

# ***WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER***

Monthly Letter #125; September, 2008 By: Teacher Clifton A. Emahiser  
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830; Ph. (419)435-2836

Fax (419)-435-7571; E-mail caemahiser@sbcglobal.net

## **TO THOSE WHOM THE COVENANT BELONGS**

### **A NON-UNIVERSAL CULTURE AWARENESS INSTRUCTIONAL PUBLICATION**

This is a non-copyrighted teaching letter.  
Please feel free to make as many copies as you wish, but not to edit.

## **A MONTHLY TEACHING LETTER**

This is my one hundred twenty-fifth monthly teaching letter and continues my eleventh year of publication. This is another in a series on the apostle Paul. With this lesson we are going to discuss what Paul taught concerning the Law. Today, the greater part of judeo-churchianity teaches two gospels; one for the so-called "Jews" and another for the so-called "Gentiles". Actually, the bad-fig-jews were/are, by-and-large, multiracial Canaanite-Edomite-Kenites!, and **should not** be confused with the pureblooded Judahites of the tribe of Judah! It is a flawed concept to consider the bad-fig-jews as any of the twelve tribes of Israel; nor does the misapplied Latin term "Gentiles" mean "non-jews", as they so insistently allege! And Paul never used the Latin term *gentilis* (Gentile) in any of his writings! Paul used the Greek terms *ethnos* or *ethné*, usually meaning "nation" or "nations". It is amazing how those in nominal churchianity display their unfamiliarity with the true meanings of the Scripture and the languages they are written in!

Such professing pastors or teachers fail to heed Paul's admonition at Galatians 1:6-9: "<sup>6</sup> **I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel:** <sup>7</sup> **Which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ.** <sup>8</sup> **But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.** <sup>9</sup> **As we said before, so say I now again, If any *man* preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.**"

It should be quite clear to everyone that "any other gospel" would consist of two or more. Yet there are those who advance the theory that Christ's sermons taught the Law, while Paul's teachings did away with that same Law. How does one reconcile the Law with lawlessness? Those who promote that the teachings of Paul did away with the Law will cite 2 Corinthians 3:3-6 thusly:

"<sup>3</sup> **Forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart.** <sup>4</sup> **And such trust have we through**

**Christ to God-ward: <sup>5</sup> Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think any thing as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God; <sup>6</sup> Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.”**

Proponents of such a dual-tenet will elaborate on “for the letter killeth” to make their point that we are no longer under the Law. By this they declare they follow the spirit rather than the Law. They seem to overlook the fact that, with the “new testament” (new covenant), the very same Law of the Old Testament is now placed in our hearts. But before any comment is made on this, we should consider what Paul said at Romans 7:1-6:

**“<sup>1</sup> Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth? <sup>2</sup> For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to *her* husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of *her* husband. <sup>3</sup> So then if, while *her* husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man. <sup>4</sup> Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, *even* to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God. <sup>5</sup> For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. <sup>6</sup> But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not *in* the oldness of the letter.”**

At this point the husband and wife relationship has entered the picture, but that still doesn't clarify what Paul was implying. So far, we have only been skirting around the subject of the Law, but it goes much deeper than most people comprehend. Paul is saying more in this passage than most realize, and we'll get to that before we are finished. Before we get into the meat of the subject we should read what Yahshua Christ had to say about the Law at Matthew 5:17-19:

**“<sup>17</sup> Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. <sup>18</sup> For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. <sup>19</sup> Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach *them*, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.”**

It may appear to many that there is a notable conflict between what Yahshua Christ instructed and what Paul later taught, but that is not the case. When we read Paul's epistles, we must keep what he wrote in its proper context, and there will be no discrepancy. There are some who make up their minds beforehand what they think the Bible should say, and then proceed to search the scriptures to find a verse or two to prove their own fanciful idea/s. To get to the very heart of the matter under consideration, Colossians 2:13-14 reads in part:

**“... hath he (Yahshua) quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses; 14 Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross ...”**

