

WILLIAM FINCK CHALLENGES DAVE BARLEY CONCERNING ARABS AND UNIVERSALISM (And Other Sins)

The following remedial discipline to correct the errors of Mr. Dave Barley by William Finck will be presented in three stages. William Finck, after reading a copy of Dave Barley's August/September 2003 newsletter was compelled out of his Biblical responsibility to write Mr. Barley as Scripture instructs. Mr. Barley has since claimed that he never received such a letter, which is very doubtful. Mr. Barley, upon receiving the letter and reading a few lines, probably pitched it in the nearest trash can, thinking, no doubt, he would never again hear from William. Herein will be William (Bill) Finck's original letter to Mr. Barley, followed by Dave Barley's reply in his January/February 12 page newsletter entirely devoted to retaliate Bill's original letter to him. I have scanned Mr. Barley's January/February issue and the contents will be reproduced immediately after Bill's initial letter to Barley. Following Barley's very inept "response" to Bill's letter, (who Barley addresses as Mr. Smith) Bill's very comprehensive response to Barley's January/February news letter will be presented in its entirety.

The management of this entire presentation and its distribution is the responsibility of Clifton A. Emahiser's *Teaching Ministries*, 1012 North Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830; Phone (419) 435-2836. Because we are observing the genocide of an entire race of people before our very eyes through the process of miscegenation (race-mixing), I will tell you in advance that I do not apologize for this action!

AN OPEN LETTER CHALLENGING DAVE BARLEY OF AMERICA'S PROMISE

Concerning Barley's August/September 2003 Newsletter
By: William Finck

Before making this challenge, it would be best to quote the offending paragraph from Barley's newsletter on page 4:

"By the way, I received a phone call from an Arab man the other day who had watched the film and became converted to following Christ. His testimony was fantastic and upon learning that Jesus Christ has a place and purpose for all people, he had great hope. He learned that God's law had many forms and facets to it, such as the law of aerodynamics, and gravity. All of God's creation experiences those 'laws of nature' and they are subject to those laws. However, as we know, there are also God's laws to Israel, and Israelites for the most part, are to teach and administer those laws, but as God's Word says, '*to whom much is given, much is required,*' and '*each man in his own order.*' This Arab learned that as he acquired truth, that there was also a responsibility that he now bore to properly use and apply that truth."

Now we will present Bill Finck's challenge in his personal letter to Dave Barley:

Dear Mr. Barley,

Hello, I have never corresponded to your 'ministry' before, but after receiving a copy of your August/September 2003 Newsletter, I am compelled to write to you. I was of the understanding that yours is an "Israel Identity" ministry, the theme of your so-called "*Heirs of the Promise*" videos. Yet reading your newsletter, I became quite puzzled at your description of how you "converted" some "Arab ... to following Christ." It seems to me, Mr. Barley, that your ministry is teaching "some other gospel" that we have not received, neither from Paul nor the other apostles, nor from Yahshua Christ Himself. You should know the consequences of that, Mr. Barley (Galatians 1:9), yet I do hope that you are not "blinded with pride" (1 Tim. 6:3-4) and have the courage to continue reading this letter.

You have misused 1 Corinthians 15:23, "But every man in his own order ..." in your newsletter, and should have finished the verse: "... Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at His coming." Do you know that the Corinthians (Dorian Greeks) were a part of the "lost" children of Israel? Paul knew, and indicates such with certainty at 1 Corinthians 10 [At 1 Cor. 10 Paul is telling the Corinthians that their fathers were with Moses in the Exodus, the equivalent of telling them that they had descended from the 12 tribes. This is unquestionable, since the conversation would be pointless if Paul did not include the Corinthians with "our."] (note 10:8 [Because I mention this verse again below. Paul is admonishing the Corinthians not to engage in the same race-mixing (fornication, Jude 7) which their fathers did, described in Numbers 25. Paul admonished the Corinthians concerning fornication also at 1 Cor. 6:18]) and in the language he chose in several other statements. [Several other of Paul's statements in 1 Corinthians reveal that Paul was speaking to Israelites, for he illuminates their fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy which only concerned Israelites. Among these are 1 Cor. 6:20, 7:23, 14:21 (spoken of Ephraim, Isa. 28:11) and 15:3. Note also 1:18 and 2:7-10.] As Yahshua Christ said, "I come but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. 15:24) it can well be demonstrated that Paul had never any intention to violate that commission. The New Covenant was made only with Israel and Judah (Jer. 31:31-34) and Paul wrote (in the poor A.V. rendering:) "no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto" (Gal. 3:15).

Do you not know, Mr. Barley, what an "Arab" is? The very word "Arab" means "mixed" (Strong's #s 6154, 6151) and the root is the verb (6150) "to grow dusky" and of people it is only common sense that this only happens through fornication. Fornication, Mr. Barley, is the pursuit of strange flesh (Jude 7). Don't try, as the Catholics do, to point to Matt. 19:5 in a quest to confuse fornication with adultery, for the two are very different things, and mentioned together at Matt. 15:19, Mark 7:12, 1 Cor. 6:9 and Hebrews 13:4 (in Greek, which I read well) they certainly are! Another word Belial (Strong's #1100) has a connection with the idea of something "mixed" (see #1098) and Christ has no concord with Belial (2 Cor. 6)!

Do you not know that the Arabs are a "degenerate plant" and a "strange vine" (Jer. 2:21) and that "Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up"? The children of Israel were punished for committing fornication with the mixed (Canaanite-Moabite) daughters of Moab (1 Cor. 10:8), and those Moabites are among the Arabs of today. Yahshua warned the church at Pergamos of this very thing (Rev. 2:12-14) and also the church at Thyatira, whose children He will kill with death (Rev. 2:20-23), surely because they are bastards (Arabs, mamzers - Strong's #4464). We, Mr. Barley, are either sons or bastards, and there is no third alternative (Hebrews 12:8). Since the faith is only for the Sons (Romans 9:4-5, Hebrews 8:8-12, Gal. 4:5, Eph. 1:3-5) and the faith is certainly not for anyone else, as Paul attests (2 Thes. 3:2, 2 Cor. 13:5,

1 Cor 15:1-2, Col. 4:5, 1 Thes 4:12, 1 Tim. 3:7 et al.) where is there any room for an Arab? Paul speaks of Ishmael at Galatians 4:30: "Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman will not be heir with the son of the free woman." This directive, Mr. Barley, from Yahweh Himself, **HAS NEVER AND WILL NEVER BE RESCINDED!!!** I adjure you now, change your unscriptural and unhealthy ways, for by opening the door to wolves, you will destroy the sheep.

"Give not that which is holy unto dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you ... what man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone? ... or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent? ... Beware of false prophets ... Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? ... A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." (from Matt. 7).

"For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness ..." (1 Cor. 1:18).

Ex Nihilo Nihil Fit,

William Finck

**America's Promise Newsletter ~ ~ Dave Barley, Pastor
P.O. Box 157, Sandpoint, Idaho 83864, (208) 265-5405
January/February 2004
Section I of III**

From the Pastor's Desk:

Recently, I received the following "challenge" from a man (presented in its entirety on the next page [*previously with this format*]), and a ministry that shall go unnamed as I do not wish to make them the issue in this discussion. What is the issue? Well, believe it or not, the issue is over whether or not an Arab, a non-Israelite can be a Christian, but in reality, it is more than that. It is about the **EVERLASTING POWER** of the accomplished work of Christ upon the Cross. "*But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world.*" (Galatians 6:14) I would like to point out that I never received a "personal" letter from this man, only a copy of the letter mass distributed by this unmentioned ministry. Therefore, I was not given any time to respond before it was published as an "Open Letter." Furthermore, this ministry is distributing this "Open Letter" and encouraging others to do so. (See offer at the end of that letter.)

The Israel Message, when properly taught and understood is a wonderful message. However, when it is misapplied and the vainness of man's racial pride gets in the way, one can become so misguided to believe that Hope solely belongs to them. All people must come to the Cross of Christ to find themselves and their purpose. The stranger's Hope as Israel's Hope must be in the great things He hath done, "*For the creature was made subject to vanity (disappointing misery), not willingly, but by reason of Him who hath subjected the same in HOPE*" (Romans 8:20).

I believe most challenges are carnal and for the most part, I will not engage such things. However, this challenge is going public for three main reasons. First and foremost, the issues that are being discussed will be of helpful Biblical understanding. We can all be helped and

benefited by this pursuit of truth no matter which side of the issue a person may take., [sic] *"Iron sharpeneth iron"* (Proverbs 27:17)

It is my prayer that there is nothing I have said that will be offensive to anyone, and that Jesus Christ's name and purposes will be glorified: *"Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began, But is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel:"* (2 Timothy 1:9-10)

Secondly, this "OPEN LETTER" was sent out through a ministry, which sought to sensationalize this issue for their purposes. This is their right, but highly improper and divisive in the manner in which it was done. Thus the issue has gone public. Therefore, I am responding in a public way to this letter.

Thirdly, except for myself being named, the other person and ministry are left out of the debate. This is so that the issue remains our focus. I will use the name "Smith" [who is really William Finck] in my reference to the individual who has written the open letter against me, but again, that is not his real name.

Pastor Dave Barley

MY (Dave Barley's) RESPONSE

Greetings in the Name of Jesus Christ our Redeemer, Mr. Smith [William Finck],

I recently received your "letter challenging Dave Barley" which was made public by a ministry. I did not receive the letter from you personally, but by the ministry distributing it. You stated in your letter, *"It seems to me, Mr. Barley, that your ministry is teaching 'some other gospel' that we have not received."* I am sorry that you have not received this gospel, Mr. Smith [William Finck], but I assure you that it is from the Word of God. You are apparently very upset with my understanding of God's Word, and if we are not careful, this disagreement that you have with me could very well end up turning into a carnal spew of hate and indignation rather than Godly reasoning. Let us do our best to be respectful and courteous with each other, which is not a sign of weakness, but rather a commandment of God. Let us do our best to set the tone of this discussion according to these high values from God's Word.

James 3:13-18: *"Who is a wise man and endued with knowledge among you? let him shew out of a good conversation his works with meekness of wisdom. But if ye have bitter envying and strife in your hearts, glory not, and lie not against the truth. This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish. For where envying and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work. But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be intreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy. And the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace of them that make peace."*

I pray that you will be in agreement with the teaching of those verses and that they will set a proper Christ-like tone for our discussion. With that said, let us begin. You are apparently angry that I believe that an Arab can be saved and experience the salvation of Jesus Christ. Although I don't mean to further anger or frustrate you, I also believe that all peoples of the earth can also partake of the salvation of Christ Jesus. I believe that the Word of God supports this conclusion and here are just a few supporting texts.

1 John 2:2: *And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.*

John 12:32: *And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me.*

Luke 3:6: *And all flesh shall see the salvation of God.*

Philippians 2:10-11: *That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.*

Psalms 65:2: *O thou that hearest prayer, unto thee shall all flesh come.*

1 Timothy 4:10: *For therefore we both labour and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, specially of those that believe.*

Colossians 1:16-20: *For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: And he is before all things, and by him all things consist. And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence. For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; And, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven.*

What a wonderful message of Jesus Christ, His Saving Grace, Hope, and Words of Life so lacking in the understanding of many Christians. Certainly the creation will be and is being judged. Many will have to go through the purging, purifying process of the lake of fire. But, **what is the lake of fire?** Why is it referred to as a “lake of fire”? Why is it not a “sea of fire,” or a “ocean of fire”?

