

# How to Read the Bible

By Pastor Eli James

## Introduction

***“For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, MY KINSMEN ACCORDING TO THE FLESH, WHO ARE ISRAELITES, to whom pertains the adoption [placement as sons or heirs] and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises.” - Romans 9:3-4.***

I am often asked the question, "Which is the best version of the Bible for Identity believers?" To this question, I have replied: "All ancient and modern translations suffer from two main problems: Jewish deceit and Roman Catholic meddling." Catholicism has always been a universalist doctrine; and this policy of universalism began to be established, "ordained" by the translations of Jerome and institutionalized by his successors. Even before Jerome, the teachings of Paul were butchered by an enthusiastic religious zealot and self-promoter named Simon Magus, a universalist deceiver if there ever was one! In short, the writings of Paul have been misrepresented by many agents, all of whom were working either for themselves or for the Anti-Christ. It is, in fact, fair to say that all of these universalistic doctrines are outright invention, complete fabrication by the translators, who, by a process of *editing by translation*, have made the Word of God of none effect. These catholic doctrines are not contained in the original autographs of either the Hebrew prophets or the Christian disciples.

It has been stated by many commentators that Paul "reinvented" Christianity. I submit that this statement is absolutely false. It was, in fact, his translators, false interpreters and false promoters, who *reinvented* Christianity. And, if Christianity was REINVENTED, then it behooves us to understand why and by whom it was reinvented!!! If the original writings are not understood, then the REINVENTION cannot be understood either. In many cases, the changes are blatant; but most of them are very subtle, noticeable only to the most assiduous scholars, who, like private detectives, leave no suspicious stone unturned.

While the early Catholics were busy reinventing the New Testament, the Jews were busy reinventing the Old Testament. The Jewish scribes who began that process were the Masoretes, who produced an edited Hebrew version of the Old Testament, the Masoretic Text, which, unfortunately, became the basis of the King James translation of the Old Testament.

Between these two diabolical sources (Jewish and Catholic), they have infected Scripture with their distortions, license, mistranslations, additions, subtractions, and outright invention. Worse yet, by virtue of an assumed authority over Scripture, not appointed by Yahweh God, the Bible has become *a mumble and jumble of perplexing, often contradictory terms and doctrines*, having no legitimate basis or conception in the original Hebrew and Greek languages. By redefining words and by inventing "history" that never happened, Catholicism and Judaism have created false contexts for Scripture. Add to this malaise the fanciful, modernist misinterpretations of Evangelical Christianity, and – *Voila!* – we have discovered the Great Apostasy, which was also prophesied by Paul in 2 Thes. 2. This collection of false priests and false religion is also referred to as the "False Prophet" in the Book of Revelation.

Of course, none of these misguided groups will ever admit that they are preaching apostasy; but they most assuredly are, for they totally misrepresent what Paul said in Romans 9:3-4 (just quoted above), and just about everywhere else in the New Testament. In that passage, Paul clearly teaches that the Ordination/Placement/"Adoption," the Covenants, the Giving of the Mosaic Law, and the GLORY are given to flesh and blood Israelites. No other people are mentioned. As will be demonstrated later, True Israel's commission is to set a national example for the heathen nations. This national message has been distorted into the "Gospel of Personal Salvation," with its focus on "evangelizing" individuals of all races.

Both the Jewish rabbinate and the Roman Catholic Church have responded enthusiastically to the lesser god of universalism. Both have been motivated by rigid dogma coupled with this agenda. It goes without saying that neither priesthood encourages questions or criticism. Rather than deal in open discussion, both religions have practiced excommunication of critics. In the case of Judaism, the double standard of Jewish religio-cultural exclusivism for themselves is contrasted with their doctrine of multiculturalism for the non-Jewish masses. While actively promoting this multiculturalism and racial integration for Whites, the Jews have declared themselves to be EXEMPT from the very amalgamation that they wish to force upon others! According to them, everything else, including your culture and mine, is subject to change and, furthermore, *needs to be changed according to Jewish "values,"* while Jewish religion and culture must be preserved for eternity, as the Jews see fit! In other words, the Jews reserve the right to butt into our business, while they cry foul if we dare to even criticize their own ideas and tactics. Now, isn't that just a bit self-serving? Yet, few Catholics or Protestants dare to criticize this self-serving theology! *"For fear of the Jews!"* (John 7:13, 9:22, 19:38, 20:19.) And for fear of being called an "anti-Semite"!

Few scholars have ever bothered to analyze or appreciate this double standard. It was with purpose and intent that this double standard was built into the "Chosen People" philosophy, as practiced by the Jews. It is, in fact, hypocrisy personified in the rabbi. *"Beware the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy."* (Luke 12:1.) But Christian Zionists pay no heed to this Scriptural statement, and the many other statements throughout the New Testament, which condemn Judaism (the religion of the Pharisees) as the religion of the Synagogue of Satan. (Rev. 2:9, 3:9.) Following the lead of their various denominations, the Judeo-Christians typically refuse to acknowledge Bible verses that contradict the rigid dogma that has been so cynically and masterfully fed to them.

## **The Priests of Apostasy**

*"After the 5<sup>th</sup> Century AD, when the Bible was compiled by the Ancient Church of the East, theologians in Urhai, the serious distortion of the Scriptures began. The Roman church drove out the Ancient Aramaic theologians, who were the masters of the language. The Ancient church of the East thrived in Persia, under the protection of certain Zoroastrian kings and they spread the Gospel to the East. They went to India and China and built many churches. To this day there can be found the inscriptions in the Ancient Aramaic language all along the path the missionaries of this church travelled.*

*Now that I'm translating the Old Testament, **I've discovered that the distortions of the Scriptures by the modern churches have been consistent and deliberate.** I asked myself why it is that the Jewish theologians didn't maintain the Ancient Aramaic Scriptures more faithfully? – "The Distortion of the Scriptures," by Vic Alexander.*

Mr. Alexander's question gets to the heart of the problems with the King James and other versions: Jewish and Catholic distortion of the Scriptures.

Like the Pharisees, the Roman Catholic Church used a well-educated priesthood to manipulate an illiterate and superstitious populace. In both cases, the priesthood exploited and still exploits the people by inventing doctrine that is not found in Scripture.

Worse still, the priesthoods of modern Protestantism have borrowed very liberally from both of these false traditions. The Fundamentalists and Evangelicals rival the rabbis and the Catholic theologians with their wholesale invention of doctrine, plus their far-fetched, modernistic interpretations of Scripture, with equally disastrous results. The "Rapture Theory," "Born Again," and "Once saved, always saved" doctrines are three examples. Another is the "God loves everyone" doctrine. I would ask these same people, "Does God love Satan?" Or does God intend to make an END of Satan? Does Jesus love everybody, or does He intend to cut evildoers asunder? The Bible teaches the latter, not the former. If God "*loves everyone*," would someone please explain these verses to me: Mal. 4:1; Matt. 15:13-14; Luke 12:51, 19:27; John 17:9; Acts 3:23; 2 Peter 3:7; 1 John 2:15?

Thanks to these three priesthoods (Roman Catholicism, Judaism, and modern Protestantism...the three "*unclean spirits*" of Revelation 16:13?), the Bible has been turned up-side-down, from a record of the exploits and promises Yahweh made exclusively to His People, Israel, into a self-serving, priesthood-empowering manual for people control, a template for religious tyranny. The pew occupants are none the wiser, mistaking this iniquity for the "*will of God*." The sheep eat the sweetened poison that the false shepherds feed them, and they relish the sweet-tasting lies. Believing themselves to be spiritual, righteous, and wise, they hypnotically return every "Sabbath" for more religious entertainment.

Given the liberal flow of slithery sweet talk coming from the rabbis and pulpitemasters, the pew occupants have become nothing more than lobotomized sheeple, drifting along with the latest anti-Biblical fads and trends of the clergy.

*"Take heed that ye be not deceived: for many shall come in my name, saying I am Christ; and the time draweth near; go ye not therefore after them."* (Luke 21:8.)

Beware of wolves in sheep's clothing! Despite the fact that the New Testament issues repeated warnings about the deceiver-priests, the Judeo pulpit rarely quotes such passages. Even more scarce is the exegesis of such passages. The reason for this is obvious. The modern apostates are the very deceivers that have been prophesied to appear in these End Times.

The purpose of this essay is to explain some of the most common errors of translation, so that the reader can take this information and apply it to the KJV, in order to correct these errors of translation and get the proper sense of questionable passages. Until a more accurate translation of the Bible becomes available, I am providing here a set of guidelines for avoiding the greatest pitfalls.

## **The Westminster Confession of Faith**

*"Variety of translations is profitable for finding out the sense of the Scriptures."* - Augustine of Hippo.

The Westminster Confession, composed in 1646, is a very detailed document explaining the principles of Protestantism. The relevant portion for our study is Chapter 1, Paragraph VIII:

*The Old Testament in Hebrew (which was the native language of the people of God of old), and the New Testament in Greek (which at the time of the writing of it was most generally known to the nations), being immediately inspired by God, and by his singular care and providence kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentic; so as in all controversies of religion the Church is finally to appeal unto them.* But because these original tongues are not known to all the people of God who have right unto, and interest in, the Scriptures, and are commanded, in the fear of God, to read and search them, therefore they are to be translated into the vulgar language of every nation unto which they come, that the Word of God dwelling plentifully in all, they may worship him in an acceptable manner, and, through patience and comfort of the Scriptures, may have hope.

Paragraph 8 is very clear in telling us that, when controversies arise about the true meaning of certain verses, we are to appeal to the original languages for a resolution of the controversy. Implicit in the above statement is the idea that the KJV is not inerrant. The WC declares that the original languages are authentic, not any particular translations. It is interesting that, except for certain independent theologians, the Judeo churches rarely employ this test. Only in Christian Identity is this test used on a regular basis. Identity theologians, such as Dr. Wesley Swift, Bertrand Comparet, Howard B. Rand and Arnold Kennedy routinely use this rule to demonstrate that the KJV has been badly translated. I have dubbed this technique as the Word Study Method. By using the Word Study Method, we can determine whether a particular word has been correctly translated or not. Having employed this technique in my own writings now for thirty years, I can say that I have uncovered hundreds of bad translations simply by referring to the original meanings of words in the Hebrew and Greek. With this simple technique, which any Christian can perform with a Strong's Concordance, we will now examine the most common errors of translation from the Hebrew Old Testament and Greek New Testament.

## **Problems in the Old Testament**

The translational problems in the Old Testament are not as many as in the New Testament. Essentially, about a dozen or so words have been either redefined or misrepresented to make the Jewish people seem to be the Israel of Yahweh. Once these few terms are understood in their Hebrew context, the Old Testament is quite easy to decipher. It is just a matter of replacing a few bad definitions with the correct ones. The words that require discussion are listed below. Just like the word 'gay' used to mean happy, today it means an unhappy homosexual.

## **Distorted Hebrew Terms**

For the purpose of unraveling the deceitful prose of the Masoretic Text, as translated in the KJV and other versions, a few common terms must be analyzed. In every case, we will find that if we stick to the actual Hebrew meanings of the words, the confusion contained in the translations falls away. In the case of the Old Testament, the list of systemically mistranslated words is actually quite short, although the occurrence of these words is quite large.