When most people read this passage, their conclusion is that the entire Law of the Old Testament was nullified. That is not what it is saying here! It simply says **“... the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us ...”** And what were these “handwriting of ordinances”? Hence, it was only the ordinances which were against us, **not the whole Law!**

To comprehend the ordinances which were against us, we have to realize that Paul was referring to the fact that Yahweh had married Israel, and when Israel was unfaithful to Him, Yahweh gave Israel an edict of divorce. Under Yahweh’s laws, once a divorce is given, neither party can remarry except for one provision, and that is if one or the other the party dies. Also, an unfaithful wife cannot simply be reconciled to her husband, since the penalty for such adultery is death. Therefore, rather than exterminating all of Israel Yahweh decided to come in the flesh and die by giving His blood on the cross so that He might meet the requirements of the Law, and then be free – as Yahshua Christ – to remarry Israel once again. That was the primary ordinance that was “nailed to the cross”, along with some of the temple rituals. The conclusion is: Christ died for every Israelite, so every Israelite is a Christian under covenant law and were called “the anointed” in the Old Testament, which is the proper definition of a Christian, and the term “Christ.” Therefore, only an Israelite can be a Christian. This is the true meaning of the term “Gospel” (good news).

### **YAHWEH MARRIES ISRAEL**

We cannot understand the idea of “redemption” unless we understand that Yahweh married Israel. This wedding took place at Deuteronomy 26:17-18, as when both the people and Yahweh took their wedding vows:

**“<sup>17</sup> Thou hast avouched Yahweh this day to be thy *singular*-Elohim, and to walk in his ways, and to keep his statutes, and his commandments, and his judgments, and to hearken unto his voice: <sup>18</sup> And Yahweh hath avouched thee this day to be his peculiar people, as he hath promised thee, and that *thou* shouldest keep all his commandments.”**

In other words, Israel was asked: “Do you take Yahweh this day to be your *singular*-Elohim?” And they answered: “We will.” Yahweh was asked: “Do you take this people Israel to be your peculiar people?” Yahweh answered and said: “I will.” Therefore, Israel became Yahweh’s own possession. With this there came a husband-wife relationship between Yahweh and Israel. We do not have any record where Yahweh ever covenanted or married any other people as He did Israel! There simply are no others! To verify that this was a wedding that took place between Him and His people, let’s consider some passages of Scripture which prove this was actually the case:

Jeremiah 3:14, 20: **“<sup>14</sup> Turn, O backsliding children, saith Yahweh; for I am married unto you: and I will take you one of a city, and two of a family, and I will**

bring you to Zion ... <sup>20</sup> **Surely as a wife treacherously departeth from her husband, so have ye dealt treacherously with me, O house of Israel, saith Yahweh.**”

Jeremiah 31:32: “**Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day *that* I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith Yahweh.”**

Once we understand this husband-wife relationship between Yahweh and Israel, then we can begin to grasp what the gospel of “Redemption” is all about. This husband-wife relationship went well at first, but then Israel began to break her marriage vows by incorporating pagan religions and thus adulterating the true tenets of Yahweh. And as can be observed with the incident at Baalpeor (Num. ch. 25), that pagan worship leads to race-mixing. Because of this, it became necessary for Yahweh to divorce Israel for her unfaithfulness. Let’s now see some passages which confirm the reason for the divorce, and that in actuality Yahweh did indeed divorce Israel:

Jeremiah 3:8: “**And I saw, when for all the causes whereby backsliding Israel committed adultery I had put her away, and given her a bill of divorce; yet her treacherous sister Judah feared not, but went and played the harlot also.”**

Deuteronomy 24:1: “**When a man hath taken a wife, and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favor in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her: let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give *it* in her hand, and send her out of his house.”**

Isaiah 50:1: “**Thus saith Yahweh, Where *is* the bill of your mother’s divorcement, whom I have put away? or which of my creditors *is it* to whom I have sold you? Behold, for your iniquities have ye sold yourselves, and for your transgressions is your mother put away.”**

