

# Gospel of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ

## CONTENTS

1. ADAM WAS NOT THE FIRST MAN
  2. MAN AND BEAST
  3. WHAT HAPPENED TO CAIN?
  4. NOAH'S FLOOD WAS NOT WORLD WIDE  

The Addendum to Noah's Flood
  5. THE MIRACLE OF THE ORIGIN OF OUR RACE.
  6. ISRAEL'S FINGERPRINTS
  7. HISTORIC PROOF OF ISRAEL'S MIGRATIONS
  8. THE SONS OF GOD
  9. DANIEL'S FIFTH KINGDOM
  10. THE KINGDOM - OF HEAVEN? OR IN HEAVEN?
  11. THE SANCTUARY AND THE DOMINION
  12. THE STONE OF DESTINY  

Editorial Note on the Stone of Destiny
  13. AMERICA IS A BIBLE LAND
  14. WHO ARE THE GENTILES?
  15. THE GREAT MASQUERADE
  16. THE BIBLE IS NOT A JEWISH BOOK
  17. WHO ARE THE JEWS?
  18. WAS JESUS CHRIST A JEW?
  19. CAN ANYTHING BE "JUDAEO-CHRISTIAN"?
  20. CHRISTIANITY IN THE OLD TESTAMENT
-

## ADAM WAS NOT THE FIRST MAN

Many people have become agnostics because of the supposed conflict between the Bible and science. In truth, there is no conflict at all between a correct translation of the Bible and really proven science - not just unproved theories. One of these supposed conflicts is between the fact that science knows that human beings have lived on the earth far longer than the few thousand years covered by the Bible, and the common belief that the Bible says that Adam was the first man. But the truth is that the Bible nowhere says that Adam was the first man; yes, I know that most of the preachers say that, but the Bible doesn't! It merely says that Adam was the first WHITE man. Let us look at the record.

The many mistranslations in the King James Version obscure much of the truth. For example. *Genesis 1:1-2* - "In the beginning, God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep." In the Hebrew, it says, "Now the earth HAD BECOME chaotic and empty." (See Rotherham's Emphasized Bible.) That is, some early catastrophe had wrecked the earth, which was not "without form and void" before that. This was a judgment of God on earlier civilizations, for their wickedness. *Jeremiah 4:23-27* gives a vision of it: "I beheld the earth, and lo, it was without form and void; and the heavens, and they had no light. I beheld the mountains, and lo, they trembled, and all the hills moved lightly. I beheld, and lo, there was no man, and all the birds of the heavens were fled. I beheld, and lo, the fruitful place was a wilderness, and *all the cities thereof were broken down* at the presence of the Lord, and by His fierce anger. For thus hath the Lord said, The whole land shall be desolate; yet will I not make a full end." Therefore, we do find buried ruins of cities older than Adam, and skeletons which can be dated by the "carbon 14" process as many thousands of years older. But the Bible itself tells us about this.

Next, the Bible tells of the creation of *men. in the plural*, in *Genesis 1:26-28*, saying, "male and female created He THEM" (1:27), and God told these people, "Be fruitful and multiply, and REplenish the earth" (1:28). Pleanish is an obsolete English word, meaning "to fill"; and you cannot REplenish what was never plenished, or filled, before. In the next chapter, *Genesis 2*, we find THE ADAM (*in the singular*) was created. The Hebrew word, "aw-dawm" (rendered "Adam" in English) is from a root word meaning "to show blood in the face" or "of a ruddy complexion" - a word obviously not applicable to the dark races, which we also know from scientific evidence to be much older than the White Race.

Bible scholars know that *Genesis 3:20* - "And Adam called his wife's name 'Eve'; because she was the mother of all living" - is a later interpolation, which was not in the earlier manuscripts. (See Moffatt's Trans.)

The *4th chapter of Genesis* records the birth of Cain and Abel; in the Hebrew, the wording suggests that they were twins. No other child of Eve is mentioned until the birth of Seth, when Adam was 130 years old - certainly long after the birth of Cain and Abel, which most scholars say was over 100 years earlier. Yet, when Cain killed Abel, and in punishment was driven out of the land, he complained to God that "any one that findeth me shall slay me" (4:14). Upon being sent away, Cain found many other people, for *Genesis 4:17* records that Cain not only married a wife, but built a city. These were the pre-Adamite races.

The Garden of Eden was not a plantation of ordinary trees and shrubs. God did nothing so foolish as to make a special creation, just to have a man to wield shovel and pruning shears, when He already had millions of pre-Adamite peoples available for that sort of work. We are told that the Garden of Eden contained 'the tree of the knowledge (or experience) of good and evil.' No tree of the forest has any knowledge or experience of either good or evil. And *Ezekiel 31* says: "Behold, the Assyrian was a cedar in Lebanon, with fair branches and a shadowing bough, and of an high stature... Therefore his height was exalted above all the trees of the field, and his boughs were multiplied, and his branches became long... all the fowls of heaven made their nests in his boughs, and under his branches did all the beasts of the field bring forth their young, and under his shadow dwelt all great nations... THE CEDARS IN THE GARDEN OF GOD could not hide him: the fir trees were not like his boughs, and the chestnut trees were not like his branches; NOR ANY TREE IN THE GARDEN OF GOD WAS LIKE UNTO HIM IN HIS BEAUTY. I have made him fair by the multitude of his branches: SO THAT ALL THE TREES OF EDEN, THAT WERE IN THE GARDEN OF GOD ENVIED HIM." Obviously, the trees in the Garden of God in Eden were "family trees" of races and nations, who admired and envied the early Assyrian Empire. These made up the "garden" That Adam was to cultivate. That is, Satan had been what we might call the Superintendent of this planet, to rule it in obedience to God's will, until he forfeited that position by rebellion against God. Adam was sent to take his place. It was Adam's job to rule the various nations and races of the earth as God's representative here, educating them in God's laws, and enforcing obedience to those laws. These other races and nations had been here long before Adam.

Therefore, the Bible makes it unmistakably clear that we are not all descended from Adam and Eve, for there were other races on earth, already old, already numerous, when Adam was created. And among these other races there are the several who are simply pre-Adamic; and one, at least which is Satanic. If you will read the *third chapter of Genesis*, you will notice that, immediately after the Fall of Adam, when God required them to answer what they had done, God condemned Satan. The word mistranslated is the Hebrew word "naw-khash," which literally means "enchanter" or "magician" - and, no doubt Satan, still possessing angelic powers, was able to be an enchanter or magician. It is certain that the one who seduced Eve was no mere scaly snake wriggling along the ground. Yes, I said "seduced" Eve, for that is what she admitted, in the original Hebrew. Cain was the son of that seduction. The Bible uses the word "begat" with monotonous regularity; but the first time the Bible ever says that Adam ever "begat" anyone is *Genesis 5:3*, where it says, "And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years and *begat* a son in his own likeness, after his image; and called his name Seth." But to get back to *Genesis 3:15* - God said to Satan, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between THY SEED and HER SEED." The same Hebrew word for "seed" is used in both cases; Satan was to have just as literal "seed," or descendants; as Eve. God's own word - being pledged to this, we must expect to find it actually happening; and we do. Jesus Christ, Himself, tells us of it.

In *Matthew 13:38-39*, explaining the Parable of the Tares Among the Wheat, Jesus says, "The field is the world; *the good seed are the children OF THE KINGDOM*; but *THE TARES ARE THE CHILDREN OF THE WICKED ONE: THE ENEMY THAT SOWED THEM IS THE DEVIL.*" Again, in *John 6:70-71*, Jesus had been talking with His 12 disciples, and we read: "Jesus answered them, Have not I chosen

you twelve and *one of you is A DEVIL?* He spake of Judas Iscariot the son of Simon: for he it was that should betray Him being one of the twelve." And again, you should read carefully *the eighth chapter of John*, where Jesus told those who hated Him, "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do." He was not being vulgarly abusive, in either of these cases, for He never resorted to name-calling for abuse. He did call some of them "hypocrites" - which they truly were, so His statement was precisely accurate; He did call some of them "serpents, children of vipers" -which, again, was accurate. Long before this, they had adopted *the serpent* as a symbol of Satan; that is why their tradition had given the word "naw-khash" the translation "serpent," when it really means "enchanter." Jesus, therefore, was telling them that they were of their father the devil (or serpent, if they preferred that word). In this He was simply stating a biological fact with scientific precision, and identifying the persons of this ancestry.

Whenever someone tells you that the Bible is in conflict with what modern science has proved true, don't you believe it. The things that many preachers teach are in conflict with scientific truth, as we all know; but these preachers are equally in conflict with the Bible. Go back to the Bible, not to any man-made doctrines; and double-check it for accuracy of translation. You will find that what the Bible really says, in its original languages, is accurate with a precision our scientists have not yet achieved.

---

## MAN AND BEAST

In these discussions, it has been our custom to frequently review current events in detail, because these show the fulfillment of Bible prophecies in our day. However, in covering the subject I now want to discuss, I shall not have much occasion to list these events in detail, and this for a definite reason. There are times when it is not so important to count every bead on the string, as it is to see whether they are all strung on the same string: When you learn *that*, you will know where to look for the next bead. My purpose is to show the existence of certain definite principles, which govern the events which we see happening, as these principles have governed them for thousands of years.

For ages, it was well understood by everyone that various nations and races had certain characteristics, which usually would be demonstrated in the actions of these peoples. National and racial policies and conduct developed out of national and racial character. There were, of course, the rare exceptions; and these, a certain type of mind seizes upon as proof that there was no general rule. "The exception merely proves the rule." Similarly, we can note that among crows, one bird in every 38 million is white, an albino; but this only emphasizes the rule that all of the other 38 million crows are black. Therefore, reasonably consistent conduct can be identified as the rule, notwithstanding an occasional exception which surprises us when we find it.

Among the ancients, nobody pretended to be ignorant of the characteristics of the Babylonians, the Egyptians, the Assyrians, or the Romans, or what they were likely to do in order to execute their purposes. Roman military ability in war and harshness in rule over conquered peoples were well understood, and nobody was surprised to

meet them. The extreme ferocity and cruelty of the Assyrians was known to all. Centuries of history demonstrated a consistency in these characteristics which only a fool could ignore.

In our own times, everyone understood that the Japanese were a warlike people, and had been for two thousand years; therefore, only the ignorant or the stupid were surprised to learn that Japan wanted to conquer many other nations. (However, we had to learn by terrible, first-hand experience that the Japanese also had the Asiatic characteristics of treachery and senseless cruelty for its own sake. This cruelty was not just typically Japanese: it was typically Asiatic, for we see the same traits displayed by the Red Chinese in their treatment of the people of Tibet, as well as their cruelty to our soldiers whom they captured.)

During both the First and Second World Wars, those strange, alien people who are so busily brain-washing us today to suit their own purposes, *then* propagandized us into believing many hideous lies about the Germans; and from these lies, we were expected to believe that the Germans were so inherently wicked that they were about to invade Beverly Hills or Las Vegas! *Then* they taught us that inborn, racial characteristics would be manifested in conduct whenever the situation called for it. But *now* this alien Minority Group teaches us (by corrupting most of our schools, our newspapers, our news commentators, even many of our churches) that there are no longer any racial characteristics or tendencies, no fixed, long-range national purposes: in short, that all people in the world, white, black, yellow or brown, civilized or savage, are exactly alike, as interchangeable as Ford parts. They have spent many millions of dollars on a high-pressure propaganda campaign, designed to blind us to the racial and national characteristics and purposes which are molding the course of history today, as they have molded history through out all time. (It might be well to ask ourselves, "What makes this worth so much money to them? Just how are they planning to get back this enormous investment?")

We can get a better perspective on present-day affairs if we view them as a continuation of thousands of years of uninterrupted history: and if we look not only for *what* happened, but also *why* it happened. Nothing important is a true accident: for every occurrence there is a cause. History is usually written as merely a list of *effects*; that is why we learn so few lessons from it. We will never really understand history until we list the *causes*, also.

Past history, current events, and the coming events of the future, all consist of *the actions of people*. Whether their actions are good or bad, people *do what they do*, because *they are what they are*: the kind of people who do good or bad things. Conduct is the product of character. The man who is kind *and* trustworthy by nature doesn't become a Jack-the-Ripper or a kidnapper of children: his own nature prevents it; and the man who is by nature cruel or dishonest will, sooner or later, act like what he is. The dull do not become brilliant merely because they receive legal permission to do so. And, since nations and races are just great numbers of individual people, they will display those traits which are characteristic of most of their people. Therefore, if we can learn something about what kinds of people there are, this may help us to understand their actions, even to learn what to expect from them in the future.

For their own purposes, men make various classifications of things and of people: but

usually, the conclusions they wish to reach dictates the classification which will best support it. Wishful thinking vitiates the result. On the other hand, God who views all eternity with a single glance, has His own classifications, based upon the eternal realities. For this, as for all other truths revealed to man, we must look to the Bible. There, we will find that God has classified several different kinds of beings, all of whom *we* lump together indiscriminately, under the one term "men"; but *God* distinguishes between them by using distinctive names for the different kinds of beings. Let us examine them, and see if the different words used have any significance as to the kind of people they denote, the level of character and spiritual understanding to be found in the different kinds of beings thus identified by their different names.

Several different Hebrew words have all been indiscriminately translated "man" or "men" in the King James Version of the Bible, although some very important differences of meaning show clearly on the face of these words. First, let us consider the word which denotes our White Race. The Hebrew word "AW-DAWM" - called "Adam" in your Bible - is from a root word meaning "to be of a ruddy complexion, to show blood in the face" - obviously not applicable to Negroes or Mongolians, but only to the White Race. When used to denote the first White Man, Adam, the Hebrew always says "The Awdawm"; when used of his descendants, the Hebrew just says "Awdawm." But your King James Version translates it "man."

Another word used in contrast to "Awdawm" is "ENOSH." It is always used in a derogatory sense. Its root meaning is "mortal," and implies weakness, physically or morally; wretchedness. It is applied to NON-Adamic races, which are, of course, all PRE-Adamic. It should be noted that the pre-Adamic races are not limited geographically to just certain parts of the earth, but some of them are found mingled among the Adamites.

A third Hebrew word translated "man" is "Ish" (Eesh). Literally, it means "a male person" or "a husband." It is used for mankind in general, and can be applied to either an Adamite or a pre-Adamite. The feminine form is Isha (eesh-shaw); the plural of which is "naw-sheem." This is so similar to the plural of "enosh" - "Anashim" that they have often been confused, leading to many mistakes in translation.

There are three other, closely related words, "gheh-ber," "gheb-ar" and "ghib-bawr," which are all derived from a root meaning "to be strong"; and these are usually translated "mighty man" or "warrior." These last three can cause no confusion, so they need not concern us further.

Now, let us note a few examples of the use of these words in the Bible. In place of the English word "man," I will use the Hebrew word used in the original. *Ezekiel 34:31* - "And ye, My flock, the flock of My pasture, are AWDAWM, and I am your God, saith the Lord God." *Psalms 115:16*, "The heaven, even the heavens, are the Lord's; but the earth hath He given to the children of AWDAWM." But note how God uses AWDAWM and ENOSH in contrast: take *Psalms 90:3*, "Thou turnest ENOSH to destruction; and sayest, Return, ye children of AWDAWM. "While destruction is visited upon the pre-Adamite ENOSH for their persistent wickedness, God leads the children of AWDAWM back to Himself in repentance.

He distinguishes between AWDAWM and ENOSH in many places: for example, *Psalms 8:4*, "What is ENOSH, that Thou art mindful of him? And son of AWDAWM, that Thou visitest him?" Note that, while God is *mindful* of what the ENOSH do, it was the sons of AWDAWM that God *visited* when Jesus Christ came to earth. Both racial groups must be disciplined, but the distinction is kept clear even there: *Isaiah 2:11* says, "The lofty looks of AWDAWM shall be humbled, and the haughtiness of ENOSH shall be bowed down, and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day." In *2 Samuel 7:14* we read, "I will be his Father, and he shall be My son. If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of ENOSH, and with the stripes of the children of AWDAWM." If these were not distinctly different races, there would be no point in using the different words.

The ENOSH were wicked, and are so spoken of. *Deuteronomy 13:13* warns that "Certain ENOSH, the children of Belial, are gone out from among you, and have withdrawn the inhabitants of their city, saying, Let us go and worship other gods, which ye have not known." When they gain power, they are brutal oppressors; so *Psalms 10:17-18* says, "Lord, Thou hast heard the desire of the humble: Thou wilt prepare their hearts, Thou wilt cause Thine ear to hear: to judge the fatherless and the oppressed, that the ENOSH of earth may no more oppress." The ENOSH have no spiritual understanding: that is the reason for their continual wickedness. *Proverbs 28:5* says, "Evil ENOSH understand not judgment: but they that seek the Lord understand all things." This distinction is still in effect, today: For *Daniel 12:10*, speaking of the Time of the End (which is our own time), says, "None of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand."

But this is not all. Some races God classifies as *animals*. Their nations are symbolized as beasts in numerous prophecies. Do you say that this isn't what you have been taught to believe? Then let us look into this a bit, and see what the Bible says about it. For example, when Jonah finally went to Nineveh with his prophecy that God intended to destroy the city for its people's wickedness, they believed him. This is not as surprising as it may seem: for the people of Nineveh worshiped Dagon, the fish god. Since they had heard that a great fish had delivered Jonah on the shore, they thought he must be a prophet sent from Dagon, and they were ready to believe him. The *3rd chapter of Jonah* says that the king was worried, "And he caused it to be proclaimed and published through Nineveh by decree of the king and his nobles, saying, Let NEITHER MAN NOR BEAST, herd nor flock, taste anything: let them not feed, nor drink water: But LET MAN AND BEAST BE COVERED WITH SACKCLOTH, AND CRY MIGHTILY UNTO GOD: YEA, LET THEM TURN EVERY ONE FROM HIS EVIL WAY, and from the violence that is in their hands.. And God saw THEIR works, that THEY TURNED FROM THEIR EVIL WAY, and God repented of the calamity that He said that He would do to them, and He did it not." Now what kind of "BEASTS" were these, who put on sack-cloth, cried to God, and turned from their evil way? It says that this was the command for "Man and BEAST" and that they did so. Is your dog that well-trained? Then who was the Bible calling BEASTS?

Let us look into this a bit further. In the *9th chapter of Genesis*, God promises Noah and his family protection; in the *5th verse*, God says, "And surely your blood of your lives will I require; at the HAND of every Beast will I require it and at the hand of man." These "BEASTS" have hands, like a man! But there were no monkeys in that region, so these beasts with hands must have been men. Again, in *Exodus 19:12-13*,

when the people of Israel were gathered at the foot of Mt. Sinai while Moses climbed the mountain to receive the Ten Commandments from God, God warned him, "And thou shalt set bounds unto the people round about, saying, Take heed to yourselves, that ye go not up into the mount, or touch the border of it: whosoever toucheth the mount shall surely be put to death. There shall not a HAND touch it, but he shall surely be stoned or shot through; WHETHER IT BE BEAST OR MAN, it shall not live." Again, we find that, whether it be *beast* or man, it must not touch the mountain with a *hand*.

The *second chapter of Genesis* tells us that God is looking for a suitable wife for Adam, and brings in review before him what your King James Version calls "every BEAST OF THE FIELD" to see if a good wife for Adam could be found among them. Do you really think that an all-wise God had to carefully look over a female scorpion, a female toad, a female giraffe and a female elephant, to decide whether one of these would be a suitable wife for Adam? Of course not! And Moses didn't write any such foolishness when he wrote the *Book of Genesis*. This is purely the work of the translators. In the original Hebrew, the account makes good sense, and tells us much about the other races.

There are two closely-related Hebrew words used here - KHAH-EE and KHAW-YAW - each of which means "a living creature": the meaning is far too broad to be translated merely "beast" or "animal," for it includes all living creatures, from microbes to men. Where the King James Version says "beast of the field," the word is always either KHAH-EE or KHA -YAW; so a correct translation would be "THE LIVING BEINGS IN THE COUNTRY." That these "living beings" include men is clear from the same word being applied to Adam. You have read *Genesis 2:7*, "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became *a living soul*" In the Hebrew it reads, "Then YAHWEH God formed THE AWDAWM out of dust from the ground, and breathed in *his* nostrils breath of life; and THE AWDAWM became NEPHESH KHAW-YAW" ("a breathing creature having life"). So "the beast of the field" - "the KHAW-YAW of the field" - or more correctly "the living beings in the countryside" - actually included the pre-Adamic races.

Now *Genesis 2:18-20* makes sense: God saw that Adam needed a wife; and, not condemning anybody without a fair chance to make good, God carefully looked over the pre-Adamic races (African and Asiatic) to see if one of them could be found who was suitable to be Adam's wife and the mother of the new race; but He couldn't find one. In the Hebrew, this reads thus: "And YAHWEH God said, Not good for THE Awdawm to be alone. I shall make him an helper - AS HIS COUNTERPART. And YAHWEH God formed from the ground every living being of the fields, and every fowl of the heavens, and bringeth in unto THE Awdawm to see what he doth call it; and whatever THE Awdawm calleth a NEPHESH KHAW-YAW, (*a breathing creature having life*), that is its name. And THE Awdawm calleth names to all the cattle, and to fowl of the heavens, and to every *living being of the fields*; and to him hath not been found an helper AS HIS COUNTERPART." That is, God recognized that Adam's wife must be HIS COUNTERPART, having the same qualities of spiritual understanding, to be able to transmit to her descendants the same qualities for which God specially placed Adam in the world; but God could not find even one out of these pre-Adamic peoples who was Adam's COUNTERPART, having these necessary qualities.

**Before someone gets the idea that I hate other races, let us look at this thing a little closer. The Black Race has been on earth at least 40,000 years, for identifiable Negroid skeletons have been discovered which can be scientifically dated as that old. Yet in all those 40,000 years there has never been a Negro civilization. Yes, I know that a few Negro tribal chiefs have conquered other tribes and built themselves up a larger kingdom: but it takes more than the brutal tyranny of a successful war-chief to make a civilization, and that was all they had. Don't speak of Egypt; Egypt was in Africa, but never Negroid. The beautiful portrait sculptures left by the ancient Egyptians show them to have been clearly a pure white people; in the days of Egypt's greatness, any Negro found north of the first cataract of the Nile River was summarily killed on sight.**

**We don't hate Negroes; we want them to be well-fed, well-clothed, comfortably housed, and in no danger of being eaten by other Negroes - something they have never had except in a civilization created and maintained by White Men. Despite all propoganda, every Negro in the United States is far better off than those in Africa: just try to find any who want to go back to any black nation in Africa! But neither Negroes nor Whites will have the blessings of civilization in a nation reduced to black standards of thinking: If they were capable of producing a civilization at all, 40,000 years is long enough to do it.**

**Yes, I know that in Asia, 2,300 years ago, Confucius taught some high ethical principles - but without a word of religion in them; and I know that the Ming Dynasty saw the production of some nice pieces of porcelain. But what did either of these do for the Asiatic people? Did it ever teach them how to produce enough food to fill those fine porcelain bowls? Shouldn't 2,300 years of Confucian philosophy be enough to develop something more than poverty, disease and misery? Again, the Asiatic mind lacks the true spiritual understanding which God saw was needed. Aren't the Asiatics who live in the United States better off than those who live in Red China, Korea, or Southeast Asia? We don't hate them; but we don't want them to reduce us to their level. This is what God was talking about in the *second chapter of Genesis*, when He said that the other beings living in the country 'round about could not produce a suitable wife for Adam, "AS HIS COUNTERPART."**

**Because of the spiritual understanding which God put in The AWDAWM, today the White Race has the highest civilization, the greatest freedom, the highest standard of living, in the world: they are the so-called "have" nations. We have not hated the other races: we have tried to help them, to show them our ways. But all of them have hated us; in the centuries when we were very few against their many, they repeatedly tried to conquer and destroy us, but God's watchful care over His people didn't allow that to happen, although several times they came dangerously close to success. In lands rich with minerals, they sit in wretchedness and poverty too lacking in enterprise to mine the enormous wealth beneath their feet; in lands where the fertile soil and ample rainfall cover the land with lush growth, they live in perpetual hunger, because they are too dull to clear the land and plant it to food crops. If we provide the capital to pay them for clearing their land and planting and harvesting useful crops, or for digging and refining the minerals in their soil, they curse us for "exploiting" them; but if we don't, they curse us for being indifferent to their misery. Now, through the United Nations where they outnumber and outvote us, they plan to rule us, plunder us, enslave us, reduce us to their level. Well did God classify them as "ENOSH," lacking utterly in the spiritual understanding necessary to follow God's**

ways.

Perhaps you may say, "All these were quoted from the Old Testament; but in the New Testament, God changed His mind and changed all that." So, let us see what the New Testament says about them. In his *Epistle to Titus (1:12)*, Paul says, "One of themselves, even a prophet of their own, said, The Cretians are always liars, EVIL BEASTS." The word "THERION," means "a dangerous animal." *Jude 10* says, "But these speak evil of those things they know not: But what they know naturally, as BRUTE BEASTS, in those things they corrupt themselves." And *2 Peter 2:12* says, "But these, as natural brute BEASTS, made to be taken and *destroyed*, speak evil of the things they understand not, and shall utterly perish in their own corruption."

These ENOSH were commonly called "DOGS," both in the Old and New Testaments. For example, *Psalms 22* is recognized by all Bible scholars as prophetic of Jesus Christ's first coming and crucifixion. In the *16th verse*, it says: "For DOGS have compassed Me: the assembly of the wicked have enclosed Me: they pierced My hands and My feet." God is certainly not complaining that some four-footed dogs barked at Him; and there is no record that any ever did. He is speaking of those who delivered Him up to be crucified. The use of this word is common, in the New Testament. In *Philippians 3:2*, Paul says, "Beware of DOGS, beware of evil workers." The four-footed dogs are no more "evil workers" than cats and cows; Paul and those to whom he wrote knew that these "dogs" were the two-footed kind.

If you say, "This is discrimination between races!" you are exactly right. Has someone told you that monstrous falsehood, that "It isn't Christian to discriminate between the races"? Let us see what Jesus Christ, Himself, did. In *Mark 7:25-29*, we read, "For a certain woman, whose young daughter had an unclean spirit, heard of Him, and came and fell at His feet: the woman was a Greek, a Syrophenician by nation; and she besought Him that He would cast forth the devil out of her daughter. But Jesus said unto her, Let the children first be filled: for it is not right to take the children's bread and to cast it unto the DOGS. And she answered and said unto Him, Yes, Lord: yet the DOGS under the table eat of the children's crumbs. And He said unto her, For this saying, go thy way: the devil is gone out of thy daughter." Jesus Christ certainly did discriminate; and not until the woman recognized the righteousness of the discrimination did He help her. She had first asked help of Him on the same basis as the Israelites, true AWDAWM. On that basis, she was not entitled to it. Jesus told her, Let the children first be filled with the Bread of Life; then they will establish the Kingdom of God on earth, and from this God's blessings will be extended to such others as can understand and receive them in the proper spirit. Meanwhile, Jesus Christ did not hesitate to openly call the ENOSH "dogs." When the woman indicated that she understood that the blessings would come to others out of the abundance which God gave to His own children, then He told her that "for this saying" He had healed her daughter.

Again, Jesus Christ carefully warned His disciples never to make the mistake of failing to discriminate, never to try to bring the ENOSH, who lack understanding, into the Kingdom of God on the same terms as the AWDAWM. In *Matthew 7:6*, He warned them, "Give not that which is holy unto the DOGS, neither cast ye your pearls before SWINE, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you." Strong words? Yes: but the direct command of Jesus Christ, Himself. We have disobeyed Him, and WE ARE NOW FACING THE TRAGIC PENALTY. We

have tried to treat the other races as equals: we have expected them to learn the same lessons from our religion that we do; we have expected them to behave with some self-restraint when they find power in their hands. But this is exactly what Jesus Christ warned us not to do, "lest they trample our pearls under their feet, and turn again and rend us." Of our advanced technology, they want only to learn how to make weapons to use against us: In fact, they are even using the very food we send them as a weapon against us, for the surplus food will allow them to take more men off the farms and put them into armies and weapons factories. To thus strengthen our enemies is only a fool's method of suicide.

To His disciples, Jesus said (in *John 14:16-17*), "And I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you forever: Even the *Spirit of Truth*, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him: but ye know Him; for He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." Therefore, it was logical to speak of those whose minds lacked the spiritual understanding as "beasts," because of their nature. In the *Book of Daniel*, the prophet traces the rise and fall of four great world-empires ruled by these people. First he interprets Nebuchadnezzar's dream of the great image, whose head was of gold, his breast and arms of silver, his belly and thighs of brass, his legs of iron, as prophesying the successive dominance of four great empires, Nebuchadnezzar's Babylon being the first of these, the golden head, and the others being Medo-Persia, Alexander's, and Rome. But in *chapter 7*, Daniel had a vision of four remarkable beasts, rising one after the other out of the sea. We know that, in prophecy, the sea is symbolic of mankind in general, all people - the great majority of whom are the ENOSH, the pre-Adamic races. Out of them came the four *beasts*: the first, a lion, symbolized Babylon, like the golden head of the image; the second, a bear, symbolized the great empire of Media and Persia; the third, a leopard, for the swift-striking empire of Alexander the Great; and the fourth, a very terrible beast with iron teeth, ten horns, and great strength, symbolized Rome. This was exactly the same series, in the same order, as the image of Nebuchadnezzar's dream. Its repetition was to confirm the first one as true prophecy.

As further confirmation, in the *Book of Revelation* we again find a beast, representing these world empires, rising out of the sea. In *Revelation 13*, we are told that this strange beast had the mouth of a lion, the feet of a bear, yet was otherwise like a leopard, but it had ten horns, like the fourth beast which Daniel saw. The fact that the qualities of all four are now combined in one beast is to show that the four great world-empires were all of one origin, all manifestations of Satanic power, all arising out of the sea of non-Adamic races. They came to power in succession; each gained enormous power over the peoples who lived in great areas; but the rule of each was harsh, tyrannical, brutal, each one more so than those before it. Man's planning, man's skill in putting his plans into effect, man's ability to judge what was needed in ruling an empire - these they had; but the spiritual understanding, the capacity to receive the thoughts of God, the capacity to organize and rule a nation under God's laws - this they lacked.

*Revelation 13* shows that this composite "beast" gained its power from the dragon, Satan. Surely, these empires demonstrated their Satanic character. Finally, to make sure that the symbolism of the vision would not be misunderstood, *Revelation 13:18* concludes, "Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the BEAST: for it is the number of a MAN."

If these "beasts" were nations of men, why symbolize them as beasts? We have seen that God's prophets, and even Jesus Christ Himself, bluntly called certain races "beasts." A nation made up of Chinese people must be a Chinese nation; a nation made up of Negroes must be a Negro nation; then, a nation made up of those whom the Bible calls "beasts" must be a beast nation - and it is so stated.

The fall of the Roman Empire ended only the vast extent of power in the hands of those who served Satan; it has not ended their desire to regain that power, nor their struggle for it. So the *Book of Revelation* shows a continuation of the struggle for power, carried on by a new beast, right down to the time of the Second Coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, when the beast makes war against Him, but is conquered by our Lord. We see this struggle for power going on in the world, today: the non-Adamic peoples, now organized into many nations so as to multiply their voting power in the United Nations (where just the cannibal tribes of Africa, alone, are recognized as about 30 nations, having 30 votes to our one). There is not one of them which stands reliably on our side; once in a while, they find it to their advantage to seek something which we also want to accomplish, and on that one issue they vote with us. But next day, they either proclaim their "neutrality" in our struggle for the survival of the free world (with which they have no sympathy), or they actively support Russia against us. It is inevitable that those who are of the same race, the same origin, having the same qualities, the same ambitions and ideals, should align themselves together, working for their common purpose. In the great world-empires of the past, Babylon, Medo-Persia, Alexander's short-lived empire, and finally Rome, they had what they wanted, *a system which expressed their own true character*. They want to restore this system: and the United Nations is made-to-order for their purpose, as God prophesied. In *Revelation 13:14*, we are told that the new beast "deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by means of the miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast; *saying to them that dwell on the earth that they should make an image of the beast which had the wound by the sword, and did live.*" They seek to give the United Nations world-wide empire, like that of Babylon and Rome, only greater; an empire which crushes and dominates all nations, enforcing its will by bestially brutal forces, as we have seen in the Congo; an empire which repudiates the one true God, where the name of Jesus Christ cannot be mentioned because it offends those who hate Him, and where the only reference to any divinity is the statue of the pagan god Zeus in the lobby; an empire ruled by those whom the Bible calls "beasts" - for they now outnumber the whole White Race 8 to 1 in voting strength: though we have 1/6 of the world's population, by this juggling of voting power we are reduced to 1/9 of its voting strength. When we see their plans for world rule developing, we can begin to understand the dreadful prophecy of the coming day when no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast...."

Nevertheless, the return of Jesus Christ will overthrow their plans. Their power will be destroyed, and they will be put in their proper place. This place emphatically does not include rule over the nations: that has brought too many thousands of years of misery and sorrow. And in the final end, when God's New Jerusalem is set up on earth, we are told (in *Revelation 22:14-15*), "Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the Tree of Life, and may enter in through the gates into the City, FOR WITHOUT ARE DOGS..." and various others. This doesn't mean that you can have your pussycat, canary and goldfish, but Faithful Fido is excluded: these "dogs" are the ones Jesus Christ names.

"Discrimination!" do you say? Yes, indeed! But from start to finish, from *Genesis* to *Revelation*, God Himself has *commanded* discrimination. I would not oppose it if I could.

## Gospel of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ

### WHAT HAPPENED TO CAIN?

"What Happened to Cain?" is a question in the minds of many Believers. The Bible does not trace Cain very far, and yet the fact is that Cain is a definite historical character of whom you can learn as much outside the Bible as you can from the Bible itself. Do not let anyone tell you that these Old Testament people are myths. They are not. They are definitely a part of history. The Bible states that Adam and Eve were expelled from the Garden of Eden - eastward, evidenced by Cherubim being placed at the east of the Garden to guard it against their possible return. - If they had gone to the south or to the west, guards at the east side would not have meant a thing. Obviously, they went to the east; and, as we learned when we were studying Noah's flood, Adam's migration actually took him and Eve into the Atrium Basin, in what is today called Sinkiang, in the extreme southwestern part of China. The migration undoubtedly took a considerable period of time. It was a long way to walk, but they had time in those days. Adam lived 900 odd years.

In the area where they settled, Eve gave birth to two children - Cain and Abel. Much is lost in the mistranslations in your King James Version. *Genesis 3:15* establishes the theme of the entire Bible, and all the rest of it is a development of that theme. Eventually, God called before Him; Adam, Eve and Satan to give an accounting of their misdeeds. Please do not get the idea, as your King James Version and all the traditional translations tell you, that Satan was a snake - a long scaly thing, wriggling along the ground, because that is not what the Hebrew says. The word they mistranslated snake is "nachash", (naw-khawsh) whose root meaning is "enchanter" or "magician." You will recall that while Satan was expelled from Heaven and his wings clipped considerably, he nonetheless retained possession of a good deal of his angelic powers. In the course of time, his children (and I do mean children, just as the Bible says) came to adopt the serpent as a symbol, an emblem of their father; and, over a period of centuries, the word was given a secondary meaning of "serpent," which was not its basic meaning.

Cain murdered Abel and was expelled from that region. Referring back to *Genesis 3:15* (and this is before Cain comes on the scene) God said to Satan, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed," etc. In the idiom of the Hebrew language "seed" and "fruit" are used not only to literally mean grain and the fruit that grows on the tree, but is also used quite regularly to refer to the descendants of people. The same Hebrew word for "seed" was used both referring to Satan and to Eve. Satan was to have just as literal children as was Eve.

God goes on to say "...it shalt bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." In other words, you have here, in the Bible, the first recorded promise of the coming of The Redeemer. Evidently God went on to tell them a great deal more than that, which the Bible does not at that point record. Abel brought as his offering the Blood

**Sacrifice.** Whereas, Cain, who also had flocks and herds, though he was primarily a farmer, brought fruits and vegetables and dumped them down, as much as to say to God, "Well, landlord, here's your crop rent." And then he wondered why his offering was not acceptable to God!

Cain murdered Abel and he was driven out "from the face of the earth." In the King James Version it quotes Cain as saying to God, "Behold, thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the earth" (*Genesis 4:14*). The implication here seems to be that he climbed into his rocket ship and went off into inter-stellar space, which of course we know is not what happened. He did not say you have driven me *off the face of the earth*. The word earth, used there, happens to be "adamah" which means merely "the ground," but it had little deeper significance. He had been a farmer, and God told him that as a curse upon him, the land - the ground - "which hath opened her mouth to receive thy brother's blood from thy hand.. shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength..." (*Genesis 4:11-12*). To this day, who ever saw a Jewish farmer?

The actual reading in the Hebrew of these verses *Genesis 4:13-17* is this, "And Cain said unto Yahweh, Great is my iniquity beyond bearing: behold thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the land and from Thy face I shall be hidden and I shall become unsettled and wandering on the earth; and it will come to pass anyone finding me will kill me."

If, as the churches teach, Adam was the first human being of any sort, then no one was left alive at this stage except Adam and Eve (who were not going to kill Cain) and Cain himself. Yet, he expected to be killed in the immediate future when he ran into someone. This is simply another instance of the Bible's recognition, in several places, of the existence of pre-Adamic races.

The next verse says, "...and Yahweh said unto him, Therefore, anyone killing Cain, sevenfold shall he be avenged, and Yahweh made for Cain a sign in order that anyone finding him not smite him. And Cain went out from before Yahweh and settled in the Land of Wandering." Your King James Version gives the Hebrew word "Nod" - but it means wandering - eastward of Eden.

It goes on to read (*verse 17*), "And Cain knew his wife (where did he get a wife if there was not anyone else on earth in those days?) and she conceived, and bare Enoch: and he builded a city." So, there were enough people on hand not only to furnish him a wife, but to build a city under his direction - "and called the name of the city, after the name of his son, Enoch." Cain, in his wandering, traveled to and built his city in the Tigris-Euphrates Valley district.

The rivers overflowed their banks every flood season and would drive the people out. In between flood seasons, they could plant crops, anything maturing quickly enough to be harvested before the next flood season. Then the overflow would drive them out again.

Evidently Cain was a man of great ability and great intelligence. He taught them something they probably vaguely realized they should do, but they did not have what it took to get organized and do it. He taught them to build dikes, to make embankments along the sides of the river channel, just as we have in our own Mississippi River valley - dikes which would hold the rivers within their channels

even during the flood season - all of which stopped it from being a "land of wandering." This enabled them to build their cities with the assurance that they would not be washed away next flood time. To this day you can find traces of the ancient embankments by which the river channels were protected.

There is a group of languages spoken from the Persian Gulf and the Zagros mountains west to the Mediterranean, which are all related in their origin. Aramaic was spoken over a vast area and it is even today a living language spoken by some people in Syria. It is also the language which Jesus Christ spoke, because that is the language the people about Him could understand. It was their contemporary language. The old classical Hebrew had become, at that time, pretty much of a dead language. The scholars knew it, like they today know Latin and Greek, but the common people did not speak it. So there was the old Sumerian, the much more important Aramaic, and Hebrew. The Phoenician Cities -spoke another dialect - a Semitic dialect, rather closely related to Hebrew.

