohibits discrimination on the grounds of "*religious belief, ethnical belief, race, colour, and ethnic or national origins*". But again, although it mentions race without defining what it is, it does not treat any of these as relating to genealogical lines or descent, apart allowing multi-racial Jewry to be the one exception. Attempts to obtain a quantitative definition from Government and Race Relations as to what a 'Maori' is, for instance, have been fruitless. Until the 1960s, a Maori was a person of 50% Maori blood or above, in law. 'Race' is supposed to now be a matter of belief or culture.

THE BIBLICAL VIEWPOINT ON 'RACE'.

'Race' in the Bible is in the sense of genealogical descent from a person who is then known as the 'father' of that race. This is shown in statements like:

- Gen. 19:37 "*The same is the father of the Moabites*".
Gen. 19:38 "*The same is the father of the children of Ammon*".
Gen. 36:9 "*And these are the generations of the Esau, the father of the Edomites*".

From this point on, through Scripture, each group with such a 'father' is treated as being a different race with different destinies. Each then are treated as being from differing 'stock'.

The sons and grandsons of Abraham are the issue of his loins, and descent is carefully traced through the male line to him. Scripture indicates that there is something genetic in the line because when his immediate offspring took wives, they were to be of the same stock as Abraham. What we do know is that God placed the letter 'H' into the names of Abram and Sara, making these names Abraham and Sarah. This 'number of the spirit' indicates the placement of a 'spirit' endowment. This carries on within the offspring from Abraham to his physical descendants through Isaac who took a wife from the same 'family'. In the modern view of genetics there is no provision for 'spirit', and racial and heredity traits are claimed to be solely the product of genetic 'flow' coupled with environmental factors.

God is spoken of as "*The Father of Israel*" and this is said directly of no other race in the Bible -[e.g. Exodus 4:22-23]. From this it can be said that Israelites are *the children of God* -[Gr. *teknon*] from conception. Children are the offspring of a 'father' who begat them. In the Bible, men '*beget*' children from conception, whereas children are '*born*' of woman at birth. James 1:18 addressing the twelve tribes, speaks of God, "*Of His own will begat He us*". Only those referred to as "*us*" in context are 'begotten' with the 'spirit' potential to become the *sons of God* -[Gr. *huios*]. It is clear from scripture that all races cannot *hear* and all races cannot *receive the things of God*. Jesus said unto His disciples, "*Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven, but unto them it is not given*" -[Matt. 13:11]. The "*them*" in this case were the Edomite leaders of the Judean nation who, in the main, were not Israelites -[John 8:39]. It is reasonable here to relate the genetic base of Abraham's seed through Isaac to the 'spirit' placed within this race; Abraham being the 'father' of this physical race from his loins. This physical race had a 'spirit' which could *witness with God's Spirit that they were children of God* -[Rom. 8:16].

In scripture we are not given much detail about genetics or technical reasons why an Edomite became different from an Moabite, for instance. We can see that one came from incest, whereas this was not the case with the descendants of Esau. In the case of Jacob and Esau, these were twins of the same gender, but they were like the opposite of identical twins. They were "*two nations and two manner of people*" that would be separated from the womb of their mother -[See Gen.25:23]. Even with the same parents they had a genetic difference.

One was '*smooth*' and one was "*red, all over like a hairy garment*". [Different genotypes].

One was a "*a plain man dwelling in tents*" and one was a "*cunning hunter and a man of the field*". [Different in aptitudes].

One was a not a "*fornicator*" whereas the other was. [Different in morals].

One married within his own race, whereas the other did not. [Different in obedience].

One valued the birthright, whereas the other despised it.	[Different in values].
One nation and people were to become subject to the other nation and people-[Gen.27:29+37].	[Different in position].
One was loved by God, but the other was hated by God, even before he was born-[Mal.1:2-3].	[Different in treatment by God].
One is destined for eternity, but the other is destined to perish for ever [See Numbers 24:20]	[Different in destiny].

They were very different in appearance as well as different in behaviour. Because the two brothers were from the same family, the differences between them were not a matter of either physical or social environment! The popular view does not make any allowance for 'spirit' in racial considerations., and it is not unreasonable to view a connection between genetics and 'spirit'. Qualities like fair play and placing value on the sanctity of life and property certainly differ between races, and this is regardless of where each live. The Anglo-Saxon race in particular demonstrates these qualities above all other races, and this is a matter of their 'spirit'.

In the New Age/World Government view, racial appearance has no connection with behaviour, but from experience, few would believe there is no connection, as groups. Biblically, 'race', is a bloodline. We all know that race and a culture do tend to go together. Culture is defined by anthropologists as, "*learned behaviour acquired by individuals as members of a social group*". They then claim that a person is "*encultured at birth*". This then would mean that behaviour would be learned before birth. In other words, they have their behaviour pattern established from the time of being begotten, and before being exposed to any environment. Confirmation of this is shown by say a developing cell after conception, or by a migrating bird on its first flight. How would these learn any behaviour pattern?

There is evidence that genetic make-up can affect behaviour, for instance men whose sex-chromosomes are XYY have been shown to tend towards criminal behaviour. The question here of course is to consider if we blame the XYY situation and other things like multiple personalities on environment, or to race mixing in the past, or on some other factors? The evidence of multiple personalities within one person also suggests 'spirit' difference between one personality and another, where thinking, behaviour and expressing emotion change according to the personality being presently manifest. The present environment may not have changed between differing personality manifestations, so this is not a matter of environment. A particular personality being manifest may be of another race and language, so this too has no connection with environment. This all does not support the 'politically correct' position.

There can be no suggestion that either individuals or races are equal in their natural endowment. There are tens of thousands of paired genes within each of us and somehow the inequalities between Jacob and Esau were genetic as shown by their physical characteristics being quite different. We might not be able to detail exactly how 'spirit' affects future generations, but Esau was stated to be the 'father' of a race, apparently with a 'spirit' difference to that of the descendants of Jacob. The race of Edomites he fathered feature through scripture, as a race, up to the end of the age, and this fact is commonly ignored by most denominations.

Further to this God treated each of these brothers differently and we are told, "*Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated*"-[Rom.9:13 and Mal. 1:2-3]. We are not specifically told whether or not God loved one and hated the other because of a genetic difference, but this appears to be a matter of 'Spirit' endowment which could be associated with different genetic makeup. There is a lot in scripture about associating "spirit" and "Israel" as a holy seed. It is clear that God's hatred carries on to all of Esau's descendants 'for ever'. This statement immediately puts the Bible 'off side' with the Universal Declaration Of Human Rights. And, of course, few churches want to believe this Bible fact.

In the efforts to say all races are basically the same, it is not "politically correct" to mention any I.Q. differences between races. Those who want to deny this always seem to point to the genetic variation that exists within any given single human population, the variation being because of varying levels of hybridisation. Whilst this variation exists, there still is a wide range of genetic differences manifest in physical, physiological, and biochemical comparisons between all given racial groups as groups. When we talk about I.Q. no one can indicate why the brain should be immune from such comparisons between races. Sometimes we will hear a remark such as, "*They do not think like us*", or "*their ways are not our ways*", and that tells the story because this obvious fact of difference does apply between two races in one physical environment..

We can see propaganda in the media and in education which tries to say that there is no essential genetic differences between the races. Again they point to the variations within a group, but the multitude of books

on genetics still point to there being clearly identifiable racial groups separated on a genetic basis. A serologist can determine which of the major races a blood sample is from. How could this be so if there were not differing 'bloods'? "Time" magazine of 7/2/94 speaks about "*Subtle variations between races in white blood types mediate specific immune responses to disease*". This is saying that such differences do exist! The reasons for body transplant rejections demonstrates that important differences do exist.

The current Human Genome Diversity Project examining blood samples from 600 differing indigenous peoples is to determine the exact location of genes on the respective chromosomes, and this is providing templates of DNA genotypes and leukocyte antigens, and other genetic epidemiological pre-dispositions. Although this has potential benefit in medicine, it has been claimed that the object of the exercise is to facilitate the issue of a computerised Universal Biometrics Card for control, surveillance, or possibly elimination of certain populations by biological weapons or medical treatments. On one hand the propaganda says that there is no essential difference genetically between races, but academically will talk when it suits about "*population genetics*", this being the mathematical consequences of heredity on populations. This then declares that genetic makeup causes racial traits. The criteria used to distinguish racial differences lists physiological and biochemical differences, and by statistical correlation of protein molecules, seven distinct major races or populations can be recognised. A B.B.C. program of February, 1997 was about tracing family trees and ancestry, and how efficiently these could be mapped genetically. This was a clear statement that there are precise genetic differences between the races..

We have to decide what the truth is, despite threats of punishment for discrimination., and whether we are going to believe God or man regarding racial separation. The Bible does not support the goal of a class-less, sex-less, race-less and nation-less world society, and many Christians are taught that Jesus will bring this to pass at the second advent. But, what Jesus does at that time is to restore the Kingdom to Israel-[Acts 1:6]. This is in accord with Old Testament prophecy. Israel [not the State of Israel] then rules with God over the other races. The World Government/New Age seeks to eliminate the Israel people with the 'spirit', trying to dilute the 'spirit' content, encouraging this by racial intermarriage and promotion of immorality. Elimination is sought through abortion, 'safe sex', together with economic and political measures. They will come close to achieving this goal according to scripture. A phrase seen by the author in France in 1966 described this ominously as, "*The final solution of the Anglo-Saxon problem*". Seemingly they know more about who these Israel people are than the Christian Churches do! And Jesus says, "*Few there be that find it*".

Races, [described as "families" in Zech.14:16-18] and nations remain separate up to the time when "*The Lord shall be King over all the earth*". The very boundaries the Bible says that God placed between the races are ordained of God. The Bible contains at least twenty cases of sexism, racism, classism and prejudice within the first twenty four chapters. It is safe to say that the Roman Catholic religion does not support the Biblical view on race unless she is shown as being that "chosen race" as she claims. But, the one-world New Age-Communist-Catholic welfare world-state thinks that they are a god. They also think that they are a god, both in dispensing "rights" and taking away rights *according to the principles and purposes of the United Nations*.-[See the Universal Declaration]. They do not seem to think that God should have His principles and purposes likewise. The real issue in religion and politics is about is "a god" or 'gods' versus "The God".

Many anthropological books have been written about racial differences, including books on racially specific diseases. These diseases are not necessarily the product of behaviour or environment, even if we know that environment may change physical things like stature. The idea that we should merge and fuse all races by intermarriage will certainly widen the scope and extent of racially selective diseases. This would not benefit mankind.

Looking at these things we can see that the Biblical and the non-Biblical views on 'race' are quite different. Without realising it, many Christians hold to the non-Biblical viewpoint. This is because they have been taught it and accept the dogma without thinking. We might say that many Churches 'brainwash' their congregations into believing the "*Brotherhood Of Man*" doctrine. They do not realise that the Bible emphasises race differences. There would be no point in specifying a person's race, or of differing destinies, if all races were treated the same.

The Bible shows that God discriminates between 'men' in many ways:

Rom. 9:13	Before birth.	Gen. 17:17-21	After birth.
John 9:1-5	Physically	2 Peter 2:12	Spiritually.
Prov. 22:2	Financially.	1 Cor. 1:24-26	In calling.
Deut. 14, 25-26	Civil rights.	Rom.9:1-5	Religious rights.
Deut. 28:1	National privileges.	Amos 9:13-15	Material blessings.
Job 1:6-9	Choosing special people	Jer.30:11	One nation above another.

Let us travel along the 'race' road a little more and demonstrate some racial differences within the Bible. We have need to determine for certain the answer to the question posed in the heading the next section.

ARE ALL RACES THE SAME IN GOD'S SIGHT?

"Time" magazine of the September 30th, 1996, contained an anti-nationalism essay which suggests that nationalism is a beast that has caused war on earth ever since God said to Abraham, "*And I will make a great nation of thee*". But, the Bible says the God would make a nation out of a race formed from among the descendants of Abraham and that God's attitude to these would be different from His attitude to all other races. Differences between "seeds" begins early in the Bible, and it persists through the Bible until after the New Jerusalem is established on earth. Christians have been indoctrinated into believing that this is no longer true.

Early in Genesis we find the "*seed of the woman*" and the "*seed of the serpent*", so no one could claim these two co-existing seeds are the same. According to the Law of God, any seed reproduces "*after its kind*". They are of that 'kind' before they have done good or evil-[Rom.9:11] and before they have been subject to any environment. Prophetically these two seeds go through to the New Covenant era-[Gen. 3:15]. Even if many will not like the thought that these two types of mankind exist, Jesus confirms it by saying there are those who originate "*from above*" and those who originate "*from below*" from conception. We will see how this applies to mankind in the Bible. Eugenics is a Bible subject involving the separation of one people from all others, but in pointing this out, there is no provision for promoting racial hatred. The issue is not white versus black and yellow, or saying that all white races are better than dark races, either. It is a matter of the 'spirit' in the race, in the Bible.

THE DIFFERENT WORDS FOR 'MAN', ETC. IN THE BIBLE

Through the Old Testament, we find ten different words for "man, "men" and "mankind", but the four major different words in Hebrew are:

'adam	-[579 times],	'enowsh	-[567 times],
'iysh	-[1,713 times],	'am	-[1789 times].

There are places where two or three of these words for man are referred to in the one verse, thus showing comparisons, e.g.:

Ps.8:4 "What is man ['enowsh] that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man ['adam] that thou visitest him".

Ps 90:3 "Thou turnest man ['enowsh] to destruction; and sayest, return ye children of men ['adam].

God is mindful or marks the 'enowsh man, but He visits [*paqad*] the 'adam man. We do not find 'enowsh as being God's flock. Ezek. 34:31 says, "*And ye my flock, the flock of my pasture are men ['adam], and I am your God, saith the Lord*". But, in Proverbs 28:5 we read "*Evil men ['enowsh] understand not judgement*". With so many references to contrast these four words we should have enough to indicate a conclusion and to admit that there are differences.