Well, I'll be as brief as possible, but in the scriptures the “sea” is used in some places to represent the “masses of people.” On the other hand, a “lake” represents a small body of people. Therefore, the “lake of fire” is a remnant body of Holy Spirit anointed Sons of God who know God's law, His judgements, His purposes, His love, forgiveness, and process of restoration. The scriptures tell us that *“His ministers are as a flame of fire”* (Hebrews 1:7). The lake of fire is Jesus Christ's New Jerusalem City of the Living God who shine forth His Light and Truth, and are given the ministry of reconciliation to which the creation is groaning and travailing to be revealed. (Get a copy of my book **City of the Living God** for a deeper study on the New Jerusalem)

Romans 8:21 *“Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God”*

I also believe that we should include the following Bible passages, which deal with the Abrahamic Covenant and who the recipients of that great Covenant include:

Section II of III

Genesis 17:10-12: *This is my covenant which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee; Every man child among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations, he that is born in the house, or bought with money of **any stranger**, which is not of thy seed.*

The reason I [Barley] believe that these verses are applicable to our discussion is because this Covenant covers every child in the household of Abraham. Please note that the household of Abraham included all the servants he was given by Pharaoh in Egypt (Genesis 12:14-16), and any others he might have purchased. I might add, that this was a large household of people who were not Hebrews or Israelites. In Genesis 14:14, Abraham armed 318 of his servants, none of whom were the chosen seed through Isaac, and yet they were obviously included in the number who were circumcised and grafted into the Covenant God made with Abraham. Ishmael,

of course, would be included in this Covenant blessing, and he was the offspring of a union with Hagar, one of those Egyptian servants, or handmaids.

Yes, *"in Isaac shall thy seed be called,"* but concerning the Abrahamic Covenant, it included more than the seed of Isaac. Abraham had six other sons after Sarah died with his later wife, Keturah, and he no doubt also had them circumcised as a prerequisite of Covenant. So there were a variety of people who were under the Abrahamic Covenant who were not of the chosen seed of Isaac, but who were none the less under the covering of that Covenant by circumcision.

Genesis 17:23-27: And Abraham took Ishmael his son, and all that were born in his house, and all that were bought with his money, every male among the men of Abraham's house; and circumcised the flesh of their foreskin in the selfsame day, as God had said unto him. And Abraham was ninety years old and nine, when he was circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin. And Ishmael his son was thirteen years old, when he was circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin. In the selfsame day was Abraham circumcised, and Ishmael his son. And all the men of his house, born in the house, and bought with money of the stranger, were circumcised with him.

Many of the present day Arab people are actual descendents [sic] of Abraham through Hagar, Sarah's Egyptian handmaid, and Keturah. Mr. Smith [William Finck], do you really believe that an Arab, a descendant of Abraham cannot be saved, converted, and become a Christian? **If you are basing your salvation solely upon your race, then what need do you have of a Savior?** Does the Bible really teach that a person is saved by race rather than Jesus Christ and His Grace? Furthermore Mr. Smith [William Finck], how sure are you that your bloodline is pure and untainted over the last 5,000 years or so? Only by faith, correct, and by faith we claim the blood of Christ which cleanses us from ALL unrighteousness even the unrighteousness of race mixing by our ancestors if there is any. The Scriptures clearly teach that *"While we were yet sinners, Christ died for the ungodly."* And, lest we get too high and mighty about being Israelites: Ephesians 2:8 informs us, *"For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God:"*

Also look at the whole purpose of God given in the first covenant of the Bible. After the flood God promised in Genesis 9:13-15. *I do set my bow in the cloud, and **it shall** be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth. And it shall come to pass, when I bring a cloud over the earth, that the bow shall be seen in the cloud: And I will remember my covenant, which is between me and you and every living creature of all flesh; and the waters shall no more become a flood to destroy all flesh.*

Five times in this chapter He states that this promise was to the whole creation. It was not just limited to Noah's family. It wasn't even just limited to man. This covenant was to all creatures of the earth! Also look at the purpose of the Abrahamic Covenant.

Genesis 12:3 *And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.*

In other words, God chose Abraham to bless the world, which was created in darkness, and part of the dominion calling is to impart Divine Light. God Almighty created Adam for this dominion purpose. The only problem is, Adam was "earth," or earthy and without the necessary God knowledge and Light of the Tree of Life.

1 Corinthians 15:47-49 *"The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy: and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly."*

Adam was kept from the "Tree of Life." God purposed that Adamic-man enter darkness so that he might come out a new creature of Light in Christ who is the Light of this world.

1 John 3:2 *"Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is."*

1 Peter 2:9 *“But Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light.”*

God was never at any time limiting Himself to just Israel. In Amos 3:2, *“You only have I known of all the families of the earth...”* the word “known” is the same word as used in as “know” in marriage relationship such as Genesis 4:1, **“And Adam knew Eve..”** God has always had a special relationship with Israel. She is His Bride. He has only “known” Israel as His wife, but that doesn’t mean that he isn't dealing with the other nations of the world. Why did He choose Israel to be His Bride? Because they were so wonderful and sinless? **No**, He chose Israel as His Witnesses in the Earth to show the Whole Creation the Gospel of Jesus Christ. He is using Israel in a variety of capacities, even in their blindness to show the earth who Christ is and after the resurrection, His peculiar treasure people will rule and reign with Him. Who are they going to rule and reign over? They will be ruling and reigning over the whole creation in the bondage of corruption!

Romans 8:21-22 *“Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now.”*

A primary example of how God uses Israelites to bring the truth to the strangers is seen in the story of Daniel.

As you know, Daniel was taken a captive in the Nation of Babylon. When he went into captivity he knew that he was going to be a captive for 70 years because of the prophecies of Jeremiah. Daniel was a very young man at the time of his capture, so he probably thought he would never see the end of the captivity. Little did he know, that he was going to be used as an obedient Son of God to “convert” the King of Babylon! What converted the King of Babylon to following Yahweh? Daniel’s witness of faithful service to Yahweh and His Law were the instruments God used to convert the King of Babylon! Let’s take up the story after Daniel has been thrown into the lion’s den:

Daniel 6:19-28 *Then the king arose very early in the morning, and went in haste unto the den of lions. And when he came to the den, he cried with a lamentable voice unto Daniel: and the king spake and said to Daniel, O Daniel, servant of the living God, is thy God, whom thou servest continually, able to deliver thee from the lions? Then said Daniel unto the king, O king, live for ever. My God hath sent his angel, and hath shut the lions’ mouths, that they have not hurt me: forasmuch as before him innocency was found in me; and also before thee, O king, have I done no hurt. Then was the king exceeding glad for him, and commanded that they should take Daniel up out of the den. So Daniel was taken up out of the den, and no manner of hurt was found upon him, because he believed in his God. And the king commanded, and they brought those men which had accused Daniel, and they cast them into the den of lions, them, their children, and their wives; and the lions had the mastery of them, and brake all their bones in pieces or ever they came at the bottom of the den. Then king Darius wrote unto all people, nations, and languages, that dwell in all the earth; Peace be multiplied unto you. I make a decree, That in every dominion of my kingdom men tremble and fear before the God of Daniel: for he is the living God, and stedfast for ever, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed, and his dominion shall be even unto the end. He delivereth and rescueth, and he worketh signs and wonders in heaven and in earth, who hath delivered Daniel from the power of the lions. So this Daniel prospered in the reign of Darius, and in the reign of Cyrus the Persian.*

Do you realize that Darius was one of the most important men in the world at that time? He was not an Israelite, yet he was converted to worship the True God of the Universe who is not just the God of Israel. We should get excited when anyone recognizes, worships, and serves our Heavenly Father! The whole creation benefits by this.

Notice this is also the story of Jonah. Jonah, like you, did not want to go preach to the enemies of Israel. Jonah did not want to do this because he was afraid that God would deliver them. After God did save them, Jonah was angry! Sounds like a stiff-necked Israelite to me! (Read the whole book of Jonah!)

Now Mr. Smith [William Finck], you stated that you were “quite puzzled” at my description of how I “converted some Arab ...to following Christ.” Mr. Smith [William Finck], nothing could be further from the truth. In the first place, I did not state that I had converted anyone to Christ, nor do I believe that I or any other person can convert anyone to Christ. I can only plant seeds of the gospel, it is Jesus Christ the Savior who saves and converts the hearts of men many times through the foolishness of preaching. *“For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.”* (1 Corinthians 1:21)

What I did say in the newsletter, and you quoted it as well, was that “I received a phone call from an Arab man the other day who had watched the film (Heirs of the Promise II) and became converted to following Christ.” I certainly did not mean to insinuate that I had converted this man, but that through the witness of this film, the Holy Spirit moved upon this man’s heart and he became convicted, or converted to following Christ the Savior.

In your open letter of challenge to me, you also make the false assumption that many people make. Most of us were taught in the Judeo-Christian world that whoever becomes a Christian becomes a spiritual Israelite. **(Please read my book, Israel: Physical or Spiritual?)** When I say an Arab can become a Christian, I am **NOT** saying that this also makes him an Israelite. This is what Judeo-Christianity teaches but it is not what I teach or believe. You see, when an Arab becomes a Christian, he becomes a Christian Arab, not an Israelite. Israel is a racial distinction and if you are not born an Israelite you cannot become one. However, Christianity is a way of life and anyone can embrace a way of life! Also there are many Israelites who are not Christians. Race does not make someone a Christian. As an example, circumcision under the old covenant did not make the strangers or non-Israelites an Israelite. But their being circumcised certainly did incorporated [sic] them under the old covenant.

You have falsely accused me of promoting race mixing in your article over and over and I have never done that! Some people wrongly accuse Paul of doing away with God’s Law when he never does when you correctly interpret his words. Because of your false assumptions, you have borne false witness against me, which is a violation of the Ninth Commandment. I have never promoted race mixing in any of my sermons or writings and in fact, we carry many books that explain why race mixing is wrong!

So when I teach that anyone can become a Christian, that’s exactly what I mean. Mr. Smith [William Finck], you are under the false assumption that all strangers among Israel were White Adamites. The White race has always been the minority among the earth’s population all of its existence. When God told Israel to separate themselves from certain other people, it was not just a matter of race, but idolatry, and often the separation was from their own kind who were involved in paganism. God Almighty even directed Abraham to leave his own family! The evil was not without the Adamic Race it was also within it.

As long as the proper Biblical guidelines are followed, the strangers (of any race) were allowed to dwell among Israel, although their status and rights were very limited. The strangers among Israel are certainly not an endorsement for race mixing as some people have wrongfully assumed. If seeing other races causes Israelites to take their pants off, they’ve got a big problem! Remember that God causes Israel to even **separate from their own kind** when they become idolatrous. And, incidentally, in this is also the meaning of 2 Corinthians 6:14, which you quoted in your letter to (I assume) somehow prove that the different races cannot even associate with Israel: ***“Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what***

fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?” The “unbelievers” presented in this verse is **not** a racial statement, but a religious statement. The strangers among Israel were limited in their association and rights, but not completely prohibited.

The stranger was allowed to attach himself to Israel by agreeing to obey God’s Law and under the Old Covenant, this also included being circumcised. Also, by his agreeing to obey God’s Law, he was also agreeing not to violate God’s kind after kind process, which preserves the racial distinction and diversity of all races, which God created. If everyone in the world accepted Christ as their King, His Law as the only Law, His people Israel as separate and peculiar, His Land as the earth and the fulness thereof, there would be absolutely no race mixing.

Section III of III

[Barley continues]: Under humanism, which promotes race mixing, true Divine created diversity is lost. The mixing of the races does not promote diversity, it creates confusion, chaos, and disorder. However, the different races, as God created them, can peacefully and orderly exist together, as long as the proper Biblical guidelines are followed. Under the Old Covenant, the “stranger” actually agreed to become a circumcised second class citizen in Israel because they realized that serving Yahweh was more important than living among the paganism of their own peoples. These strangers were never allowed to marry Israelites under God’s Law. There are many passages about the stranger, but here are just a few.

Leviticus 24:22 *Ye shall have one manner of law, as well for the stranger, as for one of your own country: for I am the LORD your God.*

Numbers 15:14-16 *And if a stranger sojourn with you, or whosoever be among you in your generations, and will offer an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the LORD; as ye do, so he shall do. One ordinance shall be both for you of the congregation, and also for the stranger that sojourneth with you, an ordinance for ever in your generations: as ye are, so shall the stranger be before the LORD. One law and one manner shall be for you, and for the stranger that sojourneth with you.*

Deuteronomy 31:12 *Gather the people together, men, and women, and children, and thy stranger that is within thy gates, that they may hear, and that they may learn, and fear the LORD your God, and observe to do all the words of this law:*

Mr. Smith [William Finck], you probably believe that all these strangers are White Adamic people. This does not hold true when you do a thorough study of the term “stranger”. Four different Hebrew words for stranger must be considered separately.