Today in Israel Identity, there are many trying to do away entirely with the tribe of Judah. But you will notice that Yahweh also married Judah, otherwise Jeremiah at 3:8 couldn’t have said, “... **yet her treacherous sister Judah feared not, but went and played the harlot also.**” It should be strikingly obvious that it would have been impossible for Judah to have “played the harlot” had not Yahweh married her also, nor could Judah be called Israel’s “sister” by Jeremiah! Those who are attempting to do away with the entire tribe of Judah haven’t yet discerned the difference between the good-figs of Judah and the bag-figs of Judah as explained by Jeremiah. And until they grasp the difference, they should learn to keep silent on the subject rather than to openly display their ignorance!

Now that Yahweh had married and divorced Israel, where does it bring us in this story? Being divorced from Yahweh, Israel could no longer call herself by His name, therefore she became known by other names. At this stage of the game things looked hopeless, as neither Yahweh nor Israel can legally marry again. The only way, by Law, that either can remarry is if one or the other spouse were to die. And had Israel been the one to die, she had not the power of resurrection as Yahshua Christ had. So if Yahweh had not taken it on Himself to come in the flesh and die as an Adam-man, there was no hope of remarriage. To verify this again, I will repeat Romans 7:1-4:

**“<sup>1</sup> Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth? <sup>2</sup> For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to *her* husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of *her* husband. <sup>3</sup> So then if, while *her* husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress; but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man.”**

Redemption is a very simple story then. Yahweh came Himself in the flesh to die so he could remarry Israel. By the death of Yahweh in the flesh, the requirements of the Law were satisfied. You can mark it down in your memory bank that anyone who claims that Old Testament Law was done away with has very little comprehension what the Bible is talking about! One simply can not read “... **the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us ...**” and apply it to the whole Law. After Israel and Judah were divorced they became estranged to Yahweh.

To show that the divorced Israelites were considered “**strangers**”, all one needs to do is read Ezekiel 14:5: “**That I may take the house of Israel in their own heart, because they are all estranged from me through their idols.**” Then at Ephesians 2:12 & 19: “**That at that time ye were without Messiah, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without Yahweh in the world .... Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellowcitizens with the saints, and of the household of Yahweh.**” Again at Colossians 1:21: “**And you that were sometime alienated and enemies in *your* mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled.**”

If you have followed this narration closely, you will plainly see there is no conflict between Christ’s teachings and those of Paul. It is really not a conflict between Christ and Paul, but a conflict between what one thinks is reading and what the Bible really says! Yahshua Christ Himself said that those who teach the whole Law will be the greatest in the kingdom, and those who teach that the Law was done away will be the least in the kingdom. Teaching that the Law is done away with may not keep one from being in the kingdom, but one will surely find oneself mighty low on the totem pole, so to speak. It’s bad enough to teach a separate gospel for two different entities, let alone to condemn the Law!

Most of those preaching or teaching that the Law is done away with, also have a perverted idea of what the term “gospel” really means. They will usually go back to the garden of Eden and blame everything on the fall of Adam. But 1 Timothy 2:13-14 shows that Adam was not in the transgression thusly: “<sup>13</sup> **For Adam was first formed, then Eve.** <sup>14</sup> **And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.**” Christ did not go to the cross to redeem “old Adam”, but to redeem his covenant people Israel! Redemption simply means to purchase back a possession that one formerly owned, and surely Israel, being the wife of Yahweh, meets that criteria. The way Adam became responsible for Eve’s transgression is when he took her as his wife. In other words, Adam by marrying Eve became responsible for her transgression. Such teachers are always talking about how we have to crucify the “old

Adam nature”, but never mention anything about crucifying the “old Eve nature”. When teaching about the “old Adam nature”, if in context what is meant is an “old Eve nature”, then the term would be appropriate.

