

SWEETGOSPELHARMONY.COM

PART V AND PART VI:

Gospel and Covenant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

title page / table of contents 1 - 2

<i>Part V: The Gospel</i>		Wrongly dividing the word of truth	p. 54
		Breaking down the wall of separation	p. 55
The Gospel	p. 3	Blessing Abraham	p. 56
Putting the Gospel front and center	p. 4	The works of Abraham	p. 57
The narrative of power / the power of example	p. 5	Father Abraham	p. 58
How much is "all"?	p. 7	Origin of the Secret Rapture Doctrine	p. 59
To whom Good News is bad	p. 8	Rothschild ambition	p. 63
Gender equality	p. 10	Let's you and him fight	p. 64
The Little Flock	p. 14	The Zionist Bomb	p. 64
A threefold Gospel witness	p. 15	More about Baruch	p. 66
The witness of Philip, the evangelist	p. 16	Winston Churchill	p. 70
Peter, the evangelist	p. 18	Quote without comment	p. 73
Hellenization	p. 21	God's Zionism or Man's?	p. 74
Paul	p. 21	Proxy Zionism	p. 77
Mother Mary	p. 24	The hidden roots of proxy Zionism	p. 79
Barnabas	p. 24	Blackstone's memorial	p. 82
Obey? Obey not!	p. 25	Charles Taze Russell	p. 82
Was the author of Hebrews in exile?	p. 27	Simon bar Kokhba	p. 83
Community/Congregation/Church	p. 28	Temple envy	p. 84
<i>Ekklesia</i> : the way out	p. 28	The rise of Islam	p. 85
		The third Temple	p. 86
<i>Part VI: The Abrahamic Covenant and its contradictions</i>		Occult faith	p. 89
Covenant	P. 32	The mark of the beast	p. 90
To Abraham, God said	p. 34	Triumphalism	p. 92
He will be mindful of His Covenant	p. 38	The Temple within	p. 93
Qualified promises to qualified people	p. 38	Judaism is not spelled with a "Z"	p. 97
The narrow way	p. 40	Genociding the children of Israel	p. 100
Continuity or discontinuity	p. 40	The Jews of Iraq	p. 102
"Nazarene" means "Branch"	p. 43		
Defining "Israel"	p. 45	Two prodigal sons, one prodigious father	p. 105
New Genetic Study	P. 51		
Ingathering of the dispossessed	p. 53	Bibliography	p. 105

FEAR NOT THE PATH OF TRUTH
FOR WANT OF TRAVELERS THERE.

– A MIDDLE EASTERN PROVERB

The Gospel

The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light:
they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon
them hath the light shined. *(Isaiah 9:2)*

darkness at noon

As if existing under a dark cloud, the Holy Land in Jesus' day was a place where illness was chronic, where poverty was endemic, where injustice reigned supreme. It was a place where the folk, like sheep without a shepherd, were herded about, harried by ravenous wolves, namely, their leaders. Such was captive Israel's sorry plight, its synagogues dominated by Pharisees, its Temple by Sadducees, while a pagan king sat upon the throne. Their problems went beyond the usual political, financial or religious ones, for spiritual oppression – even demonic possession – ran rampant throughout the land. 2000 years had elapsed since God had covenanted with Abraham. Was that it? Was this as good as it gets? Now nearly 2000 years more have elapsed. It is high time that we do some serious stocktaking.

A new day dawning

How beautiful upon the mountains
are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings,
that publisheth peace;
that bringeth good tidings of good,
that publisheth salvation;
that saith unto Zion, Thy God reigneth! (Isaiah 52:7)

Uniquely it was Israel's mission to receive God's Anointed One, the Messiah. To that end Jesus was born in Bethlehem. But all did not go according to plan. While the common folk heard him gladly, the leadership did not, which is why of a necessity Jesus lived his first 30 years in obscurity, albeit he was in plain view. On being revealed to the nation by John, Jesus said:

. . . the kingdom of God is at hand, repent ye, and believe the gospel. (Mark 1:15)

As one who was fulfilling the signs required of the Messiah, Jesus said:

. . . the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear,
the dead are raised, to the poor the gospel is preached. (Luke 7:22)

It made no difference to the powers-that-be what Jesus did. If he performed miracles they cynically accused him of doing so by the power of Beelzebub. Jesus responded in kind by accusing them of committing the unpardonable sin, that of blaspheming the Holy Spirit. For sure, he had to keep on the move for thereafter he was on the religious mafia's permanent hit list. Finally, setting his face toward Jerusalem, Jesus perfected his redeeming work from a stake of impalement. Then up from the grave he arose.

PUTTING THE GOSPEL FRONT AND CENTER

Justin Martyr spoke of the community of believers as gathering on the first day of the week to read aloud the *Memoirs of the Apostles*. Where were they gathering? Not in buildings, whether called "churches" or "synagogues," specially dedicated to worship; rather, in the homes of individual believers where the Gospel was read and discussed. By taking seriously God's word, by applying it as best they knew how, they experienced God's presence.

By 1st century's end, despite persecution, from home to home the Gospel spread throughout the world, from India to the British Isles and beyond. A professional religious caste, not needed, thank you. Denominationalism, not needed, thank you. Sacraments and ceremonials not needed, thank you. The Gospel is wonderfully sublime. It needs no amendment.

To summarize: Jesus' followers *saw*, they *heard*, they *read*. What they saw were mighty deeds; what they heard were wise teachings and to this, both words and deeds, they applied the prophetic scriptures. And all of this they made known to us. And we do well to take heed thereto for we are assured that in doing so the day star will arise in our hearts. To reiterate: if we will give Jesus time enough to speak to us long enough, a light within us will be kindled which light will lend credibility to our witness, that being not to ourselves, but, rather, to the Lord.

Whereas Protestant church services are largely built around the sermon, Catholic church services are largely built around the Eucharist. But the primitive community of believers built their communal worship around service and the Gospel record:

And the wealthy among us help the needy; and we always keep together; and for all things wherewith we are supplied, we bless the Maker of all through His Son Jesus Christ, and through the Holy Ghost. And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits; then, when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs, and exhorts to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray, and, as we before said, when our prayer is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings, according to his ability, and the people assent, saying Amen; and there is a distribution to each, and a participation of that over which thanks have been given, and to those who are absent a portion is sent by the deacons. And they who are well to do, and willing, give what each thinks fit; and what is collected is deposited with the president, who succors the orphans and widows and those who, through sickness or any other cause, are in want, and those who are in bonds and the strangers sojourning among us, and in a word takes care of all who are in need.

(Justin Martyr, his First Apology to the Roman Senate c. 150 AD)

The *Memoirs of the Apostles* to which Justin Martyr makes reference above is not the four canonical gospels, rather a harmony of the synoptic gospels which harmony included the *Gospel According to the Hebrews*. Neither the *Memoirs* nor the *Hebrew Gospel*, so far as we know, has survived to our day, except in isolated quotes, but thanks to the survival of another, related document, the *Nazarene Gospel Narrative* (which text made it down to our time in one, mediaeval manuscript), we can recover much of Justin Martyr's text.

THE NARRATIVE OF POWER / THE POWER OF PERSONAL EXAMPLE

Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the YHVH of hosts. (Zechariah 4:6)

Presenting himself as Israel's rightful King, Jesus appointed twelve men to rule Israel's

twelve tribes. But instead of being crowned king, he was crucified, his bona fide offer rejected. Before that happened, he had already moved on in his thinking to plan “B”:

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

Initially Jesus went to the lost sheep of the House of Israel. Only after every institution of Jewish corporate life had failed – the Davidic kingship, the Aaronic priesthood, the Synagogue – did he move on to Plan “B.” Rather than his trying to reform, revitalize, or replace any of the aforementioned institutions – Jesus adopted as his fallback position, not something new, but something quite **old**. Instead of establishing a “new,” replacement Israel or any such thing, Jesus put the focus back where it had been originally, on a one-on-one, faith relationship between man and his Maker which is how it all began with Abraham. His larger objective: to take the Abrahamic Covenant to a higher level with the middle wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles removed. To Abraham’s spiritual, not physical, heirs he looked:

I [Jesus] say unto you, that many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven. But the children of the kingdom shall be cast into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. (Matthew 8:11-12)

With that pronouncement, the Abrahamic Covenant from the divine perspective ceased to be the Tribal Jewish Project it had once been. By reaching out to those of other races, religions, economic and social backgrounds, and especially to the dispossessed (as it were, to the untouchables), Jesus set the tone for how to conduct redemptive fellowship, helping us to see possibilities where others before had only seen impossibilities. To that end, Jesus turned to the last remaining bastions of human decency: the individual believer, the sanctified family, and the faithful community. In doing so, he effectually *deconstructed* the narrative of power, replacing it instead with a radical egalitarianism, that being the power of personal example which yields no ground to the usual divisive dichotomies: male/female, rich/poor, Jew/barbarian. Nor should it surprise us that a universal religion would be established on a foundation of universal respect. Setting the tone for inclusion, Jesus elevated for purposes of illustration one from a despised ethnic group, a Samaritan, whose compassion for a wounded wayfarer contrasted sharply with that of a Levite who passed over on the far side of the road.

This, then, is the “East”-ness and the “West”-ness of it all, that the true Israel of God cannot help but witness to the Light in others, notwithstanding cultural divides or divergence of tradition, for no one people has a monopoly on pious impulses. But if no one ethnic group or religion has a monopoly on the Good, the True, or the Beautiful what of those burdened by a “Chosen People Complex,” who suppose that every other culture, religion, or sect – except their own – is lacking in merit? Rest assured, none of this will sit too well with them.

And yet the truth remains, the Gospel of Jesus Christ dictates that our happiness depends on our seeking the happiness of others – and that this attitude must be universally applied. Meanwhile, to Abraham’s unbelieving, bloodline descendants, Jesus addressed these uncompromising words:

The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and
given to a people bringing forth the fruits thereof. *(Matthew 22:43)*

The good news Jesus proclaimed affirms God’s character, that God is Light, that in him is no darkness whatsoever. It further affirms that God, a loving father, has established one mediator between God and man, the man, Christ Jesus (this is a big NO! to hierarchical religion.) As well, the good news is about the freedom that is ours in Jesus Christ (this is a big YES! to individual autonomy.)

In Jesus Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, neither male nor female; rather, we are all in this together as brothers and sisters. Hence, the good news is one of inclusion, that instead of abolishing the Abrahamic Covenant, Jesus expanded and revitalized it so that people everywhere might yet say “Father Abraham!” When Jewish tribalism is subsumed into Gospel universalism, a hopeful, life-affirming message emerges for humanity. Jesus’ Gospel is about neighborliness, peaceableness, and good works for all.

What’s the good news? That our Savior was not untouched by human infirmity but, rather, drank to the dregs our every woe. He tasted death for every man, he:

Who in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him for death, and was heard in that he feared; . . . *(Hebrews 5:7)*

HOW MUCH IS “ALL”?

Master, what good must I do to live? He said to him: Man, do the law and the prophets. He answered him: I did. He said to him, go, sell all that you possess and divide it among the poor and come follow me. But the rich man began to scratch his head and it did not please him. And the Lord said to him: Is it not written in the law: Love your neighbor as yourself? And see, many of your brothers, sons of Abraham, are covered with dung, dying from hunger, and your house is filled with many good things, and absolutely nothing goes out of it to them. And he turned to Simon his disciple who sat with him and said to him: Simon, son of Jona, it is easier for a camel to pass through an eye of a needle than for a rich man into the kingdom of heaven.

(Gospel of the Hebrews)

The rich man wants to absolve himself of guilt by punctilious observance, touch all the bases and be justified was the informing idea. But what if the Law doesn’t exist for that purpose? What if the Law exists for man, not man for the Law? That would seem to be the clear logical extension of Jesus’ saying that the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the

Sabbath. But we don't need to conjecture about this. Jesus said:

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.
This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy
neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets."

(Matthew 22:37-40)

If the Law and the Prophets exist for us, not we for them, then for us to divorce God's commandments from neighborly concern and practical human need is a travesty. Since human need is endless, we can never say, as did the man above, "I did."

Of like import then is Jesus' Great Commission, to:

Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. (Mark 16:15)

How great is "all"? *all* the world socially, *all* the world culturally, *all* the world environmentally, *all* the world educationally, *all* the world economically? What limits dare we place on "all"? Jesus' followers were not called to be the salt of the prayer meeting or the light of the Church steeple but "the salt of the earth" and "the light of the world?"

The good news is not just that Jesus died to make men holy; he also died to set men free. As the Physician of souls *and* bodies, he came to treat the whole man, opening the eyes of those born blind, as well, opening darkened minds, releasing humankind from bondage of every kind, be it broken hearts or broken bones. Let the captives go free! As he said in his first sermon in Nazareth:

The Spirit of YHVH is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of YHVH. (Luke 4:18)

TO WHOM GOOD NEWS IS BAD NEWS

Rather than lighten the Torah's yoke, from sunrise to sunset, the rabbis vexed the people with all manner of strict obedience, stamping upon their minds the six hundred and thirteen laws with their explanations and the explanations of the explanations, numbering sixty times six hundred and thirteen. Only a person of means could have coped with all these pseudo-obligations and imaginary duties. For that reason, it was commonly supposed that only rich folk could be pleasing to God. Truly the masters of the Law had lain upon the backs of the poor burdens grievous to be borne which they themselves touched not even with one finger.

By contrast, Jesus proclaimed his yoke was easy, his burden light. Thus when Jesus denounced the "wisdom of the elders" as making God's Law of no effect, it was the rabbis be-

loved “oral law,” their *Mishnah*, which he was speaking against, that being their justification for lording it over their fellow man.

When Jesus spoke against titles of nobility, he took aim not just at the pronouncement of words but the practices behind them. Thus to those who be his followers, Jesus said:

But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. And call no man your Father, which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is our Master, even Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant.

(*Matthew 23: 8-11*)

But that was as nothing compared to Jesus’ throwing open the shuttered doors of Jewish exclusivity, extending to all a royal welcome, be they Samaritans or Greeks, Hottentots or Eskimos. This directly impinged on the Jewish merchant class’s prerogatives for, functionally speaking, the only bible they had to inform their religious sensibilities was two brief verses:

Moreover of the offspring of the alien residents who sojourn among you, of them shall ye purchase, and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land: and they shall be your possession. And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your slaves for ever: but over your brethren the children of Israel, ye shall not rule one over another with rigor. (*Leviticus 25:44-45*)

As well, Jesus upended the counting tables on the predatory, loan-sharking financiers whose truncated bible consisted of only two verses drawn from *Deuteronomy*:

Thou shalt not lend upon usury to thy brother; usury of money, usury of victuals, usury of any thing that is lent upon usury: unto a stranger thou mayest lend upon usury; but unto thy brother thou shalt not lend upon usury: . . . (*Deuteronomy 23:19-20*)

Cutting through all the convoluted formulations of Law as promulgated by the rabbis, Jesus, quoting *Leviticus 19:18*, said: “thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself,” which begs the question “who is our neighbor?” In his parable about the good Samaritan, Jesus provides the answer, the next person whom we meet.

In announcing that he had come to “preach deliverance to the captives” did Jesus mean to limit this only to those in spiritual bondage? Was there no social application? Be assured, Jesus was also out to change the moral climate, to make usury and trafficking in slaves unacceptable and the Jewish Establishment knew it. All over the Roman Empire, Jewish merchants and financiers, the Empire’s leading purveyors of slaves and capital, were growing rich by plying their respective trades in human cargo and money bondage with some of their ill-gotten gains being plowed back into the Temple treasury to buy absolution through ani-

mal sacrifice. As we know, the Pharisees already didn't like Jesus because he represented a threat to their moral authority but why did the Temple's authorities who were Sadducees also hate him? Because Jesus' Golden Rule, to do unto others as you would have others do unto you, represented a direct threat to their Rule of Gold. The Temple priesthood had been bought and sold as if they were just so many plantation darkies.

By breaking down the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile, Jesus abolished the hostility inherent in the us/them, Jew/Gentile paradigm. Whither then *Leviticus 25:44-45*? Whither then *Deuteronomy 23:19-20*? They were left in abeyance. This organized Jewry begrudged him and holds against him to this day, for not only has his Gospel touched their wallets by de-legitimizing slavery and usury, it also de-legitimized the very concept that might makes right. Whenever Gospel values are honored: kindness, neighborliness, and friendliness, it is an unspoken rebuke of the Jewish Establishment which is then forced to operate more in the shadows than would otherwise be so, lest its predatory practices be seen for what they are, shameful and evil. Deceptive talk about "Judeo-Christian values" fills the air these days, yet the values of Jesus and of Pharisaism are diametrically opposed. Jesus' values and the world's are diametrically opposed. Paraphrasing C. K. Chesterton:

The Gospel was not tried and found wanting; rather,
the Gospel was found difficult, therefore not tried.

GENDER EQUALITY

"Even now my mother the Holy Spirit took me and carried me up unto the great mountain Thabor."

(Gospel of the Hebrews)

In Aramaic, the word for "Spirit" is of the feminine gender. Beyond the grammatical issue, however, is the fact that God is both Father and Mother. As well, Jesus possessed not only masculine attributes but also feminine attributes, even going so far as to compare himself to a mother hen who tenderly gathers her chicks under her wings.

My brethren, have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of Glory, with respect of persons. . . .

But if ye have respect of persons, ye commit sin, and are convicted of the law as transgressors.

(James 2:1, 9)

Although the Epistle's supporting example above has to do with that of the rich acting prejudicially against the poor, the underlying principle applies equally to the male/female dichotomy or to any other social divide as would artificially limit spiritual fellowship or freedom. Baptism, however, is our entre into a new moral realm where we rise above the making of invidious, biological distinctions. As Clement of Alexandria wrote c. 180 AD:

. . . men and women share equally in perfection, and are to receive the same instruction and the same

discipline. For the name "humanity" is common to both men and women; and for us "in Christ" is neither male nor female.

It must be conceded, among churchmen Clement of Alexandria was the exception, that, in fact, most of his colleagues from his days to ours, as a matter of principle, have subordinated the interests and talents of women to the interests of a male hierarchy. But this is not the way it was in the beginning, for, as part of the new Gospel order, the home, not the synagogue, became God's appointed place of worship. The home, being the nexus for faith, culture, and civility, is where friends meet, where life happens. In the classical world, it was traditional for men to dominate in a public setting, but not so in the home. Thus, when Jesus elevated the home over public or institutional settings, one consequence was that of his elevating the status of women.

On finding Jesus engaged in a well-side conversation with a Samaritan woman, his disciples became indignant. What was it that was disturbing to them? that she was a woman? a Samaritan? or that she had been married five times? Maybe it was that Jesus was upsetting the norms of society. However that may be, in imparting knowledge to her, a woman, Jesus was tacitly empowering her, for knowledge is the pathway to respect and equality.

Most challenging to the disciples was Jesus' relationship with Mary Magdalene, for by appearing first to the Magdalene after his resurrection and telling her to tell his other disciples that he had risen, Jesus, in effect, had made her his apostle to his apostles. Thus did he turn patrilineal Judaism on its ear for a qualified woman is competent to lead, not just follow. In raising her status to equal theirs, he turned patrilineal Judaism on its ear and re-balanced the gender relationship.

One of the more curious documents fashioned by the institutional Church in the 2nd century was the *Apostolic Church Order* in which the apostle John is depicted as saying:

When the Master blessed the bread and the cup and signed them with the words, "This is my body and blood," he did not offer it to the women who are with us. Martha said, "He did not offer it to Mary, because he saw her laugh." Mary said, "I no longer laugh; he said to us before, as he taught, 'Your weakness is redeemed through strength.'" (*Apostolic Tradition* 18:3)

Mary Magdalene is portrayed as failing to have carried her point about female redemption, after which the male disciples are alleged to have disallowed women from becoming priests. Along this line, speaking for the vast majority of his colleagues, Tertullian (ca. 150-225 AD), enunciated the position ever since upheld by Catholicism and by Orthodoxy:

It is not permitted for a woman to speak in the church, nor is it permitted for her to teach, nor to baptize,

nor to offer [the Eucharist], nor to claim for herself a share in any masculine function - least of all, in priestly office.

In another place, Tertullian states ever so biliously:

These heretical women - how audacious they are! They have no modesty; they are bold enough to teach, to engage in argument, to enact exorcisms, to undertake cures, and it may be, even to baptize!

(De Virginibus Velandis 9)

Oh, horror of horrors, even to baptize! What will those uppity women think of next! Evidently the idea of a woman serving in a priestly capacity was enough to send someone of Tertullian's dyspeptic disposition into a complete tailspin. But on the 6th day of the Passover, while Jesus was supping with Lazarus, it was the Magdalene who:

. . . took a pound of greatly precious ointment, and anointed Jesus' head and feet as he sat at the meal: and all the house was full of its sweetness.

(Nazarene Gospel Narrative, ch. 81)

By Mosaic provision, it was the High Priest's place to anoint Israel's King. But it was the Magdalene who fulfilled this function. Of her anointing, Jesus said:

. . . her deed shall be spoken of over all the world wherever the Good Tidings are proclaimed.

(Nazarene Gospel Narrative, ch. 81)

Who ever the Spirit inspires is divinely ordained to speak.

(Pistas Sophia 36:71)

And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak with other tongues. I will pour out my spirit on all flesh . . . Your sons and your daughters shall prophesy.

(Acts, chapter 2)

The question arises, how did we get from all down to just some? When it came to equality between Jewish and Gentile believers, Paul was fierce the way a mother bear is fierce in defending her cubs:

But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?

(Galatians 2:11-14)

The operative word above is *compel*, "why *compellest* thou?" Here Paul displays an excellent grasp of the importance of maintaining strictist equality. In this he was straight and true

but when it came to gender equality, he retreats from the same standard. (This is assuming that Paul, and not some 2nd century Church editor, wrote the following):

Let your women keep silence in the assemblies: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the assembly. What? came the word of God out from you? or came it unto you only? If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord.

(I Corinthians 14:34-37)

Paul, why would you *compel* the ladies to be silent? That's not right. The Spirit is where the Spirit goes. A Spirit-filled lady has as much right to be heard as you or I do. Was there not anyone to stand up to Paul, even as he withstood Peter to his face? If not, too bad, for I believe he could have used correcting in this matter. A larger-than-life personality, Paul might have been an awkward sort of fellow to confront. Nonetheless, an important principle was at stake and it matters not from whom it was in need of defending, for it is not according to the truth of the Gospel to condemn an entire class of people (women) instead of dealing with individuals on a case-by-case basis.

If the report in *Acts* is to be accepted, and I know no reason not to, then James extended to Paul the right hand of fellowship. No doubt he saw Paul's good side, his deep commitment, his sincerity. If he had reservations, and there's no record that he did, he probably kept them to himself. There is no record of Paul and the Magdalene as ever having met. Had they done so, she might have set him straight on a few matters. By the way, whether it be Peter or Paul, just because a person happens to be an apostle or a pillar of the community, doesn't automatically make for infallibility. That holds true for the Magdalene, for James, for anyone. Everything stands or falls on its merits, not on who said it. Divine principle trumps human say-so. Always. Test all things, eschew evil, do good.

Meanwhile, one of the finest formulations of equality is Paul's, who wrote:

There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.

(Galatians 4:28)

As for the basis for equality, Paul plainly tells us, it is baptism which water symbolizes and Christ exemplified. Of baptismal unity, he wrote:

For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.

(Galatians 3:27-29)

THE LITTLE FLOCK

“Fear not little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom.” (Luke 12:32)

In deconstructing the narrative of power, Jesus freed up local, small-scale, Christian societies from centralizing bureaucratic constraints that they might proceed unhindered with ministries of reconciliation and encouragement. The breaking of bread from home to home is qualitatively different from what happens in a congregational setting. Whereas one involves a face-to-face coming together as a society of friends, the other involves a crowd passively gazing upon the backs of strangers while looking forward to a raised platform from which professional clergy minister. It is true, the sound of congregational singing is liable to be more impressive than what might emanate from a home and it's true that a professional platform speaker is liable to be more eloquent than a home speaker. Therein lies a choice, to go with what is most outwardly impressive or else with what is most conducive of individual growth. It's not as though congregating, *per se*, was anything to be ashamed of. It's just that Jesus sanctioned his little flock.

Albeit modest in scope, Jesus' approach is revolutionary in its potential to exercise moral authority through force of personal example. Let us not rue the day of small deeds or good examples. As leaven infiltrates dough, so also does the fellowship which Jesus envisioned quietly infiltrates society, spreading contagiously from individual to individual and from home to home. The disciples went house to house breaking bread because the home is the last bastion and truly appropriate place of assembly.

Once each home is the source of its own discipline and generates its own traditions, then there exists on a practical level the basis for diversity. Unlike a sect or congregation, a community of autonomous homes can tolerantly accept a diversity of paths. Only in such an environment can Jews be Jews, Gentiles, Gentiles, with equality of fellowship between them, as Jesus' generous universalism transcends every form of boundary-setting sectarianism. Pray, sing, dance, break bread, read, converse, be it highly structured or spontaneous, jovial or solemn, it all depends on the tradition of the particular home and the inclinations of those present. Expressing this, the freedom that is ours in Jesus Christ, Paul wrote:

How is it then, brethren? when ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying. (*II Corinthians 14:26*)

If we've learned anything over the last 2000 years, it is that God does not indwell organizations but the Life of God is in the heart of man.

A THREEFOLD GOSPEL WITNESS

That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, . . . For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard. *(I John 1:3, Acts 4:20)*

“Witnessing, ” a term employed commonly enough in Christian circles, is usually applied to a personal witness, as for instance: “The Lord washed me of all my sins.” At times such declarations are credible; at other times, they are best taken with a grain of salt. The Greek word for “witness” is “martyr,” martyrdom being we know serious business. But I am not speaking about a personal testimony, however credible, rather, a Gospel witness to Jesus:

For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eyewitnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honor and glory, when there came such a voice [i.e., ear-witness] to him from the majestic glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount. We have also a more sure word of prophecy [i.e., prophetic witness]; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts: . . . *(II Peter 1:16-19)*

Since we are neither eye-witnesses nor ear-witnesses, we have to go by written evidence. Does conviction steel over us that this is the real deal and not just someone’s overactive imagination? Can we affirm that this is as it was? Let us keep in mind, this is suppose to be about real events, not “cunningly devised fables.” To summarize: Jesus’ followers *saw*, they *heard*, they *read*. What they saw were mighty deeds; what they heard were wise teachings and to this they add the study of Scripture, the latter being “a more sure word of prophecy.” Said Paul, who, like us, was no eye-witness but who did have access to the prophetic word:

I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come: that Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should show light unto the people, and to the Gentiles. *(Acts 26:22-23)*

Said Peter to Cornelius’s household:

And we are witnesses of all things which he did both in the land of the Jews, and in Jerusalem; whom they slew and hanged on a tree: him God raised up the third day, and shewed him openly; not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead. And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead. To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins. *(Acts 10:39-43)*

THE WITNESS OF PHILIP, THE EVANGELIST

In *Acts of the Apostles* (8: 26-40) the story is told with few extra trimmings of a certain Ethiopian higher-up in the court of Ethiopia's Queen who goes unnamed. He was wending his way back home from Jerusalem, when, on the road north of Gaza, he encountered Philip who had just dropped in out of the blue, literally, having departed Samaria on the fly. Immediately he espied the aforementioned Ethiopian traveling by chariot. Approaching, Philip saw that he was reading the Scriptures and inquired:

"Understandest thou what thou readest?"

Said the Ethiopian:

"How can I, except some one shall guide me?"

The Ethiopian wasn't comprehending and was honest enough to admit it. His problem was not so a dearth of information so much as having too much information. He had just left Jerusalem, his ears full of grasshoppers from contact with learned Temple scholars whose guidance proved to be little more than *mis-guidance*. Despite a long pilgrimage, the Ethiopian was returning home a disappointed man, his questions unanswered. Philip, too, had recently left Jerusalem, the difference being that he was fleeing for his very life. It was time to get out of Dodge. The Temple authorities had contracted with a zealous young ruffian named Saul who was hellbent to get anyone he could lay hands on. Having just participated in the stoning death of Philip's colleague, Stephen, Paul, breathing further threats of violence, was raring to take on the whole Nazarene movement for committing the heinous crime of naming the name of Jesus as their Savior. Albeit undeterred in his vocation, Philip prudently headed northward to Samaria where a great revival broke forth. Then, on the Spirit's prompting, Philip, suddenly departed southward from Samaria, for the desert area north of Gaza where he espied the aforementioned Ethiopian traveling along by chariot.

The book the Ethiopian was studying when his and Philip's paths had crossed was that of *Isaiah*, namely, that part which reads:

He was led as a sheep to the slaughter; and like a lamb dumb before his shearer, so opened he not his mouth: in his humiliation his judgment was taken away: and who shall declare his generation? for his life is taken from the earth.

Inquired the Ethiopian of Philip:

"Of whom speaketh the prophet this? of himself, or of some other man?"

That was all the lead-in Philip needed. The Ethiopian possessed the Scriptures but not the key that opens them and that is where Philip could be helpful, for he possessed, as it

were, the key, that being the good news of the life and teachings of our Lord. Without our knowing all the details, it's safe to say that a wide-ranging conversation ensued because the Ethiopian came around to asking Philip:

"See here is water; what doeth hinder me to be baptized?"

Evidently nothing hindered for, in reply to his question, Philip said:

"If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest."