The “ger”, OT-1616, is an alien or foreigner. One form of stranger which applies to anyone who resides in a country of which he is not a full native land-owning citizen. The stranger included the “mixed multitude” from Egypt (Ex 12:38); the Canaanites still remaining in Palestine and their descendants, as Uriah the Hittite and Araunah the Jebusite, Doeg the Edomite, Ittai the Gittite; captives in war, fugitives, and merchants, amounting under Solomon to 153,600 males (2 Chronicles 2:17), one tenth of the population.

The toshabh, OT-2114 - An alien, or foreigner. A toshabh could not eat the Passover or the “holy” things of a priest (Ex 12:45; Lev 22:10). His children could be purchased as perpetual slaves, and the law of the Jubilee did not apply to them as to Israelites (Lev 25:45).

The nokhri, OT-5235 - The nokhri or ben nekhar was a foreigner. It covers everything of alien or foreign character regardless of the place of residence. By circumcision a foreign slave could enter into the covenant with Abraham. Foreigners were of course excluded from the Passover (Ex 12:43), but could offer sacrifices to Israel’s God at the religious capital (Lev 22:25).

The Israelite could exact interest of them (Deut 23:20). Moses forbade the appointment of a foreigner as a ruler (Deut 17:15. [sic])

The zuwr, or zar. -OT:2114: Foreigner, strange, profane. The word zar means "stranger" and it can mean "stranger in blood," e.g. non-Aaronite (Num 16:40 (17:5 in Heb)), or non-Levite (e.g. 1:51), or a non-member of some other defined family (Deut 25:5).

Remember, God is the One who wrote the laws about strangers, not me. Let us now look at how Christ treated the stranger. We are told in Matthew 15 the story of the Canaanite woman. This story is also repeated in Mark and Luke. Stories are rarely in three Gospels so this must be of Great Importance.

Notice that Christ lets this woman know that she cannot have what belongs to Israel. When she affirms this position and shows that she understands that she is only allowed the crumbs, Christ says in verse 28: ***"O woman great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt. And her daughter was made whole from that very hour."*** You stated "since the faith is only for the Sons and the faith is certainly not for anyone else, where is there any room for an Arab?" Well, Christ Himself says that this Canaanite had faith. Are you calling Christ a liar?

Christ also shared with us two applicable parables. One is about the Good Samaritan. Notice that the Samaritan is blessed for taking care of a man who is not of his nationality. Also look at the parable of the unjust steward in Luke 16:1-13. Notice that the steward did not pass on the forgiveness of Christ to those underneath his jurisdiction. Is this not the same as Adam being given dominion and not passing it on to those under his jurisdiction? Have we not failed our dominion mandate by not showing the world the love of Christ by administering His Law to all of Creation? Have we not been unjust stewards?

I also must state, Mr. Smith [William Finck], that I have looked up the Scripture verses that you quoted and I fail to see how most of them apply to your reasoning. For instance, you said, "Do you not know that the Arabs are a 'degenerate plant' and a strange vine' [sic] (Jeremiah 2:21)" Jeremiah 2:21 says, *"Yet I had planted thee a noble vine, wholly a right seed: how then art thou turned into the degenerate plant of a strange vine unto me?"* This verse is not talking about Arabs. This verse is talking about Israel who was planted as a noble vine, but Israel has turned into a strange vine! Another example is where you say, "since the faith is certainly not for any one else, as Paul attests (2 Thessalonians 3:2)." 2 Thessalonians 3:2 says, *"And that we may be delivered from unreasonable and wicked men: for all men have not faith."* How do you interpret this to mean that only Israelites have faith? Not even all Israelites have faith!

Now I realize that this is not an in-depth study of this subject matter on your part or my part. All serious students of God's Word will be learning important truth about this issue throughout their Christian life, and it will be an exciting process. And, THE TRUTH WILL SET THEM FREE.

One final thought Mr. Smith [William Finck], truth is not a matter of who can out argue whom ever. Truth is ultimately in and from Jesus Christ, and therefore Truth must be a revelation from Him, and not from man. My disagreeing with you, or you disagreeing with me, does not mean that we continue to debate each other until one of us capitulates or dies. It means that we look to Jesus Christ ***"who is the Author and Finisher of our faith."*** (Hebrews 12:2). Also if you look at the promises of God, you will see that he promised us the unity of Spirit, not the unity of doctrine.

Ephesians 4:3 *Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.*

The only time that we are promised that unity of doctrine is in His Glorious Kingdom Age when *"And they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more."* (Hebrews 8:11-12). Praise the Lord that we can look forward to that day. Remember that within the body of Christ we are commanded to do the following in Galatians 4:31-32, *"Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice: And be ye kind*

one to another tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you." So while you may disagree with my understanding of the scripture, as I do with what you have shared with me, we are not allowed to be angry with one another. We are to reason together and then let the Holy Spirit work within each of us to bring us to the truth for He is the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

I would remind you that in the future, if you have any disagreements with me, that you try to resolve them with me according to Matthew 18. We are told in Galatians 5:14-15, *"For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this; Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another."*

We may agree to disagree, but is that so bad or any reason to think of each other as evil? Certainly not, and Mr. Smith [William Finck], your disagreement with me over this issue of salvation does not make you my enemy, but you know what it does mean? It means that Jesus Christ is speaking to our hearts and He is creating a troubled heart over this issue so that He might work out some of His Purposes within you and me. So Mr. Smith [William Finck], let's praise Him for His Purposes and whatever outcome He may chose [sic]. As Christ said in John 13:35, *"By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another."*

For Christ and Christ alone,

Pastor Dave Barley

William Finck's Answer To Dave Barley's January/February 2004, Newsletter

On September 17th 2003 I wrote and sent to Mr. Dave Barley, of America's Promise Ministries a letter disagreeing with some of his teachings, which he had published in his August/September 2003 Newsletter. As is my practice with nearly all such communications of this type, I sent a copy of this letter to Clifton Emahiser, whose own publications I also proofread. Clifton decided to publish this letter (with my approval, of course), which Mr. Barley never did answer and now claims that he never received, for the benefit of his own readers among other reasons I will discuss later, and now Mr. Barley seems to be quite disturbed with this action, as if he should be above all criticism. Barley claims my challenge to be "carnal" and the publication of my letter to be "highly improper" and "divisive." It seems to me that Barley doesn't think applicable to himself such Scripture as 1 Tim. 5:19-20: "An accusation against an elder you must not receive, except publicly 'by two or three witnesses.' Those wrongdoers you censure before all, in order that the rest also would have fear", or 1 Cor. 11:19: "For there must also be sects among you, in order that those approved will become evident among you." and Luke 12:51: "Do you imagine that I have come to bring peace to the land? I tell you No, but rather division." (All translations my own from the Greek of the NA27). While I recognize that I certainly should be at peace with my fellow Saxons, I must yet continue to admonish Mr. Barley's errors. For "thine enemies [O Yahweh] roar in the midst of thy congregations" (Psalm 74:4), and Dave Barley invites them in!

Now Dave Barley has answered my letter in his January/February 2004 Newsletter, and although in a personal letter addressed to both myself and to Clifton Emahiser Mr. Barley attempts to discourage any further discourse on these topics, I am compelled still more to reply to his answer. For by exposing Barley's errors I will not bear his guilt (Lev. 5:1), and I will be innocent of the blood of those deceived by him (Acts 20:26). Here is my reply to Barley's answer to my letter. First in his response, Barley appeals to his reader by quoting James 3:13-18, as if to show that it is a wrongful thing for me to dispute with him. Barley should read the rest of James, for 5:19-20 in the A.V. state: "Brethren, if any of you do err from the

truth, and one convert him; Let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins.”

Barley reduces my dispute to the following statement: “You are apparently angry that I believe that an Arab can be saved and experience the salvation of Jesus [sic] Christ.” Wherever Barley has gotten the idea that I am “angry”, I know not, though we will later see that Barley has a propensity to contrive falsehoods. Barley goes on to state: “Although I don’t mean to further anger or frustrate you, I also believe that all peoples of the earth can also partake of the salvation of Christ Jesus [sic].” And he turns to the usual judeo-unChristian device for supporting such a statement, by taking such verses which mention “all men” and “all flesh” out of context. To illustrate Barley’s folly, a discussion of these terms is in order.

What is man? Is a man simply a biped with the power of speech? Being studied and debated in scientific circles today, some claim that primates have the power of reason, though they do not speak. If found to be true, would Barley evangelize to them?

The Hebrews had three basic words for “man.” They are *ish* (376): A general word describing any man at all, *adam* (119, 120): ruddy or (circumstantially) White man (ruddy, to show blood through the skin, the Hebrew word for blood being *dam*, 1818), and *enosh* (582, 606) which is simply a mortal man and although sometimes used to describe Adamites, is also used to describe non-Adamites or those of mixed race. Daniel used the word *enosh* (Dan. 2:43, “men”) to describe the decline of Adamic Rome by race-mixing (the iron and the clay).

In Genesis, Adam was created by Yahweh. Adam’s descendants through Noah are all listed in Genesis 10. These are “all the families of the earth” as mentioned at Genesis 12:3. All of these people were White Adamites, as evidenced in history and archaeology (see Clifton Emahiser’s *Watchman’s Teaching Letters* #’s 64 and 65 for a further explanation of this) and to expand this list in order to include the other races is pure folly and an brazen attempt to rewrite the Bible. Yahweh did not create the other races (though the fallen rebels did, i.e. Malachi 2:11: “... and hath married the **daughter of a strange god.**”) and neither should such be attributed to Him, since the mixing of species (as even Barley admits) is a clear violation of the laws of Yahweh.

The Greeks had two basic words for “man.” The first •<ZD(435) appears over 200 times in the New Testament though often means not “man” but “husband”, as the word came to be used in Greek, yet the original connotation, a true “man”, is also frequently the sense, most often in Acts. According to Liddle & Scott’s Greek lexicon, •<ZD is the equivalent of the Latin *vir*, and not *homo*. The other Greek word is –<ZDT B@, which Liddle & Scott state is the equivalent of the Latin *homo*, and not *vir*, and that the derivation of the word is “probably from •<ZD [man], êR, [face], man-faced.” Since the common word for “man” in the New Testament (appearing there approximately 700 times) is –<ZDT B@, as it became also in secular Greek writing, we find that the idea of “man” seems to have degenerated at a very early time. But is that the case in the Bible? Has Yahweh Himself approved of our changing the idea of the definition of “man” to something which may be other than Adam?

In English, among the definitions for “man” found in *The Merriam Webster Dictionary* ©1994, ISBN 0-87779-911-3, we find “*often cap*: white society or people” a definition no longer found in most modern dictionaries. In *The American Heritage College Dictionary*, 3rd edition under “human” we find: “3. Subject to or indicative of the weakness, imperfections, and fragility associated with human beings. 4. Having the form of a human being.”

It should be evident to a rational person that Adam, •<ZD, *vir* (in Latin) and man may all be equated, and that *enosh*, –<ZDT B@, *homo* and human may all be equated. While the other races may, by us (not by Yahweh) be called by the terms *enosh*, –<ZDT B@ or *homo*, can we call them “Adam”? Is it even correct in the eyes of Yahweh to call them “men”? While it is obvious that our idea of “man” has degenerated, has Yahweh’s? This I will discuss next.