**LORD.** The English word, LORD, is translated from the Hebrew word YHWH. This word should never have been translated into an English word at all. It is commonly accepted translational practice that proper names in the source language are never translated. At best,

such proper names are transliterated, meaning that they are spelled out in the new language so as to phonetically represent the same sounds as in the source language.

For example, the name of Giuseppe Verdi, the Italian composer of operas, is never translated as Joe Green, especially when the discussion is about classical composers. There is no reason to translate his name, because we don't want to confuse Giuseppe Verdi with someone else, such as Joe Green, the football player. Since Verdi was an Italian, we retain the Italian spelling and pronunciation of his name to make it exactly clear of whom we are speaking.

The only reason for changing YHWH to LORD is that the Jewish rabbis have invented their own law, by which they claim that the Name of Yahweh should not be written or pronounced. Since the Psalms repeatedly say that we should honor His Name with song and praises, this Talmudic Jewish tradition should be considered scripturally unfounded and illegitimate, which it is. Yet, the Judeo-Christians never question rabbinical traditions, no matter how anti-Mosaic and unscriptural they are!

Exo. 3:14-16 states that His name is I AM THAT I AM, which is the Hebrew Tetragrammaton, YHWH (commonly pronounced Yahweh); and no rabbi has the authority to change Scripture. (Deut. 4:2.) Therefore, whenever the ALL CAPS word LORD is encountered in the Bible, it should be read as YHWH, 'Yahweh.'

**JEW.** In the Old Testament, the English word 'Jew' is always translated from the Hebrew words 'Yehud' or 'Yehudi.' 'Yehud' is the name of the patriarch, Judah. 'Yehudi' is the plural form designating the Judahites of the tribe of Judah. Since the modern Jews of this world are, by their own admission, a mixture of non-Shemitic Edomites and Khazars, plus many other non-Hebrew peoples, it is absurd to say that 'Jew' = 'Judah.' It would be like saying 'Turk' = 'Deutsch.' The two ethnicities are fundamentally different and distinct, having no religion or history in common. This means that the modern Jewish people are completely unrelated by race or religion to the Judahites of the Bible. The rabbis of Judaism know this, but it is the main feature of their religious charade of impersonating True Israel, who are, in fact, the Caucasian people.

Consequently, whenever the word 'Jew' is encountered in the OT, it should be read as "Judah" or "Judahite," depending on whether it is a reference to the patriarch or the people of that tribe, who are directly descended from Judah. Knowing this one fact will clear up many dubious passages, especially in the Book of Esther, wherein Esther and Mordecai are clearly identified as Benjamites of the House of Judah (two-tribed House of Judah). This means, unequivocally, that Esther was NOT a Jewess but a Benjamite woman of the House of Judah, a White Aryan Adamic Shemitic Hebrew Israelite of the tribe of Benjamin.

There is never any justification for using the word *Jew* to designate a Judahite, either in the OT or the NT, since the Old Testament Judahites never used such a nickname to refer to themselves. As long as we give these non-Israelite Jews credit for being something they are not, you will never understand the difference(s) between a Jew and an Israelite/Judahite. If you accept vague definitions for precise designations, you will be hopelessly confused, *ad infinitum*.

**ISRAELITE.** Simply put, an Israelite is a direct descendant of Jacob/Israel. All Israelites are racial Adamites, Hebrews, and Shemites, who possess no DNA other than that of Israel on their father's side and only Adamite DNA on their mother's side. This is how Scriptural descent is reckoned and recorded in the Bible. No other person can qualify as an Israelite. It is simply a matter of DNA. **An Israelite should never be confused with a Jew.** Jews are the modern

descendants of the Biblical Edomites and Canaanites, plus an even larger non-Israelite mixture (95%) of non-Shemitic Khazars, who converted to Judaism in the year 740 AD.

**GENTILE.** This word simply has *no* place in the Bible. Wherever you see this word in Scripture, cross it out. In the Old Testament, the Hebrew 'goy' should have been translated as "nation." In the New Testament, the Greek word, *ethnos*, almost always refers to the "Israelites of the Dispersion." That is the literal, historical reference designated by this word in virtually every instance in the New Testament. Depending upon the context, *ethnos* can also refer to non-Israelite nations, so the passages have to be read very carefully, as the context will always reveal what nations are being discussed.

The primary definition of the Greek word, *ethnos*, in Strong's (#1484) is **RACE, TRIBE**. Following these two correct definitions, we see more Jewish deception at work, where Strong's has, "*spec. a FOREIGN, (NON-JEWISH) ONE (usually, by implic. PAGAN): -- Gentile, heathen, nation, people.*" This is the same false definition that is given for the Hebrew word, *goy*.

Obviously, some devious rabbi invented this idea of foreignness and shoehorned it into Strong's definition. As with the Hebrew *goy*, the Greek *ethnos* is primarily a reference to a nation of homogeneous people. The correct designation of the word *nation* can easily be determined from the **context** of any Scripture passage under consideration. With the word *gentile*, we have another instance of Jewish meddling with the Scriptures, causing false definitions and false interpretations to destroy the intended meaning of the author. There is **NO WORD IN EITHER THE HEBREW OR THE GREEK LANGUAGE, WHICH MEANS "NON-JEWISH."** The Bible designates Israelites and non-Israelites; but it **NEVER** designates anyone or any nation as either "*Jewish*" or "*non-Jewish*." If you think it does, then you are one of millions who have been fooled by the various, sloppy translations. More about this in the NT section.

**GENERATION.** This English word is translated from two different Hebrew words. One is DOR (#1755), which can mean an age or a generation of people living during that age. At Gen. 6:9, the King James Version reads as follows: "*These are the generations of Noah: Noah was a just man, perfect in his generations.*" In Gen. 6:9, the word 'generations' comes from the Hebrew *toledaw*, which means "*descent.*" There is only one possible meaning here: Noah was pure in his genealogy, perfect his RACIAL DESCENT from Adam.

Gen. 5:1. "*This is the book of the generations (toledaw, family tree, descendants of) Adam. In the day that God created Adamkind, in the likeness of God (elohim) made He him.*" DNA is like a computer program. Any geneticist will tell you that mutations invariably cause disease and death. DNA is exclusive to every species. DNA replicates its own kind and none other. Wheat seed produces wheat. Corn seed produces corn. If this were not true, farmers would not know what crop to expect. Adamic seed produces more Adamites. Negro seed produces more Negroes. Oriental seed produces more Orientals. That's how it works. Every scientist knows this. Only when somebody deliberately messes with the genetic programming is there a different result.

The KJV, *as translated*, makes no distinction between DOR and TOLEDAW, but their meanings in the Hebrew are quite different and important for understanding what is being stated.

**SEED.** "*But thou, Israel, art My servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the SEED of Abraham my friend.*" (Isa. 41:8.) "Now to Abraham and his SEED were the promises made. He saith NOT and

*to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy SEED which is Christ [anointed, Strong's #5547]."* (Gal. 3:16)

The Hebrew word *zarah* (*seed*) is used of Abraham and Israelites repeatedly. It is never used in a spiritual sense. It is always used for physical offspring, descendants, and children in the flesh. Isa. 41:8 clearly states that a SEED, a RACE of people has been chosen. Gal. 3:16 affirms the statement made in Isaiah. Paul goes even further, explaining that only ONE SEED (one particular Race, not many races) has been anointed, and no other race. (The last word, being 'Christ,' in the Galatians quote is a poor translation, the KJV translators assuming that the word *anointed* is a reference to the individual, Christ. The Bible clearly states, hundreds of times, that the Covenants were made to Abraham's descendants, namely, the children of Israel, in their entirety, not to just one person, Jesus Christ. What Paul is actually saying is that OUR ONE AND ONLY RACIAL SEED is anointed, meaning all Israelites have been dedicated to His service. It is still up to us as individuals to perform as those anointed/predestinated. As translated, the KJV is falsely saying that only Jesus Christ is the recipient of the promises; but that is clearly ridiculous. The Redeemer came to redeem the SEED of Israel, the people of Israel. He did not come to redeem Himself, as this absurd translation implies! As the Sinless One, He had NO NEED of redemption! The Redeemer was promised to the ANOINTED SEED, the children of Israel!) The distortionists use this verse to proclaim that Jesus Christ came to save all "seeds," by which they mean "all races." But Paul is actually affirming the exclusivity of Israel. One of the promises made to Abraham's SEED (direct descendants) was that they would become an innumerable multitude. (Gen. 22:17.) Was Jesus Christ an "innumerable multitude"? This is just another example of how sloppy scholarship and deliberately false translation has made mincemeat of the Bible. Since True Israel has been prophesied to become a KINGDOM OF PRIESTS, every one of us will have the opportunity, as the head of a household of Israelites, to become anointed as a King-Priest.

In the Greek, the word *seed* is translated from *sperma* (#4690), the meaning of which should be obvious to everyone. It is not a term that has any spiritual connotations, unless you believe in "*spiritual sperm*"! *Zarah* and *sperma* are biological, genealogical words, having no spiritual connotations whatsoever, proving that the Bible is talking about literal progeny, offspring, NOT "*SPIRITUAL Israel*."

Gen. 3:15 represents one of the most important prophecies of the Old Testament. In this verse the devil's SEED, or offspring, the first in line being Cain, is foreseen as being in constant ENMITY with Eve's SEED, or offspring, the first in line being Seth, until the Day of Resolution/Judgment. The entire Bible is a record of the constant struggles between the devil's SEED (the Cainite {Kenite}, Canaanite, Edomite, Shelahite, Idumean, Jewish people) and Adam and Eve's SEED, which is the Adamite/Shemitic/Hebrew/Israelite/Caucasian race. Gen. 17:7-9 declares that the Covenants are established between Yahweh and the SEED OF ABRAHAM, not to any mythical church or multicultural cast of "believers.

**COVENANT.** "*Behold, the days come, saith Yahweh, that I will sow the HOUSE OF ISRAEL and the HOUSE OF JUDAH [both of which references are exclusive genealogical, family references to the SEED of Israel, not to any so-called "spiritual Israel," nor are they references to mongrelized Jews] with the SEED OF MAN [Adamites not of either House], and with the SEED OF BEAST [meaning non-Whites; therefore, this means that it will be a time of pervasive race-mixing, i.e., TODAY]. And it shall come to pass, that like as I have watched over them, to pluck up [the good Israelites], and to break down [the disobedient Israelites], and to*

*throw down, and to destroy, and to afflict [We are most certainly afflicted today!]; so will I watch over them [Israel, NOT all nations or "believers," or any apostate "church"], to build and to plant, saith Yahweh. In those days they shall say no more, The fathers have eaten the sour grape, and the children's teeth are set on edge. But everyone shall die for his own iniquity [refuting the false doctrine of universal reconciliation]: every man that eateth the sour grape, his teeth shall be set on edge. Behold, the days come, saith Yahweh, that I will make a NEW COVENANT with the HOUSE OF ISRAEL, and with the HOUSE OF JUDAH: not according to the COVENANT that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which COVENANT they brake [a reference to the Ten Commandments and to the Levitical priesthood's sacrificial laws], *although I was an husband unto them, saith Yahweh, But this shall be the COVENANT that I will make with the HOUSE OF ISRAEL; After those days, saith Yahweh, I will PUT MY LAW IN THEIR INWARD PARTS and WRITE IT IN THEIR HEARTS.*" (Jer. 31:27-33; Heb. 8:8-12.)*

A Covenant is an EXCLUSIVE COMPACT between two or more parties. Anyone who is not named in the agreement has no legal claim to it. Thus, the Dispensationalists are making an illegal claim when they say their churches have inherited the promises of the Covenants. That is another distortion of the language of Scripture. They have, in effect, signed THEIR NAME in place of YOUR NAME on the inheritance document!! Like Judaism, Dispensationalism is also a counterfeit doctrine.