In Hebrew, they called the city after Cain's son's name, Enoch. An actual city was built with a name so close to that, that the only difference is the difference between the two languages.

In the lower Tigris-Euphrates Valley, now named Sumeria, their civilization was very ancient. In fact, it undoubtedly goes back to the *first chapter of Genesis*. Some of their records date the beginning of their own settlement there from about 14,000 B.C., and their records of astronomical occurrences would seem to bear this out. The important events were noted in the chronicles of all the ancient peoples. In fact, this is the only way we have been able to work out any kind of synchronization of ancient history. They had no general date scale like our own, as we say this is the year 1976 A.D. But in each kingdom their own records would show that something occurred on the 11th day of the 8th month of the 14th year of the reign of King somebody-or-other. Then, when he died, they started it all over again, with the first day of the first month of the first year of the reign of King somebody-else. They noted in these records important events, such as their wars. This is one way in which we have been able to work out a synchronization of ancient history. When the records of ancient Babylonia show a war with Egypt, which the records of Egypt also show, we can learn that the 15th year of King somebody-or-other of Babylonia was the same as the 8th. year of Pharaoh somebody-else of Egypt. One other thing they did was to record the major eclipses, total or nearly total eclipses, of the sun. One can calculate to the exact day when such an eclipse would be visible in that locality. This is not a matter of guess-work. However, you do have to know the astronomical cycle to work it out. The fact that records go way back, thousands of years. before Adam, correctly showing these cycles when the eclipses occurred, seem to lend a fair amount of truth to them. At any rate, we have their current records. I do not mean records where they say that this city was settled so many thousands of years ago. I am talking about their then current record of events of the time when they were written. We have their current records from about 4500 B.C or about 500 years before Adam. For example, the records of Enshagkushana the King of Kengi which was a city in Sumer, mentions that he was also "patesi" (priest) of Enlil in the city of Nippur. This record it also dates back to around 4500 B.C. It also mentions the city of Kish and Gursi.

Alusharshad the King of Kish about 4000 B.C. left records in which he claimed to be King of the World, which was, as we may note, a rather substantial exaggeration.

So, when Cain moved into that locality, he found a civilization already in existence, with quite extensive commerce reaching clear to the Mediterranean Sea, but apparently it needed some more of his engineering skill. The geological evidences that are found indicate that the entire area there, including some of the Arabian Desert, was a luxuriant well-watered grass land, with abundant grazing animals on it, and trees (and that sort of thing) up to around 4500 B.C., when the climatic change began over a period of perhaps 500 years or so, extending down to say, roughly, 4000 B.C.

There was a gradual drying up of the area, and from being a Nomadic people, able to live like the American Indians when they followed the herds of the buffalo, these people had to settle down in the river valleys and see to it that their crops were planted, irrigated and harvested.

In this lower Tigris-Euphrates Valley, these two great rivers brought enormous loads of silt year around, carried down from their upper reaches, where they were running swiftly. The Valley of the Nile is famous for the fine silt soil. In the Imperial Valley, you find the same kind of rich silt, left there by the Colorado River. This is beautiful, fine silt soil, and perhaps nowhere in the world is there a clay so perfectly adapted to the making of tile and bricks as this clay silt of the Tigris and Euphrates Valley.

Into this scene of ancient civilization comes a definite historical character; not just somebody that people centuries later wrote about, but a man who left his own records which are in our museums today, and that is Sargon the First, Sargon the Magnificent. This is not the Sargon who was mentioned in your Bible, a king of Assyria back in 722 B.C., a son of Shalmanezar and father of Sennacherib, kings of Assyria. He simply borrowed the name of this hero of many thousands of years before. Your Bible does not mention the original Sargon under the name of Sargon. In a single reign, somewhere in the period between 3800 and 4000 B.C., Sargon the Magnificent built up this enormous empire. In the ancient records, his name is found in several various forms, depending upon which language in which his name happens to appear - Sumerian, Akkadian or Babylonian, but definitely referring to the same man in each of these different languages.

Sar or Shar means King and it is perhaps a basic derivation of the later forms of Shah, Czar, etc., which have persisted as titles of kings. "Sharukinu" - this kinu is a Sumerian form of Cain. *Genesis 4:17* tells us that Cain built the city and called it Enoch. Sargon built a city at that place, which he called in their language Unuk," a slight variation due to the difference in languages. The early bricks of this city had stamped on them - that is molded - the name "Unuk." In the latter Akkadian Babylonian it was called Erech, but in the early Sumerian it was Unuk.

This Sargon created a very phenomenal empire. He finally established his capital city at Akkad. His own records show the remarkable size of it. His empire extended from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean. He made three expeditions to what he called the Great Sea, which at the least was the Mediterranean (and there is good reason to believe it was the Atlantic). In at least one of these expeditions he said he crossed the sea and brought back loot from conquered lands. He brought cedar beams from the mountains of Lebanon for his temples. We know definitely that his expeditions into the Mediterranean included the islands of Cyprus and Crete. Very clear traces of his early Babylonian culture are found on the Island of Crete. For example, the tiles and sewer drainage system found in the cities of Phara and Knosos

on Crete are exactly like that of Nippur in Akkad.

In Crete, a cylinder seal inscribed with the name of Sargon's son or grandson, Naram Sin, was found. Babylonian inscribed clay cylinder records have been found in the Cretan tombs. In the ruins of the palace of Knosos, there is a rather elaborate alabaster coffer with the name of Cain carved in the lid of it. And also there was found an immense bronze sword with a golden hilt, of very beautiful workmanship, larger than any other ancient sword ever found, which might possibly have been his.

The Bible tells us that Cain founded this city, the name of the city Enoch, after his son, and the Sumerian records of the city of Unuk and Akkad show that Sargon the First founded the city and called it in Sumerian, Unuk.

Sargon the First called these Sumerians "black heads." Whether that meant a dark complexion or merely refers to a brunette people as distinguished from the blond we do not know. We do not have sufficient records. Sargon's own records, in our museums today, show that he conducted raids on nations to the east, certainly at least into Media, and quite possibly going back to pick up some of his own people from the Tarim Basin region. They show that he deported captured populations to make cities that he founded in the regions of Akkad. In one of his records he states "5,400 men daily eat bread before me" - the courtiers and servants of his palace. He divided his empire, which extended from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean, into districts, which were ten hours march across, and each was governed by one of "the sons of his palace," as he called them. One of his inscriptions says this: "For forty-five years the kingdom I have ruled and the black heads I have governed. In multitudes of bronze chariots I rode over rugged lands. I governed the upper country (that would be Akkad). Three times to the Great Sea I advanced."

We know that he had a very high degree of civilization. But a high degree of civilization does not always imply a high degree of morality; but, so far as civilization is expressed in the arts and sciences, and that sort of thing, they had it. Their art advanced to a degree greater than was found anywhere else in ancient times. Two cylinder seals of his time are among the most beautiful specimens of jewel engraving ever known. Evidently they did not have the secret of making paper, or if they did, they knew how perishable it was. They may have put some documents on parchment, but in the main they used this beautiful clay that they had to make thin tiles or tablets of clay. While it was still moist and soft they wrote upon the clay. Then the signature was in the form of a seal. Each man of importance had his own seal. These were in the form of a little cylinder. Back in Sargon's day, so far as we can judge by some specimens found, they were usually about the diameter of a lead pencil. I do not mean the lead, but the wood that it is made of, and would run from half or 5/8 of an inch in length to perhaps to 3/4 of an inch. Perhaps the most beautiful of these ancient seals, which goes back to the time of Naram Sin, is approximately 1/4 inch in diameter by 5/8 of an inch long. The engraving of the design on it is the most beautiful I have seen in jewel engraving. It was obviously done under a magnifying glass, because the details on it are so tiny and so perfect. When this seal was rolled across the wet clay, it molded an impression of the design on the seal into the clay. Have you noticed signet rings in jewelry store windows, which have an engraved jewel with an initial engraved in them - carnelian or some such stones? You will not find, in any jewelry store today, as perfect jewel engraving as was characteristic of this ancient empire of Sargon or Cain. Roads connected the principal cities. There

was a postal service. In those days, to send a letter, they would first make one of these clay tablets, write the message on it while it was wet, dry it out, and burn it hard in the kiln. Then they would coat it again with wet clay for an envelope, write the address upon that and again burn it hard in the kiln. Delivered to the person to whom it was written, he would then break off this outer shell, and within was the letter sent to him. Today, in the Louvre Museum in Paris are some of these ancient letters, bearing a clay seal upon them, another lump of clay with a special seal design which constituted the postage stamp, showing that postage had been paid for the carrying of this letter back in this empire of Sargon the Magnificent.

No doubt bronze and possibly iron were in use in that day, for weapons and other implements. Bronze would serve well for swords, but not for engraving tools. There was no known way to sufficiently harden copper or bronze to do that. Only within the last 50 years or so, has such a way been discovered. If they were good enough metallurgists to learn to make carving chisels out of copper or bronze, we can give them credit for that. Otherwise, they must have used hardened steel: 6,000 years of rust would have taken their toll of any iron or steel implements in that time. Babylonian art was, at this time, more highly developed than at any later time.

Beishazzar was the man who was running the city of Babylon at the time of its fall to the Medes and Persians. His father, Nabonidus, was an oddity for ancient kings. Usually they were military conquerors, people interested only in how many people they could kill or enslave, and how much loot they could steal. Instead, Nabonidus was a scholar, particularly an archeologist and antiquarian. In fact, he became so deeply interested in it that during his lifetime he turned over all the authority and responsibility of running Babylon to his son, Belshazzar, who was a worthless, drunken wastrel. Had he turned it over to his daughter Belshalti, who was quite brilliant, Babylon might possibly have had a different fate. Under Belshazzar it reached that degree of rottenness where it fell from its own internal corruption. Nabonidus made a hobby of going to the sites of the ancient cities and digging down to find the sites of their early temples and other public buildings, and in those cities which were still existent, find and restore their earliest temples. One of his records in our museums today says that he had restored the temple of the Sun at Sippar. Sippar, meaning book town, from its enormous libraries, is another name for the same city of Akkad which was founded by Sargon the First. He said that he had restored the Temple of the Sun, and indigging down to uncover the foundation, he had uncovered the cornerstone laid by Naram Sin, "which none of my ancestors, the kings of Babylon, had seen for 3200 years." Taking his own time for this, probably in the neighborhood of 550 B.C., add 3200 more to it, takes you back to 3700 B.C. as the probable time when this temple had fallen into such ruin that this foundation stone was totally covered up. This dates back to the time of Naram Sin, who was the son of Sargon, whom we can identify as Cain. Incidentally, this very same foundation cornerstone, with the inscription showing it was founded by Naram Sin, is now in the Museum at Yale University.

We have another clue, or series of clues, to indicate that Sargon was Cain. We find this in the pagan religion that he founded. The records show that the earliest forms of Babylonian religion were monotheistic. They believed in one God. Whether it be the God we know, I am not sure; but at least they had a god, and not a multiplicity of them. Their religion contained a rather garbled, but still recognizable version of the story of creation, as given in the *first chapter of Genesis*. But about the time of

Sargon, there developed polytheism - pagan gods. The three chief ones were Anu, Eia, and one whose name sometimes appears as Enlil, sometimes Mul-lil. By the myths told about these gods, you can identify and determine the origin of each god. The myths about them would identify Anu as being Adam, Eia as Eve and Mtil-lil or Enlil as Satan. Those are recognizable in these myths. Later Mul-lil becomes Bel or Baal, who was the chief god of Babylon, and indeed became the most important of the pagan gods, from there to the West, clear to the Mediterranean coast. The pagan priests garbled things somewhat in their legends, possibly intentionally. In a few of them Eia is represented as male, but most of these legends have Eia as a goddess, identifiable from these myths as being Eve. Legends about the early form of Eia are exactly the same as the later legends about Ishtar. So, Cain had carried in his own remembrance the occurrences in his own early life, and then had decided to make gods of Adam, Eve and Satan.

In Sargon's own time he was not deified. He founded pagan Satan worship, but he did not promote himself up to the top. Later he was deified. There are a few inscriptions that say "Sargon is my god." It is natural that among pagans he should become a patron god of Babylon. Babylon's patron god, whose name appears in your King James Version, usually as Merodach, although Mardach would be a more accurate translation, is derived from Marad which means "to rebel," and Cain was indeed a rebel. He is called in their legends the first born of Eia. Other legends say he was the eldest son of Ishtar and Anu was his father. Cain was the first born of Eve. Merodach is the god of agriculture. Cain was a tiller of the soil, whereas Abel was primarily a herdsman. The legends say that Merodach brought order out of chaos by separating land from water and founding homes for men. We say that Sargon, or Cain, reigned in this lower swamp land, and directed the building of the dikes and drainage canals that separated the waters from the land, enough so they could build more permanent cities.

*First John 3:12* recognizes that Cain was a son of the evil one. Your King James Version does not use the word "son," because the translators had to meet accepted doctrine. In your King James Version it says (*inverse 12*), "Not as Cain, who was of that wicked one, and slew his brother." If you will turn to the *third chapter of the Gospel of Luke*, in your King James Version Bible, you will find that it gives the genealogy of Jesus Christ. It starts with Jesus Christ and works backwards to Adam. As you know, in your King James Version, where you find words printed in italic type, these are words added by translators, which were not actually written in the original languages and manuscripts, because they were implied or understood in those languages. The English does not imply it, and therefore to make the English idiom conform to the idiom of the Greek or the Hebrew the translators have supplied the words in English which were understood in the earlier languages, and they appear in italics. Take your King James Version and look up the genealogy of Jesus Christ (in *Luke 3*). It begins with *verse 23*: "And Jesus Himself began to be about thirty years of age, being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli, which was the son of Matthat, which was the son of Levi, which was the son of Meichi," and so on down through verse after verse. Note that beginning with "the son of Heli," the words "the son" are in italic type, indicating they were not written out in the Greek. In other words, if you said "John was of William" it meant in the Greek idiom "John was *the son* of William." I have heard people try to deny this idiom in *First John 3:12*, relative to Cain, stating it meant merely that Cain was morally bad, like the evil one, not referring to any father and son relationship. If that

be a true translation of the Greek, and only referring to morality, let us apply it to Luke and see if it is correct. I do not think that they developed a completely new and different Greek language between the writing of the *Gospel according to Luke* and the *First Epistle of John*. Would it make sense to say Joseph, who was morally no better than Heli, who was just as bad as Matthat? Of course not. In the *First Epistle of John*, it is the very same Greek language, and it says "Cain, who was of that wicked one." As a matter of fact, if you look it up in Weymouth's Modern English Translation, you will find he translates it correctly: "Cain, who was a child of the evil one...." Furthermore, if you will look up the *fifth chapter of Genesis*, which gives the descendants of Adam, you will find that it nowhere lists Cain among them. With monotonous regularity the Bible says that so-and-so begat whozis and whozis begat such-and-such, and so forth, verse after verse. You cannot find any place in the Bible where it says that Adam begat Cain, because he did not. The first time it says Adam begat anyone is in the *fifth chapter of Genesis, verse 3*: "Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and *begat* a son in his own likeness, after his image; and called his name Seth."

People like to bring up *verse one of Genesis, chapter four*, and try to make it mean something it does not say, "And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain." The Bible records things that happen, but it does not once say that there was a *cause* in sex relationship. I could tell you, with absolute truth, that upon a certain evening I went to a movie, and the following morning the sun rose in the east. I could prove it by witnesses, but I did not say that the fact that I went to the movie was the thing that caused the sun to rise in the east. It is true, very true that Adam and Eve had intercourse; it is very true that Eve bore Cain; but it is not true that Cain was the son of Adam, and the Bible does not anywhere say that Cain was a son of Adam.

One of these ancient Akkadian inscriptions about Sargon says this, "The divine Sargon, the illustrious King, a son of Bel the Just, the King of Akkad and of the children of Bel." Bel, or Baal, was a later form of this obviously deified Satan, known in the earliest forms as Mul-lil or Enlil. Here they recognized that Sargon was a son of him whom we know to be Satan. Other legends of Sargon's origin say that he was adopted by Akki and raised as a gardener. The basic root of Akki is found in the Hebrew word Nachash: Naka, the Egyptian word for serpent; Naga, the Hindu word for serpent, particularly serpent god; Ahhi, a serpent water god; Arriman, the Persian devil, source of all evil.

Cain was a tiller of the soil. Sargon was raised as a gardener. One of Sargon's own inscriptions found in our museums today, says this, "While I was a gardener Ishtar loved me." Yes, he was still near the Garden of Eden - not in the Garden of Eden, but in the same part of the world to which Adam and Eve had gone. So, you can identify the Cain of the Bible as an actual historical character, the records of whose own kingdom are in our museums today.

To further convince you, we can carry it a bit further. Sargon's own records show that at least three times he went to the Great Sea; at least once he crossed it. What was that "Great Sea?" There are indications that it was the Atlantic because in Central and South America there are legends in their mythology, which cannot be accounted for on any basis except that they were brought over there by someone who knew the early mythology of Sargón's time. In turn, you find in the Babylonian

**religion the use of certain words and phrases that are Mayan.**

**The story of the worship of Cain appears among the Mayas of Yucatan and the Quichis of Guatemala. The Mayas say that their kingdom was found by King Can, and "Can" means "serpent" in their Mayan language; a change from Cain to Can, from one language to another, is very small. (Notice what we do today in our modern languages. The name in English we call William is in French Guillaume; in German it is Vilhelm; in Italian it is Guglielmo. We make more change from one language to another today with the same word than they did in those days.) There was a family of seven the father, mother and five children. Their serpent king, his wife and children were symbolized by a seven-headed serpent. Incidentally, that same emblem of the seven-headed serpent is worshiped today in India, in Indochina and in Siam, or Thailand, as it is known today.**

**This person who came and brought them this form of worship was deified in their legends as Quetzalcoatl, the feathered serpent, a serpent having feathers instead of scales. Their legends say that out of the east, on white-winged ships, came white men who taught these Mayans their civilization; and finally sailing away, back to the east on these white-winged ships, saying, "Some day we will return." Since then, these people have worshiped Quetzalcoatl, the feathered serpent, as their god, the white man who taught them their civilization. A very interesting bit of more recent history is that when Cortez landed on the shore of Mexico, he was received with relatively little hostility. Out of the East, in white sailed ships, came white men. He was greeted joyously with friendship. He had practically no difficulty marching on up to Montezuma's capital city, Mexico City, where he was greeted with reverence and friendship. In the minds of the people, this was the promised return of Quetzalcoatl. We know, of course, that Cortez was nothing but a thief and a murderer, there in search of loot. Evidently the prisons of Spain had been emptied of the worst cut-throats to provide him with soldiers, because they were out to steal what they could get. They were accompanied, of course, by a couple of Spanish Catholic Priests. It is a matter of record in their report that on one of the pagan festival days, these priests wandered into one of these pagan temples in Mexico City and they observed the pagan priests putting on a Catholic mass, perfect in every detail, except it was not spoken in Latin. So the Catholic priests stormed out in a furious rage, saying "These pagans are mocking us." They incited the soldiers to a general massacre of the inhabitants, promising them, in advance, absolution for all the murders, rapes and other crimes they might commit in the process. What these Catholics did not know was the fact that they had received their ceremonies from the same ancient source as did the Mayas.**

**That is a very interesting study. If you want to trace it in great detail, get Hyslop's book "The Two Babylons," and you will see the Babylon origin of much of the Catholic ritual.**

**Among these people are ancient legends which say that one of Can's sons, coveting the kingdom held by another of his sons, treacherously killed him, stabbed him in the back with a spear and took his kingdom, which is probably their version of the murder of Abel by Cain, even though garbled, somewhat, down through the centuries.**

**The Incas of Peru were probably Mayan colonies, because the language of Peru,**

which was Quichua, shows their descent of the Quichis of Guatemala, who were a branch of the Maya nation.

Other events show how this culture was carried back and forth. In much of Central America, after the winter rains, comes the spring dry season. Then, there are summer rains. At the beginning of the month of May, at midnight, the Southern Cross Constellation stands exactly perpendicular above the southern horizon, right in the meridian, and shortly thereafter the next rainy season begins. The natives recognize this as a sign that rain is coming soon. The Cross was a very ancient symbol among all nations. The form in which we have it in Christianity today, with the cross bar going below the top of the vertical post, is a much later form.

The earlier form of the cross was the Tau cross, with the cross bar just resting on top of the vertical bar. This cross is found in Egyptian records, as far back as you can find anything in Egypt. The very name Tau is derived from Mayan. T-a-u means literally "here water month." In other words, when this Southern Cross Constellation stood exactly vertical above the southern horizon, right on the Meridain, it indicated the beginning of the water month - the month when the rains would start. This is the month for rain. The month of May is named from Maia, the Goddess, the Good Dame, the Mother of the Gods. If you investigate the Catholic religion, you will find The Feast of the Adoration of the Holy Cross is May 3, beginning of the water month. It is the day also consecrated particularly to the Mother of God, The Good Lady. In other words, straight out of Babylonian and Mayan paganism, which again we trace to its source, in its beginning, to Cain or Sargon.

From this, you can see that we can trace these ancient religions not only to Babylonia, Sumer and Akkadia, but we can trace Cain, a real person known to history under the name of Sargon, even to Central and South America. Cain is not myth!

We trust these pages will enable you to answer, without any doubt, "What Happened to Cain?"

---

## NOAH'S FLOOD WAS NOT WORLD WIDE

Among the many mistaken and un-Scriptural notions commonly taught in nearly all churches is the idea that the Flood, mentioned in the Bible, covered all the earth, and drowned everybody on earth excepting only Noah and his family, who escaped death by being in the Ark. So many churches have firmly insisted that the Bible says this-- when there is ample proof that the Flood was *not* worldwide - that they have destroyed the faith of multitudes of people in the Bible, made atheists or agnostics out of hundreds of thousands of people who might have become Christians if they had only been taught the truth about the Bible.

Part of this mistaken idea about the Flood is due to the many mistranslations found in the commonly-used King James Version of the Bible; but also, part of it appears plainly to be false if you merely carefully read even the King James Version. Let's have a look at it.

In *Genesis chapter 6*, we read that God found the people so corrupt that He regretted that He had ever created them, so He decided to wipe them out by a flood; and He warned righteous Noah of the coming flood, and told Noah to build a great boat, or ark, in which he and his family might find safety, and where they might preserve a few of each kind of the animals. In *chapter 7*, it tells how Noah received the final warning that the time was now at hand, and he should move into the ark. Then it says - according to the King James Version - "And it came to pass after seven days, that the waters of the flood were upon the earth. In the six hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, the seventeenth day of the month, the same day were all the fountains of the great deep broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened. And the rain was upon the earth 40 days and 40 nights... And the waters prevailed, and were increased greatly upon the earth; and the ark went upon the waters. And the waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth; and all the high hills that were under the whole heaven were covered. Fifteen cubits upward did the waters prevail; and the mountains were covered. And all flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth; and every man... And the waters prevailed upon the earth 150 days. And God remembered Noah, and every living thing, and all the cattle that was with him in the ark; and God made a wind to pass over the earth, and the waters asswaged... And the waters returned from off the earth continually, and after the end of the 150 days the waters were abated. And the ark rested, in the 7th month, on the 17th day of the month, upon the mountains of Ararat. And the waters decreased continually until the 10th month; in the 10th month, on the 1st day of the month, were the tops of the mountains seen."

Now, first, let us see what the translators have done to what Moses originally wrote. You remember that the King James Version says that the rain was upon "the earth," and the waters increased greatly upon "the earth"; and that "all flesh died that moved upon the earth." But are they right in translating this "the earth"? Definitely not! Remember that in *Genesis 4:14*, when God has driven Cain away in punishment for his murder of Abel, the King James Version quotes Cain as saying "Behold, Thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the earth." So what did Cain do? climb into his rocket ship and take off for outer space? Of course not! He was not driven from the face of "the earth," and he never said so - only the translators said so. The word Cain used was "ad-aw-maw," meaning "the ground": God had told him that his farming would no longer be successful, so Cain said "Thou hast driven me off of the ground." (And you have probably noticed that Cain's descendants today are not farmers: they run pawnshops and other money-lending institutions.)

When we come to the *7th chapter of Genesis*, where it is talking about the Flood, wherever it says that the Flood covered "the earth," the Hebrew word used in the original writing by Moses was "eh-rets," meaning "the land" - the flood did cover *the particular land where it occurred*. That is, it was a local flood which covered one particular region or land, not the whole earth.

Again, notice that it specifies that "15 cubits upward did the waters prevail; and the mountains were covered." In ancient times two different lengths of the cubit were in use: the Hebrew sacred cubit of 25 inches, and the common cubit of 20-5/8 inches. Therefore, the waters rose above the tops of the mountains it is speaking of by either 25 feet 9 inches or 31 feet 3 inches, according to which cubit you use. If this meant that all the mountains on earth were covered, the waters would have to cover Mount

Everest, which is nearly six miles high: therefore, all the earth would be covered by water six miles deep. In that case, where could it have run off when the Flood subsided? No, I don't mean that the Bible was that badly mistaken: only the translators made that mistake, because they took a Hebrew word "eh-rets" which means "that land" and mistranslated it to mean the whole world. A little later, we shall look over the evidence which proves where "*that land*" was.

But if the whole earth was covered by six miles of water, then all nations must have been completely exterminated. Yet Babylonian, Egyptian and Chinese history runs right through this period without a break. The Bible gives the date of Noah's Flood as commencing in 2345 B.C. and ending in 2344 B.C. In lower Sumer, later called "Chaldea" (and which occupied the same "Plains of Shinar" to which Noah's family journeyed after the flood), the City of Ur of the Chaldees was the leading city from about 2400 B.C. until about 2285 B.C., and its history is not broken by any flood in this period. Farther to the north, Babylon was rising to power from about 2400 B.C. on, and reached a great height of civilization under the famous King Hammurabi, who lived at the same time as the Hebrew patriarch Abraham (about 2250 B.C.), and again there is no break in this history due to a flood. In Egypt, the Eleventh Dynasty began to reign about 2375 B.C. over a great and powerful nation; the Eleventh Dynasty ruled to about 2212 B.C., and was followed by the Twelfth Dynasty, which ruled to about 2000 B.C. There was no break in the Eleventh Dynasty at the time of Noah's Flood, 2345 B.C.; and the nation continued to be large and powerful throughout this period.

Accurate history of China begins nearly 3000 B.C. The Shu-King, historic record of China, shows that King Yao came to the throne in 2356 B.C. - 11 years before the start of Noah's Flood - and ruled China for many years after the Flood. During the reign of Yao, the Shu-King reports that the Hwang Ho River (which drains mountains and a great basin in Sinkiang province) had excessive floods for three generations. Here, again, there was no break in history, the Chinese nation was not wiped out, but its own records show that it continued in existence right through the period of Noah's Flood.

Therefore, the Bible is correct in stating that the Flood covered only "eh-rets" - "that land"; and the translators are wrong when they change the meaning of what Moses really wrote in the *7th chapter of Genesis*, and say that the Flood covered all "the earth."

This leaves us ready to inquire where the Flood did occur. For this, we will have to start with Adam and Eve, and trace where they and their descendants went. They started out in the Garden of Eden. *Genesis 2:10 to 14* tells us that a river went out of Eden, and this river divided into four Streams. It names these four rivers: Pison and Gihon (neither of which can be identified among the rivers existing today), and Hiddekel (which is the ancient name of the Tigris River) and Euphrates. The Tigris and Euphrates rise in what is today extreme southeastern Turkey, a little north of modern Iraq. Making some allowance for the fact that many rivers have changed their courses considerably in the course of several thousand years, this still places the Garden of Eden at the northern end of ancient Akkad.

When Adam and Eve were driven out of the Garden of Eden, *Genesis 3:24* tells us that God placed cherubim with a flaming sword *at the east side* of the Garden of

Eden, to keep Adam and Eve from returning and having access to the tree of life. If this guard was to accomplish anything, it must have been placed between Adam and the Garden of Eden, so we see that Adam and Eve were driven out to the east. From Eden, Adam's course would naturally have led him across northern Iran, around the southern end of the Caspian Sea, into what was formerly called Chinese Turkestan, and today is known as Sinkiang province in the extreme west of China.

In the southern part of Sinkiang, there is a great basin, rimmed by high mountains on all sides, but with an outlet on the eastern end of it, through the mountains where the headwaters of the Hwang-Ho River, the Yellow River, rises. This basin is today nearly all desert; but it bears the evidence of a fertile and heavily inhabited past. Explorers have found ruins of ancient cities, uncovered by the drifting sands of the desert. Also, the known geological structure shows that, in ancient times at least, beneath this desert lay enormous underground natural reservoirs, caverns filled with water - the same geological structure which furnishes *artesian* water in many parts of the world today. These underground reservoirs were covered by waterproof layers of rock, which kept the waters beneath from overflowing out on the land surface above them. In this mountain-rimmed basin, then a fertile, well-populated land, Adam and Eve - or at least their descendants of a few generations later - settled.

You who listen to this program already know that Adam was not the first man: he was only the first man in the present White Race. Adam and Eve found this land to which they had come already populated by an Asiatic people, among whom they had to live. Through the following generations, the inevitable happened: wherever there is integration, intermarriage and mongrelization of the races follows. But if God had no purp(-ses in mind which could not be properly served by the Asiatic and Negro races, there would have been no reason for Him to create Adam: neither could the purposes which Adam and *his* descendants were intended to serve be fulfilled by a mongrelized race. The consequences of this mongrelization are described in *Genesis 6:5*, "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." Again, we find that the word there mistranslated "earth" is the Hebrew word "eb-rets," which means only "the land" - that particular land; and there is reason for using that Hebrew word, for this was the place where integration and mongrelization had taken place, with its degenerative effects as compared to the qualities possessed by each race separately.

We find confirmation of this in the reason why God spared Noah. In *Genesis 6: 9*, your King James Version Bible tells you that Noah was "perfect in his generations" - a meaningless phrase. When anything in the King James Version of the Bible fails to make good sense, it is a sign that you should go behind the mistranslation and see what the words were in the original Hebrew or Greek. The word here translated "generations" was the Hebrew word "to-ledaw," which means "ancestry." That is, Noah was "perfect in his ancestry" - a thoroughbred, not a mongrel. Noah and his family were the last remaining pureblooded Adamites in (that part of) the world: therefore, God needed to save them to carry out the purposes He had planned for the Adamic people. The mongrelized people among whom Noah and his family lived must be removed, or they would be a trap which would eventually lead to the complete end of the pure-blooded Adamites. (It was part of God's plan for one of Noah's sons to produce the line of racial descent into which God would later embody Himself as the Messiah, and by His Crucifixion pay for the redemption of His people;

for this reason the lineage had to be kept pure.)

Have we any other evidence to support our view that this was the region where Adam and Eve and their descendants settled? Yes. Remember that Adam and Eve were driven out of Eden to the eastward. Later, when Cain murdered Abel, and as a punishment was banished from the land where Adam and Eve lived, *Genesis 4:16* tells us that Cain "went out from the presence of the Lord and dwelt in the Land of Nod, on the east of Eden." The Hebrew word "nod" means "wandering." That is, in the upper Tigris and Euphrates Valleys, at the north of Eden, these rivers were running swiftly downhill from their mountain sources: therefore, they cut themselves deep channels in the ground; and even today, we can find the traces of the ancient diversion dams, built by the ancients to raise the water level up close to the surface of the ground, so they would not have to pump it so high to get it into their irrigation canals. Farther to the south, in the lower Tigris and Euphrates Valleys, where the slope was no longer steep, the accumulation of silt picked up by the rivers where they ran swiftly was now settling to the bottom of the river beds, constantly raising the level, so that every high-water season the rivers overflowed their banks and flooded the valleys, exactly the same as we have had in our own Mississippi Valley. These annual floods washed away the people's houses and sent them fleeing far away to high ground: therefore, it was correctly called "the Land of Nod" - "the Land of Wandering." Here Cain settled, and taught the people to build high dikes along the river banks - just as we have done along the banks of the Mississippi River. This enabled them to stop the annual floods, so they could now build permanent cities of good houses in the lower Tigris and Euphrates Valleys, the land then called by its own inhabitants "Sumer," and later called "Chaldea." In a very few places, the Bible calls it "the Plain of Shinar." That is, Cain went back westward from where Adam and Eve lived. It was thus that Cain started his great empire. Yes, Cain is a well-known historical character, not found only in the Bible (but he is known in history under another name). He established an empire which extended from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean Sea, and even took in some of the larger islands in the Mediterranean Sea. Some day I will tell you about Cain and his empire; but that is another story.

Another bit of evidence is found in *Genesis 11:2*, which tells us that after the Flood, Noah's descendants "journeyed *FROM the east*," until they came to the land of Shinar. Therefore, they must have come from some place east of the Tigris and Euphrates Valleys; and the only place where such a flood as the Bible describes could have occurred, eastward from the Tigris and Euphrates Valleys, is this mountain basin in Sinkiang which I have been talking about.

Another bit of evidence is found in the high-water mark found in many places along the mountains which rim this basin, showing that at one time this basin was a lake, extending to this well-marked shoreline. The mountains which rim this valley were not fully covered, for many of them range from 16,000 to 25,000 feet in height, and one even rises over 28,000 feet. But within the basin are several smaller mountains, which could be fully covered by a flood held within the higher rim of the valley. In short, this basin, through which flows the Tarim River, and which is sometimes known as the Tarim Basin, in southern Sinkiang, is identified as the site of Noah's Flood.

In your King James Version Bible, *Genesis 7:11-12* reads: "in the 600th year of

Noah's life, in the 2nd month, the 17th day of the month, the same day were all the fountains of the great deep broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened. And the rain was upon the earth 40 days and 40 nights." More careful translation makes clear what really happened. in Moffatt's Modern English translation we read, "*the fountains of the great abyss all burst, and the sluices of heaven were opened.*" In Smith and Goodspeed's American Translation, it says "*the fountains of the great abyss were all broken open, and the windows of the heavens were opened.*" That is, a great earthquake broke up this water-proof layer of rock over the immense, water-filled abyss or cavern beneath this Tarim Basin, causing the floor of the valley to settle, and allowed the enormous underground reservoir to overflow and submerge the valley

46

floor: the great earthquake in the Himalaya Mountains about ten years ago produced similar effects in some places. Of course, the 40 days of torrential rains added to the flood. This filled the valley high enough to submerge the low mountains which were inside the valley, exactly as *Genesis 7:19-20* says. Don't be misled by the mistranslation, "all the high hills that were under the whole heaven were covered." The word mistranslated "heaven" is merely the Hebrew word "shaw-meh," meaning "the sky." Since this Tarim Basin is somewhat more than 350 miles wide by more than 650 miles long, all the sky visible from anywhere near the center of this valley would cover only this valley, and therefore only those lower mountains which were within the valley itself, would be covered by water.

But what about *Genesis 8:4*, reading, "And the ark rested in the 7th month, on the 17th day of the month, upon the mountains of Ararat."? Sometimes failure to *translate* can be as misleading as mistranslation. Most people understand this to mean Mount Ararat, in Armenia, some 1,600 miles west of the Tarim Basin. But this is NOT what the Bible says. First of all, note that it says "mountains of Ararat," mountains being in the plural, while Mount Ararat in Armenia is only a single peak. But Mount Ararat in Armenia was known until comparatively recent times as "Mount Massis," and nobody had ever heard of it being called "Mount Ararat" in Bible times. Furthermore, the Hebrew word "ararat" means only "the tops of the hills." Therefore, correctly translated, *Genesis 8: 4* merely says that the ark came to rest upon the tops of the high hills - some of the lower mountains which were within the valley.

A recent newspaper report mentions an expedition, equipped with the latest electronic equipment, which is going to Mount Ararat in Armenia to find the Ark, and which will melt the ice which covers the Ark by coating it with black powdered carbon. They won't find Noah's Ark, for it is not there. Several expeditions have gone to Mount Ararat to find the Ark; some of them got within sight of a mass on the side of the mountain which, from that particular point of view, looked to be shaped somewhat like a ship. That point has been very carefully inspected from the air, by airplanes flying over it very close, and it has proved to be nothing but a ledge of rock which does give a silhouette shaped like a ship, when seen from the right direction. I need not mention the many places - such as the Grand Canyon, etc - where similar

**"ship rocks" can be seen - and none of them are Noah's Ark.**

**So, when we carefully examine the whole affair, and correct the mistranslations, we find that there is no conflict between what the Bible *really* says and either science or history. In fact, there never is any such conflict: it is only *the preachers* who find themselves contradicted by either science or history; and that is only because they either won't take the trouble to find out what the Bible really says, or they have made the mistranslation a supposedly sacred church doctrine, and now they are stuck with it. Don't let any church shake your faith in the Bible: the Bible is always right, even if the preachers are often wrong.**

**Let us remember another thing: the Chinese historical record, the Shu-King, records that during the reign of King Yao, at a time beginning about the date of Noah's Flood, the Hwang Ho River carried excessive floods for three generations. Drainage out of the Tarim Basin to the eastward would have been carried off in the Hwang Ho River, and would account for this.**

**Now we come to another false doctrine taught in many churches: that since nobody survived in all the earth except Noah and his family, everybody now living is a descendant of Noah and related by blood, no matter what race they belong to. But we have already seen that the Flood did not cover the whole earth but only one valley about 350 by 650 miles in size; that Chinese history was not interrupted by it, although they do record purely local floods in the Hwang Ho valley where the waters were draining off; we have seen that Egyptian history is not interrupted by the Flood, so the continent of Africa was not touched by it and the Negro race continued unaffected by it. It would be absurd to think that Noah and his wife, both of them being White, could have one white child, one Negro child, and one Chinese child. Remember that in *Genesis 1:11-25*, when God created the world and its inhabitants, and made the laws governing their reproduction, He did not make it absurd chaos, with whales giving birth to cattle and fish hatching out of birds' eggs: His law, several times repeated for emphasis, is always that each creature must bring forth strictly "after his own kind." The churches which teach this false doctrine of everybody being descended from Noah never got it out of the Bible - that is, in any true translation of the Bible. As Moses wrote it in the Hebrew language, under divine inspiration, the Bible correctly tells that Noah's descendants went out into a world already populated by people who had lived right through the time of the Flood and were still going strong. Ferrar Fenton's Modern English translation gives this correctly. In *Genesis 10:1-5* we read of the descendants of Noah's son Japheth, and it says, "From these they spread themselves over the sea-coasts of the countries of the nations, each with their language amongst the gentile tribes." *Genesis 10:20* tells of the descendants of Noah's son Ham, "These were the sons of Ham, in their tribes and languages, in the regions of the heathen." *Genesis 10:31* completes it: "These are the sons of Shem, by their tribes and by their languages, in their countries among the heathen."**

**So never let anybody tell you that the Bible consists of the fables of a primitive people. It is perfectly consistent with all true science and all true history: it is the history of our Race, the Anglo-Saxon, Scandinavian and Teutonic White Race.**

## ADDENDUM to NOAH'S FLOOD

**Editor's Note:** The distinguishing mark of a real scholar is a continuing desire for additional knowledge and a willingness to cast aside previously held concepts the moment they are found to be false; and the honesty to acknowledge such changes in understanding is most commendable. When Dr. Comparet wrote the foregoing article on Noah's Flood, he placed the Garden of Eden near the headwaters of the present Euphrates River; in other words, in northern Mesopotamia. But he subsequently learned that the Garden of Eden was more likely located in the Pamir Plateau of central Asia, immediately west of the Tarim Basin, and now accepts the views of Frederick Haberman on the subject as being entirely correct: the views expressed in Mr. Haberman's interesting and authoritative book called **TRACING YOUR ANCESTORS** - and the following is taken from pages 11-14 of that book:

"Our next problem is to discover where the Adamic or Aryan race originated. According to Scripture it began in Eden. But where was Eden? Concerning the location of Eden we read in *Genesis 2:10-14*: 'And a river went out of Eden to water the garden; and from thence it was parted, and became into four heads. The name of the first is Pison: that is it which compasseth the whole land of Havilah, where there is gold; and the gold of that land is good: there is bdelhum and the onyx stone. And the name of the second river is Gihon: the same is it that compasseth the whole land of Ethiopia. And the name of the third river is Hiddekel; that is it which goeth toward the east of Assyria. And the fourth river is Euphrates.' Because the Euphrates is mentioned here, people have assumed that Eden must have been located on the banks of the historic Euphrates river in Mesopotamia; but as the Euphrates and the Tigris merge into one river, the situation in no wise corresponds to the description given in Genesis, which states that one river went out of Eden and divided into four heads. If we wish to accept the Bible statement as descriptive and authoritative, we are compelled to look elsewhere for a group of four rivers originating from one source.