Let us begin with Romans 5:14: “Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses ...” (A.V.), so Paul tells us that death’s reign begins with Adam. Archaeology finds many victims of death among the other races, much older than Adam. In some cases millions of years before Adam! Romans 5:12:

“Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned” is this including any race other than the Adamic? The other races were living and dying long before Adam’s appearance on the earth. Are they to be included in the term “all men” here? Certainly I think not! Neither can the other races be included in the term “all men” anywhere else! 1 Cor. 15:22: “For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.” Can this include any race but the Adamic? Acts 17:26: “[God] ... hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation.” A study of the Hebrew prophets would reveal the determination by Yahweh of the times of the nations of White Adamites, and no other races. As for the “bounds of their habitation”, even my copy of *The King James Study Bible* from Thomas Nelson Inc. (as does the NA27) cross references Deut. 32:8 here, which reads: “When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, **when He separated the sons of Adam**, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel.” Who are “all men” but “all Adamites”? The other races were not included then, and they need not apply now! In the opening paragraphs of his response, Mr. Barley quotes Romans 8:21 twice: “Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God”, and the word “creature” here is **6NF4** (2937). Barley treats this word as if by it is meant everything under the sun, so to speak, and everything beyond! He should have read all of Romans 8, for verses 38 and 39 state: “For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor ANY OTHER CREATURE, shall be able **to separate us** from the love of God, which is in Christ Yahshua **our** Lord.” And “creature” at 8:39 is the same Greek word **6NF4**, as “creature” at 8:21! Paul is only talking about one creation: the sons of Yahweh (8:14, 19), the children of Yahweh (8:17, 21), whose fate was determined long before Christ’s coming (8:28-37) and he can **only** be referring to the Adamic Race (Genesis 5:1-2, Luke 3:38). No “other creation” (8:39), which would have to include the so-called other races, need apply! How does Barley not see the differences here? Where does the Bible count the other races as the children of Yahweh, or even insinuate that they may be? (Note also: Deut. 14:1, Psalm 82:6.) How does Barley not see that the one creature, or creation, of Romans 8:21 is contrasted to the many other creatures, or creations, of Romans 8:38-39? Is he ignorant, or purposely deceptive?

What about “all flesh”? Mr. Barley points to verses such as Luke 3:6: “And all flesh shall see the salvation of God”, a quote from Joel 2:28 found also at Acts 2:17, and insinuates that such verses indicate that the other races can “partake of the salvation of Jesus [sic] Christ.” Here I must ask, Mr. Barley, are “seeing” and “partaking” one and the same thing? First, it may be evident reading some Scriptures that by “all flesh” often only the children of Yahweh (those Adamic vessels of His Spirit, i.e. Isa. 52:11) are meant, such as Num. 16:22, 27:16; Job 34:15; Psalms 65:2, 136:22-25, 145:20-21; Isa. 40:5-11, 49:26, 66:16-24 and Joel 2:27-29. Talking to Zion (Israel as a nation) Isaiah 49:25-26 says in part: “I will contend with him that contendeth with thee, and **I will save thy children**. And I will feed them that oppress thee **with their own flesh ... and all flesh shall know** that I Yahweh [am] thy Savior and thy Redeemer ...” Surely, Mr. Barley, “all flesh” may **see** the salvation of Yahweh, but many will wish they had not! Ezek. 21:4-5 states in part “Seeing then I will cut off from thee the righteous and the wicked, therefore shall my sword go forth ... against all flesh ... That all flesh may know that I Yahweh have drawn forth my sword ...” Surely, Mr. Barley, “seeing” is not “partaking”! Is Barley ignorant concerning the meaning of these verbs, or is he again being deceptive? Is he setting a pattern of deception throughout his response to my letter? This may become evident as we proceed.

Following his diatribe concerning “all men” and “all flesh” Mr. Barley finds it necessary to discuss the “lake of fire.” Fire is mentioned in the Bible in several contexts, and again Barley seems to have them confused. While it certainly is true that men are “tried with fire” (i.e. 1 Peter 1:7, 1 Cor. 3:15, Jude 22-23) it is evident that these trials are temporary (Romans 8:18, 1 Peter 1:6) and that there is hope for us once the trials are past. The “lake of fire” is quite different, as we shall see. First, Barley concludes that, because in prophetic writings the “sea” represents a mass of people and not a literal sea (which is often

correct), and because Paul states at Hebrews 1:7 “His ministers are a flame of fire” (an unrelated message) the “lake of fire” is “a remnant body of Holy Spirit anointed sons of God.” He reasons that because “sea” represents a mass of people, “lake” must represent a “small body of people” although this is evident nowhere in the Bible.

I will only mention the Old Testament here briefly. The word “lake” does not appear in the Old Testament. Hebrew words which were translated into **ס: <Q** the Greek word for lake in the New Testament are *Strong’s* #s 98 and 1295, which were also translated into the Greek words **6@8L: \$Z2D'** (swimming pool), **6DZ<O** (fountain or well), **\$V2@a** (depth or deep water), **^8@a** (marsh) and **FbFJ, :** “ (for which Brenton has “cisterns” at Jeremiah 28(51):32) in the *Septuagint*. In the A.V. 98 and 1295 are translated “pond”, “pool”, “standing water”, and “fish pool.” There is not one place in the Old Testament where any of these terms may be interpreted as applying to a body of people as Mr. Barley implies!

The Greek word **ס: <Q**(lake) appears 10 times in the New Testament, always translated “lake”, and corresponding to the 10 times which the English word “lake” appears in the King James A.V. Five of these occurrences are in Luke, at 5:1 and 2, and 8:22, 23 and 33. Nowhere in these places may “lake” mean “a body of people.” The other five occurrences of the word “lake” are all in Revelation, 19:20, 20:10, 14, 15, and 21:8. All of these mention the term “lake of fire”, and that term only appears in these verses.

Rev. 19:20: “And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him ... These both were cast alive into a lake of fire and brimstone.”

Rev. 20:10: “And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever.”

Rev. 20:14: “And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death.”

Rev. 20:15: “And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire.”

Rev. 21:8: “But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death.”

How could Barley honestly confuse the New Jerusalem (Rev. 21:9-27) with death and hell and the beast and the false prophet and the second death – from which no recovery is mentioned – with Yahweh’s people, with the 12 tribes of Israel (Rev. 21:12) who are the only people permitted to enter the New Jerusalem, with “the **nations** of them which are saved”, and with “they which are written in the Lamb’s book of life (Rev. 21:24, 27)? Is his deception purposeful? Why did he have to write a book to explain such simple concepts as those found in Revelation 21? What doesn’t Barley understand about “tormented day and night forever”?

Other passages in Scripture which discuss these events concerning the “lake of fire”, although the word “lake” is not mentioned specifically, are: Isaiah 66:22-23 (the New Jerusalem) and 66:24, Matt. 3:10-12 (Luke 3:9-17), Matt. 7:19 (John 15:6-7), Matt. 13:37-43, 2 Thess. 1:6-9, 2 Peter 3:7-13 and Jude 7. It should be clear that the wheat, the good tree, those who are written in the book of life, the nations who are saved, have a fate which contrasts starkly with that of the tares, the tree which does not produce good fruit, those who are not written in the book of life! Has Barley actually read the Bible? If so, how could he confuse these things?

Let us examine one other parable connected to these verses, that of the sheep and the goats found at Matthew 25:31-41: “When the son of man shall come in his glory ... And before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left ...” The sheep and goats here are **nations**. The Greek word is **\$2<@** (ethnos) from which we get the English word ethnicity. There is no believer/non-believer imagery here, only sheep and goat nations, and its very easy for the shepherd to tell them apart. “Then shall the king say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the Kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world” and verses 35 through 40 show that the sheep nations have generally performed the will of Yahweh. These are “the nations of them which are

saved” in Rev. 21:24. Verse 41 states: “Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, **into everlasting fire**, prepared for the devil and his angels ...” and verses 42 through 45 explain that the goats have generally not performed the will of Yahweh. The parable ends with verse 46: “And these shall **go away into everlasting punishment**: but the righteous into life eternal.” Why can’t Barley accept the clear fact that the goats, which are nations (not “sinners” nor “unbelievers”) are permanently doomed, and that the sheep, which are nations, have been predestined for salvation? Can it be any clearer than this parable? I guess that if one can mistake “seeing” for “partaking of”, as Barley does with Luke 3:6, one can believe anything! Surely this topic shall be revisited later, but now Barley offers another diversion concerning Genesis 17 and the Abrahamic Covenant.

Genesis 17:10-11 state: “This is my covenant, which you shall keep, **between me and you and thy seed after thee**; Every man child among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you.” Here it is clear that the circumcision is not the covenant. The covenant, which is only to Abraham and his descendants, is explained in the preceding verses 4 through 9. Circumcision is only a sign (“token”) of the covenant. Barley states that, because Abraham was told to circumcise his servants, that these servants – Adamite or not – were “obviously included ... and grafted into the Covenant God made with Abraham.” Yet where is this obvious? The circumcision of Abraham’s servants is a sign of the obedience of Abraham, and not of the servants, and a sign “of the covenant betwixt” Yahweh and Abraham, not Yahweh and the servants! No one is “grafted in” to Yahweh’s Covenant with Abraham: it is between Yahweh, Abraham, and Abraham’s descendants, only!

Barley asserts that of Abraham’s servants and the others with him: “this was a large household of people who were not Hebrews” (and of course they were not Israelites) and here Barley contrives a blatant deception, because he has absolutely not one piece of Scriptural evidence to base this statement upon! The only evidence as to the identity of those with Abraham lies in Genesis 12:3, and the language used there, and the location being Haran in northern Syria, from a historical and archaeological perspective, surely all indicate that Abraham’s servants were Adamic, descendants of Shem, though this is only circumstantial. Yet Barley is obviously leading his readers to a rash, reckless and unsupportable conclusion: that the Abrahamic Covenant is extendable to non-Adamic creatures.

Genesis 17:15-19 distinguish Isaac from Ishmael, and Yahweh clearly states in verse 19 that the Covenant with Abraham would be established with Isaac and his descendants after him, and that such would be “an everlasting covenant.” It was Isaac, and none other, dedicated to Yahweh (the meaning of the Greek word **ἁγίος**: set apart and dedicated to God) upon the altar of sacrifice.

Ishmael was promised to be “a great nation”, in Gen. 17:20, but this is not promised to be “everlasting”, and Isaac’s fate is again emphasized at verse 21. Following the birth of Isaac in Genesis chapter 21, Hagar and Ishmael are sent away, with no part in the Abrahamic Covenant guaranteed to be established in Isaac, but only a promise that Ishmael would be made “a nation, because he is thy seed” (21:13). Again, this was not an “everlasting” promise. Sarah states to Abraham “Cast out this bondwoman and her son: for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac.” The events of verses 12 to 15 surely indicate that this was Yahweh’s will. The main points of my initial letter to Barley, and which Barley completely ignored in his response to me, include Paul’s explanation of this very thing in Galatians chapter 4. How can Barley ignore this, and offer to the descendants of Ishmael the very thing that Yahweh so clearly denies them: a part of the inheritance of Isaac? How can Barley state that “this [the Abrahamic] covenant covers every child in the household of Abraham” and “Ishmael, of course, would be included in this covenant blessing”, so obviously contrary to the Scriptural record of Genesis chapters 17 and 21 and Galatians 4? Barley’s pattern of deception becomes more and more apparent as his statements are investigated!

Barley then insists that the sons of Abraham by Keturah be included in the Abrahamic Covenant. Now, while the sons of Keturah were clearly Adamic stock, neither were they included in the chosen line of Isaac, and they too were sent away by Abraham, for which see Genesis 25:6. In fact, some of the

Midianites evidently returned to Canaan, and mingled themselves with the baneful Amalekites (Judges 6-8), and Gideon was instructed by Yahweh to slay all the host of Midian. So much for Dave Barley's version of the Abrahamic Covenant!

Exactly who Hagar was is a mystery. For in Egypt there were Hamites (Mizraim), Shemites, and aboriginal non-Adamic peoples, including Nubians. The servants given Abraham, the wife that Lot acquired, and Hagar, may have each been any one or even a combination of these. No man can tell, except that Paul in Galatians 4 explains that Ishmael was born not according to the promise, but according to the flesh (4:23), and Ishmael was born not after the Spirit, but after the flesh (4:29). The Galatians were some of the offspring of those Israelites who were deported by the Assyrians, and Paul certainly knew that they were Israelites, which is why he says: "Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise." And the Arabs, Mr. Barley, are **NOT** children of that promise! Why is this so difficult for you to perceive?