It is simply preposterous to believe that Yahweh did away with His marriage and divorce laws. If that were true, He could marry all of the unclean and bastardized races of the world, which would appease all of those teaching universalism. Not only that, He wouldn't have to keep any of His covenant promises He had made to the Israelites (and I'm not talking about the Canaanites pretending to be Israelites). If that were true, we couldn't trust Yahweh with anything He ever said! Instead of Christ being the Kings of Kings, He would be the outlaw of outlaws. You see, if the Law has been done away for us, Yahweh doesn't have to keep it either! If that is true (and it isn't), we might as well throw our Bibles in the nearest trash can. You see, it's a two-way street on the Law. It is also preposterous to believe that Yahweh in the flesh would ever renege on keeping His Own Law. So, if we continue to insist that the Law is done away with, we shouldn't expect Yahweh to keep His end of the bargain either! After all, marriage is a two-way street, and any marriage that isn't won't last very long!

But this is not all of Paul's writing relating to Israel's marriage to Yahweh who came in the flesh as Yahshua. Let's now go to Ephesians 5:22-30:

“<sup>22</sup> **Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto Yahweh.** <sup>23</sup> **For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the assembly: and he is the saviour of the body.** <sup>24</sup> **Therefore as the assembly is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in every thing.** <sup>25</sup> **Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the assembly, and gave himself for it;** <sup>26</sup> **That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word,** <sup>27</sup> **That he might present it to himself a glorious assembly, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish.** <sup>28</sup> **So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself.** <sup>29</sup> **For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as Yahshua the assembly:** <sup>30</sup> **For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.”**

This is really an outstanding passage written by the apostle Paul. Notice verse 30 here which says, “**For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones**”, as it gives evidence that like Yahshua Christ Himself, Paul was a racist. My KJV cross-references this verse with Genesis 2:23, which essentially says the same thing which Adam said of Eve. In other words we Whites are of the same race as Yahshua Christ. And anyone who is not of our race doesn't belong among us, especially among our family members or in our assemblies. Paul could never have truly said all of this unless the Ephesians were also Israelites. How much more evidence do we need to verify that Paul didn't go to some so-called “Gentiles”, or as judeo-churchianity puts it “to all the races of the world”. If you don't already know that Christ was a racist, you need to get my paper *Was Christ Politically Incorrect, Matt. 13:47-50*. Again, this demonstrates that Paul's teachings were right in line with Yahshua's. There are lot of people who have been brainwashed into believing that Paul was a fraud and his writings uninspired (which amount to a fairy tale)!

We should also take note that at verse 26 Paul states in part: “... a glorious assembly, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish ...” What this means is that it was to be an assembly without half-breed members. In other words, a racially pure congregation of White Israelites only! One would have to look long and hard to find that kind of congregation today! Paul expands on this same topic of our husband-wife relationship with the Almighty stating at Colossians 1:18-22:

“<sup>18</sup> **And he is the head of the body, the assembly: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence.** <sup>19</sup> **For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell;** <sup>20</sup> **And, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven.** <sup>21</sup> **And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled** <sup>22</sup> **In the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unproveable in his sight.”**

It should be noted that only the twelve tribes of Israel are those who “... were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works ...”, so this whole passage concerns Israel alone, and **NO ONE** else! Notice verse 18, where Paul states in part: “**And he (Christ) is the head of the body, the assembly: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead ...**” What this means is that Yahshua Christ was the first man ever to be raised from the dead to eternal life. Oh there were others who were raised from the dead, but only to die again. Therefore, it is imperative that we are “...members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones ...” And if one is not of his body, flesh and bones (same race), one shall never be resurrected from the dead. That is why we are not to mix socially, politically, monetarily, contractually, religiously or sexually with the heathen races! Contractually, since marriage is a contract (agreement) with a non-Israelite, non-Adamic heathen. Furthermore, any man who has fathered a child by a non-Israelite, non-Adamic woman should never hold a position in the assembly (church) because it will only encourage other men in the assembly to do likewise. Also, no man should hold an office in the assembly who has adopted an alien child into his home. That is also why our children are not to ride on a school bus with them, as Yahweh commands total segregation! To have forced integrated school busing is tantamount to child molestation. And since Yahweh doesn't condone integrated school busing, surely He does not smile upon integrated school rooms, and He's not about to condone integrated assemblies! Forced integrated busing and school rooms, along with integrated churches, leads in the end to integrated families, resulting in integrated (bastard) races. And inasmuch as aliens are forbidden to be in the assembly, assuredly they will not enter into the kingdom as Stephen E. Jones insists they will. Unfortunately, there are those who have dragged this “mainstream” Pharisaical doctrine into the Israel Identity Message. Foremost among these are Stephen E. Jones and Jory S. Brooks.

