

“UNIVERSALISM” OR “RACISM”

A CRITICAL REVIEW OF JAMES BRUGGEMAN’S “History of the Doctrine of Universalism”

By: Clifton A. Emahiser

Clifton A. Emahiser’s Teaching Ministries
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830
Phone (419)435-2836, Fax (419)435-7571
E-mail caemahiser@sbcglobal.net

Please Feel Free To Copy, But Not To Edit

We are about to do a critical review on a two tape series (audio cassette tapes) made by James Bruggeman entitled “The History of the Doctrine of Universalism.” It will be somewhat like a debate in nature with James Bruggeman presenting his views and I will break in from time to time to show where he is in error. This doctrine of “Universalism” is a very dangerous and unscriptural doctrine and it is time for it to be exposed for what it is. Now I believe that that eventually all Israel will be brought back under the Covenant (maybe not in this life, but in the life to come). I believe that Yahshua paid the “ransom” price for every Israelite and He is not going to lose even one (Matthew 18:12-13). Now some may call what I believe “Universalism”, but I do not. Now James Bruggeman and Stephen E. Jones are going to bring everybody regardless of race, creed or color into the Kingdom, even the fallen angels and the Jews of all things. I believe that today Yahweh is choosing only a remnant for the restoration of Israel as a Kingdom. It is a proving ground for those who will be leaders and teachers in the Kingdom. For anyone teaching error, they will find no place of leadership in that Kingdom! Two major errors of today, or any other day, are “One Seed-line” and “Universalism.” Now if you want to teach one of both of these errors, go right ahead and see where it gets you! Don’t get me wrong, I am not out to convert people like James Bruggeman or Stephen E. Jones as I could care less what they teach or do. It is my responsibility only to point out their errors so Israel will know who their enemy is, and if any of Israel’s blood is spilled, it will not be because I didn’t give a warning signal loud and clear. My warning therefore is: these false teachers can be dangerous to your well-being!

Now in this debate, I am going to keep a running code so you will know who is speaking in every paragraph. When I am speaking there will be straight lines on each side like this:

Clifton A. Emahiser

When James Bruggeman is speaking there will be wiggling lines like the tracks of a snake. I somehow thought that would be appropriate. It will be like this:

James Bruggeman

The only other person I quote in this article who is teaching “Universalism” and “One Seed-line” is Stephen E. Jones and there will be a double snake track on each side of his presentation. I thought this would also be appropriate, one snake track for “One Seed-line” and one snake track for “Universalism.” It will appear like this:

}} Stephen E. Jones }}
}}
}}

We will start this discussion with James Bruggeman:

It has now been several months since we have concluded our ten part series entitled “The Sovereignty Of God”, and as you know, at least some of you know, we concluded that series with the introduction of a doctrine which probably astonished many listeners. Now I did not deliberately set out to astonish you or to shock or to upset you. In fact, I deliberately set out to methodically and logically build line upon line and precept upon precept to lead you to the inevitable conclusion that God will save everyone in the end. Now perhaps the reason it was so astonishing to some is because it has seldom been heard or taught in the Christian Churches for many centuries, save in a few obscure denominations or individual Churches here and there. And so I’ve spent ten hours of - actually it would be twenty hours - of Bible teaching time to lead you to the conclusion that all men will be saved - no it would be ten hours - correct that - ten parts.

Now I recognize, of course, that insofar as the doctrine of “The Restitution Of All Things”, as it is sometimes called, as far as that doctrine is concerned, that we have only opened the door, we have hardly even scratched the surface. And perhaps it has been providential that we have enjoyed a several months hiatus since we last talked on that subject. Hopefully many of you have taken this opportunity to go back and re-listen to the series and to examine these teachings at your own pace to see if these things be so. I know that it is deep, I warned you of that in the beginning. Nevertheless I find that some of the most thrilling things in the Word of God can be attained and received only by much deep study. Now this is not to put down the milk of the Word in any way. The milk is absolutely necessary and that’s the place where all baby Christians should start. But for heaven’s sake let’s not stay there all our lives, just imbibing on the milk of the Word.

So now that you’ve had a breathing spell, so to speak, in which you’ve had time for the idea of “universal reconciliation” to begin to sink in, its my purpose today to sketch for you some of the historical background of this doctrine of the salvation of all, “The Doctrine Of Universal Reconciliation” or simply called “universalism” for short. And parenthetically I should point out immediately that this is “universalism” with a lower case “u”, not a capital “U.” Since we are in no way identifying with the denomination known as the Unitarian Universalist, and I will have more to say about that denomination later.

Take your Bibles and let’s look at the book of Acts, chapter 24, this is where Paul has been accused of various misdeeds and-so-forth by the Jews and he is in front of the governor Felix, and Paul said this in Acts chapter 24, verse 14,

“But this I confess to you, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets.” We are well aware that the vast majority of the Church world considers this teaching of “Universal Reconciliation” as heresy. But that fact, in and of itself, should not bother you too much because the Church world also considers our belief that we are Israelites, and that the Jews are not “God’s chosen people”, they consider that to be heresy as well. So What? You folks are independent thinkers enough to have examined and accepted the belief that we are Israel despite the howls of heresy from orthodoxy, you have looked at the world scene, you have studied world history and you have compared it to the Word of God, and you have then compared it to what many preachers are teaching concerning the Identity Of Israel, where they say the Jews are Israel, and you have concluded that orthodoxy is wrong in that doctrine, and perhaps they are wrong in this doctrine as well.

You will notice here how James Bruggeman very cleverly makes it appear that Paul taught “Universalism” in this reference in Acts 24:14 when Paul says: *But I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets.*

On close examination of this 24th chapter of Acts, it is observed to not even intimate such a conjecture. Paul is in no way referring to any such doctrine as “Universalism.” For anyone who wishes to study this portion of Scripture, they will find this to be true. As a matter of fact, if you will go back to Acts 21:20-21, you will find that all the problem between Paul and the Jews started in the fact that Paul had gone with the message of the Gospel of Redemption to the so-called Gentiles (who were no other than the Ten Lost Tribes Of Israel), converting them. The second issue that stirred up the Jews was the matter of circumcision. I don’t know your position on circumcision, but here I only wish to point out that the issue was not about or related in any way (as Bruggeman asserts) to “Universalism.” If Paul would have been preaching “Universalism”, these Jews would have welcomed him with open arms!

As a review of what led up to Paul’s statement in Acts 24:14, I will now take excerpts from various commentaries, and you will be able to plainly see that Bruggeman is totally misrepresenting this Scripture. These excerpts will be somewhat lengthy, but necessary, to show that Bruggeman is setting up a false premise to support his false doctrine. In setting up a false premise, Bruggeman is discrediting his entire thesis. It would be well now for the reader to read from Acts 21:20 to and including Acts 24:27 to familiarize yourself with the story that surrounds it.

We will now start by quoting from the *Believer’s Bible Commentary*, by William MacDonald, edited by Art Farstad on page 1651:

Paul’s missionary journeys really end with his arrival in Jerusalem. The remainder of the Book of Acts is occupied with the arrest, trial, journey to Rome, trial, and imprisonment there. 21:17, 18 Upon arrival in Jerusalem, the apostle and his friends were cordially received by the brethren. The next day a meeting was arranged with James and all the elders. There is no way of knowing for sure which James is referred to here. It could be James, the brother of our Lord, James, the son of Alphaeus, or some other person with that name. The first is

the most likely. 21:19, 20a Paul took the lead by telling in detail what God had done among the Gentiles [nations] through his ministry. This caused considerable rejoicing. 21:20b-22 However the Jewish [Judean] brethren were apprehensive. Word had traveled around that the Apostle Paul had preached and taught against Moses and the law. This could mean trouble in Jerusalem. The specific charge being made against Paul was that he taught all the Jews [which probably included both the true Tribe of Judah and the Cain Satanic Jews] in foreign lands to forsake Moses, by telling them not to circumcise their children nor to walk according to the Jewish [Israelite] customs. Did Paul actually teach this or did he not? ... He taught that if a man received circumcision as a means of obtaining justification, then such a man cut himself off from salvation in Christ Jesus. He taught that to return to the types and shadows of the law, after Christ had come, was dishonoring to Christ. In view of this, it is not hard to see why the Jews [true and false] should think of him as they did. 21:23, 24 But the Jewish [Judean] brethren in Jerusalem had a scheme which they thought would placate their countrymen, both saved and unsaved [received or not received the Gospel of Redemption]. They suggested that Paul should take upon himself a Jewish [Israelite] vow. Four men were already in the process of doing this. Paul should join them, purify himself with them, and pay their expenses. F. W. Grant explains:

Let him take these four men, who being believers like himself could yet bind themselves with the Nazarite vow, and presenting himself in the Temple purified, take upon him the expenses necessary for the completion of it, and that publicly, that all might recognize clearly his own relation to the law.