It is not popular to divide the Word of God in the New Testament when it comes to "*man*", "*men*" and "*mankind*", but the distinctions remain. The majority words in Greek are:

<i>tis</i>	-[969 times],	<i>anthropos</i>	-[560 times]
<i>aner</i>	-[212 times],	<i>'laos</i>	-[143 times].

In John 10 we can read about Jesus saying that some there were His sheep [Israel] and also that others were "*not of My sheep*". Jesus says, "*I give My life for the sheep*". He went looking for the lost sheep, and gave His life for these sheep, but it is not recorded that He went looking for goats or other than "sheep", or that He redeemed or "*so loved*" other than the "*all the world*" [*kosmos*] of Israel. Denominations do not accept this limitation by Jesus claiming that things have changed somehow since Jesus said them.

Jesus says, "***Every plant which My Heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up***"-[Matt15:14], and so we have to admit that there are those planted by God and those not planted by God. In the New Testament we still find there are the good seed and the bad seed. The good seed are the children of the Kingdom-[Matt.13:38]. All of Abraham's seed are not children of the Kingdom-[John 8:33-37], but only those who descend through Isaac. As has been pointed out, seeds are either good or bad as seeds before they have grown or done anything. The popular evangelical teaching is that it is not the nature of God to treat one racial seed differently than another, and so they claim that God plants any one of any race in the garden, making planting a matter solely one of belief and not origin as well. When did God's eternal nature change? So, who plants the Tares and what is their end? Who then is right, Jesus or the churches? Who is right, Jesus or the World Government?

Looking in another direction, the word *aner* for "men" is never used of women, because women can never be husbands, but it is not the scope of this paper to go into all the details. People who believe that "mankind" always includes women must have difficulty with, "Thou shalt not lie with mankind as with womankind". There are nearly 2,000 references to 'husband' that are not inclusive of women. There are areas in both Testaments where God discriminates between male and female in people. The period of 'uncleaness' after childbirth is forty days for having a male child but eighty days for a female child. Modern Christians do not think that a sovereign God should discriminate between "men" and "men" or men and women, but the Bible is a very discriminating book!

Without taking note of the different words for 'men', 'mankind', etc, it becomes virtually impossible to sort out some verses. For instance:

Acts 17:26 *"And hath made of one blood, all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the earth, and hath determined the times appointed, and the bounds of their habitation"*

It is popular to use the first part of this verse to 'prove' that all races are the same and are of 'one blood'. But, the second part of the verse which is seldom quoted, talks about boundaries applying to 'all nations'. The 'one blood' applies to one kind of men in particular. The reason for this separation is given in the next verse, "that they should seek the Lord...and find Him...". If all races were the same there would be no boundaries.

Similar isolation is found in many places in regard to words like 'persons' in such as, "there is no respect of persons with God" in which the persons referred to are limited by the context. The universalists try to say that 'persons' means 'races', and of course there is no vague connection in the Greek for this. The context has to be destroyed to use such verses as a pretext for race-mixing..

There are many scriptures like, "Love one another" which are stretched beyond the context to try to make them apply the all men of every race in general. When we separate 'men' from 'men' we can see "all men" in a scripture like, "We trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men" is limited to the particular "men" concerned and the "we" of the context. The Bible remains an accurate source-book on anthropology and ethnology for God' people. The three great classifications of mankind into the Mongoloid, Caucasian and Negroid of Genesis 10 remains today.

"RACE" IN THE CREATION STORY OF GENESIS.

In both Genesis chapters one and two we have 'Adam' mentioned. Scholars may not agree but early translators, including the KJV, indicate plural in Genesis chapter one and chapter 5:2, but singular in chapter two. Even ignoring this, we have a man and a woman ["them"] being created [*bara*'] in Gen.1 before the 'Adam [singular] who was formed [*yatsar*] in Gen.2. "Created" and "formed" have differing meanings. We cannot remain honest if we try to say that "created" = *bara* ' is the same as "formed"= *yatsar*. [The same goes for *plasso* and *ktizo* in the New Testament].

In the genealogy of Jesus the Christ, we find from Luke 3:38 , "Which was the son of Enos, which was the son of Seth, which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God". We are told in Genesis 5:3 that it was not until 130 years later that Adam begat a son called Seth "in his own likeness and after his image". Neither Cain or Abel or any until Seth, the sixth from Adam, are said to be begotten by Adam "in' his own likeness, 'after' his image" and these do not feature in the genealogy of Jesus. Thus we have to question whether or not Cain and Abel's descendants, and any between Cain and Seth, are *in* that image and *after* his likeness either. If not then we have another division within the races.

Professor Michael Bennett in his paper "Doubleteness in Scripture" has the following note.

The key to understanding verse 26 is to compare the combination of prepositions and nouns with Gen 5:3:

Gen 1:26 - Let us make man..... in our image.....after our likeness.

Gen 5:3 - Adam.. begat a son..... in his own likeness.....after his image...and called his name Seth.

Briefly, research shows that in Gen 1:26, the Elohim (the *Creators* - not God Himself are about to create an order of life, human beings:

(a) They were *in our image* (in our 'shadow') - with mortal life versus the eternal life of the Elohim.

(b) They were *after our likeness* (with similar mental attributes) - it is the broad similarity between the mental capacity given to man and that possessed by the Elohim that is revealed in Gen 1:26.

Mankind was given the ability to develop technical and organizational skills after the manner of the Elohim. In Gen 5:3, the prepositon/noun sequence is reversed:

- (a) Seth was begotten in Adam's likeness because Seth would begin his life as a baby and so without similar mental attributes to Adam (until he reached adulthood).
- (b) Seth was born after Adam's because he would have a similar life span as Adam rather than a shorter span.

The sentiment is correct, but as we have seen in an earlier footnote, this is not the meaning of *in his image*. The most important difference between the mankind of Gen 1:26 and Adam in Gen 2:7 is that Adam received the Breath of God in his nostrils. Later, when the procreative power of Abram and Sara! was regenerated, the Spirit of God was embedded in their genes - memorialized by the addition of the fifth letter of the Hebrew alphabet to their names. God became incarnate to save these spirit-carrying people; His own people. Salvation requires that the individual believes God and belief is a function of the indwelling spirit, not of the natural flesh - as Jesus said to Nicodemus *what is spirit is spirit*. Hence there was no point in God becoming incarnate to people who do not have the indwelling spirit and hence no ability to comprehend and believe the things of the spirit.

From the sequence alone there is no way Genesis 2 could be a re-run of Genesis 1. Some take the view that, on a weight of evidence basis, there is more to say that Adam [as we use the word] was the first spiritual man, but not the first biological man. In other words, God took one man from Genesis 1 and breathed into him the breath of life. "*And man became a living soul*"-[Genesis 2:7]. The word "*became*" is consistently used in a manner showing that the subject became something that it had not been before. Eve was the "*mother of all living*" with God's breath, not of the others. This indicates that there are those with the Spirit, and those "*having not the Spirit*"-[Jude v19]. The latter is the "*natural man*" who "*cannot receive the things of God*"-[1 Cor.2:14], but he may become very religious. What we believe about these issues in Genesis conditions what we believe right through the Bible. From this we can see that there is no problem about where Cain found a wife; it was from amongst those who were not 'living souls'.

Because trees as trees cannot have the knowledge of good and evil, the trees in the Garden of Eden are shown to represent human family trees. We can see this through Scripture in such places as Ezekiel 31, "*Behold the Assyrian was a cedar in Lebanon.....*". Then it talks about, "*All the trees of Eden that were in the garden of God envied him*", thus relating this back to the Garden of Eden. These 'trees' represented the nations in the garden that the Adam who had become a 'living soul' was to cultivate or supervise. Satan as the Enchanter or Serpent, sought to seduce Adam, through Eve, to divert to his purpose instead.

We have to ask if Cain was the product of this seduction through being deceived into sexual relationships with the wrong "trees". There is no evidence that spirits can procreate on their own. We find early in Genesis both "*the seed of the woman*" and "*the seed of the serpent*", and as it was then, so it is today, with one seed hating the other and in no way have they now become the same. That is why Jesus could say of the Edomite leaders of the Judean nation, "*Ye are of your father the devil*". Adam comes from a root word meaning "showing red in the face" or "of a ruddy complexion", a description of part of the white race. Even today the serpent is attempting to reduce this seed by racial intermarriage, and to eliminate it by the other means mentioned earlier. The Churches have been seduced into believing that all races are the same in God's sight.

This paper will not expand racial issues such as mixed bloods, incest blood or bastards as shown for instance in Deut. 23:2-8, "*A bastard shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord until **THE TENTH GENERATION***". With Ammonites and Moabites this ten-generation prohibition is to be maintained "for ever". Israel was told, "*Thou shalt not seek their peace, nor their prosperity all thy days **FOR EVER***". With Shemites such as Edomites and Egyptians a regeneration period by mating back into Israelite stock takes only **THREE GENERATIONS**-[Deut. 23:7-8]. Up to the end of this period there is no access for them to the tabernacle. With the Canaanite we read in Zechariah 14:21 about the end of the age, "*In that day there shall **NO MORE** be any Canaanite in the house of the Lord of Hosts*". The Canaanite blood of any proportion is banned for **ALL GENERATIONS**. This then may include that section of mixed-race Jewry which descended from Judah's Canaanite wife-[Gen. 38:3], i.e. Shelah-Judah which are called Jews in 2 Kings 16:6, and who can be traced in the New Testament. These comparisons show striking differences in treatment between some races in the Bible. What this shows is that God treats even mixed offspring from differing races differently in the Bible.

God says He has war with Amelek [one of Esau's descendants] for all generations and that Israel was to "*blot out the remembrance of Amelek from under heaven*"-[Ex. 17:15 and Deut.25:19]. This is about the extermination of a particular race! Edom [also known as Idumea etc.] is stated to be "*The people against whom the Lord hath indignation **for ever***"-[Mal 1:4]. This race whom God says He hates are the enemy of Israel "*for all generations*" until they are destroyed at the brightness of Jesus's appearing. Beyond a few

races, the Bible does not mention the balance of races by name, and so no one has any right to presume anything about their destiny. We know:

1. That they cannot enter the Kingdom of Heaven since they are not begotten in the past "from above".
2. It is not given them to understand these mysteries [unto them it is not given -Matt 13:11].
3. They do not rise in the resurrection, not because they are condemned, but because there is no need for them to rise.

The Bible does not state that they are all condemned, but there are indications that most have benefit from, and should obey, the Laws of God. At the end, in the Book of Revelation, the New Jerusalem has the names of Twelve Tribes of Israel upon its gates. Zechariah chapter 14 presents the picture about the place of the other races. Certain other races will bring their worship to the New Jerusalem year by year, but they are not in the city. God discriminates racially up to the end of the age, and these things demonstrate the racial differences that are in the Bible. We have to either agree or disagree with Jesus when He says that the scriptures "*cannot be broken*"-[John 10:35]. The Old Testament discrimination *cannot be broken*; we have to believe this if we are to agree with Jesus.

Reference is often made to "*God's chosen people or race*" suggesting wrongly that "*The Jews*" equates to all of Israel. If these are "chosen", then all the others must be "unchosen". Scripture does not indicate that "The Jews" or Judeans are Israel, despite the popular suggestion. **Judaism has been a multi-racial religion since Bible days!** "The Jews" are not a singular race and they easily admit this themselves! The Encyclopaedia Judaica declares the "*Modern Jewry is Edom*" suggesting that the descendants of Esau are the driving force behind modern Jewry.

Four quotes from Jewish sources may personally help those who have been led to believe that the word "Jews" always relates to Israelites, and who might be wondering where they fit in.

1. From Alfred M. Lilienthal's book "What Price Israel".
"Here's a paradox: an anthropological fact, many Christians have more Hebrew-Israelite blood in their veins than their Jewish neighbours".
2. The Jewish author Yair Davidi in his book "The Tribes-Israelite Origins of Western peoples" [Foreword by Rabbi A. Field] tells in much detail that *the Saxon folks are Israel*.
3. Jewish author Harry Golden wrote in 1967,
"Isaiah the prophet wrote that the remnant of Yahweh's people would be found in the Islands of the sea".
4. Jewish Encyclopedia Vol. 2, P250 The Sacae or Sythians [Saxons], are the lost ten tribes of Israel.

These Islands can be shown as being be North and West of Palestine, i.e. the United Kingdom. The reader will probably be Anglo-Saxon, Celtic, or Nordic, who can be shown to be Israelites, apart from the white Japhethic and Edomic content-[Genesis 9:27 and 16:12], and the obvious foreigners, who have moved in amongst them. In the Divine foreknowledge, true Israelite posterity possess the inherent 'spirit' characteristics with which God purposed should be used to bring peace to the world and the casting down of demonic strongholds over the other races, under the righteous rule of Jesus Christ.

The Biblical message of God's severance of Israel from the other races is anathema to the New Age, World Government and also to those churches and Christians who have been seduced by the New Age or by the doctrines that originate from Roman Catholic sources. Quoting from Malachi Martin in "*The Keys of Blood*",

Pope John Paul 11 *"By the end of this decade, we live under the first One World Government that has ever existed in the society of nations.....a government with absolute authority to decide the basic issues of human survival. One world government is inevitable".*

So we can see here confirmation of where the Roman Catholic Church stands in association with world government. Likewise this church supports the fusion of all races and hence the dilution of the blood of the people with the inborn 'spirit' content. It must be noted that there are Protestant seminaries and denominations, together with big-name evangelists, who support this non-Biblical line. Evangelist Billy Graham is reported in the Charlotte Observer as saying,

"I don't see anything wrong with inter-racial marriage - there is nothing in the Bible to forbid it. It all comes down to a practical matter in today's culture" and, "Integration is the only solution. We've got to be totally integrated - in our homes, in our worship services, even in marriage".