In a brochure entitled *The Hebrew Foundation of Christ's Church*, Jory S. Brooks attempts to bring non-Israelites into the Kingdom. In a diagram in column 4, he tries to

show there is a “physical” Israel and an “allegorical” Israel. Then under the subtitle “Israel’s Relation To The Church” he says the following:

“The second illustration above demonstrates the true relationship between Israel and the church. The Bible shows clearly that Israelites were the first converts to the faith, came to knowledge of Christ in great numbers, and formed the core of the Church. Not all Israelites believed in Christ, but a large proportion of them did, and formed the foundation of the New Testament Church. These Israelites then went out and converted others, Hebrews and non-Hebrews; these latter becoming a form of allegorical Israel. In Old Testament times, non-Hebrews could join themselves to the Chosen Nation through faith in Israel’s God. (Isa. 56:3-8) Under the same principal in New Testament times, by faith in Israel’s Savior and God-In-Flesh, Jesus Christ, non-Israelites in a sense inherit some of the blessings given to Israel. We might therefore say that they are ‘EXPERIENTIAL ISRAELITES’, a term coined by Bible teacher and author, Dr. Stephen E. Jones, for those who, while not physically Israelites, come under some of the Israel covenantal blessings through faith in Christ. The combination of both groups, Christian physical Israelites and Christian ‘Experiential Israelites’, constitutes Christ’s true Church. The body of Christ is therefore physically and allegorically Israelite throughout. This explains the otherwise inexplicable fact that the New Covenant was made only with Israel (Heb. 8:8-9), a point which has caused untold confusion among those who teach that Christ’s Church is non-Israelite.”

This statement is totally unscriptural and is a lie right out of the pits of hell, and “Dr.” Stephen E. Jones holds a Master’s in subterfuge. Not only does Jones teach universalism, but he is a vicious antichrist, anti-seedliner (antichrist in the sense that he denies the Satanic seedline that was to bruise the Messiah, and if He was not bruised, then we have no Salvation). Universalism is also antichrist inasmuch as it nullifies both the Old and New Covenants which our Kinsman Redeemer died for. If, as both Brooks and Jones imply, non-Israelites can come under those Covenants, then He is no longer a “Kinsman Redeemer”. The bottom line is, if Christ were to marry any non-Israel, non-Adamic people, He would be guilty of COMMITTING ADULTERY! “Allegorical Israelites” or “EXPERIENTIAL ISRAELITES”, they surely have to be kidding! IT’S PREPOSTEROUS!

Amos 3:1-2 makes it quite clear that Israel was the only people He had ever known, stating: “<sup>1</sup> **Hear this word that Yahweh hath spoken against you, O children of Israel, against the whole family which I brought up from the land of Egypt, saying, <sup>2</sup> You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities.**” Question: Where does this leave any room for people other than Israel in the marriage sense-of-the-word? It would appear that the courtship and engagement started with Abraham, and the wedding finally took place at Mount Sinai, as confirmed at Exodus 19 and Deuteronomy 26.