"Such a location of four rivers starting from one source we find on the Pamir plateau in Central Asia, between the Tian Shan mountains on the north and the Hindu Kush on the south. Kush is the original word for Ethiopia and is a word older than the division of languages. From the lakes of that plateau issue four great rivers: the Indus, the Jaxartes, the Oxus, and the Tarim. The Oxus is still called by the natives the Dghun or Gihon; the Chitral branch of the Indus answers the description of the Pison; the Jaxartes is the original Euphrates; and the Tarim going toward the east is in all probability the Hiddekel.

"Concerning this identification, Prof. S. H. Buchanan on Pages 125 and 126 of his work, *The World and the Book*, quotes the great French Orientalist, M. Renan: 'If we search to determine the country which best satisfies the geography of the first chapters of Genesis, it is necessary to avow that all conducts us to the region of the Imaus, where the most solid inductions place the cradle of the Aryan race. There is found, as in the Paradise of Genesis, gold, precious stones, bdellium. This point is that of the world of which one is able to say with the most truth that four rivers issue from the same source. Four immense currents of water: the Indus, the Helمند, the Oxus, and the Gaxartes, take there their rise, flowing in directions the most opposite. The second chapter of Genesis presents to us a traditional geography which has no connection with the ordinary geography of the Hebrews; but which on the contrary,

offers the most astounding resemblance with the Turanian system. The Pison, which issues from the Garden of Eden, situated in the East, is very probably the high Indus, and the country of Havilah, seems well to be the country of Darada towards Chachmises, celebrated for its riches. The Gihon is the Oxus, and it is without doubt by substitution of more modern names that we find the Tigris and the Euphrates at the side of the other rivers indicated. Thus, all invites us to place the Eden of the Semites at the point of the separation of the waters of Asia; at the umbilic of the world, toward which, as with an index finger, all the races seem to point as that recognized in their most primitive traditions.'

"Sir Gaston Maspero, late director-general of Egyptian Antiquities in his *Ancient History of the Orient*, also identifies the Pamir plateau as the location of the Garden of Eden. His quotation is also taken from Prof. Buchanan's book, Pages 124-125:

"'All have preserved, mixed with the vague legends of their infancy, the memory of a primitive country where their ancestors had lived before their dispersion. This was a high mountain, or better, an immense plateau of a square figure, and so elevated that it seemed as if suspended between the heavens and the earth. From the interior flowed a great river, which soon divided itself into four arms or canals, spreading out over the four surrounding countries. There was the umbilic of the world and the cradle of humanity. The people settled between the Mediterranean and the Tigris located this legendary country in the East. The people of ancient Persia and India conceived its situation in the North. The moderns have succeeded in determining its site more exactly than the ancients had done. They have placed it in the mountains of Belurtag, near the point where the chain unites with the Himalaya. There in effect, and there only, is found a country which satisfies all the geographic descriptions preserved in the sacred books of Asia. From the Plateau of Pamir, or better, from the mountain mass of which this plateau is the center, four great rivers issue, the Indus, the Helمند, the Oxus, and the Gaxartes, which flow in directions the most diverse corresponding sufficiently to the four rivers of tradition.'

"This plateau of Pamir all the people Asia consider to be the original Eden and the central part of the world as Prof. Renan tells us, quoted by Buchanan, Pages 123-124: 'Thus everything invites us to place the Eden of the Semites (Aryans) in the mountains of Belurtag, at the point where this chain unites with the Himalaya, toward the Plateau of Pamir... We are conducted to the same point, according to Brunoff, by the most ancient and authentic texts of the Zend-Avesta. The Hindu traditions also contained in the Mahabharata and the Puranas, converge to the same region. There is the true Meru (Ararat) (of the Hindus), the true Albordj (of the Persians), the true river Arvanda, from which all rivers take their source, according to Persian tradition. There, according to the opinions of almost all the populations of Asia, is the central point of the world, the umbilic, the gate of the universe. There is the uttarakura - 'the country of happiness' - of which Megasthenes writes. There is, finally the point of common attachment of the primitive geography, both of the Semitic and the Indo-European races.'

"The Pamir plateau of today is of course a different place from what it was five or six thousand years ago. At that time the whole of Asia was lower than it is today; at that time a large inland sea covered the steppes of southern Siberia, of which the Caspian Sea and the Aral Sea are remnants; and over the now frozen steppes of northern Siberia roamed the mammoth and the sabre-toothed tiger. All the indications are that

northern Siberia then had a semi-tropical climate, and ideal conditions prevailed on the Pamir Plateau. A study of our map shows that this plateau occupies a unique position; it is called 'the roof of the world' and forms the watershed of Asia. The plateau itself has today an altitude of 15,000 feet, and upon it stand peaks 10,000 feet higher. Four great rivers derive their waters from the valleys or *pamirs*, the lakes and glaciers of that region. The main branch of the Amu Dana or Oxus forms an outlet to Lake Victoria, several others of its tributaries flowing also from the plateau.. The Oxus is still called by the natives the Gihun. Both the Chitral and the Gilget branches of the Indus have their origin close to Lake Victoria on the southern side of the Pamirs, and so also has the Yarkand River, which together with the Kashgar forms the Tarim River. The Tarim river, as will be seen, has no outlet towards the sea, but disappears in the Tarim Basin at a place that is five hundred feet below sea level. This Tarim Basin is the greatest sinkhole in the world, although it is surrounded by the highest mountain peaks in the world; yet its floor lies in many places below the level of the Indian Ocean, indicating that a great cataclysm tore the earth here in a bygone age.

"The northern branch of the Tarim, the Kashgar River, flows out of the Alai valley on the northern end of the Pamir Plateau and not far from where a branch of the Oxus originates. From the same valley also flows in a northerly direction a branch of the Syr Dana, or Jaxartes River, whose name indicates that it is probably the original Euphrates of the ancients. The Helمند, which Renan and Maspero identify with the Hiddekel does not have its origin on the Pamir plateau, but starts several hundred miles south of it in a valley of the Hindu Kush; but it is probable that the Kashgar river is the original Hiddekel, flowing towards the East.

"Only the Pamir Plateau answers to the geographical conditions described in *Genesis 4:10*, 'A lake also sprang up in Eden to supply the Garden with waters, and from there it divided and became four rivers' (Fenton translation of the Bible). Such a condition exists nowhere else in Asia, four streams coming from one group of Alpine lakes, which may once have been one lake; and all the people of Asia look with awe to the 'forbidden Pamirs' as the place of the original Paradise. There on the 'roof of the world' is located the mythical Taurus or Alai mountains, the legendary Chinese *Qucs Kiu* or Lake of Stars and the *Rang Kul* or Dragon's Lake, from which the Serpent is said to have come.

"Today the Pamir Plateau is uninhabited. Its high altitude of 15,000 feet or more makes it too inhospitable a place to live in: and, covering a territory of about 180 by 180 miles, it forms a blank and mysterious spot on the map of Asia.

"In the next chapter we shall see that all the circumstances point to the Tarim Basin, lying just east of the Great Pamirs, as the homeland of the Adamites; both locations and their peculiarities make it evident that the cradle of the Adamic or Aryan race was located in these mysterious mountain fastnesses of Central Asia."

## Gospel of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ

### THE MIRACLE OF THE ORIGIN OF OUR RACE

Those who hate to believe our Israel identity doctrine like to snarl at us, "Ah, what's so special about the White Race, anyway?" They like to close their eyes to the fact that all civilization existing in the world today is the product of that race: what the dark people have was taught to them by us. But I want to take up this challenge, and show that there is something very special about our Race, altogether aside from our abilities and accomplishments: that the very origin of the true Israel of God, the Anglo-Saxon, Scandinavian, Germanic and related peoples, was in itself a miracle from the hand of God.

You will remember that God first made His promises of a marvelous future to Abraham, telling him "I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered" (*Genesis 13:16*). "My covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations" (*Genesis 17:4*); "And I will establish My covenant between Me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant" (*Genesis 17:7*), and told how these nations would be a blessing to all the earth.

Abraham had 8 sons; but God told him that only his son Isaac was to be the ancestor of the promised line, called by God to become His people, saying, "In Isaac shall thy seed be called" (*Genesis 21:12*), and "My covenant will I establish with Isaac" (*Genesis 17:21*). Not only was Isaac, our ancestor, specially selected by God, but his very existence was a miracle. Two parties are necessary for the birth of all other children - a father and a mother; but the birth of Isaac required three parties: his father, Abraham, his mother, Sarah, - and GOD.

A year before the birth of Isaac, God gave him his name, in *Genesis 17:21*. When God spoke of a child being born to Sarah, both Abraham and Sarah laughed at the obvious impossibility: for Sarah was then 90 years old. and feeble with great age - 45 years past the time when she could bear a child and, indeed, she had been barren all her life - and Abraham was 99 years old. But God performed the miracle He had promised, and a year later, at the age of 91, Sarah bore her first and only child, Isaac.

This was only the first of miracles. Like his descendant, Jesus Christ, Isaac was named by God Himself before his birth. Jesus Christ brought the reality of resurrection from the dead; but Isaac was used to furnish a symbolic prophecy of our loved ones given back from the dead. Naturally, all of Abraham's hopes were now centered upon this miracle son, through whom all of God's great promises were to be fulfilled; then came the stunning command from God, "Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah; and offer him there for a burnt offering." Did God now mean to take away all that He had promised? No. Abraham knew better than that: not in the awful grief of a father about to witness, even to cause, the death of his beloved son, but in serene faith, Abraham obeyed God. He took the boy Isaac and went to Mount Moriah, prepared the wood fire for the burnt offering, never doubting that God would keep His promise: either God would intervene beforehand, or God would give him back his son from the dead. Abraham told Isaac, "My son, God will provide Himself a lamb for a burnt offering." He knew and relied upon the assurance that Jesus Christ was "the lamb slain from before the foundation of the world" (*Revelation 13:8*), the one who paid all debts and penalties for us, and gave us back our loved ones from the dead.

As always, God honored His word. The 22nd chapter of *Genesis* tells how God did provide the burnt offering, a ram trapped in a thicket by his horns, so Abraham made the sacrifice with the offering provided by God. Again, here is Christianity in the Old Testament. We have nothing of our own to offer in atonement for our sins: it is God who provides the lamb as the sin offering. The offering of the beloved son prefigures the sacrifice of Jesus Christ as the Lamb of God; and the fact that his promised career was not interrupted by death symbolizes the swift resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to continue His promised work on our behalf. For us, the threat of death is not real, for God has not only promised us continued life, but has strengthened our faith by clear demonstration of His power and will to resurrect us.

It is very fitting that Isaac was specially chosen and called by God to be our ancestor - as we are specially chosen and called by God to be His people and to do His will in the earth. We are all the children of Isaac; only by a miracle from the hand of God did he ever come into existence at all - and remember, that miracle is our miracle too, for without it we also would not exist today: only by another miracle from God did Isaac grow to maturity and become our ancestor - and again, we are the product of that miracle. God told Isaac, "I will make thy seed to multiply as the stars of heaven, and will give unto thy seed all these countries; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed" (*Genesis 26:4*). With all our human imperfections, we have fulfilled this prophecy. We have brought the other races the first sanitation they ever knew, and stopped the pestilences which had previously ravaged their lands; we stopped their murderous tribal wars and brought them peace, as long as we remained in command of their lands; we brought them the only public education they had ever known; we taught them improved methods of agriculture, and when they still were not able to feed themselves, we sent them on many occasions the shipments of food which saved millions from death by famine.

By a miracle, God created Isaac for a purpose - to be the ancestor of our race; by miracles, God brought us to the great numbers and power which He had promised; God said of us, "They shall show forth My praise" - and despite our human faults, we have done so.

---

## ISRAEL' S FINGERPRINTS

The Bible is written about, and addressed to, God's people, "Israel." It is the history of their past, the prophecy of their future, the law of their relation to their God, and the promise of God's eternal care of them. The common misconception, that "the Jews are Israel, or all that remains of them," has made the Bible meaningless, and most of it apparently false, to those who hold this mistaken belief. It is just as though you took a good history of the United States, but wherever the name "United States" appeared therein, you erased it and wrote "China" in its place. As a history of China, it would be obviously false; but if you applied it to the right nation, it would be clearly true.

The Bible's history of Israel's past is known to be accurate; and its prophecies of Israel's future have been fulfilled in every detail, down to the present day. When the police have the fingerprints of a wanted man, they know that the man whose fingerprints match those they have is the man they seek. Likewise, when we find the

people to whom God has fulfilled all of His promises and prophecies to Israel, we have found Israel! Today, the Anglo-Saxon-Scandinavian and Germanic nations have Israel's fingerprints in every detail.

When we realize that WE ARE ISRAEL, the Bible becomes full of meaning for us: it is our history, it contains God's promises to US! It gives us courage to face the terrible upheaval into which all the world is being drawn. If you will only read the Bible with an open mind, taking no man's word for it, but proving for yourself what the Bible says, then comparing that with what you know of present-day history, you will see that WE are God's People Israel, and that, however terrible the trial ahead, we will be brought safely through it when we turn to God.

**FIRST** - Let us briefly review the ancient history of Israel. God first made His promises of wonderful blessings to Abram, changing his name to "Abraham," meaning "Father of Nations." Note that this is the plural - nations. God repeated His promises to Abraham's son, Isaac; and again to Isaac's son Jacob, whose name God changed to "Israel," which means "He will rule with God."

Israel had twelve sons. The descendants of each son became in time a Tribe, under its ancestor's name: thus, all the descendants of Dan became the Tribe of Dan, all the descendants of Benjamin became the Tribe of Benjamin, etc. For many centuries, all members of all the twelve tribes collectively were known as the "children" - that is descendants of Israel. However, do not confuse this with the later "House," or Kingdom, of Israel, about which I will have more to say later.

Israel and his twelve sons, with their families, went into Egypt, as you will remember; and after about 2-1/2 centuries, their descendants left Egypt in the Exodus, under the leadership of Moses. For several generations they were ruled by "Judges" appointed by God. Later, they unwisely copied the customs of the surrounding nations and demanded a King; so Saul became their first king, ruling the twelve tribes as a single nation. This unified nation of twelve tribes (like the United States of fifty states) continued until the death of Solomon, in 975 B.C., when it broke into two nations, Israel and Judah.

*First Kings 11-12* tells us how Solomon finally fell into idolatry, misgoverned the people and burdened them with excessive taxes. (Yes, they babbled about "New Deals" and "Great Societies" in those days, too!) When his son Rehoboam succeeded Solomon as King, in 975 B.C., the weary people petitioned him to ease their burdens; but being vain and arrogant, and surrounded by a lot of "bright" young Jewish advisors (even as today), he threatened to make their load heavier. The exasperated people of the ten Northern tribes revolted, and *set* up their own, independent kingdom under Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, which is told in detail in *1 Kings, chapters 11 and 12* and *2 Chronicles 10 and 11*. Rehoboam, the son of Solomon had left in his Kingdom only the two Southern tribes, Judah and Benjamin, with some of the Levites, who were the priests: and this Southern Kingdom was never thereafter known as "Israel," but only as the House (or Kingdom) of Judah. The Northern, ten-tribed Kingdom was thereafter called the House (or Kingdom) of Israel. Just as the Southern Kingdom, Judah, took its name from the Tribe of Judah, which was the ruling Tribe, so also the Northern Kingdom of Israel was sometimes called "Ephraim" in the prophecies, because the Tribe of Ephraim was the most powerful tribe in it. The histories and destinies of the two kingdoms were thereafter separate:

they engaged separately in foreign wars and treaties, and were sometimes at war with each other, as the *Books of Kings and Chronicles* record.

From the time of this separation, 975 B.C., the Bible very carefully distinguished between the Southern, two-tribed nation of Judah and the Northern, ten-tribed nation of Israel. This distinction is kept clear, both in the historical record of what is past and the *prophetic* record of what is to come. It would take another volume to cover them all; but for a few examples, see the following: the distinction is made historically in *2 Samuel 19:40-43; 1 Kings 14:19-21; 15:1-33; 16:8; 2 Kings 3:1-9; 2 Chronicles 16:1; 25:5-10*; and many others. The distinction is kept clear in prophecies in *Isaiah 7:1-9; 11:12-13; Jeremiah 3:6-18; 5:11; 11:10-17; 13:11; 18:1-6; 19:1-13; Ezekiel 37:16-22; Daniel 9: 7; Hosea 1:11; 4:15; 5:9-15; Amos 1:1; Micah 1:5; Zechariah 8:13; 10:6-8*; and many others.

Just as we must carefully distinguish between the two nations of Israel and Judah, so also we must carefully distinguish between the nation of Judah and the Jews.

Both Israel and Judah were carried into captivity - but separately, and at different times, by different conquerors, and taken to different places. Israel was conquered by Assyria between 740 and 721 B.C., and by 715 B.C. all of its people had been deported and resettled in what we now know as Armenia, northwestern Iran, and the region near Baku, around the southern end of the Caspian Sea. The Assyrians brought in other people and settled them in *Samaria*, the southern half of Israel's old Palestinian land, to which the people of Israel never returned. See *2 Kings 17*. From this time onward, the historical parts of the "authorized" or King James version of the Bible do not record the further history of Israel; but in the Apocrypha, *2 Esdras 13:39-46* records their further journey to "Ar Sereth" (the valley of the River Sereth, a northern tributary of the Danube River, in modern Romania, which still bears the name "Sereth"). At the conclusion of this deportation of *Israel* from its Palestinian home, the Assyrian King Sennacherib also invaded the southern kingdom of *Judah* and captured all the smaller cities in it, everything except Jerusalem. The people of these smaller cities were deported, along with the people of the northern Kingdom of Israel. Sennacherib's own record of this invasion says that he deported 200,150 people from the southern Kingdom of Judah; *2 Kings 18:13* and *Isaiah 36:1*, mention his capture of these cities. Thus the Assyrian deportation of Israel included the entire population of the northern Kingdom of Israel and a considerable representative share of the southern Kingdom of Judah. From this time on, these people became the so-called "Lost Ten Tribes of Israel." (As we shall see, God took good care of them, as He had promised, and you who are reading this are among their descendants.)

The Kingdom of *Judah*, on the other hand, did not go into captivity until 606 to 585 B.C., and was conquered by Babylon, not Assyria. They were deported to the City of Babylon and settled nearby, a little south of Bagdad, in what is now southern Iraq. Not quite all of them were deported, a few of the poor being left behind to cultivate the land, and no other people were brought in to settle the land. (See *2 Kings 24-25*.) This Babylonian captivity of Judah lasted 70 years, as had been prophesied by *Jeremiah 20:4-5; 25:11-12; 29:10*. After the fall of Babylon, King Cyrus allowed all who wished to return to Palestine, beginning in 536 B.C. (See *2 Chronicles 36:20-23*.) *Ezra 1-2* records that only 42,360 returned, and their descendants (who had never been called "Jews" until their Babylonian conquerors gave them that name) lived in Palestine until the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans under Titus in A.D. 70.

This reconstructed nation, sometimes called "Jewish" was the "70 weeks" nation with the evil destiny "to finish the transgression," prophesied in *Daniel 9:24*; in A.D. 70, those who had survived the terrible wars ceased to be a nation at all, and became scattered wanderers in all lands.

There is not one word in either the Bible or secular history to suggest that Israel either was destroyed or that they went down to Babylon and joined Judah in the Babylonian captivity, and the Jews themselves testify that the genealogy of those who returned from Babylon shows no one from any tribe but Judah, Benjamin, and Levi, the members of the Kingdom of Judah. To the contrary, it was well known at the beginning of the Christian era that Israel THEN EXISTED IN GREAT NUMBERS: Josephus' great history, "Antiquities of the Jews" Book 11, chapter 5, speaks of them as "an immense multitude, beyond the Euphrates River." The prophetic parts of the Bible still continue to prophesy the great future of Israel several generations after they had vanished in the Assyrian captivity: Isaiah prophesied until 698 B.C., Jeremiah until 588 B.C., Ezekiel to 574 B.C., and Daniel to 534 B.C. Jesus Christ was well aware of the existence of Israel, separate and apart from Judah and the Jews; (see *Matthew 10:5-6*). Again, compare *John 7:35; 11:49-52*, which cannot refer to Judah or the Jews, as *the Jews* were not yet "dispersed" or "scattered abroad" and would not be for another 40 years; only *Israel* was "dispersed" out of its own land.

The complete and permanent destruction of the Jewish nation by the Romans under Titus, and their subsequent troubles as outcasts in every land are not a failure of the prophecies and promises to Israel, but an accurate fulfillment of the prophecies about the Jews. With the history of these nations in mind, let us examine God's promises and prophecies about Israel in the Bible.

God's promises to Abraham were *unconditional*. God must fulfill them or break His word. Consider what God said, in *Genesis 12:2; 13:16; 15:5; 17:3-7, 19; and 22:16-18*: "And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee and make thy name great: and thou shalt be a blessing: And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth; so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered. As for Me, behold, My covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of MANY nations. And I will establish MY covenant between Me and thee, and thy seed after thee in their generations, for an EVERLASTING COVENANT. Look now toward heaven, and count the stars, if thou be able to number them; and He said unto him, so shall thy seed be. BY MYSELF HAVE I SWORN, saith the Lord... that in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven and as the sand which is upon the seashore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies."

God did not say that He would do this "IF" or "PERHAPS" - these were all UNCONDITIONAL promises. Those promises which were made at Mt. Sinai on condition that men should obey God's laws, were the promises made through Moses, relating to health, prosperity, peace, etc. The promises to Abraham were UNCONDITIONAL and absolute; and in the New Testament, Paul tells us that these "the law, which was 430 years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promises of none effect" (*Galatians 3:17*). If the Bible is true, if God's word is good, then these promises must be good.

God repeated these promises UNCONDITIONALLY to Isaac, in *Genesis 26: 3-5*:

**"Sojourn in this land and I will be with thee, and will bless thee; for unto thee and thy seed I will give all these countries; and I WILL PERFORM THE OATH WHICH I SWORE UNTO ABRAHAM, THY FATHER. And I will make thy seed to multiply as the stars of heaven, and will give unto thy seed all of these countries; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed."**

**Again, in the 28th and 35th chapters of Genesis, GOD REPEATED HIS PROMISES, UNCONDITIONALLY, to Jacob-Israel, our ancestor: "I am the Lord God of Abraham, thy father, and the God of Isaac, the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed; and thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth; and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south, and in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed. And, behold, I am with thee, and will keep thee in all places whither thou goest, and will bring thee again into this land, FOR I WILL NOT LEAVE THEE UNTIL I HAVE DONE THAT WHICH I HAVE SPOKEN TO THEE OF. Be fruitful and multiply; a nation and A COMPANY OF NATIONS shall be of thee, and kings shall come out of thy loins."**

**There can't be an evasion of these promises; and God has always honored them. Even when the children of Israel worshiped the Golden Calf while Moses was on Mt. Sinai, receiving the Ten Commandments, God did not destroy them, for the sake of these promises. (See *Exodus 32:7-14*.) In many places, the New Testament recognized these promises as being still in full effect; for example, in *Hebrews 6:13, 17*, "For when God made promise to Abraham. because He could swear by no greater, He swore by Himself.. Wherein God, being willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of His counsel, confirmed it with an oath." Again in *Romans 11:1-2; 9:4-5; and 15:8* Paul tells us, "I say then, Hath God cast away His people? God forbid! For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the Tribe of Benjamin. God hath not cast away His people which He foreknew... Who are Israelites, to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came... Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers."**

**SO THESE ARE THE PROMISES OF GOD: IF THEY ARE FALSE, THEN THE BIBLE IS FALSE: BUT IF THEY HAVE BEEN FULFILLED, THEN THE PEOPLE TO WHOM THEY WERE FULFILLED ARE THEREBY IDENTIFIED AS ISRAEL. But the separate and very different prophecies relating to *the Jews*, show that the promises and prophecies to Israel had no reference to the Jews. Let us look at a few of them.**

**ISRAEL WAS TO HAVE A CHANGE OF NAME, WHILE THE JEWS' NAME WAS LEFT TO THEM AS A CURSE. In *Isaiah 65:13-15*, God tells *the Jews*: "And ye shall leave YOUR name FOR A CURSE TO MY CHOSEN: FOR THE LORD GOD SHALL SLAY THEE, and CALL HIS SERVANTS BY ANOTHER NAME." Who are God's servants? IN MANY PLACES God repeats this: "But thou, ISRAEL, are MY servant... Thou art My servant: I have chosen thee, and not cast thee away." For example, see *Isaiah 41:8-10; 43:1, and 10;44:1-2, 21-22*; etc. This has been fulfilled, ISRAEL is no longer called by its old name; but the Jews have retained their name for "a reproach and a proverb, a taunt and a curse," as *Jeremiah 24:9***

says.

**AGAIN, THE JEWS WERE TO BE KNOWN BY THEIR FACES. *Isaiah 3:9* says: "THE SHOW OF THEIR COUNTENANCE DOTHS WITNESS AGAINST THEM, as they declare their sin as Sodom, they hide it not. Woe unto their soul! For they have rewarded evil unto themselves." To this day, the Jew is known by his face, and even getting his nose bobbed can't always hide it: IT IS A WITNESS AGAINST HIM - While Israel is not so marked.**

**ISRAEL WAS TO BECOME A GREAT NATION AND ALSO A COMPANY OF NATIONS, AND TO BE A NATION FOREVER, AND TO HAVE A KING FOREVER. See *Genesis 35:11; Jeremiah 31:35-37; 33:17; Psalm 89:3-4; Isaiah 9:7; Luke 1:32-33*; etc., which say, "A nation and a company of nations shall be of thee... Thus saith the Lord, which giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night... If those ordinances depart from before Me, saith the Lord, then the seed of Israel shall cease from being a nation before Me forever... For thus saith the Lord; David shall never lack a man to sit upon the throne of the House of Israel." Since the sun, moon and stars still shine, these promises must be still in effect; and they cannot possibly apply to the Jews, who never were "a company of nations" and who ceased to be a nation at all in A.D. 70. On the other hand, Israel has fulfilled all of this, as we shall see.**

**GOD SAID THAT THE JEWS WERE TO BE DESTROYED AS A NATION, AND TO BECOME SCATTERED OUTCASTS IN ALL LANDS. In the 18th chapter of *Jeremiah*, God used the parable of the potter making a clay bottle on the potter's wheel; and on the first trial, the bottle was spoiled; so the potter mashed it back into a lump and tried again, and on the second trial he made a perfect bottle. God said that He would re-make Israel into the kind of nation He wanted, just as the potter had done with the soft clay. But in the next chapter, *Jeremiah 19*, God told the prophet to get an earthen bottle which had been burned hard, and to assemble the elders and important men of Jerusalem. Then God said: "Then shalt thou break the bottle in the sight of the men that go with thee, and shall say to them, Thus saith the Lord of hosts: Even so will I break this people and this city, as one breaketh a potter's vessel that cannot be made whole again." Again in *Jeremiah 15:4 and 24:9*, God said of the Jews: "And I will cause them to be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth, because of Manasseh, the son of Hezekiah, the King of Judah, for that which he did in Jerusalem.. And I will deliver them to be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth for their hurt, to be a reproach and a proverb, a taunt and a curse, in all the places whither I shall drive them." In fulfillment of this, after 70 weeks (or 490 years) of *Daniel 9:24* were completed, Titus the Roman General destroyed Jerusalem in A.D. 70; the Jews were broken as a nation, and have had no king of their own. In *John 19:15* they spoke truly, "We have no king but Caesar."**

**Israel was to become a very numerous people: besides the many statements of this in *Genesis chapters 13, 15, 22, 26, and 28*, it is repeated in *Hosea 1:10*: "Yet the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured or numbered...." The Jews on the other hand, were to be reduced to a remnant. In *Ezekiel 5:11-12* God said: "Wherefore, as I live, saith the Lord God; surely, because thou hast defiled My sanctuary with all thy detestable things, and with all thine abominations, therefore will I also diminish thee: neither shall Mine eye spare, neither will I have any pity. A**

third part of thee shall die with the pestilence, and with famine shall they be consumed in the midst of thee: and a third part shall fall by the sword round about thee; and I will scatter a third part into all the winds, and I will draw out a sword after them." See also *Jeremiah 15:4-9*, etc. The total Jewish population of the world is estimated to be about 16 million people, today... almost exactly what it was estimated to be just before Hitler's completely mythical massacre of six million Jews who were not killed at all. They are not so prolific that in 20 years they could increase their numbers by 60%, as would have to be the case if the alleged massacre was true. To conceal this fact, the Jews now seek to falsify the records: you will remember that in our 1960 and 1970 census, it was not permitted to ask anyone his religion, so you couldn't find out that 5,000,000 of the supposedly dead 6,000,000 had been illegally admitted to the United States. But this 16 million is certainly NOT "as the stars of the heaven or as the sand which is upon the seashore" for numbers.

For another thing, ISRAEL WAS TO BECOME BLIND TO His IDENTITY. In *Romans 11:25*, Paul comments, "...that blindness in part is happened to Israel." This is fulfillment of *Isaiah 42: 19-20*: "Who is blind, but My servant? or deaf, as My messenger that I sent?... Seeing many things, but thou observeth not: opening the ears, but he heareth not." You remember that God's servant is Israel. The Jews, on the other hand, are not blind to their identity: they know their origin and their history - although they try to fool you into thinking that they are Israel - and they generally have succeeded in this deception.

AGAIN, Israel WAS TO RECEIVE THE NEW COVENANT - CHRISTIANITY: *Jeremiah 31:33* prophesied it, and in *Hebrews 8:10* Paul quotes it in proof of this: "But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the House of Israel: after those days, saith the Lord, I will put My law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and I will be their God and they shall be My people." Have the Jews received the new covenant? Of course not! As the beloved Apostle John said, in *1 John 2:23*, "Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father." And in *John 15:23*, Jesus Christ Himself said, "He that hateth ME hateth My Father also."

**The Jews DO NOT FULFILL ANY OF THE PRINCIPAL PROPHECIES CONCERNING ISRAEL. THEREFORE, THE JEWS ARE NOT ISRAEL. DOES ISRAEL EXIST TODAY? OR HAS GOD VIOLATED ALL OF HIS PROMISES? YES, ISRAEL EXISTS TODAY: FOR THE ANGLO SAXON, SCANDINAVIAN AND GERMANIC PEOPLES HAVE RECEIVED THE FULFILLMENT OF GOD'S PROMISES AND PROPHECIES. FIRST: THEY ARE A GREAT NATION AND A COMPANY OF NATIONS, ALL OF THE SAME RACE.** The United States is the largest civilized nation in the world; its population is exceeded only by China, India, and Russia; it is the richest, the most advanced, the most benevolent in its policies, and has the greatest degree of liberty of any large nation. Between the two world wars, the former British Empire was officially reorganized into the "British Commonwealth of Nations"; Canada and Australia are independent nations. The Scandinavian and Germanic nations are of the same blood, have largely the same customs, and can be identified historically as the peoples who furnished most of the population of the British Isles and its colonies and the United States.

**SECOND: THEY ARE VERY NUMEROUS, as the prophecies said Israel would be.** In the last two centuries, the population of the United States has increased from a mere handful to over 200,000,000 of whom about 150,000,000 are WHITE

**CHRISTIANS of Anglo-Saxon-Scandinavian-Germanic stock. In the last three centuries, the population of the British Isles and their colonies of Canada and Australia increased from about 5,000,000 to over 70,000,000 Anglo-Saxons. The nations of Germany, Austria, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Finland add approximately 96,000,000 more. So the total number of the Anglo-Saxon-Scandinavian-Germanic peoples is well over 300 million.**

**THIRD: THEY ARE A MARITIME PEOPLE. Of the descendants of Israel, *Numbers 24:7* prophecies: "His seed shall be in many waters"; and *Psalms 89:25* says: "I will set his hand also in the sea, and his right hand in the rivers." The world's greatest navies are those of the United States and Britain: the greatest merchant marine fleets are those of Britain, and Norway, (and until recently, the United States).**

**FOURTH: THEY ARE THE GREATEST MILITARY POWERS. *Jeremiah 51:20* gives God's word: "Thou art my battleaxe and weapons of war: for WITH THEE will I break in pieces the nations, and WITH THEE will I destroy kingdoms." Throughout history this has been true. A century after being taken captive by Assyria, the peoples of Israel (then generally known as Scythians) had bled Assyria white by their constant warfare against it, so that Assyria was an easy push-over victory for the Medes and Persians, just before they turned their attention to Babylon. It was the Israel tribes on their march to Europe, as the Visigoths, Ostrogoths, and Vandals, who crushed the Roman Empire. In 713, at Tours, Anglo-Saxon Israel destroyed the invading hordes of Moslems, Jews and Moors. In the 13th century they defeated the Tartar, Mongol, "Jewish" Khazar hordes under Genghis Khan. Later they conquered Turkey and Japan; not without heavy cost, for the promises of EASY Victory were made through Moses and were conditional upon keeping the law. But the promise of FINAL Victory to shatter the enemy (even with heavy cost) is unconditional. This has been fulfilled consistently to only one people, those whom we identify as Anglo-Saxon Israel.**

**FIFTH: THEY "POSSESS THE GATES OF THEIR ENEMIES." You will remember that this was one of God's promises we found in *Genesis 22:17*. Obviously, this does not mean a wooden gate in some person's front yard, but the "gateways" of hostile nations - the great water-ways of the world. Consider the fact that the Anglo-Saxon nations, and THEY ALONE, have power to close EVERY important water "gate" in the world. American and British fleets based at Scotland, the Orkney Islands, Gibraltar, Malta, Aden, Capetown, Australia, Singapore, the Philippines, Hawaii, San Francisco and Puget Sound, Panama, the Falkland Islands, Hampton Roads, and Iceland - these dominate and can close the Skagerrak and Baltic Sea, the North Sea, the English Channel, the Straits of Gibraltar, the Mediterranean, the Suez Canal, the Indian Ocean, the waters around Southeast Asia and the East coast of Asia, the coasts of Africa and around the Cape of Good Hope, the coasts of North and South America, the Straits of Magellan and around Cape Horn, and all trade routes across the Atlantic, Pacific and Indian Oceans. They have proved this by actually doing it in two world wars.**

**SIXTH: THEY "POSSESS THE DESOLATE HERITAGES" OF THE EARTH. In *Isaiah 49:8* God says: "Thus saith the Lord: *In* an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in a day of salvation have I helped thee: and I will preserve thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, to establish the earth, to cause to inherit the desolate**

heritages." No one else has so successfully developed the colonies which were desolate when they first occupied them. Compare what the United States has done in its Southwestern States with Mexico, similar land, with fully as great undeveloped riches, separated from us by only an imaginary line. Compare British Africa with the African colonies of all other nations -and especially compare it with the dismal savagery of the Negroes! Compare the development of Palestine and Iraq while under British rule, with Turkey, Arabia, Iran, etc.

**SEVENTH: THEY HAVE EXPANDED IN COLONIES IN ALL DIRECTIONS.**

*Deuteronomy 32:8* says: "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." *Genesis 28:14* says, "Thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south: and in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." *Isaiah 54:2-3* tells us, "Enlarge the place of thy tent, and let them stretch forth the curtains of habitation; spare not, lengthen thy cords and strengthen thy stakes: for thou shalt break forth on the right hand and on the left; and thy seed shall inherit the nations, and make the desolate cities to be inhabited." Their colonies were established in every sea, in Europe, North and South America, Africa, Australia-New Zealand, and Asia. Who else has ever had such colonies? All the ancient empires were insignificant compared to this. Since we have allowed the Jews to teach us to turn our back on God, we have unwisely abandoned our colonies; and the chaos in the world today is largely a result of our failure to obey God's commands to occupy and rule the uncivilized peoples. However, even this was also prophetic (though that is another subject).

**EIGHTH: THEY HAVE MAINTAINED THE CONTINUITY OF THE THRONE OF DAVID.** David's descendants continued on the throne in Jerusalem until King Zedekiah was taken prisoner to Babylon, at which time all his sons were slain. But the prophet Jeremiah took the king's daughters, first to Egypt (as we read in *Jeremiah 43:6*) and from there, by way of Spain to Ireland, where Zedekiah's daughter, Tea Tephi, was married to Eochaidh, the Heremon (or Chief King) of Ireland. Eochaidh was a descendant of Zarah, one of the twin sons of Judah; while David was a descendant of Pharez, the other twin. Killing all of Zedekiah's sons did not end the dynasty, as it was established law in Israel ever since they first entered Palestine, that when a man died leaving no sons, his daughters received the entire inheritance. The two king lines of the Tribe of Judah were united in this marriage; and the lineage is clearly traced in the histories of Ireland, Scotland, and England, unbroken down to the present British Queen Elizabeth. Thus the prophecy that David's descendants should always be on the throne over an Israelite nation has been fulfilled - and by the Anglo-Saxon nations ONLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

This has covered but a tiny fraction of Biblical proof that the Anglo-Saxon, Scandinavian, and Germanic people are the Israel of the Bible. Scholars have found nearly 100 prophecies concerning Israel which have been fulfilled by this one group of people. When you consider that the United Nations now recognizes over 100 member nations, the odds against any one nation fulfilling the first of these prophecies is obviously 100 to 1. The odds against the same nation fulfilling both the first and second prophecies again multiplies this by 100, making ten thousand to one;

and the odds against the same nation fulfilling the first, second, and third prophecies becomes one million to one. Well, you figure it out; keep on multiplying by 100 - oh, even 50 more times. But even that isn't all; a group of nations all the same blood have done this; not a random assortment, like China and Spain, or Egypt and Brazil, but all of the same racial group. So this again multiplies the odds. Do you think that this could have happened by mere accident?