Perhaps he reads a different Bible that does not talk about the Doctrine of Balaam, of Biblical separation and that Ezra and Nehemiah demanded divorce of foreign wives!

CULTURE

Anthropologists and other social scientists make the claim that 'culture' is learned behaviour acquired by individuals, but go further in saying that an individual is "encultured" at birth, the culture being transmitted from one generation to another. There is a degree where a child brought up in an alien culture will adapt to the new environment, but the pull of "roots" never disappears. When a person from a 'non-Christian' culture is "converted" to Christianity under the popular "born again" terminology, it is not hard to observe that all things do not become new. When such a person is removed from the Christian cultural area and placed back among the original culture, that person will again manifest conformity with the original culture. When traversing between cultures, such a person can be observed doing something like singing "*How great Thou art!*" and then immediately afterwards praying to the spirits of the dead! Ba'al remains underneath and there is the worship of God and Ba'al at the same time. The consequence of racial mixture is a hybrid worship, and this God does not accept.

Where we find racial mixture, the culture remains within the heathen portion. It can be readily observed even where the heathen portion is very small, that person usually will more easily identify with the heathen culture or race rather than with the majority portion. This is particularly obvious amongst the males, and it is also visible that those continuing to profess 'Christianity' are almost totally women.

It is popular today to say that all cultures are God given and thus that God can be worshipped within any cultural form. But, in the Bible, God's people are instructed, "*Learn not the way of the heathen*"-[Jer.10:2]. The word '*derek*' in Hebrew is given by Strong as, "*course of life or mode of action*". In Scripture, the 'ways' of God are contrasted with the 'way' of the heathen. This then is a matter of culture that God's people are not to learn. There are many examples in Scripture about Israel practising the ways and culture of the heathen following association with them and doing, "*according to the abominations of the heathen which the Lord cast out from before the Children of Israel*"-[2 Kings 16:3 and 17:8]. As it is the Lord who did the 'casting out', there is no excuse for any re-association with either the people or the culture. Further on in 2 Kings 17:15, this association is connected with rejecting the covenant made with "the fathers". Rejection of the covenant means being cut off from the covenant. Esau did the same thing, and we are warned in the New Testament, "*Lest there be any fornicator, or profane person as Esau*"-[Heb12:16]. The profanity is crossing a threshold or doorway according to Strong. It is popular doctrine today to open such a door and to encourage God's people to go through it. It is not difficult to follow the pattern of God's judgement following cultural mixture through Scripture, but this is now being encouraged both within and without the 'Church'. Any apparent break-through following years of faithful missionary activity amongst other cultures is only an apparent breakthrough through suppression of demonic activity.

Christians have to face the question whether or not preaching the gospel is relevant to everyday decisions involving culture. There is no support for "*Unity in Diversity*" as presented today. We have seen when God "*who changes not*" made the race of Israel spiritually 'different'. He required this race to have a separate and different culture to all the peoples on earth.

Earlier in this paper, the Encyclopaedia Judaica was quoted:

"Belief in a common descent from Adam was taken over by Christianity, and became one of the fundamentals of the Christian principle of equality of all men before God".

This "*fundamentals of the Christian principle of equality of all men*" is not a fundamental Biblical teaching at all.. What this wrong belief is is that it denies Biblical teaching about the separate culture of those begotten "*from above*". The majority of pastors and teachers today have changed the Bible message that there are a people who are "above" all races. The new belief is promoted by big-name evangelists, organisations like the Promise Keepers and others who have teamed up with the Pope and the New Age. Big money is poured into this program. They are trying to, as they say, "*break down the barriers and pull down the walls*" that God has erected between the cultures. They bring indigenous culture into the schools and churches and "*teach the way of the heathen*". The concept of promoting multiculturalism, and the fusion of all races has the support of the anti-christ! From the churches we now hear that all men of all races are of the same 'spirit' origin and that all can "hear". They will to not agree with Jesus! They must be false shepherds

We will now look at God's severance of Israel from the other races from a strictly Biblical point of view. God's purpose in this is clear!

GOD'S SEVERANCE OF ISRAEL FROM THE OTHER RACES.

Lev.20:26 "*For I the Lord am holy, and have severed you from other people that you should be mine*":

When God severed Israel from the other races, there is no indication that this severance was for any limited period, in fact the opposite is shown, as shall be seen as we go along. This separation is a racial separation, or we might say that it is racism on the part of God. Before saying anything about the identity of Israel today, we must first establish what both Testaments say exclusively about "Israel" **as a race**.

Deut. 4,7-8. "For what nation is there so great, who hath God so nigh unto them....and what nation is there so great that hath statutes and judgements so righteous as this law which I set before you this day".

This is the first verse we will look into which establishes the fact that the Statutes [= "choq"] and the Judgements [= "mishpat"], connects with Israel in a way that does not apply to other races. [NOTE: This does not mention other parts of the total law, i.e. "Torah", "Mishmereth", "Chuqqah", "Mitsveh" and "Tseqdaqah" which are translated in a mixed up way as ordinances, charges, commands, statutes, and justice, all of the latter being first mentioned in connection with Abraham].

Moses, speaking to Israel alone, declares in verse 13 that this does involve The Ten Commandments.

Deut. 4,13 "...and He declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments and He wrote them upon two tables of stone".

The Old Covenant was made with Israel as a nation alone, even if there was a "mixed multitude" there with Israel at that time. The issue here is not the Law as a total, but the covenant made to the congregation of Israel [*cahal*], in isolation from the mixed multitude journeying with them [*edah*].

Deut. 4,37 "And, because He loved thy fathers, therefore He chose THEIR SEED after them".

This is a genetic statement! This reference to the seed of Israel continues through the New Testament. It is sometimes presented in connection with the words "called," "chosen," "inheritance," "predestined," "redeemed," "elect," "foreknown" and "purchased possession". When we look at this, we have to ask if this "seed" of the Fathers is genetic [physical] or spiritual. If it is claimed that this is now a spiritual seed, we have to be able to say when this changed [if we can]. "Thy Fathers" in this verse, as in so many other verses, refers to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and not just Abraham as those who like to spiritualise the "seed of Abraham" only want to insist. We are told three times "In Isaac shall they seed be called" [Gen.21:12, Rom.9:7 and Heb.11:18], and so how can any other race be included?

Deut.7:6 "For you are a holy [separate] people unto the Lord your God. The Lord your God has chosen you to be a special people unto himself, above all the people that are upon the face of all the earth".

This is one of the early Bible statements about the unique exclusive "special people" place of Israel racially among the races on the whole earth. We have to ask if this continues into the New Testament; if not, whatever happened to this special race? Paul records about the Potter who made differing vessels according to His purposes-[Rom.9:20-23], and asks who do we think we are to argue with God. Christians still want to argue and find it hard to believe what the New Testament says about "vessels of wrath" which are "fitted to destruction" and "vessels of mercy" which are "afore prepared for mercy". God did make a decision and a choice upon a racial basis.

If Israel as a seed was to disappear as a race from the Bible, prophecy would forecast this. Paul asks, "Has God cast away His people? God forbid" -[Rom.11:1]. The separation of all Israel into two houses still existed of whom "part" were blinded [v7] but Israel as a whole "hath not obtained...". The fact of this separation is not commonly taught. Isaiah 11 shows the timing factors and the "envy" between the House of Israel and the House of Judah remaining until the time stated.

Deut. 32,9 "For the Lord's portion is HIS PEOPLE, JACOB is the lot of His inheritance".

"His People" are not every race on earth, as we can see. "People" here is 'am, which is used in the sense of a tribe among other peoples. There is not one clear statement anywhere in scripture to say that any other race than Jacob [Israel] genetically is God's inheritance. "Jacob" is mentioned 24 times in the New Testament and so there is no change to this racial identity.

Deut 33,29 "Happy art thou, O ISRAEL who is like unto thee O people saved by the Lord"!

The Apostle Paul concludes his discourse about two parties by saying, "And so shall all Israel be saved"- [Rom.11:6]. The two parties concerned are the House of Judah and the House of Israel, not Israelites and non-Israelites. The "middle wall of partition" was between these two. In truth then, is there any other race "like unto thee"? Does God in fact make a difference between races? He certainly does in all these scriptures. Has our unchanging God changed?

Numbers 23,9 "Lo, this people shall dwell ALONE, and SHALL NOT BE RECKONED AMONG THE NATIONS".

This again presents the separation racially of Israel from the other nations. In the New Testament the call is still to "Come ye out from among them and be ye separate...."-[2 Cor.6:17] "Touch" or *haptomai* here is a word used of carnal intercourse with a woman, like it or not -[confirm this in 1 Cor. 7:1-3]. The "them" in this verse are "unclean" people [not 'things' which is inserted as an added word] that are not to be "touched". "Unclean" or *akathartos* shows that there is a difference between 'clean' and 'unclean' people, with the clean not to 'touch' the unclean. The "yoke" in 2 Cor. 6:14 is with *heterozugeo* which means a *different sort* [Vine], or *one who is not an equal* [Thayer]. God also made clean and unclean animals and fish; each were born that way. There is frequent reference to show that God's judgement is upon those of Israel who transgress by having this common carnal intercourse with other races. This shows up also through the New Testament. Jesus says in the Revelation that He holds it against the churches which hold the Doctrine of Balaam-[Rev.2:14]. From the 60 mentions of Balaam, what this doctrine is is quite clear. Because almost all denominations hold the doctrine of Balaam without knowing it, we can understand just why it is never taught. Probably few know what this doctrine is, but all should if Jesus holds it against them! 2 Peter 2:15 indicates that people with this doctrine have gone astray. Jude v11 calls holding it an error.

New Testament "fornication" has not changed from what Old Testament fornication was, even if we like to try to say that *porneuo* has no racial connection today. In 1 Cor.10:8 we are told that all that is mentioned in this passage, are for examples to us. When we read what one example is, we find, "*Neither let us commit fornication as some of them committed, and fell in one day three and twenty thousand*". Look back to the Old Testament and find that what caused three and twenty thousand to die was Israelites having sex with non-Israelites-[Numbers 25:1-]. Moses even demanded that all Israelites who did this should be slain because of the idolatry that followed. King Solomon got caught this way and it also led to idolatry. We read of plagues in Israel because of this -[Numbers 25:6-8]. Ezra 10 tells that divorce is demanded where "strange" or "*nokriy*" non-Israelite wives are concerned. See also Nehemiah 13:23-27. These things are written for our admonition we are told in 1 Cor. 10:11, but because of the popular but wrong doctrine to the contrary, this necessity for admonition is not accepted today. Jezebel [also a foreign wife] is permitted in the churches today even if Jesus says He holds it against the churches-[Rev.2:20]. What this means is that the New Testament doctrine about racial intermarriage is the same as that in the Old Testament. So, when did the doctrine change to the belief that God no longer requires Israel to dwell alone, not to intermarry with other races, and be separate from the other races?

2 Samuel 7,23 "*And what ONE NATION in the earth is like thy people, even like ISRAEL, whom God went to redeem a PEOPLE, and to make Himself a name.*"

Note the singular emphasis here, and that redemption refers to this singular people alone. It is Israel alone who are stated to be the people God went to redeem. Galatians 4:5 and Hebrews 9:15 confirm that the mediation of the New Covenant was for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the First Testament [Israel only]. See also Titus 2:14 and Luke 2:38. To redeem something means that it must have belonged once before, and so redemption can only apply to Israel.

Psalm 78,5 "*For He established a testimony in Jacob, and a law in Israel, which he commanded our fathers*".

This is another scripture confirming many along this line. But where can we find any scriptures giving even a suggestion that the Law and Covenants were given to other races? "*Our fathers*" and "*the fathers*" are common New Testament expressions. So, all these New Testament people being addressed must also be Israelites!

Psalm 147,19-20 "*He hath showed His word unto JACOB, and His statutes unto ISRAEL, HE HATH NOT DEALT SO WITH ANY NATION, and as for his judgements, they [the other nations] have not known them*".

This verse is both limiting and specific and relates exclusively to Israel as a race. Churches in our land that believe this are very few. The "word" here is "*dabar*", or the spoken word in the sense of a specific direction, charge, instruction or covenant. "Statutes" here is "*choq*" and Judgements is again "*mishpat*", as pointed out in the Deut.4:7 reference above. This is a very clear statement, and note this spoken word is NOT given to other races! This is not a popular concept or popular teaching, but it is confirmed in both Testaments. Acts 10:36 says, "*The Word which God sent to the Children of Israel*" so we can see that the Apostle Paul agrees about this. But if God declares "*He hath not dealt so with any nation*" we dare not question this, even if denominations ignore it. Israel is unique! The judgements are "*mishpat*"...or God's verdict or decree. THE WHOLE BIBLE IS ABOUT ISRAEL AND ISRAELITES. Non-Israel races are mentioned in the Bible two ways, firstly as they impinge upon Israel and secondly in connection to world empires. It is not difficult to conclude that the Bible is a book primarily about God's purposes for Israel [as a people] because Jehovah is

consistently declared to be the God of this one people. Because we do not find this expression of purpose for other races, we cannot presume anything that is not said about them.

BIBLE STATISTICS CONFIRM THE STATUS OF ISRAEL.

Israel as "Yisra'el"	2,514 times [Old Testament].
Israel as "Israel"	70 times [New Testament].
Jacob [KJV].	358 times [24 times in the New Testament].
Judah	813 times
Ephraim	172 times
Manesseh	143 times
Hebrews	21 times
Lord God of Israel	110 times
God of Israel	90 times
Holy One of Israel	31 times
Lord God of the Hebrews	5 times
Mighty God of Jacob	4 times
Hope of Israel	2 times
Congregation of Israel	160 times [as " <i>qaha</i> "].
" " "	173 times [as " <i>edah</i> "].
Assembly of Israel	21 times [as " <i>atsarah</i> "].
"Ekklesia"	116 times in the New Testament.
Tribes [<i>Shebet</i>] of Israel	190 times [Old Testament].
Tribes [<i>Phule</i>] of Israel	31 times [New Testament].
People of Israel	19 times [KJV].
My people	231 times.