Affirmed the Ethiopian:

"I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God."

Just like that, a done deal. Not deputized by some higher religious authority, Philip of his own volition, guided by the Spirit's prompting, was competent to preach and to baptize. No creed, no catechism, no period of investigation was required of the Ethiopian, just faith. Neither time or place were at issue; any body of water would do. Such were the ways of the Nazarenes: their ordinances were simple, their teachings public, their standard for fellowship: heartfelt allegiance to God alone.

And they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him.

Afterward, the Ethiopian went his way rejoicing and why not, since he had not been put on a mailing list, inducted into a tithe-collecting church, nor did he even have to climb, climb up sunshine mountain where heavenly breezes blow. He was home free and free to go home, unencumbered by obligations to a hierarchical institution.

How can we explain the Samaritans', as well the Ethiopian's immediate embrace of Philip's message? For one, both their societies had a long history of contact with Scripture and had received the word of Jehovah with favor. Let us recall to mind that Ethiopia as a nation had adopted Judaism a 1000 years before, yhis in the days of King Solomon after the Queen of Sheba had gone to Jerusalem to receive wisdom and had returned home carrying the seed of David. As for the Samaritans, they, too had texts of Moses older and more authentic than the Masoretic text used by the Jews today and they valued them.

In the intervening centuries, however, much had changed. The Pharisees now sat in Moses' seat. Pharisaical Judaism had replaced Mosaic Law with their own "oral Law," so-called, of which neither Ethiopians nor Samaritans had knowledge of. The "oral" Law," actually the *Mishnah*, Jesus had denounced as the wisdom of the elders which made God's Law of no effect. It was so much extra baggage, if not pernicious nonsense, which closed the eyes and ears of Jerusalem to Jesus' claims.

The revival that occurred was no flash-in-the-pan excitement whipped up by a trained

orator. For one, we know that only a little time before Philip had been appointed by the apostles to be a waiter-on-tables. Not emotionalism, but a straightforward presentation of Scripture is what did the trick. Thus it was, as *Acts* reports: the Samaritans “received the Word of God” and “were baptized into the name of Jesus.” Little place existed for American-style evangelization. That Philip could reach them so quickly with his message, reflected well on them and it reflected well on Philip and the training he received, that he was able to bring to his hearers a compelling, well-reasoned position, rooted in Scripture.

We know that Philip and the other apostles, though they lived by humble trades, yet they could articulate their faith to the world. Their boldness came from the Spirit, yes, but their learnedness came from Jesus. Though they lived by humble trades, Philip and the other apostles were able to articulate a coherent message and this before there were written gospels. Philip was emboldened and empowered by the Spirit, that we know, but from whence came his learnedness in the Word? Ultimately it came from Jesus who taught his disciples “the first principles in the oracles of God.”

Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth. (II Timothy 2:15)

PETER, THE EVANGELIST

To his apostles, Jesus said:

Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. (*Mark 16:15*)

Initially this, the “Great Commission,” was construed narrowly as only to include Jews and diaspora Jews. Eventually this came to be seen by the Nazarenes as a sadly inadequate response to the high calling of God in Christ Jesus. What limits dare we place on the word “all”?

As chief apostle, Peter thought he knew where lay the limits to Gospel presentation, that Gentiles were not included but he was in for a surprise. First, in a vision from God, Peter was instructed not to call unclean that which God called clean. Then, while pondering this vision and yet doubting its meaning, there came a knock at his door. Three men representing a certain Roman officer were there, requesting his presence in Caesarea. And immediately God’s Spirit spoke to Peter, saying:

“Arise therefore, and get thee down, and go with them, doubting nothing: for I have sent them.”

The next day Peter went to Caesarea, to the home of Cornelius, where was gathered an assembly for the purpose of hearing him out. Addressing them, Peter said:

“Ye know how it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company or come unto one of another nation; but God hath showed me that I should not call any man common or unclean.”

Peter could say this because just the day before his preconceptions about Gentiles had been upended by direct revelation from God. As we see, he was beginning to learn the difference between God's royal law of universal regard and man's propensity for arbitrary boundary setting.

In reply to Peter's accommodating statement, Cornelius said:

"Now therefore are we all here present before God, to hear all things that are commanded thee of God."

Then Peter opened his mouth and said,

"I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him."

Without attempting to recap the entire account (it runs for 66 verses), in essence, this was Peter's *eureka!* moment, the instant when on meeting a righteous Gentile it dawned on him that the mountain of faith can be climbed from many directions. For Peter, sharing the Gospel didn't just mean changing another person's mind but changing his own, for he had not been baptized into some piddling, sectarian stream but into the great ocean who is our God.

But then we make of Scripture and of Scripture's Author what we will, which is why it's often not so much *what* we believe as *how* we construe it that counts. Others before and since Peter have had such insights. Even so, his was a bright, shining moment when religion took a holiday from parochial sectarianism.

The righteous of all nations have a place in the kingdom to come.

Note: the righteous Gentile in question, Cornelius, he was neither a Jew nor a Christian but a God-fearing pagan who, as such, could not have distinguished Jesus from Adam, yet, at the time of visitation, he had God's approval. But on what basis? obviously not on the basis of his having "saving faith" in Jesus (for how can one believe who hasn't heard?) Rather, it was on the basis of his personal integrity from which issued forth faithful deeds, even as it is written:

... an angel of God coming in to him, and saying unto him, "Cornelius." And when he looked on him, he was afraid, and said, "What is it, Lord?" And he said unto him, "Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God." (Acts 10:3-4)

And what was Peter's response after he saw that God had bestowed on the Gentile believers the Holy Spirit, even as on Jewish believers? He exclaimed:

"Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Spirit, as well as we?" (Acts 10:47)

In recounting this event to the rest of his colleagues, Peter said:

“Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit.”
(Acts 11:16)

As was the case above with Peter and Cornelius, so also with Jesus' Nazarene followers generally, instead of trying to be controlling, they approached the world with full hearts and open arms and, to a surprising degree, they found their openness reciprocated, such that by 1st century's end the Gospel had spread across the globe from the British Isles to India and to many points in between and would have kept spreading except that it was subverted and eviscerated from within by the Church.

If ever we find something wisely said by the pagans, we should not scorn it with the name of the author . . . but as the apostle says, "Test all things, holding fast what is good."
(Origen, *Homily on Exodus*)

The cultural attainments of Israel's mighty neighbors, Egypt, Babylon, Persia, Greece and Rome in turn tempted and repelled. What was of Truth and need to be accepted? And what of idolatry that needed to be rejected? Either way, let us observe, biblical Judaism did not simply fall from the sky as some might suppose (or fervently wish), for overwhelming evidence exists of judicious borrowings.

From its inception, Israel drew inspiration from a multiplicity of sources: Moses, for instance, came of age in the courts of the Pharaoh where he became conversant with the learning and wisdom of Egypt. Later, fleeing to the wilderness, he was refreshed by the Midianites, particularly Jethro, the Midianite priest, who became his father-in-law. Exposure to primitive, tribal religion infused Judaism with a kind of hybrid vigor.

Later, Greek ideas and modes of expression also left an imprint on the biblical record, especially on the *New Testament* but elsewhere as well. Many scholars think, for instance, that the complete absence of Jewish features in *Job* may be because its origin wasn't Jewish at all but Greek. None of this, if true, detracts from its value. Nor does it negate the existence of direct revelation.

The Holy Land is where East meets West, where Oriental mysticism and Occidental logic combine. Only blind parochialism could keep us from seeing the reality that the Israelite commonwealth was no cultural backwater but, as John Henry Newman put it:

She began in Chaldea, and then sojourned among the Canaanites, and went down into Egypt, and thence passed into Arabia, till she rested in her own land. Next she encountered the merchants of Tyre, and the wisdom of the country, and the luxury of Sheba. Then she was carried away to Babylon, and wandered

to the schools of Greece. And wherever she went, in trouble or in triumph, still she was a living spirit, the mind and the voice of the Most High; "sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them and asking them questions"; claiming to herself what they said rightly, correcting their errors, supplying their defects, completing their beginnings, expanding their surmises, and thus gradually by means of them enlarging the range and refining the sense of her own teaching. So far, then, from her creed being of doubtful credit because it resembles foreign theologies, we even hold that one special way in which Providence has imparted divine knowledge to us has been by enabling her to draw and collect it together out of the world and, in this sense, as in others, to "suck the milk of the Gentiles and to suck the breast of kings."

HELLENIZATION

And in those days, when the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministrations. (Acts 6:1)

So reads the King James Version. Clarifying the meaning somewhat, the Revised Version of 1881 exchanged for "Grecian" the word "Hellenist." At issue, then, was not a quarrel between Jews and Gentiles as a casual reading of this verse might lead one to believe; rather, the dispute was between Greek-speaking Nazarenes who, albeit, were observant Jews, were influenced by Hellenistic ideas and thought patterns and those Nazarenes, particularly from Jerusalem, who were out-and-out Hebraics.

One would like to think that with Jesus' words yet ringing in their ears, his example fresh in their minds, and with the recent descent of the Spirit at Pentecost, that Nazarenes generally would have risen above making invidious racial and social distinctions but, as we see in the candid statement above, this was not necessarily so. There was emboldenment and ennoblement for a season, yes, but this did not resolve all issues, for Jesus' followers were men and women of like passion as ourselves, subject to honest differences of opinion as well as to disparate cultural influences. Putting them on a pedestal can easily become a copout, an excuse to look backwards instead of forwards, to institutionalize the apostles' memory, instead of learning from their example.

PAUL

His Tortuous Journey out of the Pit --
From Persecutor to Forgiveness & Freedom

As a young man Paul had turned to persecution. His problem, like that of many other over-earnest youths, was his hoping to earn God's favor through performance of good works but we suspect that he was experiencing a nagging suspicion of failure. If only on an unconscious level, he knew in many ways he fell short and judged himself harshly for that. And, judging himself harshly, he also judged others harshly. Yes, Paul had a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge. Setting about to establish his own righteousness, he missed

out on God's righteousness. With such a religion as his, it would have been better if he had none at all.

Judgmental zealotry such as Paul displayed often manifests as an exaggerated concern with creeds instead of deeds: orthodoxy instead of orthopraxy. (By definition, orthodoxy has to do with what folks believe whereas orthopraxy has to do with their actual conduct.) Since the life-blood of sectarianism is boundary setting through manipulation of doctrine, the religious establishment is all too glad to sharpen any distinction, creating, thereby, dislike of the unlike. Indeed hierarchy men take every impulse, be it high or low, and bend it to their own purposes, for, above all, religious conformity promotes the selfish will to power. Thus the followers of Jesus, being nonconformists in both word and deed, became the perfect object of the Establishment's ire and wrath.

From the astringency of religious zeal, the urge to persecute emerged. Even so, Paul would probably not have acted murderously, except for his psychological state having been adroitly exploited by the Sanhedrin. It was the High Priest who granted Paul letters of introduction to the leading Jews of Damascus, authorizing them to assist him in his task of bringing back to Jerusalem, bound in chains, believers in Jesus. By giving himself over to the impulse to control people through threat and force, Saul became the very antithesis of freedom. Today the Zionized, warmongering Church, thinking it follows Paul, instead follows, the "chief of sinners," namely, the pre-conversion Saul the Pharisee, Saul the Zionist. But then came Paul's Damascus Road experience, forever changing his life:

And as he journeyed, he came near Damascus: and suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven: and he fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him,

Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?

And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said,

I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks.

And he trembling and astonished said,

Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?

And the Lord said unto him,

Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do. (Acts 9:3-8)

Continuing on is Paul's firsthand account of this incident:

And one Ananias, a devout man according to the law, having a good report of all the Jews which dwell there [in Damascus] came unto me, Brother Paul, receive thy sight. And the same hour I looked up upon

him. And he said, The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldest know his will, and see that Just One, and shouldst hear the voice of his mouth. For thou shalt be his witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard. And now why terriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord. (Acts 22:12-16)

Once the scales had fallen from his eyes, Paul forsook the way of persecution. Once he had been filled with the Spirit and was water baptized, Paul was a new man, fit for service. His greatest victory was not that of seeing through the false claims of the religious establishment, though he did indeed do that. No, his greatest victory was that which he won over his own ego. Finally, on seeing the impossibility of earning his way into God's good graces, he humble himself before the stake of impalement.

In and of himself, Paul had failed miserably. Pouring out his guts, he confessed:

"Oh wretched man that I am! Who will deliver me from this body of death?" (Romans 7:24)

However, with a new dynamic operative in his life Paul ceased his futile struggle, spinning his wheels, making a mess of his own life as well as messing up the lives of others. Despite all the sorrows and labors that befell him, Paul found joy and fulfillment in the power of a new creation where his deepest psychological needs were being met. After that his life was revelation, for Paul the persecutor had become Paul the freedom fighter. He wrote:

Stand fast therefore in the liberty by which Christ has made us free and be not entangled again with a yoke of bondage. (Galatians 5:1)

Freedom was no end in itself, that Paul knew. He knew that freedom needed to be tempered by responsibility and that from within. It could not be coerced. As he wrote:

"For though I am free from all men, I have made myself a servant to all, that I might win the more;" (1 Corinthians 9:19)

The effect of biblical faith is not that of squashing human personality, for even as an artisan well effortlessly runs over, so too the Good Tidings brings its own form of overflowing effervescence to each individual who breathes in its essential offer of freedom and liberation.

Paul has established for all times the Christian's right to think. He raises above the faith which is valid by tradition that knowledge which flows from the spirit of Christ. There lives in him an unlimited uninterrupted reverence for truth. He accepts only those bonds which are imposed by love, not those which are imposed by scholastic authority. . . . The result of this first appearance of the activity of a great thinker in Christianity, is to establish for all time the confidence that the Christian faith has nothing to fear from the power of thought, even if the latter is disturbing to tranquility, is apt to provoke disputes which seem to promise little fruit for piety . . . Paul is the patron saint of thought in Christianity. All those who think to serve the gospel of Christ

by destroying the liberty of thinking must hide their faces from him.

(The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, Albert Schweitzer)

For one believeth that he may eat all things: another, who is weak, eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not; and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth: for God hath received him. Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up: for God is able to make him stand. One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks. *(Romans 14:2-6)*

For this is the will of God, that by doing good you may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men -- as free, yet not using liberty as a cloak for vice, but as servants of God. *(Galatians 5:13)*

M O T H E R M A R Y

Beyond excesses relating to Maryolatry, many have carried away positive impressions by reflecting on Mary, her role in the great scheme of things.

*When creation was begun,
God had chosen you to be
Mother of his precious son.*

*All of us are children too,
Often doubtful what to do,
Thus we turn to you and say:*

*When creation was restored,
You were there beside our Lord
Whom you cherished and adored.*

*Lead us to your child above
He will teach us how to love,
How to pity and forgive.
Holy Mary, full of grace.*

B A R N A B A S

And they called Barnabas, Jupiter; and Paul, Mercurius, because he was the chief speaker. *(Acts 14:12)*

From the passage above, we see that at least in the perception of certain pagans, Paul was the lesser god, Mercury, who was the spokesman for the greater god, Jupiter, that is, Barnabas. Of course, neither man wished to be taken for a god. Nevertheless, however mistaken this identification, it is indicative that both men had made a very great impression. Further confirmation is that both men were commissioned as co-equals to lead Antioch's historic first missionary journey. With this history in mind, let us now correct a glaring mis-

identification later made by the Church when it attributed one of the New Testament's most substantial epistles, *Hebrews*, to Paul, when in all likelihood its author was Barnabas.

The one thing we can be sure about is that Paul did not write *Hebrews*. Most scholars in our day who have looked into the matter agree, the style of *Hebrews* is not Paul's, nor is the subject matter his. Also, at certain points *Hebrews* exhibits an exact knowledge of Temple procedures which Paul, who was not a priest or Levite, would not likely have had but which Barnabas, a Levite would have. Unless Paul had had a brain transplant (which they weren't doing in those days or, thankfully, yet in ours) then it had to have been someone else who wrote it. Somewhat after 200 AD, Tertullian wrote:

For there is extant withal an Epistle to the Hebrews under the name of Barnabas – a man sufficiently accredited by God, as being one whom Paul has stationed next to himself

Because the Church wanted, as it were, everything done through official channels, it has ever clung tenaciously to the claim that authorship of the New Testament is limited to those who were apostles or else who were authorized by an apostle. The only exceptions made are for James and Jude, who get a special dispensation by virtue of being Jesus' relatives. Thus, Paul presumably authorized Luke to write the gospel that goes by Luke's name and Peter presumably authorized Mark to write the Gospel that goes by Mark's name. The problem with Barnabas it is too great a leap to say that he was Paul's subordinate. Since *Hebrews* in both style and substance arguably outshines any of Paul's compositions, including it in the New Testament under Barnabas's name would have exploded the churchly theory of apostolic authorship as a necessary qualification for inclusion. As is the case with modern-day scholars, so too 2nd century Church scholars saw *Hebrews* as not having been written by Paul. Two strategies were adopted. One was to reject this letter as not rising to the level of Scripture. Thus we see that it was not included in the Muratorian canon. When that didn't work because it was too good to suppress, it was embraced as having been written by the apostle Paul. That's the Church's story and they are sticking with it.

O B E Y ? O B E Y N O T !

By Catholics, by a Jehovah Witness, by a Plymouth Brethren, by one from the Church of Christ, by Adventists, by Bible Church, by those who are non-denominational, by Charismatics (the list is seemingly endless), I have heard repeatedly the same dreary old message:

Obey them that have the rule over you. (Hebrews 13:17)

With all due respect, allow me to advise: "Don't!" Don't obey for obedience sake any religious Pooh Bah whatever may be his ecclesiastical affiliation or high office. Commit yourself neither to man nor institution but to God alone! To Him alone are you accountable! First of all forget "obey". The underlying Greek word, *peitho*, means something else

altogether. As used by the author of Hebrews, it means "persuade". In fact in an earlier verse he employs the same word, *peitho*, and notice how the *KJV* translates it:

. . . we are persuaded [*peitho*] better things of you. (*Hebrews 6:9*)

Had the author of *Hebrews*, Barnabas, really meant "obey" he would have used the word, *hupakouo*, as he did two chapters before in the sentence:

By faith Abraham when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive as an inheritance, obeyed [*hupakouo*] . . . (*Hebrews 11:8*)

And forget rule over. It's not there either. Neither rule nor over is there. The Greek word used is *hegeomai*. It is the same word used by Luke when he quotes Jesus as saying:

He who is greatest (*i.e.* a leader) [*hegeomai*] among you, let him be as the younger, and he who governs as he who serves. (*Luke 22:26*)

This is yet another example of an anti-hierarchical imperative. The unification God seeks is not achieved through coercion but through persuasion. So let us forget the ominous spin that sectarian spin doctors give *Hebrews 13:17* because it more correctly translates as:

Encourage those who provide leadership [*hegeomai*] among you . . .

Another example, this from Paul's letter to the Thessalonians:

And we beseech you, brethren, to know them which labor among you, and are over you [*proistemi*] in the Lord. (*I Thessalonians 5:12*)

Again over you is not there. The underlying Greek is: *proistemi*. It is the same word as Paul uses in *Titus 3:14* where he writes:

. . . learn to maintain [*proistemi*] good works.

As it turns in this instance it is possible to have one translation suitably fit both quotes. It is to care for. Them which "labor among you" are those who "care" for you. And so "take care to learn good works."

Finally, putting obedience into proper perspective, Peter said to the High Priest:

We ought to obey God rather than man. (*Acts 5:29*)

There is a simple rule-of-thumb to help us think about these things. The early followers of Jesus were described as "disciples." They weren't disciples of each other. Paul is not described as having disciples, nor James, nor Peter, nor anyone, but they are all described as "disciples of the Lord." Therefore, in practicing discipleship, neither a disciple nor discipler be, except to be a disciple of the Lord. One hears of those who take a vow of poverty, chastity and obedience. I would suggest, if it is obedience to mortal man, then skip it.

THE AUTHOR OF HEBREWS, HAD HE BEEN EXILED?

In affirmation of this contention, J. Rendel Harris wrote.

We will restrict ourselves to one single chapter of the Epistle [to the Hebrews], . . . the chapter to which I refer is the eleventh. In my own reading of this chapter, one of the most striking in the book, and almost capable of dissected out as a separate Bible lesson or tract. . . . In my own reading of this chapter I was struck with the stress laid on the thought of exile by the writer, whether in recording instances from the past in which good men have had to leave all to follow God, or in inculcating the characteristic Christian grace of detachment, which results from a right estimate of things transitory and of things eternal.

And I have hazzarded the conjecture that in most cases where the grace of detachment is in a high state of development, it is connected with outward forms of detachment, which have providentially been the stepping-stones into the higher experiences. Now we do not say that unworldliness and *Heimweh* are found only in the Epistle to the Hebrews, but they are found so emphatically there and especially in the eleventh chapter, that one is disposed to believe that it is an exile that writes and that enforced wanderings have laid the foundation for the doctrine and experience that “there remaineth a rest to the people of God.”

Now when we read our chapter through, we find –

(1) that Abraham was one of faith's exiles: that he went in search of a promised land; that Isaac and Jacob were also dwellers in tabernacles, and they all looked for a city of God at the end of or beyond the tent-life. All this patriarchal circle confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims in the earth. Their talk betrayed their country. They might have returned if they would; but they are pressing toward a better, a heavenly country. God thinks better of them because of their passion for a better land.

(2) And what about Joseph dying in Egypt, and giving instructions about the return of his bones to the home-land? And why did he talk of the exodus of the children of Israel? We are astonished, too, to find that it was an act of faith when Moses fled from Egypt, and the incident is coupled with an allusion of the wrath of the king. It is surprising that this chapter should be credited to an actual exile, and in that case the forsaking of Egypt becomes parallel with a decree of Claudius Caesar that Jews in general, and two particular apostolical Jews among them, should depart from Rome? So we write against this chapter the words, “an exile speaks.” That the motive for the discourse was not confined to the subject-matter of the chapter, viz, “the making and fortunes of

the heroes of God,” may seem from the way the writer strikes the same note in the thirteenth chapter: “Let us go to Jesus outside the camp, and let us bear His reproach, for here we have no abiding city, but we are seeking the one to come.”

(J. Rendel Harris, *Side-lights on New Testament Research*, 1908)

COMMUNITY / CONGREGATION / CHURCH

Kyriakon

As most English translations have it, Jesus said to Peter:

“Upon this rock I will build my Church (*ekklesia*); and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.”

(*Matthew 16:18*)

By reason of this translation alone, it is axiomatic for most Christians to believe, first, that the Church IS, and, secondly, since presumably God ordained it, we’re obliged to join it, the only remaining issue being to identify which one is the true Church. Is it the one headquartered in Rome? Salt Lake City? Brooklyn? Boston? Tacoma Park? Nashville? (This list could be much extended.) Conversely, noted Hebrew and Greek scholar, James Tabor, in an open letter to supporters of the *Original Bible Project*, stated:

The *Original Bible* will be one of the few modern English translations of the Greek Christian Scriptures in which the word "church," so sacred to millions, *will not appear!*

Is this sophistry or scholarship? Is the Church real or just a mirage? Let us reason this out. Biblical Greek, albeit God breathed, is not angel talk, rather, it is idiomatic, idiosyncratic human talk, requiring close attention to context.

As for the word “church,” language scholars tell us it was not originally English but came from the German word, *kirche*, which itself derived from *kyriakon*, a Greek word meaning, “the Lord’s house.” In consulting the 16th century New Testament of William Tyndale, we find that he used the word “church” only twice, once in *Acts 14:13* and once again in *Acts 19: 37*. In each instance the reference is to a pagan place of worship, the Lord’s house being a pagan Lord, i.e., Jupiter, but in *Matthew 16: 18*, Tyndale translated *ekklesia*: “congregation.” For this heinous crime, that of making the Bible comprehensible in the vernacular, Tyndale was burned alive at the stake.

Webster’s International Dictionary defines “church” as

1. A building set apart for public worship, ...
2. A place of worship of any religion, as, formerly, a Jewish or pagan temple or a mosque. Acts six. 37.

Highly suspect is the business of substituting of one Greek word for another, *kyriakon* for *ekklesia*, then not translating *kyriakon* but only transliterating it.

Ekklesia: THE WAY OUT

In response to a question Jesus posed his disciples:

“Who do you say that I am?”

Jesus’ disciple, Peter, replied:

“You are the Messiah, the Son of the living God.”

Then Jesus said to Peter:

“Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my *ekklesia* and the gates of hell will not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.”

The above statement is incompletely translated. Left untranslated is the word "*ekklesia*," a word occurring more than 100 times in the Greek New Testament. A compound word “ek” means "out of" and "*klesia*," “called” (from the verb *kaleo*.) Who are those summoned out?

In the classical Greek of the 4th century BC, *ekklesia* was used with reference to the town crier's summons as he called citizens out for the purpose of conducting public business. The assembly consisted of the “called ones:”

He ekklesia was the lawful assembly in a free Greek city of all those possessed of the rights of citizenship for the transaction of public affairs. That they were summoned is expressed in the latter part of the word; that they were summoned out of the whole population, a select portion of it including neither the populace, nor the strangers, nor yet those who had forfeited their civic rights, this is expressed in the first.

(Liddell and Scott)

In the Septuagint Greek, a translation of the biblical Hebrew text dating to the 3rd century BC, (and from which the apostles often quote *verbatim*) *ekklesia* was the word of choice for translating the Hebrew word: *qahal*. Of the one hundred and twenty occurrences of *qahal* in the Hebrew Bible on 77 occasions the Septuagint renders them *ekklesia*. Checking each instance for meaning, we find that *qahal* generally refers to an "assembly" or "meeting" of the people of Israel. Two readings that illustrate this:

Solomon held the feast ... and all Israel with him, a very great assembly [*ekklesia*] (II Chronicles 7:8)

In the midst of the assembly [*ekklesia*] will I praise thee. (Psalm 22:22)

Occasionally, the Septuagint employs *ekklesia* to refer to entities other than to a gathering of Israel, as for instance:

. . . the company [*ekklesia*] of prophets prophesying

(1 Samuel 19:20)

I, [Jehovah] hate the assembly [*ekklesia*] of evil-doers.

(Psalm 26:5)

There is yet another Hebrew word beside *qahal* to be considered and that is *edhah*. *Edhah* is never translated in the Septuagint by the word *ekklesia*. Instead, about one hundred and thirty times in the Septuagint it is translated by the Greek word *synogoge*. Because a key issue is whether God's *ekklesia* is modeled after the Jewish synagogue or follows some other line, we find ourselves having to extend our inquiry by comparing the meaning of *edhah* and *qahal*. With regard to the distinction to be made in these allied, but not fully synonymous words, we observe that *edhah* applies to a group – but one not necessarily assembled together or even acting in concert. Its usage is broad and can even apply to animals, such as to a swarm of bees. But when applied to Israel it is properly applied to the society itself. Meanwhile, *qahal* is about the people who assemble in physical meeting:

The fact that *qahal* comes from the same root as *qol*, the word for "voice," suggests that the Old Testament *qahal* was the community summoned by the Divine Voice, by the Word of God. It was the people of the voice of the Word of God. Of that concept *ekklesia* is a very apt translation, indicating as it does the community of "the called" (*kletoi*) of God. . . . his Voice was heard by all Israel, and his Word founded the covenant community. (T. F. Torrance)

On occasion as in *Exodus 12:6* and *Numbers 14:5*, we have in Scripture the phrase *qahal edhah*. It is correctly translated:

The call to assembly (*qahal* / *ekklesia*) of the community (*edhah* / *synogoge*).

In the development of the meaning of *ekklesia*, this is the progression: first it meant a summoning of citizens to a civic event; then it applied to the meeting itself; then to the body of people so assembled. Nor is that the end of the story, for we have yet New Testament usage to consider, where additional meanings accrue, where *ekklesia* might even mean an unruly mob:

And the whole city was filled with confusion: and having Gaius and Aristarchus . . . they rushed with one accord into the theatre. . . . Some therefore cried one thing, and some another: for the mob (*ekklesia*) was confused; and most of them knew not why they had come together. (Acts 19:29-32)

Another example of *ekklesia*, this one from *Acts 8:3*, which reads:

As for Saul, he made havoc of the community (*ekklesia*), entering into every house, and haling men and women committed them to prison.

Clearly Saul was going after scattered individuals in their homes and not picking up peo-

ple *en mass* as would be the case had he interrupted a meeting in progress. Therefore I have translated *ekklesia* as “community,” rather than, as did Tyndale, “congregation,” much less “church,” as did the *KJV*.

Call and Response

“I [Jesus] have called you [my disciples] out of the world.” (John 15:19)

Not everyone who hears God's call is included, for Jesus said:

“Many are called but few are chosen.” (Matthew 22:14)

The reason many are called but few chosen is because of the many who are called few ever respond as Peter did, by taking a proactive stance:

Brethren, give diligence to make your election and calling sure. (II Peter 1:10)

Not by brick and mortar, nor by the will of man, but as an interior chapel; not as an observable, exterior kingdom, but as an interior kingdom, with the King residing within, that is God's *ekklesia*. Let us do due diligence to assure the call for this call is one of dependency on Him, God being the Rock on which Jesus builds his *koinonia*, his summoned-out community. No church is so big as to include, nor so small as to exclude, all who are upon the Rock.