And if you do think that this was pure accident, then **WHAT HAS BECOME OF GOD'S PROPHECIES AND PROMISES?** Was He too ignorant to know that He couldn't make good on His word, that all the things He had promised to Israel never got there but were all taken by other people? No, I don't think that God made any failures or any mistakes. He promised and prophesied many things about Israel. They have all come to pass, and they have all been made good to the same racial group of nations.

\* \* \* \* \*

## **THIS PEOPLE HAS ISRAEL'S FINGERPRINTS**

There is also the other line of proof of the identity of these people, by tracing historically their migration into Europe, and from there into their colonies. But that is another subject, much longer than the one just covered.

# **Gospel of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ**

## **HISTORIC PROOF OF ISRAEL'S MIGRATIONS**

In my lecture called "ISRAEL'S FINGERPRINTS" I have sketched briefly for you some of the Bible's evidence that the Anglo-Saxon, Scandinavian and Germanic people of today are the living descendants of the ISRAEL of the Bible. This evidence was in the form of many Bible prophecies of Israel's future which have been accurately fulfilled by these nations, and by no others. If the people who have actually done all the things which God said Israel would do, and who have received the exact blessings which God said He would give to Israel - if they are not Israel, how could God be so greatly mistaken? No, God was not mistaken: He knew what He would do, and for whom He would do it; and by making good all His prophecies and promises, He has identified these nations as Israel.

But there are some people who won't believe God, and will not accept His identification of these nations. In fact, one clergyman with whom I discussed this, minister of a church in this county, wrote to me demanding to know "what other historians of the time, in what books, chapters and verses, record their migration into Northern and Western Europe and the British Isles?" He is but one of many skeptics who ask this; and to these skeptics, the answer is, "Yes, various historians of those centuries have traced various steps of this migration." What I propose to do for you now is to trace this migration historically. Remember that, within the time limits

which must necessarily be fixed on such a talk as this, I can only "hit the high spots" - you know how large a library can be filled with history books, so I can't quote them all verbatim. But I will have time enough to show you that the historians have traced this migration from Israel's old Palestinian home into their European homes as the Anglo-Saxon, Scandinavian and Germanic peoples. Not under their old names, of course: but that, also is the fulfillment of God's prophecy that He would "call His servants by another name," and surely you now know that the Bible identifies Israel - and only Israel - as God's servants.

The migration of the Israelites covered about 12 centuries, during which time they were mentioned by various historians, writing in different languages, during different centuries - and therefore mentioned under different names. Even today, if you were to read a London newspaper, a Paris newspaper, and a Berlin newspaper, all dated about the end of 1940, you would find that the British newspaper said that in that year France was invaded by "the Germans," the French newspaper said that the invasion was by "les Allemands," and the German newspaper said that the invasion was by "der Deutschen" - yet all three were talking about the same people and the same invasion. Likewise, we must not be surprised to find that the Israelites were given different names in the Assyrian, Greek and Latin languages. Likewise, even in the same language, names change from century to century, just as today, we never speak of "Bohemia," as it was called only a century ago, but only of "Czechoslovakia."

You remember that the original 12-tribed nation of Israel broke up into two nations upon the death of King Solomon, about 975 B.C. The northern 2/3 of the land, containing ten Tribes, kept the name "Israel," while the southern 1/3, containing the Tribes of Benjamin and Judah, with many of the Levites, took the name of "Judah" after the royal Tribe. From that time on, they kept their separate existence until they were finally merged into a vast migration, as we will see.

Most of the kings of the Ten-Tribed northern kingdom of Israel were distinguished more for their wickedness than for any ability. However, OMRI, who reigned from 885 to 874 B.C., was a vigorous and able king - although as wicked as the others - and this reign was regarded among the other nations of western Asia as the foundation upon which the national identity thereafter rested. The languages of that day spoke of a family, a Tribe, or even a whole nation as a "house" or household. If you have read your Bible much, you must surely remember God's many references to the "House of Israel" or "House of Judah" - meaning, in each case, the Kingdom of Israel or the Kingdom of Judah. But the phrase was also used in those days to refer to a nation as the "House" of a great king who ruled it. The Assyrians, among others, began calling the Ten-Tribed Kingdom of Israel "the House of Omri." In Hebrew, "house" was "bahyith" or "bayth" - in English usually spelled BETH and pronounced "BETH." In the related Semitic language of Assyrian, this was "BIT." The Hebrew "OMRI" was in Assyrian sometimes written "HUMRI," sometimes KUMRI."

With this preface in mind, let us start tracing the Israelites from their Palestinian homeland, in the Assyrian conquest and deportation. In *2 Kings 15:29* we read, "In the days of Pekah, king of Israel, came Tiglath-Pileser, king of Assyria, and took Ijon and Abel-beth-maachah and Janca and Kedesh and Hazor and Gilead and Galilee, all the land of Naphtali, and carried them captive to Assyria." In *1 Chronicles 5:26* it

says, "And the God of Israel stirred up the spirit of Pul, king of Assyria, and the spirit of Tiglath-Pileser, king of Assyria, and he carried them away, even the Reubenites and the Gadites and the half-tribe of Manasseh, and brought them unto Halah and Habor and Hara and to the River Gozan, unto this day."

Confirmation of this is found in inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser which archaeologists have dug up and are in our museums today. One of these says: "The cities of Gala'za (probably Assyrian for Galilee), Abilkka (probably Assyrian for Abel-beth-maacha), which are on the border of Bit-Humna - the whole land of Naphtali in its entirety, I brought within the border of Assyria. My official I set over them as governor... The land of Bit Humna... all of its people, together with all their goods, I carried off to Assyria. Pahaka their king they deposed, and I placed Ausi as king." In confirmation of this change of kings, we read in *2 Kings 15:30*, "And *Hoshea* the son of Elah made a conspiracy against *PEKAH* son of Remaliah, and smote him and slew him, and reigned in his stead."

The conquest thus begun in the northeastern and northern parts of the kingdom about 740 B.C. worked southward, down to the heavily-fortified capital city of Samaria, which was captured about 721 B.C. Another king of Assyria reigned, by that time; *2 Kings 18: 9-11* records it as follows: "And it came to pass in the 4th year of King Hezekiah (of Judah), which was the 7th year of Hoshea, son of Elah, King of Israel, that Shalmanezzer, King of Assyria, came up against Samaria and besieged it. And at the end of 3 years they took it, even in the 6th year of Hezekiah, that is the 9th year of Hoshea, King of Israel, Samaria was taken. And the King of Assyria did carry away Israel unto Assyria, and put them in Halah and in Habor by the River of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes." We know that King Shalmanezzer died toward the latter part of this siege, and the final conquest and deportation was carried on by his successor, King Sargon II. In confirmation of this, an inscription of Sargon II says, "In the beginning of my reign, the City of Samaria I besieged, I captured... 27,280 of its inhabitants I carried away."

The deportation of a whole nation naturally took a considerable period of time. The journey had to be organized, with adequate supplies for each convoy on each stage of the journey, and proper organization of the places selected to receive them. We know that Sargon II did not hold "the cities of the Medes" east of the Zagros mountains until a few years after 721 B.C., so about 715 to 712 B.C. is the correct date for the deportation to Media. The places to which Israel was deported by the Assyrians can be summed up in brief as constituting an arc or semi-circle around the southern end of the Caspian Sea.

This deportation took in the entire population of the ten northern Tribes constituting the nation of Israel. From this point on, the separation into Tribes is apparently lost, and it is as a nation that the Kingdom of Israel moved into its Assyrian captivity.

This left the other 2 Tribes still living in the southern Kingdom of Judah. Assyria and Egypt were the two giant empires of that day, each seeking domination over all the smaller and weaker nations. Assyria had driven Egyptian influence out of western Asia, back to the continent of Africa, and had made all the smaller nations surrounding Judah into vassal states paying heavy tribute to Assyria. The brutal and rapacious character of the Assyrians made them no friends, and their vassal states were always hopefully looking for any means of escape from Assyrian power. Egypt

kept the hope of revolt alive by offers of military assistance to those who would rebel against Assyria. The death of a king seemed the most opportune time for revolt, since his successor would need time to get his power organized, and might even face some competition at home for his throne. Therefore, when King Sargon II of Assyria died, about 705 B.C., revolts began in western Asia, the Kingdom of Judah under King Hezekiah taking part in it, in the hope of military aid from Egypt (although the prophet Isaiah warned that the revolt would fail).

The new king of Assyria, Sennacherib, set about recovering his empire; one rebellious city after another was reconquered, with the hideous cruelty characteristic of Assyria; and in 701 B.C., Sennacherib's huge army invaded the Kingdom of Judah; midway through it, they paused briefly to defeat the Egyptian army; then moved on to besiege Jerusalem. None of the smaller cities of Judah were able to resist; *2 Kings 18:13* and *Isaiah 36:1* say that "In the 14th year of King Hezekiah, Sennacherib came up against all the fortified cities of Judah, and captured them." Then followed the siege of Jerusalem, which was ended when the angel of the Lord killed 185,000 Assyrian soldiers in one night, and Sennacherib gave up the siege and fled back to his own land. In confirmation of this, Sennacherib's own record of this says, "I then besieged Hezekiah of Judah, who had not submitted to my yoke, and I captured 46 of his strong cities and fortresses, and innumerable small cities which were round about them, with the battering of rams and the assault of engines, and the attack of foot-soldiers, and by mines and breaches made in the walls. I brought out therefrom 200,150 people, both small and great... Hezekiah himself, like a caged bird, I shut up within Jerusalem his royal city." Ancient kings were boastful of their victories, but never of their defeats: so King Sennacherib tactfully fails to state how the siege of Jerusalem ended. But he does confirm the capture of all the other cities of Judah, and the deportation therefrom of 200,150 people.

Remember that all the people of the 10 northern Tribes were already settled around the south end of the Caspian Sea, in the Assyrian deportation of Israel; now to them was added a large portion of the 2 southern Tribes of Benjamin and Judah; so that the Assyrian deportation included all of the ten Tribes and a substantial representation from the other two. These were the people who became your ancestors and mine, when they moved into Europe.

Over the years, the increasing numbers of the Israelite tribes expanded northward along both sides of the Caspian Sea. They were not basically city-builders but farmers and herdsmen; Probably in the earlier part of their stay here, the Assyrians sternly discouraged the building of cities, which would naturally be fortified centers of resistance. As they were moved into this area, herded along as prisoners, robbed of all their belongings, they had to make themselves brush shelters or booths where they stopped for any length of time. Here in the southwest our Indians call such a brush shelter a "wickiup"; the Hebrews called it a "soocaw" - applying the name also to a tent. It was the only house a nomad owned. The plural of "soocaw" was "succoth." Gradually this was slurred over into "scuth," used of a tent-dweller or nomad, and finally became "Scythian."

The great carving on the Behistun Rock made about 516 B.C. carried inscriptions showing the many different nations who were tributary to King Darius I of Persia. These inscriptions were written in Old Persian, in Median, and in Assyrian. They showed that among these were a Scythian nation called in Assyrian and Babylonian

"Gimiri," which means "The Tribes." From "Gimiri" was derived the name of the "Cimmerians," who settled somewhat to the north and into the Ukraine. But the Behistun Inscriptions also stated that these people were called "Sakka,, in Persian and Median. Already the later names are beginning to evolve.

The great Greek historian HERODOTUS, who lived from 484 to 425 B.C., and who is generally called "The Father of History," speaking of these people, says, "The Sacae, or Scyths, were clad in trousers, and had; on their heads tall, stiff caps, rising to a point. They bore the bow of their country and the dagger; besides which they carried the battle-axe or sagaris. They were in truth Amyrgian Scythians, but the Persians called them Sacae, since that is the name which they give to all Scythians." Incidentally, some of the magnificent carved walls of the ancient ruins of the Persian palace at Persepolis show illustrations of those Sacae, in their trousers and pointed caps', bringing tribute to the Persian king.

We are now getting further clues to these people. Herodotus says that the Scythians or Sacae first appeared in that land in the seventh century B.C., which is the same period in which the Tribes of Israel we're settled there by their Assyrian conquerors. Their use of the battle-axe as a weapon is a carry-over from their history as Israel. In *Jeremiah 51:20*, God says of Israel, "Thou are My *battleaxe* and weapons of war, for with thee will I break in pieces the nations, and with thee will I destroy kingdoms." We will see later that the name evolved from SAKKE' to SAXON; and it is noteworthy that the battle-axe was the great weapon of the Saxons.

These Scythians or Sacae lived up to God's description of Israel as His battleaxe and weapons of war. They became a military people of great power, who did much to break up ancient nations. The Greek geographer and historian, STRABO, who lived between 63 B.C. and about 21 A.D., says: "Most of the Scythians, beginning from the Caspian Sea, are called 'Dahae Scythae,' and those situated more towards the east, 'Massagatae' and 'Sacae'; the rest have the common name of 'Scythians,' but each tribe has its own peculiar name. The Sacae had made incursions similar to those of the Cimmerians and Treres, some near their own country, others at a greater distance. They occupied Bactriana, and got possession of the most fertile tract in Armenia, which was called after their own name, Sacasene. They advanced even as far as the Cappadocians, those particularly situated near the Euxine Sea (today called the Black Sea), who are now called 'Pontici.'

This was but the early part of their expansion, however. When a century had elapsed since their deportation to this land of Scythia, they had grown strong enough to begin the long series of harassing wars against their conquerors, the Assyrians. They lacked the strength to capture the powerfully fortified group of cities about the Assyrian capital; and in turn, their nomadic habits made it easy for them to retreat before a too-powerful Assyrian army. But generations of this constant warfare wore down the Assyrians, "bled them white," so that when the Medes finally overran Assyria and captured Nineveh in 612 B.C., their victory was a fairly easy one against the exhausted Assyrians.

From this point on, I could refer you to just one historical work which fully traces the Scythians on to their settlement in England as the Anglo-Saxons. "A History of the AngloSaxons," by Sharon Turner does a magnificent job of this. As most of you know, I am a lawyer by profession: and a lawyer soon learns to distinguish between

**the man who actually knows the facts and the man who is merely repeating hearsay - that is, gossip and rumor he has heard from others - and how do we know whether these others actually know what they are talking about? Unless a man has seen the occurrence with his own eyes, his ideas on the subject are no better than the accuracy of the information he has received. Now no historian living in our times can have any personal knowledge of what happened 2,000 years ago, so his writings can be no better than the source material he has obtained from people who lived and wrote at a time when accurate information could still be had. Most modern history books are based on rather scanty documentation from early sources, as it is so much easier for one historian to copy from another. But Sharon Turner's "History of the Anglo-Saxons" is one of the most thoroughly documented historical studies ever produced, and its reliability is beyond question. He traces the Anglo-Saxons of Britain back to the Scythians; unfortunately, he doesn't go the one step further and trace the Scythians back to Israel; but we can do that from other sources.**

**But let us go back to the Scythians, as the people of Israel became known in the land to which they were deported. Diodorus Siculus, a Greek historian who lived in the times of Julius and Augustus Caesar, says this: "The Scythians anciently enjoyed but a small tract of ground, but (through their valor) growing stronger by degrees, they enlarged their dominion far and near, and attained at last to a vast and glorious empire. At the first, a very few of them, and those very despicable for their mean origin, seated themselves near to the River Araxes. Afterwards, one of their ancient kings, who was a warlike prince and skillful in arms, gained to their country all the mountainous parts as far as to Mount Caucasus... Some time afterwards, their posterity, becoming famous and eminent for valor and martial affairs, subdued many territories... Then turning their arms the other way, they led their forces as far as to the River Nile, in Egypt."**

**Other historians record that BLOND SCYTHIANS made an expedition against Palestine and Egypt about 626 B.C. The town of Scythopolis, in the Jordan valley, is named for a settlement made on this raid. But to continue with Diodorus Siculus, he says, "This nation prospered more and more, and had kings that were very famous; from whom the SACANS and the Massagetae and the Arimaspians, and many others called by other names derive their origin. Amongst others, there were two remarkable colonies that were drawn out of the conquered nations by those kings: the one they brought out of Assyria and settled in the country lying between Paphlagonia and Pontus; the other out of Media, which they placed near the River Tanais which people are called Sauromatians."**

**Note how God's destiny for these people worked. They would not leave behind any pockets of their people in the lands where their conquerors had settled them; but when they had gained great power, they came back and picked up any who remained, taking them into the migrating mass. Likewise, history records that they raided Babylon, after its overthrow by the Medes and Persians, carrying off with them such of the people of Judah and Benjamin as were not going back to Jerusalem.**

**Even in early times, before the final mass movement into Europe, the Scythians had begun their march to their new homelands, where some of them had already arrived before the beginning of the Christian Era. Pliny the Elder, a Roman historian who lived from 23 to 79 A.D., says this: "The name 'Scythian' has extended in every direction, even to the Sarmatae and the GERMANS; but this ancient name is now**

only given to those who dwell beyond those nations, and live unknown to nearly all the rest of the world... Beyond (the Danube) are the people of Scythia. The Persians have called them by the general name of Sacae, which properly belongs only to the nearest nation of them. The more ancient writers give them the name of Aramii (Arameans). The multitude of these Scythians is quite innumerable; in their life and their habits they much resemble the people of Parthia (Persia). The Tribes among them that are better known are the Sacae, the Massagetae, the Dahae,..." etc.

Others have noted this early migration into Germany. For example, Herodotus mentions a migration and settlement of a people he calls the Sigynnoe, who themselves claimed to be colonists from Media, and who migrated as far as the River Rhine. (Remember that among the places the Israelites were resettled were "the cities of the Medes!")

Also note that Pliny the Elder said that "The more ancient writers give them the name of Aramii" - that is, "Aramean," in modern language called "Syrian." In *Deuteronomy 26:5*, every Israelite was commanded to confess that "A Syrian ready to perish was my father, and he went down into Egypt and sojourned there with a few, and became a nation, great, mighty and populous." Hence, such ancient writers could correctly identify the Israelite Scythians as "Arameans," for they had come from a land which was part of Syria.

Among the Tribes of the Scythians, the Massagetae attracted the notice of all the ancient historians, by their numbers and warlike ability. Those who described them in more detail divided them into the Massagetae and Thyssagetae; and the "getae" part of the name soon evolved into "Goth"; the Massagetae were the Greater Goths and the Thyssagetae were the Lesser Goths. Thus we already find among the Scythians names we can identify as the people who later conducted the great migrations into Europe. The Goths, as we know, were later called "Ostrogoths," meaning "East Goths," and "Visigoths," meaning "West Goths."

But to go back a few centuries, the Sacae were allies of the Medes and Persians in the attack upon Babylon, in 536 B.C. Remember that God had said that Israel was "My battleaxe and weapons of war; for with thee will I break in pieces the nations, and with thee will I destroy kingdoms." So God had used Scythian Israel to maintain constant war against Assyria for nearly a century, until Assyria was too weakened to resist the Medes and Persians; then God used Scythian Israel, the Sacae, to help in the conquest of Babylon, when its time had come. Later, King Cyrus of Persia was foolish enough to try to conquer his former allies, the Sacae; but he was killed in the battle. King Darius also tried to conquer them, but they being a nomadic people, retreated before his massive armies until he gave up and retired.

Professor George Rawlinson says that the original development of the Indo-European language took place in Armenia - which, you will remember, was at that time occupied by "Scythian" Israel. Certainly from these people we can trace the introduction of this language into Europe.

This powerful and increasingly numerous people there-after spread further north, both east and west of the Caspian Sea. To the west of it, they penetrated into the Volga and Don River Valleys as the Sauromatians and the Royal Scyths - nomadic peoples. To reach these lands, they had come up through the Caucasus Mountains by

a great pass which is today occupied by the Georgian Military Road. Perhaps the Communists have changed the name of this pass in recent years, but from ancient times until within our own lifetimes this pass was known as "The Pass of Israel." The White Race of Europe is often called "Caucasian" because the ancestors of many of them did thus come out of the Caucasus Mountains.

When Alexander the Great began his great marauding expedition across western Asia and as far as India, he had to skirt the edge of the lands held by the Scythians. In his limitless vanity and ambition, he wanted also to conquer them; but it is recorded that their ambassadors said that they would never surrender to him; that they were nomadic peoples who, if they could not resist, could retreat indefinitely before his armies; and they had no wealthy cities for him to occupy and loot. Alexander invaded their lands long enough to fight one severe battle with them, defeating the Scythian forces he met; but this was evidently just as a lesson to them not to attack the flanks of his forces, for he led his forces out of their territory and never returned to the attack.

Remember that Israel is "God's battleaxe and weapons of war." They had already weakened Assyria, and as allies of the Medes and Persians had helped overthrow Assyria and Babylon. They had beaten off attempts of the Persians to conquer them. In the article "Scythians," Chambers' Encyclopedia (1927) records that "The Scythians, after about 128 B.C. overran Persia, routed several Persian armies, and levied tribute from the Persian kings. During the first century before and the first century after Christ, hordes of Scythians, having overthrown the Bactrian and Indo-Greek dynasties of Afghanistan and India, invaded northern India: and there they maintained themselves with varying fortune for five centuries longer... The Jats of India and the Jajputs have both been assigned the Scythian ancestry." Madison Grant writes that "Ancient Bactria maintained its Nordic and Aryan aspect long after Alexander's time, and did not become Mongolized and receive the sinister name of Turkestan until the seventh century (A.D.)... The Saka were the blond peoples who carried the Aryan language to India."

A land so vast, and not the original home of the Israelite Scythians, but already having some inhabitants when they were settled there, must of course show varying types of people. The Nordic or Aryan Israelite Scythians conquered these other races. While some speak of a Mongoloid type found in some parts of Scythia, ancient writers pretty well agree that the dominant Sakka or Massagetae Scythians were a Nordic people. Dr. Hans Gunther, professor at Berlin University, in his "Racial Elements of European History," published in the 1920s, says: "The investigations into the traces left behind them by that wide-spread Nordic people, the Sacae (Scythians), with its many tribes, are well worthy of attention. It had been living on the steppes of southeastern Europe, and spread as far as Turkestan and Afghanistan, and even to the Indus. The ancient writers, such as *Polemon of Ilium*, *Galenos*, *Clement of Alexandria* and *Adamantios*, state that the Sacae were like the Kelts and Germans, and describe them as ruddy-fair. The Scythian tribe of the Alans are also described as having a Nordic appearance. *Ammianus* (about A.D. 330-400) calls them 'almost all tall and handsome, with hair almost yellow, and a fierce look.'"

We have seen that the names of the Massagetae and the Thyssagetae evolved into Goths, the Ostrogoths (or East Goths) and Visigoths (or West Goths). The historian *Ptolemy*, who died about 150 A.D., mentions a Scythian people, descended from the

Sakae, by the name of SAXONS, who had come from Media. *Albinus*, who lived in the first century B.C., also says, "The SAXONS were descended from the ancient Sacae in Asia, and in process of time they came to be called SAXONS." *Prideaux* reports that the Cimbrians came from between the Black and Caspian Seas, and that with them came the ANGLI.

We are now well into established European history. By the beginning of the 4th century A.D., many of the Goths were already Christians. In the 4th century, there were several collisions between Visigoths and Rome, and in 410 the Visigoths became the masters of Italy and captured Rome. Later, they moved on into southern France and northern Spain where they settled permanently. The Ostrogoths settled in what is modern Hungary about 455 A.D.; under Theodoric the Great, they conquered Italy about 493, and set up an Ostrogoth kingdom in Italy, which, however, was short-lived. Their descendants are the fair-skinned and blond Italians of northern Italy. But the Goths had ended the Roman Empire: "God's battleaxe" again destroying the kingdoms of the Babylonian order of empires.

The Angli and the Saxons moved up the Danube Valley and settled in Germany and along the Baltic shores, as is well known; and from there, the Jutes, Angles and Saxons colonized England after the Roman legions were withdrawn in A.D. 408.

Actually, the earliest waves of migration penetrated to the farthest edges of the European continent - partly because they could move through nearly empty lands, without meeting any peoples strong enough to effectively resist them, partly because they were pushed farther by the later waves of Israelite migration coming behind them. Hence, we find the settlement of the Scandinavian Peninsula pretty well completed before the arrival of the Jutes, Angles and Saxons along the southern shores of the Baltic Sea.

The Tribes which settled along the shores of the Baltic were a great maritime people - as some of the Israelites had been, even when still in Palestine, and as God had prophesied. The Jutes, Angles and Saxons came from the Baltic Sea area, but their ocean-borne raids on England were heavy and continuous; later, by invitation of the British, they settled along the eastern shores, in East Anglia, Mercia, Northumbria, Sussex, Wessex, Essex, and Kent.

William the Conqueror invaded England in 1066, with the Normans; they were actually Norse Vikings who had settled on the coast of France in the province of Normandy: "Norman" being really derived from "Norseman."

So we see that the migrations of Israel, first into Scythia, expanding there, then gaining the names of Goths, Angli and Saxons, and under those names moving into their present European homelands, is a well-established historical fact. There is also the fascinating story of the early migrations by sea, but that is another subject in itself.

---

## THE SONS OF GOD

The highest destiny set before any man is to be recognized as a son of God: nothing

else could equal this. Since it is mentioned in the Bible, the major churches have not been able to entirely overlook it; neither have they been able to understand it. In some very vague and general way, they have decided that we are eventually to become "sons of God" by some process which they call "adoption." A lot of fuzzy thinking has developed around that unfortunate use of the word "adoption" - which word is not in the original language from which our translations are made. It is a translator's unfortunate attempt to express his understanding - or, rather, MISunderstanding - of what he thought was meant, rather than what was SAID. What the original language refers to is NOT the adoption of a stranger, but the coming-of-age ceremony for a lawful son. The Apostle Paul's choice of words has often made his writing hard to understand for those who do not know the things he is talking about - as even the Apostle Peter commented in *2 Peter 3:15-16*. Some of the modern English translations make Paul's meaning much clearer than the earlier versions: Moffat, Weymouth, and The Twentieth Century New Testament, for example, have a more correct rendering on this point. *Galatians 3:23-26* and *4:1-7* has been the basis for this misunderstanding about "adoption." In Moffat's modern English translation, it reads thus:

"Before this faith came, we were confined by the Law, and kept under custody, in prospect of the faith that was to be revealed; the Law thus held us as wards in discipline till such time as Christ came, that we might be justified by faith. But faith has come, and we are wards no longer: **YOU ARE ALL SONS OF GOD** by your faith in Christ Jesus.. What I mean is this: as long as an heir is under age, there is no difference between him and a servant, though he is lord of all the property; he is under guardians and trustees till the time fixed by his father. So with us. When we were under age, we lived under the thralldom of the Elemental spirits of the world; but when the time had fully expired, God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the Law, to ransom those who were under the Law, **THAT WE MIGHT HAVE OUR SONSHIP. IT IS BECAUSE YOU ARE SONS** that God has sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying, 'Abba! Father!' So you are servant no longer, but son; and as son, you are heir, all owing to God."

The Twentieth Century New Testament translates it, "so that we might receive the privileges of sons." Weymouth translates it, "so that we might receive recognition as sons."

"Adoption" could not possibly be a true translation, as the general context forbids it. A stranger is not "lord of all the property" already, before his adoption; neither is he "under guardians and trustees." But one who is a true son and heir by birth is in just this situation when he is still a minor: he cannot yet take possession of what he has inherited until he becomes of age. Note how Paul emphasizes that "It is because you ARE sons that God has sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying 'Abba! Father!'"

How did we become sons? And how long have we been sons? Long before Adam. *Luke 3: 38* tells us that Adam was a SON of God. But even before the foundation of the earth, God made us sons. We read in *Ephesians 1:3-5* (and again the modern English translations are more accurate):

"Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who in Christ has blessed us with every spiritual blessing within the heavenly sphere! He chose us in Him ere the world was founded, to be consecrated and unblemished in His sight, destining us in love to be His sons through Jesus Christ." (Moffatt.) This is confirmed again in the *38th chapter of Job*, where God asks of Job, "Where wast thou when I founded the earth?... When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy?" And in the original Hebrew, God adds, *in verse 21*. "Thou knowest, for then hadst thou been born, and in number thy days are many!" These "sons of God" who were present at the creation of the earth and shouted for joy were not angels, for in *Hebrews 1:5* it asks, "For unto which of the angels said He at any time, Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father and he shall be to Me a Son?" No, it is clear that the angels are not sons of God; but "ALL the SONS of God shouted for joy" when the earth was made.

Again we have recognition that we are the sons of God, in the *82nd Psalm*. A little of its meaning is lost in the older translations, through their failure to use the Hebrew word "Elohim," meaning "Gods."

"God standeth in the congregation of the mighty; He judgeth among the Elohim. How long will ye judge unjustly, and accept the persons of the wicked? Defend the poor and fatherless: do justice to the afflicted and needy. Deliver the poor and needy: rid them out of the hand of the wicked. They know not, neither will they understand; they walk on in darkness: all the foundations of the earth are out of course. I have said, Ye are ELOHIM: AND ALL OF YOU ARE CHILDREN OF THE MOST HIGH. But ye shall die like men, and fall like one of the princes. Arise, O Elohim! Judge the earth: for thou shalt inherit all nations."

When the Jews accused Jesus Christ of blasphemy because He said that God was His Father, He quoted this Psalm, saying: "Is it not written in your law, I said YE ARE GODS (ELOHIM)?" He called them gods unto whom the word of God came. (*John 10:34-35*)

The *82nd Psalm* rebukes us for not having properly performed our duty to judge the world. Its prophecy that we shall inherit all nations is correct: as members of the Body of Christ, with Jesus Himself as the Head, we shall inherit the nations. *Psalm 2:8-9* quotes a decree that was proclaimed by Jesus Christ: "Ask of Me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." But *Revelation 2:26-27* is spoken by Jesus Christ, to us: "And he that overcometh, and keepeth My works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers: even as I received of My Father." So there can be no doubt that in the *82nd Psalm* we are called Gods, Elohim, and children of the Most High, even while we are still in our mortal bodies.

We are sons of God because we are *born* of Him, not strangers who are merely adopted. *First John 2:29* and *3:1-2* tells us so: "If ye know that He is righteous, ye know that every one that doeth righteousness is BORN OF HIM. Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God: therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew Him not. 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..."

This is what Jesus Christ was speaking of in a passage which is badly misunderstood because it is badly mistranslated: it is *John 3:1-8*, which tells of the visit of Nicodemus to Jesus Christ, and it misquotes Jesus as saying that "you must be born again" - from which fanciful doctrines of "the second birth" have been taken. But the original Greek from which this was mistranslated says: "Verily, verily I say to thee, If anyone is not born FROM ABOVE, he is not able to see the Kingdom of God. Nicodemus says to Him, How is a man able to be born, being old? Is he able to enter into the womb of his mother a second time and be born? Jesus answered, Verily, verily I say to thee, If anyone is not born of water AND THE SPIRIT, he is not able to enter into the Kingdom of God. That which has been born of the flesh is flesh; and THAT WHICH HAS BEEN BORN OUT OF THE SPIRIT IS SPIRIT. Do not wonder that I said to you, You must be born FROM ABOVE." It was only Nicodemus who misunderstood and talked of being born AGAIN; Jesus Christ never said this, but spoke only of being born FROM ABOVE, born OF THE SPIRIT. You are not somebody else's illegitimate offspring who can only hope to be adopted: you are God's own children BY BIRTH OUT OF THE SPIRIT. Now do you think that you have any need to worry about Russia and what it will try to do to you? Our Father, the one true God, will take care of His own children.

We are already the children of God, not by some process of adoption of a stranger, but because we are His children by birth, born of the Spirit. This is almost too big an idea for the human mind to grasp. Think what a marvelous position we are in! And think also of the solemn responsibility that position carries!

Jesus Christ, Himself, calls us His brothers! He is the first-born Son of God; and we His younger brothers and sisters. *Colossians 1:15-17* tells His position (I like Smith and Goodspeed's translation of it): "He is a likeness of the unseen God, born before any creature: for it was through Him that everything was created in heaven and earth - the seen and the unseen, angelic thrones, principalities, do-minions and authorities - all things were created through Him and for Him. He existed before all things, and He sustains and embraces them all."

So, in *Hebrews 2:10-12, 14-18* we read that Jesus Christ calls us His brethren: "In bringing MANY SONS to glory, it was befitting that He for whom and by whom the universe exists should perfect the Prince of their salvation by suffering. So Sanctifier and sanctified have all one origin. That is why He is not ashamed to call them brothers, saying, I will proclaim Thy name to *My brothers*: in the midst of the church I will sing of Thee... Since *the children* then share flesh and blood, He Himself participated in their nature, so that by dying He might crush him who wields the power of death (that is to say, the devil) and release from thralldom those who lay under a life-long fear of death. (For it is not angels that He succours, it is the offspring of Abraham.)

He had to resemble *His brothers* in every respect, in order to prove a merciful and faithful High Priest in things divine, to expiate the sins of the people; it is as He suffered by His temptations that He is able to help the tempted" (Moffatt).

The Bible emphasizes this close relationship: in *Ephesians 5:30* it tells us that "we are

members of His body, of His flesh and of His bones." We are the children, the family or household of God. So in *Hebrews 3:5-6*, we are told, "Now the faithfulness of Moses in all the house of God was that of a servant, in faithfully repeating what he was told to say; but Christ's faithfulness was that of a Son set over the house of God. And we are that house, if we keep up our courage and our triumphant hope to the very end" (Smith and Good-speed). The word here translated "house" is the Greek word "oikia" - here it does not mean "house" in the sense of a building, but "household" or "family."

So also where Jesus Christ said, "In My Father's house are many mansions" (*John 14: 2*) the same word is used. The meaning may well be, "In My Father's household are many mansions or temples for His spirit." We are told that each of us is a temple of God. In *1 Corinthians 3: 16* it says, "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the spirit of God dwelleth in you?" Again, in *2 Corinthians 6:16-18*, we are told: "What agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people. Wherefore, come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be My sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty."

Then what is our destiny? Wonderful: greater than we can yet understand. The angels, whose power is so much greater than anything we have seen, greater than atomic bombs, are sent to help us. In *Hebrews 1: 14* we are assured that "all angels are merely spirits in the divine service, commissioned for the benefit of those who are to inherit salvation" (Moffatt).

We are to become more like Jesus Christ. It tells us, in *Ephesians 4:11-13*, that "He has given us some men as apostles, some as missionaries, some as pastors and teachers, in order to fit His people for the work of service, for building the body of Christ, until we all attain unity in faith, and in the knowledge of the Son of God, and reach mature manhood and that full measure of development found in Christ" (Smith and Goodspeed).

Under Jesus Christ as our Head and Lord, we are to become the rulers and judges of the world - indeed, even judges of the angels: *1 Corinthians 6:2-3* says, "Do you not know that God's people are to be the judges of the world? And if the world is to come before you for judgment, are you unfit to decide the most trivial cases? Do you not know that we are to be the judges of angels, to say nothing of ordinary matters?"

Again, in *Hebrews 2:5-9*, it says: "For the world to come, of which I am speaking, was not put under the control of angels. One writer, as we know, has affirmed 'What is man, that Thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that Thou carest for him? For a little while Thou hast put him lower than the angels; crowning him with glory and honour, putting all things under his feet.' Now by putting all things under him, the writer meant to leave nothing outside his control. But as it is, we do not yet see all things controlled by man; what we do see is Jesus who was put lower than the angels for a little while to suffer death, and who has been crowned with glory and honour, that by God's grace He might taste death for everyone" (Moffatt).

Do you realize what a tremendous future our God and Father has set before us? This

is the same thing which Jesus Christ promised us in the *Book of Revelation*, where, in *chapter 2:26-27*, He says, "He that overcometh, and keepeth My works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers: even as I received of My Father."

With all the power of God in back of us to carry out His promises to us, His children, how can we take a gloomy or despairing view of the troubles of the day? Can Russia prevail against God? No sincere Christian could ever say "Better Red than dead." All the powers of hell are mobilized against us, we know: but we also know that they are destined to failure. in *Romans 8:28-33*. it assures us: "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose. For whom He did foreknow, He did also predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the first born among many brethren. Moreover, whom He did predestinate, them He also called; and whom He called, them He also justified; and whom He justified, them He also glorified. What shall we then say to these things? IF GOD BE FOR US, WHO CAN BE AGAINST US? He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also freely give us all things? Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth."

To be the children of God also brings the responsibility to *act like it*. No, I don't mean that we meet this responsibility by being effeminate and browbeaten in our manner. I mean that we must do the works of the sons of God. Remember the *82nd Psalm*? We are there rebuked for our failure to "deliver the poor and needy: rid them out of the hand of the wicked." Why are we cringing in shameful and abject cowardice here when half of our brothers of the White Christian world are in horrible slavery under Asiatic Communism? Have we no faith in God? Are we crawling before Russia and Cuba out of fear of their bombs? Why don't we believe God, instead of the "leaders" of our government? We have God's promise, in *Isaiah 54:17*, that "No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper; and every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn. This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord, and their righteousness is of Me, saith the Lord." God's work was never accomplished by cowards or weaklings. Elijah believed God, and 7,000 faithful, courageous men were all he needed to cleanse his nation. Gideon believed God, and 300 men were all he needed to rout and slaughter an immense enemy army. If we believe that God is our Father, let us start acting like His children! not just in the next world, not just several hundred years into the millennium, but NOW!

## Gospel of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ

### DANIEL'S FIFTH KINGDOM

It is universally recognized that many of the Bible's greatest prophecies are found in the *Book of Daniel* Many of these are phrased in such obscure language that they were hard to understand until their fulfillment made clear their meaning. That is exactly what God intended: for He had His angel tell Daniel, "But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end... for the words are

closed up and sealed till the time of the end. Many shall be purified, and made white, and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly; and none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand" (*Daniel 12:4, 9-10*). However, actual events which have followed through the centuries have fulfilled these prophecies so unmistakably that their meaning is now clear.

One of these prophecies is accepted by all churches that I know of, and they have agreed upon its meaning for the first 4/5 of it. Yet this prophecy so clearly sets forth the Anglo-Saxon Israel doctrines that it is hard to see how the preachers of these churches can be blind to it; and this is an especial challenge to all preachers who deny the truth of the Anglo-Saxon Israel doctrines: Follow this with me in your Bibles, and *then* let me hear you deny it!

I refer to Nebuchadnezzar's image, which Daniel explained as a prophecy sent by God. This is all in the *second chapter of Daniel*. You will remember that in Babylon, King Nebuchadnezzar had a dream of such obvious importance that it greatly troubled him: But on waking, he forgot his dream, so he could not tell it to his wise men, to ask their interpretation. Being a typical Oriental monarch, he found a quick solution to this puzzle: We read, "And in the second year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, Nebuchadnezzar dreamed dreams, wherewith his spirit was troubled, and his sleep broke from him. Then the king commanded to call the magicians, and the astrologers, and the sorcerers, and the Chaldeans, for to show the king his dreams. So they came and stood before the king. And the king said unto them, I have dreamed a dream, and my spirit was troubled to know the dream. Then spake the Chaldeans to the king in Syriac, O king, live forever! Tell thy servants the dream, and we will show the interpretation. And the king answered and said to the Chaldeans, The thing is gone from me: if ye will not make known unto me the dream, with the interpretation thereof, ye shall be cut in pieces, and your houses shall be made a dunghill" (*Daniel 2:1-5*).