Then we find expressions like, Israel's God, the Light of, the Rock of, the Redeemer of, the Stone of, the Shepherd of, the Portion of, the God of; all of which refer expressly to Israel. In the KJV we find the words:

"of Israel" occur 1,692 times!
"to Israel" occur 23 times!
"for Israel" occur 24 times!

Then there are expressions like the "*The God of your fathers*" and "*fathers of Israel*" ["fathers" is mentioned 549 times including 56 through the New Testament], so there is no doubt about the sole race concerned because "*pater*" is a genetic term in context.

There is the intimate word "*Jeshurun*" for Israel. There are at least 5,000 direct references isolating Israel as a people. This personal God OF ISRAEL, Jehovah, [*Yehovah*] is mentioned 6,528 times by this name and 21 times as "*Yahh*".

From here on in this paper, we will look very briefly at a number of topics that connect in a doctrinal way with what has been pointed out thus far. Each paragraph below is a portion, or summary, of chapters from the author's book, "*The Exclusiveness of Israel*".

WHO ARE GATHERED TO GOD IN THE END?

Jer.50:6 says, "*My people hath been lost sheep*". It was the "sheep" that Jesus says He came to give His life for-[John 10:15]. Jesus said, "*I lay down my life for the sheep*". He goes on to say these sheep are from both the Judean and the Dispersion folds. Sheep are born sheep. Goats are conceived as goats according to God's Law "*after their kind*". Tares come from tare seed. The tares are to be burned and the goats are to be separated. **They cannot ever change how they were created.** Paraphrasing Paul's contention, "*Who are we to argue with God as to how the potter makes any vessel*"-[Rom.9:21]. The "election" is made before "*having done good or evil*"-[Rom.9:11]. Election is not because of God's fore-knowledge of what a person was going to do in the future; this is what many try to say to get around Scripture.

The 'gathering', or the 're-gathering' as it is often called is always presented in the Bible as being that of Israel. Jesus mourned over Jerusalem -[Matt.23:37] and His people whom He came to save....not over any non-Israel race. Jesus gathers only His Elect nation-[Matt.24:29]. Jesus gathers "*together in one the children of God that are scattered abroad*"-[John 11:49-52]. Note that they are "*God's children*" before they are gathered. In Ezekiel 37 the Dry Bones are stated to be those of both Houses making up the whole of Israel, and in the parable of the two sticks, that which is joined together are Ephraim and Judah. Right

through the prophets, the story is the same; none but Israelites are gathered and the two parties remain Ephraim and Judah, that is, all Israel.

WHO WILL JESUS ULTIMATELY RULE OVER?

Matthew 2:6 "Out of thee shalt come a Governor, that shall rule my people ISRAEL.

Luke 1:32-33 "And the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David, and He shall reign over THE HOUSE OF JACOB for ever".

Here we are told the ultimate rule is stated to be over Israel. No one can make the "House of Jacob" or "Israel" mean all races. Denominations do not like these restrictions, and so ignore them.

Acts 1:6 "Lord, will you at this time restore again the Kingdom TO ISRAEL"?

Jesus agrees about the Kingdom being **over Israel**, but does not disclose the time factors.

WHO IS BEING ADDRESSED IN THE BOOK OF ACTS?

The genetic fathers of Israel are mentioned in at least 20 verses through the book of Acts. These are the genetic/racial 'fathers' of those being addressed. God as being the "God of **OUR fathers**" and "the God of **Jacob**" is mentioned five times in the Book of Acts. In addition, consider the additional **racially specific** verses:

Acts 2:22 "Ye men **of Israel**, hear these words"

Acts 2:36 "Let all the **House of Israel** know assuredly...."

Acts 3:12 "Ye men **of Israel** why marvel ye at this..."

Acts 3:22-24 "For Moses truly said unto the fathers, a prophet shall the Lord God raise up **unto you**, of your brethren, like unto me...."

The limitation to Israel is specific. "Unto you" and "the fathers" confirms the limitation to the Israelites being addressed. That denominations like to extend this to include all races does not make it valid. Note that this is post-Pentecost, and in this church age; so it is not in this age that anything changed, even if most say it did according to popular teachings. The "fathers" and "your brethren" are again racially selective and are definitive.

Acts 3:25 "Ye are the children of the prophets...and of the covenant which God made with **our fathers**."

This is a RACIAL statement! It concerns only one race. Scripture is not supposed to be racist according to popular doctrine, is it? So when could this covenant to "our fathers" have changed after the Book of Acts?

Acts 10:36 "The word which God sent unto the **Children of Israel**..."

This confirms the Old Testament in Psalm 147:19 where we read, "He showeth His word unto Jacob, and His statutes unto Israel. He hath not dealt so with any nation..." Note the clear "not" in this verse. This also is racist, but it is Biblical!

Acts 13:17 "The God **of this people Israel** chose **our fathers**".

There are a multitude of Old Testament scriptures confirming this racial selection. We cannot ignore the relationship between Israel, "our fathers" and the people being addressed. They are the same race!

Acts 13:23-24 "According to His promise raised up **UNTO ISRAEL**, a Saviour, Jesus..." "To give repentance to all **the people OF ISRAEL**".

This verse is one of many that say Jesus was raised up unto Israel. The original promise was made to Israel only. There are no statements at all extending this beyond "all men" of Israel in context. Again this is racial in purpose.

Acts 13:26 "Men and brethren, **of the stock of Abraham**...is this word of salvation sent..."

We do not find any stream of references about the word of salvation being sent to any but Israel. This is yet another racial statement; we cannot change the meaning of "stock" and its 'kin' connection.

Acts 13: 32 "And we declare unto you the glad tidings, how that the promise which was made **unto the fathers**, God has fulfilled the same unto **us their children**..."

This is a straight genetic statement. The prophetic promise was made only to Israel. Who can really continue to pretend that Paul was speaking to non-Israelites [so-called Gentiles]. Paul goes on to tell about justification through Jesus "by which ye could not be justified by the Law of Moses", showing that he was speaking only to Israelites.

Acts 28:20 "For the hope **OF ISRAEL** I am bound with this chain."

Paul does not say it is the hope of all races. Note that nothing has changed at the end of the Book of Acts.

THE CHOICE is between:

[a]. The Bible which does not ever state explicitly that God is other than:

-the "God of Israel" [203 times].

-the "God of Abraham" [17 times].

-the "God of Jacob" [20 times].

-the "God of our fathers" [7 times and still used at the end of the Book of Acts, chapter 22:14].

or:

[b] The universalist doctrine of the "fatherhood of God" or "the brotherhood of man" where God is supposed to be the God of every race. "God" here is not Jehovah, the God of Israel. This is commonly believed even if there are no direct statements. This is the belief of the Roman Catholic Church, the United Nations, most cults and other anti-Christ organisations, so this point is worth weighing up. The belief of most Christians comes from the misuse of "all", "every", "whosoever" and such words which we will look at shortly.

ASK THE BIG QUESTIONS,

[a] Which option is right?

[b] If the first option changed, when was this? [We will look at Acts 28:28 and Dispensational Theory].

[c] Where are all the references to God being the God of all the other races?

[d] Where are all the specific direct references to God being the "Saviour" of other races?

[e] Where are all the statements about Jesus being the Redeemer of other than the "all men" and "whosoever" of Israel, according to each context?

Those who want to declare that there has been a change have to be able to deny the unity of the scriptures which Jesus says cannot be broken. The prophets did not prophesy of any change, so there is no change in what was prophesied.

There are many scriptures that state that those to be saved were already Jesus' people before He came, but who were in an unsaved state. Look at the scriptures below and consider if people become God's people after they are saved or if they are God's people already before they are saved and redeemed. In reading these verses, see that what is being talked about is the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy. Then ask again, "did this ever change, and if so exactly when"? The emphasised words below will help identify the subject people specifically in each verse.

WHO ARE SAVED AND TURNED TO GOD?

Look at the highlighted words; they eliminate all but one specific race only.

Matthew 1:21. "And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call His name Jesus, for he shall save **His people** from their sins."

Luke 1:16 "And many of the **Children of Israel** shall he turn to the Lord their God..

Luke 1: 55 "He has helped His servant Israel, in remembrance of His mercy, as he spake to **our fathers**, to Abraham, and to His seed forever".

Luke 1:68-9 "Blessed be the Lord God **of Israel** for He hath visited and redeemed **His people**. And has raised up a horn of salvation for us in the House of His servant David....as He spake by the mouth of His holy prophets.....to perform the mercy promised to our fathers.....

Luke 1:77 "To give knowledge of salvation **unto His people** by the remission of their sins".

Luke 2: 34 "Behold, this Child is set for the rising again of **many in Israel**."

John 1:31 "But that He should be made manifest **to Israel**, therefore am I come baptising in water".

Acts 5:30 *"The God of our fathers raised up Jesus.....to be a Prince and a Saviour.....to give repentance to Israel".*

Many Christians are fond of Isaiah 53, but they have not noticed the limitation of verse 8, "for the transgression of **"my people"** was He stricken". The popular beliefs infers that Isaiah was wrong. Has this really changed to include every other race? Those who want to be able to say this have to be able to say just when it happened and why Isaiah and other prophets are wrong.

TO WHOM WAS JESUS SENT TO AND TO WHOM DID HE SEND THE DISCIPLES?

Matt. 15:24 *"I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the House of Israel".*

Matt. 10:6 *"But go rather to the lost sheep of the House of Israel".*

Matt. 11:10 *"I send my messenger before Thy face which shall prepare Thy way before Thee".*

In the latter verse from Malachi message which is quoted in Matthew was to Israel only. It is recorded in the parables that the labourers were sent into the "vineyard", which is a limited area of application, and "last of all He sent unto THEM His Son". We do not find a specific statement about Jesus being sent to others. This is the particular "kosmos" that Jesus came to save.

Luke 4:43 *"I must preach the Kingdom of God to other cities also, FOR THEREFORE AM I SENT...and He preached in the synagogues of Galilee".*

Jesus confined His proclamation to Israelites, involving Judahites and Galileans.

Luke 11:49 *"Therefore says the wisdom of God, I will send THEM them prophets and apostles".*

The context here is totally that of Israel.

Luke 13:24 *"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killeth the prophets, and stonest them THAT ARE SENT UNTO THEE, how often would I have gathered THY CHILDREN together..."*.

Could we extend these scriptural limitations?

Acts 3:20 *"And He shall SEND Jesus Christ which before was preached unto YOU".*

Peter here goes on to tell about Moses's prophecy about Jesus being raised up UNTO ISRAEL; the people being spoken unto as being the children of the prophets OF ISRAEL. Can we really extend this constraint and say Moses was wrong?

ACTS 28:28.

The popular "Dispensational Theology" suggests that God deals with different "dispensations" in different ways and they split the Bible up into dispensations. When it comes to the New Testament they say that God finished with the "Jews" at Acts 28:28 -["*The salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles and they will hear it*"].- ...at which time signs, tongues and miracles are said to have ceased. By "Jews" they mean wrongly that it is Israel that is finished with. They quote "*For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom*", to say because God has finished with the "Jews", [by "Jews" they mean Israel], that signs, tongues and miracles required for the "Jews" are therefore finished with too. To overcome the mention of tongues, in the Book of Corinthians, they have to say that this book is included in the dispensation that ended with Acts 28:28. If they wanted to do so, they also could have said that the dispensation ended back in Acts 13:46 where Paul says there, "*Lo we turn to the Gentiles*". But, we find the same word translated as "sign" as in "*for the Jews require a sign*" occurs 14 times through the New Testament after the Book of Acts. We also find the word translated as "*miracles*" 68 times and "*wonders*" 4 times. So all these books of the New Testament also would have to apply only up to Acts 28:28.

There is no record of this teaching together with the "rapture" doctrine prior to 1830, and the proponents hide the fact that it originated in Scotland with prophecy made by a "tongues"-speaking 15 year old girl named Margaret MacDonald. The teaching was popularised by J.N. Darby of the Exclusive Brethren and the notes of the popular Schoefield Bible. The problem identities are "Jews" and "Gentiles" which do not refer to Israelites and non-Israelites as they insist, but to the House of Judah and the House of Israel. Dispensational Theology which divides up history into seven or eight "dispensations" instead of the two covenant periods, is just one of many ways attempts are made to support the popular and traditional misunderstanding and use of the word "gentile".

One of the incomprehensible things about those who support futurism and any form of dispensational theology is how they can quote Daniel 9:27 about "*the midst of the week*" and then say that the second half of that same week is sometime in the future. To do that they have to say things without prophetic or biblical basis like, "*God's prophetic clock stopped ticking*"! The "*great persecution against the Church*"-

[Acts 8:1]-" or the tribulation period from "the midst of the week" until the stoning of Stephen, was three and one half years [the second half of the same week of years]. At the end of this time the early church were "scattered abroad".

GENTILES.

Determination of this word and its meaning are critical. Concordances and Bible dictionaries will not always help, and will often only show usage, not meaning. Vine's Expository Dictionary points out that the word "ethnos" denotes "a multitude of people of the same genus". It can refer thus to Israel or to non-Israel, but "genus" can never be converted into "belief". In this paper we are not going to go through each book of the Bible to show that the traditional interpretation of this transliterated Latin word is wrong, but just to give sufficient example to show that the popular meaning is wrong. The following verse is said to be written to "Gentiles". Look at this one verse below carefully and then ask if the people being written unto were Israelites or not. Then ask the question, "Whenever could this have changed within this church age"? It had not changed at this stage which is within the present 'church age'.