The Abrahamic Covenant and its contradictions

Long in advance of Abraham's day, God made certain promises, first to Adam, then to Noah, which promises are known respectively as the Adamic and the Noahic Covenants. These, and all such covenants since: Abrahamic, Mosaic, Davidic are rooted in *Genesis 3:15*, where the belly-crawling serpent is said prophetically to wound the heel of the promised seed and the promised seed is said to wound the serpent's head.

Then, too, we know, of an additional covenant, a "new Covenant" (*Jeremiah 31:31*), "a better covenant" (*Hebrews 8:6*), which is "not according to the covenant that I [God] made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt." One little question which seems too often overlooked: when is this better covenant to be implemented? I ask because many these days would deep-six the Abrahamic Covenant in favor of this better covenant and never mind that it is explicitly stated of the New Covenant that: "no man will teach his brother, but from the least to the greatest all will know the Lord." Is that to be squared with what we see going on every day? Obviously, the New Covenant is of another time, another era, an era called "the millennial kingdom." Meanwhile, in these present times, helping us deal with present realities, we have for guidance the Abrahamic Covenant.

O Israel, thou shalt not be forgotten of me. . . .
 For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed;
 but my kindness shall not depart from thee,
 neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed,
 saith Jehovah that hath mercy on thee. . . .
 Incline your ear, and come unto me: hear,
 and your soul shall live;
 and I will make an everlasting covenant with you,
 even the sure mercies of David. (*Isaiah 44:21, 54:10, 55:3*)

1. The Abrahamic Covenant is predicated on faith:

Abram . . . believed in Jehovah; and he counted it unto him for righteousness. (*Genesis 15:6*)

2. The Abrahamic Covenant has moral content:

For I [Jehovah] know him [Abraham], that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of Jehovah, to do justice and judgment; ... (Genesis 18:19)

3. The Abrahamic Covenant is an on-going, corporate, work of redemption which takes in the entire sweep of history from Abraham's time forward to our own:

And I [Jehovah] will establish my covenant with thee and with thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant. (Genesis 17:7)

4. Though an everlasting covenant, nonetheless the Abrahamic Covenant consists of qualified promises to qualified people:

... they shall keep the way of Jehovah, to do justice and judgment; that Jehovah may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him. (Genesis 17:14)

5. Because it is an everlasting covenant, the Abrahamic Covenant remains as much in effect today as ever. In no wise has it been superseded, nor will it be until Kingdom come.

6. The Abrahamic Covenant is not an agreement between equals, nor was it the result of a negotiation but is a revelation of God's sovereign intent:

I [Jehovah] will make of thee [Abraham] a great nation. (Genesis 12:2)

7. By instituting a covenant, God, in a manner of speaking, places Himself under obligation – albeit on His terms not ours. His role is that of *Respondent Superior*, for He takes responsibility for his agents, His creatures, for His creation is the work of His hands.

The law of Jehovah is perfect, converting the soul:

The testimony of Jehovah is sure, making wise the simple.

The Statutes of Jehovah are right, rejoicing the heart:

The commandment of Jehovah is pure, enlightening the eyes.

The fear of Jehovah is clean, enduring for ever:

The judgments of Jehovah are true and righteous altogether.

More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold:

Sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb. (Psalm 19:7-10)

T O A B R A H A M , G O D S A I D

Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will

show thee: and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed. (Genesis 12:1-3)

In brief, this is God's call to Abraham, the Abrahamic Covenant, which neither time nor circumstance has diminished. Nor has God revoked it. While authorities differ as to the exact year, there is general agreement that it was made in the twentieth century B.C.

To be sure, Abraham did not carry out his part of the Covenant perfectly. For instance, contrary to instructions, he took with him from his native land his kinsman, Lot, who later proved to be a serious hindrance. Albeit many times through history the Covenant's conditions have been breached, nevertheless, God's redemptive plan continues to unfold. In a pattern that repeats through Scripture, the Abrahamic Covenant was renewed and elaborated upon at least four times to Abraham, and many times more thereafter to his descendants.

There was many reiterations yet one Covenant with one all-embracing Promise. Said the Apostle Paul in chains to King Agrippa:

And now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers: unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come. (Acts 26:6-7)

What is God's overarching Promise? that He will provide the lamb:

And Abraham lifted up his eyes, and looked, and behold behind him a ram caught in a thicket by his horns: and Abraham went and took the ram, and offered him up for a burnt offering in the stead of his son. (Genesis 22)

Long in advance of Abraham's day, God made certain promises first to Adam and later to Noah, which promises are known respectively as the Adamic Covenant and the Noahic Covenant. In the larger scheme of God's redemptive purpose, these Covenants, beginning with *Genesis 3:15*, were all of one piece, for all of them, each in their own way, looked ahead to the day when God would provide a lamb. There is an abattoir:

THE BLOOD OF THE COVENANT (HEBREWS 10 : 29)

Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; and having a high priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water. (Hebrews 10:19)

The oath God made to Abraham, He reiterated to his son, Isaac:

And Jehovah appeared unto him [Isaac], and said, Go not down into Egypt; dwell in the land which

I shall tell thee of: sojourn in this land, and I will be with thee, and will bless thee; for unto thee, and unto thy seed, I will give all these countries, and I will perform the oath which I sware unto Abraham thy father; and 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; because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws.

(Genesis 26:1-5)

And to Jacob, Abraham's grandson by Isaac, the Promise was again reiterated:

And Jacob went out from Beersheba, and went toward Haran. And he lighted upon a certain place, and tarried there all night, because the sun was set; and he took of the stones of that place, and put them for his pillows, and lay down in that place to sleep. And he dreamed, and beheld a ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven: and behold the angels of God ascending and descending on it. And, behold, Jehovah stood above it, and said, I am Jehovah 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.

(Genesis 28:10-15)

Afterward God reconfirmed His Covenant with Moses:

And the angel of YHWH appeared unto him [Moses] in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush: and, behold, the bush burned with fire, and the bush was not consumed. And Moses said, I will now turn aside, and see this great sight, why the bush is not burnt. And when YHWH saw that he turned aside to see, God called unto him out of the midst of the bush, and said, Moses, Moses, And he said, Here am I. And he said, Draw not nigh hither: put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground. Moreover he said, I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.

(Exodus 3:2-6)

Then to Joshua, God reconfirmed his Abrahamic Covenant:

Hear O Israel: thou art to pass over Jordan this day, to go in to possess nations greater and mightier than thyself, cities great and fenced up to heaven, a people great and tall, the children of the Anakim, whom thou knowest and of whom thou hast heard say, Who can stand before the children of Anak!
. . . Not for thy righteousness, or for the uprightness of thine heart, dost thou go to possess their land: but for the wickedness of these nations Jehovah thy God doth drive them out from before thee, and that he may perform the word which Jehovah sware unto thy fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

(Deuteronomy 9:1-2, 5)

As the above Scripture indicates, the mandate by which Joshua acted, so far from displacing the Abrahamic Covenant, was directed entirely toward its fulfillment. Space does permit a complete recounting of the Covenant's multitudinous reiterations to King David, King Solomon, King Josiah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Nehemiah, etc, up to and including to the times of the Maccabees:

Was not Abraham found faithful in temptation, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness? Joseph in the time of his distress kept the commandment, and was made lord of Egypt; Phinees our father in being zealous and fervent obtained the covenant of an everlasting priesthood. Joseph for fulfilling the word was made a judge in Israel. Caleb for bearing witness before the congregation received the heritage of the land. David for being merciful possessed the throne of an everlasting kingdom. Elijah for being zealous and fervent for the law was taken up into heaven. Ananias, Azarias, and Misael, by believing were saved out of the flame. Daniel for his innocency was delivered from the mouth of lions. And thus consider ye throughout all ages that none that put their trust in him shall be overcome. *(I Maccabees)*

Moving forward chronologically, Mother Mary said:

He hath helped his servant Israel, in remembrance of his mercy; as he spake to our fathers, to Abraham, and to his seed for ever. *(Luke 1:54-55)*

And as Zechariah, the father of, John, the forerunner, said:

Blessed be the Lord God of Israel;
for he hath visited and redeemed his people.
and hath raised up a horn of salvation for us
in the house of his servant David;
as he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets,
which have been since the world began:
that we should be saved from our enemies,
and from the hand of all that hate us;
to perform the mercy promised to our fathers,
and to remember his holy covenant;
the oath which he sware to our father Abraham, . . . *(Luke 1:68-75)*

The Law given 430 years later did not annul the Covenant. Nor did Christ. To the contrary, through Jesus Christ the blessing of Abraham came to Jews and Gentiles alike.

My covenant I will not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. *(Psalm 89:34)*

God's promises are not as man's – contingency dependent – but immutable decrees:

And I [Jehovah] will establish my covenant with thee and with thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant. *(Genesis 17:7)*

Through His messiah, the Abrahamic Covenant applies to Jews and Gentiles alike:

And if ye be Christ's, then are you Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise. *(Galatians 3:29)*

The ethnic aspect has not been cancelled out, for:

God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew. *(Romans 11:2)*

However estranged the original Covenant people currently may be, however scattered abroad they may be, for them the best is yet to be:

And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion a Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: for this is my covenant with them, when I shall take away their sins. *(Rom 11: 26-27)*

Regarding His Covenant's future fulfillment, thus saith the Lord:

Be glad then, ye children of Zion, and rejoice in Jehovah your God: for he hath given you the former rain and moderately, and he will cause to come down for you the rain, the former rain and the latter rain in the first month. And the floors will be full of wheat, and the vats overflow with wine and oil. And I will restore to you the years that the locust hath eaten, the cankerworm, and the caterpillar, and the palmerworm, my great army which I sent among you. And ye shall eat in plenty, and be satisfied, and praise the name of Jehovah your God, that hath dealt wondrously with you: and my people shall never be ashamed. And ye shall know that I am in the midst of Israel, and that I am Jehovah your God, and none else: and my people shall never be ashamed. And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions: and also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my spirit. And I will show wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and the terrible day of Jehovah come. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall call upon the name of Jehovah shall be delivered: for in mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance, as Jehovah hath said, and in the remnant whom Jehovah shall call. For behold, in those days, and in that time, when I shall bring again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem, I will also gather all nations, and bring them into the valley of Jehoshaphat, and will plead with them there for my people and for my heritage Israel, whom they have scattered among the nations, and parted my land. *(Joel 2:23-3:2)*

HE WILL EVER BE MINDFUL OF HIS COVENANT *(Psalm 111:5)*

O give thanks unto Jehovah; call upon his name: make known his deeds among the people. Sing unto him, sing psalms unto him: talk ye of all his wondrous works. Glory ye in his holy name. Let the heart of them rejoice that seek Jehovah. Seek Jehovah and his strength: seek His face evermore. Remember his marvelous works that he hath done; his wonders, and the judgments of his mouth; O ye seed of Abraham his servant, ye children of Jacob his chosen. He is Jehovah our God: his judgments are in all the earth. He hath remembered his covenant for ever, the word which he commanded to a thousand generations. Which covenant he made with Abraham, and his oath unto Isaac; and confirmed the same unto Jacob for a law, And to Israel for an everlasting covenant: saying, Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan, the lot of your inheritance. When they were but a few men in number; yea, very few, and strangers in it; when they went from one nation to another, from one kingdom to another people; He suffered no man to do them wrong: yea, he reprov'd kings for their sakes: saying, Touch not my anointed, and do my prophets no harm. . . . For he remembered his holy promise, and Abraham his servant. And he brought forth his people with joy, and his chosen with gladness: And gave them the lands of the heathen: and they inherited the labor of the people; That they might observe his statutes, and keep his laws. Praise ye Jehovah. (Psalm 105:1-15,42-45)

QUALIFIED PROMISES TO QUALIFIED PEOPLE

Jehovah will give grace and glory: no good thing will he withhold from them that walk uprightly. *(Psalm 84:11)*
Demonstrating a balanced understanding of the human/Divine partnership, where God is the senior initiating partner and humankind the junior respondent, where each party has duties to perform and promises to keep, Jude in his *Epistle* wrote:

But ye, beloved, building up yourselves on your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Ghost, keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life. And of some have compassion, making a difference: and others save with fear, pulling them out of the fire; hating even the garment spotted by the flesh. (Jude 1:20-3)

Jewish sages of old have said that all is ordained by God except the reverence and love of God. In this way they recognized that God has granted man space to make choices. Without violating that which makes us human, namely, our freedom to choose, God executes his Covenant. Thus, when a certain individual asked Jesus: "What must I do to inherit eternal life?" he received in reply two questions: "What is written in the Torah?" and "How readest thou?" *(Luke 10:25- 26)*, the implication being that the answer to the inquirer's question is found, not only in the written word according to the normal signification of words, but also within himself as the interpreter of those words.

The promises of the Covenant are not a guaranteed outcome but a guaranteed opportunity to apprehend and apply God's Law. Is there no place then within the Covenant for

certitude? In God, yes; in ourselves, no. There's no place for saying: "once-in-grace-always-in-grace-no-matter-how-much-a-disgrace." Some who cling to the Eternal Security Doc-trine, no doubt for safety sake, will claim, "sin all you want, you can't lose your salvation." In response, others would say, "but I already sin more than I want."

This then is the conditionality of the Abrahamic Covenant by which believers live:

If my people, which are called by my name shall, humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land. (II Chronicles 7:14)

If that nation, against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it; if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good, ' wherewith I said I would benefit them. (Jeremiah 18:7-10)

Jesus also employed the if word. To his community of believers in Sardis, he said:

If therefore thou shalt not watch, [then] I will come on thee as a thief, and thou shalt not know that hour I will come upon thee. (Revelation 3:3)

As well did the apostle Peter used the if word:

For if these things [faith, virtue, knowledge, godliness, brotherly kindness, charity] be in you and abound, [then] that make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. (I Peter 1:8)

This then is the benediction at the close of Jude's *Epistle*:

Now unto him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy, to the only wise God our Savior, be glory and majesty, dominion and power both now and ever, Amen. (Jude 24-25)

In summation: Jesus Christ came into the world to confirm God's Abrahamic Covenant, the same Covenant as was reiterated over and over to the fathers. In this we see a certain symmetry, for between Abraham and the coming of Christ was 2000 years and by the end of that time the Jews had made a shipwreck of the faith. Now another 2000 years, from Christ's time to the present has passed and we see that Christendom also is making a ship-wreck of the faith. There never was a time it seems when individual responsibility wasn't called for. Just going along with the herd won't cut it. Never did. Never will.

There is guidance and comfort in the Gospel but a spur, spurring us on, for only to the extent that its core values are affirmed and put into practice, do we come into the good of it. It takes courage as well as grace to walk the Gospel walk and not just talk it. We should not overlook Jesus' sterner admonitions, that:

...narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it. (Matthew 7:14)

Whoso will have life without end, look that he keep the commandments of God.

(NGN, chapter 74)

Professions of faith notwithstanding, we are still on the hook as those who must give account and to work out our own salvation with fear and trembling, even as Jesus warned:

"God prevent it that man should tempt him by asking for help to be saved, but not help himself."

(NGN, chapter 8)

No feel-good, opiate-type religion was Jesus pitching but qualified promises to qualified people, his is, a covenanted partnership requiring the highest level of commitment whereby both Man and God have promises to keep and standards to maintain.

C O N T I N U I T Y O R D I S C O N T I N U I T Y ?

The real reason the concept of the *Testimonia* is controversial, and, therefore, is rejected, is because it is conservative. It is conservative precisely because it rests on continuity. In that it is the opposite of Gnosticism which posits a Jesus who replaces Jehovah. It is the opposite of the Church's idea who sees itself as replacing Israel. It is the opposite of evangelical Dispensationalism which posits a succession of ages, each having their own rules. Alas, many Christians, particularly those of a fundamentalist persuasion, vociferously dispute these claims, their position being that Jesus came to cancel the Law and replace it with what they call "the New Covenant." For example, one respected conservative theologian of the previous generation, Graham Scroggie, claimed:

The Old Covenant ... holds us in bondage, but the New brings us into freedom. The Old involves a curse, but the New imparts a blessing. In the Old man seeks God, but in the New God seeks man. By the Old man is condemned as a sinner, but by the New he is delivered from his sin. In the Old God says 'you cannot', but in the New Christ says 'I can'. The Old covenant is really bad news, but the New Covenant is Good News, that is, Gospel. . . . How wonderful is the contrast: Moses and Christ; Mosaism and Christianity; Death and Life; on Stone and in the Heart; Letter and Spirit; condemnation and Righteousness; Passing and Permanent; face Veiled and Unveiled; Bondage and Freedom; Transience and Transformation. ... There are at least ten points of contrast between

the Old and the New Dispensations. Christianity is not glorified Judaism; it is something entirely new. There is a fundamental difference between the Law and the Gospel. (W. Graham Scroggie *The unfolding Drama of Redemption*, Kregel Publications, 1994 (vol. II, p 74, vol. III, p. 92)

Boldly embracing a belief in contrasts, Scroggie apparently saw little in way of continuity between the Testaments, *Old and New*. No doubt he sincerely believed that he was promoting "the faith once delivered to the saints." (*Jude 3*) but he fell about a century short, embracing instead the antithetical thinking of Marcion whose competing movement's rate of growth in the 2nd century briefly outpaced that of the proto-Catholic Church. In an effort to counter it's influence, certain of Marcion's tenets were picked up and propagated in modified form by the Church, a practice continuing to this day. Though Marcion's book, *Anti-thesis*, long ago disappeared, as has his religion, their influence continues, albeit largely unrecognized for what it is.

Nor is it just the Hebrew Scriptures that are to be set aside, Jesus' teachings are also to be set aside:

Many interpreters see the Sermon on the Mount as directly and primarily applicable to Christians today. To do this, interpreters depend heavily on the method of spiritualization, for it is apparent that the laws and regulations found in the Sermon cannot be directly applied today without producing insurmountable problems and repercussions.

The requirements of turning the other cheek and not asking for that which had been borrowed, although applicable under some conditions, would be difficult to apply under all circumstances.

As Charles Ryrie observes: "But if the laws of the Sermon are to be obeyed today they could not be taken literally, for as [George Eldon] Ladd points out, every businessman would go bankrupt giving to those who ask of him. This is the dilemma every interpreter faces. If literal, it cannot be for today; if for today, it cannot be literal. Moreover, a casual reading of the Sermon reveals that it contains an embarrassing absence of church truths.

Nothing is said regarding Christ's sacrifice for sin (found as early as John 3), the faith which brings salvation, prayer in the name of Christ, the Holy Spirit, and even the church itself. These are all foundational truths taught by Christ during His early ministry.

If this the most lengthy and didactic of Christ's teachings were truly intended to be primarily related to the Christian church, its omission of basic church truths would be highly irregular.

There are, of course, parallels between precepts in the Sermon and those found in the Epistles, but this does not mean that one equals the other. The Ten commandments are all reiterated in the New Testament

except one, but this does not mean that the Ten commandments and the New Testament precepts are one and the same.

In view of these considerations, the proper conclusion with regards to the Sermon on the Mount is that the full and non-modified fulfillment of this portion of Matthew is possible only in relationship to the future institution of the Messianic Kingdom. It is applicable primarily to the nation Israel as she anticipates the institution of the kingdom at the millennium. It has no primary application in the church and should not be so taken.

(The Interpretation of Prophecy, Paul Lee Tan, Th.D.)

So here we have a situation where the Law is cancelled because we are under the New Covenant but, since the Millennium hasn't arrived, Jesus' New Covenant teaching need not be acted upon either. Thus it is that the antinomian Church has fallen into the crack between covenants, *Old* and *New*. Fundamentalist Christianity's adopted goal is to get men out of hell and into heaven, overlooking somehow that in between conversion and death there is a life to be lived. Their's is simply too narrow a foundation on which to build a moral community. The answer to covenantless Christianity is not to postulate two Israels, one Old, one New, or multiple dispensations, or multiple testaments but to accept that there are believers, both Jews and Christians, and those from every family and tribe who are spiritually awakened who name Abraham as their father and call upon God with no middle wall of division between them, having as a common mediator the man, Jesus Christ.

Naturally, none of this going to go down too well with those folk raised in conventional Christian settings, who are unprepared to countenance the idea that *none* of the Church's ceremonies, call them sacraments if you will, are efficacious; or that the Church is not a mediator between man and God, that only the man, Christ Jesus is; or that access to Jesus is not limited by any churchly hierarchy, or that salvation is dependant in any way on apostolic succession. Actually, on reflection, given repeated demonstrations of institutional frailty, this is good news, for the churches, being the human constructs that they are, are weak reeds on which any of us might rest our eternal well-being. Jesus admonishes us to take responsibility for our behavior.

And so then Jesus warned them [his disciples] of the pains and torments which they would suffer for his love. And he bade them be wise as a serpent and as simple as a dove. And at the end he comforted them and said that whoso had steadfast faith he would be safe, and that those who received them would also have good reward even as would those who received himself, or God Almighty, his father. (*ngn*, chapter 113)

This too is of the covenant, that it is not all of grace nor all of self effort but it is a partner-

ship, for:

The kingdom of God cometh not with outward show; neither shall they say,
Lo here! or, Lo there! for behold, the kingdom of God is within you. (Luke 17:20-21)

The Gospel is not just about God's transcendence but also His immanence, that being the Life of God in the Soul of Man, a core 1st century belief, is about our becoming by grace what God is by nature. Called *Theodosia* in Greek, Peter at Pentecost said of it:

For the promise [of spiritual enlightenment] is to you and to your children,
and to *all* who are afar off, as many as the Lord our God will call." (Acts 2:9)

The Gospel advances on two planes simultaneously: outwardly as the approaching millennial kingdom when Jesus will return in force but also within as the Spirit's presence.

NAZARENE MEANS "BRANCH"

And there came forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch [*N'tzer* in Hebrew or Nazareth in Gk.] shall grow out of his roots: and the spirit of Jehovah shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of Jehovah; . . . (Isaiah 11:1-2)

"A rod from the stem / a branch from the root," if you've ever puzzled about these expressions or the cognomen "Branch Davidian," they're all references to the prophesied messianic offshoot which grew forth from King David's family tree. That is the subject of this essay, Nazarene history, not Church history. Though they share certain features, they are rivals having different Scriptures, modes of operation, and potentialities.

Albeit "the Branch," Jesus did not start the Nazarene movement but John the Baptist did which is why he's known as the "Forerunner." At the root of the movement were covenantal promises made to David and before him to Abraham. This, the Abrahamic/Davidic Covenant, Jesus extended to all people. This he did not annul, replace, or supercede as some suppose, especially as the Church supposes.

Because trees grow from the bottom up, not from the top down, our assessment of the Nazarene movement necessarily depends on our assessment of its roots – is it a valid expression of the promises made to King David a 1000 years before. As for Davidic promises, are they consistent with the Covenant made a 1000 years before his time with Abraham? Abraham > the House of Israel > the House of David > the Nazarene Branch, all depend on whether they are rooted in God or not. In approaching such questions, let us do so with our eyes open, for credulity is not belief, any more than honest inquiry is sacrilege. *Intellige*

ut credas – from understanding cometh believing. Does this not comport with “the spirit of wisdom and understanding ... the spirit of knowledge and reverence of YHVH”?

And he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, he shall be called a Nazarene. (*Matthew 2:23*)

Odd that statement, since Nazareth is never mentioned in prophecy, indeed, is never mentioned in Scripture, nor even in prior secular literature. The only other *New Testament* “Nazarene” reference – at least translated as such in the King James Version – is *Acts 24:5* where Paul is described by his detractors as a “ringleader of the sect of the Nazarene.” However, all four canonical gospels, in various places, in the original Greek use the form “*Iesou Nazarene*” (e.g. *Matthew 26:71*; *Mark 1:24, 10:47, 14:67*; *Luke 4:34*; *John 17:5*; *Acts 2:22*) which, while all are translated as “Jesus of Nazareth,” might better be translated as “Jesus the Nazarene.”

“Nazarene” is the term used to this day throughout the East, in Hebrew, in Syriac, in Arabic for “Christian” – that is, “Messianic.” Three possible Hebrew words exist from which “Nazarene” could have been derived: from *N'tzer*, meaning “Branch”: or *Nozrei*, meaning “to keep” as in *nozrei ha-Brit*, “keepers of the Covenant.” Jeremiah uses the term regarding the Rechabites who “keep the oath of their father Jonadab” and: *Nazar* meaning “consecrated to,” or “set apart unto God,” that is a Nazarite. According to one scholar, Robert Eisenman:

The term [‘Nazarene’] probably cannot derive from the word ‘Nazareth’ though Nazareth could derive from it – that is, there could be a city in Galilee which derived its name from the expression Nazoraean in Hebrew, but not the other way around.” . . . “The ‘keeping’ aspect of this terminology is exactly the definition by modern-day offshoots of this orientation, ‘the Sabaeans of the marshes’ in Southern Iraq, who still hold the memory of John the Baptist dear and call their priests ‘Nazoreans’ ... Apparently ‘Mandaean’ was the name used for the rank and file of such groups, the priestly elite being known as the *Nazoraean*s! ‘*Suba*’ of course, meant to be baptized or immersed. (*James the Brother of Jesus*, Robert Eisenman)

Nearly 4000 years have elapsed since the Covenant was established with Abraham. In this expanse of time, testings have been frequent, with respites having been relatively few and brief. From the shadows of the pyramids forward, Abraham's physical descendants have long been a perishing people, yet they live and the promises of God remain. From Abraham to Jesus, 1970 BC to 30 AD (2000 years), were the former days and – since that time, there are the latter days.

In the former days were patriarchs, kings, and priests; in these latter days there are redemptive fellowships in which context no special place is accorded priests, prelates, popes, vicars, rabbis, or any other authority figure – God the Father being sufficient. If there are priests, it is the priesthood of believers. All are priests and kings or none are. Nevertheless, believers are finite and fallible. Though ruled above and from within by God, as social beings we need each other, but only on the basis of mutual respect.

Having been rejected by temple and synagogue, Jesus' fall back position was to establish an egalitarian society of friends against whom the gates of hell would not prevail. Rather than replace, abolish, or reform any of the aforementioned institutions, Jesus simply moved on. Instead of promoting a reformed or even a substitute synagogue movement, or a purified Aaronic priesthood, or a resurrected Davidic kingship, Jesus turned to the last bastions of civility: face to face communities, the home, and the individual believer. Networked together, though one waters and the other plants, and God gives the increase even as His power is diffused among them.

DEFINING "ISRAEL"

The word 'Israel' today generally refers to the oversea's political nation, the State of Israel. When people say 'I am going to Israel,' they mean a trip to Tel Aviv or Jerusalem . . . [But] the prayers that Judaism teaches, all use the word 'Israel' to mean 'the holy community.

(Rabbi Jacob Neusner)

"When I use a word," Humpty Dumpty said in a rather scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to mean -- neither more nor less." "The question is," said Alice, "whether you can make words mean so many things." "The question is," said Humpty Dumpty, "which is to be master -- that's all."

(Lewis Carroll, *Through the Looking Glass*)

Those possessing great power over society have a way of making their definitions stick. Nonetheless, a higher law than their's pertains, namely, the Law of First Mention, whereby a word means that which Holy Writ first says it means. Let us ask, what meant the word "Israel" when it fell from the lips of the unidentified "man" who had engaged the patriarch Jacob in an all-night wrestling match? Having held his own, Jacob at daybreak demanded a blessing from this mysterious person. His reply was swift in coming:

"Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but **Israel**: for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed." (Genesis 32:28)

A compound word, "Israel" in Hebrew divides into three parts: 'iIs- "man" ra- "struggle" and "-el," "God." A God wrestler, Jacob, the "man who struggles with God" wrestled God's

mysterious representative to a draw until morning and won a blessing. Suggestive of whom he was wrestling, Jacob/Israel named that place of struggle and blessing “Pneiel,” *pnei-*, meaning “face of,” for, as he put it:

“I have seen God face to face and lived.” (Genesis 32:30)

Not long thereafter, Jacob built an altar. In naming it, he appropriated his new name, calling that place “*El-elohe-Israel*,” which translated means: “God is the God of him who struggles with God.”

Now here’s where things get just a little complicated for there exists an alternative way of translating “Israel,” one widely recognized in antiquity, that is to break the word *Israel* into three parts: *’is ra’a el*, meaning the “man who saw God.” (Or: *yasur el*, meaning: [he] sees God.) Let us recall what Jacob said:

“I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved.” (Genesis 32:30)

Wrote Philo of Alexandria (c. 25 BC - 41 AD?) :

For seeing is the lot of the freeborn and first born Israel, which [name], translated, is the one seeing God.
(*On Flight and Finding*)

Hippolytus of Rome (c. 170-c 236 AD) wrote:

“Israel means a “man seeing God,” while others say it is a “man who will see God.” (Pentateuch)

Wrote Origen (185-232 AD):

“It is this people alone which it is said to “see God,” for the name Israel when translated has this meaning.”
(*On First Principles*)

Wrote Eusebius (c. 260 - c. 340 AD):

“Israel” means “seeing God,” in the sense of the knowing and contemplative faculty.” (*Praeparatio Evangelica*)

Wrote Augustine of Hippo (354 - 430 AD):

. . . he [Jacob] then asked for a blessing from the same angel whom he had just overcome. The granting of this new name was thus the blessing. For Israel means “one seeing God,” which in the end will be the reward of all the saints.
(*City of God 16:39*)

Let us leave to linguists the finer points of definition. Given our present state of knowledge, it is reasonable to allow for both meanings, both “to struggle” and “to see.” And who is to say that a double meaning wasn’t intended from the outset?