It is an irrefutable fact that all of the Covenants in Scripture are made exclusively with Abraham and his direct descendants, the children of Israel. Get a Concordance and look up the word *covenant* (Strong's #1285 BERITH, or BRITH), and you will find that what I am saying is true. When two people make a compact between each other, it applies to no one else. Nowhere in Scripture is there ANY STATEMENT that can be construed or misconstrued as implying that the Covenants were made or expanded to include non-Israelites, or transferred to some metaphorical/allegorical "church," consisting of mere "believers" or a non-existent "spiritual Israel."

One of those covenants is the Law itself. It was established at Mt. Sinai where OUR ANCESTORS took an oath to obey the Law (Ex. 19:3-8 and Deut. 29:29). *"That he may establish thee today for a people unto himself, and that he may be unto thee a God..."* (Deut. 29:13.) However, we broke our national Covenant, our promise to keep the Law. That is why we, as a people, continue to suffer the curses outlined in Chapter 28 of Deuteronomy. It is now up to us to perform the Covenant that our ancestors failed to keep. The Judeo churches must redefine the terms of the covenants, which, in effect, is overruling the Creator.

**ADAM.** The very first thing that must be realized is that the Hebrew word, *AWDAWM*, means "to show blood in the face." This literally means "to be able to blush." Only the White Adamic race has ever had this ability. Hence, Gen. 1:26-27 is declaring that only the White Race was made in the image of Elohim. The other races were already created at Gen. 1:24-25, as the "beast of the earth." This includes the Orientals, the Blacks, the Amerindians and all non-Whites. In the biblical narrative, the Covenants were continuously narrowed down to an ever smaller group of people, from the Adamites down to Noah's eight souls. From Noah, the Covenants were transmitted, exclusively, through Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (Israel). Only the direct descendants of this genealogy were ever made a party to these promises and covenants. Note that a Covenant is a legal contract, which cannot be disannulled, just as Paul says. (Gal. 3:15, 17.) Yahweh has sworn by His own Name that these Covenants will never be altered or abolished.

Jonah 3:8 describes the fact that Nineveh had “beasts” (non-Whites) and “men” (White Adamites), both of whom were dressed in sackcloth and repented of their sins. There is no such thing as a four-legged “beast” capable of repenting. Only two-legged non-Whites can perform what is required here.

Gen. 1:28-30 declares the Dominion Mandate, which is given exclusively to the Adamic Race and to no one else. History proves that the White Race has always been the Dominion Race, exactly as Yahweh had intended. Likewise, our current decline was prophesied. Fortunately, our eventual re-emergence as God’s Chosen People was also prophesied (Hosea 1:10; Rom. 9:25-26); and nothing can stop this prophecy from being fulfilled.

Satan perfectly understood that the creation of an immortal seedline would overthrow his rebellion (Rev. 12). Hence, he understood that the only way he could thwart Yahweh’s Plan to overthrow this rebellion was to adulterate Eve’s offspring, by seducing her. That is exactly what Gen. 3 is about. All of the punishments that were inflicted upon Adam and Eve in that chapter are sexual in nature, from covering their sexual organs with loincloths to Eve’s conception being cursed with exceptional pain. The resultant offspring of this seduction was Cain, while Abel was actually the son of Adam. Eve had a dual pregnancy (superfecundation) by two different males. Although superfecundation was rare among the Israelites, it is very common today, as more and more women have become promiscuous, sharing their beds with different men on different nights, and sometimes with men of different races. In this way, a woman can be pregnant by two different men at the same time.

Gen. 4:1 records Eve’s surprise at Cain’s appearance, where she says, “*I have gotten a man* (IYSH, not AWDAWM) *from Yahweh.*” The meaning of the Hebrew word IYSH is “a male of any species.” Moreover, the root word from which IYSH derives is ENOSH, meaning “mortal.”

Eve was twice surprised: by Cain’s appearance and by the fact that she perceived he was a mortal. Eve’s statement is one of surprise and shock! Given Yahweh’s promise that Adam and Eve would be immortal if they refrained from sin, Eve was very surprised that she would have produced a non-Adamic, mortal offspring, such as Cain. (As genetic studies and pregnancy studies increase our knowledge of fetal development, scientists are finding that the mother retains some of the cells of the offspring in her body, including her brain, after delivering the child. These pregnancy cells suggest that there is a biochemical mechanism for telegony, or the cross-contamination of future offspring from a previous pregnancy. This article even suggests that such cross-contamination can occur between twins in utero:

<http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=scientists-discover-childrens-cells-living-in-mothers-brain> ) In this way, both Eve and Abel would have been affected by the presence Cain’s aberrant DNA. Cain was not capable of being immortal because his DNA was already sinful, on his father’s side.

The fact that Cain killed Abel is proof that there was something seriously wrong with Cain. We in Christian Identity understand why: Adam was not Cain’s father. Nachash, the “serpent,” was Cain’s father. The “Serpent” having thus polluted Eve’s womb, Abel, through cross-contamination, was also born a mortal; and Eve, because her error had made herself no longer immortal, could no longer produce immortal offspring. She never got the chance, because Nachash impregnated her about the same time that Adam did. This is the true meaning of the FALL of Adam and Eve. Rather than ask Yahweh for a replacement, Adam chose to do what Eve did. He fraternized with the other races and apparently bore hybrid offspring as well. He should have asked Yahweh for a replacement for Eve; but this idea never occurred to him. Either

that, or he loved Eve so much that he could not bear to lose her. Another possibility is that neither one of them were able to comprehend the consequences of their sin.

Gen. 5:1 records Adam's satisfaction with Seth, Abel's replacement, because Seth was born in Adam's own image, just as the Adamic race was conceived in the image of Elohim, the angelic host which effected the Creation, under Yahweh's direction (Gen. 2:4). Since Cain was not Adam's son, Cain was never even considered as part of Adam's genealogy. Even the New Testament genealogy leaves Cain out. Had Cain been the elder son of Adam (as he was older than Seth), he would have had the rights of the elder son over Seth. But since he was not Adam's son, Cain had no such claim. (This theme was repeated later, when Esau, the elder, despised his birthright, transferring it to Jacob-Israel, the younger.)

The KJV makes no distinction among several different Hebrew words, which are all translated as "man." This indiscriminate type of translation fails to capture the true meaning of the Hebrew. Besides AWDAM, IYSH and ENOSH, several other words are indiscriminately translated as "man," and this lack of discernment allows the multi-culti pastors of race-mixing to make false assertions about the universality of the meaning of the word MAN in the Bible. For this reason, I advocate the use of the word ADAMKIND wherever we the Hebrew word AWDAM is used to refer to our Race.

**KINDRED.** Gen. 24:1-7, 36-38: "My kindred" refers to the Shemitic nation of Abraham. No Canaanite wife is permitted for Isaac. Rebekah is the pure White Shemite that Yahweh has selected for Isaac. She is blessed by Yahweh at Gen. 24:58-60. Gen. 25:1-6: The sons of Keturah (the Brahmins of India) are sent away so as not to interfere with Isaac's inheritance, circa 1800 BC. These are the Indo-Aryans. They are still a kindred people to the Shemitic sons of Isaac (Saxons), but they are not Israelites.

**HOLY, SEPARATE, SEVERED.** "Holy" means "called out." It is only in modern times that the word 'holy' has developed the strictly RELIGIOUS meaning of 'saintly' or "non-sinful." Even so, these modern meanings are derived from "called out." Obviously, the Israelites were hardly ever a non-sinful people, so that definition makes no sense at all. Yahweh has constantly struggled with us because of our sinfulness. Only the Elect, or Remnant, ever achieves righteousness to the degree acceptable to Yahweh for governance of the Kingdom. We are the Elect, in spite of our faults, because Yahweh intends to purge the sin out of us.

Ex. 19:5-6: *"Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine. And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation."*

Isa. 6:12-13: *"And Yahweh has removed men [#120, AWDAM] far away [into the wilderness of Europe, which became the regathering place for all White Israelites], and a great forsaking [of His laws, way back in Palestine and the Great Apostasy today] in the midst of the land. But yet in it shall be a tenth [a remnant], and it [the remnant] shall return [to Me, Yahweh], and shall be eaten: as a teil tree, and as an oak, whose substance is in them, when they cast their leaves: so the HOLY SEED shall be the substance thereof."*

The Israelites will yet bear holy fruit, which can be "eaten" when the harvest is ripe. The other 90% are so rotten that they cannot be "eaten." This is also confirmed by the prophetic Church of Laodecia, the End Time Apostasy of "Judeo-Christianity," which is so foul that it literally nauseates Yahshua! (Rev. 3:16.) Only the Israelites are spoken of in this manner. None of the historical escapades undergone by Israel apply to any other race. The exclusivity of the

Bible is unmistakable, once the fog of universalism is removed from one's eyes. Segregation is not an option. It is mandatory.

*“For I am Yahweh your Elohim, the HOLY ONE OF ISRAEL, your Savior: I gave Egypt for your ransom, Ethiopia are for you. Since you (Israel) were precious in My sight, you have been [somewhat] honorable, and I have loved you: therefore will I give men for you, and people for your life. **Fear not: for I am with you:** I will bring **your seed** from the east, and gather **you** from the west. I will say to the north, Give up; and to the south, Keep not back: bring **My sons** from afar, and **My daughters** from the ends of the earth; Even every one that is called by my name: for I have created him for my glory, I have formed him; yea, I have made him.” - Isa. 43:3-5.*

These words are spoken exclusively to Israel and to no other people. In fact, these words are part of the dominion Mandate given to the Adamic race way back in Gen. 1:26-31. Yahweh will present the other races and nations to us, once the Remnant has mastered righteousness. The Hebrew word for ‘holy’ is *qadash*. More than anything else, it means “*appointed, dedicated, consecrated.*” The dedication ceremony was the placing of Isaac on the sacrificial altar by Abraham. Only by virtue of this ceremony are Isaac’s descendants intended to be “sacred,” or “non-sinful.” Certainly a priest and God’s people Israel should be non-sinful; but that is not what the word means. It means that Yahweh has dedicated us exclusively, setting us apart from the heathen, in order that we might refrain from sin, so that we could provide the world with a holy example, so that we might be the City on the Hill.

Peter confirms this dedicated state for Israel. I Peter 2:9-10: “*Ye are a **chosen** [selected out of many races] **Race**, a **royal** [kingly, above all others] **priesthood**, a **holy** [dedicated exclusively to Yahweh] **nation**, a **peculiar** [different from all other peoples] **people**, that ye should show the praises of him [to the rest of the world, as in Gen. 12:3] who hath called you out of darkness in to his marvelous light. Such in time past were not a people, but now are the people of God.”*

Because the Israelites had been already scattered throughout the Greco-Roman world, Peter is simply stating that the New Covenant has again made us One People, via the common forgiveness, healing the division that had occurred between the two houses. Because Israel was broken up into **two houses** after the death of Solomon, we were no longer ONE PEOPLE. And because we had forgotten His Covenants with us, we were no longer a cohesive culture. But Christ’s forgiveness of our past sins made us one people again.