We do not know much about what this vow involved. The details are veiled in obscurity. But all we need to know is that it was a Jewish [Israelite] vow, and that if the Jews saw the apostle going through the ritual connected with it, they would know assuredly that he was not turning others away from the law of Moses. It would be an indication to the Jews [true or false] that the apostle himself kept the law. ... 21:25 The Jerusalem brethren advised Paul that no rules need be imposed on Gentile [Ten Tribed Israelite] believers other than those proposed by the council in Jerusalem, namely, the Gentiles ... should abstain from things offered to idols, from blood, from things strangled, and from sexual immorality. ... 21:27-29 When the seven days of the vow were almost ended, Paul's attempt to pacify the Jews [of the Satanic seed of Cain] proved futile. When some of the unbelieving Jews from proconsular Asia saw him in the temple, they incited a riot against him. Not only did they charge him with teachings that were contrary to the Jewish people and to the law, but they also accused him of defiling the temple by taking Gentiles [of the Ten Northern Tribes] into the inner courts. What actually happened was this: they had previously seen Paul with Trophimus in the city of Jerusalem. Trophimus was a Gentile [Israelite of the Ten Lost Tribes Of Israel] convert from Ephesus. Because they saw them together, they supposed that Paul had taken his Gentile [Israelite] friend into the inner courts of the temple. 21:30-35 Although the charge was obviously false, it served its purpose. All the city was thrown into an uproar. The mob seized Paul, and dragged him out of the temple area, closing the gates of the inner courts behind them. As they proceeded to kill him, word reached the chiliarch, a military commander in charge

of the garrison of Antonia. He came in a hurry with some of his soldiers and took Paul from the infuriated mob, bound him with two chains, and asked who he was and what he had done. The mob was, of course, incoherent and confused. Some ... cried one thing and some another. The frustrated officer commanded the soldiers to bring the prisoner into the barracks so he could find out more definitely what was going on. Even in the attempt to do this, the mob surged forward with such determination that Paul had to be carried by the soldiers up the stairs. 21:36 As they did so, they heard words ringing out from the multitude — words perhaps some of them had heard before — “Away with him!” 21:37-39 Just as they were about to take Paul into the barracks, he asked the officer if he could say something. The officer was startled to hear Paul speaking Greek. He apparently thought he had arrested an Egyptian who had stirred up a rebellion and led four thousand men called assassins out into the wilderness. Paul quickly assured him that he was a Jew [Judean, Israelite from the Tribe of Benjamin] from the city of Tarsus, in Cilicia. As such, he was a citizen of no mean city, it was famous as a place of culture, education, and commerce, and had been declared a “free city” by Augustus. With characteristic fearlessness, the apostle requested permission to speak to the people. 21:40 Permission was granted, and as Paul stood there, flanked by Roman soldiers, he quieted the crowd by motioning with his hand. The silence was as great as the tumult had been. He was now ready to give his testimony to the Jerusalem Jews [true Israelites of the Tribe of Judah and Satanic seed of Cain]. ... 22:22-23 Up to this point, the [Satanic] Jews had been listening to Paul quietly. But his mention of going to the Gentiles [the Ten Lost Tribes] with the gospel aroused insane jealousy and hatred. Chanting furiously in wild disorder, they cried out for Paul’s life. 22:24, 25 When the commander saw them in their mad frenzy, he concluded that Paul must have been guilty of some very serious crime. Apparently he could not understand Paul’s message since it was given in Aramaic, so he determined to extract a confession from the apostle by torturing him. He therefore ordered his prisoner to be brought into the barracks and bound with thongs in order to be scourged. As these preparations for the scourging were moving ahead deliberately, Paul quietly asked the centurion if it was legal to scourge a Roman citizen when he was uncondemned. As a matter of fact, it was unlawful even to tie up a Roman citizen before his guilt had been proved! To scourge him was a very serious offense. 22:26 The centurion quickly went and told the commander to take care what he did to Paul, because this man was a Roman citizen. ... 22:29 Disclosure of Paul’s Roman citizenship cancelled all plans to scourge him, and caused fear among the authorities. 22:30 The commander was obviously anxious to know for certain why Paul had been accused by the [Satanic] Jews. At the same time he was determined to carry out the proceedings in a legal and orderly manner. therefore, on the day after the mob scene in Jerusalem, he had Paul taken out and brought before the chief priest and Sanhedrin. 23:1, 2 Standing before the Sanhedrin, Paul prefaced his remarks with a statement that throughout his life he had lived in all good conscience. The high priest, Ananias, was infuriated by this statement. He doubtless looked on Paul as an apostle from the Jewish religion, a renegade, a turncoat. How could one who turned from Judaism to Christianity claim such innocence. Accordingly the high priest ordered that the prisoner be slapped on the mouth. This order was extremely

unjust, since the case had hardly gotten underway. 23:3 Paul snapped back to Ananias that God would strike him for being such a whitewashed wall! Outwardly the high priest seemed righteous and just; inwardly he was corrupt. Professing to judge others according to the law, here he commanded Paul to be struck contrary to the law. 23:4 The attendants were shocked by the apostle's scathing rebuke. Did he know that he was speaking to the high priest? Now we will skip to Acts 22:31-35: The Roman governor, Felix, had enjoyed a meteoric rise from slavery to a position of political prominence in the Roman Empire. As to his personal life, he was grossly immoral. At the time of his appointment to be governor of the province of Judea, he was husband of three royal ladies. While in office, he fell in love with Drusilla [an Edomite Cainite Jew], who was married to Azizus, king of Emesa. According to Josephus, a marriage was arranged through Simon, a sorcerer from Cyprus. He was a cruel despot, as is evidenced by the fact that he arranged the assassination of the high priest named Jonathan, who criticized him for his misrule. It was this Felix before whom Paul had to appear. 24:1 Five days after Paul had left Jerusalem for Caesarea, Ananias the high priest arrived with certain members of the Sanhedrin. They hired a Roman named Tertullus to be their prosecuting attorney. His duty was to stand before Felix and press the charges against Paul. 24:2-4 Tertullus opened the case for the prosecution by showing the governor with flattery. Of course, there was a measure of truth to what he said. Felix had maintained order by suppressing riots and insurrections. But Tertullus' words went beyond a mere acknowledgment of that fact, in an obvious effort to ingratiate his case with the governor. 24:5-8 He then proceeded to specify four distinct charges against the Apostle Paul: (1) He was a plague, that is, a pest or nuisance. (2) He was a creator of revolt among all the Jews. (3) He was a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes. (4) He tried to profane the temple. 24:9 After Tertullus had expressed confidence in Felix's ability to determine the accuracy of the charges against Paul, the [Satanic] Jews who were present added their voice in support of Tertullus' charges. 24:10 Paul in response to a nod from the governor, rose to his own defense. First he expressed satisfaction at being permitted to appear before a man who, because of many years of experience, had familiarity with the customs and manners of the Jewish(?) people. This might sound like flattery, but actually it was merely a courteous statement of the truth. The apostle then answered the charges against him, one by one. 24:11 As to his being a public nuisance, he replied that only twelve days had passed since he went up to Jerusalem, and that his purpose in going was to worship, not to cause a disturbance. 24:12, 13 Next he denied the charge that he incited the [Satanic] Jews to rebel. At no time, either in the temple ... the synagogues or in the city, had he disputed with the people or attempted to stir them up. These were the facts, and no one could disprove them. 24:14-17 Paul did not deny the third charge, namely, that he was a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes. But what he did say was that in this capacity he served the God of the Jews [Israelites], believing all things which are written in the Old Testament. (Notice: nothing about "Universalism.") He shared the expectation of all orthodox Jews [of the Satanic seed-line] especially the Pharisees, that there would be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust. (By doing this, Paul separated the Pharisees from the Sadducees, a good legal strategy.) In light of that coming