1 Cor. 10:1-2 *"Moreover, Brethren, I would not have you ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the [Red] sea, And were baptised unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea...."*

The whole of this book is in the Israel context and does not include anyone else but Israelites. There is a mass of such confirmation through the New Testament. It is the pre-conditioning about "gentiles" that blinds the eye.

In the KJV the word "ethnos" is translated 64 times as "nations", 5 times as "heathen", 2 times as "people", and 93 times as "gentiles". BUT, we also find the word "hellen" sometimes translated as "Gentiles". The translators have made a sorry mess! Let us look further into this mess. Anyone who cares to take a look in any concordance will find that the words in both Greek and Hebrew for "Gentiles" are also used of Israel. Knowing this, then "have some fun". For instance, anyone can transfer translations for a given word and quickly find that when God said to Abraham, "I will make a great nation of you", it could equally be translated "I will make a great Gentile of You". Rebecca would have had two Gentiles in her womb, and thus Israelites would have to be Gentiles. The word "Gentiles" refers to any group of people of a common origin, and never did mean what Bible dictionaries try to make it mean. It is not difficult to "knock" the popular interpretation to bits of every reference in the New Testament that appears to contradict the right meaning of "Gentiles". We can look at every so-called type, such as the Ethiopian Eunuch -[Acts 8:37]- that is used in support of the wrong meaning and show that they are not valid. Either a look into the original languages or simple questions give us the answer, in this case such as:

- Would a black man have been allowed into the Temple at that time?
- What would a black non-Israelite man be doing going to an Israelite feast?
- Would we expect him to be reading the prophets?
- Could we be sure an Israelite could not have been in the employ of the Queen of Ethiopia?
- Why was there such a fuss when Paul wanted to take a Greek [suspected of being a non-Israelite] into the temple?

Anyone who uses a territorial/national term and converts the same into a racial term is liable to come to a wrong conclusion, every time. Yet, this is the common experience and teaching. For instance, when we read in Galatians 3:28 and Colossians 3:11, "Neither Jew nor Greek, circumcision or uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond or free", it is popular to treat the territorial terms as being racial terms. Those who promote this should then be able to say how four racial terms could cover every other race. What this verse is saying is that it does not matter whether or not the Israelites came from Judea, Greece, Scythia, or whether or not they had had a barbarous religion, and whether or not they had been circumcised. Further to this, when we read in Revelation 5:9, "And hath redeemed us by The Blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people and nation", it is popular to miss out the meaning of "out" [ek] and make this mean "of" instead of "out of" to try to accommodate every race. The prophets only spoke about Israel in connection with both the Blood and who is gathered to the City. It is also recommended that those supporting the popular doctrine should have a good look into the different meanings of "Christ", "Christ Jesus", "Jesus Christ", "Christ's" etc., according to grammar. For instance, where "Christ" is a verbal adjective, no one has any right to translate and use it differently.

It is popular to claim that Ruth was a 'Gentile', but Ruth who was an Israelite who had been living in Moab. We read in the first verse of the Book of Ruth about Israelites going to live in the land of Moab. That their sons married "women of Moab", does not tell us anything about race; Moab was where the women lived just as we find her Israelite family living in the first verse. Numbers 21:25-35 and Deut. 2:32-34 tell us how Israel killed off all the Moabites completely, and then occupied that land. For an Israelite to be known as a

Moabitess is no different than Israelites being known as Judeans or Galileans. It was unlawful for any Israelite to marry other than an Israelite, so Ruth would have to be an Israelite. Ruth was not an ancestor of Jesus because no female blood passes to the child and we are told that Jesus was, "without mother or father, without descent" in the Book of Hebrews. Because the Old Testament is so clearly racist we are quoting primarily from the New Testament, because this is where the changes are supposed to have been made. But, perhaps we should look at one more Old Testament verse which spells out the real position.

Jer 31:36 "If those ordinances depart from me, saith the Lord, then the seed of Israel shall cease from being a nation before me".

Note "the seed [*zera*'] of Israel". Those ordinances, the sun and the moon, have not disappeared yet, and so Israel is still the same people today. As the word for "nation" is the same as that translated "gentile" and "heathen", we could equally read "*the seed of Israel shall not cease from being Gentiles before Me*". We could even say Israel would not cease from being heathen! This becomes absurd if we take modern meanings! Yet, much more modern teaching is equally as absurd.

THE TWO PARTIES.

The traditional meaning of the words "Jews and Gentiles" are so ingrained into the sub-conscious that it is hard for anyone to think they might mean something else. After the time of Solomon and all through the prophets, the two parties are:

[1] The House of Judah. Two tribes. or "the *Circimcision*" [The Jew of the N.T].

[2] The House of Israel. Ten tribes. or "the *Uncircumcision*". [The Greek of the N.T.].

They are whom the "middle wall of partition"-[Eph.2:14] is between. A "middle" wall is in the middle of one thing, not in the middle of two quite different things. The one race in two Houses exists today with a wall between them, because the time of the total fulfilment about joining them together again into "*one body*" does not occur until Jesus returns, at which time He leads them both back to the inheritance land-[see Isaiah 11:1-13]. When the Apostle Paul concludes his argument about the Jew and Gentile, he says, "*and so shall all Israel [both parts] be saved*"-[Rom.11:26].

GRAFTING TOGETHER AND "NEITHER JEW NOR GREEK".

Of course, we all know that grafting in can only take place between trees that are both of a common origin, such as Israel and Judah are. In Romans chapter 11 it is popular to say that metaphor, "*contrary to nature*" means the grafting of things quite different together, suggesting the grafting of non-Israelites into Israel. But Vine points out that it means the grafting of a wild stock into a cultivated tree, rather than the normal grafting of good stock into a wild original. This of course refers to the House of Israel joining the House of Judah. The House of Israel had been divorced by God whereas Judah had not. If we look at the expression, "*God is able to graft them in AGAIN*", those grafted back must have been attached once before they were cut off. The problem again is the Latin word from which we get "Gentiles"; if the meaning was non-Israelites then these non-Israelites were never attached once before.

Where Paul talks about "*neither Jew nor Greek*" in Col.3:11 he is talking to the "elect" who always are Israel as a whole. The same applies in Gal.3:28 where those who had been under the Law [Israel as a whole] become equal and "all one" as they individually come under the New Covenant. John 7:35 tells us about those of Israel who are dispersed among the Greeks. What misleads most people is the mistranslation of "*hellen*" to read "gentiles", here and in other places. "Greeks" is used as a synonym of this dispersion 35 times in the New Testament. In no way could "Greeks" mean all the races who were not Judeans. Why would Paul pick just on "Greeks" [meaning Greek speaking] if he meant all races? It has to be noted that the translators did not translate here; they used the Latin-origin word "Gentile" to suit their doctrine.

STRANGERS.

In the Old Testament there certainly are scriptures that look as if they are saying that non-Israelite strangers could become circumcised, keep the Passover, the Laws of Moses and thus become as "*one born in the land*". The immediate necessity is to look at the word "*stranger*" and similar words like "*foreigner*", "*sojourner*" and "*alien*". In both the Hebrew of the Old Testament and the Greek of the New Testament there are at least eight different words translated as "*strangers*," "*foreigners*" and "*servants*", etc and this is the problem. Our translators [this includes the N.I.V.] have had no system of consistent translation of any one of these words. That there are "strangers" who are Israelites and "strangers" who are not Israelites is very obvious. The most common word with which there is mis-understanding is the Hebrew word "*ger*", that is translated as "stranger/s" 86 times out of the 92 times it occurs in the Old Testament. The meaning of this word might be summarised as being an Israelite who was living apart from the main body of Israel, i.e. living among, or in the land, of other races. The important fact is that this stranger was an Israelite by race. A word-by-word examination will show the premise about non-Israelites becoming part of racial Israel is not

valid. In the wilderness, the congregation of Israel contained both Israelites [the *cahal*] and also a mixed multitude [the *edah*], both of whom were travelling together. Only the '*cahal*' could attend the tabernacle. Both *cahal* and *edah* are translated as 'congregation' which makes for the confusion.

ADOPTION.

The whole popular presentation suggesting that anyone can be "adopted" into Israel is false. Paul says in Romans eight, "*Who ARE Israelites, to whom pertaineth the adoption*". Thus it does not pertain to anyone else than Israelites.

From the Extended Vines Expository Dictionary:

"The A.V. 'adoption of children' is a mis-translation and misleading.....It is not a putting into the family by spiritual birth.....Israel was brought into a special relation with God, a collective relationship not enjoyed by other nations".

Paul writing unto "Gentile" Israelites says Israel alone are the people out of whom the sons can be placed. These are the people who can "*be led by the Spirit*" from the bondage of the Law into the "*glorious liberty of the Children of God*". Only Israelites had been under the bondage of the Law. The word "*huiiothesia*" is never used to mean "*make anyone a son*". It is to "*place a son*". Each son who is placed already exists as a son. The Greek does not suggest making anyone a son, and some lexicons point this out.

Strong's G5206 also gives "*the placing of a son*".

Following up this in Thayer we find:

"That relationship which God was pleased to establish between Himself and the Israelites, in preference to all other nations.....It also includes that blessed state looked for in the future life after the visible return of Christ from heaven.....i.e. the consummate condition of the sons of God, which will render it evident that they are the sons of God".

Rom.8:23

"Which have the firstfruits of the spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body".

In this verse we can see an explanation of what "*adoption*" is, namely the redemption of our body. Adoption is not available to all and sundry. There is no way "*adoption*" refers to the popular concept of presently bringing non-Israel into Israel. "*Adoption*" does not apply to all and sundry.

THE GALATIANS 3:16 PROBLEM.

There is a major translation error in Galatians 3:16 where the verbal adjective "*christ*" has had a capital "C" put on it to create another meaning. As the verbal adjective it reads, "*And to thy seed which is anointed*". The "as of one" in this verse refers to Isaac out of all Abraham's seed. A reading through many commentaries will show how many commentators have copied each other for many years in saying something like, "*It is appropriate to say by the Holy Ghost*" to try to say that Paul did not mean what is written. This is to try to support the popular doctrine that the genetic seed of Abraham through Isaac has somehow become the seed of Jesus. It is really not only difficult but impossible to convert the "*sperma*" of Abraham into a spiritual seed! If any want to maintain this idea, then when exactly did the promise to the "*sperma*" of Abraham through Isaac and Jacob change into a spiritual seed?

Jesus was a "*minister*" to confirm the promises made to the fathers of Israel -[Rom 15:8-9]- that the nations of Israel [mistranslated "Gentiles"] might glorify the God of Israel. It is the House of Israel who were "gentilised", living apart from the temple system following their captivity in Assyria. The "*all nations*" [sometimes mistranslated as "Gentiles" and "heathen"] that were to be blessed in Abraham were none other than the Tribes of Israel. This is verified from both accurate translating in both Hebrew and Greek, and from the English. Both Abraham and Joshua were asked to walk through the length and breadth of the land, but neither walked through the entire globe, did they? The "land" here and the "earth" are the same word "*erets*" in the promise given to Abraham in the "*in thee shall all the nations of the earth be blessed*"-[Gen. 12:3]. The popular concept that "*all the nations of the earth*" means all races in the earth does not hold water. The promises to Abraham were passed on to Isaac and Jacob as a genetic line. Did Jacob [Gen.49] prophesy about any besides the sons of Israel for "*the last days*"? Did Moses prophesy anything different?-[Deut.33] When is this supposed to be changed and dropped? No universalist denomination will touch what Jacob and Moses say here.

THE CHURCH.

The *ekklesia* are certainly called out, but "out" from where? It is popular to say it is out of "the world", but the calling is of sons [*huios*] out of the children [*teknon*] of Israel under the New Covenant, which covenant was made with the same people with whom the Old Covenant was made. No race but Israel had an "Old

Covenant". This "world" where the church is called out from is the "*kosmos of Israel*"; it is not from the "*oikoumene*" or inhabited earth as is commonly taught. Each particular "kosmos" is determined by its context. There are no statements either in prophecy or in the New Testament to say that the New Covenant is made with anyone else but the House of Judah and the House of Israel-[See Hebrews 8:8-9]. The Redeemer is never once spoken of as other than the Redeemer of Israel, so when is this supposed to have changed? Were the prophets really wrong?

The supposed antithesis between, Law and Grace, Israel and the Church, which has been the subject of multitudes of difficult books over many years, disappears when we realise that Jesus Christ did not terminate the Law, but is Himself the climax or *telos* of the Law in harmony with the Law. Paul, in 2 Corinthians 3:6, claims to be a minister of the New Covenant, with the Old Covenant; it is the veil that is taken away from Israel when Israel turns their heart to the Lord. The total Law is not disposed of; it becomes written upon the hearts of Israelites-[2 Cor. 3:3].

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.

This is impossible to spiritualise. "*Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the Kingdom **TO ISRAEL***"-[Acts 1]. The reason why the 306 references about proclaiming this Kingdom is not carried out is because the Kingdom is made out to be something else by trying to spiritualise it. The throne of David over Israel is forever-[2 Sam. 7:12-16 and Luke 1:30-33]. From The extended Vines Expository Dictionary [Page 626] we can read, "*The Kingdom of Heaven....is used only....in connection with Israel*". Vine details the difference between the 'Kingdom of Heaven' and the 'Kingdom of God'.

ISRAEL, GOD'S FIRST-BORN SON.

It is often said, "*As Creator He is father to all men, but he is the 'spiritual' Father only to believers*". Although there is one reference in Malachi. 2:10 that appears to be at variance, the context is strictly Israel only, God being the Father of the particular "us" being addressed. In other verses, "*as many*" is not "*all*". Through scripture Father = "ab" simply is NOT used in the creative sense but consistently in the sense of a person who fathers children. Moses was to tell Pharaoh, "**ISRAEL IS MY SON, EVEN MY FIRSTBORN**".-[Ex.4:22]. Under God's law "*all **the firstborn** of thy sons shalt thou redeem*"-[Ex.34:20]. God says, "*All **the firstborn** are mine*"-[Num.3:13]. "*All **the firstborn** of my children I will redeem*"-[Ex.13:15]. God does not break His own law by redemption of or for everyone else as is commonly taught today, although obedience to the father is still required of the other sons. The Church is the church of *the firstborn*-[Heb.12:23] in the New Testament, the general assembly being plural.