Was the person whom Jacob saw the same his grandfather Abraham saw, Melchizedek, King of Salem? Was it the same as the “son of man” whom Daniel saw in the fiery furnace? Was the voice Jacob heard, the still, small voice Elijah heard? However that may be, Jacob was a changed man.

Truly a tale of epic proportions, Israel’s story was written on a very large canvas, one possessing numerous twists and turns and surprising psychological insights. Only a few notables, a Moses or a David, are given a fuller, more detailed treatment in Scripture. Thus it has come to pass that in all his struggles Jacob/Israel has come to embody the hopes and fears, not only of his own people, but of people everywhere, for his life speaks volumes about the passions and pathos of the human predicament. Even in our relentlessly secular era among those not religiously inclined, broad acquaintance exists with the particulars of his story, for instance, how he obtained his twin brother Esau’s birthright by cunningly disguising himself so as to deceive his blind, aged father, Isaac, into granting him Esau’s blessing. After that he had to flee to the far country to escape Esau’s wrath. There he lived 20 years in Laban’s household (Laban being his mother Rebekah’s brother). By agreement with his uncle, Jacob worked seven years for the hand of Laban’s daughter, Rachel, and, as the Scriptures read, those years seemed to him “but a few days, for the love he had for her.” But on his wedding night, he discovered that he had been deceived, that his veiled bride was not Rachel, rather Rachel’s unmarried older sister, Leah. Therefore he worked another seven years for Rachel and six more years after that, and all the while Laban kept diddling him and changing his terms of employment.

After two decades absence, on a word from God, Jacob and his extensive entourage, including two wives and many sons returned to the land promised to Abraham. On approaching Canaan, Jacob learned to his chagrin that Esau was advancing toward him with an army of 400. As it is written, he was “afraid and distressed.” As some exegetes have said, he was afraid of losing all in battle but also distressed that he might have to kill. Working every angle he could, Jacob sent gifts ahead and divided his people into two bands. Taking up the thread of his story as told in *Genesis*, let us begin with the eve before his fateful meeting with Esau:

And Jacob said, O God of my father Abraham, and God of my father Isaac, YHVH who said unto me, Return unto thy country, and to thy kindred, and I will deal well with thee: I am not worthy of the least of all thy mercies, and of all the truth, which thou hast shown unto thy servant; for with my staff I passed over this Jordan; and now I am become two bands. Deliver I pray thee, from the hand of my brother, from the hand of Esau: for I fear him, lest he come and smite, and the mother with the children, and thou said, I will surely do thee good, and make thy seed as the sand of the sea, which cannot be numbered

for multitude. And he lodged there that same night . . . And Jacob was left alone; and there wrestled a man with him. And when he saw he prevailed no against him, he touched the hollow of his thigh; and the hollow of Jacob's thigh was out of joint, as he wrestled with him. And he said, Let me go, for the day breaketh. And he said, I will not let thee go, except thou bless me. And he said unto him, What is thy name? And he said, Jacob. And he said "Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel: for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed." And Jacob asked him, and said, Tell me, I pray thee, thy name And he said, wherefore is it that thou ask after my name? And he blessed him there. And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel; for I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved. And he passed over Peneul the sun rose upon him, and he hated upon his thigh.

(Genesis 32:9-13, 24-31)

Returning to a previously-made point, that language is idiosyncratic, that it is the nature of the idiom for multiple meanings to attach to a single word. Let us consider how the meaning of "Israel" expanded in biblical usage as to include Jacob/Israel's descendants. For instance, in *Exodus*, God tells Moses to tell Pharaoh:

"Thus saith YHWH, 'Israel is my son, even my first born . . . Let my son go.'" (Exodus 4:22-23)

Later, it is written of King Solomon that "all Israel obeyed him" (*I Chronicles 29:23*), the idea being, not that every Israelite obeyed him, but, corporately speaking, the nation was subject to him and obeyed him. After King Solomon's time, the Israelite nation broke apart into two: the Southern Kingdom, called "Judah;" and the Northern Kingdom, called "Israel" (*I Kings 15:9*). Thus we see that besides Jacob and his descendants, there was a political entity called "Israel."

But let us go a step further by inquiring whether Jesus IS Israel. In *Isaiah 41:8*, God is credited with saying:

"But thou, Israel, art my servant ... the seed of Abraham."

Referencing to this same verse immediately above, the apostle Paul wrote:

"Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. The Scripture does not say, 'and to seeds' meaning many people, but, 'and to your seed' meaning one person, who is Christ." (*Galatians 3:16*)

"Seed of Abraham" is singular above, not plural. Referring only to Jesus, it does not include Abraham's wicked posterity. Abraham was promised heirs who would become as numerous "as the sands of the sea and the stars of heaven." But those heirs are not necessarily racially Jews but Gentiles also who through the ages have trusted God and obeyed his Spirit. But it's not just Paul. About 800 BC, Hosea too speaks of Israel in the singular. He recorded God as saying:

“When Israel was a child, then I love him, and called my son out of Egypt.” (*Hosea 11:1*)

Matthew, quoting this verse as applying prophetically to Jesus:

... until the death of Herod: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord
by the prophet, saying, “out of Egypt have I called my son.” (*Matthew 2:15*)

So, *Hosea* had in mind the nation but *Matthew* had in mind the person. So which is it, individual or nation? There’s a way to straddle this question by seeing that Jesus was representative Israel. To an amazing degree, Holy Writ, unlike any other book, contains types and antitypes. That is to say, the nation of Israel and the outworking of its history, were object lessons foreshadowing the events of Jesus’ life.

If we’re right in our supposition that the man/angel who wrestled Jacob until dawn was the pre-incarnate Jesus, then, perhaps, we can see that by renaming Jacob “Israel,” Jesus was lending to him his own name, a name which he later reclaimed. But why would Jesus lend his name to Jacob? because Jacob, in his struggle to save his family, mirrored or foreshadowed the struggles Jesus would have as Savior. This we see of Jesus on the stake of impalement, crying forth in agony, “My God, my God why hath thou forsaken me?” His was code language, for so the psalms were identified by speaking forth their first verse. He was saying in effect, go read *Psalms 22*.

Jesus intervenes with God on man’s behalf, even as it is written: “For there is one God and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a ransom for all, ...” (*I Timothy 2:5-6*). Why so? because he is uniquely “... the lamb slain from the foundation of the world” (*Revelation 13:8*). In the great controversy between God and Satan, Jesus, by appointment of God, entered the fray on our behalf. That’s why he’s the Eternal God wrestler, the Eternal Israel of God.

They are not all Israel, which are of Israel. (*Romans 9:6*)

Unrepentant sinners of any race have no inheritance from a holy God – on earth or in heaven. They can only expect God’s wrath. Evangelicals misinterpret God’s blessing to Abraham and also misread His curses. God told Abraham, “I will bless them that bless you and curse them that curse you.” (*Gen. 12:3*) Most Christians mistakenly fear that to criticize evil Jewish leadership is to “curse God’s chosen people.” Result: they unconditionally support Israel’s most egregious injustices. But this verse applies to righteous Abraham and only to those descendants who also walk in righteousness. Yes, God did promise the land of Israel to Abraham’s genetic descendants. But only obedient Jews can enjoy that inheritance. Paul says someday a Jewish remnant will repent at Christ’s return; “the Lord shall return to Zion and turn ungodliness from Jacob (*Rom. 11:26*) The Promised Land is their birthright. Out of the dry bones of Jewish unbelief, Christ will raise

up a nation of saints (Ezekiel 37); and for the first time in at least 2,000 years, believing Jews will be divinely endorsed to occupy Palestine. . . . God hasn't changed. He said the Jews turned away from Him, but He remained the same (Malachi 3:6). Those who have changed and forgotten God's law are not only the Jews – but tens of millions of evangelicals. (Who are Abraham's Children, Rev. Tred Pike 3/23/2010)

There is the outward, physical fact of generation, but also the inward reality of spiritual regeneration. It wasn't merely that his grandfather was Abraham or his father Isaac, but Jacob, through the integrity of his faith in God, attained spiritual reality. The nature of his engagement with God merited remembrance. Prophesied Balaam:

“There shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel . (Numbers 24:17)

In *Psalms 80:8*, Israel, the nation, is called “a vine” whom God brought out of Egypt but Jesus says of himself, that “I am the true vine” (*John 15:1*). And Isaiah quotes God as saying of the nation, Israel:

“Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delights; I have put my spirit upon him: he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed he shall not break, and the smoking flax he shall not quench; he shall bring forth judgment unto truth.” (Isaiah 42:1-3)

God called Israel “mine elect,” but we see that Jesus is God's elect. How did he handle election? By emptying himself, by becoming a servant. That's what Abraham did, that's what Jacob did, and that's what we have to do. Moving on, let us consider another expression of Paul's:

For neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation. And as many as shall walk by this rule, peace be upon them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God. (Galatians 6:15-16)

If I'm hearing Paul aright, he's expanding the meaning of “Israel” beyond what we have heretofore considered to include a spiritual aspect separate apart from any ethnic consideration. In other words, a Gentile could have the same quality of engagement with God that Jacob/Israel had. Certainly, earlier in his epistle to the Galatians, that would seem to be the thrust of Paul's argument when he writes:

If you are in Christ, then you are Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promises. (Galatians 3:29)

Be they Gentile or Jew, whoever is Abraham's seed, spiritually speaking, is Israel. Alas, Christian theologians have pushed the whole matter in the wrong direction by claiming that the “Church is the “new,” replacement Israel. The problem with this line of reasoning (sometimes referred to as replacement theology or supersessionism) is that the name “Israel”

is applied to a corporate entity, the institutional Church, when it's only rightly applied to the individual or class of individuals who quest to know God. The idea, then, is not of a "new," replacement Israel but of the Israel of old who prevailed with man and God.

Behold Israel after the flesh, . . . (*I Corinthians 10:18*)

Paul's expressions "Israel after the flesh" and "the Israel of God" are often treated as if they were diametrically opposed but this cannot be. Jesus was both Israel after the flesh and Israel after the Spirit. Paul's expression need not be seen as an either/or proposition.

Arises, then, the question, who is "Israel after the flesh" in our day? Are modern-day Israelis even descended from the Israelites of old? Strong evidence exists that they are not. According to one historian, Shlomo Sand, of Tel Aviv University:

Then there is the question of the exile of 70 AD. There has been no real research into this turning point in Jewish history, the cause of the diaspora. And for a simple reason: the Romans never exiled any nation from anywhere on the eastern seaboard of the Mediterranean. Apart from enslaved prisoners, the population of Judea continued to live on in their lands, even after the destruction of second temple. Some converted to Christianity in the 4th century, while the majority embraced Islam during the 7th century Arab conquest.

Most Zionist thinkers were aware of this: Yitzhak Ben Zvi, later President of Israel, and David Ben Gurion, its first prime minister, accepted it as late as 1929, the year of the great Palestinian revolt. Both stated on several occasions that the peasants of Palestine were the descendants of the inhabitants of ancient Judea. Yitzhak Ben Zvi, the second president of the State of Israel, wrote in 1929 that "the vast majority of the peasant farmers do not have their origins in the Arab Conquerors, but rather, before then, in the Jewish farmers who were numerous and a majority in the building of the land."

But if there was no exile after 70 AD, where did all the Jews who have populated the Mediterranean since antiquity come from? The smokescreen of national historiography hides an astonishing reality. From the Maccabean revolt of the mid-2nd century BC to the Bar Kokhba revolt of the 2nd century AD, Judaism was the most actively proselytizing religion. . . . The most significant mass conversion occurred in the 8th century, in the massive Khazar kingdom between the Black and Caspian seas.

And now we have the genetic evidence to back up Shlomo Sand's contentions:

**NEW GENETIC STUDY REPORTEDLY PROVES KHAZAR
ANCESTRY FOR ASHKENAZI JEWS (ABRIDGED)**

Shmarya Rosenberg

Ashkenazi Jews are a mix of genetic ancestries, far more of which than previously thought originating in tribes from the Caucasus – a region that sits in between Eastern Europe and Asia between the Black and the Caspian seas,

Reuters reports. Those Slav, Scythian, Hunnic-Bulgar, Iranian, Alan and Turkic tribes formed a confederation that created the Khazar empire – which at its height stretched from Kiev in the west to the Aral Sea in the southeast. But it didn't last. After more than 500 years, the Khazar's empire collapsed in the 13th century CE due to Mongol attacks and the Black Death. Many Jewish refugees fled westward into Eastern Europe, becoming the bulk of what we know today as Ashkenazi Jewry.

Known as the Khazar Hypothesis, it had previously been dismissed by geneticists whose studies often contradicted each other and which often seemed to be geared to proving a preconceived notion or desire – near-unadulterated ancestry from ancient Judea – rather than discovering the truth. That led geneticist Eran Elhaik of the Johns Hopkins School of Public Health in Baltimore, Maryland to try to reconcile those conflicting studies. And that led him to genetic data that he believes proves the Khazar Hypothesis is accurate. Elhaik found ancestral genetic signatures that pointed clearly to the Caucasus. He also found such signatures that pointed the Middle East, but to a far, far smaller degree.

“We conclude that the genome of European Jews is a tapestry of ancient populations including Judaized Khazars, Greco-Roman Jews, Mesopotamian Jews and Judeans. Their population structure was formed in the Caucasus and the banks of the Volga, with roots stretching to Canaan and the banks of the Jordan,”

Previous genetic studies appeared to support the Rhineland Hypothesis, which posits that Ashkenazi Jews descended from Jews who fled the Land of Israel after the Moslem conquest in 638 AD, settling in southern Europe and slowly working their way north. 50,000 supposedly later moved from the Rhineland into eastern Europe in the later Middle Ages. But there are serious problems with the Rhineland Hypothesis – so serious that some of its proponents actually posited a Divine miracle to account for them.

For example, the population of Eastern European Jews surged from 50,000 in the 15th century CE to about 8 million by the start of the 20th century – a birthrate 10 times greater than the local non-Jewish population that surrounded them. That implausible population surge would have had to take place despite the economic hardship, wars and pogroms that ravaged those Jewish communities, and the plague that ravaged the entire region. Another problem with the Rhineland Hypothesis is Yiddish, the language of Eastern European Jews. “Yiddish, the language of Central and Eastern European Jews, began as a Slavic language,” Elhaik notes. It was classified as a dialect of High German later.

Elhaik's study, published in the British journal *Genome Biology and Evolution*, compares the genomes of 1,287 unrelated individuals who come from eight Jewish and 74 non-Jewish populations.

If those currently ruling the Promised Land are not racially Semites but Asiatics, it's next reasonable to ask whether they are religiously or spiritually Israelites? Since most modern, Israeli Jews are religiously nonobservant, one can hardly say that they qualify on religious grounds. But what of the observant Israeli minority? According to Jesus their practices, be-

ing the practices of the Pharisees, is diametrically opposed to anything Jacob would have known of or have approved of. Of Talmudic Judaism, Jewish authorities say:

The Jewish religion as it is today traces its descent without a break through all the centuries from the Pharisees. Their leading ideas and methods found expression in a literature of enormous extent, of which a very great deal is still in existence. The Talmud is the largest and most important single piece of that literature and the study of it is essential for any real understanding of Pharisaim.

(The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, p. 474)

If we had any real interest in Abraham's physical offspring, that is, Israel after the flesh, or even if we had any interest in simple justice, we would be championing the Palestinians' cause because the current situation is one of Ashkenazis interlopers, awarding to themselves the Law of Return when they were never there in the first place while denying to those who were there all along the right to continue living there. When we support the modern State of Israel, what we're supporting is not the faith once delivered to the saints but Pharisaim, or worse yet, an international bankers' conspiracy. Supporting such would make us doubly Abraham's foes in that we would be opposing both his physical and spiritual heritage. In a nutshell Zionism is the granting to Asiatic pretenders rights to the Promised Land when they possess no legitimate claim whatsoever – be it legal, racial, or religious. God promised Abraham,

“Unto thy seed will I give this land.” (Genesis 12:7)

THE INGATHERING OF THE DISPOSSESSED

And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications: and they shall look upon me whom they pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his firstborn.

((Zechariah 12:10)

To whom applies this verse, to Asiatic interlopers or to Abraham's true physical descendants? Much of Christendom is off on a fool's errand to “bless Israel,” this based on race, not grace, and it is another gospel entirely. Despite pretensions Asiatic interlopers entertain regarding their chosen-ness, they are not the apple of God's eye; rather, redeemed humanity is. That is the Israel of God. In due course, as it is written, Jehovah God will throw the money changers out, as well, the armies of Gentiles which they have mustered to serve their cause:

Then shall YHWH go forth, and fight against those nations, as when he fought the day of battle. . . . And it shall be in that day, that living waters shall go out from Jerusalem; half of them toward the former sea, and half of them toward the hinder sea: in summer and in winter shall it be. And YHWH shall be king over all the earth: in that day shall there be one YHWH, and his name one. *(Zechariah 13:3, 14:8-9)*

WRONGLY DIVIDING THE WORD OF TRUTH

Dispensationalism is a system of theology whose adherents strive for a consistently literal interpretation of the Bible. It makes careful distinctions between different periods of God's progressive dealings with mankind, and between His plans for national Israel and for the New Testament Church. Dispensationalism is currently the most common interpretive framework for lay-level evangelicals in the United States. What makes dispensationalism distinct from other historical perspectives is that a new dispensation is generally not responsible for the revelation intended for other dispensations. The Church is not under the obligations of the Old Testament law, and in fact is not subject to any law at all. As Lewis Sperry Chafer explained, whereas the command of the Old Testament was "repent," the command of the New Testament is "only believe!" (C. Pope)

Contrasting Law and Grace as belonging to entirely different dispensations, Dr. Cyrus Scofield, the famed author of the Scofield Reference Bible, wrote:

It is, however, of the most vital moment to observe that Scripture never, in any dispensation mingles these two principles. Law always has a place and work distinct and wholly diverse from that of grace. . . . Everywhere the Scriptures present law and grace in sharply contrasted spheres. The mingling of them in much of the current teaching of the day spoils both, for law is robbed of its terror and grace of its freeness. . . . As a dispensation, grace begins with the death and resurrection of Christ.

As a corollary to his injunction not to co-mingle Law and Grace, Dr. Scofield came to the surprising conclusion, that both the Lord's prayer and the Sermon on the Mount are "pure law" rooted, he says, in "legal ground." The prayer "forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors," is applicable, he claims, only to a past or future dispensation and he warns his readers that Jesus only intended by the Sermon on the Mount to convey a legalism impossible to practice.

One of the most remarkable innovations dispensationalists ever came up with is the assertion that there are two New Covenants, one for the Jew, one for the Christian:

There remains to be recognized a heavenly covenant for the heavenly people, which is also styled like the preceding one for Israel, a "new covenant." It is made in the blood of Christ (cf. Mark 14:24) and continues in effect throughout this age, whereas the new covenant made with Israel happens to be future in its application. . . . To suppose that these two covenants – one for Israel and one for the Church – are the same is to assume that there is a latitude of common interest between God's purpose for Israel and His purpose for the Church. (Lewis Sperry Chafer, *Systematic Theology*)

[The] basic premise of Dispensationalism is two purposes of God expressed in the formation of two peoples who maintain their distinction throughout eternity. (Charles C. Ryrie)

The church and Israel are two distinct groups with whom God has a divine plan . . . These considerations all arise from a literal method of interpretation. (Dwight Pentecost, *Things to Come*)

As we see from the quotes above, leading dispensationalists, if they had their druthers, would forever separate followers of Jesus from Israel.

According to Lewis S. Chafer, founder of Dallas Theological Seminary, the 20th century's leading dispensationalist systematizer, the Church is "wholly unrelated to any divine purpose which preceded it or follows it." In light of such views, it is understandable that some evangelicals, supposing the Church age to be all but over, a mere parenthesis, so they say, bracketed on either side by Israel, are moving their allegiance to Israel:

In the last eight years alone, an estimated 400,000 born-again donors have sent [Rabbi Yechiel] Eckstein about a quarter of a billion dollars for Jewish causes of his personal choosing. No Jew since Jesus has commanded this kind of gentile following.

("The Rabbi Who Loved Evangelicals and Vice Versa" Zev Chafets)

Alas, the love which evangelicals have showered on the rabbi is unrequited. In his book, *What You Should Know About Jews and Judaism* (p. 295), Rabbi Eckstein, states explicitly:

A Jew who accepts Jesus as Lord or Messiah effectively ceases to be a Jew.

What we have then, beginning with Dr. Cyrus Scofield, is not so much new-found tolerance between Jews and Christians as a temporary convergence of triumphalisms:

. . . an alliance in which each side assumes that the other is playing a role it doesn't understand itself, in which each often regards the other as an unknowing instrument for reaching a higher goal. (Gershom Gorenberg)

Zionized Christians and Zionized Jews, even as they trumpet "our Judeo-Christian heritage," each in their own way, are building a wall of separation between Jews and Christians and, as well, between Israel and the Church. Zionized Christians and Zionized Jews,

B R E A K I N G D O W N T H E W A L L O F S E P A R A T I O N

Wherefore remember , that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands; that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world: but now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making

peace; and that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby: and came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh. For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father. Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit. *(Ephesians 2:11-22)*

B L E S S I N G A B R A H A M

Now the Lord had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee: and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed. *(Genesis 12:1-3)*

Evangelicals are adamant, if we will just bless the Jews, then God will bless us. But how true is that? Is that what Scripture says? Not really, for the Promise is not to carnal but to spiritual generation through faith, otherwise Ishmael, not Israel, is blessed. But, then, evangelicals have displayed an uncanny knack for calling blessed that which God calls cursed.

One might reasonably ask, how blessed is America for having under-written the Zionist State these last 60 years? Not blessed at all. In this same time span America went into steep moral decline, as well as ending up awash in debt (at least \$14 trillion of which is owed to foreigners), and this from fighting the interloper's wars. Thus has America gone from being history's biggest creditor nation to history's biggest debtor nation, with indebtedness now so great, it can never be repaid.

As we see above, God's Covenant with Abraham includes aspects both tribal and universal, with the universal aspect predominating. That Gentile Christians can say "Father Abraham" is because they are Abraham's children, not distant relatives. By breaking down the middle wall of partition separating Jew and Gentile through his sacrificial death, Jesus opened the way to those not physically descended from Abraham to fellowship on a par with those who are so descended. That is to say, Jesus did not abrogate or annul the Abrahamic Covenant; to the contrary, he expanded it out to include all God's children, and this on the basis of strictest equality. This then is the east-ness and the west-ness of it all:

And they shall come from the east, and from the west and from the north, and from the south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God. But the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness.

(Luke 13:29, Matthew 8:12)

THE WORKS OF ABRAHAM

When certain Pharisees claimed that "We be Abraham's seed," (*John 8: 33*), Jesus in effect replied that this wasn't their automatic birthright as they seemed to think, that certain criteria existed, for, as he said to them:

"If you were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham." (*John 8:39*)

"The works of Abraham"? Since so much seems to rest on it, we'd like to know more specifically, what works are these? But maybe we already know, for it is written:

He hath shown thee, O man, what is good; and what doth YHVH (Jehovah) require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God? (*Micah 6:8*)

On one level, the works of Abraham relate as we see above to simple honesty motivated by goodwill. More specifically, however, it can also relate to Abraham's willingness to part with the apple of his eye, his son Isaac, the son of promise, in obedience to God's decree. However, in many a conventional Christian circle it is commonly taught (however implausibly) that Jesus replaced the Abrahamic Covenant with the New. (By the Law of First Mention, the New Covenant defined in *Jeremiah 31* applies to the millennial Kingdom-to-come, not to present times or circumstances.) The antinomian "once saved, always safe" concept, cannot be squared with Jesus' sterner admonitions regarding the path of duty as the Way of Life. Once again (albeit this time not through works of the Law but through trivialization) the "children of the kingdom," albeit seated at their Father's table, are starving for want of spiritual reality, while faithful others from afar do feast. If the Abrahamic Covenant Jesus neither canceled, replaced, or annulled but graciously extended to all, then let us inquire as to its prophetic foundation for inclusion:

It is through Isaac [through faith] that your offspring will be reckoned. As he [God] saith in Hosea, I will call them my people, which were not my people; and her beloved which was not beloved. And it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people; there shall they be called the children of the living God. (*Romans 9:6, 7, 25-26*)

From the quotes immediately above and below (a sample of many), we see that the Abrahamic faith from its very inception was intended to be universal in scope:

"And I will make of thee [Abram] a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." . . . Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be called Abraham, for a father of many nations have I made thee." (*Genesis 12:2-3, 17:5*)

FATHER ABRAHAM

Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar?

Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? (*James 2: 21-22*)

Though half dead from old age and though there seemed to be no way, yet Abraham, hoping against hope, believed God would somehow redeem the situation. What Abraham sought for was a place under the sun for himself and his progeny, for more than life itself, Abraham loved his son, Isaac, the apple of his eye, whom God had gifted to him in his old age but somewhere along the way Abraham took to heart a deep truth: that of putting the giver above the gift. Thus he subordinated his personal desires to a higher consideration, a stance which stood him in good stead in the day of testing on Mount Moriah. His was true Zionism, indeed, and:

"It was counted unto him for righteousness."

(*Romans 4:3*)

In response to Abraham's faithfulness, God said to him:

By myself have I sworn, saith YHVH, for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son: 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 that is upon the seashore; and thy seed shall possess the gates of his enemies; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice."

(*Genesis 22:16-18*)

"Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be called Abraham, for a father of many nations have I made thee."

(*Genesis 17:5*)

"And I [Jehovah] will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed."

(*Genesis 12:2-3*)

Too often it's been the case with evangelical Christians that the verse above has been twisted to mean that one should support the Zionist State. Think about that for a moment – giving aid and comfort to those who, spiritually speaking, are linearly descended from the very Pharisees who put Jesus to death. Besides which, they fail to distinguish the interests of the Jewish people from those of the Jewish Establishment, a grievous error in its own right because 2000 years ago the former heard Jesus gladly while the later had him crucified.

THE ORIGIN OF THE SECRET RAPTURE DOCTRINE

The sooner the end times are ushered in, the sooner the Christians are raptured out, the sooner the Rothschilds are left to their own devices to rule the world from Jerusalem. That is what helps drive the need to distinguish Christians as God's heavenly people from Jews as God's earthly people:

In the predictions concerning the future of Israel and the church, the distinction is still more startling.

The church will be taken away from the earth entirely, but restored Israel is yet to have her greatest earthly splendor and power. (Dr. Cyrus Scofield)

And what of the teaching of a secret rapture that takes away the Church but leaves everyone to suffer? No church before 1830 promoted such a doctrine, none. To be sure, Scofield's 1909 Study Bible, heavily promoted by its publisher, Oxford University Press, lent this doctrine an aura of respectability and is to be credited with mainlining this doctrine into the bloodstream of Protestant, evangelical Christianity but the doctrine itself predates Scofield's birth in 1843. Scofield was merely a transmission belt for Darby.

With 30 volumes to his credit, each averaging 600 pages, Darby was a force to be reckoned with. Much of Protestant Christendom was bowled over by his learnedness but not everyone was equally impressed. Said one of his worthy contemporaries, George Mueller:

I am a constant reader of the Bible, and I soon found that what I was taught to believe did not always agree with what my Bible said. I came to see that I must either part company with John Darby, or my precious Bible, and I chose to cling to my Bible and part from Mr. Darby.

As to Darby's professional background: in the 1860s he entered into the employ of the British East India Company, which organization took its profits running opium into China. The British East India Company's owners, the Sassoons, otherwise called the Rothschilds of the Far East, with whom they are now intermarried, established what amounted to a symbiotic relationship, the missionaries to China would go over on the same ships as were carrying the Sassoons' opium and both parties were protected by the British army and navy.

Let us be realistic about this, in their quest to subvert all nations, the powers-that-be have not ignored religion. Working with Darby and others, they eventually succeed in poisoning much of Christendom with their peculiar brand of religious opiate. Today, Zionist control of the evangelical churches is near complete. In part this has been achieved by limiting the oxygen of publicity to select televangelists, (particularly those in three-piece, polyester suits with blow-dried hair-jobs), thus creating the false impression that these nabobs are Christianity's spokesmen.

Some are born great, some achieve greatness, some have greatness thrust upon them. That would be Jerry Falwell, an almost buffoonish character, yet founder of an influential, multi-million member movement, the Moral Majority. It was a set-up job. Others did the work, he got the credit. By cheapening and trivializing Christianity, the powers that be have done much to reduce it to the level of a laughingstock religion, thereby marginalizing it. At a more basic level, by taking control of Christian theology, they have led astray individual Christians with a subtle, lying propaganda.

Dr. Scofield originated neither the secret rapture doctrine nor the dispensational scheme. Rather, his mentor was Dr. James H. Brookes, whose mentor was James Nelson Darby and it was Darby who did the real work of systematizing. Eventually Darby and Scofield would meet.

Amply demonstrating that it's not *what* you know but *who* you know that counts, Dr. Scofield's career was much enhanced after he was befriended by Samuel Untermyer, the same Untermyer as was President Wilson's confidant (and blackmailer, for with Wilson's purloined love letters, he wrangled from Wilson a promise to appoint the Zionist Louis Brandeis to the Supreme Court.) Untermyer opened various doors to Scofield, one being to the New York City's exclusive Lotus Club, which for the next 20 years Scofield listed as his place of residence. One might wonder, what Untermyer, a New York sophisticate who operated at the highest levels of society, was doing hobnobbing with a fundamentalist preacher from Dallas (or vice versa)? However, as the leading Zionist of his day and chairman of the Jewish National Congress, Untermyer had his reasons, having to do with the subversion of Christianity.