resurrection he sought to preserve an unclouded relationship with the Lord and with his fellow [Adamic] men at all times. Far from stirring the [Satanic] Jews up to insurrection, Paul had come to Jerusalem to bring alms to the Jewish [true Judean Tribe of Judah] people. He was referring, of course, to the collection from the churches of Macedonia and Achaia, earmarked for the needy Hebrew Christian saints in Jerusalem. 24:18-19 With regard to the fourth charge, namely, that he had profaned the temple, Paul made this reply: While he was in the act of bringing offerings to the temple, in the performance of a Jewish [Israelite] vow, certain **Jews from Asia** found him and accused him of taking unclean Gentiles [Israelites] into the temple. This, of course, was not true. The apostle was alone at the time, and had been purified from ceremonial defilement. These accusing [Satanic] Jews from Asia] who caused the riot against him in Jerusalem ought to have come to Caesarea to accuse him, if they have anything against him. 24:20-21 Paul then challenged those [Satanic] Jews who were present to state clearly what crimes he had been proved guilty of when he stood before the council in Jerusalem. They could not do it. All they would be able to say was that Paul cried out, “Concerning the resurrection of the dead I am being judged by you this day.” **(Again no “Universalism.”)** In other words, those things in the accusation that were criminal were not true, and those things that were true were not criminal. 24:22 When Felix heard the case, he was faced with a dilemma. He knew enough about the Christian faith to realize who was right. The prisoner before him was obviously innocent of any crime against Roman law. Yet if he were to acquit Paul, he would incur the wrath of the [Satanic] Jewish people. From a political standpoint, it was important that he should curry their favor. So he adopted the expedient of continuing the case. He announced he would wait until Lysias the commander could come to Caesarea. Actually this was just a delaying tactic. We have no record that the commander ever did arrive. 24:23 In concluding the case, Felix commanded that although Paul should be retained in custody, he should be permitted reasonable liberty, and that his friends should be allowed to visit him and provide food and clothing. This certainly indicates that the governor did not consider Paul a desperate criminal. 24:24, 25a Some days after the public trial, Felix and his [Satanic] wife Drusilla arranged a private interview with the apostle in order that they might hear more concerning the Christian faith (no doubt a fishing expedition). With consummate fearlessness, Paul reasoned with this profligate governor and his adulterous wife about righteousness, self-control, and the judgment to come. They knew little of personal righteousness, either in their public or personal life. They were strangers to self-control, as was witnessed by their present evil marriage.

There you have it from the *Believer's Bible Commentary* by William MacDonald, Edited by Art Farstad. It was necessary for me to add brackets to these quotations from this commentary in order to identify the difference between the good seed of the Tribe of Judah and the rotten seed of the Satanic Jews. While we are on this subject of the Jews, I would like to quote now from *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, volume E-J, page 898, on the term “Jews”. Because the terms Jew/Jews are quite confusing the following quotation will help clear up the commotion and disarray on them. This is the best explanation I have run across in my reference books on the term, “Jew.”

5. The Jews. As shown above, the usage of the term “Jew” was very fluid even in biblical times. It does not refer exclusively to members of the tribe of Judah. While it is freely used to indicate national origin, this usage begins only after the southern kingdom of Judah had survived the northern kingdom of Israel in the seventh century B.C. Soon, however, one was called a Jew, regardless of nationality, if he adhered to Judaism. Nonetheless, religion did not become a sole criterion by which to call oneself a Jew, as noted in the Old Testament and New Testament passages (§§ 2-3 above), for proselytes were often distinguished as such, while those of racial or national origin were distinguished as Jews.

Today the term is even more fluid. There are Jews both by religion and by birth, by religion but not by birth, and by birth but not religion. Race, nationality, physical type, language, culture, belief— none of these nor any combination of these will distinguish or identify the Jew. While it is without question that the Jews represent a clearly traceable continuum in the history of mankind, there is no least common denominator for the some twelve [eighteen] million people today who call themselves Jews. Indeed, perhaps the best that can be said is that he is a Jew who says he is. (To be added to this is the fact that the Jewish race started with Cain who was fathered by Satan and who in turn mixed with the Edomites and Rephaim who became known as Canaanites — this is the “common denominator,” Also to be added to this is the fact that the true Tribe of Judah today are the Germans, Scottish and Irish peoples and they are to be distinguished from the Jews.)

2. OT usage. On the OT, ... (“Jew”) is not used for members of the old tribe of Judah or even to distinguish persons of the Southern Kingdom from those of the Northern Kingdom (cf. ... in 1 Sam. 11:8; 2 Sam. 2:4; cf. 2 Kings 16:6). It is scarcely used until the kingdom of Judah had survived N Israel (2 Kings 25:25; Jer. 38:19; 52:28-30). In postexilic times “Jews” refers to a subject of the Babylonian or Persian province of Judah or of the Maccabean state (Esth. 9:15; Neh. 4:1 — Hebrew Holiness Code 3:33; Zech. 8:23; 1 Macc. 8:20 Jos. Antiq. XI. v7) in contrast to Gentiles. The term is used to mean a member of the Jewish people or religion (Ezra 4:12; 5:5; Esth. 2:5; cf. especially Esth. 8:17: proselytes).

3. NT usage. In the NT, ... (“Jew”) is used in contrast to “Gentiles” (John 2:6; Acts 14:1), to “Samaritans” (John 4:9), and to “proselytes” (Acts 2:10; cf. John 4:22). This would indicate that “Jew” in the NT is applied to one who is Jewish by both nationality and religion. It would appear that the factor of nationality was the stronger, for Jewish Christians are called Jews (Acts 21:39; Gal. 2:13; cf. John 8:31). On the other hand, one may be called a Jew, not by race or nationality, but because of his faith: “He is a Jew who is one inwardly” (Rom. 2:28-29; cf. Rev 2:9; 3:9). The NT at times rather indiscriminately speaks of Jews as antagonists to Jesus, his ministry, the gospel, and his followers. ...

Now you can see that the word “Jew” can mean many things depending on how it is used. The object of presenting all of this background commentary on this passage of Scripture is to prove that Bruggeman has absolutely no grounds to use this or any other Scripture as a base to establish his and Stephen E. Jones’ “Universalism” on. Not only does Bruggeman on his presentation on two cassette tapes, “History of the

Doctrine of Universalism”, take this passage totally out of context, but he and Jones take liberties beyond reason with Holy Writ. He will take this liberty of taking Scripture out of context several times in this presentation on Universalism, and I will point them out as he goes along. Now we will consider another blunder of Bruggeman’s

| BRUGGEMAN MISUSES THE TERM “HERESY” |

We need to look into this term, “Heresy”, as used by Paul in this passage. Let’s repeat Acts 24:14 again to see how it is used:

⎵ *But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so*
⎵ *worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in*
⎵ *the law and in the prophets.*

Bruggeman here is using the word “heresy” to mean “unorthodox”. This would be a correct meaning in the English, but not in Greek. By using it in this way, it proves that Bruggeman didn’t do his homework. Let’s look into it for a moment and see what it means in the Greek. *The Adam Clarke’s Commentary on the Bible, Abridged By Ralph Earle, page 968 illustrates the meaning of the word “heresy” as such: The high priest ... and ... the sect of the Sadducees. “The heresy of the Sadducees.” In this place, as well as in several others, the word hairesis, “heresy” has no evil meaning in itself. It signifies a “sect” or “party”, whether good or bad, distinguished from any other sect. Hairesis, heresy, comes from haireo, “I choose”, and was anciently applied to the different “sects” of the heathen philosophers, the members of each sect having chosen their own preference to all the others.* In view of this, let’s do Acts 24:14 over again and see how it would read if we use the word “sect”:

| *But this I confess unto thee, after the way which they call a sect, so*
| *worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in*
| *the law and in the prophets.*

If you will notice here very carefully, this verse teaches against “Universalism.” If Paul worshipped according to the God of his fathers, that excludes all the people who are not related or descended from Paul’s fathers. You will notice that Paul didn’t include everybody’s father here, but only the “God of his fathers.” It should be pointed out that “Universalism” is a doctrine which is 180 degrees diametrically opposed to race. As the Bible is a racial book, it cannot in any way be “Universal.” If biblical Scripture is racial, it cannot be “Universal”! If biblical Scripture is “Universal”, it cannot be racial. “Universalism” and “racism” cannot exist side by side. You are either a Universalist or a racist as there is no in-between. You cannot say, “I am half racist and half Universalist”, as you cannot have it both ways. If you have “Universalism”, you have to throw race out the window. If you have “racism”, you have to throw “Universalism” out the window. Communism teaches “Universalism”!!!!!! “Universalism” is Communism. Communism is “Universalism.” Jones and Bruggeman are teaching Communism when they promote Universalism. Universalism was the original lie in the Garden when Satan told Eve there was no difference in the Satanic race and the race of Yahweh —that Eve could eat of the Satanic racial tree. Jones and Bruggeman, and others like them, are teaching the original lie. “Universalism” and “racism” are light years apart and they can never be

reconciled. Universalist today and in all ages have and are causing far reaching damage to Yahweh's Kingdom.

| DO THE SCRIPTURES TEACH "UNIVERSALISM" OR "RACISM"?