"GO INTO ALL "THE WORLD" "to every creature".

So far we have only skimmed the surface and made some points. From here we will look in more detail at the two much-loved verses which are used to contradict the flow of scripture.

John 3:16-17 For God so loved **the world** that He gave is only begotten Son that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not His Son into **the world** to condemn the world, but that **the world** through Him might be saved.

Mark 16:15 "and He said unto them, go ye into all **the world** and preach the gospel to every creature".

These are two much quoted verses. "The world" has been emphasised. In both cases it is the same word "kosmos" in the Greek. This word "kosmos" is probably one of the least understood and mis-used words in the New Testament, and perhaps we should take a short-cut and make statements about the word "kosmos" that is usually translated as "world". It does not mean every race or the inhabited earth-["*oikoumene*"]. Nor does it mean the land mass of the earth or its soil-["*ge*" and "*ghay*"].

Its prime meaning is "order", "arrangement" or "beauty", but never the common multi-racial meaning as taught. It often means that particular world which is being spoken about, to the exclusion of other "worlds".

It can refer to other things than people, e.g. the adornment of woman's hair [-see I Tim.2:9 where "*kosmos*" is translated as "modest"]. This is particularly hard to preach the gospel unto!

"*Kosmos*" is spoken of, not only as the world that now is, but also of that which is to come. [Do we preach to the world to come?].

"*Kosmos*" is used of the world that was before the flood-[2 Peter 2,5]. This world was destroyed-[Heb.11:7], although the principle continued through Noah and Abraham.

"Kosmos" can mean the whole 'world' of wicked and reprobate men as opposed to the "world" of God's elect.

"Kosmos" is used of many other things and these can include either order or disorder, fame and honour, the orderly universe, the stars in the universe and even heaven!

So, which "world" of all these "worlds" did God "so love"? From the scriptures we can see that there are differing kinds of "worlds". In the Old Testament we are told that God loved Israel. There does not seem to be a single direct reference to God loving any other race. Let us consider the Israel order [or "world"] whom God says He loved in the Old Testament.

Deut.7:8 *But the Lord **loved you**, and because He would keep the oath which he swore to your fathers..." [i.e. Israel].*

Psalm 47:4 *"The excellency of Jacob **whom he loved**".*

Isaiah 63:7-9 *"I will mention the **loving kindnesses** of the Lord.....and the great goodness toward the House of Israel.....in his love and pity he redeemed them....".*

Hosea 3,1 *'...according to the **love of the Lord** towards the children of Israel".*

Hosea 11:1-4 *"When Israel was a child, then I **loved him**....I drew them with cords of a man, with bands **of love**".*

Zeph. 3,17 *"The Lord thy God in the midst of thee [i.e.Israel] is mighty, He will save, he will rejoice over thee with joy, he will rest in **His love***

Malachi 1,2 *"Yet I **loved Jacob**....and I hated Esau".*

N.B. If God hated just Esau, then Edom could not be included in the "all" of "Go ye into all the world" and "God so loved the world".

Quoting from R.K. and R.N.Phillips in "The Book Of Revelation", part 2, [page 25]:

"For those who are firmly convinced that the one who was crucified is Gentle Jesus, meek and mild, please note that He is capable of hate. The Greek word is "miseo", to hate, regard with ill-will, to detest, to abhor. This puts the followers of the Nicolaitanes in the same category as Esau [whom God hated before he was born]. If deeds have nothing to do with resurrection, why does Jesus make such a statement about the deeds of the Nicolaitanes? If all men are equal before God, why did God hate Esau before he was born?"

In the Old Testament we have expressions of the Israel people that God "so loved." Cast the mind back to all the scriptures in the New Testament we have looked at which show the exclusive nature of Israel. Both tell of the love of God for Israel in a way which separates Israel from the other races. Are we now to believe that this people Israel have somehow disappeared, despite prophecy to the contrary? If any reader still has reservations about "the world" having different meanings, we will look at pairs of verses each of which contain the words kosmos ="the world".

Pair One.

John 7:7 *"**The world** cannot hate you, but Me it hateth".*

1 John 3:13 *"Marvel not, my brethren, if **the world** hates you".*

If both of these two "worlds" were the same, then the disciples could not be hated by a world that was not able to hate them. Both worlds are "kosmos", but are different worlds.

Pair Two.

John 17:6 *"I have manifested Thy Name unto the men which thou gavest me out of **the world**".*

John 17:14+16 *"They are not of the world, even as I am not of **the world**".*

In one verse they are out of "the world" and in the second they are not of "the world".

Pair Three

John 17:18 *I pray not for **the world**, but for them which thou hast given me; for they are Thine".*

John 3:16 *"God so loved **the world**".*

Might it not be blasphemy to suggest that Jesus would not pray for that world He loved? So He would have to pray for one "world" and not for another! Here are demonstrated three pairs of scriptures which show contrasts in the "worlds" they are talking about.

THE "WORLD" - "KOSMOS" OR "OIKOUMENE"?

These two words are both translated "world", but they are different in application and meaning. "Kosmos" is determined by context to say which particular world is being spoken of, whereas "oikoumene" roughly means the inhabited earth in general.

We can see the true meaning of "oikoumene" easily in verses where it is used like Luke 2:1 where Caesar was to tax "all the world" and Acts 11:28 about a famine throughout "all the world". In Acts 17:6 we read where the disciples "turned the world upside down". In Acts 19:27 we read about "all Asia and the world" worshipping the goddess Dianna and in Acts 24:5 about Paul being said to be "a mover of sedition throughout the world". In Rev.3:10 Jesus speaks about the "hour of temptation which shall come upon all the world". In Romans 10:18 we are told the Word of God went "into all the earth" and "unto the ends of the world". When we remember that both parts of Israel were scattered among the nations this is easily understood. We might say that the "kosmos" of Israel was scattered throughout the "oikoumene". Jesus came into the "oikoumene" [Heb.1:6] to minister to the "kosmos" of Israel.

God's love to the Elect is in no way limited. He so loved this "world" of His Elect. This is the order of Israel He loved and sent His Son to redeem. This is whom Jesus died for. It is pointed out again, He came "to save HIS PEOPLE from their sins". Scripture says, "Whosoever believeth on Him shall not perish, but have everlasting life". We have to look at which "world" is being addressed and see that the "whosoever" refers to "all" of that part being spoken about and not "all" of everything. Lexicons support this. The context here is Israel so "whosoever" refers to "whosoever of Israel".

When we go back to the Old Testament scriptures with understanding we will see many references that say that part of the total law, namely the Statutes, the Judgements and the Ten Commandment were given to Israel ALONE as a covenant. This is vital to understand. Redeeming Love can only mean redemption from the curse of a broken Law. This Law Covenant had not been made with all races. Israel is the world Jesus came to save. He "bought back" or redeemed Israel. No other races could possibly be redeemed or "bought back" again, because they had not been there in the first place.

When Jesus said "I am the light of the world", the "world" in each case it is the "kosmos", not "oikoumene". The disciples of Jesus were to be lights to the "kosmos" of Israel, not the "oikoumene". This is confirmed when Jesus told the disciples to go to ONLY to the lost sheep of the House of Israel. What has changed, and when did it change?

We find a similar difference that is often missed with the word translated "earth". In Isaiah 54:5, for instance we read, "Thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel, the God of the whole earth shall He be called". The "whole earth" does not mean the whole globe [*ge* or *ghay*]. The word in this verse and others similar is "erets"; each race has its own separate "erets" or land. John 1:11 confirms this, "He came unto His own, and His own received Him not". There are two different words for "own" in this verse; one is His land etc, and the other is His people. It is popular to ignore the differences between "kosmos" and "oikoumene", and also the difference between "erets" and "ge" because they cannot fit in with popular all-race doctrines.

JOHN CHAPTER THREE. ..."BORN AGAIN"?

Jesus did not say anything about a second time even if the translations make Him appear to say He did. JESUS DID NOT USE THE WORD "AGAIN" AT ALL HERE! There is no manuscript at all that says Jesus used the word "again". It was Nicodemus who used the word "deuteros" = "a second time". Jesus did not use this word "deuteros"; Jesus used the word "anthen"

Strong's G509 for "anthen" includes "from above", or "from the first".

Thayer: "Anthen' is used of things that come from heaven [from God], or from a higher [upper] place, or from the very first, or from the origin".

Jesus was speaking of something which existed at the time of speaking, and of having an origin in the past. The adverb "anthen" always relates to place and is used of past or former time, never the future time. Knowing this one word difference helps understanding and shows up the problems there are with the popular concept. Jesus confirmed to Nicodemus that He was not speaking of a second birth when He told Nicodemus that He was referring to being born of water and of Spirit. Jesus did not use the future tense as did Nicodemus.

"Born" in John 3:3-5 is "*gennao*" and it is found 98 times in the New Testament. The sense usually has connection with procreation; the most prominent meaning being "beget" or "begotten". We must thus determine the time when this begetting takes place. Jesus was begotten before the foundation of the earth but He was born later of Mary. Teachers in bulk insist that people already born can be re-born in the future to try overcome this difference. If we want to understand its use in John 3:3-5, it is necessary to look at the Greek tenses which are not the Future tense. Modern theology or teaching likes to use the words in the Future tense [from tradition], but this is a total error. We have been taught so wrongly to use the words, "*except a man be born again*" in the Future tense, but this can never possibly relate to "*begotten*". Jesus taught exactly what is taught through the Old Testament that God's race are born from an original sowing, back in the past

Going back to John chapter three where Jesus was talking with Nicodemus, a Master of Israel. In context, Israel is the "world" they were talking about. Consider, "*For God so loved the world*"; the word "for" connects with what is spoken of immediately above. This provides the context. To whom is Jesus speaking with? This tells us what *kosmos* is being spoken of. The whole subject matter concerns Israelites and a master in Israel, Nicodemus.

Verse 3 They have to be begotten "*from above*" [not "*again*" as translated] to be able to perceive [in their minds' eye] the Kingdom. Remember that Jesus used the word "*another*"; it was Nicodemus who used the word "*deuteros*" or "*a second time*", not Jesus.

Verses 5-7 Unless this spirit is inherited FROM CONCEPTION, none can enter the Kingdom [1 John 3:9]. "Begotten" and "born" are mixed up by translators and are different in meaning!

Verse 8 We, [the Israelites] have [all] received the Spirit of God].

Verses 14-15 "*Even as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of Man be lifted up*".

To what race did Moses lift up that serpent? What race only was then healed and cleansed from the serpent bites? Jesus was 'lifted up' to the same people, Israel, and Jesus is saying that the "*even as*" applies just to those same people He died for.

WHICH "WORLD"?

At the beginning of this chapter we quoted Mark 16:15 about going into all the "*kosmos*" and "preaching" [i.e. proclaiming] the gospel to every creature. Which "world" were the disciples to go into? This is a fair question. When the disciples were sent to the "*Lost sheep of the House of Israel*", to whom and to which "world" were they sent? When Jesus said in Matthew 15:24, "*I was not sent EXCEPT to the lost sheep of the House of Israel*", to what race was He sent? Are we to say Jesus was wrong, and that He was sent to every race? Are we to say Jesus was wrong in sending His disciples only to Israelites? If the disciples were told, "*go ye into all the world*", why did they not go to the Negroes, the Chinese or the Indians? Why did they choose only one direction and go to where the Children of Israel were? Where the House of Israel were at that time can easily be established historically. They were in parts of the old Greek empire, this is why these Greek-speaking Israelites are called Greeks.

Matt. 11:1 "*He departed thence to preach in their cities*".

Matt. 10:6 "*Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans, enter ye not, but go rather to the lost sheep of the House of Israel, and as ye go, preach saying, the Kingdom of God is at hand*".

The disciples were instructed specifically not to go to certain peoples. The disciples of Jesus went out from Galilee knowing exactly where to find these "*lost*" sheep. They were not so "*lost*" that they could not be found! The disciples did not stay in Judea with the Judean Israelites either! These "*lost*" or *apollumi* sheep of the House of Israel were "set aside for correction". They needed saving, as well as the Judean Israelites.

"ALL", "EVERY ONE", "WHO-SO-EVER", "EVERY CREATURE" ETC.

Consider again these two verses:

John 3:16 "*God so loved the world...*"

Mark 16:15 "*Go ye into all the world...*"

Such verses are the basis of the thought that the "*go and preach the gospel to every creature*" of Luke 16:15, refers to going to every person of every race on earth. Let us consider some of the words in these verses.

[a] Preach or "*kerusso*" means to proclaim, or to announce good news like a town crier. It does not mean "to make disciples" or "to evangelise" as many teach.

[b] But where were they to make their proclamations? Was it to everyone of every race? Let us look at "every creature". The Greek word "ktizo" is given by:

Strong's G2936-7 as "*original formation, building, creature, and ordinance*".

Vine's Dictionary of New Testament Words says "ktizo" is "*used among Greeks to mean the foundation of a place, a city, or a colony*".

Thayer's Lexicon says: "*To make habitable to people, a place, region, island*" The verb "ktisis" is the act of creating as in Rom. 1:20 and Gal. 6:15 and indicates the product of the creative act. Thayer says further, "*The act of founding, establishing, building*", and, "*of some particular kind or class of created things or beings*".

This is the "creature" in Mark 16:15. The word "ktizo" in the classics is used in the sense of a village, or place where certain people live. The disciples were to go specifically to the places or the villages, cities, colonies or places where the Israelites lived.

Matt.10:23 "Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel until the son of man be come".