The most important door Untermyer opened to Scofield, one not normally available to the uncredentialed, was that to Oxford University Press which became the *Scofield Reference Bible's* publisher. In print ever since 1909, with multiple millions of copies sold, this book greatly influenced Protestant theology throughout the 20th century and beyond.

When it comes to the secret Rapture Doctrine, not even Darby is to be fully credited with originating it, only with placing it within a dispensational, End Times, prophetic framework. The original source of Darby's secret rapture doctrine appears to have been a book titled: *The Coming of the Messiah in Glory and Majesty*. Presumably written by one Rabbi Juan Josephat Ben Ezra, a convert to Christianity, it was actually written by Emmanuel de Lacunza, a Jesuit Priest:

With Jesuit cunning, he [Lacunza] thus conspired to get his book a hearing in the Protestant world. They would not even permit it in their homes coming from a Jesuit pen but as the earnest work of the "converted Jew," they would consume it with avid interest! Within the pages of this elaborate forgery, Lacunza taught

the novel notion that Jesus returns not once, but twice, and at the "first stage" of His return He "raptures" His Church so they can escape the reign of the "future antichrist." (J. Preston Eby)

Lacunza's does not tell us outright his purpose. We have to deduce it but it seems to have been to deflect the Protestant charge made by Martin Luther and others that the Pope was the anti-Christ. Whatever his motive, Lacunza spent the better part of his adult life creating a book interpreting the *Book of Revelation* from what is called the futurist perspective, meaning that, as much as is possible, *Revelation's* contents are seen as applying strictly to the end times. His work is so cryptic it's doubtful whether anyone knows what it's really all about, but one passage is particularly relevant to this inquiry and therefore worth quoting:

The instruments or documents which we have presented in this dissertation, if they be seriously considered and combined with one another, appear more than sufficient to prove that God hath promised in his word, to raise many other saints besides those already raised, before the general resurrection; . . .

Here we have Christ returning, not once, as in Scripture, but twice, the first time to rapture the saints, then, after a time of trouble and lawlessness, i.e., the Great Tribulation, returning to rule the world in power. On this bifurcated return, the dispensational schemers built their theological edifice.

Originally published in 1811 in Spanish, Lacunza's book was translated by Edward Irving (founder of the Catholic Apostolic Church) into English and published in 1827. Both Irving and Darby thereafter began espousing a pre-tribulation rapture. Darby wrapped around the pre-trib rapture an entire theologic system, derisively termed by some as "Darbyism:"

John Darby (1800-1882) said that the dispensation of law ended at the cross when the dispensation of grace began. But then when the seven year dispensationalist tribulation period begins, another dispensation of law begins - so proposed Darby. This created a problem for Darby's theory. How could another dispensation of law go on when the Church was still on earth? He thought that in the dispensation of law during the tribulation, God would be dealing with the Jews. Would the Church in the tribulation return to be under the law? The solution was that Darby postulated that before the events of the tribulation began and the one man dispensationalist Anti-Christ appeared, the Church would be raptured off the earth. With the Church gone, God would then turned to deal with the Jews during the tribulation. (Bernard Pyron)

Thus we see, with not one scintilla of biblical backing, yet according to dispensationalists, Jesus plans, not one, but two returns. The first time around, instead of "all eyes will see him," no eye will see him since it is suppose to be a "secret rapture," whereby the living saints are lifted out of the world with the rest left behind to cope with the Great Tribulation.

When the late Reverend Jerry Falwell introduced Israel's Prime Minister Menachem Begin,

to his peculiar version of modern-day, evangelical Christianity, it must have warmed the cockles of the Prime Minister's heart, for its core belief that born-again Christians will be secretly raptured off of the planet, would leave the Jews in charge. That such news fell as sweet music on Begin's ears, is seen in the Prime Minister's reply, for as he put it to Falwell, if the Christians will support the Jews today, he, Menachem Begin, will support the Christians tomorrow when the Messiah comes.

That's the tradeoff, Zionist Christians get to entertain their chimerical illusions about a pre-tribulation rapture, for which not one scintilla of biblical evidence exists, while Judaic Zionists get to fulfill their nefarious plan to rule the world from Jerusalem. And think not for one moment that the Christians' Judaic brethren wouldn't give their good, Christian brethren a swift kick where it counts and send them all to kingdom come.

In placing its hope in a pre-tribulation rapture, much of evangelical Christianity, has seen its status reduced to the level of a death-dealing, latter-day, dooms-day cult, one which tends to leave its adherents unprepared to face the terrors which it has itself helped unleash. To be sure, not all evangelicals have been conned and some of them actively counter this error:

There are some among us teaching there will be no tribulation, that the Christians will be able to escape all this. These are the false teachers that Jesus was warning us to expect in the latter days. Most of them have little knowledge of what is already going on across the world. I have been in countries where the saints are already suffering terrible persecution. In China, the Christians were told, "Don't worry, before the tribulation comes you will be translated - raptured." Then came a terrible persecution. . . . Later I heard a Bishop from China say, sadly, "We have failed. We should have made the people strong for persecution rather than telling them Jesus would come first. Tell the people how to be strong in times of persecution, how to stand when the tribulation comes - to stand and not faint." (Corrie Ten Boom)

"If we Americans fail to support Israel," intoned Reverend Falwell, "we will be unimportant to God." However questionable that assertion, there is no questioning Falwell's importance to the State of Israel which, for services rendered, gifted him a Learjet, no doubt to facilitate his spreading abroad the secret rapture doctrine. After having the nuclear power plant in Iraq bombed, before phoning President Reagan, Prime Minister Begin first called his pal Jerry Falwell with the news, no doubt a signal honor.

How much Falwell's perspective has been taken to heart by his fellow Zionists can be seen from one of his Holy Land bus tours, whose participants, when given a choice, were least interested in visiting Nazareth but most interested in meeting with an Israeli general.

The worship of one's own collective human power, as embodied in a parochial community and organized in a parochial state, has been in truth the master religion . . . The process by which parochial-community-

worship has been imposed on a previously established religion may thus have been different in the histories of civilizations of different generations, but one unhappy consequence has been the same. In all cases, the victory of parochial-community-worship has worked havoc. . . . this religion is an expression of self-centredness; because self-centredness is the source of all strife; and because the collective ego is a more dangerous object of worship than the individual ego is. . . . the ultimately fatal effects of this religion are slow to reveal themselves and do not become unmistakably clear till the mischief has become mortally grave. . . . the self-worship of a parochial community is essentially incompatible with the moderation commended in such maxims as 'Live and let live' and 'Do as ye would be done by'.

(Arnold Toynbee, *An Historian's Approach to Religion*)

With multiple dispensations to juggle, it's no wonder that rudderless, covenantless Christendom has lost its way. Having been subverted, it now finds it easier to acquiesce to the demand for a Jews-only State, than to uphold Christian universalism. Jewish (actually Ashkenazi) particularism represents a giant backward leap into apostasy. Said Albert Einstein:

I fear the internal damage that Judaism will sustain due to the development, in our ranks, of a narrow nationalism. We are not anymore the Jews of the Maccabees period. To become again a nation in the political sense of the word will be equivalent to turning away from the spiritualization of our community that we owe to the generosity of our prophets.

ROTHSCHILD AMBITION

In a letter extraordinarily for its candor written in 1919, Lord Balfour articulated what would be the Zionist's *modus operandi*:

For in Palestine we do not propose even to go through the form of consulting the wishes of the present inhabitants of the country," ... [T]he Four Great Powers are committed to Zionism. And Zionism, be it right or wrong, good or bad, is rooted in age-long traditions, in present needs, in future hopes, of far profounder import than the desires or prejudices of the 700,000 Arabs who now inhabit that ancient land. . . . [I]n short, so far as Palestine is concerned, the Powers have made no statement of fact which is not admittedly wrong, and no declaration of policy which, at least in the letter, they have not always intended to violate.

From the outset the aim has been to enmesh the West in a struggle to secure Palestine, the strategic center of the religious world. Subsidized into existence by a bankers cartel and our tax money, the Zionist State exists not only as a pretext to seize Middle Eastern oil but, worse yet, as a pretext to instigate a global religious war for global religious unification.

If we just let our vision of the world go forth, and we embrace it entirely and we don't try to piece together clever diplomacy, but just wage a total war . . . our children will sing great songs about us years from now.

(Richard Perle, Pentagon advisor)

That is Zionism in a nutshell: "total war" on behalf of a self-serving goal, world dominion. Presumably Richard Perle would be good to his own children but, in plotting aggressive, unjust war, he has made himself an unholy terror to his neighbors' children. Ethnic cleansing, dead American soldiers, the maiming of civilians, all of this seems to have been a matter of no moment to a "pragmatist" of his stripe, for whom the end always justifies the means. But should any of Perle's offspring be so fortunate as to survive the coming onslaught, instead of "singing great songs" about him, as he supposes, more than likely they will rise up and denounce his memory, maybe even piss on his bones, for most Jews are moral people, glad to affirm that all humankind are God's children and worthy of our concern.

"LET'S YOU AND HIM FIGHT"

"Money is the god of our times, and Rothschild is his prophet." (Heinrich Heine)

From one generation to the next, first by expanding the money supply, then by contracting it, the Rothschild banking syndicate has bankrupted homeowners, businesses, and entire nations. Thus does the Syndicate lay upon the backs of the poor burdens grievous to be borne which it touches not with one finger. By loaning money to both sides to buy Rothschild munitions, the ones who promote war always prosper. What this leads to is appropriately called a "bloodsucker economy," for these leaches feasts morning, noon, night on the blood of widows, orphans, and the elderly.

THE ZIONIST BOMB

Science has taught us how to put the atom to work. But to make it work for good instead of for evil lies in the domain dealing with the principles of human dignity.

(Bernard Baruch, UN Atomic Energy Commission, June 14, 1946)

Unlike his friend Churchill who was a spellbinding speaker, Baruch was a platitudinous bore who could anaesthetize almost any audience. His so-called Baruch Peace Plan would have placed all nukes worldwide at the Zionists' disposal. Like the League of Nations, this too was rejected by the USSR. Ironic that Lenin and Stalin were all that stood between us and the Zionists.

The atomic bomb was developed at the Los Alamos Laboratories in New Mexico. The top secret project was called the Manhattan Project, because its secret director, Bernard Baruch, lived in Manhattan, as did many of the other principals.

(Eustice Mullins)

One might reasonably wonder, why was Baruch, a Wall Street financier, running a nuc-

lear bomb program? But who better than he to represent the Zionist dream of world domination? And what better way to get control of the world than through fear of the bomb?

When Einstein arrived in the United States, he was feted as a famous scientist, and was invited to the White House by President and Mrs. Roosevelt. He was soon deeply involved with Eleanor Roosevelt in her many leftwing causes, in which Einstein heartily concurred. Some of Einstein's biographers hail the modern era as "the Einstein Revolution" and "the Age of Einstein", possibly because he set in motion the program of nuclear fission in the United States. His letter to Roosevelt requesting that the government inaugurate an atomic bomb program was obviously stirred by his lifelong commitment to "peace and disarmament". His actual commitment was to Zionism; . . .

Einstein's letter to Roosevelt, dated August 2, 1939, was delivered personally to President Roosevelt by Alexander Sachs on October 11. Why did Einstein enlist an intermediary to bring this letter to Roosevelt, with whom he was on friendly terms? The atomic bomb program could not be launched without the necessary Wall Street sponsorship. Sachs, a Russian Jew, listed his profession as "economist" but was actually a bagman for the Rothschilds, who regularly delivered large sums of cash to Roosevelt in the White House. Sachs was an advisor to Eugene Meyer of the Lazard Freres International Banking House, and also with Lehman Brothers, another well known banker. Sachs' delivery of the Einstein letter to the White House let Roosevelt know that the Rothschilds approved of the project and wished him to go full speed ahead.

Of Japan's 66 biggest cities, 59 had been mostly destroyed. 178 square miles of urban dwellings had been burned, 500,000 died in the fires, and now twenty million Japanese were homeless. Only four cities had not been destroyed; Hiroshima, Kokura, Niigata, and Nagasaki. Their inhabitants had no inkling that they had been saved as target cities for the experimental atomic bomb. Maj. Gen. Leslie Groves, at Bernard Baruch's insistence, had demanded that Kyoto be the initial target of the bomb. Secretary of War Stimson objected, saying that as the ancient capital of Japan, the city of Kyoto had hundreds of historic wooden temples, and no military targets.

The tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki was that a weak, inexperienced president, completely under the influence of Byrnes and Baruch, allowed himself to be manipulated into perpetrating a terrible massacre.

. . . the President's Interim Committee on the Atomic Bomb decided on May 31 'that we could not give the Japanese any warning'. . . . On June 1, 1945, a formal and official decision was taken during a meeting of the so-called Interim Committee not to warn the populations of the specific target cities. James Byrnes and Oppenheimer insisted that the bombs must be used without prior warning.

Otto Frisch remembers the shouts of joy, 'Hiroshima has been destroyed!' 'Many of my friends were

rushing to the telephone to book tables at the La Fonda Hotel in Santa Fe in order to celebrate. Oppenheimer walked around "like a prizefighter, clasping his hands together above his head as he came to the podium".

Dr. Hida says that while treating the terribly mangled and burned victims, "My eyes were ready to overflow with tears. I spoke to myself and bit my lip so that I would not cry. If I had cried, I would have lost my courage to keep standing and working, treating dying victims of Hiroshima."

When the Air Force dropped the atomic bomb on Nagasaki . . . the principal target was a Catholic church. The roof and masonry of the Catholic cathedral fell on the kneeling worshippers. All of them died.

M O R E A B O U T B A R U C H

I probably had more power than perhaps any other man did to the war, doubtless that is true.

(Bernard Baruch speaking in an appearance before a select Congressional Committee)

What Baruch is referring to above is President Wilson's having appointed him Director of the War Industries Board with the entire nation's industry subject to his dictates. Alas, on his watch a seemingly endless stream of scandals occurred, for instance, a billion dollars of taxpayer money being expended on airplanes that were never delivered. It has been claimed that Baruch himself netted \$200 million on the war effort.

One of the 20th century's most powerful Zionists, Bernard Baruch operated for 50 years at the highest levels of finance and government, yet, curiously enough, few these days have ever heard of him. (Just ask anyone under 90 and see the glazed look you get.) The who's who of the Jewish world is the *Encyclopedia Judaica*. With 20,000 plus pages of biographical material in its 22 volumes, one might suppose that a person of Baruch's stature, whose name was once a household word, would merit an individual listing, yet only brief mention is made in an article about his father (a civil war surgeon). It is understandable that the powers that be would want to throw a veil over his activities, given the nature of those activities. Thanks to the internet, this veil has been partially lifted.

Bernard Baruch (1870-1965), a Wall Street millionaire before he was 30, was given to sitting alone on a park bench in Lafayette Park, Washington, D.C. or in Central Park, New York City, as if he were a simple commoner with spare time, watching the world pass by. But, lo, who should join him there? a Winston Churchill or some other dignitary.

On behalf of Rothschild banking interests, Baruch established tobacco and copper trusts. His specialty as a stock market plunger was seeing to it that others lost their shirts while he and his Wall Street banker buddies made out like bandits. That is what happened in 1929. But also in 1907. The way the game is played: first loosen credit, causing the market to soar

and getting new players in, then suddenly removing the punch bowl by constricting credit. With insider information, sell short then buy back low.

They always want more for themselves and less for everyone else. But it's not enough for them just to gyp people, no, they have to ruin and enslave them. Thus in 1907, the head of Rothschild subsidiary Kuhn, Loeb and Co., Jacob Schiff, in a talk before the NY Chamber of Commerce, warned that:

Unless we have a Central Bank with adequate control of credit resources, this country is going to undergo the most severe and far reaching money panic in its history.

Here is how his warning came to pass:

The panic of 1907 was triggered by rumors that the Knickerbocker Bank and the Trust Company of America were about to become insolvent. Later evidence pointed to the House of Morgan as the source of the rumors.

The public, believing the rumors, proceeded to make them come true by staging a run on the banks. Morgan then nobly helped to avert the panic by importing \$100 million worth of gold from Europe to stop the bank run.

The mesmerized public came to believe that the country needed a central banking system to stop future panics.

(Ellen Brown)

Baruch's role in helping the Rothschilds take control of America's finances revolved around advancing the career of one Woodrow Wilson, first by becoming his biggest campaign contributor, then by leading him about as if he were a poodle on a string. For instance, when Wilson balked at signing into law the Federal Reserve Act of 1913, Baruch all but guided his hand. But the bankers' ambitions went well beyond merely the counterfeiting of money by having their own, privately-owned central bank; they also wanted the US Constitution amended to allow for a Federal Income Tax. Once they achieved those two goals, they then initiated WWI, the idea being to exhaust physically, financially, and emotionally both sides, then get agreement for a world army and world government. That was the real purpose of the League of Nations treaty which Wilson signed but the Senate never ratified. Ultimately their plan included making Jerusalem the world capital. That is why the Ottoman Empire was drawn into the conflict, to break Palestine loose from it and why the Balfour declaration promised a "Jewish homeland." Yes, they were all Zionists.

In an appearance before a Congressional Committee, Baruch testified:

I thought a war was coming long before it did . . . I explained to him [Wilson] as earnestly as I could that I was very deeply concerned about the necessity of the mobilization of the industries of the country. The President listened very attentively and graciously, as he always does . . .

Baruch was treading on delicate ground. After all, Wilson had gotten himself re-elected

on the slogan: “he kept us out of war,” yet immediately on re-election reneged. Because Wilson didn’t like looking foolish or dishonest (who does?), he would get bulky, making it necessary for Baruch and his Zionist co-conspirator, Colonel Mandell House, to whip him into line. Colonel House had become, as Wilson confessed, his “alter ego.”

We shall reveal the origin of "the strangest and most fruitful personal alliance in history," and tell, for the first time, the true story of why it was broken. There will be no doubt as to who was the real author of the Fourteen Points and who tried to save them in Paris. We shall discover that Woodrow Wilson made a secret agreement pledging the United States to war before he was reelected,

Wilson's mysterious physical breakdown was probably due largely to psychic causes. All his life Wilson shrank from contact with other men. Everyone who knew Wilson closely testifies that such contacts, except under conditions chosen by himself, were a torture to him. But Wilson had found an escape from his difficulty by his alliance with House, who permitted the outside world to filter through his mind to Wilson, but protected his sensitive partner from the harsh winds that blew. For seven years House had functioned as his defense. The collapse of his alliance with House compelled him to bear unendurable frictions and combats.

(George Sylvester Viereck)

Poor Wilson, beset on all sides by Ashkenazi Zionists, who in turn buttered him up or else hectorated him, he soon fell into a state of abject dependency. One of these Zionist hangers-on was the shyster lawyer, Samuel Untermyer, the same as oversaw Dr. Scofield’s bogus reference Bible, who threw before Wilson a packet of Wilson’s love letters addressed to another man’s wife. He then magnanimously offered to pay the munificent sum of \$40,000 to buy off the presumed blackmailer, that is, if only Wilson would appoint his Zionist buddy, Louis Brandeis, to the Supreme Court. And it worked! Wilson caved. Probably there never was a blackmailer except Untermyer himself who then paid himself the \$40,000.

It wasn’t just blackmail that kept Wilson in line, nor was fear the only motivator, for he, too, had the courage of his convictions. When his doctor advised against his conducting an arduous campaign to convince America to give up its sovereignty to the League of Nations, he responded, saying:

I know why you are here. You want to persuade me not to go. I know all your arguments and I admit their truthfulness. But the boys who went overseas did not refuse to go because it was dangerous. Many of them sacrificed their lives in an attempt to bring about a permanent peace. The thought of their sacrifice makes me more determined to put forth my utmost endeavor to have the League ratified, for I believe it will prevent another such world-wide catastrophe. No; despite your advice, I must go. . . . Even though, in my condition, it might mean the giving up of my life, I will gladly make the sacrifice to save the Treaty.

Raised a Scotch Presbyterian, Wilson was brought up to be an earnest Calvinist to which

he later added a Zionist overlay. Not one who could bear the thought that he had sent the flower of America's youth to their death in vain, although he had been bullied and humiliated by the Zionists, nevertheless, he believed in their agenda, that if we as a people do not submit to them, terrible consequences will ensue. As he said:

I can predict with absolute certainty that within another generation there will be another world war if the nations of the world do not concert the method by which to prevent it. (Woodrow Wilson, 1919)

Because Wilson really believed this, he sided with the Zionist perspective of Colonel House against his own Secretary of State's pacific, Christian agenda. Said William Jennings Bryan to Wilson on resigning:

Colonel House has been secretary of state, not I, and I have never had your full confidence.

That Wilson sided with the Zionist Jews is confirmed below:

Mr. Balfour had been in communication with Lord Rothschild, who was the head of the Zionist Movement in this country, and who was pressing on behalf of his fellow Zionists for a declaration which could be issued to the Jews throughout the world, guaranteeing that the Allies would make it one of the conditions of the Peace Settlement with Turkey that there should be a National Home for the Jews in the land from which they had been driven as a people, but with which their name would always be associated. When the matter was brought to the attention of the Cabinet on the 3rd of September, 1917, it was decided to communicate with President Wilson informing him that the Government were being pressed to make a declaration in sympathy with the Zionist Movement, and seeking his views as to the advisability of such a declaration being made. It took so Mr. Balfour reported that "President Wilson gave me for the Peace Conference" (David Wilson, George Meyer, *as our the Peace Conference*)

Regarding the Balfour Declaration, President Wilson gave this explanation to the American public:

I am persuaded that the Allied nations, with the fullest concurrence of our Government and our people, are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundations of a Jewish Commonwealth.

Part of Zionism's appeal to Southerners of Wilson's stripe is that it is rooted in racism, with the Jews presumably being God's master race, followed thereafter by Caucasians, followed thereafter by people of color:

One of Wilson's first acts when he became president, was to re-segregate Washington, to impose the Jim Crow doctrine, 'separate but equal,' on the city of Washington . . . (Gary Gerstle, professor of history)

After victory, Wilson appointed Baruch to head a 117 member delegation to Versailles. When all did not go as the Zionists had planned and the US Senate rejected handing over American sovereignty to the League of Nations, the Zionists' expectation for the war were

greatly set back. But Zionists are not giver-uppers. Still set on achieving their objective of world dominion they started all over again manufacturing new crises, fomenting more wars. Thereafter, Baruch became one of the Council of Foreign Affairs's founding members, from this platform, to manufacture the next world crisis that Wilson had tried in vain to warn the world about. And of course Baruch continued on with his activities as a stock market plunger:

In June, Bernard Baruch told Bruce Barton, in a famous interview published in *The American Magazine* that "the economic condition of the world seems on the verge of a great forward movement." He pointed out that no bears had houses on Fifth Avenue. (John Kenneth Galbraith, *The Great Crash 1929*)

That to be sure was the bunk. What was going on behind the scenes was another story altogether:

On the three black days – Thursday Oct 24th, Monday Oct. 28th and Tues. Oct. 29th 13 million shares, 9 million shares and 16 million shares were transferred from the middle class to international high finance. The crashes were in each case precipitated deliberately by banks making margin calls which forced sell offs. When the ticker tapes got behind three hours in a steadily falling market – Percy Rockefeller, Bernard Baruch, Thomas W. Lamont (senior partner of Morgan's), Albert Wiggin (chairman of Chase National), Seward Prosser (Bankers Trust) and William Potter (Guarantee Trust) . . . each day after the ticker got behind, these men began to buy, gaining all of those shares of American industry.

Meanwhile, as a little side project, in 1933, Baruch advised President Roosevelt to seize Americans' gold, and give it to his Rothschild buddies. Roosevelt's executive order authorizing this heist came April 5, 1933. By this decree, anyone not turning over his or her gold was subject, presumably, to a ten-years jail sentence but almost no one was prosecuted and no one actually did time. It was all part of a ruse to get people to cough up their savings. And it worked. Tons of gold were confiscated in one of the greatest daylight robberies on record. Rest assured, though sitting on a dragon's hoard of gold, neither Roosevelt nor Baruch, or the rest of them ever surrendered a thin dime. That was just for little people. And now it is clear why the Great Depression was so enduring, the means of restarting the economy, private capital formation, was discouraged.

Z I O N I S T S G O F O R T H E G O L D

From: President of the United States Franklin Delano Roosevelt

To: The United States Congress Dated: 5 April, 1933

Presidential Executive Order 6102

Forbidding the Hoarding of Gold Coin, Gold Bullion and Gold Certificates By virtue of the authority vested in me by Section 5(b) of the Act of October 6, 1917, as amended by Section 2 of the Act of March 9, 1933, entitled An Act to provide relief in the existing national emergency in banking, and for other purposes, in which amendatory Act Congress declared that a serious emergency exists, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, do declare that said national emergency still continues to exist and pursuant to said section to do hereby prohibit the hoarding gold coin, gold bullion, and gold certificates within the continental United States by individuals, partnerships, associations and corporations and hereby prescribe the following regulations for carrying out the purposes of the order:

Section 1. For the purpose of this regulation, the term "hoarding" means the withdrawal and withholding of gold coin, gold bullion, and gold certificates from the recognized and customary channels of trade. The term "person" means any individual, partnership, association or corporation.

Section 2. All persons are hereby required to deliver on or before May 1, 1933, to a Federal Reserve bank or a branch or agency thereof or to any member bank of the Federal Reserve System all gold coin, gold bullion, and gold certificates now owned by them or coming into their ownership on or before April 28, 1933, . . .

Section 9. Whoever willfully violates any provision of this Executive Order or these regulation or of any rule, regulation or license issued there under may be fined not more than \$10,000, or, if a natural person may be imprisoned for not more than ten years or both; . . .

~ ~ ~ ~

Every man's life is at the call of the nation and so must be every man's property. (Bernard Baruch, 1919)

WINSTON CHURCHILL

During WWI Baruch and Churchill became best of friends. Then and afterward, they both did their level best to involve their respective countries, Britain and America in war: first WWI, then WWII, then in the Cold War.

A week before the [Lusitania] disaster, Churchill wrote to Walter Runciman, President of the Board of Trade that it was "most important to attract neutral shipping to our shores, in the hopes especially of embroiling the United States with Germany."

The story of Winston Churchill, like Teddy Roosevelt's, is one best not shared with young boys or liberals. It tends to overheat the blood.

In 1911, Churchill became First Lord of the Admiralty, and, during the crises that followed, used every opportunity to fan the flames of war. When the final crisis came, in 1914, Churchill was all smiles and was the only cabinet member who backed war from the start. Asquith, his own Prime Minister, wrote: "Winston very bellicose and demanding immediate mobilization . . . has got all his war paint on."

Never one to pass up an opportunity to watch history in the making, Winton Churchill was in the gallery of the New York Stock Exchange on October 24, 1929, a witness to Black Thursday. Then, October 29th, the day the stock market did its biggest swan dive, Churchill was Baruch's guest of honor at his Fifth Avenue mansion. Later Churchill was to write ever so obliquely, that he was not there "quite by chance."

Beginning in 1925, as head of the British exchequer, Churchill had played a unique role in crashing the British economy which led to the Great Depression. The larger purpose of the Great Depression was to create the conditions that would necessarily lead to the "New Deal," that being a type of socialism with centralized planning. After that it was on to WWII and after that the founding of NATO and the UN.

In violation of American sovereignty and constitutional rights (but with the approval of Roosevelt):

In 1940, Churchill sent British agent "Intrepid" to the United States, where he set up shop in Rockefeller Center, where, with the full knowledge and cooperation of Roosevelt and the collaboration of federal agencies, "Intrepid" and his 300 agents "intercepted mail, tapped wires, cracked safes, kidnapped, . . . rumor mongered" and incessantly smeared their favorite targets, the "isolationists" (i.e., Jeffersonians) as nazis and fascists.

After the U.S. had officially entered the war, on February 15, 1942, in the House of Commons, Churchill declared, of America's entry into the war:

"This is what I have dreamed of, aimed at, worked for, and now it has come to pass."

Never one to be overly shy in making his sentiments regarding "lesser races" known, Churchill was not one to be squeamish in applying severe measures in dealing with them either:

In 1919, as Colonial Secretary Churchill advocated the use of chemical weapons on the "uncooperative Arabs" in the puppet state of Iraq. "I do not understand the squeamishness about the use of gas," he declared. "I am strongly in favor of using poison gas against uncivilized tribes."

I do not admit that a great wrong has been done to the Red Indians of America or the black people of Australia. I do not admit that a wrong has been done to these people by the fact that a stronger race, a higher-grade race, a more worldly wise race, has come in and taken their place. (The Real Churchill, Adam young)

Not to be overlooked is Churchill's mother, Jenny Jerome, who, being Jewish, meant that, by Talmudic law, Churchill was Jewish. It may be in making the crack above about a "more worldly race," that the object of his racial affection was his mother's lineage more than his father's.