Now we will search the Scriptures to see whether they teach "Universalism" or "racism." We will let the Scriptures speak for themselves and we will not take them out of context as Bruggeman will do many times before this "critical review" of his cassette tape presentation is finished. The first scripture we are going to consider on race is 1st Peter 2:9:

*But ye are a chosen **race**, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light.*

In the King James Version of the Bible, the translators used the word "generation" but it is better translated "race" and is correctly translated so in some Bibles. The Idea of being "chosen" here means to separate from all other races. Also "an holy nation" means to set apart for Yahweh's purpose making Israel the only race in His eyes, just as an earthly wife is the only woman in her husband's eyes. A "peculiar people" (#4047) means they were purchased in a peculiar manner (peculiar property) which other people are not. Also it was only Israel that was in darkness, so only Israel could be "called out of darkness." Next we will go to Numbers 23:9:

For from the top of the rocks I see him, and from the hills I behold him: lo, the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations.

This hardly sounds like "Universalism." The Idea that Israel shall dwell alone and not be counted among the other peoples means they shall ever be preserved as a distinct people separate from all others. Only today, with multiculturalism, is the White race of Israel being threatened though not dwelling alone. If Israel is ever completely mixed with the other races, then it would truly be "Universalism." Balaam was predicting that the destiny of Israel was to be a distinct, peculiar people, separate from the rest of the nations in government, religion, customs, and divine protection. *Matthew Henry's Commentary* says: *They never lost their reputation till they mingled among the heathen.*

Duteronomy 32:8-9 |

8 When the most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel. 9 For the LORD's portion is his people; Jacob is the lot of his inheritance.

The "nations" spoken of in this verse are #1471, "goy." The term "goy" usually means "heathen" but the word is used generally for the nations at large and can mean Israelites. Yahweh promised Abraham that He would make him many "goy." I believe that in this verse #1471, "goy" means Israelites, because these nations received "their inheritance" as a result of the separation of the "sons of Adam." These Adamites became later the children of Israel. There were no niggers or Mongolians that came from Adam, only White people. What this verse is saying, then, is that Yahweh displaced these other peoples and that displacement became

Israel's "inheritance." That hardly sounds like "Universalism"! It doesn't say that the other races are going to inherit anything of the kingdom! That's only wishful thinking on Bruggeman's part.

The next Scripture we are going to consider is Deuteronomy 14:2. With this reference we are, once again, going to prove that Holy Writ does not teach "Universalism", but its opposite, "racism."

Deuteronomy 14:2 |

For thou art an holy people unto Yahweh thy singular-Elohim, and Yahweh hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto himself, above all the nations that are upon the earth.

Matthew Henry's *Commentary*, volume 1, page 783, has this to say about the White Israelites and how they are to be a separate people from the other races of people:

Moses here tells the people of Israel, ... How God had dignified them, as a peculiar people, with three distinguishing privileges, which were their honour, and figures of those spiritual blessings in heavenly things with which God has in Christ blessed us. ... Here is election: The Lord hath chosen thee, v:2. Not for their own merit, nor for any good works foreseen, but because he would magnify the riches of his power and grace among them. He did not choose them because they were by their own dedication and subjection a peculiar people to him above other nations, but he chose them that they might be so by his grace; and thus were believers chosen, Eph. i. 4. ... Here is adoption (v. 1): "You are the children of the Lord your God, formed by him into a people, owned by him as his people, nay, his family, a people near unto him, nearer than any other." Israel is my first-born; not because he needed children, but because they were orphans, and needed a father. Every Israelite is indeed a child of God, a partaker of his nature and favour, his love and blessing, Behold what manner of Love the Father has bestowed upon us!... Here is sanctification (v. 2) "Thou art a holy people, separated and set apart for God, devoted to his service, designed for his praise, governed by a holy law, graced by a holy tabernacle, and the holy ordinances relating to it." ... The Lord has set them apart for himself, and qualified them for his service and the employment of him, and so made them holy unto himself

Another passage which speaks out against "Universalism" is 1st Kings 8:53. Nowhere in Holy Writ can this doctrine, which Bruggeman promotes, be found. The only way it can be forwarded is by taking Scripture totally out of context which Bruggeman does several times, and we will be getting to that in due time.

1st Kings 8:53 |

For thou didst separate them from among all the people of the earth, to be thine inheritance, as thou speakest by the hand Moses thy servant, when thou broughtest our fathers out of Egypt, O LORD God.

It is sometimes hard to find much in the various commentaries on this subject, but Matthew Poole's *Commentary On The Bible* Has the following to say on this verse, volume 1, page 673:

They be thy people; for howsoever they may sin against thee, or suffer from men, yet still remember that they are thy peculiar people. and therefore do thou pity,

and pardon, and save them. ... Thou didst separate them to be thine inheritance; thou hast begun to build a work of great and glorious mercy to them; do not give occasion to thine enemies to think thou wast unable to finish it; or that thou art unstable in thy ways and counsels, or unkind to thine own children.

Again, Exodus 33:16 teaches segregation, not “Universalism.” Scripture teaches total segregation forever. When we get back to Bruggeman, you can read some of his cockeyed muddled awry statements supporting “Universalism.”

Exodus 33:16 |

For wherein shall it be known here that, I and thy people have found grace in thy sight? is it not in that thou goest with us? so shall we be separated, I and thy people, from all the people that are upon the face of the earth.

Matthew Poole’s *Commentary On The Holy Bible* comments, volume 1, page 191 as follows:

Wherein shall it be known here? by what other token shall other nations and after-ages know? So shall we be separated, i.e. distinguished by thy peculiar kindness and privileges afforded to us. Or, be made wonderful, or eminent, or glorious above all other people.

In Matthew 13:49, we read again a Scripture teaching against “Universalism.” Later you will hear Bruggeman say that the Edomite-Jews will be “saved in the end” and somehow that is “Universalism.” (By the way, “Universalism” is “universalism” whether it is spelled with a capital “U” or a lower case “u.”) This Scripture says quite the opposite from what Bruggeman says on the fate of the “wicked.” We will have to quote verses 47 through 49. I will have quite a bit of comment on this passage.

Matthew 13:47-49 |

47 Again, the kingdom of heaven is like a net, that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind (#1085 genos, from #1096, “kin”, “posterity”, offspring): 48 Which, when it was full, they drew to shore, and sat down, and gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away. 49 So shall it be at the end of the world: the angels (messengers) shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the just.

You will notice here that when it speaks of “kind”, it is speaking of people who are related to various races or families. Only the White Israelites are the good or “clean” fish while all other races including the Jews are the “unclean.” We have reached that period of time when it is necessary to “cast” these “unclean” sea creatures away that have been caught in the net of the “kingdom.” If we don’t get rid of them, they will only cause the rest of the “clean fish” to become polluted and spoil. Already with all of these stinking foreign fish coming in to mix with our White fish, the good fish are already beginning to rot. The apostles were commissioned to be “fishers of men.” They threw in the net of the Gospel of the Kingdom and caught a lot of “unclean” fish for which the gospel was never intended, even Jews. With this thought in mind, let’s see what some of the commentaries have to say on this passage:

Matthew Henry's Commentary, volume 5, page 193: |

Here is the parable itself. Where note, (1.) The world is a vast sea, and the children of men are things creeping innumerable, both small and great, in that sea, Ps. civ. 25. Men in their natural state are like the fishes of the sea that have no ruler over them, Hab. i. 14. (2) the preaching of the gospel is the casting of the net into this sea, to catch something out of it, for his glory who has the sovereignty of the sea. Ministers are fishers of men, employed in casting and drawing this net; and then they speed, when at Christ's word they let down the net; otherwise they toil and catch nothing. (3.) This net gathers of every kind, as large dragnets do. In the visible church (#1577, ekklesia, called out ones, in Greek, #4864, sunagoge, #4864 in Hebrew, called out ones, to designate the people from Israel in distinction from all other nations) there is a deal of trash and rubbish, dirt and weeds vermin, as well as fish. (4.) There is a time coming when this net will be full, and drawn to the shore; a set time when the gospel shall have fulfilled that for which it was sent, and we are sure it shall not return void, Is. lv. 10, 11. The net is now filling; sometimes it fills faster than at other times, but still it fills, and will be drawn to shore, when the mystery of God shall be finished. (5.) When the net is full and drawn to the shore, there shall be a separation between the good and bad that were gathered in it. ... the good shall be gathered into vessels, as valuable, and therefore to be carefully kept, but the bad shall be cast away, as vile and unprofitable; and miserable is the condition of those who are cast away in that day. While the net is in the sea, it is not known what is in it, the fishermen themselves cannot distinguish; but they carefully draw it, and all that is in it, to the shore, for the sake of the good that is in it. Such is God's care for the visible church (ekklesia).

Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Bible, Abridged By Ralph Earle, page 798: |

47 Is like unto a net. A "dragnet." As this is dragged along it keeps gathering all in its way, both good and bad, small and great; and when it is brought to the shore, those which are proper for use are preserved, and those which are not are either destroyed or thrown back into the water. By the net may be understood the preaching of the gospel of the Kingdom, which keeps drawing men into the profession of Christianity.

The Wycliffe Bible Commentary, Editors: Charles F Pfeiffer & Everett F. Harrison, page 954:

*47-50. The Net. A parable similar to The Tares, but with a different emphasis. This **net** is a large seine, often left in the water for some time. It depicts the Gospel, which was sent out into the world (sea in Scripture often symbolizes the restless nations, Luke 21:25; Dan 7:3,7) by Christ and his apostles. Among the various kinds of **fish** enveloped by the net are some **unusable** ones, which Jesus interpreted as **wicked** men, and which in The Tares are shown to have been put there by Satan (cf. also birds in the branches, v. 32). Not all who seem responsive to the Gospel **are** genuinely converted. (By this last sentence, you can tell the commentator is not aware that this passage is speaking of race. It is not speaking of conversion here but separating true Israel from the other races. This whole passage hinges on the word "kind." How do you convert a black to be a White?)*

Commentary On The Whole Bible, by: Jamieson, Fausset & Brown. page 927: |

47. Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a net, that was cast into the sea, and gathered every kind — The word here rendered “net” signifies a large *drag-net*, which draws everything after it, suffering nothing to escape, as distinguished from a *casting-net* (Mark 1:16, 18). The far-reaching efficacy of the Gospel is thus denoted. This Gospel net “gathered of every kind” (*genos*), meaning every variety of character (not character, race). **48. Which when it was full, they drew to shore for** — the separation will not be made till the number of the elect is accomplished. **and sat down** — expressing the deliberateness with which the judicial separation will at length be made. **and gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away** — literally ‘the rotten’, but here meaning ‘the foul’ or ‘worthless’ fish: corresponding to the “tares” of the other parable. **49. So shall it be at the end of the world...** — (See on vs. 42). We have said that each of these two parables holds forth the same truth under a slight diversity of aspect. What is that diversity? First, the bad, in the former parable, are represented a vile seed sown among the wheat by the enemy of souls (Israel): in the latter, as fowl fish drawn forth out of the great sea of human beings by the Gospel net itself. Both are important truths — that the Gospel draws within its pale, and into the communion of the visible Church, multitudes who are Christians only in name; and that the injury thus done to the Church on earth is to be traced to the wicked one. But further, while the former parable gives chief prominence to the present mixture of good and bad, in the latter, the prominence is given to the future separation of the two classes (The two classes are Israel and non-Israel. Separation hardly is “Universalism.”)

Peake’s Commentary on the Bible, page 786: |

The parable of the Drag-net turns the attention once more to the conclusion. The perspective is universal (‘every kind of fish’ ...). The accent falls not on the waiting period but on the separation of the elect from the evil ones.

I quoted from this last reference, Peake’s *Commentary on the Bible*, especially to show you that “every kind of fish” means “Universalism.” You will notice in this passage that “angels” (messengers) were sent to do this job of separating these bad fish from the good ones, and that is what I am doing. Now I am not the only “messenger” who is doing this, but we have people like James Bruggeman who are taking the bad fish and throwing them back into the net as fast as we are sorting them out, and we will be getting to more of that later in this article.

Now for another Scripture which proves that “Universalism” is untrue. Yahweh only made a covenant with one people and that was with Israel. The following Scripture spells it out:

Genesis 17:7: |

And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee.

This has nothing to do with “spiritual seed” as *Matthew Henry’s Commentary* says in volume 1, page 112. This is only speaking of the progeny of Abraham and not some group of blacks or Mongolians. Of course, if you give James Bruggeman or

Stephen E. Jones a chance, they will try to fit them in. The only good comments I find were in *The Interpreter's Bible*, volume 1, pages 610-611 and they mistakenly think Abraham's progeny to be the Jews. Anyway the remarks are good if you apply them to the White Israelites:

*God's second promise is to be God to you and to your descendants after you. It is to be noted that the correlative "and they shall be to me a people" (cf. Jer. 7:23; 11:4; etc.) ... Skinner remarks that the covenant is thus "as a self-determination of God to be to one particular race all that the word God implies." His further statement, "a reciprocal act of choice on man's part being no essential feature of the relation." ... **The Consecration of the Family.**— The covenant was made by God with Abraham alone. **I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations ... Thou shalt keep my covenant, therefore thou, and thy seed.** In Hebrew thought a man and his children were no casual aggregation. They were bound together under God by spirit stronger than individual caprice. Family consciousness, family constancy, family cohesiveness, built on loyalty to something in itself but larger than itself — that stands out through all the O.T. ...*

Again, you can see that this is hardly "Universalism." Nowhere in Holy Writ is there a teaching such as "Universalism." We will be showing later where this doctrine originated and how it was propagated. Now we will look at another Scripture which teaches "separatism" rather than "Universalism":

Deuteronomy 26:16-19: |

16 This day the LORD thy God hath commanded thee to do these statutes and judgments: thou shalt therefore keep and do them with all thine heart, and with all thy soul. 17 Thou hast avouched the LORD this day to be thy God, and to walk in his ways, and to keep his statutes, and his commandments, and his judgments, and to hearken unto his voice: 18 And the LORD hath avouched thee this day to be his peculiar people, as he hath promised thee, and that thou shouldest keep all his commandments; 19 And to make thee high above all nations which he hath made, in praise, and in name, and in honour; and that thou mayest be an holy people unto the LORD thy God, as he hath spoken.

You will notice here that the Israelites "avouched" to Yahweh to be obedient to Him and His ways; and Yahweh in turn "avouched" to take Israel as his "peculiar people." This is actually a wedding that was taking place in this passage where Yahweh married Israel. It was to be a husband-wife relationship. Yahweh never took any other people into a marriage relationship with Him as He did Israel! Israel is the only people Yahweh married — Israel is the only people Yahweh divorced — Israel is the only people Yahweh Redeemed — and Israel is the only one that Yahweh remarried! Israel was the only people ever to be put under the Law. Sin is a transgression of the Law. People other than Israel cannot sin because they have never been under the Law, therefore they cannot be redeemed.

| **REDEMPTION** |

Now let's take up this subject of Redemption. This is a big subject, so we are going to have to take some time on it. Because redemption has not been taught correctly

by the so-called “Churchs” (Baal boxes), this may seem like a new mysterious doctrine. I assure you it is not. Upon getting into this phase of “Israel Only”, I found that I had to run references for about two months or better. In running all of these references, I did find a few (very few) who understood the redemption message. Before we get into all of these quotes, I would like to point out the meaning of the word “redeem” in the *Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*:

#1350 gâ'al gaw-al'; a prime root, to redeem (according to the Oriental law of kinship), i.e. to be the next of kin (and as such to buy back a relative's property, marry his widow, etc.): - X in any wise. X at all, avenger, deliver, (do, perform the part of near, next) kinfolk (-man), purchase, ransom, redeem (-er), revenger.

The Hebrew word number 1350 is used 96 times in the Old Testament, and the problem is: it is always translated “redeemer” instead of “kinsman redeemer.” Because of this most people don’t understand that it is absolutely necessary that redemption be by a near of kin. So what I am going to do here is: I am going to quote some of these 96 passages and add the term “kinsman” in brackets. It really should not be necessary to add brackets as the word “kinsman” is there, (We are really not adding anything.) You probably have noticed how the King James Version of the Bible puts some of the words that were not in the original manuscripts in italics. By doing this they have tried to add English words to make it mean in English what it meant in whatever language they were translating it from. They have taken educated guesses at this, and sometimes they are right and sometimes they are not. Well here the word “kinsman” is in the original text, so we shouldn’t really have to use brackets or italics to place it in the text.

Exodus 6:6 |

Wherefore say unto the children of Israel, I am the LORD, and I will bring you out from under the burden of the Egyptians, and I will rid you out of their bondage, and I will redeem you as a [kinsman] redeemer with a stretched out arm, and with great judgment.