After attempting to pervert the terms of the Abrahamic Covenant by "grafting" various peoples into it, blindly assuming that they are not Adamites, Barley asks of me three questions. I will here answer the third, and then the first two together. The third is: "Furthermore ... how sure are you that your bloodline is pure and untainted over the last 5,000 years or so?" To which I will only answer: What should my personal situation matter? If I were a bastard (of mixed blood), should I attempt to mold Yahweh in my own likeness? Should I perceive His Word after my own image? Oh, there are plenty who do such things, Mr. Barley: I beg not to walk before Yahweh if I am one of them! Jeremiah 13:23 comes to mind here: "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? May you also do good, that are accustomed to do evil." "A corrupt tree brings forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit" (Matt. 7:17-18). You claim to be a pastor in Israel, and need to ask these things?

As for Barley's first two questions: "If you are basing your salvation solely upon your race, then what need do you have of a Savior? Does the bible really teach that a person is saved by race rather than Jesus [sic] Christ and His Grace?"

First, Mr. Barley, the New Covenant is a matter of prophecy, and it was prophesied only for Israel (Jeremiah 31:31-33) and no one else. As Paul says in Galatians: "Brethren, (I speak as befits a man), even a validated covenant of man no one sets aside, or makes additions to for himself" (my own translation). An oft-discussed theme in the prophets is that Israel was disobedient, Israel would be scattered among the other (and all Adamic) nations, Israel would be later redeemed, Israel would be "saved" (or preserved), Israel was regathered, and Israel would be reconciled to Yahweh. This story is related in Jeremiah, in Isaiah, in Ezekiel, in Hosea, and elements of it are related in all the other prophets! Both salvation and redemption (which is kinsman redemption, by the law) are matters of prophecy, and only prophesied for Israel. The promises of redemption for Israel are too numerous to list here completely. A good start would be with Psalms 25, 105:6-10, 135:4; Isaiah 25, 29:18-24, 41:8-16, 43, 44:21-24, 51:1-11, 61:1-3; Jeremiah 31:11, Hosea 7:13 and Zechariah 10:8. Ezekiel 16:59-63 confirms Jeremiah 31:31-33. In Romans 11:29 Paul explains that these prophecies are irrevocable. Israel was chosen and called long before the birth of Christ, Mr. Barley. There is no argument between "race" and "grace" since the fact is that its both! Israel, the race, was preserved by the grace of Yahweh. Israel was not chosen out of the non-Adamic races, rather Israel was chosen out of all the branches of the Adamic race, listed in Genesis 10, all of whom have since been consumed by the non-white, non-Adamic races! That's right, Mr. Barley: All of the Genesis 10 nations were White, and now they are not, except for the remnant of Israel. This story, presented in the Bible, is fully evident in history and archaeology also. And why wouldn't it be? This is why Zechariah the father of John the Baptist prophesied: "Blessed *be* Yahweh God of Israel; for he hath visited **and redeemed his people**, And hath 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, which have been since the world began: **That we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us**; To perform the mercy *promised* to our fathers, **and to remember his holy covenant**; The oath which **he sware to our father Abraham**. ... we, being **delivered out of the hand of our enemies**, might serve him with fear ..." and more today than ever

do we need to know these things, Mr. Barley, because as Judaea fell into the hands of the Edomites in 40 B.C., America has fallen into the hands of the Edomites since 1913! You claim to pronounce “America’s Promise”, yet you know not these things? Today Israel, blind and on the way to extinction through miscegenation, needs their Savior more than ever!

Barley goes on to quote Ephesians 2:8 “For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: *it is* the gift of God” and of course Paul was absolutely correct, by grace through faith the Ephesians, being descended from the Israelites via the Danaans, Dorians and Phoenicians who became known as Greeks, certainly are redeemed and granted salvation “As he spake by the mouth of his prophets” (Luke 1:70). There were also Romans among the Ephesians, and they too were Israelites. That Paul knew the Ephesians were Israelites is evident at Eph. 1:4-7, 1:11-14, 2:3, 2:11-17, 2:19 and elsewhere. His language in these verses: chosen, predestinated, redemption, purchased possession, inheritance, in times past, aliens (alienated), only makes sense if indeed the Ephesians are Israel.

But before quoting Ephesians 2:8 Barley makes an odd statement which needs to be addressed: “... and by faith we claim the blood of Christ which cleanses us from ALL unrighteousness even the unrighteousness of race mixing by our ancestors if there is any.” This is exactly opposite to the apostle John’s statement in 1 John 5:16: “If any man see his brother sin a sin *which is* not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death: I do not say that he shall pray for it.” Jeremiah at 2:21 lamented Jerusalem’s becoming a “strange vine.” Ezekiel 16:3 tells us why, for the people of Judah in Jerusalem mixed themselves with the Canaanites, Amorites and Hittites. For this reason in Jeremiah 2:22 he says: “For though thou wash thee with nitre, and take thee much soap, *yet* thine iniquity is marked before me ...” These mixed Judahites, among whom are descended many of today’s Arabs and Jews, were the bad figs of Jeremiah 24, and their race-mixed children can not be cleansed ever!

“But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation.” Is this not the “sin unto death” of 1 John? Is this not the iniquity of Jeremiah 2:22, which cannot be washed off? In Greek, Mr. Barley, (~~ἅγιος~~) (“holy”) means “devoted to God” (Liddle and Scott) or “set aside for God” (*Thayer*) This leads back to Exodus 19:5-6, repeated at 1 Peter 2:9. A holy nation, a peculiar people, a chosen generation (Greek (~~ἕθνος~~), **race**). How can we be, upon accepting non-Adamites as our peers and fellows? Such is the blasphemy of the Holy Spirit! And as Paul states at Hebrews 10:29: “Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing (~~κόσμιος~~ | 2839: common or profane), and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?” This is what you are doing, Mr. Barley: making common, or profaning, the blood of the Covenant by attempting to wash unholy people with it! This is blasphemy of the Holy Spirit! You say that “ALL unrighteousness” can be cleansed, yet ignore the sin which can not be forgiven. ~~ἀσέβητος~~ | is an antonym of (~~ἅγιος~~). The word “ungodly” in Romans 5:6 which you quote here is • **F, \$ZI**, more properly translated “impious” and a perfect description of Israel. Race mixing is a sin which can not be washed off, for one’s offspring there is no repair. See the recent Clifton Emahiser pamphlet *The Unpardonable Sin* for a further discussion of this very topic, from the same perspective.

Dave Barley then quotes Genesis 9:13-15, and calls this Scripture “the whole purpose of God”, which seems to insinuate that this great revelation would enable us to ignore the thousand pages or so of Scripture that follow it. Now it may be demonstrated, Mr. Barley, that the Noachic covenant has nothing to do with the aboriginal peoples of the planet, because the lands that they inhabited at this time were not even affected by the flood. Those races are not a part of the picture here, since the only people with Noah were his Adamic sons, wife and daughters-in-law. Yes, the Noachic covenant was made with Noah and every beast that was with him, however the only promise made to those creatures is that they would not again face total destruction by flood. They are not made part of any other covenant. They are not given a ticket to heaven. They are not granted eternal life. They do not become “sheep”, sons of Yahweh, children of Abraham, or anything else other than that which they were before the flood!

Next Barley quotes Genesis 12:3, as if to draw some connection between “all the families of the earth” there and “every living creature” or “every beast of the earth” that was with Noah. Barley neglects to notice that “all the families of the earth” (or “of the land”) may intend only those Adamic families of Genesis 10, called such at 10:5, 20 and 32. Barley also fails to notice that Genesis 12 only promises a covenant, and that at the consummation of that covenant described at Genesis 15, the dispossession of certain families, including the Canaanites of Genesis 10 (although not all of these Genesis 15 families descended from Noah,) is discussed in verses 18-21. Surely the Kenites, Rephaim, Amorites and their cousins are not among “all the families” of Genesis 12:3, for these people have no heritage with Adam! Barley’s version of Scripture leads to nothing but confusion, and all roads lead back to Genesis 3:15, yet I will not make that the topic of discussion here.

Barley then quotes 1 Corinthians 15:47-49 in an effort to further support his universalistic theology, yet he doesn’t realize that Paul at 15:45 is here equating man (—~~2DT B@~~) with Adam. Paul earlier says at 15:39, that “all flesh is not the same flesh” and explains that Adam-man is “sown a natural body” and “raised a spiritual body.” This Spirit is in us as we are “sown”, i.e. at our conception (Romans 8:11, Gal. 4:29, 1 Cor. 5:5, 6:20, 7:40, Eph. 4:4, 1 Thess. 5:23 etc.) because it was “breathed into” our father Adam (and no other creature), and here Paul connects the Spirit of Adam with the seed of Adam. The good seed are the children of the kingdom, and the bad seed are headed for the “lake of fire” from which there is no return (Matt. 13:37-43, Rev. 20:10, 14, 15). As I said in my first letter, Mr. Barley, we are either son or bastards (Heb. 12:8), and there is no third alternative!

Philippians 2:14-15 from the Greek of the NA27: “Do all things apart from murmuring and disputing, that you would be perfect and with unmixed blood, blameless children of Yahweh in the midst of a race crooked and perverted – among whom you appear as luminaries in the cosmos” (Note 1 Cor. 15:40-41) with which 1 Peter 1:23 agrees: “Being born from above, not of corruptible parentage but of incorruptible, through the word of the living and abiding Yahweh” (my own translations).

The “man” of 1 Corinthians 15, Mr. Barley, is Adamic man, and no other. As Paul says at 15:50, “flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God” and Ishmael, “born after the flesh” and not after the Spirit (Galatians 4:21-31) certainly “shall not be heir with the son of the free woman”, because Arabs are not Adam, and have not the spirit of Yahweh! Mr. Barley, it is hard for you kick against the pricks (to offer vain resistance). Why do you resist the Word of Yahweh? Or have you some hidden agenda?

Barley goes on to quote 1 John 3:2, yet who is John referring to, but Israelites? Surely not to the many Anti-Christes already in the world, described at 1 John 2:18-23. Does Barley know the identity of those people? Yes, but he denies it. As I have just mentioned, all roads lead back to Genesis 3:15. Barley then quotes 1 Peter 2:9, as if Peter is addressing someone other than Israel, as if 2:9 is a reference to something other than Exodus 19:5, and as if 2:10 is a reference to something other than Hosea 1:6-11. Mr. Barley, where is your shame? To quote these verses and then state “God was never at any time limiting Himself to just Israel,” Oh, the deceit!

Barley here quotes Amos 3:2, and insists that the word yada (*Strong’s* 3045 and its Aramaic twin 3046) doesn’t really mean “to know”! In Barley’s world, where the verb “to see” used in Luke 3:6 may mean “to partake of”, I suppose that anything is possible. However in the real world, yada is the most common Hebrew word meaning “to know”, and is translated as such over 600 times in the A.V. Can Yahweh not express His Own intent, Mr. Barley? Barley then asks “Who are they [Israel] going to rule over?” But he neglects to realize that by Abraham’s seed all of the Genesis 10 Adamic families will be blessed: since they too have the Spirit which Adam had, and will be resurrected, as Yahshua Christ Himself testifies at Matthew 12:41-42. Now there is nothing, Mr. Barley, which indicates that any Arabs or other mixed people will be in the Kingdom, for the evidence is quite the contrary: the children of fornication are to be killed by Yahshua Christ (Rev. 2:20-23). Keep denying this, Mr. Barley, and you multiply your iniquity.

Here again Barley quotes Romans 8:21-22, ignoring the fact that all Adamites represent one “creation” (Acts 17:26, Gen. 1:26-28, 2:7, 5:1-2, 9:1-6) which Paul here contrasts to “any other creation”

at 8:38-39. Evidently Barley does not read the entire Bible, but only certain verses that fit his image of God.

Barley goes on to make much of Daniel's "conversion" of Cyrus the Persian, as if Cyrus were not also an Adamite. Cyrus was anointed by Yahweh to assume the stature which he did, as recorded by Isaiah at 44:28 and 45:1ff. A review of both history (for Herodotus says much concerning this Cyrus) and the Bible reveal that on his mother's side Cyrus was the grandson of Astyages, the king of the Medes, and on his father's side he was heir of the throne of Persia. The Medes were descendants of Madai son of Japheth (Gen. 10:2) and the Persians were Elamites, from Elam the son of Shem (Genesis 10:22), all of which I discuss in Clifton Emahiser's *Watchman's Teaching Letters* #'s 64 and 65. The Magi who visited Bethlehem at the birth of Christ were a priesthood of the Persians and Medes. Barley claims to be a pastor in Israel, and does not know these things? The Medes and Persians, Mr. Barley, were all Adamites, as Cyrus was, as the Magi were, and among those Genesis 10 families blessed by Abraham's seed. The Arabs are not!