This was surely a startlingly unreasonable demand to make. These were sorcerers, old hands at the game of thinking up impressive but vague answers - vague and equivocal enough to let them fit their words into whatever might happen. an art they shared with some of the famous Greek oracles. But to be required to give an answer when you didn't yet know what the question was! That was too much to expect. They replied, "There is not a man upon the earth that can show the king's matter: therefore, there is no king, lord, nor ruler, that asked such things of any magician, or astrologer or Chaldean. And it is a rare thing that the king requires, and there is none other that can show it before the king, except the gods, whose dwelling is not with flesh." But this did not pacify the king, who commanded that all the magicians, astrologers and Chaldeans be killed, because their inability to explain his dream exposed them as frauds. Only Daniel and his Hebrew companions escaped this purge, because God gave to Daniel the power to recount the dream itself, as well as to explain it. In Daniel's own words, this was the dream:

"Thou, O king, sawest, and behold a great image. This great image, whose brightness was excellent, stood before thee: and the form thereof was terrible. This image's head was of fine gold, his breast and his arms of silver, his belly and his thighs of brass, his legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay." Then Daniel went on to explain to king Nebuchadnezzar the meaning of this image: "Thou, O king, art a king of kings: for the God of heaven has given thee a kingdom, power, and strength, and glory. And

wherever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the heaven has He given into thine hand, and has made thee ruler over them all. *Thou art this head of gold. And after thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee, and another kingdom of brass, which shall bear rule over all the earth. And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron: forasmuch as iron breaks in pieces and subdues all things: and as iron that breaks all these, shall it break in pieces and bruise. And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potter's clay, and part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided: but there shall be in it of the strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou sawest the iron mixed with miry clay. And as the toes of the feet were part of iron, and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong, and partly broken. And whereas thou sawest iron mingled with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men: but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay"* (Daniel 2:31-43).

As I said, the churches are all in agreement that this image represents the Babylonian Succession of Empires. The head was Babylon itself, under Nebuchadnezzar, who brought it to its pinnacle of power and wealth. In its day, it was the most important empire in the then known world: western Asia and the lands fronting on the Mediterranean Sea. It ruled the entire Fertile Crescent. from the Persian Gulf even to Egypt. The next succeeding empire of comparable power was that of the Medes and Persians, who conquered Babylon about 536 B.C. The kingdom of Media was absorbed in the rising power of Persia even before the conquest of Babylon. This Persian Empire extended from Northwest India and Afghanistan across the Fertile Crescent, over most of Asia Minor (which constitutes modern Turkey), down through Syria and Palestine, and even included Egypt. This was the empire represented by the "breast and arms of silver" in Nebuchadnezzar's dream image. It was conquered and absorbed into the empire of Alexander "the Great," of Macedon between the years 334 and 331 B.C. Alexander became king of Macedonia in 336 B.C.; by 332 he had conquered Asia Minor (modern Turkey), Syria, Palestine and Egypt; he conquered the Tigris-Euphrates Valleys in 331, swept over Persia, Bactria (largely the same as modern Afghanistan) and into North India. In ten years, he had built up an empire covering all the then known civilized world from Greece eastward to northern India. In 323 B.C. he died in drunken debauchery in Babylon. His huge but short-lived empire was the "belly and thighs of brass" in Nebuchadnezzar's dream-image. Fourth and last came the great empire of Rome, represented by the legs of iron. The city of Rome was founded in 753 B.C., and the Roman Republic, which began its greatness, was established about 500 B.C. Its empire began with the conquest of Macedonia and Egypt, in 168 B.C. Eventually, the Roman Empire expanded so that it ruled Italy, Spain, Gaul (modern France), Macedonia, Greece, North Africa and Egypt, western Asia Minor, Syria, and Palestine; its frontiers were: the Atlantic Ocean, the Irish Sea, the south border of Scotland, the North Sea, the River Rhine, the Danube River, the Black Sea, the Caucasus Mountains, Armenia, to the middle of ancient Babylonia, the Arabian Desert, the Red Sea, Nubia and the Sahara Desert, and the Moroccan mountains. Its outstanding characteristic was its harsh and cruel treatment of its subject peoples: as Daniel said, "and the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron: forasmuch as iron breaks in pieces and subdues all things: and as iron that breaks all these, shall it break in pieces and bruise." Remember there were *two* legs of iron, and so the Roman Empire split into the Western, or Roman Empire, and the Eastern Empire, often called "Byzantine." Likewise, each of these two was an enforced mixture of different peoples, having nothing in common except that they were ruled by the Roman Army; and when that

military force failed, they broke up into their original fragments. As Daniel had said, "As the toes of the feet were part of iron and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong and partly broken. And whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men: but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay." Up to this point, all the churches are with me 100%. Their preachers all agree that these are the empires which Daniel's prophecy foretold, because they fulfill that prophecy so perfectly.

Now we come to the place where most of the churches don't want to recognize Daniel as a prophet. Let's continue with what Daniel said. After concluding his description of the image and its interpretation as these four successive empires, in the very next verse, *Daniel 2:44*, he says: "And *in the days of these kings* shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." Now, let's analyze this. First of all, let us note that this fifth kingdom spoken of by Daniel is not like the first four: they were the creations of pagan men; but this fifth kingdom shall be set up by God Himself. *When* shall it come into existence? "In the days of these kings" - that is, at some time during the existence of the four empires of the Babylonian order. So, let us refresh memory as to their dates. Babylon and its empire came to an end in 536 B.C., when it was conquered by the Medo-Persian Empire; the Medo-Persian Empire came to an end when it was overrun and conquered by the armies of Alexander the Great, 331 B.C. After his death, Alexander's empire fell apart into four parts, as another prophecy of Daniel's had foretold. Alexander died in 323 B.C. These are the first three empires symbolized by Nebuchadnezzar's dream-image; this leaves only the fourth and last, Imperial Rome.

The city of Rome was founded in 753 B.C.; the Republic was established about 500 B.C.; expansion into an empire began with the conquest of Macedonia and Egypt, 168 B.C. We need not cover in detail the history of the Roman Empire: enough to note that, just as the dream-image had two legs, the Roman Empire was divided into eastern and western parts: first by emperor Diocletian, in 283 A.D., and the division became permanent at the death of emperor Theodosius, 395 A.D. The two separate empires, the western generally governed from Rome and always called Roman, and the eastern, governed from Constantinople (the original name of which city had been Byzantium), and generally called the Byzantine Empire, continued for some time after their separation.

The western, or Roman Empire, fought a losing battle against the ever-increasing pressure of the invading peoples who were the Israelites, moving from Scythia into their new European homes. The Visigoths were an Israelite people, largely Christian by 350 A.D. They were driven west by the pressure of the invading Huns; they entered the Roman Empire in 376 A.D., scoring a decisive victory over Roman armies in 378, 50 Rome ceded them certain Roman territories; they invaded Italy in 400 A.D., forced Rome to pay ransom in 408 A.D. That year Rome withdrew its armies from Britain to aid in the defense of Rome; but to no avail, for in 410 A.D. the Visigoths captured and looted the City of Rome itself; in 412 they moved on into southern France and northern Spain, ruling Spain until the Moorish conquest in 711. In 476 A.D., Odoacer, the general of German mercenary soldiers in the Roman army, rebelled, captured the capital city of the Western Roman Empire and deposed the last emperor, Romulus Augustulus; and *this date, 476 A. D., is accepted by historians*

*as marking the end of the Western Roman Empire.*

Meanwhile, the *eastern* empire, generally called the Byzantine Empire with Constantinople as its capital, claimed to be ruling even the Western Roman Empire; although this was claim rather than fact except for brief periods: From 395 A.D., the Western Roman Empire was separate. Enemy pressures were building up against the Eastern, or Byzantine Empire borders, pressures too strong to be resisted. By about 650 A.D., the Moslems had conquered Arabia, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, North Africa and Sicily: The Byzantine Empire was reduced to Asia Minor and the Balkans. Then, in 1074, the Turks captured most of Asia Minor. Then came enemies from an unexpected source: The combined forces of Venice and the Fourth Crusade captured Constantinople in 1204, taking also all the Balkan territories, and they set up the short-lived *Latin Empire of Constantinople*. While the authority of the Byzantine Empire was restored in the City of Constantinople in the 1260s, all the Balkan territories were lost: They broke up into many small independent nations. (Remember that Daniel said that the toes were part iron and part clay, and would not stick together!) For two centuries more, a mere shadow of the Byzantine Empire continued, consisting of just the City of Constantinople and its environs, until the Turks captured the city in A.D. 1453, ending the last pretense of the existence of this leg of the Roman Empire.

So the year 1453 marks the end of the four world-empires of Nebuchadnezzar's dream-image. Remember now, the words which many preachers won't face because it ruins their doctrines: in *Daniel 2:44*, Daniel said, "*In the days of these kings shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever.*" We must find God's own kingdom in this world, not in some remote future to which the preachers would like to assign it, but NOW: It must have had its beginning "in the days of these kings" - and therefore we must study this period which we have seen, extends from Daniel's own time, about 600 B.C. to not later than 1453 A.D.; for that is the period in which the kings of the Babylonian succession of Empires ruled, as we have just seen. Why do the preachers like to ignore this verse of Daniel's prophecy? Because there *is* a great kingdom which was set up within that period, and which still exists, just as God promised through Daniel that it would. But it is a nation of Anglo-Saxon Israel: And if they recognize this as a kingdom which the God of Heaven set up, they can no longer deny the truth of the Anglo-Saxon Israel doctrines. So they would rather try to make a liar of Daniel than to admit that their own doctrines are in error and that God has kept His promises to His people Israel.

If it shocks you to think that the nations of Anglo-Saxon-Germanic and Scandinavian Israel today are the Kingdom of God, then prepare to be shocked, for that is just what I am about to prove. The Kingdom of God is the only everlasting kingdom. *Psalms 22: 27-28* says, "All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord: and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before Thee. For the kingdom is the Lord's: and He is the governor among the nations." *Psalms 145:13-14*, says, "Thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and Thy dominion endureth throughout all generations." *Daniel 4:3* adds, "How great are His signs! And how mighty are His wonders! His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and His dominion is from generation to generation."

**But this Kingdom of God is not just an abstract idea, lost somewhere among the clouds; it is a very real kingdom upon this earth. It has not been governed as well while mere men rule it as it will be when Jesus Christ returns to be its king; nevertheless, it is still the Kingdom of God, here on earth. Remember how Jesus Christ, Himself, in *Matthew 21:43*, told the Jewish usurpers who ruled in Judea, "Therefore say I unto you, *The Kingdom of God* shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof."**

**God had repeatedly promised to establish a kingdom - God's own kingdom - in this world, and place descendants of King David upon the throne of God's Kingdom. In *1 Chronicles 17:11-12, 14*, God's promise to David was, "I will raise up thy seed after thee, which shall be of thy sons, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build Me an house, and I will establish his throne forever... I will settle him in Mine house and in My Kingdom forever: and his throne shall be established forevermore." David believed God's promise, for in *1 Chronicles 28:4-5*, David said, "Howbeit the God of Israel chose me before all the house of my father to be king over Israel forever: for He hath chosen Judah to be the ruler; and of the House of Judah, the house of my father; and among the sons of my father He liked me to make me king over all Israel: And of my sons (for the Lord hath given me many sons) He hath chosen Solomon my son to sit upon THE THRONE OF THE KINGDOM OF the Lord over Israel."**

**This is a very real and substantial kingdom on this earth. In His famous parable of the tares sown among the wheat, in *Matthew 13:38, 41*, Jesus Christ said, "The field is the world; the good seed are the children of The Kingdom: but the tares are the children of the wicked one. The Son of man shall send forth His angels, and they shall gather OUT OF HIS KINGDOM all things that offend, and them that do iniquity." Certainly the children of Satan, those who offend and do iniquity, are not in Heaven with God, so that they will yet have to be gathered out of Heaven: but they are still here in this world, living here among the nations of Anglo- Saxon, Germanic and Scandinavian Israel, for you meet them and have business dealings with them every day: So this is the same Kingdom of God of which Jesus Christ spoke.**

**The Bible leaves no doubt that, when Jesus Christ returns to rule the world, He will sit upon the throne of this very same kingdom. *Isaiah 9:7*, which all churches recognize is prophesying of Jesus Christ, says, "or the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David and upon his Kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever. The zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this." Confirming this, in the New Testament we find the same thing in *Luke 1:32-33*, "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David: and He shall reign over the House of Jacob forever; and of His kingdom there shall be no end." But this is still the same kingdom of Israel which God established under King David, a kingdom of God's saints, who are the Children of Israel. *Daniel 7:27* confirms it: "And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey Him."**

**So now we know these things:**

**(1) *the time* within which God will set up the fifth great empire, which is "in the days of these kings" of the Babylonian series of four Gentile empires, between 600 B.C. and 1453 A.D.;**

**(2) that the kingdom which God will set up is an everlasting kingdom - and only the Kingdom of God is everlasting;**

**(3) that it is an Israel kingdom, in fulfillment of God's promises to David and to God's chosen people, Israel.**

**For a little foundation information, we must go back even before 1500 B.C. The Israelites were then in Egypt. In *Genesis 49:8-10* the throne had been promised to the Tribe of Judah until Jesus Christ takes the throne. Judah had twin sons, Pharez and Zarah; but Pharez was born before Zarah, so Pharez inherited the right to the throne. Ancient writings record that the descendants of Zarah were very able men - even King Solomon being compared to them in wisdom. Since they could never take the throne in Palestine, where their ability could be used in governing the people, a large part of the descendants of Zarah left Egypt even before the general exodus, looking for places where their abilities could be fully used. They migrated northward along the east coast of the Mediterranean Sea, where they settled along the coasts of Asia Minor and in parts of Greece; they founded the city of Troy, and also the city of Miletus. It is accepted British history that after the fall of Troy, as described in Homer's great poem, the Iliad, Brutus the Trojan led a party of Trojans to the west, and finally landed in Britain where they founded the city of London. The place where he landed is marked by a monument.**

**The city of Miletus became powerful and famous. Its coins were stamped with the lion of Judah. Milesian mercenary troops were hired by Egypt as border guards. It established several colonies, the most important of which was in Spain. This Milesian colony in Spain became powerful, and an expedition they sent to Ireland captured the whole island. Before that time, there were several tribal kings in various parts of Ireland, but the Milesians united them in one kingdom, Eochaidh the Heremon becoming the first king of Ireland, somewhat before 600 B.C. The Milesian kings ruled Ireland until the overthrow of Roderick O'Conner, the last native Irish king, by the invading Anglo-Norman armies under King Henry II of England, in 1171 A.D. The Irish of today who have names beginning with "Mc" or "O" are descendants of the Milesians.**

**In the early centuries of the Christian Era, Ireland was known as Scotia, and its people as Scots. More and more settlements were made by them on the northern part of the island of Great Britain, until by a little after 500 A.D. they founded a separate nation, Scotland. For a time, Ireland was called Scotia Major and Scotland Scotia Minor.**

**Meanwhile, the raids of the fierce Norse and Danish Vikings on the east coast of England had become so terrible, after withdrawal of the last of the Roman legions in 408 A.D., that the Britons invited settlements along the Channel coast by the Jutes, Angles and Saxons - Jutland being a part of modern Denmark, the Angles coming from what is modern Schleswig in Germany, and the Saxons being part of the people who gave their name to Saxony in Germany. You will recall that before the Israelites left Scythia, two of their tribes were already known as the Angli (the Latin form of**

"Angles") and the Saxons. So by the year 600, we have Ireland, Scotland and England settled by Israelite people. Norse and Danish Vikings also settled areas along the English Channel coast. In my discussion of Historic Proof of Israel's Migration, I have mentioned the proof of the migration of the Israelites from Scythia into Northern and Western Europe, so there can be no doubt that the settlers of the British Isles are Israelites.

However, this period did not bring a consolidation of them into a single kingdom: Only Ireland was united under a single king, while the island of Great Britain was broken into many petty kingdoms, always at war with each other. We must look to a later date to find the consolidation into one kingdom.

It is well-established history that Norse Vikings raided the coasts of Gaul (which is modern France) for centuries: even capturing and looting the city of Paris three different times. Finally, in 911 A.D., King Charles III of France ceded the province of Normandy, on the Channel coast, to a Viking Chief, Rollo, who became the first Duke of Normandy; this was done on condition that Rollo would settle large numbers of Norsemen there, to form a buffer against further raids by Viking chiefs. In fact, the word "Norman" is really just a form of "Norseman," and shows the racial make-up of its population. From Normandy came Duke William of Normandy, William the Conqueror, in the year 1066 A.D., in a successful invasion of England. His Norman followers were Israelite Norsemen, of the same racial strain as much of the population of England.

William the Conqueror established the English kingdom which has continued without a break since the year 1066 A.D. True, there have been battles between competing claimants to the throne: but the successful contender never was a conqueror setting up a new kingdom - he was always a claimant to the existing throne of England. This kingdom has had an unbroken existence since the year 1066 A.D. It is well established historical fact that the Kings of England (and the Queens, in the two reigns when there was no King), have all been descendants of King David of Israel. Thus, God's promise in *Jeremiah 33:17* that David shall never lack a descendant to sit upon the throne of Israel, has been fulfilled.

But let's get back to Daniel and his five kingdoms. All the churches agree that history has proved the four kingdoms represented by Nebuchadnezzar's image to be Babylon, Medo-Persia, Alexander's empire, and Rome. Then Daniel goes on to say, in *Daniel 2: 44*, that "IN THE DAYS OF THESE KINGS" - and in the preceding verses he has been careful to mention only FOUR kingdoms, the last of which we know to be the Roman Empire - "in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed." Daniel never speaks of the toes or the clay in them as kings or kingdoms.

The continuity of the Throne of David, through Ireland, Scotland and England, is historically established. Now, what about the time of its establishment as the Kingdom of England? As we saw the final end of the Roman Empire came in the year 476 A.D. But the present Kingdom of England was established in the year 1066 A.D., well within what Daniel calls "the days of these kings."

All the churches are willing to recognize Daniel as an inspired prophet through the interpretation of the vision of the image as representing the four successive world-

empires. "In the days of these kings" the Kingdom of England was established and it became a world-empire many times greater than all the previous empires of world history. If this is not the kingdom set up by the God of heaven Himself, as Daniel says, then how did God happen to overlook the most remarkable kingdom in all human history? No, this isn't according to the accepted doctrines of most churches; and they would rather reject the word of God than admit that any of their doctrines might be mistaken. It is a bitter pill for them to swallow, for it proves that we who preach the Anglo-Saxon identity message are right: The God of heaven DID set up His kingdom "in the days of these kings."

---

## THE KINGDOM - OF HEAVEN? OR IN HEAVEN?

There is some dispute in ecclesiastical circles, whether the Kingdom of God, so often mentioned by Jesus Christ, is to be *on earth* or only *in heaven*. This is based chiefly on the use by Matthew (ONLY) of the phrase "the kingdom of *Heaven*": from which some have argued that the Kingdom must be only *in heaven*, being heaven itself as ruled by Almighty God. But neither Mark, Luke nor John refer to the Kingdom "of Heaven," but only to the Kingdom "of God"; and even Matthew himself uses as an equivalent phrase "the Kingdom of *God*" 4 times (*Matthew 6:33; 12:28; 21:31; and 21:43*); and in *Matthew*, Jesus Christ speaks of "the Kingdom of their Father" (*13:43*) and "My Father's Kingdom" (*26:29*), both phrases being obviously equivalent to "the Kingdom of God." Clearly, there is no distinction between "the Kingdom of HEAVEN" and "the Kingdom of God." Then why were the two phrases used?

Because *outwardly* pious Jews had first taken the name of God, Yahweh, out of the Scriptures, substituting the word "Adonai" (Lord) - this in the 7th century B.C. At least as early as 200 B.C. they had begun to substitute "heaven" for "God." (Even today, many Jewish publications won't use the word "God," writing it "G-d.") Funk & Wagnalls New Standard Bible Dictionary says:

"KINGDOM OF GOD: Usage of terms: A New Testament phrase based upon and expressing in its final form the Old Testament idea of the spiritual rule of God over Men. The phrase 'Kingdom of Heaven' is used in the New Testament by Matthew only, and is an exact equivalent of the phrase 'Kingdom of God.' The substitution of 'heaven' for 'God' is based on the popular superstitious feeling in later Judaism which led to the avoidance of the Divine Names in common speech."

So nothing can be based upon the use of the words "Kingdom of HEAVEN"; but what clues can we find in the Bible? First, GOD'S THRONE AND KINGDOM ARE ETERNAL: "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of Thy kingdom" (*Psalms 45:6*). "Thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and Thy dominion endureth throughout all generations" (*Psalms 145:13*).

BUT AN ETERNAL THRONE AND KINGDOM *ON THIS EARTH* WAS PROMISED: "And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, AND I WILL ESTABLISH HIS KINGDOM. He shall build an house for My Name, and I WILL ESTABLISH THE THRONE OF HIS KINGDOM FOR EVER. I will be his Father,

and he shall be My son. If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men: but My mercy shall not depart away from him, as I took away from Saul, whom I put away before thee. **AND THINE HOUSE AND THY KINGDOM SHALL BE ESTABLISHED FOR EVER BEFORE THEE: THY THRONE SHALL BE ESTABLISHED FOR EVER**" (2 Samuel 7:12-16). "And of all my sons (for Yahweh hath given me many sons,) He hath chosen Solomon my son to sit upon **THE THRONE OF THE KINGDOM OF YAHWEH OVER ISRAEL**" (1 Chronicles 28:5). "THEN SOLOMON SAT ON THE THRONE OF YAHWEH AS KING instead of David his father, and prospered; and all Israel obeyed him" (1 Chronicles 29:23).

"I have made a covenant with My chosen, I have sworn unto *David My servant*, Thy seed will I establish for ever, and build up **THY THRONE** for all generations... My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and My covenant shall stand fast with him. His seed also will I make to endure for ever, and *his throne* as the days of heaven... My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of My lips. Once have I sworn by My holiness that I will not lie to David. **HIS SEED SHALL ENDURE FOR EVER, AND HIS THRONE AS THE SUN BEFORE ME**" (Psalm 89:3-4, 28-36). "And in the days of these kings shall the God of Heaven set up **A KINGDOM, WHICH SHALL NEVER BE DESTROYED**: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it will break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, **AND IT SHALL STAND FOR EVER**" (Daniel 2:44).

We know that Solomon never sat on the throne of Yahweh God in heaven; but we are told in the Bible that "Solomon sat on the throne of Yahweh as king" - and therefore God has an earthly throne, as well as a heavenly one. It is prophesied that Jesus Christ shall sit upon the throne of the Kingdom of God - but quite definitely an earthly kingdom, although an eternal one. "And the 7th angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, *The kingdoms of this world* are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ; and He shall reign for ever and ever" (Revelation 11:15). "For the Lord Most High is terrible; *He is a great king over all the earth...* For God is the King of all the earth: sing ye praises with understanding. *God reigneth over the heathen...*" (Psalm 47:2-7). **THIS KINGDOM CONTAINS EVIL PEOPLE, WHO MUST BE REJECTED.** (Any of these in heaven?) "And from the days of John the Baptist until now **THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN SUFFERETH VIOLENCE, AND THE VIOLENT TAKE IT BY FORCE**" (Matthew 11:12). "Again, **THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN** is like unto a net, that was cast into the sea, *and gathered of every kind*: which, when it was full, they drew to shore, and sat down, and gathered the good into vessels, **BUT CAST THE BAD AWAY.** So shall it be at the end of this age: the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the just, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth" (Matthew 13:47-50). "Therefore say I unto you (the Jews), **THE KINGDOM OF GOD SHALL BE TAKEN FROM YOU, AND GIVEN TO A NATION BRINGING FORTH THE FRUITS THEREOF**" (Matthew 21: 43).

**WE ARE EVEN TOLD THAT THE CHILDREN OF SATAN ARE IN THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN, AND MUST BE EXPELLED:** This can't be IN heaven! "He that soweth the good seed is the Son of Man; the field is the world; the good seed are the children of the Kingdom; but **THE TARES ARE THE CHILDREN OF THE WICKED ONE**; the enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the

age, and the reapers are the angels. As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this age. The Son of Man shall send forth His angels, and they shall GATHER OUT OF HIS KINGDOM all things that offend, and them which do iniquity" (*Matthew 13: 37-41*). AND, THIS KINGDOM IS ONE WHERE PEOPLE ARE MATERIAL ENOUGH TO EAT AND DRINK: "I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in My Father's Kingdom" (*Matthew 26:29*). "And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as My Father hath appointed unto Me: that ye may eat and drink at My table in My Kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the Twelve Tribes of Israel" (*Luke 22:29-30*).

So, in short, the Kingdom of Heaven is the Kingdom of God; it is on earth; it contains both good and wicked people at present, who will both be in the Kingdom until the Second Coming of Jesus Christ, when the angels will cast out the wicked; it will be here forever; and those in it will be not mere spirits, but real and solid enough to eat and drink earthly meals. It is "the Kingdom OF Heaven," but it is not IN heaven.

---

## THE SANCTUARY AND THE DOMINION

Those who have deeply studied the Bible know that the living descendants of God's People ISRAEL are today those nations which are commonly known as the "Anglo-Saxon" group, including the British, the Germans, the Scandinavians, the Dutch, and their descendants in the United States and the various colonies of these nations. Knowing this fact enables us to explain and understand their history as the fulfillment of Bible prophecies concerning ISRAEL: and it also enables us to foretell their future by applying those few Bible prophecies concerning ISRAEL which have not yet been fulfilled.

Every event in our history for 3,000 years has demonstrated its faithful adherence to God's prophesied plan: each event for its own purpose - which also required each event to come at its appointed time. If we lose sight of PURPOSE, we fail to understand *why* the event happened WHEN it did; if we lose sight of TIME, we misunderstand the PURPOSE.

When the people of ISRAEL entered the Promised Land of Palestine, they were 12 Tribes organized into one nation - just like this United States of 50 States. Even from early times, however, there were internal jealousies which foretold the coming division into two nations: David was king over Judah for several years before he became king over all ISRAEL. On the death of King Solomon, in 975 B.C., the nation was broken in two - the ten northern Tribes becoming a separate kingdom with their capital city at Samaria, and keeping the name Israel; while the two southern Tribes of Judah and Benjamin kept the old capital city of Jerusalem, and took the name JUDAH for their kingdom. The great turning points of our history are no mere accidents; and God said of this division, "This thing is of Me" (*1 Kings 12:24*).

ISRAEL left Egypt and entered Palestine as ONE nation: yet God's purpose in the later division was already predestined. *Psalms 114:1-2* says: "When Israel went out of Egypt, the House of Jacob from a people of strange language, JUDAH was His SANCTUARY, and ISRAEL His DOMINION" - TWO PURPOSES to be served, each by a separate nation.

Through Jesus Christ, God reached down toward man, to bring man salvation, redemption, a good life under God's own rule; to complete this contact and receive these gifts, man reached up toward God, through God's Chosen People, ISRAEL. But what is too often lost sight of is the fact that God's purpose toward man involves more than just the religious phase, necessary though that is. **FOR WHAT PURPOSE** are we saved? It is to live in **THE KINGDOM OF GOD**, that same Kingdom of God which Jesus Christ preached throughout His entire career. The end of God's purpose is social, economic, governmental, to which the other is but the means. Hence we must recognize both the religious and the governmental purposes.

Jesus Christ came the first time as our High Priest, to offer on our behalf the sacrifice of His own blood for our sins; He will come again as King of kings and Lord of lords, to rule a world-wide empire from the throne of His own Kingdom. A priest functions only at the altar; a king only at the throne. Hence, there must be provided for Him the altar of sacrifice at His first coming, and the throne at His second coming. Note how God fulfilled this: *Psalm 114* tells us that **JUDAH** was His **SANCTUARY**, and **ISRAEL** His **DOMINION**, and that this was predestined from the time they left Egypt - 5 centuries before the nation was divided, and 15 centuries before the crucifixion.

After the division into the two nations in 975 B.C., the ten-tribed northern kingdom of Israel had no need to remain longer in Palestine, for its destiny was to furnish the **DOMINION**, the Kingdom of God, to be ruled by Jesus Christ when He shall come the second time. The tiny land of Palestine can never furnish this: it would scarcely provide standing room for the multitudes which **ISRAEL** would become, according to God's promises in the Bible, and it lacked the enormous resources promised to **ISRAEL** and which were needed to produce the mighty power of the predestined Kingdom. Accordingly, they were removed from their old, Palestinian land, by the Assyrian captivity - a thing which seemed harsh at the time, yet it was necessary for they would not have left their old home voluntarily. After about 715 B.C., they were out of Palestine, embarked on the long migration which would bring them, many centuries later, into their north and west European homelands, and from there to spread into the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. In these new homes, they developed such advanced civilization, such wealth and power as were never before known in all world history - and this, also in fulfillment of God's prophecies for **ISRAEL**. While they remained frankly, boldly **CHRISTIAN**, these nations ruled half the world. It was only after we allowed those who hate Jesus Christ to immigrate, to infiltrate our institutions, to influence and corrupt our leaders, that we have been put on the defensive and driven out of our colonial possessions. We must remember that it is **JESUS CHRIST'S DOMINION** that we hold: and we can keep it only as long as we hold it **FOR HIM**. In these, the **ISRAEL** nations, we find the **DOMINION**, just as the *114th Psalm* prophesied; but they had no part in the First Coming of Jesus Christ, as the **SANCTUARY** for the High Priest was not in their destiny.

But what of the other, the southern, Two-Tribed Kingdom of Judah? Originally, the throne had been in Judah; but out of the Tribe of Judah was taken David and his family to be the kings; and the throne was forever given to the House of David. But the **DOMINION** was not in the destiny of the Kingdom of Judah, so the Davidic king line ceased in Judah at the time of the Babylonian captivity; but it was transferred to Ireland, where the two king lines of Pharez and Zarah were united; and from here

can be traced the British royal family today - so the throne, the DOMINION, has remained in ISRAEL.

However, the SANCTUARY, the Temple, remained in the southern Kingdom of Judah. True, it was infiltrated and corrupted with alien priests and alien doctrines, after the return from Babylon: yet it was still His Sanctuary, even though occupied by usurpers, just as the Kingdom is still His, even though usurpers have wrongfully occupied His land. Since only the SANCTUARY was to be there, we find no majestic *dominion* in Judah. In its very origin, it was reduced to only *two* out of the 12 Tribes. It shrank in importance, becoming vassal alternately to Egypt and Babylonia; after the Babylonian captivity, it was vassal to Persia, Syria, and finally the least of the provinces of Rome. But here was the SANCTUARY, and to it came Jesus Christ; here He offered Himself in sacrifice, and entered into the real Holy of Holies with His own blood as the offering for our sins. This completed the work of the SANCTUARY, the separate destiny of JUDAH, and 40 years thereafter JUDAH ceased to exist as a nation separate from ISRAEL.

Jesus Christ preached only the Gospel of the Kingdom of God, not the Gospel of Personal Salvation. The prophets before Him had foretold His life, crucifixion, resurrection, and the salvation of men and redemption of ISRAEL which He accomplished thereby. Why repeat it? As Jesus said, "If they will not hear Moses and the prophets, neither will they believe though one rose from the dead." Therefore, He did not preach the part of His mission which was finished. Now it was time to preach the KINGDOM OF GOD, to inspire His people ISRAEL to work out their destiny in preparing for Him the Kingdom, the DOMINION, for His second coming.

When He came the first time, the priests ignored the *114th Psalm*, and would not accept Him as Savior, as the Great High Priest: they would accept Him only as King, or not at all. Today, nearly all churches make a similar mistake. They ignore the *114th Psalm*; they refuse to see we are ISRAEL, and our destiny is to furnish the DOMINION, not the SANCTUARY. They preach only a Savior, not a King; they offer Him only the cross, not the crown. But God's destiny is not to be frustrated: The Israel NATIONS have created the DOMINION, whose work is still ahead. The history of JUDAH leads to Christ's first coming; the history of ISRAEL leads to His second coming. The THRONE is as literal as the CROSS: He *was* given His SANCTUARY: Now we must give Him His DOMINION.

## Gospel of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ

### THE STONE OF DESTINY

In the Coronation Chair in Westminster Abbey in London is an oblong block of sandstone, upon which all of England's kings have been crowned for several centuries - and before that, the kings of Scotland, and before them the kings of Ireland. This is another bit of evidence of the identity of the Anglo-Saxon people as the Israel of the Bible, and that the House of David still rules over them.

The history of this stone begins in the *28th chapter of Genesis*, where we read that Jacob camped overnight in a field, and for his pillow used a stone with his folded cloak over it. During the night, God appeared to him in a vision, and promised to give him the Land of Canaan. When Jacob awoke, he said, "this is the house of God," and named the place Beth-el, meaning "House of God." Then he took the stone he had used as his pillow and set it up as a monument, and dedicated it with an offering of oil. He promised that, if God would help him, "then shall the Lord be my God: and this stone which I have set for a monument shall be God's house." In *Genesis 34*, God instructs him to go back to Bethel and set up an altar to God, which Jacob did. It was at this time that God changed Jacob's name to Israel; and Israel again set up and dedicated as a monument of witness the stone pillar which he had dedicated as "God's house." Its sacred character was now firmly established.

We next find mention of it in *Genesis 49*, when the aged Israel, before he dies, tells his 12 sons what will befall their respective descendants in the last days. Speaking of Joseph, he says, "From thence is the shepherd of the Stone of Israel." We should, therefore, expect to find the Stone in custody of the sons of Joseph in the last days. The English are the Tribe of Ephraim, descended from one of Joseph's sons. Its sacred character having been established, the stone would not be thereafter abandoned.

We next hear of it when the Children of Israel, in their exodus from Egypt, were facing death by thirst in the desert. God instructed Moses, "I will stand before thee there upon *the rock* in Horeb; and thou shalt smite the rock, and there shall come water out of it, that the people may drink"; thus they were saved from death. This miracle was repeated later, but this time Moses was instructed merely to *speak* to the rock, not strike it; because Moses disobeyed God and hit the rock in a "grandstand play" before the people, he was not allowed to enter the Promised Land. We must not think that this rock was merely the native rock cliffs of these desert places, for in *1 Corinthians 10:1-4*, Paul says, "...all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea.. and did all drink the same spiritual drink, for they drank of that spiritual Rock THAT FOLLOWED THEM, and that Rock was Christ." That is, they were given water to drink from a rock which was carried along with them; and as Israel had said, "this stone which I have set up for a monument shall be God's house," so Christ hallowed it with His presence.

After Joshua had conquered the Promised Land and divided it among the 12 Tribes, he reminded them that they must ever be loyal to God, and he set up a stone as a monument of witness to this warning; the Hebrew says he took "the stone of greatness" - and what would that be, or what more fitting witness could there be, but the stone which was "God's house"?

Before God ever allowed Israel to have a king, the rebel Abimelech had himself crowned king beside this pillar or monument (*Judges 9:6*). Later, when the lawful monarchy was established in the House of David, we find it was the custom that the king be crowned standing by the "pillar" or monument, for we read in *2 Kings 11:12-14*, "And he brought forth the king's son and put the crown upon him, and gave him the testimony; and they made him king, and anointed him; and they clapped their hands and said, God save the king. And when Athaliah heard the noise of the guard

and of the people, she came to the people into the Temple of the Lord. And when she looked, behold, *the king stood by a pillar, as the manner was* and the princes and the trumpeters by the king, and all the people of the land rejoiced."

The Stone had become a sacred relic, a *witness* of the mutual promises of God and of the Children of Israel. It would be found close to the Temple and the throne. Upon the fall of Jerusalem to the Babylonians under Nebuchadnezzar, *2 Maccabees 2:4-8* says that ancient records stated that Jeremiah had taken the Ark of the Covenant and the Tabernacle and had hidden them in a cave on Mount Nebo. While *1 Samuel 4-5* records the capture of the Ark by the Philistines, and its return, there is no mention of it being taken by the Babylonians, so the ancient record of the Ark being hidden must be correct. Along with the Ark, we may be sure that Jeremiah would also safely hide the sacred Witness Stone, "God's house," which had twice been used to give water to the people to save them from death, and which was now used in the coronation of the kings. When I spoke to you on "What Jeremiah Planted," I told you how Jeremiah and the daughters of the last King of Judah, Zedekiah, were taken to Egypt with the refugees; but in order to fulfill God's prophecy that Jeremiah was also "to build and to plant," Jeremiah had to leave Egypt and take the princess to where another Israelite kingdom was then in existence - in Ireland. We know that with Jeremiah went Baruch, his scribe, and the king's daughter; and with the princess, he would also certainly take the hidden Stone upon which the kings were crowned.

The ancient Irish records record the coming of "the Great Prophet," "Brugh" his scribe (obviously Baruch), and the daughter of a king, about 583 B.C., which would be the correct date; and that with them they brought the "Wonderful Stone," or "Stone of Destiny." In one of our congregations is a woman whose family genealogy shows that one of their ancestors came to Ireland with Jeremiah, and that this ancestor's duty was that of custodian of the Stone! Tea Tephi, the king's daughter, married Eochaidh the Heremon, or Chief King, of Ireland. The stone, called "Lia Fail" or "Stone of Destiny" was kept at the capital city of Tara for some three centuries, and all the kings, descendants of Eochaidh and Tea Tephi, were crowned on it. Then, about 350 B.C., it was sent to Scotland for the coronation of Fergus, King of Scots, who was a descendant of the Milesian kings of Ireland. It remained in Scotland, and all Scottish kings were crowned on it, until 1297 A.D. when King Edward I of England invaded Scotland and captured the Stone, which he took to England, where it was placed in Westminster Abbey, its home ever since that date. It was built into the Coronation Chair - the oldest piece of furniture in England still serving its original purpose - and all English kings have been crowned on it ever since. Its origin was well known during the entire time it has been in the British Isles, and from practically the first it was called "Jacob's Stone." William of Rislanger, writing in the 13th century, records the coronation of John de Baliol as King of Scotland in the year 1292 "upon the stone upon which Jacob placed his head."

While the ten-tribed nation of Israel had to "abide many days without a king" as God prophesied in *Hosea 3:4*, yet there must always be a royal family of David's line on the throne over some Israelite people, for God promised through *Jeremiah (33:17)* that "David shall never lack a man to sit upon the throne of the House of Israel." We know that Eochaidh the Heremon was of the Milesian line of Kings of Ireland, and that the Milesians in Ireland were descendants of Zarah, a son of Judah; and that Tea Tephi was a descendant of David, who was also of the Royal Tribe of Judah

through Judah's son, Pharez. So the two royal lines of Judah were united with the marriage of Eochaidh and Tea Tephi, and a descendant of David was always on the throne over Israelite people, as God had promised.

The Ark of the Covenant belonged in the Temple; and the Temple was not to be a continuous institution like the Throne of David; so it is not surprising that the Ark has disappeared from history, and probably will not be revealed again until Jesus Christ returns to reign upon the Throne of David, as is prophesied in *Isaiah 9: 7*. But the Throne was to be a *continuous* throne (*Jeremiah 33:17*); therefore, it is only logical that the Coronation Stone, which the Hebrews had called "The Stone of Majesty" and "The Pillar of Witness," should be found where the Throne of David had its continued existence. After all, it was "The Pillar of Witness" for it had been made witness to both Israel's promise to be God's People and God's promise to be their God. It should be there, as a witness that God always makes good His promises, and "David shall never lack a man to sit upon the Throne of the House of Israel."