Exodus 15:13 |

Thou in thy mercy hast led forth the people which thou hast redeemed as a [kinsman]: thou hast guided them in thy strength unto thy holy habitation.

Leviticus 25:25 |

If thy brother be waxen poor, and hath sold away some of his possession, and if any of his kin come to redeem it, then shall he redeem as a [kinsman] that which his brother sold.

Ruth 3:13 |

Tarry this night, and it shall be in the morning, that if he will preform unto thee the part of a kinsman [redeemer] well; let him do the kinsman's [redeemer] part: but if he will not do the part of a kinsman [redeemer] to thee, as the LORD liveth: lie down until morning.

Psalms 74:2 |

Remember thy congregation which thou hast purchased of old; the rod of thine inheritance, which thou hast redeemed as a [kinsmen]; this mount Zion, wherein thou hast dwelt.

| Psalm 77:15 |
| *Thou hast with thine arm redeemed as a [kinsman] thy people, the sons of Jacob and Joseph. Selah.* |

| Psalm 107:2 |
| *Let the redeemed [kinsman] of Yahweh say so, whom he hath redeemed as a [kinsman] from the hand of the enemy.* |

| Isaiah 43:1 |
| *But now thus saith the LORD that created thee, O Jacob, and he that formed thee, O Israel, Fear not: for I have as a [kinsman] redeemed thee, I have called thee by thy name; thou art mine.* |

| Isaiah 44:22-23 |
| *22 I have blotted out, as a thick cloud, thy transgressions, and as a cloud, thy sins: return unto me; for as a [kinsman] I have redeemed thee. 23 Sing, O ye heavens; for the LORD hath done it: shout ye lower parts of the earth: break forth into singing, ye mountains, O forest, and every tree therein: for the LORD hath redeemed his [kinsman] Jacob, and glorified himself in Israel.* |

| Isaiah 48:20 |
| *Go ye forth of Babylon, flee ye from the Chaldeans, with the voice of singing declare ye, tell this , utter it even to the end of the earth: say ye, The LORD hath redeemed his [kinsman] servant Jacob.* |

| Isaiah 63:9 |
| *In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them: in his love and in his pity he redeemed them as [kinsman]; he bare them, and carried them all the days of old.* |

| Jeremiah 31:11 |
| *For the LORD hath redeemed Jacob his [kinsman], and ransomed him from the hand of him that was stronger than he.* |

| Lamentations 3: 58 |
| *O LORD, thou hast pleaded the causes of my soul; thou hast as [kinsman] redeemed my life.* |

| Psalm 69:18 |
| *Draw nigh unto my soul, and redeem it as [kinsman]: deliver me because of mine enemies.* |

| Leviticus 25:48-49 |
| *48 After that he is sold he may be redeemed [by a kinsman] again; one of his [kinsman] brethren may redeem him: 49 Either his uncle, or his uncle's son, may redeem him, or any that is nigh of kin unto him of his family may redeem him; or if he be able, he may redeem himself.* |

| Psalm 106:10 |
| *And he saved them from the hand of him that hated them, and redeemed them as a [kinsman] from the hand of the enemy.* |

- | Hosea 13:14 |
| *I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them as a [kinsman] from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction: repentance shall be hid from mine eyes.* |
- | Job 19:25 |
| *For I know that my [kinsman] redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth.* |
- | Psalm 19:14 |
| *Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart, be acceptable in thy sight, O LORD, my strength, and my [kinsman] redeemer.* |
- | Psalm 78:35 |
| *And they remembered that God was their rock, and the high God their [kinsman] redeemer.* |
- | Isaiah 41:14 |
| *Fear not, thou worm Jacob, and ye men of Israel; I will help thee, saith the LORD, and thy [kinsman] redeemer, the Holy One of Israel.* |
- | Isaiah 44:6 |
| *Thus saith the LORD the King of Israel, and his [kinsman] redeemer the LORD of hosts; I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no God.* |
- | Isaiah 44:24 |
| *Thus saith the LORD, thy [kinsman] redeemer, and he that formed thee from the womb, I am the LORD that maketh all things; that stretcheth forth the heavens alone; that spreadeth abroad the earth by myself.* |
- | Isaiah 47:4 |
| *As for our [kinsman] redeemer, the LORD of hosts is his name, the Holy One of Israel.* |
- | Isaiah 48:17 |
| *Thus saith the LORD, thy [kinsman] Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel, I am the LORD thy God which teacheth thee to profit, which leadeth thee by the way that thou shouldest go.* |
- | Isaiah 49:7 |
| *Thus saith the LORD, the [kinsman] Redeemer of Israel, and his Holy One, to him whom man despiseth, to whom the nation abhorreth, to a servant of rulers, Kings shall see and arise, princes also shall worship, because of the LORD that is faithful, and the Holy One of Israel, and he shall choose thee.* |
- | Isaiah 49:26 |
| *And I will feed them that oppress thee with their own flesh; and they shall be drunken with their own blood, as with sweet wine: and all flesh shall know that I the LORD am thy Saviour and thy [kinsman] Redeemer, the mighty One of Jacob.* |

| Isaiah 54:5 |
| *For thy Maker is thine husband; the LORD of hosts is his name; and thy [kinsman] Redeemer the Holy One of Israel; The God of the whole earth shall he be called.* |

| Isaiah 54:8 |
| *In a little wrath I hid my face from thee for a moment; but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee, saith the LORD thy [kinsman] Redeemer.* |

| Isaiah 59:20 |
| *And the [kinsman] Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the the LORD.* |

| Isaiah 63:16 |
| *Doubtless thou art our father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not: thou, O LORD, art our father, our [kinsman] redeemer; thy name is from everlasting* |

| Psalm 107:2 |
| *Let the redeemed of the LORD say so, whom he hath redeemed as a [kinsman] from the hand of the enemy.* |

| Isaiah 62:12 |
| *And they shall call them, The holy people, The redeemed by their [kinsman] the LORD: and thou shalt be called, Sought out, A city not forsaken.* |

| It should be quite obvious here that the Bible has much to say about the idea of purchasing back the next of kin out of a state of slavery. If we do not understand that we, as Israel, sold ourselves into servitude as a result of breaking our marriage vows by taking up pagan religions, then we cannot understand why it was necessary for Yahweh to come in the flesh and die so He could be in a position to purchase us back to Him. If we cannot understand “redemption”, then we cannot understand one of the chief doctrines of the Bible. As I said before, what is being taught on this in the “Churches” of today’ is not redemption. We shall now get into a detailed study on this “purchasing back” or “redemption.” We will start with Galatians 4:4-5,7

| *4 But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, 5 To **redeem** them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. ... 7 Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son, then an heir of God through Christ.* |

| We will see here, by this Scripture, that Yahweh Himself came in flesh form so He might die in flesh form that He might, by Law, remarry Israel. It was necessary for Him to do this because Israel was under the curse of the Law. Because He died as prescribed by the Law, then Israel by remarriage to Yahweh, is no longer in a state of servitude thus “no more a servant.” Let’s see what Peake’s *Commentary on the Bible*, edited by Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley, page 977, has to say about this passage:

| *Redemption is naturally suggested by his previous description of man as ‘slaves’, for it means emancipation by purchase. Paul may have at the back of* |

his mind a familiar legal fiction (story) by which this was accomplished: the slave having acquired the money for his purchase, deposited it in a temple, the god of which then bought him from his master 'for freedom.'

The Matthew Henry's Commentary says this, volume 6, page 664-5: |

He, in pursuance of the great design he had undertaken, submitted to be made of a woman — there is his incarnation; and to be made under the law — there is his subjection. He who was truly God for our sakes became man; and he who was Lord of all consented to come into a state of subjection and to take upon him the form of a servant; and one great end of all this was to redeem those that were under the law — to save us from an intolerable yoke and to appoint gospel ordinances more rational and easy. He had indeed something more and greater in his view, in coming into the world, than merely to deliver us from the bondage of the ceremonial law; for he came in our nature, and consented to suffer and die for us, that hereby he might redeem us from the wrath of God, and from the curse of the moral law, which as sinners we all lay under ... for he was sent to redeem us — that we might receive the adoption of sons — that we might no longer be accounted and treated as servants, but as sons grown up to maturity to larger privileges, than while they were under tutors and governors.

Here is a short quote out of the *Commentary On The Whole Bible* by Jamieson, Fausset & Brown page 1269:

made of a woman — “made” is used as in 1 Cor. 15:45, “The first man, Adam, was made a living soul”, Greek “made to be (born) of a woman.” The expression implies a special interposition of God in His birth as a man, viz., causing Him to be conceived by the Holy Ghost.