For one placed in charge of the British Exchequer, Churchill had a surprisingly tenuous hold on financial issues. Indeed, he could hardly balance his own check book. No wonder Churchill esteemed Baruch, referring to him as “his favorite American”:

. . . men who have amassed fortunes while he [Churchill] has struggled year after year creditors, hold enormous appeal for him. That was Baruch's charm. It also explains, in part, Winston's fondness for Baruch, though Baruch's appeal is broader. He is American, he is Jewish, he recognizes the menace of an aggressive Germany, and Churchill is indebted to him for an extraordinary act of shrewdness and generosity. Winston was badly hurt in the Wall Street Crash three years ago. Had it not been for Baruch, however, it would have been much worse; he could have spent the rest of his life in debt. He is not a born gambler; he is a born losing gambler. In New York at the time, he dropped into Baruch's office and decided to play the market, and as prices tumbled he plunged deeper and deeper, trying to outguess the stock exchange just as he had tired to outguess roulette wheels on the Riviera. In Wall Street, as in Monte Carlo, he failed. At the end of the day he confronted Baruch in tears. He was, he said, a ruined man. Chartwell and everything else he possessed must be sold; he would have to leave the House of Commons and enter business. The financier gently corrected him. Churchill, he said, had lost nothing. Baruch had left instructions to buy every time Churchill sold and sell whenever Churchill bought. Winston had come out exactly even because, he later learned, Baruch even paid the commissions.

(William Manchester, *The Last Lion; Winston Spencer Churchill; Visions of Glory*)

QUOTE WITHOUT COMMENT

The League of Nations is a Jewish idea. We created it after a fight of 25 years. Jerusalem will one day become the Capital of World Peace. (Nahum Sokolow)

The collapse of these three Powers (Germany, Austria-Hungary and Russia) in their old form represents a considerable gain for the carrying on of a Ashkenazi national policy, and the fact that the same war, which brought about the world-wide recognition of Zionism, also brought about the fall of three anti-Ashkenazi powers, is a unique coincidence which may well give cause for thought. (Dr. Martin Buber, Berlin 1919)

With the fall of Jerusalem some few days ago and the passing of the Holy City into British hands, there can be no doubt that the cause of Zionism has made very far-reaching progress, and we should pray that Palestine never again pass from under the suzerainty of Great Britain.

(Jacob H. Schiff, to Zangwill, December 12, 1917)

A great industrial nation is controlled by its system of credit. Our system of credit has been concentrated. The growth of the nation and all our activities are in the hands of a few men. We have come to be one of the worst ruled, one of the most completely controlled and dominated governments in the world – no longer a government of free opinion, no longer a government by conviction and vote of the majority, but a government by the opinion and duress of small groups of dominant men. (Woodrow Wilson)

G O D ' S Z I O N O R M A N ' S Z I O N I S M , O U R C H O I C E

There are two ways of teaching and two wielders of power;
one is of light and the other is of darkness.
Between those two ways lies a vast difference,
because over the one are posted light-bearing angels
while over the other are Satan's messengers;
and one of these two is the Lord from all eternity,
while the other stands paramount over
this present age of iniquity.

TRUE ZIONISM:

For YHVH hath chosen Zion; he hath desired it for his habitation. *(Psalm 132:13)*

Beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth, is mount Zion, on the sides of the north, the city of the great King. *(Psalm 48:1-2)*

But ye are come unto mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, . . . *(Hebrew 12:22)*

Behold, I lay in Zion a chief corner stone, elect, precious: and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded. *(Isaiah 28:16, 1 Peter 2:6)*

And I looked, and lo, a Lamb stood on the mount Zion, and with him a hundred forty and four thousand, having his Father's name written in their foreheads. *(Revelation 14:1)*

O Zion, that bringest good tidings, get thee up into the high mountain; Jerusalem, that bringeth good tidings, lift up thy voice with strength; lift it up, be not afraid; say unto the cities of Judah, Behold your God! *(Isaiah 40:8)*

. . . thy gates shall be open continually; they shall not be shut day nor night; . . . The glory of Lebanon shall come unto thee, . . . The sons also of them that are afflicted shall come bending unto thee; . . . and they shall call thee, The city of YHVH (Jehovah), the Zion of the Holy One of Israel. *(Isaiah 60:11, 13, 14)*

Many things more did I see concerning the heavenly city, the New Jerusalem, which are hard to be uttered, and would be hard to be received. But, in short, this holy city is within the light; and all that are within the light, are within the city; the gates whereof stand open all the day (for there is no night there), that all may

come in. Christ's blood being shed for every man, he tasted death for every man, and enlightens every man that comes into the world; and his grace, that brings salvation, having appeared to all men, there is no place or language where his voice may not be heard. The christians in the primitive times were called by Christ 'a city set upon a hill;' they were also called 'the light of the world,' and 'the salt of the earth;' but when christians lost the light, salt, and power of God, they came to be trodden under foot, like unsavory salt. Just as the Jews were preserved above all nations while they kept the law of God, but when they turned their backs on God and his law, they were trodden under foot of other nation. Likewise Adam and Eve, while they obeyed God, were kept in his image and in the paradise of God, in dominion over all the works of his hands; but when they disobeyed God, they lost the image of God, the righteousness and holiness in which they were made; they lost their dominion, were driven out of paradise, and so fell under the dark power of Satan, and came under the chains of darkness. But the promise of God was, 'that the seed of the woman, Christ Jesus, should bruise the serpent's head,' should break his power and authority, which had led into captivity, and kept him in prison. So Christ, who is the first and last, sets man free, and is the resurrection of the just and unjust, the judge of the quick and dead; and they that are in him are invested with everlasting rest and peace, out of all the labors, travails, and miseries of Adam in the fall. So he is sufficient and fully able to restore man up into the state that he was in before he fell; and not into that state only, but up into that state also that never fell, and beyond that state even to himself.

(George Fox, *Statement of Principles*)

And now let Christendom examine themselves and see "if they be come to Mount Zion and the heavenly Jerusalem, and to the innumerable company of angels,' and to the general company of the first born written in heaven , and to the 'spirits of just men made perfect , and to Jesus the Mediator, and to the blood of sprinkling;' and that they do not turn away from hearing Christ that speaks from heaven. Heb. Xii. 'For he stands at the door and knocks.' Rev.iii.

(George Fox, *Gospel Truth Demonstrated*)

FALSE ZIONISM:

The "founding father," of the Zionist State, its first Prime Minister, David ben Gurion, at a meeting of Labor Zionist, December 7, 1938, rejected plans to save Jewish children from Europe, saying:

If I knew that it would be possible to save all the children in Germany by bringing them over to England, and only half of them by transporting them to Eretz Yisrael, then I would opt for the second alternative. For we must weigh not only the life of these children, but also the history of the People of Israel.

February 1, 1940 Henry Montor, executive vice-President of the United Jewish Appeal, declined to intervene on behalf of a shipload of Jewish refugees stranded on the Danube river. As he put it:

Palestine cannot be flooded with . . . old people or with undesirables.

In an article titled “Zionists Were Spiritually And Physically Responsible For The Holocaust” by Rabbi Gedalya Liebermann of Austria, made the following historical points:

On December 17, 1942 both houses of the British Parliament declared its readiness to find temporary refuge for endangered persons. The British Parliament proposed to evacuate 500,000 Jews from Europe, and resettle them in British colonies, as a part of diplomatic negotiations with Germany. This motion received within two weeks a total of 277 Parliamentary signatures.

On Jan. 27, when the next steps were being pursued by over 100 M.P.'s and Lords, a spokesman for the Zionists announced that the Jews would oppose the motion because Palestine was omitted.

On Feb. 16, 1943 Roumania offered 70,000 Jewish refugees of the Trans-Dniestria to leave at the cost of \$50 each. This was publicized in the New York papers. Yitzhak Greenbaum, Chairman of the Rescue Committee of the Jewish Agency, addressing the Zionist Executive Council in Tel Aviv Feb. 18 1943 said,

"When they asked me, "Couldn't you give money out of the United Jewish Appeal funds for the rescue of Jews in Europe, I said NO! and I say again, NO! . . . one should resist this wave which pushes the Zionist activities to secondary importance."

No one will ever accuse David Ben Gurion of thinking small. He wasn't thinking merely in terms of the Promised Land but, rather, of the Promised Planet:

In Jerusalem, the United Nations will build a shrine of the prophets to serve the federated union of all Continents; this will be the seat of the Supreme Court of Mankind, to settle all controversies among the federated continents, as prophesied by Isaiah. (Prime Minister ben Gurion, *Look Magazine*, '62)

Our God-given country is a unity, an integral historical and geographical whole. The attempt to dissect it is not only a crime but a blasphemy and an abortion. Whoever does not recognize our natural right to our entire homeland, does not recognize our right to any part of it. And we shall never forego this natural right. (from Menachem Begin's address to the nation, May 15, 1948)

“We must use terror, assassination, intimidation, land confiscation, and cutting of all social services to rid the Galilee of its Arab population.” (David Ben-Gurion, 1948, to the General Staff. From *Ben-Gurion, A Biography*, by Michael Ben-Zohar, Delacorte, New York 1978)

“There is no such thing as a Palestinian people . . . It is not as if we came and threw them out and took their country. They didn't exist.” (Golda Meir, statement to *The Sunday Times*, 15 June, 1969)

“This country exists as the fulfillment of a promise made by God Himself. It would be ridiculous to ask it to account for its legitimacy.” (Golda Meir, *Le Monde*, 15 October 1971)

(IAP News) (02/06/03) -- An Israeli professor and military historian hinted that Israel could avenge the holocaust by annihilating millions of Germans and other Europeans. Speaking during an interview which was published in Jerusalem Friday, Professor Martin Van Creveld said Israel had the capability of hitting most European capitals with nuclear weapons. "We possess several hundred atomic warheads and rockets and can launch them at targets in all directions, perhaps even at Rome. Most European capitals are targets of our air force."

Creveld, a professor of military history at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, pointed out that "collective deportation" was Israel's only meaningful strategy towards the Palestinian people. "The Palestinians should all be deported. The people who strive for this (the Israeli government) are waiting only for the right man and the right time. Two years ago, only 7 or 8 per cent of Israelis were of the opinion that this would be the best solution, two months ago it was 33 per cent, and now, according to a Gallup poll, the figure is 44 percent." Creveld said he was sure that Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon wanted to deport the Palestinians. "I think it's quite possible that he wants to do that. He wants to escalate the conflict. He knows that nothing else we do will succeed." Asked if he was worried about Israel becoming a rogue state if it carried out a genocidal deportation against Palestinians, Creveld quoted former Israeli Defense Minister Moshe Dayan who said "Israel must be like a mad dog, too dangerous to bother." Creveld argued that Israel wouldn't care much about becoming a rogue state.

"Our armed forces are not the thirtieth strongest in the world, but rather the second or third. We have the capability to take the world down with us. And I can assure you that this will happen before Israel goes under."

(By Nadim Ladki)

P R O X Y Z I O N I S M

Its divisiveness is repugnant. Its history is bloody. And the "God loves me more than you" mindset is infantile at best, and homicidal at worst.

(Judy Andreas)

By its combining the worst elements in Judaism with the worst elements in Christianity, Zionized Protestantism has become the standing denial of everything Jesus ever stood for. Instead of Christendom turning the world upside down, Zionism has turned Christendom upside down, the anti-Christ being substituted for Christ, the false messiah for the true. Duped by Zionism, a large swath of Western-style religiosity lays smoldering in moral ruins as does a large swath of the world itself lay in ruins from Zionist-inspired wars.

At root, Zionism is about who gets to control Jerusalem's Mt. Zion, the great ambition being to demolish the Dome of the Rock, rebuild the Temple, and from it rule the world. Thus, the impetus to defame/destroy the Islamic people. But it doesn't stop there. Zionism's posture toward all the world is one of balled up fists – not open arms. In pursuit of the religious

high ground, i.e., to be king of the mountain, they've conquered the Promised Land but, in so doing, have forfeited the moral high ground.

Let us inquire more specifically: what kind of Zionism is this? Not Christian Zionism such as was practiced by mediaeval crusaders (which was bad enough), the proof being that the number of Christians dwelling in Palestine/Israel over the last 60 years continues to dwindle with each passing year. What many Christians are practicing is proxy Zionism, which religion subordinates every consideration to the Jewish Tribal Project. Their brand of Zionism isn't the last stage, only the latest stage, in a long-developing descent into apostasy.

To the extent that Christendom has morphed into an End Times, rapture-crazed, doomsday cult, then to the same extent has it parted company with the Faith once for all delivered to the saints. Is this overstating the case? Unfortunately, no.

The 2004 exit poll showed that a whopping 78% of white evangelicals voted for President Bush and that they comprised 23% of the overall electorate, making them by far the single most potent voting block in the electorate. (Report of the Pew Forum, *The Guardian*, 05/31/06)

Said Joe Biden:

You don't have to be Jewish to be a Zionist. I'm a Zionist!

(Senator Joe Biden, *Shalom TV, Israel*, 04-07-07)

Right on Joe! the vast majority of Zionists, like yourself, are not Jewish at all; rather, they are Catholic, Protestant, Pentecostal but, especially, they are evangelical and their numbers run in the tens of millions.

By reason of sheer numbers - in excess of 25 million - and on account of their having coalesced around one individual, namely, President George W. Bush, "born-again" Christians, for a little while in recent years, had the upper hand in the making of national policy, such that without their support, it is doubtful whether the Iraq war could have been prosecuted, let alone these many years - or even ever begun. But what was there about it to cause evangelical Christianity to veer off in this direction? This is the answer:

I can tell you, from all of our polling, that no issue more encapsulates an evangelical view of the world than the United States relationship to Israel. I have had evangelical leaders say that George Bush can do just about everything and not alienate his base, except on the issue of Israel.

(Luis Lugo, the director of the Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life)

Support for the State of Israel comes down to Jerusalem, even to Mount Zion, God's holy hill. But which one, since there are two? A choice exists made explicit by the apostle Paul who observed that there are two Jerusalems, one from above and one from below.

For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a free-woman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the free-woman was by promise. Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all.

(Galatians 4:23-26)

Generally speaking, the more we have to do with the Jerusalem below, the less we will have to do with the Jerusalem above. And now within the ranks of conservative, evangelical Christianity there is growing disquietude, as one by one Christians awaken to this reality that there never were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, only weapons of mass deception aimed at themselves by their own lying prophets.

The prophets of war, as if hellbent on bloody rampage, actively seeking to ramp-up the “War on Terror,” to include preemptive attacks on Iran & Syria, then on to Venezuela and Cuba, and after that, Russia & China. Fixated on a pre-tribulation rapture (for which not one scintilla of biblical support exists), these “Christian leaders” seem to think that Paradise lies on the other side of WWII, their attitude being “bring it on!” Once we get our eyes open to the reality that these are false prophets, then we will have the incentive to work our way past their style of “fundamentalism” to the fundamentals Jesus taught. What few Christians could have imagined just a few years ago is that when they chose to follow Jesus, they’d be immersing themselves into a subculture backing across-the-board assaults on ancient principles of jurisprudence, ranging from preemptive, nuclear war to secret prisons, from torture to illegal surveillance.

Mushroom clouds, bacteriological warfare labs, these were not “intelligence failures,” but bald-faced lies. Why were we so gullible as to believe any of it? Behind our gullibility was our misplaced allegiance to the modern, Zionist State. Meanwhile, sucker-punched National Guardsmen, serving third or fourth tours of duty in Iraq, didn’t choose to be the “Chosen People’s” bullet-stoppers, much less their instruments for mass-murder, but were dragooned into an unjust, illegal war. One might reasonably have hoped for better things from those who claim to represent Christ, who proclaim his gospel, for:

Those who defend war, must defend the dispositions that lead to war, and these are clean against the gospel.

(Erasmus)

PROXY ZIONISM'S HIDDEN ROOTS

Between the time when Christopher Columbus flourished in the early 16th century and the rise of dispensational Christianity in the early 19th century, some 300 years had elapsed, in which a sea change in thinking occurred in the Western world, most particularly, in the Eng-

lish-speaking world, causing interest in the muscular brand of Zionism to wither away, while the servile, proxy variety prospered. Let us seek to identify causes.

England of the 1600s, as Carlyle put it, had become a place of "awful devout Puritanism" but what of the merry Old England of Chaucer's day? One needn't look too far afield, beginning with King Henry VIII. Born the year before Columbus set sail to America, he was coronated King in 1509. Two days later, he then had two of his late fathers ministers arrested, then executed for treason. This was a pattern repeated itself during his long reign or terror which finally ended with his demise in 1547. He even had two of his six wives' heads cut off. Meanwhile the wastrel king lived in luxury, having fifty-five castles. But how did this affect Christianity?

As part of his break with Catholicism leading on to his excommunication, King Henry had the monasteries shuttered and their assets seized. This led to a huge social dislocation for the monasteries harbored much of England's poor who were now put out, as it were, on the street, destitute and left to perish. Such was England's introduction to the Protestant Reformation, with King Henry as Supreme Governor of the English Church.

On a brighter note, King Henry had the Bible translated into the vernacular. On a less bright note, however, he then banned its distribution.

The upshot of Henry's machination as well as those of his successors, was that many sects arose, some such as Levelers and Ranters, quite fanatical but others, such as the Quakers, respectable. Understandably amidst the insanity of it all, people were looking for reality, as they still do today.

After King Henry's daughter, Queen Elizabeth I, assumed the throne, his policy of keeping the Bible from the laity was reversed. The effect of this, however, was not as immediately uplifting as one might hope:

To most or them it [the Bible] was their only book. How they poured over their treasure one can well imagine. Buried long in an unknown tongue, it came to them with all the freshness of a new revelation, producing effects very different from those produced upon adult readers in the nineteenth century. We read the Bible in the light of commentators, who have established rules of interpretation well suited to the modern mind. The inconvenient passage is a figure of speech; this monstrous law condemning witches or idolaters to death was intended only for a special time; these teachings of the Savior are not to be taken literally, for our society could not continue under such a construction; but the passage which conform to our ideas of right or propriety, which sustain our theological systems, and which allow us to live the life which is agreeable, whether they are found in the Old or New Testament, in the simple Gospels or in the philosophical letters of St. Paul, have no figurative meaning and were written for all time. . . .

When this record was for the first time placed before the Englishman of the sixteenth century, it was inevitable that he should be attracted by the portion that suited his stage of moral and intellectual development. This he found in the Old Testament.

But these men of three hundred years ago had no conscious conception of this modern mode of dealing with the word of inspiration. To them the Bible was a whole; every book, every chapter, and every word was equally inspired, every commandment was of equal binding force. Yet, consciously or unconsciously, men will take from the Bible that which suits their dispositions.

(Douglas Campbell, *The Puritan in Holland, England, and America*)

The Puritans' identification with the chosen people of the Old Testament, is evidenced in the naming of their children, all the Hezekiahs, Obadiah's, Uriah's, etc. Their foremost literary figure, John Milton, in his essay on education, advocated adding the Hebrew language to the general curriculum. Most striking of all, however, was their so-called Sabbath observance (which applied not to the Biblical seventh day, but to the first):

It may first appear strange that a rite, ordained in the most ancient state of the ancient Israelites, should have no inconsiderable influence in the modern history of Great Britain— and in no other! For three hundred years after Christ, the most erudite researchers have shown that the Christian was bound by no law to the strict observance of the Lord's day, nor was any sort of labour interdicted on Sundays. . . . [Queen] Elizabeth unquestionably never considered Sunday as a Sabbath, . . . [She said] "And if for any scrupulosity or grudge of conscience some should superstitiously abstain from working on those days, they shall grievously offend."

It was however in the reign of Elizabeth, during the unsettled state of the national religion, that a sect arose among those reformers of the reformed, the first Puritans, who were known by the name *Sabbatarians*. These held the Decalogue as of perpetual obligation; and according to their new creed, if the Sabbath-day had been changed, which they doubted, the Judaic rigors of its strictest observance were still to sanctify it. Labor and recreation, with those persons, equally profaned the silence and the repose of the Sabbath. John Knox the great Reformer of Scotland, was the true father of this doctrine in England, . . . Knox acquired many advocates in England [including] Whittingham, the Puritan Dean of Durham, who had resided at Geneva and married the sister of Calvin, . . .

At Paris-garden where public amusements were preformed on Sundays, a crowded scaffold gave way, and by this accident some were killed and many wounded. The Lord Mayor sent notice of it to Lord Burleigh as a judgment of Heaven for the violation of the Sabbath; and the Recorder chronicled the event in his Diary under the head of "a punishment of the violators of the Sabbath." This doctrine therefore must have been general in 1582.

A gloomy and anti-social spirit was fast prevailing among the people in their "preciseness," as this new system was termed. Puritanic persons had deprived the populace of their accustomed festivals and pastimes on the

Sunday afternoons after divine service; festivals and pastimes are the poor man's inheritance, his unbought enjoyments, the leisure of his servitude, the common solace of the ancient friendships of the village!

(Isaac Disraeli, *Commentaries on the Life and Reign of Charles the First, King of England*)

When the strength and glory of England were placed in the hands of the Puritans, their extravagant conduct on many national objects was never more visible than on their sabbatic regulations. It seemed as if religion chiefly consisted of the Sabbatarian rigours, and that a British senate had been transformed into a company of Hebrew Rabbins. In 1605 an act was passed for inflicting penalties for breach of the Sabbath, some of which included dancing and singing, or traveling in a boat, on horseback, or in a coach or sedan, except to church. This exception occurred on the remonstrance of one of the Members of the House of Commons complaining that "in their zeal they had tied the Godly from going to Church by water or coach, for this he coming from Westminster to Somerset-house to sermon, had his boat and waterman seized for the penalty." . . . In their code of laws, among the Sabbatic prohibitions under severe penalties are these, "No one shall run on the Sabbath-day, or walk in his garden, cook victuals, make beds, sweep house, cut hair or shave." "No woman shall kiss her child."

BLACKSTONE'S MEMORIAL

March 5, 1891, Chicago real estate magnet and Methodist Episcopal layman, William E. Blackstone, presented President Benjamin Harrison and Secretary of State Blaine with a petition to "use their good offices and influence to secure their holding at an early date of an international conference to consider the condition of the Israelites and their claims to Palestine as their ancient home." Known to history as the "Blackstone Memorial," it was signed by 413 of America's wealthiest, most prominent, most powerful citizens, including the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court; the Speaker of the House, a future US President (William McKinley), the Governor of Massachusetts, mayors, editors, publishers, notable clergymen (Dwight L. Moody, for instance), business moguls, John D. Rockefeller, J. Pierpoint Morgan, Cyrus McCormick, Russel Sage, Charles Scribner, etc., etc.

Blackstone's motivations were religious. A dispensationalist after having been converted at the Niagara Conference of 1878, he was given to describing himself as "God's Little Errand Boy." But what of the others who signed on to his petition? Overall, they were not known to be religious enthusiasts or even believers. Some of them were quite roguish. As "Rothschilds' Errand Boys," they were in service to those whose family's ambition for generations has been to rule the world from Jerusalem.

CHARLES TAZE RUSSELL

Please observe the year of Blackstone's Memorial, 1891; that was the year before Nathan Birnbaum had coined the term "Zionism" and a decade before the "father of Zionism,"

Theodor Herzl, first published. Yet, predating Blackstone, Birnbaum, Herzl, *et al*, was Charles Taze Russell. In 1879 he propounded the concept of a “prophetic double,” whereby God’s favor, which rested on the Jews from Jacob to Jesus, was then withdrawn, only to be restored in 1878. In 1880, with amazing foresight, Russell prophesied that the Jews would return to the Holy Land, this just two years after the founding of two tiny villages, Petah Tikvah in Judah and Rosh Pinnah in Galilee. In 1891 Russell wrote Lord Rothschild:

May the God of Jacob direct you, my dear Sir, and all interested with you i the deliverance and prosperity of Israel, and blessed will they be who, to any extent, yield themselves as his servants in fulfilling his will as predicted.

(To its credit, the Watchtower organization would later reversed course from its founder, Russell, in this matter by removing themselves from the Zionist circle of war.)

In 1910, Charles Taze Russell addressed some 4,000 Jews in New York’s Hippodrome about immigrating to Palestine. His message, though well received, was little heeded with few American Jews making *aliya*. In England he addressed 4600 Jews in Prince Albert Hall. Back again state-side, he held additional meetings but for all his personal magnetism, which was great, Russell’s immediate impact was small, nor did his efforts change facts on the ground, anymore than having the rich and the famous sign a petition. It would take two world wars and 70 million dead to bring about the birth of the Jews-only, Zionist State.

S I M O N B A R K O K H B A R E D U X

Unquestionably one of Jewish history’s most controversial figures, Simon bar Kokhba, presented himself to Israel as its long-awaited messiah. Confirming this were coins struck during his reign inscribed "Shimon, President of Israel," and "Year One of the Redemption of Israel." So impressed was the great rabbinical sage, Rabbi Akiva with bar Kokhba that he exclaimed, “this is the king Messiah.” Not everyone was likewise impressed. Replying to Rabbi Akiva, Rabbi Yochanan said: "grass will grow from your cheeks and yet the son of David (the king messiah) will not have come." In the Talmud, bar Kokhba is no longer called “bar Kokhba,” (that is, “son of a Star,” the star being Jacob’s), rather, “bar Koseva,” (that is “son of deceit”) on account of his having deceived the Nation.

Again a rising star, bar Kokhba’s fortified headquarters, Beitar, today is the name of a Zionist youth movement. After Beitar’s fall, bar Kokhba and his forces regrouped in the famous Dead Sea fortress, Massada, where they made their last stand. Today, recruits are initiated into the Israeli Defense Force in that very place in a bizarre, cult-like ceremony. The State of Israel’s first prime minister, Ben Gurion, took his name from one of bar Kokhba’s

generals. In his day bar Kokhba collected materials for the rebuilding of the Temple. To-day, materials are again being collected for the anticipated rebuilding of the Temple where the Ashkenazi anti-Christ is to be installed.

Now here's the kicker: more Christians are involved in this later day restoration of Jewish national aspiration than there are Jews. It is Zionized Christendom which fights the Zionists' wars, whose children are sacrificed in the fires of Molech that have been lit for them in Iraq and Afghanistan, who fall for the false prophets: the Jerry Falwells, the Pat Robertsons, the Hagees, the Lindseys, the Grahams. Behind them, underwriting them, providing them with the oxygen of publicity are the international bankers, the Rothschilds and the Rockefellers, whose objective is to rule the world from Jerusalem.

TEMPLE ENVY

The moral of our tale is that the Christian world has been perennially haunted by the ghost of the temple - a ghost in which it does not believe. If the least be said for it, the temple has never lost its power to stir men's imaginations and excite their emotions, and the emotion which it has most often inspired in Christian breasts has certainly been that of envy, a passion the more dangerous for being suppressed. The temple has cast a shadow over the claims and the confidence of the Christian church from early times, a shadow which is by no means diminishing in our own day. (Hugh Nibley)

Hugh Nibley, a Mormon scholar, made above the Mormon argument for re-instituting Temple worship. He had sound historical grounds on which to make his case:

Upon taking Jerusalem in 1099 the Crusaders moved straight to the object of their desire, the Holy Sepulchre, and then proceeded directly to Solomon's Temple: *ad dominicum sepulcrum, dehinc etiam ad Templum*. As they marched they sang apocalyptic hymns of joy hailing the millennial day and the New Jerusalem. The Crusades are a reminder that Christianity was never able to settle for a spiritual temple or forget the old one: . . . (Hugh Nibley)

Ironic that for many centuries until the rise of Islam, the Roman Church tried to put a damper on interest in Jerusalem. Roman Catholicism wanted Rome, not earthly Jerusalem, to be God's holy city, thus Jerusalem's Bishop Macarius, by authorization of the Emperor, demolished the temple of Jupiter that the Romans had "built on the very spot where formerly the Temple of God had stood." This occurred immediately after his return from the Council of Nicea in 350 AD but he did this not so as to honor the site for after that the Temple Mount became a trash dump.

Pope Leo I also known as "Leo the Great" (c. 391 or 400 - 461) saw a problem in the Church's having two centers, one in Rome, one Jerusalem:

Leo, who did more than any other man to transform the old universal *devotio Romana* into a new *devotio Christiana*, clearly saw in the temple at Jerusalem his most serious opponent. His sermons bristle with barbed and invidious remarks that betray his touchiness on the subject.

Rome has died pagan and been resurrected Christian. The tomb of Peter now performs the function that once belonged to the *templum* of Hadrian, the great round tomb by the Tiber that was designed to draw all the world to it, while Hadrian's image now stands in the temple of Jerusalem - the roles of the two cities have been neatly reversed.

Leo freely admits the debt of Christian Rome to pagan Rome, and sees in the great Easter and Christmas congregations of his people both the old Roman national assembly and the gathering of Israel at the temple: "Here you see the heavenly Jerusalem, built of all nations," he cries, addressing such assemblies, "purged of all impurity on this day, it has become as the Temple of God!" "Now a new and indestructible Temple has been erected," with Leo himself presiding in it, ordained in honor of Christ, the prophet "after the order of Melchizedek, not after the order of Aaron whose priesthood ceased with the Law of the Old Testament." Rome has not abolished the rites of the temple, however, but simply taken them over, every particle of the ancient ordinances and imagery having been absorbed in the Christian sacraments: "Ours today is the circumcision, the anointing of priests, etc. is the honor of the Temple!" Thanks to the ministrations of Peter and Paul, the people of Rome are now "a holy generation, a chosen people, a priestly and royal city." In a word, Rome was now Jerusalem. (Hugh Nibley)

THE RISE OF ISLAM

Only with the Islamic invasion did the situation on the Temple Mount change. On conquering Jerusalem in 638 AD, Caliph Omar wanted first of all to see "the glorious Temple that Solomon had built," only to find out that the Christians had turned it into site for refuse. That which had been spurned by the Church, the Moslems exploited by building the magnificent Dome of the Rock, which monument became the focal point of pilgrimage.