Barley makes the same mistake interpreting the book of Jonah, not realizing or pointing out that the Assyrians of Nineveh were of the tribe of Asshur, the son of Shem (Genesis 10:22) and were also Adamites. Why doesn't Barley mention that the Assyrians were White Adamic people? Because he would rather twist the truth in order to support a twisted theology. And two paragraphs later Barley accuses me of making false assumptions! Mr. Barley, the Assyrians were Adamites, and the Arabs are not. You can not pervert those simple and basic facts.

Next Barley complains that I blamed him for the responsibility of having "converted some Arab to following Christ." He is correct, that he did not in his original newsletter take credit for this thing directly, but apparently the Arab watched a tape produced by Barley, had Barley's phone number, called Barley, received encouragement and comfort from Barley, and Barley revels in this to such a degree that he tells all of his readers about this experience. Barley teaches Arabs that they may be Christians, non-Adamites (the equivalent of non-Israelites in our era, since only Israel was preserved by Yahweh) that they can somehow be "saved", and now he won't accept the blame for his errors, but instead accuses the Holy Spirit! For Barley states that "the Holy Spirit moved upon this man's heart and he became convicted, or converted to following Christ the Savior." Should the Holy Spirit move upon the heart of an Arab? Would it do so? Jeremiah at 2:21 called the inhabitants of Jerusalem a "degenerate plant of a strange vine", as Ezekiel at 16:3 explains, the Judahites there mixed with the Canaanite tribes. The very word "arab", as I tried to explain to Barley in my first letter, means "mixed." This is why Jeremiah at 2:13 says of them "they have forsaken me, the fountain of living waters *and* hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water." For one may realize, this is a poetic metaphor for physical bodies which cannot contain the Spirit of Yahweh.

Isaiah 52:11 says "Depart ye, depart ye, go out from hence, touch no unclean *thing*; go ye out from the midst of her; be ye clean, that bear the vessels of Yahweh." Paul in Romans 9 tells us that Yahweh made "of the same lump" (comparing Jacob and Esau) one vessel unto honor, prepared for glory (Israelites) and one vessel unto dishonor, "the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction" (Edomites). At 2 Cor. 16:16 Paul states "for ye are the temple of the living God", and at verse 17 paraphrases Isa. 52:11, and notice that again "thing" is added to "unclean" by the translators. The physical body of every Adamite is a temple, because it contains the Spirit of Yahweh given to Adam. The other races do not have that Spirit, and they are "the unclean" in these verses. In the Old Testament things ~~604~~ ⁶⁰⁴ ~~I~~, or common, were "unclean" as opposed to things ~~(4)~~ ⁽⁴⁾, or holy, being sanctified. Only Israel as a race was ever sanctified (Gen. 22:9, Exod. 19:5) and not even the other Adamites, and certainly not the other and mixed races!

Peter at 2 Pet. 2:14-17 discusses the "cursed children" who "have forsaken the right way, and are gone astray, following the way of Balaam ..." and says "These are wells without water, clouds carried with a tempest; to whom the midst of darkness is reserved for ever ..." The "way of Balaam" is race-mixing, which is fornication (Rev. 2:14, 2:20-23), which Jude calls the "error of Balaam" and calls these people "clouds without water, carried about of winds; trees whose fruit withered" and says "to whom is

reserved the blackness of darkness forever”, “wells without water” and “clouds without water” are just like “broken cisterns, that can hold no water” and “vessels of wrath, fitted for destruction” which obviously hold no water either. It was Balaam who counseled Balak (Numbers chapters 22 through 25) to have his Canaanite-Moabite subjects seduce the men of Israel “and fell in one day three and twenty thousand” (1 Cor. 10:8). For more evidence of this see Micah 6:5, and *Josephus’ Antiquities* 4:6:6 (4:126-130) where this is explained explicitly. Now Mr. Barley, since these Arabs (mixed) people are the products of fornication (race-mixing), who are “trees whose fruit is withered” for whom “is reserved the blackness of darkness forever”, how do YOU suppose that they can be “saved”? And if they are “broken cisterns that can hold no water” how do YOU suppose that the Spirit of Yahweh could or even would inhabit them? How do you suppose that the Holy Spirit would touch the unclean *thing*? What is a cloud without water? Dust. And what was Adam before Yahweh added His Spirit? Dust. See Genesis 2:7. A cloud without water is equivalent to a “man” without the Spirit of Yahweh, which bastards are!

Then Mr. Barley lies: “In your open letter ... you also make the false assumption that many people make. Most of us were taught in the Judeo-Christian world that whoever becomes a Christian becomes a spiritual Israelite.” And goes on to plug his book! This is the second book Barley has tried to sell me so far. It seems to me that he made up a lie about my letter simply to get this plug into his reply, for no place in my letter did I make the ridiculous “false assumption” which I am accused of! Is Barley’s real intent to sell books? And to sell tapes? No wonder he should not accept the truth: that, as we will see, only Israelites can be legitimate Christians. The truth severely narrows Mr. Barley’s prospective market! “Christian Arab”, Mr. Barley is quite an oxymoron! Mr. Barley goes on to state “Race does not make someone a Christian” and underlines his statement, as if to have it sound authoritative. What is a Christian?

The word Christian appears in the New Testament at Acts 11:26, 26:28 and 1 Peter 4:16 only. It is derived from the word **ODFJ`I** (Christos) or “anointed.” While the translators of our Bibles simply write “Christ” every time they see **ODFJ`I**, many times the word in context applies not to Yahshua Christ Himself, but to His people Israel, the anointed people. Examples supporting this will be provided here. First, it is the children of Israel who are called Yahweh’s “anointed” at 1 Samuel 2:10 and 2:35 (and the *LXX* Greek has **ODFJ`I** here). This is also true at Psalm 132:17 (and the *LXX* also has **ODFJ`I** there), and Psalms 20:6, 28:8 and 105:15. Paul tells the Corinthians (Dorian Greeks, who were “lost” Israelites) that God “hath anointed us” (2 Cor. 1:21) and John speaks of “the anointing which ye have received” (1 John 2:27). When was this anointing, except at Exodus 19:5-6?

Once it is evident that the word **ODFJ`I** refers not only to Yahshua Christ Himself but also to His body (1 Cor. 12 et al.), the anointed children of Israel, many Greek New Testament passages may be translated much more clearly in context:

Hebrews 11:26: “[Moses] having esteemed the reproach of the Anointed [people] greater riches than the treasures of Egypt ...”

Romans 9:1-5: “I speak the truth among the Anointed [people], I lie not ... for I have prayed that I myself would be accursed from the Anointed [people] for my brethren ... those who are Israelites ... whose are the fathers; and of whom are the Anointed [people] in regards to the flesh, being over all [other Adamic people] blessed of Yahweh for eternity. Truly” (comparing Edomites and Israelites in Judaea).

1 Cor. 1:13: “Have the Anointed [people] been divided? Has Paul been crucified on your behalf? ...”

Galatians 3:16: “Now to Abraham the promises have been spoken, and to his offspring. It does not say ‘and to your offsprings’, as of many [i.e. Ishmael, et al.]; but as of one: ‘and to your offspring’ which are Anointed [Israel].”

Ephesians 5:5: “This is known by you: that any fornicator, or unclean or greedy *person* – who is an idolater, has no inheritance in the kingdom of the Anointed [people] and of Yahweh.”

Colossians 1:27: “To whom Yahweh did wish to make known what the riches of the honor of this mystery *are* among the Nations, which is the expectation of honor anointed in you.” (For the translators also overlooked the basic meaning of **ODFJ`I** “anointed”, a simple Greek adjective).

There are many more examples of this usage, however these are just a few of the obviously important ones. Yet I am still not finished examining this word **ODFJ`I**.

In Isaiah 43:1 Yahweh stated that Israel is redeemed and called by His name. Of course this was a prophecy, of an event to happen in a time after Isaiah wrote it. Yahweh states at Isaiah 45:3-4 that Israel, His elect, is called by His name. Isaiah 62:2 foresees that Israel will "... be called by a new name, which the mouth of Yahweh shall name." Speaking to the mixed-Canaanite inhabitants of a desolate Jerusalem (Isa. 64:10) at Isaiah 65:13: "... ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen: for the Lord Yahweh shall slay thee, and call His servants (Israel) by another name." And Numbers 6:27 prophecies that: "... they shall put my name upon the children of Israel." When did this happen, Mr. Barley, if not when the faithful children of Israel, returning to Christ (whom Yahweh is), began to be called "Christian"? And for how many centuries was (mostly) Israelite Europe called "Christendom"? And if His Name as a matter of prophecy was to be applied to the children of Israel, how is it proper that you apply any of the names He is called by to anyone else but Israel? So no, Mr. Barley, an Arab (or any other creature) can NOT be a Christian! Yet this is what you do, make common the blood you were bought with, and thereby blaspheme the Holy Spirit. For indeed, Mr. Barley, race is the first requirement: being of the race of Israel, needed for one to be a Christian, one of Yahweh's Anointed.

Circumcision alone incorporated no one into the Old Covenant. I have already demonstrated this in the preceding pages. The New Covenant was made with Israel and Judah (Jer. 31:31), and that is prerequisite for believers (Matt. 15:24). This is the context of the Bible, the book of the race of Adam, and no other race is included.

Barley proceeds by telling me "you have falsely accused me of promoting race mixing in your article over and over and I have never done that!" But does he not see his own hypocrisy, staring at him in the face? I stated in my letter that the very word "Arab" means "mixed." The Arabs, all of them, are products of that same fornication which Barley claims to be against! Can one embrace the idol, but reject the process which made it? Can one promote Chevrolets, yet not benefit General Motors? Does Barley believe that a bad tree can produce good fruit, contrary to all Scripture? How can an Arab, a mamzer, a bastard, even function under any law which makes his very existence a sin? Barley embraces Arabs, while Peter says that they are "... to whom the midst of darkness is reserved forever." And Jude says they are "trees whose fruit is withered ... to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever." Barley looks upon this darkness, and calls it light! And Christian! How could this be? Has light concord with darkness?

I must say, by embracing the products of other men's sins – for the Arabs are products of fornication – Dave Barley has made himself a partaker of other men's sins (1 Tim. 5:22), whether he realizes it or not. Paul, at the end of Romans chapter 1, lists some of their crimes, among which is fornication (1:29), which is race mixing. At 1:32 Paul states "... such as these who knowing the judgments of Yahweh, that they practicing such things are worthy of death, not only they who cause them, but also they who approve of those committing them." Yahweh did not create Arabs, and it would be blasphemy indeed to accuse Him of breaking His Own laws. Fornicators created Arabs, and no Arab can even procreate without further fornication. Fornication, then, becomes a never ending process to which Barley places his seal of approval, making the claim that an Arab can "become" a Christian! But Yahshua Christ says quite the contrary: "Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up" (Matt. 15:13). O, Dave Barley, who art thou that repliest against God? (Rom. 9:20). Next Barley talks about strangers in Israel, which I will surely address shortly ...

Barley here makes a rather silly statement: "... you are under the false assumption that all strangers among Israel were white Adamites. The White race has always been the minority among the earth's population all of its existence." Silly because Barley rather consistently confuses the "planet" with the "world." The Greeks did not have this confusion. Strabo the Geographer's "world" included all of Africa north of the Sahara from the straits of Gibraltar to the horn of Africa, east to the Ganges river in India, north to the Jaxartes river in Asia, and west to the British Isles. This was the Greco-Roman "world" in spite of the fact that Eratosthenes calculated the circumference of the planet a couple of centuries before

Strabo, and that they knew of land masses beyond their “world.” They knew the planet was a sphere, and Eratosthenes’ calculation of its size was within reason. This Greek world was the **ἡ γῆ** or “inhabitable earth”, but in the A.V. simply “world.”