We cannot make "*the cities of Israel*" to mean the cities of every race. Note here that Jesus is speaking primarily of the time of the end. What is the area of evangelism? Is it not all the world of Israel? What were they teaching? Was it not the Gospel of the Kingdom? The Kingdom is what Jesus and John the Baptist came proclaiming, "*Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand*". Who proclaims that today? It is impossible to believe and teach both the traditional universal gospel to all races and the exclusive Kingdom of Heaven over Israel at the same time.

Here Jesus is talking about the end of the age. Likewise, He confines "*all the world*" to the cities of Israel! In other words it is the dwellings or places throughout the earth where the Israelites live, right up to the end of the age. In the Old Testament, there is not a suggestion that Israel should try to convert other races so that they could join Israel and thus share the same inheritance. The inheritance land was not promised to other than the 'Seed of Abraham'.

"ALL", "EVERY", ETC. ARE LIMITED EXPRESSIONS.

In other words, does "*all*" usually mean "*all of everything*" or "*all of that part being spoken about only*". Does "*all the world*" mean all the planet, or just all of that part of the planet being spoken about? A look through Young's Analytical Concordance will show how these words are used. This will give an indication without having to go into the Greek. Being certain on this topic is well worth the time involved researching lexicons and concordances. To grasp the use of "all" in Greek and Hebrew, consider Deut.28:10, "*And all the peoples of the earth shall see that thou art called by the name of Jehovah, and they shall be afraid of you*". Here, "*all the peoples of the earth*" does NOT include Israel. In the same way, "*go ye into all the world*" is not all inclusive of every race. Failure to understand this is the source of error in the normal teaching. Jesus says that it is not given for everyone to hear or to understand. Immediately we have just one exception then "every" and "all" cannot include that exception, or the other exceptions. If an exception is made about the Edomites who cannot find repentance, or of those Jesus said, "*Leave them alone*", then these cannot be part of the "all" being addressed. Jesus did not preach to certain peoples, as we have seen. It is recorded that Jesus said ten times, "*Who hath ears to hear, let him hear*". Consider whether or not this means that there are those who cannot hear. Jesus said to the Edomite leaders of Jewry, "*Ye cannot hear my words*"-[John 8:43]..

"GOD WILL BE GRACIOUS TO WHOM HE WILL BE GRACIOUS".

Romans 9:18. "Therefore hath He mercy upon whom He will have mercy, and whom He will He hardeneth".

God does what He wants. So, is He really gracious to everyone of every race? We are told about the Potter who makes one vessel unto honour and another unto dishonour, and about vessels "*fitted for destruction*" and a different lot of vessels "*afore prepared for glory*". It is the Potter who fashions the vessels from the raw materials before they have done either good or evil. Paul asks who we think we are to argue with God?-[Rom. 9:20]. Yet denominations still think God is wrong and want to argue this!

To those who say, "*All is now of grace to everyone of every race*", listen to the much-loved writings of the well known author Selwyn Hughes in "Every Day With Jesus", in the daily reading for 17th February 1994:

"The word 'grace' is unquestionably the most significant single word in the Bible, I agree. But it must be understood right away that grace is a characteristic of God which is exercised only towards those who are seen as having a special relationship with Him. Nowhere in the Bible is the grace of God

ever mentioned in connection with mankind generally, though some theologians frequently use the term 'common grace' [a term not mentioned in the Bible] -the idea that God gives a special form of grace to the whole of mankind which restrains them from being as bad as they could be.

The other day I came across a writer who said, "The creation of the universe was an exercise of grace". I understand that he might have been using the word 'grace' as a synonym for love, [a mistake often made by Christian writers],but strictly speaking the exhibition of grace is reserved for the elect....."

Selwyn Hughes then quotes Arthur W. Pink as saying:

"Grace is the sole source from which flows the goodwill, love and salvation of God unto His chosen people".

Quoting from "The Best of Spurgeon", Pages 62-3,

"Why should not Jesus Christ have the right to choose His own bride?"

"You must first deny the authenticity and full inspiration of scripture before you can legitimately deny election".

"Whatever may be said about the doctrine of election, it is written in the Word of God with an iron pen, there is no getting rid of it. To me it is one of the sweetest and most blessed truths in the whole revelation, and those who are afraid of it are so because they do not understand it. If they could but know that the Lord had chosen them, it would make their hearts dance for joy".

We just cannot change the racial basis of election; the New Covenant opportunity being given to both Houses of Israel-[Heb. 8:8]. We cannot say the Bible is not racist. The mechanism for bringing the other races into subjection is by them witnessing God's blessing upon Israel as Israel obeys God. The principle shown by Jesus is when others witness "that ye have love for one another". When Paul took a contribution from Macedonia it was for the "poor saints" at Jerusalem, not for all and sundry of the poor. Denominations like to extend this beyond the context of "yourselves" because they think that "yourselves" means all races. So feeding the hungry and foreign aid is extended beyond the purposes of God.

In the end, the word of the Lord **TO ISRAEL** [Mal.1:1] and to **THE SONS OF JACOB** [Mal. 3:6] is "That they shall be mine, saith the Lord of Hosts, in that day when I make up My jewels -[Mal.3:17]. This is not addressed to any but those of Jacob/Israel who become sons. Have a look through the scriptures and see who these "peculiar", "special" jewels are. Psalm 135:4 says," For the Lord hath chosen Jacob for Himself, and Israel for His peculiar treasure"..[or Jewels]. In the New Testament they are still the same holy, separate, elect, precious, peculiar people.

IN THEE SHALL ALL NATIONS BE BLESSED

Gal 3:7-9 Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached (proclaimed) before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, in thee shall all nations be blessed. So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham.

This verse together with and the verses below, are favoured by universalists because they seem to present a universal gospel for all races. "Nations" is sometimes translated emotively as "Heathen" to try to add weight to the universal argument. To understand any passage of Scripture it is necessary to look at it as a whole by going back to the prophecy behind it to see what it is fulfilling.

To Abraham:

Gen 12:2,3 And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing; and I will bless them that bless thee, and will curse him that curseth thee, and in thee shall **all families of the earth** be blessed.

Gen 18:18 Seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great and a mighty nation, and all **the nations of the earth** shall be blessed in him?

Gen 22:18 And in thy seed shall all **the nations of the earth** be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice.

To Isaac:

Gen 26:3 Sojourn in this land, and I will be with thee, and will bless thee; for unto thee, and unto thy seed, **I will give all these countries**, and I will perform the oath that I sware unto Abraham thy father.

To Jacob:

Gen 28:14 *And thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south: and in thee and in thy seed shall all the **families of the earth** be blessed.*

To Israel:

Psalm 22:27 *All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord: and all **the kindreds of the nations** shall worship before thee.*

Here are six important verses which are used to support the doctrine of universal racial salvation. Indeed, they do appear to give valid support on the surface. But do they actually say what the religious translators make them say? Is this the problem here?

THE "FAMILIES OF THE EARTH" BEING BLESSED IN ABRAHAM

The major source of error in these *blessing* passages is what we mean by certain words. We have different words translated as *earth* and the *ground, countries* and the *land*, as also occurs with the words translated *nations, families* and *kindreds*. Although an extensive technical Hebrew language exposition is beyond the scope of this book, there are things that need to be pointed out.

Originally Abraham was told to go from his father's house unto an *eretz* that God would show him. If *eretz* here is the whole Earth, then Abraham must have gone to another planet! Abraham was told *all The 'Earth' which thou seest, I will give thee*. He was told to arise and walk through the earth. Did he walk across the whole globe? So we have to ask if this 'earth' is the whole earth or the promised land. It is not all the 'eretz' of all the races on earth. Abraham was told to get himself out of his present *earth* and to go to *THE earth*. There are many references which give confirmation of the meaning. *THE earth* does not mean the whole globe, but rather that portion belonging to the particular area or person under consideration.

Contrary to popular presentation, we must note that in Genesis 12:3, the 'them' in *I will bless them* is plural, whereas the 'him' in *I will curse him* is singular. The Hebrew allows for two possible translations of *be blessed*, namely:

*may be blessed in, or by, association with thee, and
may bless themselves [as the RV footnote says].*

Some awkward questions could be posed here if it was to be taken that *all nations* had the meaning of "every race on earth":

1. If those who curse Abraham are cursed, how could those so cursed be part of *all nations* which were to be blessed?
2. Were the Egyptians blessed or cursed through Israel's presence during their captivity and also in the Exodus?
3. When the Children of Israel went into the Promised Land, they were told to exterminate all the Canaanite nations. Was not that an unusual way of blessing the Canaanites? After all, they were supposed to be part of *all nations*. Likewise Amalek was to be exterminated.
4. In Deut 23:6, God commanded Israel that they should not seek the peace or the prosperity of the Ammonites and the Moabites right up to the end of the age. Ezra 9:12 indicates similar treatment of the non-Israelites in the land. This is hardly a blessing on those nations, is it?
5. When The House of Judah was in captivity in Babylon, is there any evidence of Israel being a blessing to Babylon?
6. When the House of Israel was in captivity in Assyria, did this make the Assyrians blossom?
7. In prophecy why are all the forecasts concerning non-Israel nations always detailing them as being servants to Israel and for them to perish if they refuse this destiny? This is so right up to the end of the age.
8. The promise to Abraham was to "ALL" nations without any exceptions. "All" cannot include those who are cursed and those God says that He hates. Hence "all" means *all the nations of Israel*.

Throughout Scripture, Israel was *to dwell alone and shall not be reckoned among the nations* [Num 23:9]. Prophecy sustains this to the end.

Daniel 7:27 *And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve him.*

Isaiah 60:12 *For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted.*

Zech 14:16,17 *And it shall come to pass, that every one that is left of all the nations which came up against Jerusalem shall even go up from year to year to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, and to keep the feast of tabernacles. And it shall be that whoso will not come up of all the families of the earth unto Jerusalem to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, even upon them shall be no rain.*

Israel and Judah were scattered among *all nations*, but are these other nations to be blessed? Jeremiah does not agree.

Jer 30:11 *... though I make a full end of all nations whither I have scattered thee, yet I will not make a full end of thee ...*

Jeremiah repeats this in Jer 46:28, addressing this to Jacob.

In all these Scriptures we can see the unique place of Israel among the other nations. This continues after Jesus returns and Israel reigns with God over the other nations. Finally there will be no more death. What a blessing! The blessing is either given by this seed, or by the Act of God.

THERE ARE NOT TWO PROPHETICAL STREAMS.

If there were two streams of prophecy, one for Israel and one for non-Israel, a mixing, or a natural Israel and a spiritual Israel, or for both "The Church" and "Israel" as in the popular presentation, all would be there in prophecy. The popular concept of a natural and a spiritual Israel does not exist. As God says He will do nothing without revealing it to His servants the prophets, any change would be found written in the prophets. When God "placed" [=yanach] Adam in the garden it was isolated to him. *Yanach* is used very often isolating one person or group. e.g. Is. 14:1 "*I will have mercy upon Jacob, and will yet choose Israel, and set [yanach] them in their own land*". We cannot pretend that this means that God will place people of every race each in this particular land that was promised to the fathers of Israel, even if popular or orthodox Christianity likes to say so, [or otherwise to say the land is heaven]. They do this because the separation is now supposed to be by belief only for all races, ignoring "*seeds' seed*" and "*childrens' children*". The popular concept of "the church" cannot be found in the prophets. We must be prepared to not go beyond what is "*fitly framed*" -[Eph.2]- in the Cornerstone with the foundation of the apostles and prophets, because this cannot be broken. Jesus says so!

NO DISPARAGEMENT OF NON-ISRAEL RACES.

In saying that Israel is still exclusive racially, in covenant terms, it has to be stated clearly that there is no implied disparagement of all the other non-Israel races. Race is a fact of life and it is also an insistent Bible fact that cannot be denied through both Testaments. But, the Bible is primarily a book about the people of the book, Israel. Israel is declared to be a servant race, not a better race than others. Israel is presented in scripture as a "*stiff necked*" rebellious people who have a responsibility given to them to demonstrate to the other races the benefits of compliance with the laws of God. One great difference between Israel and the other races is that God made a covenant relationship between Himself and Israel that He did not make with other races. This made Israel accountable for keeping the covenant relationship. Breaking the covenant brought judgement upon Israel and it was with the same people who had the old Covenant that God made the New Covenant with-[Heb.8:8]. If God has not recorded in the Bible His purposes for all the other races in the same way He has done for Israel, no one has the right to presume anything about the non-Israel races that is not stated. The sense that Israel are God's chosen people is by covenant relationship and redemption. Israel has a heavy accountability and burden that is not laid upon other peoples.

But, we do have evidence that other races are cared for by God, although there are differences between these various races expressed in scripture. We find a blessing given to Hagar and it is recorded that God heard the cry of her son Ishmael-[Gen. 21:17]. We find things like the repentance of Nineveh through the ministry of an Israelite. Nebuchadnezzar had a lengthening of tranquillity, a word that does not relate to salvation, through an Israelite man of God. We have Naaman healed through the prayer of a prophet of Israel. Also, within Solomon's great prayer as found in 2 Chronicles 6:32-33 we find Solomon requesting God concerning the stranger "*which is not of Thy people Israel*" and asking God to hear and answer their prayers so that they might know God's name and fear him. This was not a statement by God but was a request made by Solomon. The prayer request was for these strangers to be able to travel to God's house [Solomon's temple] and make their prayers, but this temple was later destroyed. We can find that the servants of Pharaoh who feared the Word of the Lord were spared from being killed by the hail -[Exodus 9:18-21]. On the other hand we have expressions of God's hatred for certain races such as Edom being called "*the people against whom the Lord hath indignation for ever*"-[Malachi 1:3-4].