That was the first wedding, after which later came the divorce, but Hosea 2:19-20 speaks of the remarriage of Yahweh in the flesh to Israel thusly. “<sup>19</sup> **And I will betroth thee unto me for ever; yea, I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness, and in judgment, and in lovingkindness, and in mercies. <sup>20</sup> I will even betroth thee unto me in faithfulness: and thou shalt [again] know Yahweh.**” If one will read the



verses surrounding this passage, it is definitely speaking of Israel, and NO ONE ELSE. There is no record that Yahweh ever married anyone other than Israel before Hosea, and his prophecy confirms that He will not marry anyone other than Israel afterwards.

Joel, like Hosea did in ancient times, also predicts Israel's future marriage to Yahweh thusly, at Joel 2:16-17: “<sup>16</sup> **Gather the people, sanctify the congregation, assemble the elders, gather the children, and those that suck the breasts: let the bridegroom go forth of his chamber, and the bride out of her closet.** <sup>17</sup> **Let the priests, the ministers of Yahweh, weep between the porch and the altar, and let them say, Spare thy people, O Yahweh, and give not thine heritage to reproach, that the heathen should rule over them: wherefore should they say among the people, Where *is* their God?”**

This is a prophecy for our own day, as at no other time in history have there been so many heathen aliens in high governmental offices of authority in the United States, as well as all Israel lands. I would say that it's almost time for the bridegroom (Christ) to show Himself and the bride (the assembly) to come out of hiding! And yes, it's about time for the Israel ministers to do some earnest weeping! But all those calling themselves “ministers” or “priests” are not ministers or priests of Yahweh! Far from it!

Yahshua Christ Himself touched on the matter of divorce at Matt. 5:31-32, saying: “<sup>31</sup> **It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement:** <sup>32</sup> **But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.”**

That Israel had committed adultery and thus broken her marriage vows to Yahweh is explained by Hosea 2, verses 5, 7 & 13 thusly:

“<sup>5</sup>**For their mother hath played the harlot: she that conceived them hath done shamefully: for she said, I will go after my lovers, that give *me* my bread and my water, my wool and my flax, mine oil and my drink. ...** <sup>7</sup> **And she shall follow after her lovers, but she shall not overtake them; and she shall seek them, but shall not find *them*: then shall she say, I will go and return to my first husband; for then *was it* better with me than now. ...** <sup>13</sup> **And I will visit upon her the days of Baalim, wherein she burned incense to them, and she decked herself with her earrings and her jewels, and she went after her lovers, and forgot me, saith Yahweh.”**

This same thing happened time and again ever since the time of the Judges. (cf. Exod. 32:34; Deut. 32:18; Jdg. 2:11-13; 3:7; 10:6; 1 Ki. 16:31-32; 18:18-40; 2 Ki. 1:2; 10:28; 21:3; Jer. 2:23-25; 2:32; 11:13; 18:15; 23:2; Ezek. 23:35, 40-44; Hos. 9:10; 11:2; 13:1.)

All of what has been presented here should pretty well establish what the gospel is – who kingdom people are – and to whom it is directed. Many may question why the other White peoples of the world at Abraham's time were not included under Yahweh's covenant. All one needs to do resolve such a question is to simply examine the Scripture on Abraham's own immediate progenitors and it will quickly reveal they were all pagan. It was only Abraham who was looking for a city whose foundation and maker was God (Heb. 11:10). All pagan religions are universalist in nature and will lead, in the

end, to racemixing. Thus, Yahweh saw in Abraham and his wife a couple whose descendants would preserve their race pure. Now that doesn't mean that the Israelite men couldn't take virgin women from the other branches of the White race, and any children born to them would come under the covenant. On the other hand, that doesn't mean an Israelite woman was free to take a husband from any White families not under Yahweh's covenant to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, as the children of such a union would not come under the covenant, as the lineage is always traced through the father. All we have to do today is consider what happened to the White peoples such as the Persians and Medes, as they have by-and-large mixed with the arabs. As we can see, provisions under all the covenants cannot be taken lightly!