Another word translated “world” in the Bible is **κόσμος**, which in Greek means “order.” Liddle & Scott give: “order, ... 2. good order, good behavior, decency ... 3. the form, fashion of a thing ... 4. of states, order, government ... II. an ornament, decoration, embellishment, dress ... III. a regulator ... IV. the world or universe, from its perfect order ... 2. mankind, as we use ‘the world’, N.T.” Now this last definition is only as the various N.T. translators, not the Greek writers, use the word, but even that is acceptable once realized that “mankind” is Adam kind, and “the world” is the **ἡ γῆ** and not the planet. In all actuality, the **κόσμος** is the state of order within the **ἡ γῆ** (extended to its heavenly bodies also, which the ancients perceived as being much more a part of their “world”); the **κόσμος** is the decorum of the **ἡ γῆ**. Liddle & Scott define **ἡ γῆ** as “... the Greek world ... so in Roman times, the Roman world, N.T.” So once we see how these two words translated “world” in the A.V. were actually used in ancient times, and that they never meant “planet” as we know it, we may perceive these terms in a more realistic, sounder manner when we meet them in Scripture.

What does this have to do with Barley’s statement? First, it eliminates, and rightly so, most of the aboriginal non-Adamic peoples of the planet (which make the White race a minority today,) from the scope of the Bible. Second, once one realizes that the “world” as described by Strabo and all of the Greeks before him, was astonishingly White, and that the non-white races or the mixed races at its fringes were quite marginalized, the context of so many New Testament statements becomes so much clearer.

Abraham came to Palestine from the White “world” of northern Syria. He brought with him servants who were “the souls that they had gotten in Haran”, a town certainly familiar to Abraham since it bears the same name as his grandfather and one of his brothers, and from archaeology we know beyond doubt that a large Semetic-speaking population dwelt in this region at an early time. He also brought with him several family members. Mr. Barley would rather assume that Abraham had a bunch of non-whites with him, because it promotes his “universalist” cause, yet he can not establish that except to state that “the White Race has always been a minority.” Mr. Barley, is the White Race a minority in Idaho, Montana, Wyoming or Oregon, places near the region which you inhabit today?

The **ἡ γῆ** of Abraham’s time was much smaller than that of Strabo’s and the non-white tribes which our Adamic fathers had contact with are all mentioned in the Bible. Aside from the “battle of the kings” in Genesis 14, we have the Kenites, Kenizzites, Kadmonites, Perrizzites and Rephaim of Genesis 15, none of whom are descendants of Adam or Noah. With these mingled Canaanite tribes, and later the Edomites (from Esau), Moab, Ammon, and Ishmael. Another non-Adamic tribe which entered the **ἡ γῆ** are the Horites (for which “Hivite” is a scribal error), the Hurrians of archaeology, and they are mentioned later in Genesis. More or less, the Bible tells us all we need to know concerning the non-Adamic peoples which our ancestors came into contact with. There is no foundation for Mr. Barley’s false assumptions.

Barley then states “the strangers (of any race) were allowed to dwell among Israel” which is a totally false assumption because it is based upon a perverted view of both the scope of the Bible and the prevalence of non-white nations within the Biblical **ἡ γῆ**. Barley ignores the fact that the Israelites were told to kill all of the non-white and mixed tribes of the land, which were the Canaanites. When Israel failed, these people were to become a great scourge to them, as foretold at Numbers 33:55, Joshua 23:13 and Judges 2:3. And a scourge these people are, since the Canaanites and related Edomites of Biblical times are found in the Arabs, Jews and other mixed races of the Mediterranean and Mesopotamia today! Surely in the days of the Judges, there were many universalist panderers such as Mr. Barley, admitting these people into our communities!

Barley goes on to say: “Remember that God causes Israel to even separate from their kind when they become idolatrous. And, incidentally, this is also the meaning of 2 Corinthians 6:14, which you quoted in your letter to (I assume) somehow prove that the different races cannot even associate with Israel.” and

here Mr. Barley tells two lies in one statement! First, I never quoted 2 Cor. 6:14 in my letter. I did make a loose reference to 2 Cor. 6 in connection with the term Belial, and quoted part of 6:15, stating that “Belial (*Strong’s* #1100) has a connection with the idea of something “mixed” (see #1098) and Christ has no concord with Belial!”, after showing that the word “arab” also means “mixed.” Barley didn’t address this in my letter, but rather diverts his readers’ attention to 6:14. He ignores 6:15 out of convenience, and then manufactures a second lie concerning 6:14!

Barley states of 2 Cor. 6:14: “The ‘unbelievers’ presented in this verse is NOT a racial statement, but a religious statement.” Well, Mr. Barley, now that **you** brought up 2 Cor. 6:14, I am quite pleased that you did, for here I will prove that this verse IS a racial statement, and NOT a religious one!

- **Ⓞ, ⓓⓁ(Ⓧ)** is the verb translated “be unequally yoked” in this verse. It appears no where else in the Bible.

- However, **Ⓞ, ⓓ . Ⓛ(Ⓞ)**, the adjectival form appears in the *LXX* at Leviticus 19:19. This word is derived from two Greek words, **. Ⓛ(Ⓛ)**, a yoke (Matt. 11:29, 30; Acts 15:10, Gal. 5:1, 1 Tim. 6:1) and **Ⓜ, ⓓⓁ** meaning “other” or “other than.” Liddle & Scott define **Ⓞ, ⓓ . Ⓛ(Ⓞ)**: “coupled with an animal of diverse kind, *LXX*.”

- **Ⓞ, ⓓ . Ⓛ(Ⓞ)** was used to express in Greek what the English, of the A.V. reads “with a diverse kind”, in Lev. 19:19: “Thou shalt not let thy cattle gender with a diverse kind”, for which the *LXX* Greek is: **Ⓜ • ⓂⓏ < Ⓞ ⓕⓁ** (your cattle) **ⓂⓏ ⓂⓏ ⓂⓏ, ⓂⓏ, ⓂⓏ** (do not let “gender”, where the verb implies the act of sexual intercourse) **Ⓞ, ⓓⓁ . ⓂⓏ**.

- This word must also be contrasted to the word **ⓕⓁ . Ⓛ(Ⓞ)** used by Paul at Philippians 4:3, which Liddle & Scott define as: “yoked together, paired ... **ⓕⓁ . Ⓛ(Ⓞ) Ⓞ "ⓁⓂ" Ⓜ**wedded union ... As a female substantive, a wife ... masculine a yoke-fellow, comrade.”

With all of these facts in mind, here I will translate this verse from the NA27 Greek, bearing in mind that **Ⓞ, ⓓ . Ⓛ(Ⓞ)** can not possibly be represented by a single English word: “do not be yoked together with aliens not to be trusted” or “do not be yoked together with untrustworthy aliens.” The word translated “unbelievers” in the A.V. here being an adjective, and not a noun. It should be evident with this alone that 2 Cor. 6:14 is a racial, and not a religious statement, however there is more.

Paul explains at 1 Cor. 7:12-14, that Christians should remain with their unbelieving spouses, if the spouse desires such, and if not then the unbelieving spouse should depart. Now it should also be evident that if 2 Cor. 6:14 is only a “religious” statement, then Paul would be a hypocrite. Rather, Dave Barley is a liar! 2 Cor. 6:14 is a racial statement, **Ⓞ, ⓓ . Ⓛ(Ⓞ)** meaning just what it does at Leviticus 19:19, and Paul is certainly no hypocrite!

Barley, pandering to the other races, goes on to make statements concerning “true Divine created diversity” and the promotion of diversity, and that “the different races, as God created them, can peacefully, and orderly exist together”, and pretending to criticize humanism, he promotes it! Did Yahshua come to bring peace? Nay, rather a sword! (Matt. 10:34). “Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, Nay: but rather division.” (Luke 12:51). Where in the Bible, Mr Barley, did God create the different races? Yahweh only created Adam, and the beasts of various kinds. Adam was to have dominion and subdue the earth and everything in it. (Genesis 1:26-28, 2:4-7, 2:19-20, 5:1, 9:1-3). Since your “other races” are not Adam-kind, they must be beast-kind (Genesis 9:5, Exodus 19:13, 22:19, Leviticus 20:15, 16 and Jonah 3:8, and Hebrews 12:20). Jeremiah 31:27-30 states in part: “Behold, the day come, saith Yahweh, that I will sow the house of Israel and the house of Judah with the seed of man (Adam), and with the seed of beast ... but every one shall die for his own iniquity: every man that eateth the sour grape, his teeth shall be set on edge.” So is our trial in this day, and Dave Barley is swallowing sour grapes by the carton?!?! And Isaiah 56:9 “All ye beasts of the field (other races), come to devour, yea, all ye beasts in the forest.” And because our pastors see not the evil in this: “His watchmen *are* blind: ... they are all ignorant, they *are* all dumb dogs, they cannot bark; sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber. Yea, **they are greedy dogs which can never have enough**, and they *are* shepherds that cannot understand: they all look to their own way, **every one for his gain**, from his quarter.” Keep selling your

books and tapes, Mr. Barley, teaching the beasts of the earth and all the mingled races that they can possibly be “Christians”, as if it were so. You are wallowing in your reward.

Barley proceeds by giving three examples from Scripture which use the word “stranger”: Leviticus 24:22, Numbers 15:14-16 and Deuteronomy 31:12. He says to me: “... you probably believe that all these strangers are White Adamic people. This does not hold true when you do a thorough study of the term ‘stranger.’ Four different Hebrew words for stranger must be considered separately.” I wonder if Barley realizes that all three of his examples containing the word “stranger” employ instances where only Hebrew #1616, *geyr*, is used. But Barley’s deception here is deeper than this ...

He goes on to give definitions of these four words for “stranger.” Under *geyr* #1616 Barley says that this includes “the Canaanites still remaining in Palestine and their descendants, as Uriah the Hittite and Arahnah the Jebusite, Doeg the Edomite, Ittai the Gittite ...” And nowhere in the bible can Barley establish that any of the people he lists were ever associated with the Hebrew word *geyr*, #1616 by itself; for *geyr* is the word for “stranger” at 2 Chron. 2:17, but there (see *Strong’s* under “strangers”) it is coupled with the word *enosh*, #582 and from that we may assume these were Canaanites, but not where *geyr* is used alone. Doeg the Edomite (never referred to as a *geyr*: Barley is inventing his definitions) was more than happy to slay 85 Israelite priests for Saul, who couldn’t get a Hebrew to do the task (1 Samuel 22). This was just one reason why our Redeemer told the Edomite Pharisees: “From the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zechariah ... verily I say unto you, It shall be required of your race.” (Luke 11:51). As I’ve said before, all roads lead back to Genesis 3:15. Today we have a million Doegs walking the streets, thanks to men such as Dave Barley, who would have them to be “Christians”! Most Doegs have changed their profession, and are lawyers, bankers, doctors, merchants, or work in the media.

Now, I will not tarry much longer on the subject of Mr. Barley’s definition for “stranger”, but must point out one more serious error on his part. For Barley states that a *nokhri* (*Strong’s* #’s 5235 & 5236) stranger was “excluded from the Passover ... **but could offer sacrifices** to Israel’s God at the religious capital (Lev. 22:25).” Here I must quote this Leviticus 22:25: “**Neither** from a stranger’s (1121, 5236 “son of a stranger”) hand shall ye offer the bread of your God of any of these; because their corruption is in them, and blemishes be in them: they shall **not** be accepted for you.” Now from the *LXX*, to make sure we are reading this correctly: “**Neither** shall ye offer the gifts of your God of all these things by the hand of a stranger, because there is corruption in them, a blemish in them: these **shall not be accepted** for you.” Well, Mr. Barley, how can you read this and say that these strangers “**could** offer sacrifices”? Certainly they could not! I guess a man who says that “the whole purpose of God” is “given in the first covenant of the Bible ... Genesis 9:13-15” could believe just about anything. For Yahweh has a much greater purpose than to simply keep people from drowning. You, Mr. Barley, are drowning in false conclusions, if not purposeful deceit!