From the Adam Clarke's *Commentary on the Bible*, Abridged by Ralph Earle, page 1161, we have the following:

5. To redeem them .To “pay down a price” for them, and thus “buy them off” from the necessity of observing circumcision, offering brute sacrifice, performing different ablutions, etc. That we might receive the adoption of sons.

The *Believer's Bible Commentary* by William MacDonald, page 1886-7 has this to say:

*Born into the world as an Israelite, He was therefore **born under the law**, As Son of God, the Lord Jesus would never have been under the law; He was the One who gave it. But, in condescending grace, He put Himself **under the law** that He had made, in order that He might magnify it in His life, and bear its curse in His death. ...*

Because He was Man, He could die as a substitute for man. Govett says: “Christ, by nature Son of God, became Son of man, that we, by nature sons of man, might become sons of God. Wonderful exchange!”

The *Interpreter's One-Volume Commentary On The Bible* says on page 830: |

Slavery Under the Law. This concluding passage on the law has an instructive parallel in Rom. 8:1-17. Man apart from Christ, living under the law, is like a

*minor **child** for whom the inheritance is only prospective. He is **no better than a slave**, for he is not free to inherit what has been promised.*

These comments are pretty good for the most part. It should be remembered, though, that these sources have some very bad teaching so we have to be careful. I am not sure that the above comment on "circumcision" has anything to do with this subject. The next Scripture we are going to consider is Ephesians 5:25-27:

25 Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; 26 That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, 27 That he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish.

The first thing that we really should take notice of here in the husband-wife relationship between Yahweh and His people. You will notice here He wants a people "holy and without blemish." This means he wants a people pure of race without any admixture of some nigger or Mongolian or what have you. These other races were never "under the law", so they are not to be included among the "Church" (ekklesia - called out ones). All of this garbage about some kind of organized "Church" is not what Yahshua died for. The true ekklesia has never been with the organized "Church." So when all of these commentators keep talking about how "Christ died for the Church", its all nonsense.

We are taught in the 21st verse of this chapter that the wife (ekklesia, or the called out ones) is/are to be in submission to Yahshua which means honoring and obeying His commandments with love as a wife would her husband. The ekklesia, as a devoted wife, is to do this in compliance to Yahweh's authority who has commanded it, *for the husband is the head of the wife*. It is Yahweh's right to direct and govern His creation *thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee*. Yahshua is head as a husband of the ekklesia. As the husband is employed for the protection of his spouse, so is Yahweh employed for the protection of the ekklesia. It is His duty to do so. It is through His great love for His wife that He does this. We, as Israel, in the past, got mixed up in pagan religions and we now find ourselves in the process of being "washed" of this filth. This cleansing process is painful for many as it is hard to give up these pagan habits. There is one thing that you can be sure of, if you are Israel, you are going to be washed! Once the paganism is all washed off, then it is a glorious ekklesia not having spot or wrinkle! This washing takes place as we hear the Word of Yahweh and obey it. It is now our duty to rid ourselves of all paganism! It is time for the bride to present herself to the her bridegroom totally clean as a virgin. If Yahshua gave Himself totally, even to death for his people, How much more should the bride prepare herself for her Husband? Yahshua did His part to prepare for His bride and now the bride must prepare for her intended Husband.

The next passage we are going to consider is 1st Corinthians 6:20: |

For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's. |

We are going to quote first from the Adam Clarke's *Commentary on the Bible*, Abridged by Ralph Earle on this verse:

Ye are bought with a price. As the slave who is purchased by his master for a sum of money is the sole property of that master, so, you, being bought with the price of the blood of Christ, are not your own, you are His property.

Now we shall see what the *Matthew Henry's Commentary* has to say on this one:

But the inference is plain that hence we are not our own. We are yielded up to God, and possessed by and for God; nay, and this in virtue of a purchase made of us: You are bought with a price. In short, our bodies were made for God, they were purchased for him. If we are Christians indeed they are yielded to him, and he inhabits and occupies them by his Spirit: so that our bodies are not our own, but his.

I don't like the last part of the above where it says, "if we are Christian." It is not a matter of whether we are Christians as if the price He paid did not cover all of the Adamic race. It makes it appear like something we have done as stated here. He bought them all and He is going to get them all. Like it or not, all Israelites are going to be brought back under the Covenant. The Jamieson, Fausset & Brown *Commentary On The Whole Bible* has the following remark:

bought with a price — *Therefore Christ's blood is strictly a ransom paid to God's justice by the love of God in Christ for our redemption.*

It should be evident from this that we have been purchased from the slave market at a great price. It was further nothing of our own doing but the choice of Yahweh alone. Whether we like it or not, we belong to Him. Now let's go to Isaiah 44:6, 21-23:

6 Thus saith the LORD the king of Israel, and his redeemer the LORD of hosts; I am the first, I am the last; and beside me there is no God. ... 21 Remember these, O Jacob and Israel; for thou art my servant: I have formed thee; thou art my servant: O Israel, thou shalt not be forgotten of me. 22 I have blotted out, as a thick cloud, thy transgressions, and, as a cloud, thy sins: return unto me; for I have redeemed thee. 23 Sing, O ye heavens; for the LORD hath done it:: shout, ye lower parts of the earth: break forth into singing, ye mountains, O forest, and every tree therein: for the LORD hath redeemed Jacob, and glorified himself in Israel.

Let's take into consideration verse 22 where it mentions the Idea of "blotting out." We have to remember that the scribes of those days didn't have erasers. So in order to show that a payment had been paid to an account they literally blotted out the entry they had made of a debt. We really have to stop for a moment and consider the conditions the scribes had in those days. They couldn't go down to a stationery shop or office supply and buy paper as we can today. They had to go down to a marshy area and get some papyrus and after much work and care they managed to make a role of writing surface about 18 inches wide and about 20 feet long. Maybe it would take about a month to prepare. It would be something like if we were to go into a office supply store today to purchase some writing paper and the price would be five hundred dollars a sheet. You can be sure if we had to pay that much for a sheet of paper and didn't have an eraser, we would be quite careful how we used it. We might even take some wet clay to practice with so if we made a mistake we could just rework the surface and try again. After all, clay would not be

that expensive and one could use it over and over again. Isn't this what they did? If they wanted to keep the writing on the clay, didn't they bake it? We have to take these things into account so we can understand the terms the Bible is using when it says "blotting out." Its like a storekeeper who operates by extending credit and when someone comes in to pay their bill, the storekeeper draws a line through the entry to show it has been paid in full.

Now let's see what *Matthew Henry's Commentary* has to say about this passage, volume 4, page 247:

He formed them into a people, formed them from the womb, v. 24. From the first they were under his particular care and government, more than any other people; their national constitution was of his framing, and his covenant with them was the charter by which they incorporated. They are his, and he will save them ... He has redeemed them formerly, has many a time redeemed them out of great distress, and he is still the same, in the same relation to them, has the same concern for them. "Therefore return unto me, for I have redeemed thee, v. 22. Whither wilt thou go, but to me?" Having redeemed them, as well as formed them, he has acquired a further title to them and propriety in them, which is a good reason why they should dutifully return to him and why he will graciously return to them. ... Note, the work of redemption which God has by his Son wrought for us encourages us to hope for all promised blessings from him. He that has redeemed us at so vast an expense will not lose his purchase. ... He has glorified himself in them (v. 23), and therefore will do so still. ... He has pardoned their sins, which were the cause of their calamity, and the only obstruction to their deliverance, v. 22. Therefore he will break the yoke of captivity from off their necks, because he has blotted out, as a thick cloud, their transgressions.

Now to make a short quote from the *Believer's Bible Commentary* by William MacDonald, page 971:

*Israel is called to **remember** that God is their Creator who never forgets them, and that they are His **servant**. He has **blotted out** the **cloud** of **transgression** that hid His face from them; He has bought them back from bondage and invites them to **return to him**.*

This last quote is pretty good except about "blotted out the cloud of transgressions." It's not a "cloud of transgressions", but the "cloud" like a "blot" hides the transgressions.

Now let's consider two verses found in Isaiah chapter 54. They will be verses 5 and 8:

*5 For thy Maker is thine husband; the LORD of hosts is his name; and thy **Redeemer** the Holy One of Israel; The God of the whole earth shall he be called.*

*8 In a little wrath I hid my face from thee for a moment; but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee, saith the LORD thy **Redeemer**.*

The New Treasury of Scripture Knowledge, edited by Jerome H. Smith, has a very brief and concise indication of what the word “Redeemer” means in these two verses, on page 805:

“**thy Redeemer.** or kinsman-Redeemer.”