## EDITORIAL NOTE

Subsequent to the time when Dr. Comparet delivered the foregoing address, Mr. E. Raymond Capt, author of "The Glory of the Stars," "Great Pyramid Decoded," and other writings, stated that new evidence, recently discovered, indicates that the transfer of the throne of David from Palestine to Europe may have been accomplished in a different manner than what is commonly believed. According to the older tradition, the daughters of Zedekiah were Tamar Tephi (known to her family and friends as Tea Tephi or Tea), and her younger sister, Scotia; and this Tamar Tephi, or Tea, was married to Eochaidh in Ireland. The new evidence mentioned by Mr. Capt is discussed on pages 64-65 of his book, "King Solomon's Temple," in which he quotes *Ezekiel 17:22*, which says: "Thus saith the Lord God; I will also take of the highest branch of the high cedar, and will set it; I will crop off from the top of his young twigs a tender one, and will plant it upon an high mountain and eminent." Mr. Capt then says:

"This was fulfilled when Scotia, King Zedekiah's daughter (the tender twig), was taken to Egypt by Jeremiah and then to Spain where she married 'ane Greyk callit Gathelus, son of Cecrops of Athens, King of Argives' (The Chronicles of Scotland by Hector Boece). In due time a son was born and was named 'Eochaidh' (Eremhon or King).

"There is a tradition that when Jeremiah brought Scotia to Spain, he also brought the 'stone' upon which Jacob laid his head, at Bethel, when he had the vision of a ladder extending to heaven (*Gen. 28:12-19*). This was the 'stone' used as a Coronation Stone in Solomon's Temple. *Second Kings 11:11-14* tells of the anointing of a king, after which all the men around the king 'clapped their hands' and said, 'God save the King' while 'the king stood by a *pillar*, as the manner was, and the princes and the trumpeters by the king.'

"From the 'Annals of the Kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters,' we find the following statement: 'Tea, the daughter of Loghaldh, son of Ith, whom Eremhon married in Spain was the Tea who requested of Eremhon a choice hill as her dower, in whatever place she should select it, that she might be interred therein. The hill she selected was Druim-caem, i.e. Teamhair (in Ireland)' (Vol. 1, pg. 31).

"This is only one of many historical records that place not only Tea in Ireland, but her husband Eochaidh, 'the Heremon' (chief or King). At this same time there appeared, with Eochaidh (brought by Dedannans and set up at Tara as the inauguration stone of Irish Kings - Encyclopaedia Britannica 14th ed.) a stone of red sandstone, a type found in Palestine. It had iron rings fastened at each end which could have been used for porter poles. The stone became known by the name 'Lia Fail' and 'Stone of Destiny.' It is not unlikely that Jacob's Stone and the 'Stone of Destiny' were one and the same."

By whatever course the throne of David may have been carried to Europe, it is nevertheless a fact that it was eventually transferred to Ireland, then Scotland, and then England.

---

## AMERICA IS A BIBLE LAND

All Christians know that the prophets foretold the future, and gave many prophecies which are being fulfilled in our time; but it may be news to many that the Bible even speaks of our own United States of America. Not under that name, of course; but the Bible describes a certain land in such terms as definitely identify it as the United States. However, part of this has been concealed from all but the deepest students of the Bible by the unfortunate mistranslation of certain words in the commonly-used King James Version.

The Prophet Isaiah, one of the most deeply inspired prophets in the Bible, foretells the future of a number of different nations. With one exception, these kingdoms which were then important nations, were competing with one another for mastery over western Asia and the Mediterranean shores. In his *thirteenth chapter*, Isaiah names Babylon, and foretells its coming destruction - even naming the Medes as the chief nation by whom Babylon would be overthrown (although Isaiah wrote this 176 years before the fall of Babylon); he also foretells that, after its destruction, the Arabs would never camp overnight at the site of the ruined city - which is still true, even today. In his *fourteenth chapter* Isaiah concludes his prophecies against Babylon, and names another people doomed to be broken as a punishment for their evil ways - the Assyrians.

In the *fifteenth* and *sixteenth chapters*, Isaiah prophesies the destruction of another nation, that of Moab. In his *seventeenth chapter*, Isaiah foretells the fall of Damascus. (Let us skip over the *eighteenth chapter* for the moment; but we will come back to it.) In the *nineteenth* and *twentieth chapters*, he foretells the destruction of another mighty nation - the great empire of Egypt; and in the *twenty-third chapter*, he foretells the doom of the powerful commercial seaport of Tyre.

All of these nations were pagan enemies of God's people, and God's patience with their wickedness was near its end; so these prophecies are all prophecies of *destruction*. Isaiah lists these nations all by name - for they then had names, and were the important nations of their day. But in the midst of this, in the short *eighteenth chapter*, Isaiah speaks of another nation which he does not name, but merely describes it. Unfortunately the translators have sadly garbled this short chapter until its meaning is lost. Correctly translated from the Hebrew, its references to this un-

named nation (found in verses *one, two, three, and seven*) read thus:

**"Ho! to the land of buzzing wings, which lies beyond the rivers of Ethiopia;**

**"That sends its ambassadors by sea, in water-drinking vessels upon the waters. Go, you swift messengers, to a nation tall and smooth-shaven, to a people terrible from their beginning onward; a nation measured out by lines under foot, whose land the rivers divide.**

**"At that time shall a present be brought to the Lord of Hosts: A people tall and smooth-shaven, a nation measured out by lines under foot, whose land the rivers quarter, to the place of the name of the Lord of Hosts, Mount Zion."**

Now, let us examine this very unusual description, and see which nation it will fit. It is not named - and as we shall see, this is for the very good reason that, at the time when Isaiah wrote, it had no name, for it did not yet exist.

The first strange thing we note is that it is "the land of buzzing wings." Nearly all of you who listen to me can, at this moment, hear the drone of airplanes in the sky. No other nation in the world has its skies so filled with "buzzing wings," day and night, as our own United States.

Next, where is it Located? Isaiah says it is "beyond the rivers of Ethiopia." The rivers of Ethiopia are the tributaries which unite into the great River Nile and flow northward into the Mediterranean Sea due west of Jerusalem. Look straight west from Jerusalem, where the Prophet wrote these words, and your line of vision will cut across the mouths of the River Nile, across the north African shore, through Libya, Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco - none of which can possibly answer any part of the description of this nation. So we keep going on, due west, across the Atlantic Ocean, and we arrive at the shores of the United States on the coastline of Georgia and South Carolina.

Isaiah says that this nation "sends its ambassadors by sea, in water-drinking vessels upon the waters." The American ambassadors can go only to Mexico and Canada by land; more than almost any other nation, we must send our ambassadors by sea - until just the last few years, when we became able to send them on the "buzzing-wings." By sea, they have gone, for most of our history, in "water-drinking vessels" - that is, steamships, which must "drink" great quantities of water for their boilers.

It is a nation "tall and smooth-shaven." You have noticed how few foreigners are of our height. In both World Wars, the United States Army was the tallest army on record; and among them were few moustaches, practically no beards. Today, except for the "beatniks," where can you find a beard among us?

It is a "people terrible from their beginning onward" - and so we have been. We were born by defeating the greatest power in Europe, the British Empire - not only once, but twice; we whipped the North African pirate kings to whom even proud Britain was paying tribute; we ended Spain's long dream of world-wide empire; we won two World Wars which must have gone the other way if we had stayed out.

"A nation measured out by lines under foot," says Isaiah. The United States Metes and Bounds Act, enacted by Congress about a century and a half ago, established the world's first system of surveying the whole nation into sections and townships, laid out by the compass - which, even today, most nations do not have - truly "a nation measured out by lines on the ground, under foot."

It is a nation "whose land the rivers divide, or quarter." The Mississippi River cuts our land in half, from north to south; the Ohio River and its tributaries divide the eastern half in two; and the Columbia, the North Platte, and related streams, cut the western half in two. Where else do you find the like?

Isaiah says, "All you inhabitants of the world and you dwellers on the earth, when a banner is raised on the mountains, look in fear; and attend when the bugle is blown." Truly, we are "a nation terrible from their beginning onward"; and when our battle-flags fly and the bugles call our armies to war, the whole world has learned that it had better pay very respectful attention.

There is no other nation in the world which will fit this entire description; but our nation does. But there is still one more point: verse *seven* says:

"At that time shall a present be brought to the Lord of Hosts: a nation tall and smooth-shaven, a people terrible from their beginning onward, a nation measured out by lines under foot, whose land the rivers quarter, to the place of the name of the Lord of Hosts, Mount Zion."

This is no pagan nation, like those of Asia and Africa; it is no atheist nation, like those of the Communist empire; it is a Christian nation, bringing its people, its strength, its hopes and ideals as a present to our God.

It has been proved to you that we are even today living in Bible times. But it is also true that you are living in a Bible land, one favorably mentioned in the Bible. The Bible is written about us, and written to us: **IT IS OUR BOOK AND WE ARE ITS PEOPLE.**

---

## WHO ARE THE GENTILES?

It is unfortunate that most people have so many mistaken ideas about their religion, due largely to the many mistranslations of words in the commonly-used King James Version of the Bible. One of these mistaken ideas is that most of the people of the United States and Western Europe - in fact, nearly all the Christians in the world - are "Gentiles." You hear many of them - even clergymen, who should know better - say, "I'm just a Gentile, saved by grace." I think it is high time that we learned something about one of the most mis-used words, "Gentile."

First, you might be surprised to know that there is no such word in the Bible, in its original languages. Oh yes, I know that you are now riffing the pages of your King James Version, looking for some of the many places you will find "Gentile" in it. But I said that there is no such word in the Bible **IN ITS ORIGINAL LANGUAGES.** The word was put into it by translators, who changed the wording of the Bible centuries

after the last book in the Bible was written. If you are a good Christian, you will surely agree with me that what the prophets originally wrote in the books which make up our Bible was inspired by God. It was correct as the prophets wrote it. But not one of them wrote in English, remember, because no such language as English existed until many centuries after the prophets lived. It was written in Hebrew, as to the Old Testament; and the New Testament was originally written in the language which Jesus Christ spoke, Aramaic, a Semitic dialect somewhat similar to, but not the same as, Hebrew. But Aramaic was not generally understood outside of Western Asia; so when Christianity began to spread into southern and southeastern Europe, the New Testament had to be translated into a language which was widely used in Europe. Greek served this purpose nicely, for it was understood by well-educated men over nearly all of Europe. Therefore, the New Testament was first translated into Greek. Protestant English-language translations of the Bible, today, are nearly all translated from Hebrew manuscripts of the Old Testament and Greek manuscripts of the New Testament. So, let us start at the beginning, with the Old Testament.

The word "Gentile" is not even once used in any Hebrew manuscript of the Old Testament, for the good reason that there is no such word in Hebrew, nor any word which corresponds to it. Everywhere you find the word "Gentile" used in the Old Testament, it is a mistranslation of the Hebrew word "GOY," which means "NATION." The plural form of it is "GOYIM." Since it means "nation," why didn't they translate it correctly? Sometimes they did; but for the most part, they translated it to fit the official doctrines of the church of their day, no matter what violence that did to the true meaning of the word. The church hierarchy had long since determined what its doctrines should be: and if the Bible didn't agree with them, so much the worse for the Bible. Men were still being burned at the stake for heresy, in those days, and "heresy" meant any religious idea which differed from the official doctrines proclaimed by the bishops. So the translators did the best the Church would allow them to do. Let us take some examples.

In *Genesis 12:2*, God said to Abram, "I will make of thee a great nation." in Hebrew, God said "I will make of thee a great GOY." It would have been too silly to translate that "I will make a Gentile of you," so they correctly translated it "nation." Again *Genesis 25:23*, Rebekah was pregnant with the twins, Esau and Jacob; and while still in her womb, the unborn children were struggling against each other; so she wondered at this, and asked of God what was the meaning of this? God said to her, "Two GOYIM are in thy womb." Certainly God was not telling her, "You are an adulteress, pregnant with two Gentile children, when your husband is not a Gentile." God said "Two NATIONS are in thy womb," and that is the way it was translated; but it is that same word, "GOYIM," which elsewhere they generally translate as

Now let us take some examples from the New Testament. Here the word mistranslated "Gentile" is nearly always the Greek word, "ETHNOS" which means just exactly "NATION," the same as the Hebrew word "Goy." *Luke 7* begins with the incident of a Roman Centurion who appealed to Jesus Christ to heal his servant who was sick unto death. The Elders of the Jews praised him to Jesus, saying "He loveth our ETHNOS, and hath built us a synagogue." These Jews would never praise anyone for loving the Gentiles; and the Centurion would not have built a synagogue for Gentiles. So, to avoid complete absurdity, the translators were forced to translate "ETHNOS" correctly, as "NATION." Again, in *John 11:50*, we find that the Jewish

High Priest, Caiaphas, was plotting with the chief priests and Pharisees, to murder Jesus Christ; and Caiaphas told them, "it is expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and that the whole ETHNOS perish not." Nothing could have pleased this evil Jew more than for all the Gentiles to perish - using the word "Gentile" as we do today. Therefore, the translators had to translate "ETHNOS" correctly, as "nation." Yet in many other places they mistranslate it "Gentile."

The Greek word "ETHNOS" means simply "nation," nothing more or less. It has no pagan, or non-Israel, or even non-Greek connotation. The Greeks distinguished between Greeks and all non-Greek peoples, whom they called "Barbarians." All educated men of that day knew this, and the Apostle Paul was a very well-educated man, who was quite familiar with the Greek language and its idioms. He recognized this distinction in *Romans 1:14*, where he said, "I am debtor both to the Greeks and to the Barbarians." Paul, therefore, never wrote the word "Gentile" in any of his Epistles.

What does this word "Gentile" mean, and from what is it derived? It is derived from the Latin word "GENTILIS," which means "ONE WHO IS NOT A ROMAN CITIZEN." If you use the word correctly, then you would have to say that Jesus Christ and His twelve disciples were all Gentiles, because none of them was a Roman Citizen. Only Paul could say that he was not a "Gentile," because in the *22nd chapter of Acts*, Paul says that he was a Roman citizen by birth.

How, then, is it used at present when the speaker means to say that someone is non-Jewish? About the fourth century A.D., its use was loosely extended to cover more than its original meaning. It was applied especially to those who were heathen, pagan; it became a term for those who were neither Christian nor Jewish, for Christians and Jews were generally called just that, (Christian; or Jew). But this was centuries after the last book in the New Testament had been written.

The word "Gentile" was never used by the writer of any book of the Old Testament, because none of them had ever heard it, as they had never come in contact with Rome. It was not used by the writer of any book of the New Testament, for there is no such word in the Hebrew, Aramaic or Greek languages. They did not borrow the word from the Latin, for if you will look up every place it is used in your King James Version, you will see that it is never used in the correct sense, to say that someone is not a Roman citizen; and that is the only meaning it had, the only way anybody used it, in those days. It was put in by the translators in an effort to make the Bible say what the Translators thought it should have said. Therefore, it has no authority at all.

In short, wherever you see the word "Gentile" in the Bible, remember that the correct word is "nation," "race," or "people." Sometimes it is used when speaking of ISRAEL nations or the ISRAELITE race, as we have seen in the examples I have given you. In other instances, the context will show that it is being used of a nation which is non-Israelite. Only the context in which it is used will show you which meaning to give it. When used of non-Israelite peoples, perhaps "Gentile" is as good a word as any, for we seem to have no other in general use. But never be deceived by reading the word "Gentile" in your Bible, for its only correct meaning is "nation" or "race."

---

# Gospel of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ

## THE GREAT MASQUERADE

The whole Bible is the history of the conflict between our God and the rebel, Satan - carried on between *their children*, also. Didn't you know that they both had children? (Yes, I do mean CHILDREN, not merely followers.) if you don't know this, you should read your Bible more carefully.

*Luke 3:38* tells us that *Adam was the son of God*: and surely you know that Adam had children and descendants down through our own generation. In many other places, God refers to His children: for just a few of these, consider *Deuteronomy 32:19*, "And when the Lord saw it, He abhorred them, because of the provoking of HIS SONS AND OF HIS DAUGHTERS." Again, *Isaiah 43:6*, "I will say to the north, Give up; and to the south, Keep not back: bring MY SONS from afar, and MY DAUGHTERS from the ends of the earth." *Isaiah 45:11*: "Thus saith the Lord, the Holy One of Israel, and his Maker: Ask Me of things to come concerning MY SONS, and concerning the work of My hands command ye Me." In *Psalms 82:6*: "I have said, Ye are gods; and all of you are CHILDREN OF THE MOST HIGH." In the New Testament, we read in *John 11:51-52*, "...he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation; and not for that nation only, but also that He should gather together THE CHILDREN OF GOD that were scattered abroad." And Paul, in *Romans 8:14, 16* says, "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, THEY ARE THE SONS OF GOD... The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that WE ARE THE CHILDREN OF GOD."

As to the children of Satan, this also is affirmed in the Bible from beginning to end. First in *Genesis 3:15*, where God tells Satan, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between THY SEED and HER SEED." The same Hebrew word for "Seed," or descendants, is used in both instances, so Satan is to have just as literal seed, or children, as the woman, Eve. - Jesus Christ, Himself, affirmed this, several times. For example, in *Matthew 13:38-39*, where He said, "The field is the world; the good seed are the Children of the Kingdom: but the tares are *the children of the wicked one*; the enemy that sowed them is the devil." In *John 6:70-71*, Jesus said to His 12 disciples, "Have not I chosen you 12, and *one of you is a devil*?" Again, very carefully read *John 8:31-55*, where Jesus said to these people, "I speak that which I have seen with MY Father: and ye do that which ye have seen with YOUR father. They answered and said unto Him, 'Abraham is our father. Jesus saith unto them, IF ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham. But now ye seek to kill Me, a man that hath told you the truth, which I have heard of God... Ye do the deeds of YOUR father.'" They tried to masquerade as God's children, but they couldn't deceive Him: they said, "We have one father, even God. Jesus said unto them, IF God were your Father, ye would love Me: for I proceeded forth and came from God .Ye are of YOUR FATHER THE DEVIL, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He 'was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him.. It is My Father that honoureth Me: of whom ye SAY that

**He is your God: yet ye have not known Him."** Jesus was not using vulgarly abusive language to them: He was stating a biological fact, with scientific accuracy.

**Paul, also, does not hesitate to identify certain people as the *children* of the devil. Meeting one, in *Acts 13:6-10*, Paul plainly called him "thou *child of the devil*."**

**In the thousands of years of this conflict, whenever we have remembered that we are the children of God, remained loyal to Him, and remembered that God Himself put enmity between HIS children and SATAN'S CHILDREN, we have had prosperity and high civilization, with very little crime; and the wars which the wicked started against us ended quickly with tremendous victories in our favor. Satan's tactics have always been the same, down through the ages: first he tries to crush us by force, as the Bible records many times, and as we saw a few years ago in Japan's treacherous attack upon us. But these attacks always fail, when we remember who WE are and who THEY are, and act accordingly. Then Satan tries another method: Since God has given us the victory whenever we remember that we are HIS CHILDREN and have nothing to do with the children and the ways of Satan, the only way to conquer and enslave or destroy us is to make us forget this division between the CHILDREN OF GOD and the CHILDREN OF SATAN, get us all mixed together so our ways will be corrupted with theirs, our children will learn their evil, our government will be controlled by their power, and they will make us enemies of God like themselves. Only when we are in rebellion against God, and therefore do not receive His help, can Satan and his children hope to destroy us.**

**We were warned of this, as of all other dangers. In *Deuteronomy 7:2-4* we got the first warning: "Thou shalt smite them, and utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor show mercy unto them: neither shalt thou make marriages with them: thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son. *For they will turn away thy son from following Me*, that they may serve other gods: so will the anger of the Lord be kindled against you, and destroy thee suddenly." But we have allowed them to enter our land in great numbers - multitudes of them were admitted illegally, under the Roosevelt administration - and to take over control of our commerce, our government, our schools, and now they who hate our God are even laying hands on our churches. God warned us not to allow them in the land, "For they will turn away thy son from following Me." They have done this: Their organizations have made such a bitter fight against any mention of the name of Jesus Christ in our schools that many school boards have yielded to their pressure; they have sometimes been able to put some of their own people into public office, where they have ruled officially that we cannot even read one verse from the Bible in our schools, because it offends them! Our children are not allowed to hear the name of God in our schools; and now even our churches are being infiltrated and corrupted in the same way. Under the guise of "interfaith" movements, supposedly Christian ministers have been induced to bring into their pulpits those whose official doctrine calls our Savior, Jesus Christ, a liar and a fraud; to avoid offending these people, supposedly Christian ministers carefully avoid preaching anything from the *Gospel of John*; they practically deny their Savior to please His enemies; so our children, who cannot hear the name of our God in school, often cannot hear it in their churches either. The evil of which God warned us has come upon us.**

**How are Satan's children able to do this? By a great masquerade, in which they**

pretend to be God's children, and have corrupted most of our clergymen until these no longer tell us who *we* are. We received warning of this also, if we would only heed it: In *2 Corinthians 11:13-15*, where it says, "Such men are sham apostles, dishonest workmen, masquerading as apostles of Christ. And no wonder, as even Satan himself masquerades as a shining angel. So it is nothing strange if his servants also masquerade as servants of uprightness. But their doom will fit their actions." So we are told by them that these people are God's chosen, that they must be helped to invade and steal other people's land, that our own institutions must be changed so as not to offend them and that our churches must abandon Jesus Christ because these people hate His name and we must abandon Him in order to have fellowship with them. But God warned us NOT to have fellowship with devils.

All masquerades must reach an end; and this one is almost finished. It has nearly succeeded in bringing us to destruction. But God will save us, because we are HIS CHILDREN. Though most of us have forgotten our identity, He has not forgotten. Masks will be removed and our true identity revealed. In *Isaiah 51:1-2*, God has told us, "Hearken to Me, ye that follow after righteousness, ye that seek the Lord: look unto the rock from whence ye are hewn, and to the hole of the pit from whence ye are digged LOOK UNTO ABRAHAM YOUR FATHER, AND UNTO SARAH THAT BORE YOU." That is, look to your ancestry, recognize that you are Israel, God's children; stop masquerading as gentiles; and tear the mask off Satan's children who masquerade as you.

## Gospel of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ

### THE BIBLE IS NOT A JEWISH BOOK

The statement is commonly made - even by those who should know better - that "We Christians owe a debt to the Jews, for we got our Bible and our religion from them." While many people have been deceived into believing this, it is completely false. Part of the mistake comes from the complete confusion in the minds of nearly all people as to just what they mean by "Jew" - are they referring to people of a certain race? or people of a certain religion? for the two are not the same. There are in Africa today some pure-blooded Negroes who are Jews by religion, and there are in China today some pure-blooded Mongolians who are Jews by religion. Likewise, there are some people today who are racially of the stock we know as Jews, but who have been converted to other religions.

First, let us consider the claim that we got our Bible and our religion from the Jews, as meaning Jews by *religion*. It is certain that we did not get the New Testament from them, for it condemns the Jewish religion throughout all the New Testament. But did we get the Old Testament from them? No; for several reasons. In the first place, no Jew by religion existed before the return from the Babylonian Captivity, shortly after 536 B.C. The great historian, Josephus, says "So the Jews prepared the work: that is the name they are called by from the day that they came up from Babylon." The only books of the Old Testament that were written after the return from Babylon are: Kings, Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah (all of them historical, rather than doctrinal); and Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi. In none of these do the Jews receive anything but

rebuke for their wickedness, for their apostasy from the religion of the Old Testament. The late Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, formerly the Chief Rabbi of the United States said, "The return from Babylon and the introduction of the Babylonian Talmud marks the end of Hebrewism and the beginning of Judaism."

The learned Rabbi was correct in distinguishing the true religion of the Old Testament as "Hebrewism" - for it was the religion of the real Hebrews - -who were not Jews at all. Judaism, the religion of the Jews, is as the learned Rabbi says, based upon the Babylonian Talmud, which contains the supposed oral law, never reduced to writing as part of the Bible, and which gradually gained greater force among the Jews than the written law in the Bible, with which it often conflicted. In Jesus' day, the Babylonian Talmud was known as the Tradition of the elders. This is why Jesus Christ told the Jews:

"Well hath Esaias prophesied of you hypocrites, as it is written, This people honoreth Me with their lips, but their heart is far from Me. Howbeit, in vain do they worship Me, teaching for doctrines the Commandments of men. For laying aside the commandment of God that ye may keep your own tradition.. .Making the word of God of none effect through your tradition which ye have delivered" *Mark 7:6-13*.

"Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God" *Matthew 22:29*. And "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith" *Matthew 23:23*.

This was the religion of the Jews, as the learned Rabbi Stephen S. Wise said: JUDAISM, as distinguished from Hebrewism, the real religion of the Old Testament. Certainly Christianity took nothing from any Jewish religion, for we have never taken any part of Christianity from the Talmud. Naturally, the Jews didn't give us any part of the New Testament, either, for it completely repudiates and condemns the Jewish religion of the Talmud.

Well, then, can it be said that we got our Bible or our religion of Christianity from men of Jewish *race*? No, it cannot. While I have not the time in the remainder of this broadcast to give in detail the Bible evidence, and will have to reserve that for a later broadcast, it can be clearly proved, both out of the historical books of the Bible and out of the only thorough history of the times written by one living when the facts were still well known, Josephus' "Antiquities of the Jews," that the Jews were a people distinct and separate from God's people Israel, although living among them. The Jews were the Canaanite peoples who lived in Palestine before Israel entered the Promised Land, and who were not driven out, but allowed to remain in the land while paying heavy tribute taxes; and the half-breed mixture from some intermarriage between the Canaanites and the Israelites. The prophets who wrote the books of the Old Testament, on the other hand, were all of pure Israelite stock, from one or another of the 12 Tribes of Israel. Moses, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Habakkuk, Haggai and Zechariah were of the Tribe of Levi; Joshua and Samuel were of the Tribe of Ephraim; Isaiah, Daniel, and Zephaniah were of the House of David; Jonah of the Tribe of Zebulun; Hosea was of the Tribe of Issachar.

When the Assyrians conquered and deported the people of the ten northern Tribes, the Bible records that the Assyrians brought other people in from the Assyrian

Empire and settled them in Samaria, in place of the Israelites they had deported. But Samaria is only the southern half of the territory occupied by these ten northern tribes; the northern half was Galilee, and this was left vacant. When the Kingdom of Judah was later deported to Babylon for their seventy years' captivity, their land was left with very little population; and while they were gone, the Edomites, descendants of Esau mixed with Canaanite people, were forced out of their own land by pressure of invading Arab tribes, and moved westward into the vacant lands of Judah, occupying the southern half of the former Kingdom of Judah. Therefore, when a portion of the two Tribes of Judah and Benjamin returned from the Babylonian captivity, they were too few in numbers to drive out the warlike Edomites, and had to try to squeeze into the very little territory they had left. It was too small for them, so what was left of the Tribe of Judah took the little territory remaining around Jerusalem, and Benjamin was pushed to the north. They could not move next door, into Samaria, as that was occupied by the people the Assyrians had settled there, so Benjamin had to leapfrog over them into the vacant territory of Galilee. That the Apostles and the majority of Christian converts came from the Benjamites should not surprise us, for when the kingdom was split in two upon the death of Solomon, God said that He would leave Benjamin with Judah so that the House of David should have a light before them; and in Christ's time the people of Benjamin were still the Light Bearers. In the New Testament all of the Apostles were of the Tribe of Benjamin except Judas Iscariot, the only Jew among them, who came from the village of Kerioth in southern Judea. "Iscariot" is a corruption of Ish Kerioth - man of Kerioth. Paul tells us that he (Paul) was of the Tribe of Benjamin; and all of the other Apostles except Judas Iscariot were from Galilee, where the Tribe of Benjamin settled after the return from Babylon.

This is confirmed by Jesus Christ, Himself. In *Matthew 15:24*, He said, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the House of Israel." In the *10th chapter of the Gospel of John*, Jesus tells the Jews, "I am the Good Shepherd, and know My sheep, and am known by Mine... But ye believe not because *ye are not of My sheep*, as I said unto you. My sheep hear My voice, and I know them and they follow Me." From the Savior's own lips we have the proof that the Jews are not of the Tribes of Israel. Note carefully that He does *not* say that their unbelief keeps them from being of His sheep: He says the exact opposite, that the reason why they do not believe is that they are not of His sheep, the House of Israel.

Christianity and Judaism are completely and irreconcilably inconsistent. Whichever one is right, the other must be wrong, for they mutually repudiate each other. A great part of Jesus Christ's reported words are His denunciation of the Jews for their religion, which He tells them is not that of the Old Testament. In *John 5:46*, Jesus told them, "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed Me: for he wrote of Me." And in *Luke 16:31*, Jesus said, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." He was right: He did rise from the dead, but to this day they are not persuaded.

It is clear, therefore, that we did not get either our Bible or our Christian religion, either in whole or in part, from those who were Jews either by religion or by race. We owe them no debt, for they gave us nothing.

# WHO ARE THE JEWS?

The identification of the Anglo-Saxon-Scandinavian-Germanic peoples as the surviving members of the peoples of Israel, leaves us with two other questions to answer:

1. WHO ARE THE JEWS?
2. Was Jesus Christ a Jew?

To answer these questions, we must first define what we mean by "Jew." The muddled thinking of most people on this subject is due to the fact that they never know just what they do mean by "Jew" - sometimes they mean a Jew by religion, regardless of his race (for Negroes, Chinese and Japanese have all been converted to Judaism), or sometimes they mean a Jew by race, regardless of his religion (for example, Premier Ben Gurion of the Jewish nation in Palestine was a Buddhist by religion, though a Jew by race) - and usually people don't know which of these they do mean.

Since it can be answered quickest, let us first take the question - was Jesus Christ a Jew by RELIGION? The answer is clearly "NO." Jesus had the true religion of the Old Testament, found in the Law and the prophets, and He constantly rebuked the Jews for having abandoned this for Judaism under the Babylonian Talmud (which in His day was called "The Tradition of the Elders"). In *Matthew 5:17-18*, He said: "Think not that I am come to destroy the Law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill; for verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the Law till all be fulfilled."

Jesus constantly rebuked the Jews for their apostasy, for setting aside the Laws of God in favor of the Tradition of the Elders. This Talmudic Judaism was very different from the religion which we find in the Old Testament. The late Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, Chief Rabbi of the United States, expressed it so clearly that I cannot improve on his words. He said: "THE RETURN FROM BABYLON, AND THE ADOPTION OF THE BABYLONIAN TALMUD, MARKS THE END OF HEBREWISM, AND THE BEGINNING OF JUDAISM."

Since the true religion of the Old Testament was the religion of the real Hebrews (NOT JEWS), the learned Rabbi was quite right in calling it "Hebrewism" and noting that it came to its end when the Talmud (then called the Tradition of the Elders) was adopted; and that this WAS THE BEGINNING OF A NEW RELIGION - "JUDAISM," (or BABYLONIANISM).

So we read in *Matthew 15:1-9*: "Then came to Jesus Scribes and Pharisees which were of Jerusalem, saying, Why do Thy disciples transgress the Tradition of the Elders? for they wash not their hands when they eat bread. But He answered and said unto them, Why do you also transgress the commandment of God by your Tradition?... Ye hypocrites! well did Isaiah prophesy of you, saying, This people draweth nigh unto Me with their mouth, and honoreth Me with their lips; but their heart is far from Me. But in vain do they worship Me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." (The same incident is found also in *Mark 7:5-13*.) In *John 5:37-46*, Jesus told the Jews: "The Father Himself, which hath sent Me, hath borne

witness of Me... Search the Scriptures: for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and it is they which testify of Me... For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed Me: for he wrote of Me." Again, in *John 8:54-55*, He said: "It is My Father that honoreth Me: of whom ye say that He is your God: yet ye have not known Him." In *John 15:23*, Jesus said: "He that hateth Me hateth My Father also." In the *21st chapter of Matthew*, Jesus summed up their position by saying that even the Tax Collectors and the harlots could enter the Kingdom of God before the Jews. Surely, Jesus Christ's entire ministry was a complete demonstration that He was not a Jew by RELIGION.

Was Jesus a Jew by RACE? To answer this, we must trace the racial ancestry of both Jesus and the Jews. Jesus Christ was a pure-blooded member of the Tribe of Judah - and no true Judahite was a Jew by race, as we shall see.

---

## WHO ARE THE JEWS?

Jesus' ancestry is given in both *Matthew 1* and *Luke 3*. Both of them show that He was a descendant of the Patriarch Judah, through one of his twin sons, Pharez; by His mother Mary, He came through the line of David, and Nathan, the brother of Solomon, as traced in the *3rd chapter of Luke*. Jesus Christ was therefore a pure-blooded Israelite, of the Tribe of Judah as Paul says in *Romans 9:4-5*.

Now, let us trace the racial descent of the Jews. First, let us note that the Jews were not - and are NOT - Israelites. Yes, I know that you have been taught the "Jew" and "Israelite" were the same thing; but no greater falsehood was ever taught, as we shall see. Let us get the first proof of this from Jesus Christ Himself. He stated plainly, in *Matthew 15:24*: "I am not sent but unto the Lost Sheep of the House of Israel." Therefore; He was sent to those who were of Israel - but not to others. Accordingly, when He sent His 12 disciples out to preach His gospel, *Matthew 10:5-6* records that He told them this: "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not; but go rather to the Lost Sheep of the House of Israel." And He added, "Ye shall NOT have gone over the cities of *Israel* till the Son of man be come" (*Matthew 10:23*). They could have gone over all the cities of Judea in a month; so it was obvious that the cities of *Israel*, to which He referred were the cities of the so-called Lost Tribes who had already entered Europe in their long migration. But take careful note of Jesus Christ's own words: "I am not sent but unto the Lost Sheep of the House of Israel." If the Jews were any part of Israel, then they would have been some of His sheep; but He says that they are not.

In the *10th chapter of John*, Jesus says: "I am the good shepherd, and KNOW MY SHEEP, AND AM KNOWN OF MINE." But He tells the Jews - and it says "Jews" - "But ye believe not, BECAUSE YE ARE NOT OF MY SHEEP, as I said unto you. MY SHEEP HEAR MY VOICE, AND I KNOW THEM, AND THEY FOLLOW ME." Note carefully those words: He does NOT say that the reason that the Jews are not His sheep is that they don't believe, and that they could become His sheep just by changing their minds; to the contrary, He says that the reason they don't believe is that THEY ARE NOT OF HIS SHEEP: He knows His sheep, and knows that the Jews are not of His sheep.

Since the Jews are not any part of any Tribe of Israel, then **WHO ARE THE JEWS?** Let's trace their ancestry. We find that the true line of His people must be kept free from mongrelization with the neighboring Canaanites. Accordingly, *Genesis 24:3-4* records that Abraham took great pains to see that his son, Isaac, should marry only a woman of his own people; likewise *Genesis 27:46* and *28:1* records that Isaac also required that his son, Jacob (the father of the Israelites) should also marry only within his own race line. This law had been obeyed for several centuries, to keep the race line pure. But one of the sons of Israel, the patriarch Judah, father of the tribe of Judah, violated it by marrying a Canaanite woman, who bore him 3 sons, of whom only one, Shelah, survived and left descendants. (See *Genesis 38:1-5*) This half-breed, mongrel line must be distinguished from Judah's pure-blooded descendants by his twin sons Pharez and Zarah. Judah fathered Pharez and Zarah by his daughter-in-law Tamar; although born out of wedlock, they were of pure, Israel stock on both sides; and from one of them, Pharez, Jesus Christ was descended. The descendants of these twins are the real tribe of Judah.

The half-breed son, Shelah, accompanied Judah into Egypt, and in the following centuries left many descendants. They were in the Exodus, and accompanied the armies of Israel into the Promised Land. (See *Genesis 46:12* and *Numbers 26:20*.) However, they bred true to type: They were half-breed Canaanites, lacking the spiritual insight which God gave to his own people, so they remained idolators, Baal-worshippers. In *1 Chronicles 4:1*, you will find them referred to as "the House of Ashbea." "Ashbea" is a corruption of "Ish-baal" ("man of Baal") and shows that they were still idolators, unable to perceive the God of Israel. So these Shelanites, half-breeds, formed one of the peoples of the land, who made up the Jews in the time of Jesus Christ.

Another alien racial group who became part of the Jews were the "mixed multitude" which *Exodus 12:38* says left Egypt along with the children of Israel. The Hebrew word here translated "mixed" is the word "EREK," meaning half-breed or mongrel. During the two centuries in Egypt, many had violated the divine law against race-mixing, and these were the result. On the Exodus, when the going became hard in the wilderness, the Bible records that this "mixed multitude" made a lot of trouble, and led some of the Israelites into rebellion. (See *Numbers 11:4-6*.) This mongrelized group was still in the land after the return from the Babylonian captivity; for we find them listed in *Nehemiah 13:3* as still in the land, and still a source of trouble. They also were among the Jews in Christ's time.