Now on to the story of the Canaanite woman, found at Matthew 15:21-28 and Mark 7:24-30 (though not in Luke, as Barley falsely attests). First it may be plainly observed that the apostles tried to run this woman off, yet weren’t admonished for such behavior. Hardly any way to treat a prospective “Christian”, one may think, and a situation only understood once one realizes that such a prospect simply did not exist. This must be compared to the reception which certain other people received, notably at John 1:47, Luke 13:16 and Luke 19:9. At Matthew 15:24 Yahshua Christ repeats His very commission, repeated throughout the New Testament, i.e. Luke 19:10 (Matt 18:11) Matt 2:6, 10:6, Mark 12:29; Luke 1:16, 1:54, 1:67-80, 2:25-34, 24:21; John 1:31, 1:49, 12:13; Acts 1:6, 28:20 etc. etc. (It is highly expedient to read these passages, or one will not fully understand this encounter with the Canaanite woman at Mark 7:24-30!)

In Mark’s gospel this woman was called “a Greek (1674, {+880<V}), a Syro-Phoenician by race” where (, <X” must mean “race” here since “Syro-Phoenician” was never a nation at any time, for the term is a geographical description and does not appear in secular Greek writings until Lucian wrote, circa 160 A.D. Strabo in his description of Syria notes that “Some writers divide Syria as a whole into Coele-Syrians and Syrians and Phoenicians, and say that four other tribes are mixed up with these, namely

Judaeans, Idumaeans, Gazaeans and Azotians, and that they are partly farmers, as the Syrians and Coelo-Syrians, and partly merchants, as the Phoenicians” and it can be shown that in Strabo’s time (64 B.C. to 25 A.D.) few of the terms had the same meaning that they had in more ancient times. Mark, being a Greek himself, identifies the woman by Greek standards: a Greek by language and custom (as opposed to the Judaeans and Edomites who resisted Greek customs) and a Syro-Phoenician by race. On the other hand Matthew, being a Levite and much more aware of people from a Hebrew perspective, properly identifies the woman as a Canaanite, the tribe of her lineage. Ancient Palestine was just as confusing concerning race and nationality as New York is today. Mark was doing the best he could to describe this woman with the terms known to Greeks of his time. He would have identified the woman as a Greek, Roman, or Judaeans by race, if such had been the case, hence the distinction.

The Canaanite woman knew immediately that she was NOT one of the children (sheep) of Yahweh (the master), and she was then rewarded only for openly showing that belief. The Greek word **BFJ4** is simply “trust”, “faith” or “belief”, here used (and this is important) without the Greek article. This should be contrasted to the use of **BFJ4** with the Greek article when used to denote “The Faith.” Simply believing does not earn a non-Adamite “salvation”: (Matt. 7:21-23, 22:1-14) an **impossible thing** to begin with!

Upon the Canaanite woman’s departure she was still a dog. She had no “salvation”, “eternal life” for which one must have the Spirit of Adam in the first place: obtainable only at conception, so she had no claim of being a “Christian”, and neither did she expect any of these things. Zechariah’s prophecy, not yet fulfilled, still applies to this woman (14:21): “... in that day there shall be no more the Canaanite in the house of Yahweh of hosts.” Scripture such as that found at Romans 10:9, to which many resort when confronted with this, are not at all applicable here. Paul was instructing Romans, and not Canaanites.

Dave Barley, on the other hand, would have a dog to be a sheep, for he wants to make “Christians” of them! This is tantamount to taking God’s name and putting it upon His enemies. Barley takes the plates and loaves of the children, dumps them onto the floor, and calls them “crumbs” just like the Catholics do! Barley goes on to talk about Samaritans, yet doesn’t notice that the term “Samaritan” is a strictly geographical one. Many called Samaritans, at Messiah’s time, were Adamites, and some even descended from Israelites. Even the Samaritan woman of John 4 must have been an Israelite for she knew her Identity (see verses 4:12, 25, 29 and 42) and her claims were not denied. From the days of the Maccabees, the Judaeans had despised the Samaritans, confusing geography for nationality, even as we do today. That even the Galileans were to some degree considered lesser citizens by the Judaeans is evident at John 7:41, 52, and distinguished by manner of speech: Mark 14:70. Barley should know all of these things, yet instead reveals himself to be but a surface reader of Scripture, using mention of “Samaritans” to promote universalism, without considering just who some “Samaritans” may have been.

Mr. Barley next fails to see how “most” of the Scripture I cited in my first letter applies to my reasoning, He cites Jer. 2:21 as an example. While I have already discussed this verse at length in this response, I will again here briefly. First, Jeremiah was not addressing the greater portion of Judah, long having been deported by the Assyrians, but only the inhabitants of Jerusalem, among whom were good figs and bad figs (Jer. 24). How does a plant, planted by Yahweh become “strange” and “degenerate”, if not by mixing itself with other plants, not planted by Yahweh? This is evident of these inhabitants of Jerusalem at Ezekiel 16:3. This is why the iniquity can not be washed off (Jer. 2:22). Now Barley may claim that the Canaanites, Amorites and Hittites of Ezekiel 16:3 are found in Genesis 10, and this is true, but it does not remove the facts that Canaan and his descendants were cursed, were supposed to be slaughtered, and had themselves mixed with the non-Adamic Kenites, Kenizzites, Kadmonites, Perrizzites and Rephaim (Gen. 15:19-21). Again, “Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up.”

The Arabs, even by definition of their name, but also by Biblical and historical attestation, are a mixed race; most, if not all, of them carry the blood of the Canaanites, in addition to the Edomites, Ammonites and Moabites (No, Barley, Ruth was not a Moabite, except by geography). This makes the

Arabs “degenerate plants” and “strange vines” also. This is a simple concept, Mr. Barley. How do you not understand it?

Another example given by Barley where he failed to see how my citations apply is 2 Thessalonians 3:2, and here his failure is understandable, given the A.V. translation of the verse. I must apologize for doing most of my New Testament research exclusively in Greek, and not having checked the A.V. here. Though now that Barley mentions it, I will explain this citation here. For this verse certainly does not state that “all men have not faith.” My own translation of this verse reads: “And that we should be protected from those disgusting and wicked men, since the faith is not for all.” I am not going to concern myself with the first clause of this verse, explained in 2 Thess. chapter 2, but only the second which is the issue here. I will send a copy of my entire 2 Thess. translation (it is only four handwritten pages, eight with notes) freely to anyone who may request it.

Among all known mss. cited by the NA27 (Nestle-Aland’s Novum Testamentum Graece, 27th edition) there are no variations in the Greek of 2 Thess. 3:1-2 anywhere. The last clause of v. 2 is indisputably: $\text{ἅ} (\text{D BV}\langle\text{JT} < \text{° BFJ4}$. The conjunction (**VD** is here “I. Argumentative, to introduce the reason for a statement, which usually precedes ...” (Liddle & Scott). The other uses of (**VD** listed by L&S, “II. Epexegetic” and “III. Strengthening” do not fit the grammatical purpose or context here. L&S also state, as is always evident, that in Greek (**VD** is “regularly placed after the first word of a sentence” though of course this is not the case in our language. In the A.V. here (**VD** is rendered “for”, and may be ignored for the balance of my explanation of this clause.

It may already be evident here that the word “men”, italicized in the A.V. here, does not appear in the clause. Neither does the verb “to have”, not italicized in the A.V. While this is not even the most serious error of the translators here, it is surely indicative of others. “the faith”, ° **BFJ4**, with the Greek article, is in the Nominative case and certainly can not be the object of any verb, a situation which would require the Accusative: **JZ< BFJ4**. Since ° **BFJ4** is Nominative, the word must be the subject of the clause. This is a fundamental of grammar and should be readily evident in any basic Greek grammar textbook.

The word **BV}\langle** here is the Genitive Plural of **B I**, “all.” The Genitive case marks source or possession. Surely in this case it does not indicate source. The particle ἅ is an unconditional negative, as opposed to the conditional : **Z**. Here it negates **BV}\langle**. The verb , ἔστω , “to be”, is unique among Greek verbs in that “as in classical Greek, so also in the N.T. , ἔστω is very often omitted ... ἔστω most frequently of all the parts” (see *Thayer*, , ἔστω , VI., page 180 col. B). ἔστω is the 3rd person Present singular of , ἔστω , i.e. “it is” or simply “is”: Examples of this are near at hand, see 2 Thess. 1:5, 1:6, 3:1, 3:16 and 3:18 in the A.V., noting the words in italics.

With this it surely should be clear that the A.V. rendering of $\text{ἅ} (\text{VD BV}\langle\text{JT} < \text{° BFJ4}$ is absolutely untenable. Here I will summarize: **Since** (the conjunction (**VD** introducing the reason for the statement which preceded); **the faith** (because in English we are inclined to state the subject of the clause at its beginning); **is** (ἔστω being implied, as it often is); **not** (the negative particle preceding that which it negates); **of**, i.e. belonging to or for all (the word being in the Genitive case). Hence my rendering, “**Since the faith is not for all**” is a proper translation, and one that no judaized “Christian” could possibly understand. Certainly Paul **meant what he wrote!**

In conclusion, Yahshua Christ came only for the sheep, and for no one else. The non-Israelite nations (ethnicities) of this age are all “goat” nations (Matt. 25). This commission is recorded in ALL gospels, right through to John (21:15-17) and was never changed, nor could it be. Dave Barley’s errant and deceiving comprehension of the terms “world”, “all men” and “all flesh” is where the problems lie. Barley claims that truth “is ultimately in and from Jesus [sic] Christ” yet would disregard half of the statements of Yahshua Christ in favor of the other half, which better fit his world-view. In order to “believe in” Yahshua Christ, one must believe in ALL of his words (Luke 4:4, 1 Tim. 6:3-5, Matt. 4:4, 2 John 9:11, 1 Peter 4:17). These words exclude the other races, including the mixed races and Arabs, time

and again. Could your Arab friend accept this, Mr. Barley? Can he accept that he is a dog? That he is not, nor could he ever be, one of Yahweh's children? That once he is dead in body, so also permanently (Jude 12), not having the Spirit of Yahweh given to the sons of Adam? Can he accept that he could never procreate, without further breaking Yahweh's laws (for his seed is mixed)? Then Mr. Barley, as the Canaanite woman's, great would be his belief. Yet even that wouldn't buy him a "ticket to heaven."

I do not expect Dave Barley to accept what I have written here. I would believe rather that Mr. Barley is much more comfortable with his ministry and its lucre, than with the truth of the Word. I only hope to help those who understand to have a defense from Barley's deceptive devices. And if one of Mr. Barley's victims were to be saved from those deceptions, then I am satisfied that my efforts have been worth the time spent writing this manifold. Barley surely is not comfortable being criticized, for he states that "My disagreeing with you, or you disagreeing with me, does not mean that we continue to debate each other until one of us capitulates or dies." And in a personal letter to Clifton Emahiser and myself, begs that our differences not be aired publicly. What Barley fails to understand is this: who is he to feel that he should be above public criticism? Mr. Barley, if you spread your lies publicly, you should be admonished publicly! I quoted 1 Tim 5:19-20 on the opening pages of this paper. Here I will state that "no Man", Mr. Barley, "lights a candle and sets it in a secret place." See Luke 8:16-18, 11:33, and 12:3 and Mark 4:22.

And one thing more, Mr. Barley, if you need to find who the sheep are try: Ezekiel 34, Isaiah 53:1-6, Jeremiah 50:6 & 17, Joel 1:18, Micah 2:12 and 5:8, and Zechariah 13:7. Don't attempt to redefine "sheep", as you have the verbs "to know" and "to see"!

William Finck

Note: You have now been apprised at length of both sides of this story. Feel free to copy this data electronically or in hard copy. Among the requests we have is that in whatever form one might use is that the Greek fonts be faithfully reproduced, and that no part of this manuscript be edited or altered in any way. Again, please do not save in any file that will distort the Greek fonts. Under these conditions, feel free to print or to E-mail or post on a Web Site.

Clifton A. Emahiser's
Teaching Ministries
1012 North Vine Street
Fostoria, OH 44830
Ph. (419) 435-2836