The Moslem intellectuals, exactly as the Jewish and Christian doctors before them, protested against the glorification of a mere building, and campaigned vigorously against the pilgrimages, but the temple had a powerful advocate in Christian jealousy. Like children fighting for a toy, each faction came to prize the temple more highly when it saw how much the other wanted it. (Hugh Nibley)

Since Islam identifies with Abraham's son, Ishmael, the question arises, why would it want to build a shrine on Mt. Zion associated with Abraham's other son, Isaac? (The Temple Mount, after all, was the place where Abraham was told to sacrifice Isaac.) It looks as if Islam is picking peas on the wrong side of the fence.

However that may be, in 1090 AD, the crusaders took possession of the Temple Mount, converting the Dome of the Rock into a church, called the *Templum Domini* i.e., "Temple of

our Lord" and it remained in Christian hands until Saladin's army retook Jerusalem in 1187 AD. After that the Dome was restored to Islam. Whether it is Islam or Christianity, this was Zionism. To be sure the Zionism of the crusaders was not the modern dispensational variety but a muscular brand of Christianity which existed for its own sake and not for the sake of the Jews. As such, it represented a partial break from former times when the papacy wanted to underplay the Temple Mount's importance.

Beginning in 1492, Christopher Columbus made four trips to the New World, his primary purpose being that of finding gold but not, as some have surmised, for personal enrichment, for this would be to misread the man entirely. To the contrary, Columbus, a religious zealot, had taken to wearing a Franciscan habit and referring to himself by the title "Christ-bearer." His expressed intention? that of funding an expedition to retake the Holy Land. His ambition was, as admiral, to lead a fleet of ships across the Mediterranean, this as an agent to Spain's King Ferdinand, the same as who on his deathbed in 1516 told his minions that he could not die as yet, for God had told him that he would lead a great crusade to recapture Jerusalem. Nonetheless, the King and Columbus, too, died, their ambition left unfulfilled.

The blood and treasure expend on Zionism over the centuries simply defies description.

On a visit to Salt Lake City in 1875, Baron Rothschild asked:

"Elder Taylor, what do you mean by this temple? What is the object of it? Why are you building it?"

After being given a detailed explanation, Baron Rothschild replied:

"This is not our temple."

Then Elder Taylor said to Baron Rothschild:

"No, but you will build a temple, for the Lord has shown us, among other things, that the Jews have quite a role to perform in the latter days – that all the things spoken of by your old prophets will be fulfilled, that you will be gathered to the old Jerusalem."

Later Baron Rothschild would proclaim:

"I created the Yishuv [the Jewish settlement in Palestine], I alone. Therefore no men, neither colonists nor organizations, have the right to interfere in my plans."

THE THIRD TEMPLE

The ROTHSCHILDS are the wonders of modern banking. Sprung from that poetic, that ancient, that

mysterious race, from which we derive all our religion and half of our civilization, we see the descendants of Judah, after a persecution of two thousand years, peering above kings, rising higher than emperors, and holding a whole continent in the hollow of their hands. The Rothschild govern a Christian world. Not a cabinet moves without their advice. They stretch their hand, with equal ease, from Petersburg to Vienna, from Vienna to Paris, from Paris to London, from London to Washington. Baron Rothschild, the head of the house, is the true king of Judah, the prince of the captivity, the Messiah so long looked for by this extraordinary people. He holds the keys of peace or war, blessing or cursing. To what will all this lead? Is the holy city to be rebuilt – the third temple to rear its turrets to heaven? (N. Y. Herald, Sept., 1835)

Currently underway is a collaborative effort by Jewish and Christian Zionists to rebuild what they term "the Third Temple" in Jerusalem. It all began in 1866 when the British War Office lent Lieutenant-General Sir Charles Warren to the Palestine Exploration Fund. In a massive archaeological undertaking, he played a leading role in revealing the outer walls of Herod's temple 1,000 ft. long, and 200 ft. high. A member of the Rothschild-dominated Masonic "research lodge" (*Ars Quator Coronatorum*), Sir Charles could be viewed as acting as a Rothschild agent, as well as acting on the Crown's behalf.

Even now in Jerusalem there stands a palatial, intricately-designed edifice, Israel's Supreme Court. Costing untold millions to construct and loaded with masonic religious symbols (including a huge pyramid, perhaps demonstrating a certain spiritual affinity for Egypt), it could provide a suitably grand venue in which to conduct a legally-sanctioned "anointing" of the prophesied "priest-king." Picking up the tab, as well as controlling every detail relating to its construction, is the Rothschild banking family, the same as originally whistled the Zionist entity into existence. A multi-generational family project, their aim goes well beyond simply that of establishing a one-world political or economic system. The larger objective is to elicit the world's adoration. Thus the third pillar of their family project calls for a global religious system in which their representative is to be worshiped universally in the temple in Jerusalem:

Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers, nor the desire of women, nor regard any god: for he shall magnify himself above all. But in his estate he shall honor the God of forces: and a god whom his fathers knew not shall he honor with gold, and silver, and with precious stones, and pleasant things.

(Daniel 11:37-38)

Naturally few are privy to Rothschild plans and deliberations, especially regarding so sensitive a matter as this, but we can make an educated guess, mine being that the one whom they have in mind to serve as "New Age Messiah" will somehow be tied in with either British or European royalty and whose ancestry traces back to the Merovingians and, presumably, through them back to Mary Magdalene and Jesus. Currently seeking to re-establish the

temple priesthood, at the same time undo the judgment of 70 AD, are the self-described "Temple Mount Faithful" who have gathered together furnishings, sacred vessels, vestments, etc., in anticipation of the removal of the Islamic Dome of the Rock to be replaced by an edifice of their own devising and who's to say what mischief they contemplate or what mayhem they might instigate to achieve their goal? Already hundreds have been trained in their duties to carry out the anticipated temple's functions. All stands in readiness for the messianic claimant to the Davidic throne to reveal himself and authorize construction to begin:

On the 7th October 1998 The Temple Mount and Land of Israel Faithful Movement brought the cornerstone for the Third Temple to the gates of the Temple Mount and the City of David in a very exciting and historical event. . . . the Israeli authorities . . . allowed the Faithful, and even encouraged them, to bring the cornerstone to the City of David very close to the gates of the Temple Mount and then to carry the cornerstone around the walls of the Temple Mount and the Old City seven times. . . . The struggle will continue until the Israeli flag will again be on the Temple Mount . . .

(www.templemountfaithful.org)

In an article appearing in *The Times*, (12/13/19'99) p. 39. titled, "The righteous will survive and the rest will perish," Sam Kiley, the *Times*' Jerusalem correspondent, in interviewing Gershon Salomon, the Temple Mount Faithful's founder, quoted him as insisting on the Islamic shrine's removal: "We must have a war," he said. "There will be many nations against us but God will be our general. I am sure this is a test, that God is expecting us to move the Dome with no fear from other nations. The Messiah will not come by himself, we should bring Him by fighting." These are not merely the ranting of a lone, half-crazed, religious crank:

The Israeli rabbinical council involved with re-establishing the Sanhedrin, is calling upon all groups involved in Temple Mount research to prepare detailed architectural plans for the reconstruction of the Jewish Holy Temple. The Sanhedrin was a 71-man assembly of rabbis that convened adjacent to the Holy Temple before its destruction in 70 AD and outside Jerusalem until about 400 AD. . . . the group will establish a forum of architects and engineers to begin plans for rebuilding the Temple, a move fraught with religious and political volatility. The group, which calls itself the Sanhedrin, is calling on the Jewish people to contribute toward the acquisition of materials for the purpose of rebuilding the Temple, including the gathering and preparation of prefabricated, disassembled portions to be stored and ready for rapid assembly, "in the manner of King David." . . . [Rabbi Adin] Steinsaltz [temporarily the Sanhedrin's president] is best known for his translation and commentary on the Talmud, but he has also served as resident scholar at Princeton and Yale Universities. He heads a network of Israeli educational institutions called Mechor Chaim and outreach programs in the U.S., the former Soviet Union, Great Britain and Australia. He is also a past recipient of the Israel Prize.

The Sanhedrin was reestablished last October in Tiberias, the place of its last meeting 1,600 years ago.

Since then, it has met in Jerusalem on a monthly basis. (New 'Sanhedrin' plans rebuilding of Temple.

WorldNetDaily.com Wednesday, June 8, 2005)

Not for the sake of the Jewish people is this happening nor to advance world peace, not even to advance "normative" Judaism but to advance the ambitions of designing men who, for more than a century, have used Zionism as a vehicle for exploitation, dominion, and war. It is true to fact to say that Israel exists not to serve as a "homeland" for the beleaguered Jewish people, rather, to advance empire on a grand scale:

The Jews might have had Uganda, Madagascar, and other places for the establishment of a Jewish Fatherland, but they wanted absolutely nothing except Palestine, not because the Dead Sea water by evaporation can produce five trillion dollars of metaloids and powdered metals; not because the sub-soil of Palestine contains twenty times more petroleum than all the combined reserves of the two Americas; but because Palestine is the crossroads of Europe, Asia, and Africa, because Palestine constitutes the veritable center of world political power, the strategic center for world control.

(Nahum Goldman, President World Jewish Congress)

In the 19th Century the Rothschilds played a key role in formulating a theology called British Israelism. Through this and the Rothschilds' intermarrying into British aristocracy, Jewish and Gentile ambitions have become somewhat intertwined.

Queen Victoria seems to have subscribed to this Davidic theory and had her male children circumcised by a Jewish ritual circumciser, a mohel. Both Edward VII, the duke of Windsor, and Charles, the current prince of Wales, were circumcised by a well-known London physician and mohel, Dr. Jacob Snowman.

(Shalom Goldmann *God's Sacred Tongue*)

Confirming her abiding interest in all things Jewish, Queen Victoria took upon herself the title: Protectress of the Jews.

OCCULT FAITH

What neither evangelicals nor rabbinical Judaism properly calculate on, is that the Rothschilds have something up their sleeve beyond anything Judaism or Christianity ever dreamed of, for the Rothschilds are not Talmudic, Law-observant Jews, rather, for generations, they have been the leaders of another religion, namely, the worldwide Masonic movement where they have been working behind the scenes at the highest levels.

The modern State of Israel does not exist for the sake of advancing Judaism, nor for the sake of the Jewish people. The Rothschilds funded Israel into existence for their own sake because they intend to control the world from Jerusalem with one of their own, a cosmocrat, at the helm. A central tenet of the Masonic faith to which they adhere is that of establishing a Temple in Jerusalem:

. . . Take from Freemasonry its dependence on the Temple; leave out of its ritual all references to that sacred edifice, and to the legends and traditions connected with it, and the system itself would at once decay and die . . .

Freemasonry is not the sort of religion to put all its cards on the table:

Masonry conceals its secrets from all except the Adepts, the Sages, and the Elect; and uses false explanations of its symbols to mislead those deserving to be misled.

(Albert Pike, Commander of the Scottish Rite)

As one pious rabbi, Benamozegh, wrote:

Are we to wonder that Judaism has been accused of forming a branch of Freemasonry? It is quite certain that Masonic theology is at root nothing else than Theosophy, and that it corresponds to the theology of the Cabala. Besides, a deep study of the rabbinical monuments of the early ages of the Christian era supply numerous proofs that the aggada was popular form of an esoteric science, which presents, in its methods of initiation, the most striking resemblance to the Masonic system.

As Jewish apologist, Bernard Lazare, put it:

There were Cabalistic Jews around the cradle of Freemasonry, as certain rites still in existence conclusively show.

THE MARK OF THE BEAST

“Hex” is Greek for “six.” Also “to cast a spell.” A triple witching, “hex-hex-hex” is bewitchment. In occult circles the six-pointed star passes for being a magical talisman, meaningful to alchemists and Kabbalists alike. No evidence has been adduced showing that it was used by King David or that he ever intended it for Temple use. In fact, the terms “Star of David” i.e., “Magen David” cannot be traced earlier than the Middle Ages. Likewise, the term “King Solomon’s Seal,” it, too, is of mediaeval origin. Historically, the Menorah, not the hexagram has symbolized God's Covenant.

Here is wisdom: Let the one having reason count the number of the beast, for it is the number of a man and its number is six hundred and sixty six. (Revelation 13:18)

While we are told of the shared values of the State of Israel with those of the USA and of Christianity, in reality Zionism is naught but the golden calf of Ashkenazi supremacy. It is Pharisaism on steroids. “Judeo-Christianity,” being neither Judaism or Christianity does justice to neither. Rather, it functions to condition us to war and to view favorably the mark of the beast squarely planted at the center of Israel’s flag. The fate of those who submit:

If any man do homage to the beast and his image, and receive his mark on his forehead, or upon his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name. And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever; and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name. (Revelation 14:9-11)

Resistance to the imposition of the mark of the beast, albeit possibly fatal, is not futile, for there stands God's promise of reward to those who resist:

And I saw...them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image and over his mark. . . . And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshiped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. (Revelation 15:2, 20:4)

Though pledging allegiance to the hex flag of the State of Israel may risk the judgment of *Revelation 14*; yet many a Zionized, evangelical church displays it from the podium. In this regard, check out the "Rothschild" name, for it is not the family's original name but the one it took up in conjunction with the display of the *roth* (red) hex shield on their door. *Roth* is German meaning "red," the same as the Hebrew word, "Edom." Those who follow these latter day Edomites, the same will surely receive an Edomite's reward.

A chilling indication of the higher-level alliance currently pertaining has to do with the 20 tons of heavy water that was surreptitiously sent to Israel in the years 1959 to 1960 from Great Britain. Great Britain? In the movie, *Exodus*, wasn't it Britain that at every turn tried to thwart Israel? That was for public consumption. In reality, there has been a co-ordinated effort, with Britain providing the heavy water, France, a nuclear reactor, and the US, in 1967, huge quantities of fissile material. Taken together, all of this made possible for a small, seemingly impoverished nation to become one of the world's premier nuclear powers with hundreds of nuclear bombs in its arsenal.

To top it off, at the very time Germany was in negotiation with Iran to limit its nuclear energy program, it was providing long-distance submarines to Israel, thereby allowing the Zionist entity to bring its nuclear-tipped missiles to within striking distance of Iran. Five such submarines were underwritten, if not outrightly gifted, by Germany to Israel. By the time of this writing, spring 2012, four of these have been delivered.

What does this indicate regarding these “Christian” nations’ commitment to non-proliferation? Maybe that it was always just a ploy, a public relations charade, that in truth no such commitment ever existed.

The one person who stood up against the Zionist State's nuclear ambitions was President Kennedy. His principled stance that Israel’s nuclear facility, Dimona, be inspected (this among others), not a lone gunman, is what cost him his life.

As does its submarines, Zionism runs silent, runs deep, and is lethal. The ruling passion of our age, Zionism runs roughshod over all who would stand in its way. Some worry about an Islamic bomb. But what about the Zionist bomb? The nuclear era began in greatest secrecy in the Manhattan home of Wall Street financier, Bernard Baruch (the Atomic Energy Commission’s first head). Hence the expression “Manhattan Project.” Behind Baruch, however, were the Rothschilds and behind them, a substantial part of the world’s wealth. The bomb was dropped on Japan, not to end the war with Japan, but to terrorize the world.

Lumping Islam with Confucianism and condemning them both, a prominent Establishment academic, Samuel Huntington, identified the "Islamic- Confucian world" (that being Eurasia, from the Middle East to China) as "an arc of crisis," in need of American intervention. As the one who coined the expression: "clash of civilizations," the title of his book, he foresaw hostilities between the US and China breaking out by the year 2010, predicting that the flash point will be the oil lanes of the South China Sea. Evidently, his brand of Judeo-Christianity knows not the commandment: thou shalt not covet thy neighbors' oil. Though he called his book *Clash of Civilizations*, he might better have called it *Clash of Religions, Zionism against the entire planet*. That would better describe the cleavage line.

TRIUMPHALISM, THE CHURCH MILITANT

Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial? . . . Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you. (II Corinthians 6:14-15, 17)

There is a war on for our allegiance. The battle is an ongoing, knock-down, no-holds-barred fight. Once we understand that, we will be far more inquiring about our choices and less trusting in the things we are told. The synagogues of Satan will be judged in due course. Speaking truth to power has always been a hazardous occupation.

THE TEMPLE WITHIN

“Neither shall they say, Lo here! or, lo there! for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you.” (Luke 17:21)

Said the Samaritan woman by the well to Jesus and Jesus’ reply to her:

Our fathers worshipped in this mountain; and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship.

Jesus saith unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. . . . [for] God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth. (John 4:20-21, 24)

In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink. He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. (But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Spirit was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified.) (John 7:37-39)

The above declaration Jesus made in the Temple during the eight-day, feast of Tabernacles. This, the last in the Mosaic cycle of feasts, also called the feast of Booths, is when temporary structures called *succas* are constructed of palm fronds in which are hung fruit, symbolizing the coming Messianic kingdom, when each family will live at peace under its own fig trees. Then will earth be baptized in God’s Holy Spirit. Poured out without measure, He will flow forth to every nook and cranny, filling all.

A tradition grew up in the few centuries before Jesus that on the 7 days of the Feast of Tabernacles, a golden container filled with water from the pool of Siloam was carried in procession by the High-Priest back to the temple. As the procession came to the Watergate on the S[outh] side of the inner temple court, 3 trumpet blasts were made to mark the joy of the occasion and the people recited Is. 12:3, “With joy you will draw water from the wells of salvation.” At the temple, while onlookers watched, the priests would march around the altar with the water container while the temple choir sang the Hallel (Pss. 113–118). The water was offered in sacrifice to God at the time of the morning sacrifice. (*The MacArthur Study Bible*)

It was no more pleasing to the Temple rulers then to have Jesus stand up and claim that God’s Temple existed to symbolizes him, than it is today to their Zionist successors. Having made a 2000-year opposition to Jesus, they are not going to desist, particularly not now that they have made deep inroads into the servile, churches, their willing sycophants.

“But I say unto you, That in this place is one greater than the temple.” (*Matthew 12:6*)

In declaring that he is greater than the Temple Jesus placed himself at the center of all worship. Once we are clear on that point, that Jesus saw himself so, then we are in a better

position to fathom what Ezekiel was saying:

Afterward he brought me again unto the door of the house; and, behold, waters issued out from under the threshold of the house eastward: for the forefront of the house stood toward the east, and the waters came down from under from the right side of the house, at the south side of the altar.

Then brought he me out of the way of the gate northward, and led me about the way without unto the utter gate by the way that looketh eastward; and, behold, there ran out waters on the right side.

And when the man that had the line in his hand went forth eastward, he measured a thousand cubits, and he brought me through the waters; the waters were to the ankles.

Again he measured a thousand, and brought me through the waters; the waters were to the knees. Again he measured a thousand, and brought me through; the waters were to the loins.

Afterward he measured a thousand; and it was a river that I could not pass over: for the waters were risen, waters to swim in, a river that could not be passed over.

And he said unto me, Son of man, hast thou seen this? Then he brought me, and caused me to return to the brink of the river.

Now when I had returned, behold, at the bank of the river were very many trees on the one side and on the other.

Then said he unto me, These waters issue out toward the east country, and go down into the desert, and go into the sea: which being brought forth into the sea, the waters shall be healed.

And it shall come to pass, that every thing that liveth, which moveth, whithersoever the rivers shall come, shall live: and there shall be a very great multitude of fish, because these waters shall come thither: for they shall be healed; and every thing shall live whither the river cometh.

And it shall come to pass, that the fishers shall stand upon it from Engedi even unto Eneglaim; they shall be a place to spread forth nets; their fish shall be according to their kinds, as the fish of the great sea, exceeding many.

But the miry places thereof and the marshes thereof shall not be healed; they shall be given to salt.

And by the river upon the bank thereof, on this side and on that side, shall grow all trees for meat, whose leaf shall not fade, neither shall the fruit thereof be consumed: it shall bring forth new fruit according to his months, because their waters they issued out of the sanctuary: and the fruit thereof shall be for meat, and the leaf thereof for medicine.

(Ezekiel 47:1-12)

Along with Zionism's unbridled ambition to be "king of the mountain." goes a willingness

to run roughshod over anyone standing in the way. To that end, the Temple Mount Society actively contemplate seizing from Islam the Temple Mount:

The Temple Mount and Land of Israel Faithful Movement is fighting to ensure the Temple Mount will no longer be desecrated and that the Israeli Government will remove the shrines and rebuild the Temple in our lifetime. We know that this will soon come about. (<http://www.templemountfaithful.org>)

Even now certain evangelicals are helping the Temple Mount Faithful in such matters as locating a red heifer as required by rabbinical authority or with funding, etc. Their advocacy of Temple animal sacrifice borders on contempt for the shed blood of Jesus Christ. The rationalization: that this is a necessary step to ushering in the prophesied messianic age. Also, of course, are prophesied wars, plagues, and apostasy. Does moral imperative attach to advancing these woes, as well? Shall we do evil that good might come of it? What Zionized Christians are doing amounts to little more than an attempt to undo the judgment of 70 AD.

Never mind about holy places, here or there or anywhere, this is totally retrograde thinking. Our place is to cultivate the chapel within:

What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's. (*1 Corinthians 6:19-20*)

For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together.

(*Romans 8:14-17*)

It is unfortunate that down through the ages a significant part of Christendom never got the message that our Lord had called us, not to brick and mortar edifices, rather, to the constructing of a chapel within. But that seems too ephemeral to many for them to countenance. The Spirit comes and the Spirit goes and like the wind, it bloweth where it will, but a good piece of masonry, now that in their eyes has a degree of real permanence. Thus do they choose that which they can see, feel, and touch and will not join Jesus and his people outside the camp. Stuck in their edifice complex, there they will remain.

“Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me.
And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life.”

(John 5:39-40)

“Judaism is not spelled with a “Z”

Rabbi Ahron Cohen, an address delivered at Birmingham University, England 02/26/2003

As you have already been told, I am an orthodox Jew (that is a Jew who endeavors to live his life completely in accordance with the Jewish religion). I am involved in ecclesiastical duties within the Jewish Community and am particularly involved in educating our youth and in helping them to achieve healthy and correct attitudes. It is therefore of particular interest to me to be able to talk to you, a student body, today.

I have been asked to talk to you about Judaism and Zionism. This subject is of course tremendously relevant in the light of the current situation in Palestine, where you have - let's face it - one side, the Zionists (who are also Jews), wishing to impose a 'sectarian' State over the heads of an indigenous population, the Palestinians. A confrontation which has resulted in horrific bloodshed and brutality with no end in sight unless there is a very radical change.

My qualification to talk on this subject is by virtue of my being one of many orthodox Jews who absolutely sympathize with the Palestinian cause, and we protest vehemently against the terrible wrongs being perpetrated against the Palestinian People by the Zionist illegitimate regime in Palestine. . . .

Let me firstly state quite categorically that Judaism and Zionism are incompatible. They are diametrically opposed. The question must surely arise in the minds of many of you here today that there appears to be a paradox. After all everyone knows that Zionists are Jews and that Zionism is for the benefit of Jews. The Palestinians are the enemies of the Zionists. How come then that I, a Jew, can sympathize with the Palestinian cause? I would like to try to answer this question and to revert to the subject of my talk - Judaism and Zionism - on two levels, religious belief and humanitarianism. Bearing in mind that to be humanitarian is also a basic religious requirement.

Firstly from a Jewish religious belief point of view. One has to take a look at some aspects of the history of the Jewish people and at their basic belief in the Al-mighty's control of our destiny and what the Al-mighty wants of us. All as set out in our Religious teachings, our Torah, and as taught to us through the generations by our great religious leaders. Against this we also have to look at the history of Zionism, how it developed, what are its aims. Our religion is for us a total way of life. Showing us how to live a life in the service of the Al-mighty. It affects every aspect of our life from the cradle to the grave. We are taught that it was revealed to us by Divine Revelation, as described in the Bible, some three and a half thousand years ago, and that is when the Jewish People came into being. All of our religious requirements, practical and philosophical, are set out in the Torah which comprises the Bible (the old testament) and a vast code of Oral Teaching handed down to us through the generations.

As mentioned, our religion is a total way of life covering every aspect of our life. One area of our religion is that subject to certain conditions is that we will be given a land, the Holy Land, now known as Palestine, in which to live

and carry out various parts of our service of the Al-mighty. Now, before I go any further, I wish to point out something which is very basic to understanding the difference between Judaism and Zionism and that is that the orthodox Jewish concept of nationhood is very different to the concept of nationhood held by most peoples. Most peoples understand a nation to be a specific people living in a specific land.

The land is essential for the identity of the nation. They may or may not have a religion, but the religion is immaterial to the national identity. The orthodox Jewish concept of nationhood however, is a specific people with a specific religion. It is the religion that establishes the national identity. They may or may not have a land, the land is immaterial to the Jewish national identity. This is borne out by the fact that the Jewish nation has been without a land for 2000 years, but as long as they retained their religion they retained their identity.

Now I mentioned earlier that we were given a land but under certain conditions. The conditions were basically that we had to maintain the highest of moral, ethical and religious standards. The Jewish People did have the land for approximately the first one thousand five hundred years of their existence. However, regrettably, the conditions were not fulfilled to the required degree and the Jews were exiled from their land. For the last two thousand years or so the Jewish people have been in a state of exile decreed by the A-lmighty because they did not maintain the standards expected of them. This state of exile is the situation that exists right up to the present day. It is a basic part of our belief to accept willingly the Heavenly decree of exile and not to try and fight against it or to end it by our own hands. To do so would constitute a rebellion against the wishes of the A-lmighty. In practical terms, although we have maintained our Jewish identity by virtue of our attachment to our religion, never the less exile for us means firstly that Jews must be loyal subjects of the countries in which they live and not attempt to rule over the established indigenous populations of those countries.

Secondly, that we may not attempt to set up a State of our own in Palestine. This would apply even if the land would be unoccupied and it certainly applies when, as is the case, there is an existing indigenous population. This prohibition is a basic part of our teaching and we are forsworn not to contravene it and we are warned of the dire consequences of doing so. It follows, therefore, that Jews have no right to rule today in Palestine.

. . . The practical outcome of Zionism in the form of the State known as 'Israel' is completely alien to Judaism and the Jewish Faith. The very name "Israel" which originally meant what are known as the Children of Israel i.e. the Jewish People was usurped by the Zionists. For this reason many orthodox Jews avoid referring to the Zionist State by the name 'Israel'.

The ideology of Zionism is not to rely on divine providence but to take the law into one's own hands and to try to force the outcome in the form of a State. This is completely contrary to the approach to the matter of exile which our Torah requires us to adopt, as handed down to us by our great religious teachers. I have spoken till now from the religious belief point of view. But let us consider the humanitarian point of view (and to do so is also a religious requirement as I mentioned earlier). The Zionist ideology was and is to force the aim of a State irrespective of the cost in life and property to anyone who stands in the way. The Palestinians stood in the way. We have a fact that

in order to achieve an ill conceived nationalistic ambition, a shocking contravention of natural justice was committed by the Zionists in setting up an illegitimate regime in Palestine completely against the wishes of the established population, the Palestinians, which inevitably had to be based on loss of life, killing and stealing.

To sum up. According to the Torah and Jewish faith, the present Palestinian/Arab claim to rule in Palestine is right and just. The Zionist claim is wrong and criminal. Our attitude to Israel is that the whole concept is flawed and illegitimate. We have another problem and that is that the Zionists have made themselves to appear as the representatives and spokes-people of all Jews thus, with their actions, arousing animosity against the Jews. Those who harbor this animosity are accused of anti-Semitism. However, what has to be made abundantly clear is that Zionism is not Judaism. Zionists cannot speak in the name of Jews. Zionists may have been born as Jews, but to be a Jew also requires adherence to the Jewish belief and religion.

So what becomes abundantly clear is that opposition to Zionism and its crimes does not imply hatred of Jews or 'anti-Semitism'. On the contrary Zionism itself and its deeds are the biggest threat to Jews and Judaism. . . . The strife between Arab and Jew in Palestine only began when the first Zionist pioneers came to Palestine with the express aim of forming a State over the heads of the indigenous Arab population. That strife has continued until this very day and has cost and continues to cost thousands and thousands of lives. The oppression, abuse and murder in Palestine is a tragedy not only for the Palestinians but for the Jewish people as well. And is in fact part of the dire consequences of which we are warned if we transgress our religious requirement not to rebel against our exile.

I wish to add that the connection between Muslims and Jews goes right back into ancient history. Mostly the relationship was friendly and mutually beneficial. Historically, the situation frequently was that when Jews were being persecuted in Europe they found refuge in the various Muslim countries. Our attitude to Muslims and Arabs can only be one of friendliness and respect. I would like to finish with the following words. We want to tell the world, especially our Muslim neighbors, that there is no hatred or animosity between Jew and Muslim. We wish to live together as friends and neighbors as we have done mostly over hundreds even thousands of years in all the Arab countries. It was only the advent of the Zionists and Zionism which upset this age old relationship. We consider the Palestinians as the people with the right to govern in Palestine.