Yahweh is speaking to His people through the apostle Peter, referring to us, using the exact same exclusive language that is contained in the Old Testament, declaring that we are a "chosen" or "elect" race, as a "holy nation" and as a "people for God's own possession." By God's grace we occupy a very favored position in His universe. This is what it means to be CHOSEN. If every group, race and nation were likewise “chosen,” the word would have no meaning.

Now, True Israel, what are you going to achieve with this very favored status? Are you going to do as the Judeo-Christians do and destroy your own talents by wasting them on this evil world; or are you going to use your peculiar talents to bring in the Kingdom?

**STRANGER.** The multiculturalists of Judeo-Christianity like to quote OT passages that seem to permit race-mixing. That these “theologians” are practicing deliberate deceit is unquestionable, as they systematically ignore those passages which prohibit intercourse, both sexual and social, between Israelites and strangers of other races. Some of the words that are indiscriminately translated as “stranger” are GER, ZUWR, NEKAR and NOKRI.

Here is a quick survey of the exact meanings of these words, as used in the Hebrew text: IN THE OLD TESTAMENT there are eight words which are translated as stranger, strangers, foreigner, sojourners or aliens and some clarification is necessary. Without this clarification we have translations which make the Bible appear contradictory and inconsistent.

**Gur** [H1481] are strangers who are Israelites travelling in foreign lands. *A primitive root; properly to turn aside from the road (for a lodging or any other purpose), that is, sojourn (as a guest); also to shrink, fear (as in a strange place); also to gather for hostility (as afraid): - abide, assemble, be afraid, dwell, fear, gather (together), inhabitant, remain, sojourn, stand in awe, (be) stranger, X surely*

Examples: Gen 12:10. *And there was a famine in the land: and Abram went down into Egypt to sojourn there; for the famine was grievous in the land.* Exo 6:4. *And I have also established my covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their pilgrimage, wherein they were **strangers**.* Psa. 105:12. *When they were but a few men in number; yea, very few, and **strangers** in it.*

**Ger** [H1616] are strangers or guests who are always fellow Israelites.

Examples: Gen 15:13. *And he said unto Abram, Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a **stranger** in a land [that is] not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years; Exo 12:19. Seven days shall there be no leaven found in your houses: for whosoever eateth that which is leavened, even that soul shall be cut off from the congregation of Israel, whether he be a **stranger**, or born in the land.* Exo 18:3. *And her two sons; of which the name of the one was Gershom; for he said, I have been an **alien** in a strange [nokri, #5237] land: Exo 23:9. Also thou shalt not oppress a **stranger**: for ye know the heart of a **stranger**, seeing ye were **strangers** in the land of Egypt.*

**Zur** [H2114] are strangers who are always undesirable to or enemies of Israelites.

Examples: Num 1:51. *And when the tabernacle setteth forward, the Levites shall take it down: and when the tabernacle is to be pitched, the Levites shall set it up: and the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death.* Exo 29:33. *And they shall eat those things wherewith the atonement was made, to consecrate [and] to sanctify them: but a stranger shall not eat [thereof], because they [are] holy.* Lev 22:12. *If the priest's daughter also be [married] unto a **stranger**, she may not eat of an offering of the holy things.*

**Magur** [H4033] are strangers who are either Israelites or non-Israelite travellers.

Examples: Gen. 17:8. *And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a **stranger**, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God.* Gen 28:4. *And give thee the blessing of Abraham, to thee, and to thy seed with thee; that thou mayest inherit the land wherein thou art a **stranger**, which God gave unto Abraham.* Gen 37:1 *And Jacob dwelt in the land wherein his father was a stranger, in the land of Canaan.*

**Nekar** [H5236] are strangers or foreigners who are non-Israelites who are put away.

Gen 17:12. *And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations, he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any **stranger**, which [is] not of thy seed.* Neh 9:2. *And the seed of Israel separated themselves from all **strangers**, and stood and confessed their sins, and the iniquities of their fathers.* Eze 44:7. *In that ye have brought [into my sanctuary] **strangers**, uncircumcised in heart, and uncircumcised in flesh, to be in my sanctuary, to pollute it, [even] my house, when ye offer my bread, the fat and the blood, and they have broken my covenant because of all your abominations.*

**Nokri** [H5237] are strangers who are adulterous, or foreigners, non-Israelites who are not brothers.

Examples: Deu 17:15. *Thou shalt in any wise set [him] king over thee, whom the LORD thy God shall choose: [one] from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee: thou mayest not set a **stranger** over thee, which [is] not thy brother.* Deu 23:20. *Unto a **stranger** thou mayest lend upon usury; but unto thy brother thou shalt not lend upon usury: that the LORD thy God may bless thee in all that thou settest thine hand to in the land whither thou goest to possess it.* Ezr 10:2. *And Shechaniah the son of Jehiel, [one] of the sons of Elam, answered and said unto Ezra, We have trespassed against our God, and have taken **strange** wives of the people of the land: yet now there is hope in Israel concerning this thing.*

From the above examples, we can see that certain types of strangers must be killed if they touch the holy implements of the Israelites or have sexual intercourse with them. The universalists of Judeo religion make no distinction among these various types of “strangers.” Typically, they never quote the negative passages about strangers; and they deceitfully use positive statements about strangers to argue that race-mixing is permitted in the Bible.

When these verses are correctly translated, we can see that their meaning is often the exact opposite of what the Jews and Judeos preach. The blanket declaration that the Israelites were allowed to race-mix because certain “strangers” were allowed into their company is proven false by this word study. Furthermore, if anyone argues that the KJV is infallible, the contradictory verses concerning the word ‘stranger’ are proof that the translators had little accuracy with regard to biblical strangers.

[Examples taken from “Stranger.” <http://www.fathersmanifesto.net/stranger.htm> ]

## **Problems in the New Testament**

Translational problems in the New Testament also include poorly defined words, mistranslations, misinterpretations, but with the added problem of deliberately implanted universalism. This latter tactic has been accomplished by the most subtle means. In addition to poorly translated words and definitions which have changed over time, the pulpitmasters of antinomianism and Paulianity (elevating Paul above Yahshua and the other Apostles) have mastered the art of taking key verses out of context and reassembling them, from this epistle and that epistle, into a completely fabricated theology.

## **Genealogy and Racial Segregation**

The Book of Matthew opens with Yahshua’s genealogy. The whole point of this genealogy is to prove that Jesus is a direct, racial descendant of David. The prophets declared that the Messiah must be a son of David. (II Sam. 7:11-16; Isa. 9:6-7; Isa. 11:10-13; Matt. 1:1; Acts 2:29-30; Romans 8:29-32.) Matthew and Luke provide proof of this line of descent. Jesus did NOT come to redeem all races. He came to redeem the nation of Israel only.

The Gospel of Luke (Luke 3:23-38) gives a more extensive genealogy of Jesus Christ, giving His line of descent, through David, all the way back to Adam and Yahweh. Messiah is also called “*Son of Man*,” which means that He is also a pure-blooded descendant of Adam, the one who shows blood in the face.

John 7:35. The Pharisees acknowledge that the Lost Tribes still exist and are scattered throughout the Greco-Roman world. The Greek word translated as LOST is APPOLUMI, which means “*put away in punishment.*” Only the Israelites were ever put away in punishment.

Therefore, it is **a tribally exclusive word that cannot be applied to non-Israelites.** The best one-word translation of *appolumi* is EXILES or EXILED.

John 8:32-47. “*You shall know the truth; and the truth shall set you free.*” The Edomite Jews expose their non-Israelite sperma. (*Seed* comes from the Greek word *sperma*.) There is no such thing as spiritual sperm. John 8 cannot be spiritualized. The discussion here is about literal descendants and the false Jewish claim to being the descendants of Abraham. Since these Pharisaic Jews admit that they were “*never in bondage to any man,*” Christ tricked them into admitting that they are the descendants of Esau, since all the tribes of Israel had been in bondage in the past.

While Christians slumber in the pews, the Judeos preach “pie in the sky” while the Edomite and Khazar Jews rape the earth and genocide our people through perpetual proxy wars, communist revolutions, weaponized immigration and race-mixing. Satan himself has entered into the pulpits, where the forbidden homosexuals, pagans, wiccans, pedophiles, usurers, and globalists spout their version of Satanic “Christianity.”

The above are a small sampling of distorted and mistranslated passages. I could write a dozen books on the subject of horrible translations and misinterpretations the KJV NT.

### **Some Common Misperceptions of Paul’s Epistles Corrected**

In this section, I will deal with some of the horrible translations of Paul’s epistles (letters) in the King James Bible. King James “authorized” this version with the explicit intention of negating the influence of the **Geneva Bible**, and other earlier versions, such as the Tyndale Bible, which were not approved by the Anglican Church. His motivation was to unify church and state under himself, so as to have authority over both. Englishmen who did not buy into his version were severely persecuted. In fact, the Pilgrims and Puritans were Britishers who fled from the tyranny of King James. The Bible they brought with them to America and the Bible that they preferred was the Geneva Bible. Also, it was in response to this ecclesiastical tyranny of King James, still fresh in the memory of the Founding Fathers, that they created the misnamed “Separation Clause” of our Constitution, which states that, “*Congress shall make no law with respect to the establishment of religion or the free exercise thereof.*”

Space and time do not permit a thorough analysis of the deliberately universalistic and spiritualized passages contained in the New Testament of the KJV. A few important pericopes will be considered.

### **The Gospel of “Personal Salvation”**

The world of evangelism today makes a great to-do about the phrase, “born again.” In fact, it has become the major theme of the televangelists, as if being “born again” has some powerful, life-changing influence for the individual Christian. But there is no evidence that “born again Christians” are making this world a better place. As a matter of fact, this theology is part of the “gospel of personal salvation,” which is nowhere emphasized in Scripture. The Bible’s emphasis is on personal morality, not upon some “spiritual” experience. The Bible emphasizes the Gospel of the Kingdom, which is righteous government. The people in this Kingdom are motivated by the Golden Rule (Matt. 7:12), not by some emotional experience by which the believer declares oneself to be “saved.”

It is a fact that, up until the era of the televangelists, most preaching was fire and brimstone preaching, which included lots of warnings about unrepentant sinners going to hell and damnation. Today's preachers, instead, emphasize "salvation," but on purely "spiritual" terms, not moral terms. Hence, they teach that we should not judge others, lest they be offended. Christians should stand aside and should not involve themselves in politics, etc. Thus, sinners are not to be warned about the consequences of their sins. Rather, they, such as homosexuals and wiccans, are invited into the churches to spread their diseases among the Christians. Somehow, the good intentions and spiritual pronouncements of these apolitical Christians are supposed to replace morality.

Of course, the devil himself invented this idea of inoffensiveness, so as to neutralize the moral impact that Christianity has had throughout the ages. Western jurisprudence comes directly from the Bible. According to today's false priests, the law "has been done away with." The so-called gospel of personal salvation has, in fact, undermined Christian civilization by telling Christians that they should not impose Christian morality upon an evil world.

In my youth, growing up in a Catholic community in Chicago, it was common for me to hear the expression: "*A Christian should make a difference in the world. He should leave the world a better place than how he found it.*" Thanks to the "gospel of personal salvation," which places the emphasis on the self, taking it away from interpersonal morality, modern Christianity has contributed immensely to this world's moral collapse. The modern churches, in their attempt to increase their numbers by accommodating those who do evil, have utterly forgotten the words of Jesus Christ: "*If you love Me, keep My commandments.*" – John 14:15.