Then there were the various Canaanite peoples who were still in the land, chief of whom were the Jebusites, the Hittites, the Hivites, the Perizzites, and the Amorites. When the Israelites were about to enter the Promised Land, God gave them specific instructions to completely drive out or exterminate all of these Canaanites, saying "When the Lord thy God shall bring thee into the land whither thou goest to possess it, and hath cast out many nations before thee, the Hittites, and the Gergashites, and the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites, seven nations greater and mightier than thou; and when the Lord thy God shall deliver them before thee: **THOU SHALT SMITE THEM AND UTTERLY DESTROY THEM**; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor show any mercy unto them... But of the cities of these people which the Lord thy God doth give thee for an inheritance, thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth: but thou shalt utterly destroy them; namely, the Hittites, and the Amorites, the Canaanites, and the

**Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites: as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee." (See *Numbers 33:50-56; Deuteronomy 7: -6; 20:16-18.*)**

**I know that it is fashionable among the "liberal" church members of today to look down their noses at God, and say, "I just can't believe in that cruel God of the Old Testament." However, I think He will manage very well without their belief. He always has a good reason for what He does or tells us to do. The Bible never argues with you about the reasons for its rules, it just states the rule: but there is always a good reason, if you will look for it. For about 2,000 years, the Canaanites had worshiped Baal and Ishtar - the most immoral religion in the world, with the possible exception of some Hindu religions even today. Part of the worship of Baal and Ishtar consisted of the compulsory prostitution of all the women. On certain festival days of the year, all the women of the village had to sit in the field outside the village gate: and any wandering camel-driver who came along could select the woman of his choice, hand her the coin which she must pay over to the temple, then take her aside and leave with her his syphilis or gonorrhoea, as the case might be. This funneled into Palestine the venereal diseases of all western Asia. Any Doctor can tell you that one infection of syphilis, not cured, can produce degenerative changes in the children for as many as four generations. But the Canaanites had been replenishing the disease with new infections every generation for 2,000 years; they were not physically, mentally, morally, or spiritually fit to marry or even associate with our people. Therefore, God warned the Israelites to exterminate them; if you do not, He warned them, you will have "integration"; your children will grow up with theirs as playmates, they will intermarry, until you become as badly polluted as they are, and I will have to destroy you as I am commanding you to destroy them.**

**But the Israelites are often soft-hearted and soft-headed. While they did exterminate the people of Jericho and a couple of other cities, the Bible records that they left most of the others alive, merely making them pay a heavy tribute tax. For example, the city of Jerusalem was inhabited by the Jebusites at the time the Israelites came in. The Bible records that the Jebusites were neither killed nor driven out, but continued to live among the people of the Tribes of Judah and Benjamin. (See *Joshua 15:63; Judges 1:21, 27-35; and 19:10-12; and 2 Chronicles 8:7-8.*) Even after the people of the southern Kingdom of Judah returned from the 70 years' captivity in Babylon, the Jebusites were still in the land, and some of the people were intermarrying among them. (See *Ezra 9: 1-2 and Nehemiah 13: 23-29.*) And the Bible records the same thing as to the other Canaanite peoples. Further proof of this is found in various places, such as *Ezekiel 16: 1-3*: "Again the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Son of man, cause Jerusalem to know her abominations, and say thus saith the Lord God unto Jerusalem; Thy birth and thy Nativity is of the land of Canaan; thy father was an Amorite, and thy mother an Hittite." God could not have said this truthfully to any real Israelites: BUT He was NOT saying it to Israelites: He said it to the city of Jerusalem and her people. They were in large part Canaanite Jews, and they had gained power in the manner by which Jews usually gain it: Hence Jerusalem was becoming more and more corrupt, as most of the prophets record. They surrounded, and became the influential advisors of, the Kings of Judah, just as today they surround and are the principal advisors of our President. We find clear proof of this in *Isaiah 3:8-9*, where he says: "For Jerusalem is ruined, and Judah is fallen: because their tongues and their doings are against the Lord, to provoke the eyes of His glory. THE SHOW OF THEIR COUNTENANCE DOTHS WITNESS AGAINST THEM; and they declare their sin as Sodom, they hide it not. Woe unto their soul! for they**

have rewarded evil unto themselves."

Now in China, where their rulers were Chinese, you couldn't say that "the show of their countenance doth witness against them" - their faces would be just like those of the rest of the Chinese; and in Sweden, where their ruling class were Swedes, you couldn't say that their faces were witness against them, for they had the same kind of Swedish faces as the rest of the people had. But in Jerusalem, the faces of the Canaanite-Jebusite Jews identified them, "were a witness against them." The true Israelites were not hook-nosed. The ancient kings of Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, and Persia were very vain about their military conquests, and left carved stone monuments telling how they captured this city and that one, killed so many people and enslaved the others, etc.; and on these monuments they usually had carved in the stone pictures of the captive people. Whenever they showed Israelites, the faces had straight noses and were generally of Anglo-Saxon type; but when they showed Canaanites, the faces were those of typical hook-nosed Jews. Therefore, the faces of the Canaanite-Jebusite Jews who had gained controlling power as merchants, bankers, advisors of the King, the wealthy ruling class, identified them as separate from the real Israelites - "the show of their countenance doth witness against them." They had brought ruin upon the Kingdom of Judah. Now go back and read the many places where Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel condemn the wickedness which was found in Jerusalem; don't you find the same conditions existing in New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, and Washington D.C., where large numbers of the same people have gained power through their wealth? So we find that there were still large numbers of Canaanites in the land, "integrated" with the real Israelites and Judahites, and bringing the lowering of standards which integration always brings: Look at the City of Washington, D.C., for example. Besides the Jebusites in Jerusalem, the Bible records that the other Canaanite peoples - the Hittites, the Hivites, the Perizzites, and the Amorites - were not exterminated or driven out, but merely conquered and made to pay a tribute tax, and left in the land to be integrated with the people and corrupt them. So these Canaanites were another element of the Jews in the time of Jesus Christ.

You will remember that when the people of Israel left Egypt, they were accompanied by a "mixed" - mongrel multitude. The same is true of the return of the remnant of the people of the Kingdom of Judah from their captivity in Babylon. The books of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah* record the return. They show that the total number who returned was 42,360; but they also show that among these were many who were not Israelites of any tribe; they were Babylonians who had come with them, in order to "get in on the ground floor" as the saying is, and they had even infiltrated into the priesthood. But it says that "these sought their register among those that were reckoned by genealogy, but they were not found." When you add up the total of all these other elements listed in *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*, they equal 8,381 of these alien Babylonians - about 1/5 of all the people who returned from Babylon to Palestine. So they also formed another element of the Jews in the land of Jesus Christ's time.

One more, and we complete the list; that is the Edomites. You will remember that Esau and Jacob were twin brothers; but Esau was a man of such low character that we have God's own testimony, in *Malachi 1:2-3*: "Was not Esau Jacob's brother? saith the Lord: yet I loved Jacob, and I hated Esau." Jacob kept the race-line pure, and God changed his name to Israel and made him the father of God's own chosen people, Israel. But Esau married two Canaanite wives and one Ishmaelite wife, and

left only half-breed, mongrel children. (See *Genesis 26:34-35; 27: 46; and 36:2.*) As his mongrel descendants could not marry into the true Semitic line, he moved out from among them, and went down to Mount Seir, the rugged range of mountains southeast of the Dead Sea, and this land was called "Edom" (or occasionally by the Grecianized form of the word, "Idumea"); thereafter, his descendants were called "Edomites." (See *Genesis 33: 16 and Genesis 36:1-9.*) There they had a long and troublesome history. Esau's grandson was Amalek, father of the Tribe of Amalek, who were such an evil lot that, in *Exodus 17:14-16*, God said that He would have perpetual war with Amalek until they were all destroyed. The Edomites constantly harassed the southern portion of Israel until King Saul beat them off, about 1087 B.C. But Saul disobeyed God's command to EXTERMINATE them, and for this disobedience, God deposed him as king, in favor of David. See *1 Samuel 15:1-26*. But even David didn't exterminate them, and there was a long history of wars between Edom and Israel (later with Judah). (You will find it in *2 Kings, chapters 8 and 14*, and *2 Chronicles, chapters 20 and 25.*) The whole book of *Obadiah* is devoted to God's condemnation of Edom's treacherous attack upon the Kingdom of Judah when Judah was being conquered by Babylon.

During the Babylonian captivity of Judah, the land lay practically empty; and during this period, the people of Edom, partly from opportunity and partly from pressure against them from the east, moved into the vacant southern half of the old Kingdom of Judah. (See article "Edom," in Funk & Wagnalls New Standard Bible Dictionary, pages 198-199, and Scribner's Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. 1, pages 644-646.) From this new area, they continued to harass the little nation which returned from Babylon. By about 142 B.C. the returned exiles of Judah won complete independence under the Maccabean line of Kings; and about 120 B.C. John Hyrcanus, one of the Maccabean kings, conquered the Edomites. He, too, instead of exterminating them, took them into his kingdom, offering them full citizenship if they would give up their paganism and adopt the religion of Judaism. This they did, and from A20 B.C. they were full citizens of the kingdom. (See Josephus, "Antiquities of the Jews," Book 13, chapter 9, and see also The Jewish Encyclopedia, article "Edom," Vol. V, page 41.)

By 69 B.C. incompetent leadership and intrigue within the Maccabean monarchy, together with the rising power of Rome in western Asia, gave opportunity to Antipater (also called Antipas), an Edomite chieftain, founder of the Herodian family, to rise to power. By bribery, boldness, and military skill, he gained the favor of Rome, and the Romans made him Procurator (Governor) of Judea. His son, Herod I, beginning as Governor of Galilee, used the same methods to secure appointment as King of Judea in 40 B.C.; and by 37 B.C. he had gained complete control of Judea. He maintained himself in power by extreme ruthlessness and by bribery, for which he taxed the people very heavily. (The New Deal, Raw Deal and Great Society are not so new, after all!) This is the same Herod who had all the little male children in Bethlehem murdered, trying to murder Jesus Christ.

His son Herod Archelaus, held the Governorship (the Romans didn't trust him with the crown) for ten years of astonishingly evil misrule, from 4 B.C. to 6 A.D.; after which the Romans convicted him of crimes and removed him: and thereafter Judea was governed by Roman Procurators (of whom Pontius Pilate was number six). Nevertheless, the Romans left practically complete power of local government in the hands of the Herodian Edomites, who had complete control of the Temple and power to enforce all their local laws. (Remember how Pontius Pilate tried to get out of

condemning Jesus Christ, telling the Jews: "Take YE Him, and judge Him according to YOUR law" (*John 18:31*).

These Edomite Jews could say that Abraham was an ancestor of theirs, through Esau, as they did in *John 8:33*; but this Hebrew blood through Esau had been diluted to the vanishing point by 1,700 years of marrying only people of Canaanite racial stocks. Therefore, Jesus Christ rebuked them for falsely claiming to be still of Abrahamic (and therefore inferentially of Israelite) lineage, for He told them, in *John 8:44*: "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth because there is no truth in him." You should very carefully observe the *8th chapter of John, verses 31-47*. These were Jews to whom Jesus was speaking, and the Bible identifies them as Jews.

In the Jewish Encyclopedia, the article on Edom concludes with the words: "The Edomites today are found in modern Jewry."

---

## WAS JESUS CHRIST A JEW?

Now, let us review for a moment what we have covered. We have seen that Jesus Christ was NOT a Jew by religion, for the Jews based their religion on the Babylonian Talmud, which was at that time called "The Tradition of the Elders," and Jesus Christ's whole ministry was one constant battle against the evils of Judaism. We have seen that Jesus Christ was a TRUE ISRAELITE, of the Tribe of Judah, BY RACE. And we have seen that the Jews of His time included the mongrel descendants of Shelah, the mongrel "mixed multitude" which followed the Israelites out of Egypt, the various Canaanite peoples in Palestine, including the Jebusites, the Hittites, the Hivites, the Perizzites, and the Amorites. NOW do you understand why Jesus Christ said that He was sent only to "the lost sheep of the House of Israel"? and told the Jews that "I know My sheep, and they know Me, BUT YE (the Jews) BELIEVE NOT BECAUSE YE ARE NOT OF MY SHEEP, AS I SAID UNTO YOU. MY SHEEP HEAR MY VOICE, AND I KNOW THEM, AND THEY FOLLOW ME" (as recorded in the *10th chapter of John*).

The tiny remnant of Judah and Benjamin which came back to Palestine from the Babylonian Captivity did leave some descendants in Palestine; but THESE were Jesus Christ's sheep, and He Himself said He knew them, they knew Him, and they followed Him. All those in Palestine who became Christians were true members of the tribe of Judah or the Tribe of Benjamin, but they were NOT Jews And the Jews were not members of Judah; Benjamin, or any other Israelite tribe, for Jesus Christ Himself said they were NOT of His sheep.

Now we know who it was who constituted the Jews in Jesus Christ's time. If you want to bring it down to date, and find out who are the Jews in our own day, we must add one more racial element. Of course, the descendants of the Jews of Jesus Christ's day are among them: but there is also another element: the KHAZARS. These make up the Slavic Jews of today.

Meanwhile, we must return to the Jews of Palestine for a few words. As you know, by A.D. 68, the Romans had found the rascality of the Palestinian Jews so intolerable

that they began the campaign which resulted in the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. The Jews were then expelled from Palestine, and most of them migrated in large numbers to what was then called Byzantium, later called Constantinople, and today is known as Istanbul, facing the Bosphorus, outlet of the Black Sea. Here, they again demonstrated the truth of the Bible's lesson, that **CONDUCT IS THE PRODUCT OF CHARACTER**: or in Jesus Christ's own words, "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do." By about the year 300 A.D. their rascality had again become so intolerable that they were again expelled; and they moved northeast, into the Khazar kingdom.

About the year 150 A.D. the Khazars, an Asiatic people related to the Turks, migrated westward from Central Asia, and established a great empire which covered what is today southwestern Russia, north of the Aral Sea, the Caspian Sea, including the Don and Dnieper Valleys and the Crimea. About 740 A.D. Bulan, the Kagan or King of the Khazars, was converted to the religion of Judaism, together with some 4,000 of the most powerful nobility of the kingdom. In those days, it was not healthful for a subject to be in a religion in conflict with that of the king or with the baron on whose land he lived; so in due course, most of the Khazars became Jews by religion. In fact, it became part of the kingdom's constitution that no one but a Jew by religion could be king. The principal languages spoken were the Khazar (called "Yiddish" today) and Turkish. During the great invasion by the Mongols under Genghis Khan, many of the Judaized Khazars were dispersed into what is now Poland and Lithuania. These Khazars, Jews by religion, constitute the Slavic Jews of today, those with names such as Minsky and Baranov and Moscovitz, (the latter often shortened to "Mosk"); also, since much of the western part of this area has been at one time or another ruled by Austrian or Germanic peoples who brought in their own language, the Khazars' also took Germanic names, such as Gold or Goldberg, Rosenberg, Eisler, and so forth. If you are wondering how they can be so much like the other Jews, historical documents written at the time the Khazar empire was at its greatest height refer to their tradition that their ancestors originally came from the region of Mt. Seir, which is Edom, the home of the Edomite Jews.

If you wish to look up further details, you will find brief articles on the Khazars in various encyclopedias such as the Britannica; the Jewish Encyclopedia has 6 pages on it. In some it is spelled "Khazar" and in others, "Chazar" - and even other variations. It is also discussed in "A History of the Jews," by Solomon Grayzel, and "A History of the Jews," by Prof. H. Graetz, both works being published by the Jewish Publication Society of America. The most thorough discussion of the whole problem is found in that magnificent bit of historical research, "The Iron Curtain Over America," by Col. John Beatty. Col. Beatty is an Historian and Professor of History, whose works are used as text books in more than 700 colleges and universities. "Iron Curtain Over America" is one of the most thoroughly documented and accurate works ever put in print. It is well worth the cost. It should be in the library of every patriotic American and good Christian.

Perhaps you are wondering, "Why does my Bible sometimes speak well of the Jews? such as Paul saying in *Romans* that "the gospel of Christ... is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek"; and in *Acts*, Paul saying that he was "a Jew of Tarsus." If you will look up these few instances in a good concordance, such as Strong's, you will find that in each instance the translators have written the word "Jew" in English, where it was not used in the

original Greek from which they MIS-translated it. In such instances, in the ORIGINAL Greek, the word used was "Ioudaios" which does not mean "Jew," but simply a "Judean," a person whose home is in the land of Judea, or southern Palestine. It has no religious connotation, and it has no racial connotation either; it is purely a geographic term, like "Californian." A "Californian" could be white, black, brown or yellow by race; and he could be Christian, Jew, Buddhist or atheist. So also a "Ioudaios" was merely a person who lived in Judea, where, as we saw, there were some few Israelites of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin; but there were far more Canaanite Jews, and also a general mixture of Romans, Greeks, Syrians, Egyptians, etc. It is true that Christian salvation was first offered in the land of Judea, hence to those who were living there, the Ioudaios; and later, as the Apostles traveled from city to city, it was soon offered to the Greeks. But it was never offered to the Jews as a preferred class, for you will remember that Jesus Christ taught only in hard-to-understand parables when there were Jews around, and explained them privately to His Disciples, explaining that He spoke among the Jews ONLY in parables "lest at any time they should be converted, and their sins should be forgiven them." Both *Matthew 13: 10-15* and *Mark 4:10-12* record this. Jesus was taking great pains to see that the Jews could not understand Christianity and be converted. He was preaching only "to the lost sheep of the House of Israel," the members of the Tribes of Judah and Benjamin which He said were His sheep, who knew His voice, and followed Him. The Jews He rejected as the children of "their father, the devil."

Now to sum it up; the Jews are not, and never were any part of any tribe of Israel; they include various mixtures of Egyptians, Babylonians and Canaanites, the Edomites, and - later - the Khazars. Christ was a pure-blooded Israelite of the Tribe of Judah, without any Jewish ancestry; and He was NOT a Jew by religion.

Now think this over carefully; the group of nations which we loosely group under the term "Anglo-Saxon," (including nearly all of Germany, Holland and some few of the people of France and Belgium, with the closely-related people found in Austria, some of the Swiss, Czechs, some of the Hungarians, North Italians, and Spanish, and their descendants now living in the United States, Canada, Australia, and South Africa) are the living descendants of the Israel of the Bible, blood brothers of our Savior, Jesus Christ!

If you are descended from these, the true "people of the Book," - the "Lost Sheep of the House of Israel" - accept gladly the Salvation and Leadership of your Risen Savior and King, the Lord Jesus Christ. You are called as Israelite Christians to stand up for righteousness and decency in the home, the church, the community, the nation, and the world, as Jesus directed, ... teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you..." Don't you appreciate your Ancestry, your Salvation, and your Calling? That truly is YOUR HERITAGE.

## **Gospel of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ**

**CAN ANYTHING BE "JUDAEO-CHRISTIAN"?**

**This is an age in which news has been superseded by propaganda, and education by brainwashing and indoctrination. From the advertising used to sell shoddy goods, to the classes in your schools designed to make your children into obedient robots of a socialist state, the art of persuasion has displaced the simple virtue of truth. The masters who rule out of the shadows, using as puppets those who govern us, to drive this nation ever further down the path to socialism, they seek to gain control of your mind - for with that, they will rule you in all things. And one of the great fortresses of the mind, which they must capture if they are to change your destiny, is your religion.**

**Suddenly we have been bombarded from all sides with references to "our Judaeo-Christian religion," and "our Judaeo-Christian heritage." Just as the other Communist party-line phrases, "war-monger," "hate-monger," and "extreme right wing" have appeared suddenly in all our newspapers and most of our magazines, when the Communist Party decreed it, so likewise has the similarly inspired phrase "Judaeo-Christian" appeared suddenly in the writings of hosts of men who seek to mold public opinion. Were this the spontaneous idea of some one writer who originated it, he would have a monopoly on it for some time; instead, it has been used simultaneously by the many who serve the Party, until even the fumbling copyists join in the chorus, not knowing whose purpose they are serving.**

**Is there any truth in this phrase, "Judaeo-Christian?" Is Christianity derived from Judaism? Does Christianity have anything in common with Judaism? Who can say with authority what the answer may be? Certainly Jesus Christ is the great authority on this subject, for none knows better than He; and next would come His disciples. Let us ask them whether Christianity can be truthfully called "Judaeo-Christian."**

**The foundation and highest authority of Judaism is the Talmud. In the time of Jesus Christ, this bore the name of "The Tradition of the Elders." At that time, there were two principal religious sects: the Sadducees and the Pharisees. The Sadducees were gross materialists, who did not believe in a resurrection of the dead, or in any other form of immortality. They recognized the written Law, as given by Moses in the Pentateuch, but it was "lip service rather than honest obedience. In the time of Christ, they controlled the priesthood, and the High Priest was always chosen from their ranks. The Pharisees, on the other hand, recognized the existence of angels and spirits, both good and bad, and believed in resurrection of the dead. While they recognized the written Law, as given in the Scriptures, they also claimed that there was a great body of oral tradition which was of at least equal authority with the written Law - and many claimed that the Tradition was of greater authority. By their tradition, they undertook to explain and elaborate upon the Law. This was the Tradition of the Elders, to which the name of "Talmud" was later given. It had its beginning at Babylon, during the Babylonian captivity of the nation of Judah, where it developed in the form of the commentaries of various rabbis, undertaking to explain and apply the Law. This traditional, or Talmudic, Judaism, was very different from the true religion which we find in the Old Testament. The late Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, who was the chief Rabbi of the United States, expressed this so clearly that I cannot improve upon his words. He said, "The return from Babylon, and the adoption of the Babylonian Talmud, marks the end of Hebrewism, and the beginning of Judaism." Since the true religion of the Old Testament was the religion of the real Hebrews (NOT Jews), the learned Rabbi was quite right in calling it "Hebrewism," and noting that it was abandoned when the Talmud, or "Tradition of**

the Elders" was adopted, and that this also constitutes the beginning of Judaism.

Nothing could be clearer than the total antagonism between Judaism and Christianity. All the opposition to Jesus Christ, including their murder of Him upon the cross, came from Judaism and those who professed it as their religion. And remember that the total entirety of Judaism was represented by the Pharisees and Sadducees. Now, with this in mind, let us review *the Gospels*, and see if there we can find anything which can truthfully be called "Judaeo-Christian."

The scene opens with John the Baptist at the River Jordan, baptizing those who came to him in genuine repentance of their sins. And we read in *Matthew 3:7*, "But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his baptism, he said unto them, "O children of vipers!, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" John must have felt that he didn't get any of his religion from Judaism, the Talmud, the Tradition of the Elders.

But what of Jesus Christ, Himself? Did He feel that He owed any of His religion to Judaism? Let Him answer that. In *Matthew 15:1-9*, we read, "Then came to Jesus scribes and Pharisees, which were of Jerusalem, saying, Why do Thy disciples transgress the Tradition of the Elders? for they wash not their hands when they eat bread. But He answered and said unto them, WHY DO YE ALSO TRANSGRESS THE COMMANDMENTS OF GOD BY YOUR TRADITION?.. Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition. Ye hypocrites! Well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying, This people draweth nigh unto Me with their mouth, and honoreth Me with their lips; but their heart is far from Me. BUT IN VAIN DO THEY WORSHIP ME, TEACHING FOR DOCTRINES THE COMMANDMENTS OF MEN."

Do you find anything "Judaeo-Christian" in that? Jesus was always warning people to beware of the false religion of the Pharisees and Sadducees. For example, in *Mark 8:15*, we read, "And He charged them, saying, Take heed, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees." In *Matthew 5:20*, again, He said, "For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the Kingdom of Heaven." In *Luke 11:39*, it says, "And the Lord said unto him, Now do ye Pharisees make clean the outside of the cup and platter: but your inward part is full of ravening and wickedness." Was it from *this* source that Jesus Christ drew Christianity? Nothing "Judaeo-Christian" in that!

Turn now to the *23rd chapter of Matthew: in verses 13, 14, 15, 23, 25, 27 and 29*, seven different times, Jesus Christ begins His denunciation of them with the words, "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!" And remember that the Pharisees represented the highest form of Judaism: Was this "Judaeo-Christian?" Without one single exception Jesus Christ utterly rejected and condemned Judaism, in language as strong as He ever used against complete idolatry.

But what of the Pharisees and Sadducees? Did they show any attempt to become reconciled to Him, and to have a part in some so-called "Judaeo-Christian" religion? When they heard of His miraculous healing of the sick, or even saw it with their own eyes, their attitude is summed up in *Matthew 12:24*, "But when the Pharisees heard it, they said, This fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of the devils." They totally rejected Him: for example in the *7th chapter of John*, where they

sent officers to arrest Jesus, so they could murder Him, but the officers came back without Him. And we read, "Then came the officers to the chief priests and Pharisees; and they said unto them, Why have ye not brought Him? The officers answered, Never man spake like this man. Then answered them the Pharisees, Are ye also deceived? Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on Him?"

And finally, their only reaction to Him was that of hatred and murder. *Matthew 12:14*, *Mark 3:6*, and *John 11:47-53* all record the incident: "Then gathered the chief priests and Pharisees a council, and said, What do we? for this man doeth many miracles. If we let Him thus alone, all men will believe on Him... Then from that day forth, they took counsel together for to put Him to death." In fact, as we read in *John 12:10-11*, they even conspired to murder poor Lazarus, whom Jesus had raised from the dead, because this miracle caused many to believe in Jesus Christ. Is THIS "Judaean-Christian"? "Judaean" it truly is; but Christian it is NOT, and never was.

Wake up! Who is behind this great propaganda effort to brainwash you into thinking that your religion is "Judaean-Christian"? Why are they spending so much money to give it such great publicity? What do they hope to accomplish by it? It is false and sinister to the utmost extreme. Never be misled by it: Your Redeemer, Jesus Christ, Himself condemned it in the strongest terms. Believe Him, not the propagandists.

---

## CHRISTIANITY IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

When you see some new machine, with its shafts turning, gears spinning, motors humming, you can't understand what it is or what it does, until somebody shows you a plan of it. Similarly, you can't understand history and its climax - modern civilization - until you see a plan of it. The only such plan of history is in *the Bible*; and it is amazingly complete. But you can't understand this plan, the Bible, until you know *who you are*; that the Bible was lived and written by *your* ancestors, written *about* you and written *to* you. The identity of the Anglo-Saxon, Scandinavian and Teutonic peoples as the Israel of the Bible is the only key to the whole book.

If somebody wrote a very exact history of the United States - but never used the name "United States" therein, always calling the nation in this history "China" - you couldn't make much sense out of it. As a history of China, it would be demonstrably false. It could never make good sense until you put the name of the right nation into it. But all the major churches have falsified *the Bible*: They have taken *our* history, the various prophecies about *us*, and told us that all this was just about the Jews - which is an easily demonstrated falsehood. That is why any intelligent and well-educated atheist has always made a monkey of any clergyman who has ever debated him on the Bible: the traditional church doctrines on the Bible are such easily exposed falsehoods.

And the churches have taught us another falsehood: They have taught that the Old Testament is a record of a different religion: the Jewish religion, which God tried out and found that He couldn't make it work, so He had to abandon it and start a brand new religion - Christianity - in the New Testament. In this, they have greatly slandered our God.

**On this program, you have heard us prove that the Anglo-Saxon, Scandinavian and Teutonic peoples are the Israel of the Bible. We have proved this by showing you that these people, and no others - especially not the Jews - fulfill the Bible prophecies about Israel; and I have proved it to you by tracing the actual migration of Israel from their ancient Palestinian homeland to their modern homelands in Europe and their former colonies, the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa - and let us not forget our brother Israelites in Rhodesia. We have traced this migration through the writings of most of the recognized historians of those centuries.**

**You have heard me prove that the New Testament is just as much an Israel book as is the Old Testament: In a series of seven broadcasts we reviewed the New Testament, and showed that it was clearly speaking *about* and speaking *to* Israel. And you have often heard me say that "The Old Testament is just as much a Christian book as is the New Testament." Today, I shall begin the proof of the Christian content and character of the Old Testament. Our God was not mistaken when He inspired the prophets to write the Old Testament: It was not a failure which He had to abandon and start all over again with a new and different religion: He was right the first time, and His religion and His plan of the ages has always been the same, from the very beginning until this moment.**

**So that we can recognize Christianity when we find it in the Old Testament, we must clarify our ideas about it: What is the essence of Christianity, expressed in a few words? Isn't it this? that man is responsible for his own actions: If he disobeys God, this disobedience is sin, and the penalty of sin is death. Man must personally pay this penalty by his own death - unless someone else pays it for him. But no other ordinary person could do this for you, because the other person is already under the death sentence for his own sins, and therefore could not die in your place. Therefore, God provided the only possible sacrifice which could pay the penalty of your sins: - Jesus Christ, the Son of God, being perfect and without sin, had no penalty of His own to pay. Therefore, when He gave His own life for us when He died on the cross, He paid all the penalty of our sins, so that we will not have to meet this penalty. If we accept this basis of our relation to our God, openly confessing that Jesus Christ is our only Savior, then we have become acceptable to God, because sin no longer stands between Him and us. Instead of bearing the responsibility for our sins, we now have attributed to us the righteousness of Jesus Christ. This is Christianity: This is what we must now look for in the Old Testament.**

**The first promise of the coming of Jesus Christ, the Redeemer, is found in *Genesis 3:15*. God has called Adam, Eve and Satan before Him, to give account of their misdeeds; and God says to Satan, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: He shall crush thy head, and thou shalt bruise His heel." That is, One who is of the seed, or descendants, of Eve, shall crush the power of Satan; but in doing so, He shall suffer from Satan's malice. However the wound to Satan is far greater than the wound received by the Redeemer. We have seen this fulfilled in the crucifixion of Jesus Christ - a most terrible thing for Him to endure; but by this and His resurrection, Jesus Christ totally and permanently broke the power of Satan to hold all men in his power through fear of death. The prophecy of *Genesis 3:15* unmistakably applies to Jesus Christ, and is the first instance of Christianity in the Old Testament.**

Note that this says that Satan was to have just as literal *children* as was Eve: the same Hebrew word for "seed" - "zerah" - is used in the case of both Satan and Eve; and that one of Eve's descendants (which we know to be Jesus Christ) was to defeat Satan, although suffering terribly in the process. And carefully note another thing: *It is God Himself who puts enmity between Satan's children and Eve's children.* You know how Satan's children love to parrot the official Communist Party Line phrase, and call us "hate mongers." But the Bible itself tells us that God Himself commanded and created that enmity or hatred. As a matter of fact, it only appears as hatred among Satan's children: We don't hate them, we just detest the evil character shown by the wicked things they are constantly doing.

The Bible records only a very limited account of this conversation between God and Adam and Eve; but it very clearly implies that at this time God clearly explained to them the entire scheme of Redemption, including the fact that He, God Himself, would be the Redeemer, coming in the form of a descendant of Eve. Naturally, Adam and Eve didn't like being under the curse which came as a consequence of their disobedience of God, and they hoped that the curse would soon be ended. Since God had not explained to them how many generations it would be until He came as the promised Redeemer, Eve hoped that her first child, Cain, would be the Redeemer. This is concealed from you by the mistranslation in your King James Version of the Bible, which says this: "She conceived and bore Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the Lord" (*Genesis 4:1*). In the Hebrew, it reads, "She conceived and bore Cain, and said, I have gotten a man - EVEN YAHWEH." That is, she thought that this, her first child, was Yahweh God Himself, come in the flesh as one of her descendants, to be the Redeemer of His children. This also is Christianity in the Old Testament. You will remember that in my series of broadcasts on "Who Is Your Savior?", I gave the Bible's proof that Jesus Christ is God Himself, come in the flesh to be our Savior and Redeemer.

Again, we find further confirmation of this in *Genesis 4:3-7*, which tells us that "Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto Yahweh. And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And Yahweh had respect unto Abel and to his offering: but unto Cain and to his offering He had not respect. And Cain was very wroth, and his countenance fell. And Yahweh said unto Cain, Why art thou wroth? And why is thy countenance fallen? If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? And if thou doest not well, the *sin offering* lieth at the door. And unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him" Yes, I know that your King James Version Bible says that "sin lieth at the door;" but the same Hebrew word means both the sin itself and the sin-offering, the blood sacrifice - so closely were the two ideas identified, of the sin and of the offering which cleansed the sinner of his guilt.

Although Cain had herds and flocks of his own, he brought no blood sacrifice, just fruits and vegetables. He made no confession of sin, no prayer for pardon: he merely told God, "Landlord, here's your crop-rent" - and then he wondered why God was not pleased by this! But Abel knew that sin would separate any man from God, and he could not become acceptable to God until cleansed of his sins; and that only by making the blood offering, to proclaim his faith in God's revelation that some day the Savior would die to pay the penalty of Abel's sins, could he become free from sin. In other words, Abel showed an understanding of the basic principles of Christianity, nearly 4,000 years before the birth of Jesus Christ!

Again (as *Hebrews 11:4* reminds us), Abel understood the need of the blood sacrifice, symbolic of his *faith* that the Savior would give His life to pay for Abel's sins. These incidents in the *third* and *fourth chapters of Genesis* occurred close to 4000 B.C. But the *Book of Genesis*, which tells of this, was written by Moses about 1446 B.C., and it is not the earliest book in the Bible. Although the *Book of Job* was later assigned its place as the *18th book in the Bible*, it was - written about nine centuries before Moses lived. Its great age appears from the fact that it never mentions the Law which God gave to Moses, and nothing as important as the Law would be omitted if the *Book of Job* had been written later. Job complains of his undeserved suffering, and his "friends" assure him that suffering comes only as a just punishment - so Job must have done something very wicked to deserve such punishment; but they never mention any Law which they think Job has broken. Also, Job, who wrote the book, is mentioned in *Genesis 10:29* as "Jobab" - "Father of Job" - a great-great-grandson of Shem, and a grandson of Eber, from whom the people got the name of "Hebrews." In all his suffering, Job never loses sight of the promise of the coming Redeemer, even while he is wishing for death to put him out of his misery, In *Job 19:25-27*, he says, "For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that He shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God: Whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another."

Abraham also knew and expressed some of the basic ideas of Christianity. In *Genesis 22:1-14*, we read that God put Abraham to a severe test: He told Abraham to offer his beloved son, Isaac, on the altar, as a burnt offering. Remember how much Isaac meant to Abraham: In addition to all the ordinary love of a father for his son, God had promised Abraham that the many great prophecies given to him would be fulfilled through Isaac. Then, when Isaac was still a mere child, and none of the promises had yet been fulfilled, God suddenly commanded Abraham to sacrifice Isaac as a burnt offering! Did it mean that God had changed His mind, and would not make good on His many promises? No, Abraham knew that God's word was always reliable. Therefore, God would find a way to fulfill His promises that through Isaac would be born a number of nations destined to demonstrate to the world the goodness of God. So Abraham started out with Isaac for the place where he was to offer up the sacrifice, going cheerfully; not in the awful grief of a father about to not only witness, but even to cause, the death of his beloved son. He went in the serene confidence of one who knew that his God was always faithful. It says that "Isaac spoke unto Abraham his father, and said, My father: and he said, Here am I, my son. And he (Isaac) said, Behold the fire and the wood: but where is the lamb for a burnt offering? And Abraham said, My son, GOD WILL PROVIDE HIMSELF A LAMB FOR A BURNT OFFERING." Possibly his confidence might have been based in part upon the conviction that, if God did permit the death of Isaac, He would resurrect him, so that the promises WOULD BE FULFILLED THROUGH Isaac; and if so, remember that *resurrection* is a basic part of Christianity. But by his own statement, Abraham also was calmly certain that God would intervene, providing a lamb for the sacrifice to be offered in place of Isaac, so that *by the death of this lamb in his place*, Isaac would be spared. This, again, is of the very essence of Christianity. In *John 1:29*, Jesus Christ is called "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world"; and again, in *Revelation 13:8*, Jesus Christ is called "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." *Genesis 22* tells how Abraham's faith was justified: God stopped him before any harm could come to Isaac, and provided a ram, caught in a nearby thicket, for the sacrifice.

**This incident of Abraham and Isaac was written in the *Book of Genesis* by Moses. Do you think Moses did not know the significance of what he had written? Not at all: The Bible itself tells us that *Moses was a Christian!* Does that surprise you? In *Hebrews 11:24-26*, it says, "By faith, Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter: choosing rather to suffer affliction with the People of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; *esteeming the reproach of Christ* greater riches than the treasures of Egypt: for he had respect unto the recompense of the reward." Certainly you can't have faith in something you have never heard of; so it is clear that Moses knew the significance of the symbolism in the Old Testament rituals which he told the people of Israel to use.**

**Christianity is the central theme of the Old Testament, especially in the writings of Moses and Isaiah. The deepest religious truths therein are expressed symbolically in the sacrifices and rituals. Since they are not explained in words of one syllable for the benefit of the lazy, the uninterested and the shallow, they have not been perceived by churchmen whose religion never gets beyond mere emotionalism. These are the men who tell us that God was mistaken in the Old Testament, that His plan would not work, because men in their wickedness were stronger than God, and they would not let Him carry out His plans, so He had to abandon all this and start over again in the New Testament. Isn't that an inspiring religion! They call themselves "New Testament Christians" - but they either won't read or won't believe the New Testament, either. In that same New Testament, Jesus Christ (to whom they render lip-service) calls their attention to Christianity in the writings of Moses. In *the 5th chapter of John*, He twice called attention of the Jews to this fact, saying, "Search the scriptures: for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and it is they which testify of Me." The earliest book of the New Testament - Matthew - was not written until ten years after Christ spoke, so "the Scriptures" He told them to read were necessarily those of the Old Testament. Again, Jesus Christ told them, "There is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed Me: *for he wrote of Me.*" Can you be a "New Testament Christian" if you won't believe Jesus Christ's own words?**

**Again we find the essence of Christianity clearly symbolized in the origin of the Passover. You remember that Moses had repeatedly demanded of the Pharaoh of Egypt that he let the people of Israel go, and the Pharaoh had each time refused, despite the many miracles Moses worked, bringing down plagues upon Egypt to show his authority. So God told Moses that one more plague would be sent upon Egypt which would surely convince Pharaoh that he should let the Children of Israel go: "Thus saith Yahweh, About midnight will I go out into the midst of Egypt: and all the firstborn in the land of Egypt shall die, from the firstborn of Pharaoh that sitteth upon the throne, even unto the firstborn of the maidservant that is behind the mill; and all the firstborn of beasts... But against any of the Children of Israel shall not a dog move his tongue, against man or beast: that ye may know how Yahweh doth put a difference between the Egyptians and Israel."**

**Note what this means: Because of the stubborn wickedness of the Egyptians, the death penalty was to come upon them; yet the Children of Israel, who also were imperfect and sinful, were to escape this penalty. But there was only one way in which they could be spared - by the ritual of the Passover, and this Passover certainly symbolizes Christianity as the way of salvation from death.**

The instructions for this ritual were given in *Exodus 12*: "In the tenth day of this month they shall take to them every man a lamb, according to the house of their fathers, a lamb for an house... And ye shall keep it up until the fourteenth day of the same month: and the whole *Qahal* of the congregation of Israel shall kill it in the evening. And they shall take of the blood, and strike it on the two side posts and upon the upper door post of the houses, wherein they shall eat it. And they shall eat the flesh in the night, roast with fire, and unleavened bread; and with bitter herbs shall they eat it... And the blood shall be to you for a token upon the houses where ye are: and when I see the blood, I will pass over you, and the plague shall not be upon you to destroy you, when I smite the land of Egypt. And this day shall be unto you for a memorial: and ye shall keep it for a feast to Yahweh throughout your generations; ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance for ever."

This symbolized Jesus Christ giving His life to save those who believe in Him. This festival was always kept in the Hebrew month Nisan. This meal gave the Israelites strength for their forced march, that night and all the next day, leaving Egypt in the Exodus. The lamb's blood had to be placed outside the door on the two door-posts and the lintel above the front door of each house. Although they were cruelly mistreated slaves in the land of their enemies, they could not eat the Passover supper in secret: Salvation from death came only to those who publicly proclaimed their faith that the blood of the lamb would save them.

This is clear "New Testament" Christianity. First, the necessity for public confession of faith in the blood of the Lamb: In *Matthew 10: 32-33* Jesus Christ Himself says, "Whosoever therefore shall confess Me before men, him will I confess also before My Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny Me before men, him will I also deny before My Father which is in heaven." See *Luke 12:8-9*. In *Romans 10:9*, Paul reminds us, "That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved."

Eating the flesh of the lamb, to gain strength for the great effort of the Exodus from the world and evil into salvation and the Kingdom of God, is again clear Christian symbolism. In the *6th chapter of John*, Jesus Christ says: "I am the bread of life: he that cometh to Me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on Me shall never thirst... I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever: and the bread that I will give is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world."