The Zionist State known as "Israel" is a regime that has no right to exist. Its continuing existence is the underlying cause of the strife in Palestine. We pray for a solution to the terrible and tragic impasse that exists. Hopefully based on results brought about by moral, political and economic pressures imposed by the nations of the world. *We pray for an end* to bloodshed and an end to the suffering of all innocent people - Jew and non-Jew alike - worldwide. We are waiting for the annulment of Zionism and the dismantling of the Zionist regime, which will bring about an end to the suffering of the Palestinian people. We would welcome the opportunity to dwell in peace in the holy land under a rule which is entirely in accordance with the wishes and aspirations of the Palestinian People. May we soon merit the time when all mankind will be at peace with each other.

GENOCIDING THE CHILDREN OF ABRAHAM

The Irradiation of 100,000 Sefardi Jewish Children

Barry Chamish 0/17/05 – abridged

On August 14, at 9 PM, Israeli television station, Channel Ten, broke all convention and exposed the ugliest secret of Israel's Labor Zionist founders; the deliberate mass radiation poisoning of nearly all Sephardi youths. Every Sephardi child was to be given 35,000 times the maximum dose of x-rays through his head. For doing so, the American government paid the Israeli government 300,000 Israeli liras a year. The entire Health budget was 60,000 liras. The money paid by the Americans is equivalent to billions of dollars today.

To fool the parents of the victims, the children were taken away on "school trips" and their parents were later told the x-rays were a treatment for the scourge of scalpal ringworm. 6,000 of the children died shortly after their doses were given, the many of the rest developed cancers that killed them over time and are still killing them now. While living, the victims suffered from disorders such as epilepsy, amnesia, Alzheimer's disease, chronic headaches and psychosis.

Yes, that is the subject of the documentary in cold terms. It is another matter to see the victims on the screen, ie. To watch the Moroccan lady describe what getting 35,000 times the dose of allowable x-rays in her head feels like. "I screamed make the headache go away. Make the headache go away. Make the headache go away. But it never went away."

To watch the bearded man walk hunched down the street. "I'm in my fifties and everyone thinks I'm in my seventies. I have to stoop when I walk so I won't fall over. They took my youth away with those x-rays."

To watch the old lady who administered the doses to thousands of children. "They brought them in lines. First their heads were shaved and smeared in burning gel. Then a ball was put between their legs and the children were ordered not to drop it, so they wouldn't move.

The children weren't protected over the rest of their bodies. There were no lead vests for them. I was told I was doing good by helping to remove ringworm. If I knew what dangers the children were facing, I would never have cooperated. Never!"

Because the whole body was exposed to the rays, the genetic makeup of the children was often altered, affecting the next generation. We watch the woman with the distorted face explain, "All three of my children have the same cancers my family suffered. Are you going to tell me that's a coincidence?"

Everyone notices that Sephardi women in their fifties today, often have sparse patchy hair, which they try to cover with henna. Most of us assumed it was just a characteristic of Sephardi women. We watch the woman on the screen wearing a baseball-style hat. She places a picture of a lovely young teenager with flowing black hair opposite the

lens. "That was me before my treatment. Now look at me." She removes her hat. Even the red henna can't cover the horrifying scarred bald spots.

The majority of the victims were Moroccan because they were the most numerous of the Sephardi immigrants. The generation that was poisoned became the country's perpetual poor and criminal class. It didn't make sense. The Moroccans who fled to France became prosperous and highly educated. The common explanation was that France got the rich, thus smart ones. The real explanation is that every French Moroccan child didn't have his brain cells fried with gamma rays.

The film made it perfectly plain that this operation was no accident. The dangers of x-rays had been known for over forty years. We read the official guidelines for x-ray treatment in 1952.

The maximum dose to be given a child in Israel was .5 rad. There was no mistake made. The children were deliberately poisoned. David Deri, makes the point that only Sephardi children received the x-rays.

"I was in class and the men came to take us on a tour. They asked our names. The Ashkenazi children were told to return to their seats. The dark children were put on the bus."

The film now quotes two noted anti-Sephardi racist Jewish leaders, Nahum Goldmann and Levi Eshkol. Goldmann spent the Holocaust years first in Switzerland, where he made sure few Jewish refugees were given shelter, then flew to New York to become head of the World Jewish Congress headed by Samuel Bronfman. According to Canadian writer Mordecai Richler, Bronfman had cut a deal with Prime Minister Mackenzie King to prevent the immigration of European Jews to Canada.

The Moroccan lady is back on the screen. "It was a Holocaust, a Sephardi Holocaust. And what I want to know is why no one stood up to stop it."

David Deri, on film and then as a panel member, relates the frustration he encountered when trying to find his childhood medical records. "All I wanted to know was what they did to me. I wanted to know who authorized it. I wanted to trace the chain of command. But the Health Ministry told me my records were missing." Boaz Lev, the Health Ministry's spokesman chimes in, "Almost all the records were burned in a fire."

Here was the government cabinet at the time of the ringworm atrocities:

Prime Minister - David Ben Gurion / Finance Minister - Eliezer Kaplan

Settlement Minister - Levi Eshkol / Foreign Minister - Moshe Sharrett

Health Minister - Yosef Burg / Labor Minister - Golda Meir

Police Minister - Amos Ben Gurion / Director General Of The Defence Ministry, Shimon Peres.

That a program involving the equivalent of billions of dollars of American government funds should be unknown to the Prime Minister of cash-strapped Israel is ridiculous. Ben Gurion was in on the horrors and undoubtedly chose his son to be Police Minister in case anyone interfered with them.

~ THE JEWS OF IRAQ ~

By Naeim Giladi

I write this article for the same reason I wrote my book: to tell the American people, and especially American Jews, that Jews from Islamic lands did not emigrate willingly to Israel; that, to force them to leave, Jews killed Jews; and that, to buy time to confiscate ever more Arab lands, Jews on numerous occasions rejected genuine peace initiatives from their Arab neighbors. I write about what the first prime minister of Israel called "cruel Zionism." I write about it because I was part of it.

My ancestors had settled in Iraq more than 2,600 years ago-600 years before Christianity, and 1,200 years before Islam. I am descended from Jews who built the tomb of Yehezkel, a Jewish prophet of pre-biblical times. My town, where I was born in 1929, is Hillah, not far from the ancient site of Babylon.

I made my way to the new state of Israel, arriving in May, 1950. My passport had my name in Arabic and English, but the English couldn't capture the "kh" sound, so it was rendered simply as Klaski. At the border, the immigration people applied the English version, which had an Eastern European, Ashkenazi ring to it. In one way, this "mistake" was my key to discovering very soon just how the Israeli caste system worked.

When I reported to the Labor Office in al-Majdal, they saw that I could read and write Arabic and Hebrew and they said that I could find a good-paying job with the Military Governor's office. The Arabs were under the authority of these Israeli Military Governors. A clerk handed me a bunch of forms in Arabic and Hebrew. Now it dawned on me. Before Israel could establish its farmers' city, it had to rid al-Majdal of its indigenous Palestinians. The forms were petitions to the United Nations Inspectors asking for transfer out of Israel to Gaza, which was under Egyptian control. I read over the petition. In signing, the Palestinian would be saying that he was of sound mind and body and was making the request for transfer free of pressure or duress. Of course, there was no way that they would leave without being pressured to do so. These families had been there hundreds of years, as farmers, primitive artisans, weavers. The Military Governor prohibited them from pursuing their livelihoods, just penned them up until they lost hope of resuming their normal lives.

That's when they signed to leave. I was there and heard their grief. "Our hearts are in pain when we look at the orange trees that we planted with our own hands. Please let us go, let us give water to those trees. God will not be pleased with us if we leave His trees untended."

I asked the Military Governor to give them relief, but he said, "No, we want them to leave." I could no longer be part of this oppression and I left. Those Palestinians who didn't sign up for transfers were taken by force-just put in trucks and dumped in Gaza.

Subsequently, I wrote letters trying to get a government job elsewhere and I got many immediate responses asking me to come for an interview. Then they would discover that my face didn't match my Polish/Ashkenazi name. They would ask if I spoke Yiddish or Polish, and when I said I didn't, they would ask where I came by a Polish name. Desperate for a good job, I would usually say that I thought my great-grandfather was from Poland. I was advised time and again that "we'll give you a call." I was disillusioned at what I found in the Promised Land, disillusioned personally, disillusioned at the institutionalized racism, disillusioned at what I was beginning to learn about Zionism's cruelties. The principal interest Israel had in Jews from Islamic countries was as a supply of cheap labor, especially for the farm work that was beneath the urbanized Eastern European Jews. Ben Gurion needed the "Oriental" Jews to farm the thousands of acres of land left by Palestinians who were driven out by Israeli forces in 1948.

And I began to find out about the barbaric methods used to rid the fledgling state of as many Palestinians as possible. The world recoils today at the thought of bacteriological warfare, but Israel was probably the first to actually use it in the Middle East. In the 1948 war, Jewish forces would empty Arab villages of their populations, often by threats, sometimes by just gunning down a half-dozen unarmed Arabs as examples to the rest. To make sure the Arabs couldn't return to make a fresh life for themselves in these villages, the Israelis put typhus and dysentery bacteria into the water wells. Uri Mileshtin, an official historian for the Israeli Defense Force, has written and spoken about the use of bacteriological agents. According to Mileshtin, Moshe Dayan, a division commander at the time, gave orders in 1948 to remove Arabs from their villages, bulldoze their homes, and render water wells unusable with typhus and dysentery.

Acre was so situated that it could practically defend itself with one big gun, so the Haganah put bacteria into the spring that fed the town. The spring was called Capri and it ran from the north near a kibbutz. The Haganah put typhus bacteria into the water going to Acre, the people got sick, and the Jewish forces occupied Acre. This worked so well that they sent a Haganah division dressed as Arabs into Gaza, where there were Egyptian forces, and the Egyptians caught them putting two cans of bacteria, typhus and dysentery, into the water supply in wanton disregard of the civilian population. "In war, there is no sentiment," one of the captured Haganah men was quoted as saying.

About 125,000 Jews left Iraq for Israel in the late 1940s and into 1952, most because they had been lied to and put into a panic by what I came to learn were Zionist bombs. Among the most important documents in my book, I believe, are copies of two leaflets published by the Zionist underground calling on Jews to leave Iraq. One is dated March 16, 1950, the other April 8, 1950. The difference between these two is critical. Both indicate the date of publication, but only the April 8th leaflet notes the time of day: 4 p.m. Why the time of day? Such a specification was unprecedented. Even the investigating judge, Salaman El-Beit, found it suspicious. Did the 4 p.m. writers want an alibi for a bombing they knew would occur five hours later? If so, how did they know about the bombing? The judge concluded they knew because a connection existed between the Zionist underground and the bomb throwers.

This, too, was the conclusion of Wilbur Crane Eveland, a former senior officer in the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), whom I had the opportunity to meet in New York in 1988. In his book, *Ropes of Sand*, whose publication the CIA opposed, Eveland writes:

In attempts to portray the Iraqis as anti-American and to terrorize the Jews, the Zionists planted bombs in the U.S. Information Service library and in synagogues. Soon leaflets began to appear urging Jews to flee to Israel. . . . Although the Iraqi police later provided our embassy with evidence to show that the synagogue and library bombings, as well as the anti-Jewish and anti-American leaflet campaigns, had been the work of an underground Zionist organization, most of the world believed reports that Arab terrorism had motivated the flight of the Iraqi Jews whom the Zionists had "rescued" really just in order to increase Israel's Jewish population."

Eveland doesn't detail the evidence linking the Zionists to the attacks, but in my book I do.

I not give his name, confided in me that the laboratory tests in Iraq had confirmed that the anti- American leaflets found at the American Cultural Center bombing were typed on the same typewriter and duplicated on the same stenciling machine as the leaflets distributed by the Zionist movement just before the April 8th bombing.

Tests also showed that the type of explosive used in the Beit-Lawi attack matched traces of explosives found in the suitcase of an Iraqi Jew by the name of Yosef Basri. Basri, a lawyer, together with Shalom Salih, a shoemaker, would be put on trial for the attacks in December 1951 and executed the following month. Both men were members of Hashura, the military arm of the Zionist underground. Salih ultimately confessed that he, Basri and a third man, Yosef Habaza, carried out the attacks.

Zionist Leaders: From the start they knew that in order to establish a Jewish state they had to expel the indigenous Palestinian population to the neighboring Islamic states and import Jews from these same states. David Ben Gurion, Israel's first prime minister, told a Zionist Conference in 1937 that any proposed Jewish state would have to "transfer Arab populations out of the area, if possible of their own free will, if not by coercion." After 750,000 Palestinians were uprooted and their lands confiscated in 1948-49, Ben Gurion had to look to the Islamic countries for Jews who could fill the resultant cheap labor market. "Emissaries" were smuggled into these countries to "convince" Jews to leave either by trickery or fear. In the case of Iraq, both methods were used: uneducated Jews were told of a Messianic Israel in which the blind see, the lame walk, and onions grow as big as melons; educated Jews had bombs thrown at them.

We Jews from Islamic lands did not leave our ancestral homes because of any natural enmity between Jews and Muslims.

Two Prodigal Sons, One Prodigious Father

Were all of Holy Writ lost to me save one portion alone, I would choose for that portion Jesus' parable about the prodigal son. Uniquely preserved by Luke, it is an unparalleled revelation of God's fatherly concern for us all. Jesus, the story's narrator, is saying in essence: This is what God is like. As a revelation of God's love, it is without peer. From that standpoint alone, it is the greatest story ever told.

The circumstance of its telling was that certain religious folk had observed Jesus in conversation with those whom in their view were beyond redemption, common, run-of-the-mill neer-do-wells. Bad enough, they grumbled, his conversing with sinners but did he have to eat with them too? They were totally offended. Perceiving their disapproval, Jesus said in substance: Why don't you folk stand stock still a minute because I want to paint your picture with some words. Thus he told them about a shepherd who'd lost a sheep, a woman who'd lost a coin, and finally about a father who'd lost a son. It is the latter story about a father who lost a son, to which I now draw attention.

By using commonplace examples, Jesus illustrates the principle that the lost animal, the lost article and, ultimately, the lost person has a claim to our attention. No representation is made that the lost sheep was better than other sheep. Nor was the lost coin necessarily more valuable than other coins. It's simply that it was lost and needed to be found.

Sometimes it's hard for us to see how this principle applies even in the case of the profligate, i.e., someone who is a sinner by every standard of his day. This limitation in our vision could reflect on our natural tendency as finite creatures to underestimate, or else undervalue, God's mercy. It's where a deeper acquaintance with this parable can benefit us, by making as clear as the Gospel itself, that the basis for forgiveness is the heart of the Father.

While traditionally it is called: the "Parable of the Prodigal Son," singular, actually two prodigals are in view and it's very clear who the two are suppose to represent – you and me. We are a combination of the sins of the flesh of the younger son and the sins of the attitude of the older son. Now we may put on a pretty good front – but inwardly we all have our problems. As well, it is clear who the father is intended to represent – God the Father.

The younger of the two sons went to his father and said: "Father, divide unto me the portion of my inheritance that is due me." Normally speaking a Jewish boy would not make such a request of his father, but he was within his legal rights to do so. Given what we know about the elder brother, it may be that in part the younger brother's motivation was to get

away from the atmosphere created by his big brother – the religious prig that he was. Be that as it may, it is all too evident that the younger son, contemptuous of advice, and eager for the pleasures of the world, was out of step with the father, for not many days thereafter, having gathered all together, he shouldered up his backpack and caught the first bus out of town, the one heading south to the border. There in a foreign land he

. . . wasted his substance with riotous living.

Considering his improvident lifestyle, it's not surprising that his financial picture soon went from bad to worse to bankrupt:

And when he had spent all, there arose a mighty famine in the land and he began to be in want. And he went and joined himself to a citizen of that country who sent him off into his fields to feed swine.

While slopping the hogs isn't anyone's idea of a desirable occupation, for someone of Hebraic ancestry, for whom swine were *trief* (unclean), this chore was particularly onerous.

And he would have satisfied his hunger with the husks that the swine did eat, yet no man gave unto him.

Finally, as the *King James* reads, "he came to himself." Sometimes it takes a disaster for us to come to ourselves, to get our head on straight. Nor is it surprising that our darkest moments provide the catalyst to make us receptive to God's greatest revelations. And while he was yet there in the pig pen, the son got down to composing a speech. Rehearsing, he said:

"I will arise and go to my father, and will say unto him, 'Father, I have sinned against Heaven and before thee and am no more worthy to be called thy son, make me as one of your hired servants.'"

It was his will which had taken him from his father, it would be his will that would take him back.

But when he was yet a great ways off, his father saw him, and had compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him.

Can you picture that father running down the road, all his servants running down the road after him? Aristotle once said: "Great men never run in public." Great men may not run in public but this father ran when he saw his boy. Not standing on formality, he ran, for there was his son standing forlorn and destitute in rags, the odor of the pig pen yet about him.

But the son said: "Wait a minute Dad, I have a speech to make." And so he started in, saying: "I have sinned before heaven and in your sight and am no more worthy to be called your son." Now that was not his full speech. Interrupting the recitation, his father said: Bring a robe and put it on him, cover those vestiges of the pigpen. And bring a ring, the family signet ring, and put it on his finger. And, oh, yes, put shoes on his feet. The significance of this latter request is that servants didn't wear shoes; only sons wore shoes.

The son's carefully rehearsed speech was devoted to the idea of his earning his way back into his father's good graces, *earn* the ring, *earn* the robe, *earn* the shoes, but his words fell on deaf ears. The father wasn't accepting his son home as a second-class citizen; he was home as son. "Put shoes on his feet; and a ring on his finger; and a robe about his shoulders." And, oh, yes, go out and get the fatted calf, the one that won the prize at the stock and rodeo show and call in the neighbors because we're going to have the biggest party and barbeque you've ever seen. As the *King James* put it: "And they began to be merry." We'd say "They had a blast!"

What a party that must have been! I'm afraid some of us wouldn't have known how to act at such a party, so afraid are we of good times, but maybe that would be because we don't understand the heart of the Father.

Meanwhile, the elder brother, having come in from the field, heard the music. Not knowing what was going on, he inquired of one of the hired hands, who said to him:

"Your brother is back and your father has killed the fatted calf because he has returned to him safe and sound."

That piece of news did not sit at all well with the older brother, for:

Then was the elder brother angry and refused to enter in or partake of the festivities.

On being entreated by his father to join in, the elder son said:

"Lo, these many years did I serve thee, neither transgressed I at any time thy commandment: and yet thou never gavest me a kid, that I might make merry with my friends: but as soon as this thy Son was come, who hath devoured thy living with harlots, thou hast killed for him the fatted calf."

There are several points one could make about the elder brother: first, that he had an "I" problem: "I," "me," and "mine;" also, a conveniently selective memory: "neither transgressed I at any time thy commandment." Come, come, no one is *that* perfect! Nor could he call brother "brother;" all he could say was "thy son." As Augustine of Hippo put it:

A darkened heart is the far country for it is not by our feet but
by our affection that we either leave Thee or return unto Thee.

Real forgiveness, this parable's basic message, is costly. It's not telling the youth who came back from the far country that what he did didn't make any difference, because it did. It hurt him. It hurt his father. It was wrong and the scars incurred remain. But no one gets to be 20 years of age or 30 years of age, much less 40 years of age, without incurring a number of scars. And what are scars but symbols of healing, of starting over? Forgiveness is not to say: "Let's keep score." Rather, it is to say: "Let's begin anew."

Now the elder brother was right in a certain sense that this does not add up to a fair deal.

But if you're hung up on having your rights, then you are just going to be hung up at that point. Forgiveness may not add up to a fair deal but it will add up to freedom from the kind of resentment the elder brother was experiencing as he stood outside listening to the party going on within. When we forgive, when we seek forgiveness, then are we in touch with God, for He invented forgiveness and He is its greatest practitioner.

Many elder sons out there in the world work hard year in and year out, yet some essential ingredient is missing. Because their confidence rests on their own good works, they are inclined to discount God's good work of forgiveness. And yet:

There is one who can forgive everyone everything because he shed innocent blood for everyone and everything. (Fyodor Dostoevsky)

So compelling was the logic of welcoming back his wayward son that the father said to his elder son:

"It was fit that we should make merry, and be glad: for this thy brother was dead, and is alive again; he was lost and now he is found."

If we're still trying to get on God's good side, maybe it's only because we haven't yet absorbed this parable's message, that our Father has already come to our side. As for anyone's status as son or daughter – it's not earned; but is a free, unmerited gift, for which the Father put everything on the line to make happen, including His own son. Such is the good tidings.

How did we ever get the erroneous notion that God's got Gabriel up there putting stars by our name every time we do something commendable – as if we were accumulating merit with God? That's exactly backwards. The Good News is not about us. The Good News is about God. Nor does love originate with us. Love originates with God, for God is good and God is love and all we have to do is love him back, and when we do, then language begins to fall into place and our feet start to assume the upward path.

We call it the "Parable of the Prodigal Son," when in reality the story's chief protagonist is neither of the two sons; the chief protagonist being instead the sons' prodigious Father.

And all things are ours: the robe, the ring, the shoes, the party. Therefore, why stand about with the elder brother wondering what's going on within when the choice is ours to join the party? After all, we're all invited.

"For the son of Man has come to seek and to save that which is lost." (Luke 19:10)

Bibliography

- Baarda, Tjitze, *Essays on the Diatessaron*. 314 pp. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994.
- Barnard, Leslie William, *Justin Martyr*, Cambridge University Press, 204 pp., 1966.
- Beale, G. K., Carson, D. A., ed. *Commentary of the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, Baker Academic, 1280 pp., 2007.
- Bellinzoni, A. J., *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr*, 155 pp., Brill, '67.
- Black, Matthew, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. 1st edition, 1946, 2nd edition, 1953, viii + 304 pp., 3rd edition 1967.
- Brown, Raymond E., *The Community of the Beloved Disciple*, 204 pp., Paulist Press, '79.
- Buckley, Eric Rede, *An Introduction to the Synoptic Problem*, xii + 292 pp., 1912.
- Burkett, Delbert Ryce, *Rethinking the Gospel sources: from Proto-Mark to Mark*, 290 pp., T & T Clark, 2004.
- Burkitt, F. Crawford, *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, 2 vol., 556 pp. + 322 pp. Syriac text of the Curetonian version of the Old Syriac, with variants of the Scianatic palmiset; 1904.
- Burkitt, F. Crawford, *Christian Beginnings*. University of London Press, 1924.
- Burney, C. F., *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, viii + 176 pp., 1922.
- Chase, F. H., *The Old Syriac Element in the Text of Codex Bezae*. xiii + 160 pp., 1893, reprint 2004.
- Chase, F. H., *The Syro-Latin Text of the Gospels*. London, x + 148 pp., 1895, 2004.
- Culpepper, Alan R., *John The Son of Zebedee The Life of a Legend*, xix + 376 pp., 1994.
- Edwards, James R., *The Hebrew Gospel & the Development of the Gospel Tradition*, xxiii + 356 pp., 2009.
- Ehrman, Bart D. *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*, xiii + 314 pp., 1993.
- Falchetta, Alessandro, editor, *James Rendel Harris: New Testament Autographs and Other Essays*. xvi + 256 pp., 2006.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A., "4Q Testimonia" and the New Testament, published in "Theological Studies," 25 pp., 1957.
- Grenfell, Bernard P., *New Sayings of Jesus and Fragments of a Lost Gospel from Oxyrhynchus*, Oxford Uni. Press, 47 pp., 1904.

- Griffinhoofe, Charles George, *The unwritten sayings of Christ: words of Our Lord not recorded in the four*, xii + 192 pp., 1903.
- Gregory, John Burslem, *The Oracles Ascribed to Matthew by Papias of Hierapolis*, 284 pp., 1894.
- Groates, Margory editor, *The Pepsysian Gospel Harmony*, xxv + 187 pp. Early English Text Society, 1922.
- Harris, James Rendel, *Testimonies*. Part I, 1916. 137 pp. Part II, 1920, 150 pp., Cambridge University Press.
- Harris, James Rendel, *The Origin of the Prologue to St. John's Gospel*. 66 pp., 1917.
- Harris, James Rendel, *The Origin of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, 41 pp., 1919.
- Harris, James Rendel, *Josephus and His Testimony*, 35 pp., Evergreen Essay, # 2, 1931.
- Harris, James Rendel, *Nicodemus*, 22 pp. Evergreen Essay number four, 1932.
- Harris, James Rendel, *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon Syriac text, translation, and commentary*. 218 pp. Cambridge, 1909.
- Harris, James Rendel, *A Popular Account of the Newly-Recovered Gospel of Peter*, viii + 97 pp., Hodder & Stoughton, 1893.
- Harris, James Rendel, *Codex Bezae: a study of the so-called Western Text of the New Testament*, 272 pp., Cambridge University Press, 1891.
- J. Haskins, Susan, *Mary Magdalen: Myth and Metaphor*. 518 pp., Harper 1993.
- Hatch, Edwin, *The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church*. 3rd edition. xxiii + 359 pp., Williams and Norgate, 1891.
- Hobson, Alphonzo Augustus, *The Diatessaron of Tatian and the synoptic problem*. 86 pp., Chicago Uni. Press, 1904.
- Holdsworth, William West, *Gospel Origins, A Study in the Synoptic Problem*, xiv + 211 pp., 1913.
- Hemphill, Samuel, *The Diatessaron of Tatian: a Harmony of the four holy Gospels compiled in the Third Quarter of the Second Century*, xxxi + 78 pp., 1888.
- Howard, George, *Hebrew Gospel of Matthew*. 240 pp., Mercer U., Press, 1995.
- Hunt, B. P. W. Stather, *Primitive Gospel Sources*, 341 pp., Philosophical Library, 1951.
- Jackson, Blomfield, *Twenty-Five Agrapha or Extra-Canonical Sayings of our Lord*, 77 pp., London and New York, 1900.
- Joosten, Jan, *The Gospel of Barnabas and the Diatessaron*, pp. 73-96, *Harvard Theological Review* 95:1, 2002.
- Kraft, Robert A., *The Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila*.
- Klijn, A. F. J., *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition*, Vigiliae Christianae, 1992.
- Kline, Leslie Lee, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies*, 198 pp., 1975.
- Kuchinsky, Yuri, *The Magdalene Gospel: a Journey Behind the New Testament*, 488 pp., Roots Publishing, Toronto, 2002.
- Livingstone, Elizabeth. ed, *Studia Patristica. vol. xxx. Biblica Et Apocrapha, Ascetica, Liturgical. Papers presented at the Twelfth International Conference on*

Patristic Studies held in Oxford, 1995, pub. 1997.

Nilsson, Donal E., *Studies of the New Testament Traditions in The Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila*, a dissertation in religious studies, University of Pennsylvania, 500 pp., 1997.

Nicholson, Edward Bryon, *The Gospel according to the Hebrews: Its Fragments, Translated and Annotated*, xii + 162 pp., 1879.

Nispel, Mark, *Jewish/Christian Conflict and Origen's Use of the Christian Testimonia Proof Text Tradition*, 503 pp., 2003.

Parvus, Roger, *A New Look at the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch and other Apelleian Writings*, 178 pp., 2008.

Petersen, William L., *Tatian's Diatessaron: its Creation, Dissemination, Significance, and History in Scholarship.*, xix + 555 pp., 1994.

Petersen, William, Vos, Johan S., and de Jonge, Henk J., editors, *Sayings of Jesus: Canonical and Non-Canonical: essays in honor of Tjitze Baarda*, 344 pp., Brill, '97.

Pick, Bernhard, *Paralipomena: Remains of Gospels and Sayings of Christ*, ivx + 158 pp., 1908.

Plooij, Daniel, *Studies in the Testimony Book*, 48 pp., 1932.

Plooij, Daniel, *A primitive text of the Diatessaron: The Liege manuscript of a mediaeval manuscript of a Dutch translation: a preliminary study*, 1923.

Plooij, Daniel, *A Further Study of the Liege Diatessaron*, 92 pp., E. J. Brill, 1925

Plooij, D., Phillips, C. A., Bakker, A. H. A. (editors), Eng. Translation, Barrow, A. J.

The Liege Diatessaron, Edited with a Textual Apparatus, 797 pp. pub. in eight parts, 1929-1970.

Quispel, Gilles, *Tatian and the Gospel of Thomas: Studies in the History of the Western Diatessaron*, Brill, 1975.

Sanday, William, *The Gospels in the Second Century*, xiv + 384 pp., 1876.

Schneemelcher, Wilhelm, ed., *New Testament Apocrypha*, II vols, vol. I: Gospel and Related Writings, revised ed., (trans. of the 6th German edition), 500+ pp., 2003.

Schonfield, Hugh, *An Old Hebrew Text of St. Matthew's Gospel*, T & T Clark, xi + 195 pp., 1927.

Selwyn, Edward Carus, *The Oracles in the New Testament*, xxiv + 452 pp., 1911.

Shedinger, Robert. F., *Tatian and the Jewish Scriptures: a Textual and Philological of the Old Testament Citations in Tation's Diatessaron*, 2001.

Skarsaune, Oskar, *The Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text Type, Provenance, Theological profile*, xiv, 505pp., Leiden, Brill, 1987.

Snodgrass, Klyne Ryland, *The Christological stone testimonia in the New Testament*, 970 pp. 1973.

Varner, William, *Ancient Jewish-Christian Dialogues: Athanasius and Zacchaeus, Simon and Theophilus, Timothy and Aquila*, 302 pp., 2004.