### **"Born Again?" – Or Born From Above?**

John 3:1-21 is the story of the discussion between Yahshua and Nicodemus, the Pharisee. Nicodemus came to Jesus during the night, so that no one could see him. He was afraid that the other Pharisees would find out about his visit. The world of evangelism today uses this expression, "born again," as a linchpin of theology. This expression is usually associated with the idea that "You must accept the Holy Spirit into your heart." And there is no doubt that this must be done; however, that is not the end of the story. The evangelistic world, as usual, takes these words out of context, and fails to reveal the morality tale that is being told by Yahshua.

First of all, "born again" is a bad translation of John 3:3. It should read "**born from above.**" Also, the point of the story is to contrast the Pharisaic view of the world with the Christian view of the world. Observe:

#### **– You Must Be Born From Above –**

*The conversation between Jesus and Nicodemus in John 3 is the climax of a rejection that was announced in the first chapter. "He came to his own and his own received him not" (verse 11). Luke tells us that Jesus' contemporaries "hated him" (Luke 19:14), but as representatives of the realm of darkness, the Jews were not able to quench his light (John 1:5). John the Baptist witnessed that Jesus was the Son of God (John 1:15-34), and Jesus' identity was evident in his miracles (as in turning water to wine, John 2). Some Jewish rulers and teachers (3:10) knew that he had divine powers, but they rejected his message. Samaritans, ironically, accepted his teaching (4:39-42).*

John's intent in chapter 3 was to highlight the Jewish rejection in terms of a confrontation between two representative individuals (Jesus and Nicodemus). Nicodemus represented Judaism in this account; this is evident from John's description of him as a Pharisee, a teacher, a ruler of the Jews (John 3:1, 10). This is also shown by the plural personal pronouns used by Nicodemus and by Jesus in the claim "we know" (3:2), in which Nicodemus refers to Judaism, and in Jesus' response "I told you [plural] but ye..." (3:12). These pronouns present Nicodemus as the embodiment of Judaism, speaking on its behalf.

In addition to the hints mentioned above, John has included another reference to the blindness of the Jews in his mention of night (3:2). Nicodemus' preference for the night echoes the thought that the Jews loved darkness because their deeds were evil (3:19-21). Jesus could have praised Nicodemus for coming to him, but the issue in this account is Judaism, not Nicodemus' personal attitude toward the truth.

Nicodemus approached Jesus with a comment that is often misread. He began with an acknowledgment that Jesus was a man "come from God: for no one can do these miracles that you do, except God be with him" (John 3:2). This admission did not grant that Jesus was the Son of God, but only that he had been commissioned by God, as the prophets of the Old Testament had been. At best, the Jews represented by Nicodemus were prepared to allow a divine mission for Jesus. In John's terms, however, the status of a divinely-commissioned teacher does not capture the truth concerning Jesus.

Nicodemus could see that miracles were being performed, but he was not able to perceive their full importance or purpose. For this reason, Christ pointed out to him that these were only signs, a visible manifestation of a higher power, and could not be experienced through the senses. Sense experience is what John meant by "see" (John 3:3), as can be surmised from expressions like "see life" (3:36) and "taste death" (Mark 9:1). The kingdom of God would be in view only if the missing condition were present, namely an internal change that would bring about an entirely new outlook. **The person who undergoes this internal change is so drastically changed that he could be described a new being.** Since the new being would see things from a higher perspective — God's — he is described as **born from above.**

### **Meaning of gennao and tikto**

Gennao derives its meaning from the root genna (birth). It means "to produce through birth." Whether the agent is male or female, the meaning of the verb is the same, "to bring a child into the world." Some clear passages that illustrate the meaning of this verb are:

Matthew 2:1: "Jesus was born [gennao] in Bethlehem."

Matthew 19:12: "...eunuchs, which were so born [gennao] from their mother's womb."

Luke 1:13: "Your wife Elizabeth shall bear [gennao] you a son."

Greek has other verbs for describing birth specifically as an act of a woman. One of these verbs is tikto. This verb cannot be applied literally to a father because he is not bodily equipped for this function, but a figurative application of the verb to a man can be done. In this sense, Onesimus became Paul's son — "who became my son [tikto] while I was in chains" (Philemon 10, NIV). Some clear passages in which tikto is used literally (to describe parturition) are:

Matthew 1:21: "She shall bring forth [tikto] a son."

Luke 1:57: "Elisabeth's full time came that she should be delivered [tikto]."

Hebrews 11:11: "...and was delivered of a child."

*In John 3:3, the verb is gennao — which describes coming into the world, not a birth in the sense of parturition.*

### ***Again or from above?***

*In John 3:3, the verb gennao is accompanied by the adverb anothēn. Depending on the context, this adverb can mean "again" or "from above." The nearest expression in English is "from the top" (ano = above, then = from). Christ's tunic was "woven from the top [anothen] in one piece" (John 19:23). John uses the expression only in the sense of "from above" (see also John 3:31, 19:11).*

*When John wants to say "again," he uses other terms. One such term is palin (John 1:35, 4:3, 13, 46, 54, etc.). **John 3:3, therefore, should be rendered "born from above," not "born again."** Of course, if someone is born from above when he is old, he is also born again. John's meaning is a birth from God, not merely a second birth. Only a birth from God would enable Nicodemus to perceive that the kingdom of God was at work in the miracles that the Jews had witnessed. In fact, John states clearly that those who receive Christ (1:12) are born (gennao) "not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" (1:13).*

- <http://www.wcg.org/lit/gospel/born/bornabov.htm>

An entirely false theology has been created around this expression, "born again." The idea that one's life can be instantly changed by some emotional experience is entirely contrary to the Gospel of the Kingdom, which requires the ability to overcome tribulation and create a moral world order. Completely lost on these evangelists is the concluding verse of the conversation:

*"And this is the condemnation, that the light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For everyone that does evil hates the light, lest his deeds should be reproved. But he that does truth comes to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought of God." – John 3:19-21.*

Completely absent from the bogus theology of the "born again" crowd is that evil deeds must be condemned. Those who are *born from above* teach the true gospel of condemning evil, because truth and righteousness do indeed come from above, from Father Yahweh and enter into us through the Holy Spirit. Those who preach the gospel of personal salvation completely miss the point, the very point that Nicodemus apparently failed to understand, that those who are born from above will reject evil in favor of good. This is a commitment to the Kingdom, wherein all evil will be destroyed. Those who preach "born again" do not have the Holy Spirit, because they do not understand or accept the context of John 3.

The simplistic notion that being "born again" punches your ticket into some spiritual realm, where evil must not be confronted by good, is totally far-fetched and absurd. The gospel of personal salvation, and its various false doctrines are, in reality, escapism. Such doctrines allow the Christian to escape the moral responsibility of making the world a better place. Our thoughts and actions must be wrought from above, from the moral order that Yahweh intends to install at the Judgment Day, which is the Gospel of the Kingdom.

Modern Churchianity is at odds with this moral order, especially when its false priests promise easy salvation.

*"Enter you in at the narrow gate: for wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat: Because narrow is the gate and narrow is the way which leads to life, and few there be that find it." - Matt. 7:13-14.*

Do you really believe that an "altar call" can save you?

*“Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out.” – Acts 3:19.*

The idea that salvation is guaranteed by claiming to be “born again” is a mockery of the True Gospel. The “born again” crowd studiously avoid the idea of repentance, because that would suggest that we are still sinners. The fact is that this doctrine has contributed greatly to the decline of Christian civilization, because it is the widest path of all: salvation by “claiming it.” This dubious doctrine is born of a contrary spirit, a spirit from below.

## **Romans, Chapter 9.**

Because of the false definition of the word ‘*Gentiles*,’ many Christians falsely believe that Jesus came to redeem non-Israelites. Contrary to this notion, Paul, in Romans 9 is actually confirming the exclusivity of the Covenants (Rom. 9:3-5) and confirms that **Esau is excluded** from the Covenants (Romans 9:7-15. “*Esau I have hated.*”). Romans 9 is a confirmation of John 8, where the racial distinction between Israelites and Edomites is declared. The Israelites are the “*vessels of mercy*,” (Verse 23) while the Edomite Jews are the “*lump of dishonor.*” (Verse 21.) The correct translation of Verse 24 is this: “*Even US, whom He has called, not of the Judeans [meaning the Judahites who resided in Judea] only, but also of the Race [ethnos]*” Verse 25 confirms that he is speaking exclusively about the race of Israel (including the Judahites of the country of Judea).

## **Endless Genealogies**

The genealogies that Paul criticizes at I Tim. 1:4 and Titus 3:9 are NOT references to Israelite genealogies. Paul is here criticizing the endless genealogies among the Greeks and other Dispersed Israelites. The Dispersion (James 1:1) consisted of many estranged Israelites. “*I am not sent but unto the estranged [or exiled] sheep of the House of Israel.*” - Matt. 15:24. Many of these estranged Israelites had adopted heathen practices and claimed to have descended from the “gods” of the various nations within which they lived. This is what Paul is criticizing in these passages. He is not challenging the genetic code of True Israel. In fact, Paul goes out of his way to assert that he is an Israelite of the Tribe of Benjamin. (Romans 11:1-2.)

*The reference in Titus 3:9 and 1 Timothy 1:4 in which Paul denies the need to search out one's own genealogy, does not conflict with Isaiah's call to Israel. Herod the Tetrarch had ordered the burning of those genealogical records of Israel which were kept in the archives of the Temple, to protect his own rulership. He himself was an Idumean, and therefore he feared any investigation into ancestral records. At that time, of course, the Pharisees were frantically trying to retrace their genealogies in order that they could continue to boast about their ancestry. Paul was also well aware of the class distinction, which would arise when the "heathenised" Israelites, having lost all their records in the captivity, would be joined to the Assembly. - <http://anglo-saxonisrael.com/site/node/84>*

This discussion of endless genealogies shows that the subject is not the genealogies of the Israelites, but the genealogies of the pagan Greek Israelites:

*Some even claim that people who believe in British-Israel “... give heed to fables and endless genealogies, which minister questions, rather than godly edifying which is in faith:” (1 Tim 1:4; Titus 3:9). Is this true?*

*Answer: First, the Bible is loaded with genealogies. All one has to do is look into the books of Genesis, Numbers, 1 Chronicles etc. and even the New Testament Gospels to see all the*

genealogies of the people of Israel, and the world in Genesis. Doesn't this contradict what Paul is saying? Absolutely Not!

The genealogies that Paul is speaking of are not the Biblical genealogies, but are, "...found in Philo, Josephus and the book of Jubilees, by which the Jews [sic, Judahites and Israelites - Eli] traced the descent from the Patriarchs and their families, and perhaps also to Gnostic 'genealogies' and orders of aeons and spirits. Amongst the Greeks, as well as other nations, mythological stories gathered around the birth and 'genealogy' of their heros [hence Paul's reference to 'fables']. Probably Jewish 'genealogical' tales crept into the Christian communities" (*Vines Expository Dictionary*, p.262). **Clearly these are not the Biblical genealogies Paul was speaking of.** Josephus "appeals to the priestly registers and is proud of the royal descent of his mother; he shows that even the priests residing in Egypt had their sons registered authentically in Jerusalem, so as to safeguard their priestly prerogatives (C. Apion., I, vii)." (*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, under article "Genealogy"). Philo, "to the various stories and fables told about Moses and the Patriarchs" (*ibid*).