Perhaps some of you are wondering about the command in *Exodus 12: 24*, "And ye shall observe this thing for an *ordinance* to thee and to thy sons forever." - are we violating God's law when we do not celebrate Passover as such today? No - for this reason: You will note that the Passover ritual was an *ordinance*. All the religious rituals were stated as *ordinances*. There are four grades of divine law:

- (1) the *Commandments*, which are the greatest rules governing man's relation to his God;
- (2) the *Statutes*, which are the rules for governing the nation, including many of the rules for man's relation to his fellow man;
- (3) the *Judgments*, which are the rules telling the judges how to decide

**cases between man and man; and**

**(4) the *Ordinances*, which are the rules for the religious rituals and ceremonies.**

**The Commandments, the Statutes and the Judgments are the rules which are forever necessary for a good life in this world, and they are still in force. But the *Ordinances* governed only the religious ceremonies and rituals, and all of these were symbolic of the coming Savior and Redeemer, Jesus Christ, Since He had not yet come in Old Testament times, all the symbolism of the rituals looked to the future. But after Jesus Christ had actually come, we cannot go on proclaiming our faith that our Redeemer has not yet come but will come in the future: That would be a rejection of Jesus Christ Who has already come. Therefore, only THE FORM of the ceremony - not its eternal truth - is changed to a new FORM (the Lord's Supper, or Communion) which proclaims our faith in a Redeemer WHO HAS ALREADY COME; it is still the same eternal truth about the same Redeemer. It does not reject any of the truth implied in the Passover, it merely proclaims this as already accomplished.**

**As I said, the Passover was on the 14th day of the Hebrew month Nisan. The Passover lambs were killed and dressed in the afternoon, ready for that evening's Passover supper. Your King James Version Bible wrongly translates this as in the evening." But the Hebrew said "between the evenings" which meant between the time when the sun first started toward sunset - that is, at noon - and the time when it finished its going down. Jesus Christ was crucified soon after noon, and He died about 3 o'clock P.M.; the Bible says, "about the ninth hour." The Hebrews divided the night into "watches" and the day into twelve hours, beginning at sunrise (which came about 6 A.M. at that time of year), so "the ninth hour" was 3 o'clock P.M. So Jesus Christ died right in the middle of the period when the Passover lambs were being killed, emphasizing the fact that He was our Passover.**

**The next day, the fifteenth day of Nisan, began the seven days of the Feast of Unleavened Bread. We find this in *Leviticus 23:6-8*, "And on the fifteenth day of the same month is the Feast of Unleavened Bread unto Yahweh: seven days ye must eat unleavened bread. In the first day ye shall have an holy convocation: ye shall not do any servile work therein. But ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto Yahweh seven days: in the seventh day is an holy convocation: ye shall do no servile work therein:" Like all the other festivals and rituals of the Old Testament, this Feast of Unleavened Bread is symbolic of Jesus Christ and His ministry.**

**Leaven was a symbol of sin - its fermentation being perhaps thought of as similar to putrefaction; and the way just a little leaven introduced into the dough would soon spread through it all. Hence we find Jesus Christ warning His disciples to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and the Sadducees (*Matthew 16:6-12*). Since Jesus Christ was "the bread of life," as He explained in the *6th chapter of John*, the fact that**

**(1) Jesus Christ has saved us by His death in our place on the cross, followed by**

**(2) the fact that our lives are thereafter sustained by His power, is symbolized by the Passover, followed by the Feast of Unleavened Bread. Jesus Christ's perfection, free from all sin, is symbolized by the**

use of unleavened bread.

The third of the Spring Festivals, Firstfruits, came before the end of Unleavened Bread. On the first day after the Sabbath following the Passover, was the Firstfruits festival. It is mentioned in many places (*Exodus 23:16; 34:22; Leviticus 23:10-14; Numbers 18:12-13; 28:16; Deuteronomy 18:4; 26:1-11*), and the entire ritual is given in *Deuteronomy 26:1-11*: "And it shall be, when thou art come in unto the land which Yahweh thy God giveth thee for an inheritance, and possessest it, and dwellest therein: that thou shalt take of the first of all the fruit of the earth, which thou shalt bring out of thy land that Yahweh thy God giveth thee, and thou shalt put it in a basket, and shall go unto the place which Yahweh thy God shall choose to place His name there. And thou shalt go unto the priest that shall be in those days, and say unto him, I profess this day unto Yahweh thy God, that I am come unto the country which Yahweh swore unto our fathers for to give us. And the priest shall take the basket out of thine hand, and set it down before the altar of Yahweh thy God. And thou shalt speak and say before Yahweh thy God, A Syrian ready to perish was my father, and he went down into Egypt, and sojourned there with a few, and became there a nation, great, mighty, and populous: and the Egyptians evil entreated us, and afflicted us, and laid upon us hard bondage: and when we cried unto Yahweh, God of our fathers, Yahweh heard our voice, and looked on our affliction and our labor and our oppression: and Yahweh brought us forth out of Egypt with a mighty hand and with an outstretched arm, and with great terribleness, and with signs and with wonders: and He hath brought us into this place, and hath given us this land, even a land that floweth with milk and honey. And now, behold, I have brought the firstfruits of the land which Thou, O Yahweh, hast given me."

The people in general have never shown any ability to understand the deeper truths of religion, only the very few upon whom rests the Spirit of God have ever understood. Therefore, to keep the rituals in the mind of the people, Moses had to give an explanation simplified within the range of comprehension of the average man. Therefore, he tied in the Festival of the Firstfruits with the idea of expressing gratitude to God for His gift of the Promised Land. But the Promised Land of Canaan was only for this world, a temporary value: What was the true Promised Land, the one which was eternal? It must necessarily be resurrection and continued life after the death of this fallen body. Therefore, that is the true symbolism of the Festival of the Firstfruits, and that is the fulfillment which Jesus Christ gave it. On the morning after *the sabbaths*, He was resurrected, to demonstrate the reality of the Redemption He had given us; and this was on the exact day of the Festival of the Firstfruits. He always fulfilled the great reality on the exact day of the Festival which symbolized that reality.

He carried out the symbolism of the Firstfruits to the exact letter. In *Leviticus 23:10-11*, it is commanded that the Firstfruits offering shall be a *sheaf* of grain - a number of stalks, each with its head containing many individual grains; and the priest shall take the sheaf and wave it - that is publicly display it - before Yahweh. When Jesus Christ was resurrected, He did not rise alone: *Matthew 27:52-53* tells us that, "The graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves after His resurrection, and went into the holy city, appeared unto many." Thus He fulfilled the symbolism of the wave sheaf, containing many individual grains, by resurrecting many persons when He arose as the Firstfruits from the dead, and making public display of His victory over death.

That this is the correct interpretation of the symbolism is shown by Paul's words in *1 Corinthians 15:20-23*: "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become *the Firstfruits of them that slept*. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the Firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at His coming."

The Firstfruits Festival came at the time of the barley harvest - for the barley ripened several weeks before the wheat. The offering of the Firstfruits at the Temple was of only a small amount, a mere token, as a pledge that when the major harvest, that of the wheat, was brought in, the full tithe of the grain harvest would be brought to the Temple. This was to be done at what the Bible calls "The Feast of Weeks," and which the churchmen, with the usual specialists' delight in developing a jargon of their own, have chosen to call "Pentecost." Jesus Christ knew and respected the symbolism here involved: At Firstfruits, He did not bring all the magnificent gifts He would give to His followers; just a token resurrection of a few persons, to show how great would be His eventual gift to men. But men must live out their lives, under all the usual circumstances of this world, before they reach the stage of death and resurrection; so they need another gift before that time. What they need to bring them triumphantly through life is the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit. Jesus Christ had promised them this gift, in *John 14:16-18*, "And I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you for ever: even the Spirit of Truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him: but ye know Him; for He dwelleth with you, and shall be in you. I will not leave you comfortless; I will come to you." So, at the time of Firstfruits, Jesus Christ demonstrated the reality of His gift of resurrection by bringing several of the dead to life: It was not yet time for actual resurrection to come to everyone, so this was just a token, given in pledge of the final harvest. With this proof, everyone could wait in serene confidence for what was yet to come. The rest of the harvest for man was to be demonstrated in its own good time, at the Feast of Weeks.

This was celebrated on the fiftieth day after Firstfruits, as specified in *Leviticus 23:15-21*: "And ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave offering, seven sabbaths shall be complete: even unto the morrow after the seventh sabbath shall ye number fifty days: and ye shall offer a new meat offering unto Yahweh. Ye shall bring out of your habitations two wave loaves of two tenth deals: they shall be of fine flour; *they shall be baked with leaven*: they are the firstfruits unto Yahweh. And ye shall offer with the bread seven lambs without blemish of the first year, and one young bullock, and two rams: they shall be for a burnt offering unto Yahweh, with their meat offering and their drink offerings, even an offering made by fire, of sweet savor unto Yahweh. Then ye shall sacrifice one kid of the goats for a sin offering, and two lambs of the first year for a sacrifice of peace offerings. And the priest shall wave them with the bread of the firstfruits, for a wave offering before Yahweh. with the two lambs: they shall be holy to Yahweh for the priest. And ye shall proclaim on the selfsame day that it may be an holy convocation unto you: ye shall do no servile work therein: it shall be a statute forever in all your dwellings throughout your generations."

## Gospel of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ

## Christianity in the Old Testament continued

Note here some contrasts, which are intended to make clear the different things symbolized. In the Feast of the Firstfruits, the symbolism was that of Jesus Christ resurrected as the Firstfruits from the Dead. Since leaven symbolizes sin, there could not be any leaven in the offerings made on the day of Firstfruits. Along with the sheaf of barley, the Israelite was to offer a he-lamb of the first year, without blemish, as a burnt offering, which symbolized that Jesus Christ offered to pay the penalty of our sins; and there was also to be an offering of fine flour mingled with oil - but not baked into a leavened loaf, nor could any leaven be included in the offering, as Firstfruits must symbolize Jesus Christ who is without sin. But the Feast of Weeks, also called Pentecost, does not directly represent Jesus Christ; it symbolizes the true church, and Jesus Christ's gift of the Holy Spirit to the church. Even the very best of men still have some sins, even when called by Jesus Christ to be part of His church; therefore, the wave-loaves which symbolize the church were made with leaven. Note also that at the Feast of Firstfruits, there was the offering of a sheaf of stalks of barley, each stalk having its head containing many individual grains, and symbolizing the many individuals to whom Jesus Christ brings the gift of life and resurrection. But with the call to form His church, all the believers become part of one body, the church, as Paul points out in *1 Corinthians 10:16-17*, saying: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we, being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread." Therefore, the offering at the Feast of Weeks is no longer of a sheaf containing a multitude of individual grains, but of the wave loaves symbolizing the many believers now become one church.

In fulfillment of this, at the Feast of Weeks, or Pentecost, next following the crucifixion, the Disciples were waiting in Jerusalem in obedience to Jesus Christ's promise and command (*in Luke 24:49*): "And behold, I send the promise of My Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high," and in *Acts 1:8*, "But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto Me, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth." At the Feast of Weeks, the Holy Spirit came upon them, (as set forth in detail in the *second chapter of Acts*) which began the work of the church, men united in their fellowship as parts of the mystic Body of Christ. Remember, this was but the fulfillment of the thing symbolized in the Feast of Weeks, in the Old Testament.

Have we now completed our review of Christianity in the Old Testament? Far from it! Let us now turn to *Isaiah 53:3-7*, which even our various churches all admit refers definitely to Jesus Christ (I will correct a few errors in translation in it): "He is despised and rejected of men; a man of pains and acquainted with sickness: and we hid as it were our faces from Him; He was despised, and we esteemed Him not. Surely, He hath borne our sickness and carried our pain: yet we did esteem Him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But He was wounded for *our* transgressions, He was bruised for *our* iniquities: the chastisement of *our* peace was upon Him, and with His stripes we are healed. All we, like sheep, have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and Yahweh hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all. He was oppressed, and He was afflicted, yet He opened not His mouth: He is brought as a lamb to the slaughter." Indeed, what can the so-called "New Testament" add, which

is not found here? And remember, Isaiah wrote this almost 7-1/2 centuries before it was fulfilled!

How can the clergymen be so blind? Most of them quote this passage from Isaiah, at one time or another; even they preach that it is referring to Jesus Christ; and yet they then preach that the Old Testament set forth a different and false religion which had to be abandoned, to make way for the New Testament and Christianity!

*The Psalms* make many references to Jesus Christ and His work of salvation. *Psalm 2* contains clear reference to Him: "I will declare the decree: Yahweh hath said unto Me, Thou art My Son: this day have I begotten thee. Ask of Me, and I shall give Thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel. Be wise now therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve Yahweh with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest He be angry, and ye perish from the way, when His wrath is kindled but a little." *Psalm 16:9-10* also clearly refers to the resurrection of Jesus Christ: "My flesh also shall rest in hope. For Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell: neither wilt Thou suffer *Thine Holy One* to see corruption." *Psalm 22* is generally admitted to be a prophetic picture of the crucifixion of Jesus Christ. It is too long for me to quote here, but read it for yourself and you will see that it describes the crucifixion.

*Psalm 40:6-10* again prophesies Jesus Christ, as is recognized in *Hebrews 10:5-14*. Don't these "New Testament Christians" ever read the New Testament? Jesus Christ certainly did fulfill these words of *Psalm 40*: "Sacrifice and offering Thou didst not desire; Mine ears hast Thou opened: burnt offering and sin offering hast Thou not required. Then said I, Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of Me, I delight to do Thy will, O my God; yea, Thy law is within My heart. I have preached righteousness in the great congregation: lo, I have not refrained My lips, O Yahweh, Thou knowest. I have not hid Thy righteousness within My heart; I have declared Thy faithfulness and Thy salvation: I have not concealed Thy loving kindness and Thy truth from the great congregation." Again, *Psalm 41:9* is prophetic, saying, "Yea, mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, which did eat of My bread, hath lifted up his heel against Me." In *John 13:18*, Jesus Christ Himself quotes this verse, telling the Disciples that the betrayal by Judas Iscariot is the fulfillment of this Psalm. Also, *Psalm 45:6-7* refers to Jesus Christ, saying: "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: the sceptre of Thy kingdom is a right sceptre. Thou lovest righteousness and hatest wickedness: therefore God, Thy God, hath anointed Thee with the oil of gladness above Thy fellows." This is quoted, word for word, in *Hebrews 1:8-9* as applying to Jesus Christ.

*Psalm 68:18* refers to Jesus Christ's deliverance of the dead from their previous captivity by the powers of evil, saying: "Thou hast ascended on high, Thou hast led captivity captive: Thou hast received gifts for men: yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them." This Psalm is quoted by Paul in *Ephesians 4:7-10*, explaining its reference to Jesus Christ.

*Psalm 69:9*, referring to Jesus Christ's single-minded devotion to doing His Father's will, regardless of the sequences, says, "For the zeal of Thine house hath eaten Me up; and the reproaches of them that reproached Thee are fallen upon Me." *John 2:17* and *Romans 15:3* explain that this verse applied to Jesus Christ. Why don't these

"New Testament Christians" *read* their New Testament, and see that it so frequently refers to the Old Testament for confirmation of its truths?

*Psalm 110:1, 4*, refers to Jesus Christ, saying, "Yahweh said unto my Lord, Sit Thou at My right hand, until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool" and "Yahweh hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek." In *Matthew 22:41-45*, Jesus Christ quoted this Psalm in proof of His divine nature, and Peter also cited it as such proof, in *Acts 2:29-36*; and in Hebrews, Paul quotes it as authority three times, (see *Hebrews 5:6, 6:20*, and all of *chapter 7*). There are also several other identifiable references to Jesus Christ in other *Psalms*, but we have covered that field enough. But before we leave this point, let us note how thoroughly it is explained in the *Book of Hebrews (9:1-12)*: "Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and an earthly sanctuary. For there was a tabernacle made; the first, wherein was the candlestick and the table, and the shewbread, which is called the Sanctuary. And after the second veil, the tabernacle which is called the Holiest of all; which had the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold, wherein was the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tablets of the Covenant: and over it the cherubims of glory, shadowing the mercyseat... Now these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God. But into the second went the High Priest alone, once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself and for the errors of the people... Which was a figure of the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience... But Christ being come, an High Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this creation; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." That is, the religious ordinances of the Old Testament were all symbolic of the true redemption which would be accomplished by Jesus Christ at His first coming.

Now do you see why Paul said in *Galatians 3:24* that "the Law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ"? The first three major parts of the Law, that is, the *Commandments*, the *Statutes*, and the *Judgments*, established rules of conduct which one must follow if his conduct is to be righteous; but we all fall short of such good conduct, and do not gain righteousness by our own actions, and the Law condemns us for this. But the fourth division of the Law, the *Ordinances* which set up all the religious rituals and ceremonies, points out that righteousness can be gained only through the death of another in our place, paying the penalty of our sins; and as we have seen, this clearly symbolized that the real sacrifice, not the mere symbol of it, was that which would be made by Jesus Christ at His first coming, in His crucifixion and resurrection.

We cannot go on forever with our discussion of Christianity in the Old Testament, but there remains one part of it which is as important as all that we have studied thus far: The three Fall Festivals, the Hebrew New Year (Rosh Hashanah), The Day of Atonement (Yom Kippur), and the Feast of Tabernacles, all symbolize the Second Coming of Jesus Christ. Let us now examine these in detail.

The Hebrew day began at sunset. Each month was a lunar month, always beginning with the new moon. Today, we calculate the time when the moon is exactly opposite

from its position at Full Moon, and this is the astronomical New Moon; but the moon is not visible at all on that day: It is too close to the sun to be seen, even at sunset. The Hebrews counted as New' Moon the first day that a thin crescent could be seen just after sunset, and this comes one day later than the day marked "New Moon" on your calendar. So sunset of the day of New Moon of the first month of the year was their New Year's Day. They posted watchers on nearby hilltops or on towers in the cities, to watch for the first glimpse of the thin crescent New Moon; when they saw it, they notified the people of the town by loud shouts, and the people joined in the shouting and blowing of horns. (In fact, we still do something much like this, but we delay our New Year's shouting until midnight.) We find the ordinance governing it in *Numbers 29:1*: "And in the seventh month, on the first day of the month, ye shall have an holy convocation; ye shall do no servile work; it is a day of blowing the trumpets unto you." If you are wondering about this reference to it as "the seventh month," the answer is that the Hebrews had two separate calendar years: one was the *civil* year, commencing with the month Nisan in the spring; the other was the *sacred* year, commencing with the month Tishri, which was the seventh month in the civil year.

On the small scale, the New Year ritual was this: Watchers scanned the heavens, looking there for the sign of the end of one period of time, a year, and the beginning of another. What it symbolized on the great scale is this: We are to watch for the sign in the heavens marking the return of Jesus Christ, ending this age and beginning the next. Christ explained this for us in *Matthew 24:30-32*: "And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory. And He shall send His angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together His elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." As they watched anxiously for the sign of the end of a year, so we watch hopefully for the sign in the heavens which will show us that Jesus Christ is on His way and nearly here, leading the vast armies of heaven, come to overthrow all wickedness and set us free from its power, ending the sinful age in which we have been living and beginning the next age of true and complete righteousness when Jesus Christ shall rule all the earth as King of kings and Lord of lords.

Today, we who really believe His words remain alert to perceive the signs of His second coming, in accordance with His warnings in the *24th chapter of Matthew*: "Watch therefore: for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come Therefore, be ye also ready: for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh." The importance of this sign cannot be overrated, so strongly and repeatedly does the Bible state it. In *Matthew 25:1-13*, Jesus Christ tells the parable of the ten virgins and their lamps, five of them being wise and keeping their lamps not only trimmed but also filled with oil, in readiness for their master's return from His wedding supper; while the other five were foolish and had no oil for their lamps. He concludes this parable by saying, "Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh." And in *Luke 21:34-36*, He also said: "And take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness and cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares. For as a snare shall it come upon all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth. Watch ye therefore, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man." And Paul tells us in *1 Thessalonians 5:4-6*: "But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief. Ye are all the children of light, and the children of the day:

we are not of the night, nor of the darkness. Therefore, let us not sleep, as do others; but let us watch and be sober." And remember, all of this was symbolized by the Hebrew New Year ritual in the Old Testament.

The return of Jesus Christ, which is the dearest hope of the Christian, will not be a source of joy to those who hate Jesus Christ. Both Old and New Testaments alike tell us of His enemies' terror as they see their judgment and punishment coming. *Zechariah 12:10-11*, says: "...and they shall look upon Me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for Him as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for Him, as one is in bitterness for his firstborn. IN THAT DAY SHALL THERE BE A GREAT MOURNING IN JERUSALEM." And *Revelation 6:15-16* adds: "And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman and ever free man, hid themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains; and said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us and hide us from the face of Him that sitteth upon the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb." As the *Book of Revelation* is entirely symbolic, the "mountains and rocks" of which it speaks are the nations and the communities into which the enemies of Jesus Christ have infiltrated. In calling upon these nations and cities to "fall on us and hide us," they will be seeking protection by trying to pass as just ordinary members of these nations and communities, denying any double allegiance to another nation, race, or religion. Some of them have deceived us by this means, and they will try also to deceive God, but without success.

The next Fall Festival was the Day of Atonement, on the tenth day of the Hebrew month Tishri. It was the most solemn of all the festivals, and it carries the deepest symbolism in the entire Bible. But before we can consider it in detail, we must learn the identity of a fallen angel named Azazel (Aw-zaw-zale).

You will not find his name mentioned in your King James Version of the Bible, although it is there in the original Hebrew; and the entire story is not given in the books of the accepted canon of the Bible; so we must turn to the *Book of Enoch* for many of the details. But we start with *Genesis 6:1-4*, as it reads in the Hebrew: "And it comes to pass that mankind (Adamites) have begun to multiply upon the face of the earth, and daughters have been born to them; and sons of God see the daughters of men, that they are fair, and they take to themselves women of all whom they have chosen.. THE FALLEN ONES (Nephilim) were in the earth in those days, and even afterwards when sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they have borne to them - they are the heroes who, from of old, are the men of renown." That is to say, the fallen angels who followed Satan into rebellion were the ones who "left their first estate (or condition)" as we are told in *Jude 6*. Your King James Version Bible says "There were *giants* in the earth in those days," but that is pure mistranslation, as the Hebrew says "The NEPHILIM were in the earth in those days," and the meaning of "Nephilim" is "the fallen ones," obviously the fallen angels who had gone into rebellion under the leadership of Satan.

But *who is "Satan"*? The word "Satan" is not the *name* of any person, but a mere *title*, meaning "the opponent"; he is sometimes called "Lucifer," but this also is only a title, meaning "the shining one," or perhaps "the light bearer." To learn who is the person carrying these titles, we must turn to the *Book of Enoch*, as I have said. In the *sixth chapter of Enoch* it says: "And it came to pass, when the children of men had multiplied, that in those days were born unto them beautiful and comely daughters.

And the angels, the children of the heaven, saw and lusted after them, and said to one another, Come, let us choose us wives from among the children of men, and beget us children." It goes on to list the names of the chief ringleaders among the rebel angels, among whom is one named Azazel.

*Chapter 8 of Enoch* says: "And Azazel taught men to make swords and knives and shields and breastplates, and made known to them the metals of the earth and the art of working them... And there arose much godlessness, and they committed fornication, and they were led astray, and became corrupt in all their ways.. And as men perished, they cried, and their cry went up to heaven." It tells how God sent a committee of four archangels, Michael, Uriel, Raphael and Gabriel, to investigate and report back to Him just how bad conditions really were. In *Chapter 9*, they report: "Thou seest what Azazel hath done, who hath taught all unrighteousness on earth... And the women have borne giants, and the whole earth has thereby been filled with blood and unrighteousness." In *chapter 10*, God orders Raphael to "Bind Azazel hand and foot and cast him into the darkness: and make an opening in the desert which is in Dudael, and cast him therein." Then God pronounces sentence upon Azazel: "The whole earth has been corrupted through the works that were taught by Azazel: TO HIM ASCRIBE ALL SIN," and God commands that Azazel be kept imprisoned in darkness in the pit in the desert, awaiting his final judgment and condemnation.

With this background, knowing who and what Azazel is, we are ready to commence our study of the Day of Atonement. The instructions for the Day of Atonement are found in the *16th, and 23rd chapters of Leviticus*. Usually I read you the Scripture on the point, and then explain it; but if I read it in detail here, just the *16th chapter of Leviticus* alone would take all of my time; so I shall suggest that you read first *Leviticus 23:26-30*, and all of *Leviticus 16*, and we will now study its meaning.

Ordinarily, the High Priest performed his duties dressed in a magnificent embroidered robe, decorated with golden ornaments as well as colored embroidery, and with the golden breastplate set with twelve jewels, each with the name of one of the Tribes of Israel engraved on the jewel. (See *Exodus 28*.) It was the best man could do to indicate the majesty of one who, when so clad, represented the godhood: that is to say, the High Priest when clad in his regular robes of office represented Jesus Christ in all the glory and majesty of God, before He came in the form of a man.

On the Day of Atonement, however, the High Priest laid aside his magnificent robes, bathed, and dressed entirely in white linen, symbolic of sinless purity, thus representing Jesus Christ coming in human form, having for a time laid aside the full majesty of the godhood, and being without sin. (See *Leviticus 16:4*.) But the High Priest was himself a man, with the faults and sins which all men have; so he must cleanse himself of his own sins before he can act out the part of Jesus Christ in the ritual of the Day of Atonement; therefore, he next sacrifices a sin offering on behalf of himself and his household. By this he is cleansed of his sins, and so can play the part of the sinless Christ. (See *Leviticus 16:6, 11, 14*.)

The symbolism of the animal sacrifices offered by individual sinners was clearly this: Realizing that he had sinned, the sinner went to the Temple and offered his sin offering - the death of the animal symbolizing his faith that the death of the real Savior would pay the penalty of his sins. By this, he was cleansed of his sin - that is,

he left the sin and its penalty at the Temple. While the sinner was freed from the penalty, the sin must still be accounted for; so the sins of the people accumulated at the Temple, all through the year. Then, on the Day of Atonement, the Temple contained all the sins of the people for the entire year, and the Temple must be cleansed of these accumulated sins before the rest of the ceremony could be performed. So, after the High Priest had offered the sin offering on behalf of himself and his family, he was ready to make the great atonement for the people. The real meaning of this has been concealed by mistranslation in your King James Version Bible - and, indeed, in many of the modern translations. In the Hebrew, it reads thus:

"And Aaron shall take from the assembly of the Children of Israel two kids of the goats for a sin offering.. and he shall take the two goats and cause them to stand before Yahweh at the door of the Tabernacle. And Aaron shall cast lots over the two goats, one lot for Yahweh, and *one lot for Azazel*; and Aaron shall bring near the goat on which the lot for Yahweh has fallen, and shall make it a sin offering. And the goat on which the lot for Azazel fell he shall cause to stand living before Yahweh, to make atonement by it, to send it away for a goat of departure into the desert... And he shall slaughter the goat of the sin offering which is the people's, and shall take its blood into the inside of the veil... and shall sprinkle it on the mercyseat and at the front of the mercyseat, and he shall make atonement for the sanctuary because of the uncleanness of the Children of Israel and because of their transgressions in all their sins, ...and he shall make atonement for himself, and for his household, and for all the assembly of Israel."

Before we finish this, let us understand this part of it. The High Priest has received from the nation of Israel two goats, and he has cast lots over them, to select one goat for a sin offering to Yahweh God on behalf of all the people, and the other goat is thus selected for Azazel. The goat of the sin offering on behalf of the people is then slaughtered in sacrifice, and the High Priest takes its blood into the Holy of Holies where he sprinkles a little of the blood on and before the mercyseat where Yahweh God sits, thus reminding God that blood has been shed to pay for all the sins of all the people. This symbolizes Jesus Christ offering His own innocent blood, shed to pay for all the sins of all the people who will accept Him as their Savior. In the *Book of Hebrews, chapter 9*, it is explained thus: "Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God. But into the second went the High Priest alone, once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people... But Christ being come an High Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this creation. Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood He entered in once into the Holy Place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, Who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?... Almost all things are by the Law purged with blood; and without the shedding of blood is no remission. It was therefore necessary that the *patterns* of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us: nor yet that He should offer Himself often, as the High Priest entereth into the holy place every year with the blood of others; for

then must He often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the age hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself - So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many..."

Clearly, the sacrifice of the goat as a sin offering on behalf of the people symbolizes Jesus Christ offering His own life as the sacrifice for us, and entering heaven to stand before God to offer the shedding of His own blood as the proof that no blame now remains upon those whom He has thus saved. Christianity? Of course it is! But remember that all this is found in the early part of the Old Testament. God didn't give us a different religion there, nor make any mistakes which needed correction later: He was right the first time and all the time, and He gave us Christianity in all its completeness in the Old Testament.

Next, the High Priest comes out of the Holy of Holies, and he lays aside the plain white linen and resumes his gorgeous robes. This symbolizes Jesus Christ coming again, not as a mere man who could be treated with contempt and murdered, but returning with all the power and glory of God. The High Priest now took the other goat, the one selected for Azazel. *This goat was not sacrificed.* The High Priest laid his hands on the head of this goat and confessed over him all the sins of all the people. *Leviticus 16:21-22* says: "And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the Children of Israel and all their transgressions in all their sins, *putting them upon the head of the goat*, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the desert: and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited: and he shall let go the goat in the desert."

Remember how the *Book of Enoch* reported God's judgment upon Azazel? "Unto Azazel ascribe all sin" - since he had taught men to sin, and had created and ruled the evil conditions which kept them sinning, Azazel must himself bear the full responsibility for all their sins. For him there was no sacrifice to pay his penalty for him: to him the message was, "Here, Azazel, all these sins are yours: You must answer for every one of them."

Again, notice the perfect consistency of Bible symbolism. The goat bears the people's sins, and takes them away into an uninhabited desert. The Bible's doctrine of forgiveness of sin is not merely that God withholds the punishment we have earned: it is that God has removed the sin and all its unclean stain from us, He has *separated us* from our sins. *Psalm 103:12* says, "As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he *removed our transgressions from us.*" The sin and all its consequences are gone from us, and delivered to Azazel for him to bear the consequences of his own misdeeds.

So the Day of Atonement is not just something out of an old religion, superseded now by the new: It is the mystery of Christianity in its purest essence. *Leviticus 16:34* commands, "And this shall be an everlasting statute unto you, to make an atonement for the Children of Israel for all their sins, once a year." While we no longer sacrifice one goat and drive another out into the desert, we are supposed to understand the truth which the ceremony symbolized, and never forget it.

The Hebrew New Year came on the first day of the Hebrew month Tishri, and the Day of Atonement came on the tenth; then on the fifteenth of Tishri began the week-

long Feast of Tabernacles. *Leviticus 23:34-43* gives the rule: "Speak unto the Children of Israel, saying, The 15th day of this 7th month shall be the Feast of Tabernacles for 7 days unto Yahweh. On the 1st day shall be an holy convocation: ye shall do no servile work therein. Seven days shall ye offer an offering made by fire unto Yahweh: on the 8th day shall be an holy convocation unto you; and ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto Yahweh: it is a solemn assembly; and ye shall do no servile work therein.. In the 15th day of the 7th month, when ye have gathered in the fruit of the land, ye shall keep a feast unto Yahweh 7 days: on the 1st day shall be a sabbath, and on the 8th day shall be a sabbath. And ye shall take you on the 1st day the boughs of goodly trees, branches of palm trees, and the boughs of thick trees, and willows of the brook: and *ye shall rejoice before Yahweh your God 7 days*. And ye shall keep it a feast unto Yahweh 7 days in the year. It shall be a statute forever in your generations: ye shall celebrate it in the 7th month. Ye shall dwell in booths seven days; all that are Israelites born shall dwell in booths: that your generations may know that I made the Children of Israel to dwell in booths... when I brought them out of the land of Egypt: I am Yahweh your God."

Now let us consider what this means. Remember that the Israelites were then farmers and stock-raisers: theirs was an entirely agricultural civilization. Very few made a living as merchants; in fact, the same Hebrew word, "ken-ah-an" means both a Canaanite and a merchant - even as it so often is, today! The agricultural year began with the plowing and sowing of seed, and it ended with the completion of the harvests. The last harvest was the grape vintage; and by the time of the Feast of Tabernacles, even this was complete. The farmers had worked hard all the year, and now their labors were finished; they had their crops gathered and stored in their barns; now they could rest and enjoy the fruits of their labors. But the year symbolized the age: We have lived under the curse of a fallen world, and have spent all the age in hard labor; but when Jesus Christ comes the second time, to free the world of its curse and set up the Kingdom of God in all its glory, starting a new age, God has not forgotten our labors: The reward of our good deeds awaits us, just like the farmer's crops stored in his barn: Then we can rest and rejoice.

Of all the festivals, only the Day of Atonement was a somber one; the others were happy, and the Feast of Tabernacles was the most joyous of all. While emphasis was laid upon the people dwelling for seven days in brush shelters, sometimes called "booths," and there was mention made that this was in commemoration of the Exodus from Egypt, where the people were nomads, without any houses, it does not seem that this was the entire significance of it. For one thing, it is associated with the idea of the end of this age - and we know that this age will end in terrible war and devastation; so it may be prophetic of a time to come, when the destruction of cities will again force the survivors to dwell in such temporary shelters as they can find.

But there are some further things about the Feast of Tabernacles we should study. First, the word itself: In the Hebrew there are three words which have all been indiscriminately translated "tabernacle," meaning a tent or temporary, moveable dwelling; but these three words have different meanings. The first is "*chel*," meaning a tent; the second is "*sukkah*," meaning a hut of brush and twigs, a booth; and both of these words mean a *temporary* dwelling-place; but the third is "*mishkan*," meaning a *permanent* dwelling-place. On the Exodus from Egypt, the people were constantly wandering about, and had to dwell in tents (if they were lucky enough to have them) or in booth of brush. In *Hosea 12:9*, God warns us that "I, Yahweh, thy God from the

land of Egypt, will yet make thee to dwell in tabernacles, as in the days of the solemn feast." This reinforces the idea that the command to live in such brush booths for the seven days of the Feast of Tabernacles was prophetic of a coming time when we would again be in flight from disaster, and would have to take what shelter we could get. We will come back to the meaning of these words a little later.

There is one further significant thing about the Feast of Tabernacles: It came right after the last harvest (that of the grape vintage) was completed. In *Matthew 13:38-41*, Jesus Christ explains the parable of the tares sown among the wheat, saying: "The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the Kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one; the enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the age; and the reapers are the angels. As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this age. The Son of Man shall send forth His angels and they shall gather out of His kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire." We know that the coming end of the age is with the final World War, including the Battle of Armageddon, and this is the process of gathering out all the wicked for destruction. Other prophets have written of it as the Harvest of the Vine of the Earth; for example, *Joel 3:13*, "Put ye in the sickle, for the harvest is ripe: come, get you down, for the winepress is full, the vats overflow; for their wickedness is great." The idea is completed in *Revelation 14:14-19*: "And I looked, and behold, a white cloud, and upon the cloud One sat like unto the Son of Man, having on His head a golden crown, and in His hand a sharp sickle. And another angel came out of the Temple, crying with a loud voice to Him that sat upon the cloud, Thrust in Thy sickle, and reap: for the time is come for Thee to reap; for the harvest of the earth is ripe. And He that sat upon the cloud thrust in His sickle on the earth; and the earth was reaped. And another angel came out of the Temple which is in heaven, he also having a sharp sickle. And another angel came out from the altar, which had power over fire; and he cried with a loud voice to him that had the sharp sickle, saying, Thrust in thy sharp sickle, and gather the clusters of the Vine of the Earth, for her grapes are fully ripe. And the angel thrust in his sickle into the earth and gathered the Vine of the Earth, and cast it into the great winepress of the wrath of God." Certainly, no rest for us, no enjoyment of our reward, is possible until the harvest removes from us the wicked who have ruined our every effort to build the Kingdom of God during this Age. So the symbolism of the Feast of Tabernacles, coming right after the harvest, and marking the first time in the year when we have had time and opportunity to enjoy the fruits of our own labors, is fully consistent with the other portions of the Bible which develop other parts of the same basic idea.

Now, to get back to the meaning of "tabernacle," there was a minor fulfillment in the birth of Jesus Christ, which occurred on *October 4*, 4 B.C. on the first day of the Feast of Tabernacles. No, He was *not* born on December 25th, for that is only an old pagan holiday, celebrating the Winter Solstice, which can be traced back to at least 2000 B.C. in Egypt. The real Christmas Day is October 4th. In *John 1:1, 14*, we read that "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God... And the Word became flesh, and *did tabernacle among us*, and we beheld His glory, glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." He came to live among us in the form of a mortal man only temporarily, so it is said that He "*tabernacled* among us." But the *great* fulfillment is yet to come, when He comes to remain forever among us, in fulfillment of the rest of the prophecy in both Old and New Testaments. First in *Leviticus 26: 11-12*, where God says, "I will set My

tabernacle among you (and here the word is "mishkan," My *permanent* dwelling-place); and My soul shall not abhor you. And I will walk among you and will be your God, and ye shall be My people." So in fulfillment of this is again prophesied in *Revelation 21:3*, saying: "And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people, and God Himself shall be with them, and be their God." Here, the word translated "tabernacle" is the Greek word "skene," which, like the Hebrew "mishkan," means a *permanent* dwelling-place.

So, we have reviewed the Old Testament, and found it to be as fully a Christian book as is the New Testament; just as we have on another occasion shown that the New Testament is as fully an Israel book as is the Old Testament. And while we are about it, let us correct that false use of the word "testament," meaning the written Will by which a dying man leaves his property to others. But the words used correctly mean "a *covenant*," that is, a solemn contract or agreement between two or more persons. This correct usage makes sense, and is consistent with all the Bible has to say about it. God made His covenant with Abraham, and God never breaks His word. So the Bible tells us, in *Jeremiah 31:31-33*: "Behold the days come, saith Yahweh, that I will make a new covenant with the House of Israel and with the House of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which My covenant they broke, although I was an husband unto them, saith Yahweh: but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the House of Israel: after those days, saith Yahweh, *I will put My law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be My people.*" The only change is from a rigid code of laws which are followed just to the letter and no more, to a code which God has written in the hearts of His people so that they now obey Him willingly, out of love, not out of compulsion and fear. But it is the same covenant, dealing with the same laws. In *Hebrews 8:8-10*, this passage from *Jeremiah* is quoted exactly, showing that the "New Covenant" is merely the Old Covenant written in the people's hearts. There is no way the preachers can twist this into a repudiation of the Old Testament, or more correctly "Old Covenant"; indeed, it is the clearest kind of affirmation of it as being right and good from the very beginning. True, our ancestors and ourselves have frequently violated it, on our part; but God was always faithful to His word, and the only change to a New Covenant is one which will make us also faithful to our promise to obey Him and be His people.

So, as we have told you many times on this program, there is as much Christianity in the Old Testament as in the New; and as much Israel in the New Testament as in the Old. Both Testaments are but the two halves of one, consistent Book, written by one God, Who is always truthful and consistent; He knew the end from the beginning; He made no mistakes and no failures; He has no need to abandon anything nor make a new start. In the beginning, only His chosen prophets fully understood His message - and, indeed, that has always been true; but with the passing of time, the message was more clearly unfolded for the people in general - but it was always the same message throughout the *entire Book*: that the Israelites are God's people, and that He provided Christian salvation and redemption for them, despite their sins, so that He could make good all of His wonderful promises to His people.

**The End**