In the Bible, God has expressed his purposes for both the House of Israel and the House of Judah as a total singular race. One of God's purposes in giving the statutes and judgements to Israel is expressed in Deut. 4:6,

"Keep therefore and do them, for this is your wisdom in the sight of the nations, which shall hear of all these statutes, and say, 'Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people. For what nation is there so great, who hath God so nigh unto them, as the Lord our God is in all things that we call upon Him for, and what nation is there so great that hath statutes and judgements so righteous as I set before you this day'?"

This verse demonstrates again the separation of Israel from other races, and also one of the purposes God has for Israel.

In saying these things, there is no suggestion of hatred or oppression towards other races, but the practice of reverse discrimination is contrary to the Bible teaching. Reverse discrimination is actually discrimination in itself because it allows for promotion on the basis of race alone without any fair competition on the grounds of ability. Where God says that his people should not allow other races to rule over them, however clever or accomplished they might be, is a statement of purpose, not one of hatred.

RACIAL IDENTITY.

If we try to say there are no differences between races in God's sight, then we are unlikely to discern any answers. First of all we must believe God's word, relentlessly consistent as it is. We are told, "*By their fruits ye shall know them*"-[Matt. 7:18-20]. The popular way of dealing with this is to say that the "fruit" are spiritual manifestations apart from anything else. But Jesus speaks about "*good trees*" and "*corrupt trees*" in this passage, and He says that it is impossible for a corrupt tree to ever bring forth good fruit. "*Karpos*" = 'good' means it is intrinsically good. We have to agree or to disagree with Jesus that these differences exist. Fruit is the product of the tree and it bears the same seed as the original tree. The seed in the fruit will produce the same type of tree again!

When the Apostle Paul proclaimed the Message, "*as many as were ordained to eternal life believed*"-[Acts13:48]. What about those who were not so ordained? What was the basis of being ordained before they believed? In the New Testament we have those who God "*foreknew*". These are the same people as He "*knew*" in the Old Testament. Rom.11:2 confirms this, "*God has not cast away His people which He foreknew*". *Foreknown* and *foreordained* are the same word. Jesus was foreordained, "*before the foundation of the world*"-[1 Peter 1:20], so the time of being "*known*" was back in the past; so with Israel.

We are told that "*God knows them that are His*"-[2 Tim. 2:19]. It is not the purpose of this paper to detail racial identity because it is doubtful if anyone who does not agree with God about these racial differences would be able to see the difference between say an Israelite and a Canaanite or Edomite. With experience, members of some Biblical races are identifiable today, and some are not. We can see obvious differences between Shemites and some non-Shemites, but not all Shemites are Israelites. Some races exhibit things like shame, and experiencing the grace of God in a way that other races never do. Some races never leave their culture behind and still want to worship God and pray to the dead, or to the spirits of their ancestors, at the same time. Take away the missionary or Israelite influence from some races and they will revert to pagan ways or fall into a Roman Catholic type syncretism. It is not until we accept, "*It is written*" can we divide things that differ and do it in a practical way.

This paper has not made any presumption or statement that all other races are lost, damned or anything else; what the Bible says is that they do not have either the old or new covenant relationship that God made with Israel as a race. The Law of God applies to all races and all must benefit from submission; there is no suggestion that this should not be taught. Indeed, Israel is described as God's battle axe -[Jer.51:20]-to bring the other races into subjection. The sons of God, out from Israel, will yet be raised "*as a standard for the nations*".

If someone says something like, "*What about the move of God in Africa*" suggesting that this contradicts what this paper is saying, it is not so. For instance in Rwanda prior to the killing fields there, there was a supposed revival resulting in a reported Christian population of 86%. This did not stop the machete madness very shortly afterwards. There was "*another gospel*" involved. "Time" magazine pointed out that the massacre leaders were Roman Catholic priests and nuns. We must discern between the parallel that we think we see with our eyes, and "*it is written*". This is what Jesus referred back to, and we must do the same. Think this through; all we can be sure of is "*It is written*". As it is recorded of Jesus in Isaiah 11:3, "*He shall not judge after the sight of His eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of His ears*". We cannot do better!

COULD ORTHODOX CHRISTIANITY BE CULTISH?

We need to look at something that might sound heretical to many at first.

1. Could orthodox Christianity be cultish?
2. Could orthodox Christianity be something that refuses to accept all the Word of God? [Primarily from the pre-conditioning of tradition, not necessarily from insincerity].

3. Is the "Go into all the world" doctrine as generally taught really based on the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets, or on valid interpretation of both Testaments? It certainly does not reflect the "As ye go preach, saying, the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand", and restoring the Kingdom to Israel.

4. Has orthodox Christianity a wrong slant because it will not believe the prophetic words of Jacob and Moses for Israel in the "last days"? Jesus says that if any will not believe Moses, they cannot understand His words. In Luke 16:31 Jesus goes further and says people would never be persuaded to believe even if one rose from the dead. Believing Moses and the prophets is essential. For this reason alone, many churchgoers can not fully understand Jesus' words because they will not accept the authority of Moses and the prophets. This is a significant and important issue!

If the "all the world" universalist doctrine is wrong, then that belief is cultish. This is so even if Martin Luther confirmed what he was brought up to believe and introduced it into Protestantism and most have followed it since. This one belief is the source of conflict which undermines faith, but it is wrongly inferred "it is what every Christian must believe or he is not a Christian".

The wrong doctrine is summed up in the generalised belief, "Jesus died to save the world" and it arises from, "Go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature", and "God so loved the world"- These are said to be the best known and the best loved verses in Christendom, but as the "all", "world" and "every creature" are taken wrongly, then Rome has originated the greatest fraud of all time.

Part of this fraud is inferring that 'Israel' and 'The Jews' are synonyms. This is false for many reasons. ["The Jew" and "The Jews" do not have the same meaning in the New Testament]. "Jews" is a multi-racial term. It is a lie to say that having a belief makes every one of that belief into a race! It is common to hear people referring to "Jews" when talking about "Israel" in the Old Testament. In the Old Testament the word relates to Judah as part of Israel. The Encyclopedia Judaica makes the claim several times that "**Modern Jewry is Edom**" and that Jewry made no claim to association with Hebrews or Israel until 1860, the time of the founding of Zionism. In saying what has been said in this paper, readers will have no need to doubt the basis of their redemption through the Blood of Jesus, because the readers will probably be an Israelite Anglo-Saxon, Celtic or Nordic person. Also, they may be of Israel/Jew stock as part of Israel. Redemption only applies to the race of Israel being the people Jesus came to save-[Luke 1:1:77]. They alone could be redeemed from the broken Law since that Law was given to none others as a covenant. They alone could be "bought back". But, others can have safety by obedience, just as much as the mixed-multitude travelling with Israel had at the crossing of the Red Sea.

Daniel shows that the nations of the earth symbolised in four world-kingdoms will be ended and be replaced by the Stone Kingdom. The present madness shown in Nebuchadnezzar's dream will end when Israel rules with Jesus and the Most High will rule in the kingdoms of men. Jesus has not yet returned as King to rule, [even if it is popular to sing affirmations that He has]! Even so, "Come Lord Jesus"!

"ANOTHER GOSPEL"?

We can hear things said such as "*Nationalism is incompatible with the Gospel*", the reasoning being that since "*all are now one in Christ*", there is no place for nationalism and discrimination. This is exactly the position of the anti-Christ world government which desires to merge all races, and so who are those who talk about incompatibility really aligned up with? Whether or not there is incompatibility depends upon whether or not redemption is universal or particular in application, only one of which can be the true gospel. In scripture we find continuous racial separation until the end of the age. Even after Jesus returns to reign over the nations with a "rod of iron" [Ps. 2:9, Rev. 2:27, 12:5, 19:5], Israel is to rule with God as God's "*battle axe and weapons of war*" over the other races which are still separated.

When we study the teaching of the New Age Lord Maitreya, we can see that he supports universality in his claim that he will inspire all humanity to see itself as one family in his words, "*spiritually link all races, cultures and religions into a common cause for global harmony and peace*". This also is the doctrine of the World Council of Churches, World Government, Roman Catholicism and Communism.

When we read, "*neither is there salvation is any other,*" and, "*I am the Way, the Truth and the Life*", we have statements that declare Christianity to be totally unique and exclusive. There is no room for any mixture of Christianity and other cultures and their Gods. Those who want to "*spiritually link all races, cultures and religions into a common cause for global harmony and peace*" are of necessity preaching what Paul calls '*another gospel*'. The great deception is in denying the Bible doctrine that teaches that all races are treated differently by God. God made the vessels for different purposes, He says. God did not give them equal

rights, either! Jesus said, "*But he that is greatest amongst you, let him be your servant*". If even one person is greater than another, then all are not equal. As we have said, there is no equality in natural endowments either.

The deception is in a mis-representation of 'love'. Because the Bible deals with truth, it recognises racial behavioural patterns and intellectual attainment differences rather than covering them up. Indigenous cultures, if left without contact with what has sprung from Israel's inventive ability, remain primitive. If we look at this from the historical viewpoint, the Bible says that God's people were to be colonisers, ultimately to rule over that other nations with a rod of iron, and thus to bless them. The British colonisers with the Anglo-Saxon genius for government were able to demonstrate love in bringing to an end the tribal wars and tribal genius for murder and mayhem. If any say want to say that 'love' is ending colonisation and then mixing cultures, then it is not hard to observe the reinstatement of the murder and mayhem following de-colonisation. The now popular propaganda is that the British stole or destroyed the cultures of other races, and that therefore they have a responsibility to pay heavily to reintroduce and promote these cultures. The false idea is that the world will then have global harmony. This Bible pictures what is now happening and that God's punishment for Israel's failure to teach the Laws of God will be giving their wealth to foreign races. They would become impoverished from within.

Thus we can see the essential difference between the Bible and the International Bill of Human Rights is the uniqueness of the Gospel of the Kingdom of God as opposed to 'Human Rights'. 'Human Rights' are not equal because they are dispensed or withheld '*according to the principles and purposes of the United Nations*', and not God..

This all leaves Christendom with two differing gospels only one of which is consistent through all scripture. The reader has to admit that only one of these can be the true gospel, and then consider whether or not what is commonly preached so often today is right or wrong in application.

GOSPEL NUMBER ONE

This is that gospel which cannot be found throughout the Law, The Psalms, the Prophets, or through the New Testament. So, it must be false. It says in effect:

1. The Law and The Ten Commandments were given to every race, as a covenant.
2. Jesus gave His Life so that He becomes the Redeemer of all races, to redeem them from the curse of that broken law, even if the other races did not have that covenant-law relationship.
3. God loves all men and every individual member of all the human races, including those God says that he hates.
4. The gospel is for all sinners of every race, [not "*the sinners of My people*"-Amos 9:10].
5. All are called. There are no Tares or Goats, despite what Jesus says to the contrary.
6. All are chosen. There are no inferior vessels, despite what Paul says to the contrary.
7. There are no Twelve Tribes of Israel any more -[Even if they are through the N.T.].
8. All men are supposed to have faith. -[The Bible says "*All men have not faith*".]
9. The Father gave Jesus to "*all men*" of all races, not "*all men*" of Israel.
10. All races are pre-destined -[God must have been wrong to expect Israel to destroy certain mixed races. All are the same now, it is suggested].
11. There are no elect people, nor any election according to grace.
12. God has mercy on everyone, not just on whom He chooses or elects.
13. There are no scriptural differences between men of differing origins.
14. That "men" always includes women as well.
15. That non-Israel races can be "adopted" into Israel, ignoring, "*Who are Israelites to whom pertaineth the adoption*"-[Rom.9:4] and "*of whom concerning the flesh Christ came*".
16. God may be worshipped acceptably within any culture and religion; all being paths to God.
17. All races are the same in God's sight.
18. It is now up to all sinners of all races to embrace the love of God or to not embrace it. It is up to everyone of every race to either have eternal life, or to perish.

I.E.-THIS GOSPEL IS FALSE BECAUSE IT SAYS IT IS MANKIND, IN GENERAL, THAT IS SOVEREIGN, AND MAKES THE CHOICES. This would mean God is not sovereign in establishing a covenant relationship with Israel. About this we read in Galatians 1:9, "*If any preach any other gospel unto you than you have received, let him be accursed*".

GOSPEL NUMBER TWO -[The True Gospel].

This is the everlasting gospel, the true gospel in which we stand, if we continue in "*The Faith*" that was once delivered unto the saints, and delivered to no one else. This says:

1. The Bible does not say anywhere that God loves all mankind, but only the 'world' of His elect nation. Election is established before having done good or evil.
2. Jesus came for those chosen from before the "*foundation of the world*" -[which means the "overthrow of the order"].
3. Jesus is the Shepherd of the sheep only. He said, "*I lay down my life for the sheep*"-[John 10:15]. He did not add "*for the goats and everyone else as well*".
4. Jesus prayed for "*them which Thou gavest Me*", not everyone else as well.
5. Jesus came to save His People from their sins. They were already His people. The gospel is for "*the transgressions of my people*"-[Is.53:8].
6. It is the gospel of grace...."*And I will be gracious to whom I will...*"
7. It is not of ourselves, it is the gift of God.
8. God is merciful to whom He will-[Rom.9:18].
9. The Sons [*huios*] of God are adopted out of the Children [*teknon*] of Israel, not out of others of other races.
10. The Potter makes different vessels, according to His purposes, some for glory and some for destruction-[Rom 9:21].
11. All races are not the same in God's sight.
12. God does not accept mixed worship of Ba'al and Himself.
13. The gift is given only to the elect, through regeneration and efficacious calling of God.
14. Jesus is the Redeemer of Israel [both Houses only].

I.E. -THE TRUE GOSPEL SAYS THAT GOD IS ABSOLUTELY SOVEREIGN AND PARTICULAR!

This is no new doctrine. It can be found through many years of history in the songs of the redeemed from among one people!

*Ye chosen seed **of Israel's race**,
A remnant weak and small,
Hail Him who saves you by His grace,
And crown Him Lord of all.*