As for the Gnostics, "[These were] genealogies of spirits and aeons, as they called them, "Lists of Gnostic emanations" [ALFORD]. So TERTULLIAN [*Against Valentinian*, c. 3], and IRENÆUS [*Preface*]...Endless" refers to the tedious unprofitableness of their lengthy genealogies (compare Tit. 3:9). - Peter Salemi, <http://www.british-israel.ca/answers.htm>

**Hence, Paul's condemnation of genealogies concerns the existing mythical genealogies of the Dispersion as well as those of the emerging anti-Gospel sects, whose "genealogy" was traced back to the Gnostic aeons, i.e., gods and goddesses.** Not all of the Gnostic sects were anti-Christian, but most of them added ideas and ideology that were either spurious or anti-Gospel. Thus, serious scholarship proves that Paul had no intention of negating the genealogies of Matthew and Luke. Nor do these passages have anything to do with denying the racial genealogy of the Israelites, past, present, or future.

### **Circumcision Versus Uncircumcision.**

Contrary to the doctrine of the Judeo-Christian sects, Paul, in Romans 2-4, is NOT asserting that the "uncircumcision" refers to "Gentiles," or non-Israelites. Rather, Paul is distinguishing between the Israelites of the House of Judah, then living in Palestine (the "Circumcision"), versus the Dispersed Israelites (House of Israel) scattered throughout the Greco-Roman world (the "Uncircumcision").

Remember that the rite of biblical circumcision was made exclusively with the posterity of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. No other peoples are included in this Covenant. The Circumcision are the Israelites who still practiced circumcision, as the Levitical priesthood still existed in Judea, but it had been commingled with Edomite Pharisees. The Dispersion, adopting the customs of the nations in which they lived, stopped practicing circumcision. Therefore, the Israelites of the Dispersion are the Uncircumcision. This is what Paul means by his usage of these two words. At Gal. 3:28, Paul is trying to explain that both groups of Israelites, **circumcised or not**, male or female, free or bond, were forgiven for their past sins at the Cross. This unconditional forgiveness was promised to all Israelites, whether they lived in Judea or elsewhere. **Because that promise was given exclusively to the Progeny of the Chosen Race, it has nothing to do with any other people, nor can any other people claim the benefits of inheritance.** We have here another example of expert word twisting at the hands of the KJV

translators, who, by conveying the notion that “Gentiles” are non-Israelites, make the Gospel of none effect.

The history of the laws of inheritance proves that no one but those specifically named in the Will (Testament) can be a party to the Will. No outsiders are ever invited to the reading of the Will. It is none of their business! The New Testament is the story of the delivering of the Will to its intended recipients, namely, the two Houses of Israel. (Jer. 31.) But most Christian Israelites are still clueless that this Will even applies to them.

The Jews have been claiming to be the beneficiaries of the Will, but they are impostors trying to steal it from the true heirs!!! The Epistles of Paul document his strenuous efforts to 1.) explain to the Uncircumcision that they are a Party to the Covenants because of their Israelite heritage and 2.) explain to the Circumcision that their forgiveness is a direct result of the unconditional promise (having nothing to do with the Levitical sacrifices) to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob that all of these direct descendants will get this inheritance, whether they practice circumcision or not, whether they live in or outside of Judea. Thanks to the poor translations of Paul’s writings, as found in the KJV, Paul’s words have been universalized; but this universalization is totally contrary to the specificity of the Covenants themselves.

Paul, throughout his Epistles, is constantly explaining to members of both Houses that the unconditional promise to forgive Israelites of their sins (via the sacrifice on the Cross) applies to both categories (“Houses”) of Israelites, the circumcised and the uncircumcised, male or female, free or bond, Judean or Dispersed. Since the Judeos know nothing of the actual history of the Dispersion, they are forced to make wild speculations that defy the categorical imperatives of Covenant Theology. There is NO WAY that Paul is extending the terms of the Covenants, Promises and Inheritance to anyone else. Paul did not have such authority. Paul did not claim such authority; nor did he do any such thing. The idea that Paul universalized the terms of the covenants to all peoples and races is pure speculation. It is a total distortion of the Gospel. The devil himself could not have created a more devious, anti-Scriptural doctrine. Actually, he did create it. The devil, in the form of the Catholic Church, began the universalization of Paul’s Epistles. The Protestant denominations, with help from the Jewish “theologians,” have carried the torch of Satan’s Apostasy ever since.

## **The Racial Segregation of the Covenant People**

Remember that Jeremiah 31 prophesied that the New Covenant would be made to BOTH HOUSES. Thus, the two houses have been reunited, as also prophesied by the Two Sticks prophecy of Ezekiel. (Eze. 37: 28.) This prophecy is exclusively to the twelve tribes of Israel. Christ’s Passover sacrifice on the Cross DID NOT unify all races, as the apostate churches claim today. In fact, the current global decline of the formerly White Christian nations is being caused by the very diversity that is being promoted by the churches. We are to remain a segregated people, so that we can bring forth the fruits of the Kingdom. (Matt. 25:31-32; Matt. 7:6; Matt. 15:24.) No Israelite in Scripture has ever stated that the Israel should intermarry with non-Whites. That theology is based on the perversion of the word ‘Gentile.’ “*Lo, the people [Israel] shall dwell alone and **shall not be reckoned among the nations.***” – Num. 23:9.

The theology of amalgamation is totally contrary to the entire history of the covenants, promises and inheritance, which are exclusive to the posterity of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. There is simply no doubt about this. When Abraham placed his son, Isaac, on the sacrificial altar, Isaac’s progeny were thus being dedicated to Yahweh. Only Isaac’s descendants can

qualify for this promise. *“In Isaac shall thy seed (progeny, descendants, posterity) be called.”* Only the Anglo-Saxons have ever been called by Isaac’s name. This is a very specific branch of the Adamic Race. The rest of the world will be blessed as long as they bless us. They will be cursed if they curse us. Because the Jews have successfully trained the world to bless them and curse us, we have patent evidence of why the world is going to hell in rapid fashion. This deluded world is blessing the progeny of Satan. The beginning of America’s precipitous decline into moral degradation began the moment that President Truman recognized the Bastard State of Israeli, that illegitimate, hybrid child of Khazar and Edomite parents, who claim descent not through the patriarchs of Israel but through their hybrid mothers.

There is a direct, causal relationship between Truman’s recognition of that Luciferian State and the chaos that we have descended into since. Since then, American Israel has allowed all sorts of non-Whites to enter into our borders, thus violating all the laws of segregation that Yahweh has commanded us to follow. ISRAEL IS TO DWELL ALONE. We cannot dwell alone in an integrated society.

Jesus Himself declares that, when He returns to judge the nations, He will SEPARATE them, not integrate them: *“When the Son of Adam shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the throne of His glory: And before Him shall be gathered all nations: and He shall SEPARATE THEM ONE FROM ANOTHER, as a shepherd divides sheep from the goats.”* - Matthew 25:31-32.

Since the Jews reckon their genealogy through the various mothers of their mongrelized breed, most of whom have little or no Israelite blood, they cannot possibly be the Israel of Scripture. This matriarchal reckoning is totally contrary to the PATRIARCHAL reckoning of the genealogy of True Israel, which is amply documented in the Bible.

Paul confirms the law: *“But we know that the law is good.”* Jesus was *“born of a woman, according to the Law.”* (Gal. 4:4) This means that His genealogy is purely Adamic, through the patriarchs. His mother, Mary, was also of royal blood, being descended from David. Joseph, his legal father, or “stepfather,” was also a descendant of David. Therefore, Yahshua’s genealogical descent is totally in conformity with Hebrew law and the Covenants. His genealogy is PERFECT, just as Noah’s was. Mary’s genealogy is reckoned through her father, Heli, at Luke 3:23. Heli was Mary’s father and became Joseph’s father-in-law. Since the expression, “father-in-law” was not in common usage, verse 23 simply declares Joseph to be the “son of Heli.” Jesus said, *“I am the ROOT and the OFFSPRING of David.”* (Rev. 22:16.) Because Mary was a descendant of David, so was Yahshua.

It is amazing that the Jews claim that Jesus could not have been the Messiah because He did not have an earthly father – while they themselves reject the patriarchal lineage!!! This is nothing but incredible sophistry and hypocrisy! But the prophecy concerning the Messiah simply states that He will be the offspring of David. And David’s genetic code was transmitted to Yahshua through Mary. That is the bottom line. Furthermore, who better than the Holy Spirit could be your father?

From Wikipedia, which is a Jewish-owned service, we are told, under the heading of “Who Is a Jew?” *According to Halakha (Jewish law), only a convert or a child born to a Jewish mother is counted as Jewish. A child with a Jewish father and a non-Jewish mother is considered a non-Jew.*

So, who are the Jews to criticize Christ’s genealogy when they themselves admit that they do not follow the clearly documented patriarchal reckoning of Scripture? Hypocrisy, thy name is Judaism!

## JUDEAN

The placard that Pontius Pilate had nailed to the cross had the statement, *Jesus Nazarenus Rex Iudeorum*. (INRI.) When Pilate asked Him, “*Are you the king of the Jews?*” Yahshua answered, “*You say I am.*” (Mark 15:2.) Yahshua did not come to be the king of a multicultural state. He came to be, ultimately, the King of Israel, not Judea. These are two entirely different nations and concepts. The Greek word IOUDAIOS means “Judean.” It is not a reference to the race or tribe of Judah.

Since the kingdom of Judah was usurped by Herod the Edomite, Judea had become a balkanized country, with two main ethnic groups: Judah and Edom. This is like combining White America with Aztlan Mexico and calling it Amerexico. The Jews have always used non-White immigration as a weapon against the White Race. We can see this happening on a global scale today. Jesus did not come to be king of a multicultural state. “*I come not but unto the exiled sheep of the Hose of Israel.*” (Matt. 15:24.) That’s why He rejected the title, “*King of the Jews.*”

The rabbis of Judaism have used the art of confusion to suggest that “*Jesus was a Jew.*” But Jesus was NOT a Judean. Even though His parents were both descended from King David and therefore Israelites of the tribe of Judah, He was a Galilean by residence. His home town was Nazareth, not Bethlehem or Jerusalem. Yahshua rarely spent any time in Judea or in Jerusalem. When He did, He was in constant conflict with the Edomite Pharisees, who sought to kill Him (John 7:1).

The modern word JEW is a contraction of the word *Ioudaios*, which describes the multicultural state run by Edomite Jews. The Jews are indeed a multiethnic group. There are Black Jews, Oriental Jews, Arab Jews, Khazar Jews and Edomite Jews, but there are NO Judahite Jews. A Judahite is a racially pure descendant of the tribe of Judah. A Jew is always a mongrel who practices the religion of the Pharisees, Judaism. The Sephardic Jews trace their ancestry to the Edomite Judeans of Judea. They were NEVER part of the tribe of Judah.

I John 2:18-19 tells us this: *Little children, it is the last time: and as you have heard that **antichrist** shall come, even now are there **many antichrists**; whereby we know it is the last time.* [Now pay strict attention to the prepositions, which I will highlight.] *They [these antichrists] went out FROM us, but they were not OF us; for if they had been OF us, they would have continued WITH us; but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all OF us.*”

Then, in verse 22, John states, “*Who is a liar but he that denies that Jesus is the Messiah?*”

There was only one ethnic group that was not OF Judah but that went out FROM Judah. It is a historical fact that the Edomites of Judea became known to the world as the Sephardic Jews. Of this ethnic group, John is prophesying that it would one day be realized **that they are not OF Judah**. This same group is called **antichrist**. This group is the Edomites of Judea, led by the Herodian Pharisees. In short, Judea was a multicultural state under the administration of the Idumean usurpers. (The same thing happened in America under the Jew Deal of Federal Dictator Rosenfeldt.)

We live in the days when it is finally being made manifest that these antichrists were the Edomite *Ioudaios* of Judea. See also Rev. 2:9 and 3:9, for confirmation: those who SAY they are Judahites of Judea but are actually Idumeans.

## ANTHROPOS (MAN)

The Old Testament prophets, Isaiah, Ezekiel and Jeremiah had occasion to use the expression, "Son of Man." This expression was always used of themselves, being pure-blooded descendants of Adam, through Seth. In the Old Testament, in over 100 instances, the Hebrew word for "man" in this expression is always AWDAWM, meaning those who show blood in the face. So, "Son of Man" = "Son of Adam." It is a statement of pure racial descent. Non-Identity theologians have pondered the meaning of this expression and are baffled because they refuse to accept the racial descent laws and the meaning of the word *awdawm*.

The Greek word '*anthropos*' is the common word for a male person of the Greco-Roman world, just as the Greek word '*gyne*' is the common Greek word for a woman of the same culture. It is this world (*cosmos*) that John is speaking of in John 3:16. This fact is proven by the way in which '*anthropos*' is used in the Greek Septuagint. For example:

Deuteronomy 17:5. "*Then you shall bring out that anthropos or that woman, and you shall stone them with stones*"

Deuteronomy 22:24. "*They shall be stoned with stones, and they shall die, the young woman, because she did not cry out in the city, and the anthropos, because he violated his neighbor's wife.*"

Isaiah 4:1. "*Seven women shall take hold of one anthropos, saying, we will eat our own bread, and wear our own raiment; only let your name be called upon us, and take away our reproach.*"

Jeremiah 51:7: "*to cut off anthropos and woman of you, infant and suckling from the midst of Judah...*"

Now, for the New Testament:

Matthew 19:5 "*Therefore shall an anthropos leave his father and mother, and hold fast to his wife.*" (also in Ephesians 5:31)

Matthew 19:10 "*If such is the case of an anthropos with his wife, it is better not to marry.*"

I Corinthians 7:1 "*It is good for an anthropos not to touch a woman.*"

Since the law was given exclusively to Israel, these statements, using the word *anthropos*, cannot apply to any other group. Furthermore, neither the Greeks, many of whom were Japhethites, nor the Israelites of the Greco-Roman world, considered non-Whites to be *anthropos* of their own race. The Greeks and Romans never considered the other races to be part of this COSMOS (world-order), which was run exclusively by ANTHROPOS (White, Adamic Man). Non-whites, whether of Oriental, South Asian or Black origin, were never accorded citizenship status until much later in Greek and Roman history. In both cases, the half-breed offspring of Greco-Roman Whites and non-White slaves were not given citizenship status *until these cultures were in the throes of fatal decline*. (The parallel to today's decline of civilization is that it has the same cause!) From this history, which includes myriads of statues and artwork of Whites only – the statues of Venus and David are clearly Caucasian - we know that the Greco-Roman world was an exclusively White *anthropos* world. This reality is assumed by and reflected in the language of the New Testament. This racial exclusivity is also assumed by the Greek Septuagint. There was NEVER a non-White leader of the Greco-Roman world.; and there is no such thing as a non-White Israelite. There is simply no doubt that the Greco-Roman world was both Hebrew and Indo-Aryan.

All of the nations named in Genesis 10 were exclusively White. The rulership of these nations remained exclusively White, even after non-White slaves were brought in, after military subjugation. In no way did any of these Adamic civilizations treat race-mixing as an acceptable practice. Indeed, the Hindu caste system is a holdover from Aryan dominionism in India. Racial exclusivity was, quite simply, the norm, not the exception, in the White, Greco-Roman world. No anthropologist, except for Jewish deceivers, has ever stated otherwise.

By the time of Christ, most of the Greeks of the Greco-Roman world were actually Japhethites and Israelites of the Dispersion, and most of the Romans were pre-Dispersion Israelites of the House of Zarah-Judah, as Rome, Troy, Spain and Britain were settled by Zarah-Judah and Dan even before the Exodus; and it was only the Dispersed Israelites of the Greco-Roman world who had any interest in going to Jerusalem for any Israelitish feasts. Nor would any non-Israelites be allowed to attend these Feasts. This is just as true of the Magi, who were of the Parthian (Pharez-Judah) nation, as it was of the various “nations” represented at Pentecost in the Book of Acts. The Parthians were a blend of Persian (Aramaic Shemite) Whites and Saxon-Israelite Whites. They were ruled by kings descended from Pharez and by priests of the house of Levi (Magi). The Scythians were a blend of Japhethites and Israelites who were not ruled by Pharez-Judah. Their territory was north of Parthia, well into Russia and Sweden, and extended far into the East, even into China (the Tocharians and Uighurs) and was well established in the eastern and northern parts of Europe (as the Veneti, Frisians, etc.). The Veneti (also called Wends) were Japhethites (today known as Slavs), who were the Aryan traders that delivered goods into Venice from the rivers of northern Europe and Russia.

All of these nations were White, from top to bottom; and they were descended from Noah’s three sons, Ham, Shem and Japheth, as related in Genesis 10. All of these sons of Adam considered non-Whites to be forbidden races. When these White tribes confronted Mongolians or Africans, there was war, not integration. This is the racial COSMOS that the Israelites were brought up in; and the Apostles display this racial reality when they are confronted by non-Israelites. (See Matt. 15:22-29.)

When Yahshua refers to Himself as the “**Son of Man,**” He is acknowledging His pure racial descent from Adam through Seth. Indeed, the New Testament begins with His genealogy, in order to prove His descent from David; and Luke, chapter 3 records His descent from Adam Himself.

At Gal. 4:4, Paul decrees that Yahshua was born “under the law,” meaning that He was a racially pure Judahite. Verse 5 states that He came to redeem them who also were “born under the law,” namely, the Israelites, who were the only people to whom the law was delivered, thus verifying Rom. 9 3-4, our opening verse; and both of these verses are based upon Deut 4:1-8. The law can be summed by Deut. 23:2, which states that “*No mongrel shall enter the congregation of Yahweh.*”

### **The Last Word: GENTILE.**

One of the most abused and misunderstood words of Scripture is the word ‘*gentile.*’ This word is actually of Latin origin and it NEVER had the meaning of “*those who are non-Jews.*” This meaning is of modern origin and is based on the false Jewish idea that Jews are Israelites and that all non-Jews are so-called “Gentiles.” The reality is that the Latin word ‘*gentile*’ was substituted for the Greek word *ETHNOS*, which simply means, “*race, tribe.*” In the original Latin, the word meant, very specifically, a person of one’s OWN RACE OR TRIBE. Hence, we see that the

Jewish-inspired definition of the word is the exact opposite of the original meaning. The Jews use it to designate non-Jews, when, Scripturally, the word most often refers to the Israelites of the Dispersion (dated 745 BC). Just as the modern word, 'race,' can refer to any race, the Greek 'ethnos,' the Hebrew 'goy' and the Latin 'gentilis' can refer to any race, so the context of a particular passage must be taken into consideration before determining which race is being referenced.

Race-mixing with non-Whites was simply unheard of in the Greco-Roman world. It only occurred among the wealthy who brought non-White slaves back to Greece and Rome from the various military campaigns. **Race-mixing was taboo in America as late as the 1950's.** It was the Jewish-owned televangelist networks that began promoting the idea that the races must integrate; and it was the Supreme Court under the Jewish rabbi, Earl Warren, that urged the Jew Eisenhower to forcibly integrate Mississippi's schools. It wasn't the Bible that changed. The Bible Belt of the South was just fine with segregation since 1776.

What changed? It was the pastors of apostate Judeo-Christianity who started changing THEIR doctrine, claiming that today, after 2,000 years of segregation, that the Bible must be interpreted differently!

Although Strong's Concordance includes, as the last entry, the Jewish definition of the word 'goy' as "foreign nation," a careful study of the passages in which this word is used shows conclusively that the word 'goy' is used far more often of Israelites than of any other nation, so "foreign nation" is a false definition provided to James Strong by Jewish rabbis, not by the standard of Biblical usage. This false definition has been picked up by the deceived "Gentiles" themselves, who don't know how the Jews have distorted the definitions of words for their own, supremacist purposes.

Here is how the **Ensign Message** describes the deception that has come about, regarding this word:

*THE ENGLISH WORD "GENTILE"  
A SAD ERROR IN TRANSLATION*

*An examination of this word, and how it came into the English language from the Bible, shows that it was evidently coined by the translators of the Authorised Version to their individualistic understanding that excluded the main national theme of Israel from the New Testament. Ignorant of the whereabouts of dispersed Israel and the Nation building in the Isles of the West, they considered "Israel" and "Jew" as interchangeable terms as denoting the same people mostly resident in the Holy Land and nearby districts. They used the word "Gentile" to describe all peoples other than those termed "Israel" or "Jew." They took great liberties, in translating the Greek word ethnos in a variety of ways - Gentiles 93 times, heathen 5 times, nation 64 times, people twice with the greatest inconsistency including the Greek word hellen, which they also indiscriminately rendered "Gentile."*

*The collective word ethnos which means - "nation" - is not applicable to an individual. A person cannot be addressed as a "nation." The idea that a person can be called a "gentile" - stems from incorrect translation of the original word.*

*The English word - Gentile - has its origin from the Latin gentelisis and the French gentil, both derived from the root stem gens, a Latin word meaning - "A Selected Clan or Race of the same stock," in a collective sense.*

*Had the translators used the word - "nation" - in every instance, the context would reveal whether ethnos was applicable to the nations of Israel or nations of non-Israel race.*

**Church leaders erroneously read the Pauline Epistles as addressed to alien peoples of non-Israel race - termed "Gentiles."**

In doing so they introduce doctrine so full of contradictions as to subvert the Gospel of the Kingdom as taught by Jesus and the message the Apostles were commanded by HIM to expound to the lost sheep of Israel and not alien "Gentiles" (Matthew 10:5-6).

The true Kingdom Gospel - covered by the Mystery of the Kingdom - (Matthew 13:11), was revealed only to HIS Disciples and those who had ears to hear. Blind Israel was not immediately receptive to the message and those of the early centuries A.D. - lost in a maze of Christian dogmas - had relegated God's Servant Nation to the limbo of forgotten legend.

In the light of new knowledge the old mistakes can be accounted for. It can now be seen that the Bible contains a "cover story" implanted for the very purpose of concealing Israel from the world at large.

Instead of following the unchanging purpose of Yahweh in the Israel race and the political base of the Gospel of the Kingdom, Christians were carried away with the individual aspects of personal salvation and substituted a gospel that excluded the national theme.

Undoubtedly the translators of the A.V., biased by this attitude, misapplied the meaning of the original word for nation and substituted religious connotations to it - such as "Jews" and "Christians." In proof of this corruption see our modern English dictionaries, which continued to perpetuate the error, an example - according to "The New Hamlyn Encyclopedic World Dictionary":

"Gentile = of or pertaining to any people not Jewish."

The absurdity of such an error is profound, and that it should have been handed down to this day and age without correction, shows to what an extent tradition may lead astray. The muddle can only be solved by accurate definitions:

"Jewish" denotes a person professing - "the Jews' religion" - (Gal. 1:13) and is not applicable to a race.

**Directly opposed to the above, gens, the root stem of Gentile, appertains to people belonging to the same family, clan or nation - and NOT to a heterogeneous collection of many different races of people.** [Given this factual understanding, it's actually the Jews who are "Gentiles," because they are not Israelites. – Eli]

The same bias that actuated the translators of the A.V. to distort the meaning of ethnos, is evident also with the Greek words genes, genos and gennema, whose primary meaning in each case is race.

In many passages they confused the racial theme by rendering "race" as "generation" - striking examples of this, where "generation" makes no sense with the context, are - Matthew 3:7. 12:34; 23:33, 24:34, Mark 13:30; Luke 3:7; 21:32; 1 Peter 2:9.

{End of quotation.} Now you know the Truth. Please use it to set yourself free from Jewish and Judeo dogma.

## **Appendix A: "The Bible Commands Segregation," by Pastor Bertrand Comparet**

### **THE BIBLE COMMANDS SEGREGATION by Bertrand Comparet**

In the Bible, God repeatedly warns us against any mixing of races ... and especially against intermarriage and mongrelization. Some of this has been overlooked because of imperfect translations out of the Hebrew and Greek languages in which the Bible was written. Let us

examine some of these passages, carefully noting the exact meaning of the words used in the original tongues.

From the very beginning, the commandment not to permit mongrelization is strongly emphasized. For example: EXODUS 33:16 "So shall we be separated, and all of Thy people, from all the people that are upon the face of the earth." LEVITICUS 20:24 "I am the Lord thy God, which have separated you from other people."

JOSHUA 23:12-13 "...if ye do in any wise go back and cleave unto the remnant of these nations, even these that remain among you, and shall make marriages with them, and go in unto them and they unto you: know for a certainty that they shall be snares and traps unto you, and scourges in your sides and thorns in your eyes, until ye perish off from this good land which the Lord your God has given you. "

DEUTERONOMY 7:3 "NEITHER SHALT THOU MAKE MARRIAGES WITH THEM: thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, *nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son.*"

Many warnings are given in the Bible not to mate with "the stranger." But the Hebrew words translated "stranger" in these verses are "ZUWR", "NEKAR", and "NOKRI...and each one means a person of DIFFERENT RACE FROM OURS.

(There are other Hebrew words "ger" and "toshab"... meaning persons who are aliens only in a political sense, but of our race.) The warning against race mixing is always against those "strangers" who are, ZUWR, NEKAR or NOKRI. For example: PROVERBS 23:27 "For a whore is a deep ditch; and a strange ZUWRI woman is a narrow pit."

The reason for the warning is clear: MONGRELIZATION IS THE WORSE FORM OF "GENOCIDE". If you kill 99% of a race; but leave the other 1% pure-blooded, they will in time restore the race; but when you mongrelize them, you have destroyed that race eternally. Once mixed with the Black or Yellow Races, the White Race would be totally and forever destroyed. Hence, God has forbidden it.

PSALM 144:11-12 "*Rid me and deliver me from the hand of strange [NEKAR] children, whose mouth speaketh vanity, and their right hand is a right hand of falsehood: That OUR SONS may be as plants grown up in their youth, that OUR DAUGHTERS may be as the polished cornices of a palace. "*

JEREMIAH 2:21, 25 "*Yet I planted thee a noble vine, wholly a right seed. HOW, THEN, ART THOU TURNED INTO THE DEGENERATE PLANT OF A STRANGE "ZUWR" VINE UNTO ME? \* \* Withhold thy foot from being unshod, and thy throat from thirst: but thou saidst There is no hope: no: for I HAVE LOVED STRANGERS (ZUWR) AND AFTER THEM WILL I GO.*"

HOSEA 5:6-7 "They shall go with their flocks and their herds to seek the Lord, but they shall not find Him: He hath withdrawn Himself from them. THEY HAVE DEALT TREACHEROUSLY AGAINST THE LORD: FOR THEY HAVE BEGOTTEN STRANGE (ZUWR) CHILDREN.

NOAH WAS SAVED BECAUSE HE WAS PURE BLOODED, WHILE THOSE AROUND HIM WERE MONGRELIZED. Genesis 6:2, 4-5 record the forbidden mixing of races, and the evil results thereof. But of Noah, Genesis 6:9 "Noah was a just man, and perfect [Hebrew *taw-meem without blemish in his generations [Hebrew 'to-led-aw'....descent, ancestry]*. Hence, Noah and his family were saved while the mongrels were wiped out.

MONGRELIZATION IS THE SIN FOR WHICH SODOM AND GOMORRAH WERE DESTROYED!

JUDE 7 "Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them in like manner, giving, themselves over to fornication, and GOING AFTER STRANGE FLESH are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire."

Those who seek to force integration in the schools and churches are now beginning to admit that their real purpose is to bring about RACIAL INTERMARRIAGE. They have even deceived certain well-meaning but ignorant clergymen into helping them. Even without intermarriage, JUST ALLOWING NEGROES INTO THE WHITE CHURCHES IS DISOBEDIENCE TO GOD. Do you say, "I didn't see that in my Bible?" That is only because mis-translation conceals it from you. No doubt, you were puzzled when you read the following: DEUTERONOMY 23:2 "A bastard shall not enter into the Congregation of the Lord: even to his tenth generation shall he not enter into the Congregation of the Lord."

You wondered at this, because an illegitimate child is not to blame for the sins of its parents; and why should the penalty extend for ten generations? They might all be legitimately born.

But the Hebrew word mistranslated "bastard" is the word "MAMZER": It means a MIXTURE, A HALF-BREED OR MONGREL. It has nothing to do with whether a child's parents were married, but it refers to THE FORBIDDEN INTERMIXTURE OF RACES. THAT IS WHY THE PENALTY EXTENDS FOR TEN GENERATIONS: and it shows how seriously God treats this sin. It is true that the mulatto child is not to blame for his parents sins: BUT HE IS STILL A MULATTO. The first generation would be half-breed; the second would have at least a quarter of the dark blood; the third at least 1/8; the fourth, 1/16; and so on. IN THE TENTH GENERATION, THE NEGRO BLOOD MAY BE AS SMALL AS ONE PART IN 1,024 .... YET GOD HIMSELF SAYS THAT THIS IS TOO MUCH TO BE ALLOWED TO "ENTER INTO THE CONGREGATION OF THE LORD."

If you admit that YOUR measure those qualities which God so carefully implanted in the White Race to carry out certain purposes which He has assigned to them. Recognition that God, Himself, made the races different does not imply hatred or contempt for any of them: difference has its purposes, which must be respected. I do not expect the family cat to sing like a canary, nor the canary to keel) mice out of the kitchen; if I went quail hunting, I would not expect a horse to point quail for me, neither would I try to saddle and ride the best hunting dog in the world. All the family pets are equally loved, and neither is despised because he can't do what some other does; but each has his own purpose, and trying to mix them up or interbreed them can only harm them.

I know that there are many people to whom these facts are new. There are also many who have learned the evil lesson that they can get more money or more political popularity by violating these laws of God than by obeying them. Some of you may not like to be reminded of these things. But remember, I did not write the Bible: God wrote it, through His prophets: and commandments are always right. FOR OUR OWN GOOD, FOR THE VERY SURVIVAL OF OUR WHITE RACE UPON THE EARTH, AND THAT WE MAY FACE OUR GOD WITH A BETTER CONSCIENCE, WE HAD BETTER OBEY THESE LAWS OF GOD.

<http://newchristiancrusadechurch.com/sermons/sermon3.htm>

*"I am Yahweh. I change not. Therefore, you sons of Jacob are NOT consumed."* – Malachi 3:6.  
*"Has God forsaken His people, Israel? God forbid! For I am an Israelite, of the tribe of Benjamin."* – Romans 11:1.

## Appendix B: The Rules of Bible Scholarship

“Search the Scriptures, to show thyself approved.” - Paul, II Tim. 2:15.

This command was given by Paul to all of the children of Israel, not just to the priests. The reason why most White Christians are utterly ignorant of the Scriptures is because they have allowed the false priests of Apostianity to do their research and thinking for them. Having now researched the Bible for over thirty-five years in proving the Christian Identity thesis, I have come up with the following simple rules, by which we should study OUR Scriptures:

### Eli's Rules of Bible Scholarship

- 1.) Be as true as possible to the original language. (Westminster Confession)
- 2.) Pay attention to idioms and metaphors.
- 3.) Use the Word Study Method to resolve poor translations
- 4.) Do not generalize beyond the context.
- a.) Take careful note of where the context changes
- b.) Hermeneutics: interpretation should be based on Scriptural paradigms, not mere theological tradition.
- c.) Never take a verse, part of a verse, a phrase or sentence out of its context.
- d.) Try to identify the beginning and ending of the context in question.
- 5.) With respect to the NT, try to employ OT concepts, types and symbols, in order to understand or interpret NT passages.
  - a.) Try to resolve allegorical language with symbolism from the Old Testament before resorting to guesswork.
  - b.) Keep a list of OT and NT symbols
  - c.) Never resort to guesswork
- 6.) Wherever possible, historical statements in the Bible should conform to known history and archeology. Since Yahweh is the author of BOTH the Bible and natural history, the two MUST AGREE. If there is disagreement, closer study of the original Hebrew and Greek, plus better science are in order.
- 7.) Dogmatism (unproven assertions) is to be avoided at all costs. Dogma usually consists of doctrine invented by theologians, which has no basis in Scripture. Purgatory and indulgences are good examples of non-Scriptural doctrine that is taught by the Catholic Church but is nowhere mentioned in Scripture. Often, dogma comes about by frequent repetition of a false idea, such as “*Jesus loves everybody.*” But Jesus had no love for the Pharisees, nor does He love evildoers. Scripture is very clear about this. Church dogma has superseded Scriptural Truth.
  - 8.) Any new interpretation must show why the old idea is false. Rapture anyone?
  - 9.) No conditional or hypothetical can be converted to an imperative or a declarative.
  - 10.) Be objective towards your own interpretation. If an alternative hypothesis suggests itself, discuss it or footnote it.
  - 11.) Eisegesis: Never try to force Scripture to conform to a pre-conceived notion.
  - 12.) Exegesis: Always strive to stay true to the Scripture, as written. Always identify metaphors and similes as such, so as not to confuse the literal with the metaphorical, and vice versa.

## **Rules of Engagement**

- 1.) Whoever resorts to name-calling first loses the debate.
- 2.) Respect your adversary, who is usually a fellow Israelite.
- 3.) Be patient. The Truth will reveal itself through diligent study.
- 4.) Be objective toward your own Self.
- 5.) Never forget who your audience is. The one with whom you are debating is the vehicle by which your views are contrasted with his, so that the audience can better understand both points of view.
- 6.) Avoid sophistry, no matter how good it sounds.
- 7.) Do not allow hatred to get in the way of interpretation. Take the approach of a trial lawyer, who lays the case out in the most rational terms possible, with cold, hard facts.
- 8.) Let the reader/listener make up one's own mind.

“The Old Testament is the New Testament concealed. The New Testament is the Old Testament Revealed” – Anonymous.