In verse 5 here we notice that Yahweh is both “husband” and “Maker.” This is the relationship of Yahshua to His Ekklesia (called out ones). Yahweh was never married to a so-called “Church.” To be married to Yahweh, it is necessary to be a “kinsman” of the Holy Seed. All this garbage about “God” being married to the “Church” is not Scriptural. Furthermore, the Ekklesia (called out ones) are Israel. The Scriptures record no others as being “called out”.

Next we are going to quote from *The Interpreter’s Bible*. For once in a very few times, this 12 volume monstrosity of garbage got something right! I think how this happened was that they had so many consulting editors and contributors that there had to be someone among them who knew a little about the Bible that they couldn’t get everything wrong. So let’s now see this little gem that they accidentally produced here on this passage of Scripture in volume 5, page 635:

*The reason for the admonitions and assurances are stated here: **Your Maker is your husband, ... the Holy One of Israel is your Redeemer.** Israel owes the origin of her life to God, her uniqueness to the covenant marriage. As Israel’s **Holy One**, he is her protector and guardian of her destiny, the *gôel* or **Redeemer** who is responsible for her deliverance and liberation. As God of the whole earth, he is omnipotent to achieve his purposes. Therefore Israel must not fear. The juxtaposition of the divine titles is noteworthy. Yahweh is Israel’s **Maker**, and he is her **Redeemer**; he is her husband and her **Holy One**. Israel’s beginning and end are under his sovereignty; her existence is with the holy God. ... He is **the Lord of hosts** with all the forces of the universe at his beck. He is **the Holy One**, immeasurably above and other than man, and at the same time **the Holy One of Israel**, her **Maker** and her **husband**, who has chosen, educated, and is now redeeming his people.*

I will have to tell you, I was surprised to even find such a passage as this in this reference. This doctrine is not being taught in the “Churches” or in the religious institutions such as their seminaries. It has been very difficult to find these references that I am presenting here, it represents a lot of work finding them! Next, we will consider Hebrews 10:4, 11-12:

4 For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. ... 11 And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: 12 But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever sat down on the right hand of God

Let me ask you a question here: Why didn’t the sacrifice of bulls and goats do the job of taking away sins? This may seem like a strange question, but it is an important one! Here is the answer: The bulls and goats were not kin (don’t ever forget that)! By the law, only a kinsman can “redeem.” In other words the redeemer couldn’t be a nigger or a Mongolian or any other sub-race. So, too, the “redeemed” likewise can only be kinsmen! And, too, these kinsmen must be better than 99 and 44/100’s%

pure! They must be totally pure! Now I am going to use a fairly long quote from the *New Treasury of Scripture Knowledge*, Edited by Jerome H. Smith on page 1455. Sometimes, with this long a quote, there may be some commentary that is not the best. We have to consider the source of some of these remarks, but for the most part I think you will find the following on target:

The atoning sacrifice must be one capable of consenting, and must voluntarily substitute himself in the sinner's stead: Christ did so. The nature and requirements of Christ's office as our substitute in his work of redemption through His death on the Cross absolutely require of Him that He be divine. A substitute must meet at least these six qualifications: (1) He must honor and obey the law which those for whom he substitutes are dishonoring and disobeying, as highly as though it had never been broken, so that justice will not be injured. Gen. 18:25; Ps. 40:7,8; Is 42:21; Jn 8:46. This demands the impeccability of Christ (He + 4:15). (2) Though giving perfect obedience to the law that is being broken, he must yet suffer its full penalty as though he had been the supreme criminal against it, so that mercy will not be injured. He. 7:26; Is. 53:3; 2 C 5:21. (3) He must do his work as a substitute voluntarily and without the slightest pressure from without, so that he himself will not be injured. He. 12:2; Jn 10:18. (4) He must have the absolute and inherent right thus to dispose of himself, so that no one else will be injured. Christ has the inherent right thus to dispose of himself, provided He is Creator and not creature. No creature, not even the highest and greatest of the sinless angels has the right over his own life. It belongs to, and is therefore wholly at the disposal of the Creator. When Christ died, obedient to death (Ph 2:8), though he voluntarily dismissed His spirit (Lk. 23:46), no man taking his life from him, yet did not thereby commit suicide, but the very opposite. For when one suicides, he thrusts himself unbidden into the presence of God, having no right to take his life because he cannot bring it back again. No creature could qualify under this fourth requirement, for none has the right to lay his life down. Moreover, if God should grant any sinless creature that right, and he should lay his life down by the permission of God, here then would be God giving a creature instead of Himself, and this would wholly remove Him, and therefore His love, from the transaction. For love is self-giving, not the giving of someone else. God could never show His love without giving Himself (Ge 22:8). If Christ is not actually God Himself, manifest in the flesh (1 T 3:16), He was but a creature, and as such, wholly unable to qualify at this point. This fourth requirement of a substitute thus demands the deity of Jesus Christ. (5) A substitute must be able fully to represent and answer for both God and man in his work as a substitute, so that neither party to the transaction will be injured. In meeting this fifth requirement, Christ is fully able to answer for and represent both God and man if He IS both God and man. That Christ is both God and Man is shown by His ability to render wholly acceptable service to God as, on the one hand, He represents Him in maintaining His Law to the last jot and tittle in qualifying before Him on behalf of the sinless; and on the other hand, as represents man in receiving the penalty of the Law on behalf of the sinful. For no one ought to answer for man's sins but man; and no one can answer for them but God. Ransom therefore demands the virgin birth of Jesus Christ. God must be his Father, else He cannot be God, just as a woman must be His mother, else

He cannot be Man. Herein lies the philosophy of the incarnation. This is why the Mighty God tabernacled in the flesh. (6) His work as a substitute must be of such intrinsic moral worth as forever to satisfy the utmost demands of perfect righteousness and holiness, so that the principles of equity will not be injured. Christ's work as substitute was of such intrinsic moral worth as to present to God a value sufficient to cover the moral needs, not only of his own holy Law in bringing it up out of dishonor, but also of the whole sinful world. Here once more reason demands the deity of the substitute, and the Scripture declares it. And such is what gave His work its worth, such worth did His work have that no injury could ever come to the eternal principles of equity and righteousness inherent in God's holiness. Christ's suffering was the perfect satisfaction given to the justice of God by infinite merit of the holiness of the selfsame God (Ge 22:8), who Himself became the substitute to meet on man's behalf His own just requirements. ... It was God Himself expressing His love, at infinite cost to Himself, in a way that gave full satisfaction both to the justice and the mercy which must be demanded by a holy and loving God.

I hope you didn't go to sleep on this one. I question the intent of this writer when he indicates that Yahshua died for "the whole sinful world." This is true, but it was only Israel who had sinned because only they were ever under the Law. Also this writer should have had a seventh requirement which would have been that the "Redeemer" had to be a kinsman. He did say this in a way inasmuch as he said the Law had to be satisfied, but he didn't say in what way the Law had to be satisfied. If we don't understand that the Law required a kinsman to be the Redeemer, we lose the meaning of the whole thing!

Now we shall quote from the *Believer's Bible Commentary* by William MacDonald, pages 2188-9:

***The blood of bulls and goats** simply did **not** have the power to **take away sins**. As mentioned previously, these sacrifices dealt with ritual errors. They gave a certain ceremonial cleansing but they were utter failures as far as providing satisfaction for man's corrupt nature or for his evil deeds. ... The ministry of **every** Aaronic **priest** is now contrasted sharply with that of Christ. The former stood **daily** in the performance of their duties. There was no chair in the tabernacle or temple. There could be no rest because their work was never completed. They **repeatedly** offered **the same sacrifice**. It was an unending routine which left sins untouched and the conscience unrelieved. ... The **sacrifices could never take away sins**. "Aaron," writes A. B. Bruce, "though an important personage within the Levitical system, was after all but a sacerdotal drudge, ever performing ceremonies which had no real value." ... Our blessed Lord offered a single **sacrifice for sins**. None other would ever be needed!*

Again, the "bulls" and "goats" were not kin! This fact must be repeated or we will not get it! The next passage we are going to use is Job 19:25:

*For I know that my **redeemer** liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth.*

Here, again, it is the number 1350 in the Strong's Hebrew dictionary, "kinsman redeemer." *The Dake's Annotated Reference Bible* has a note on this on page 534 of the Old Testament, column 4:

Kinsman redeemer (Job 19:25): Heb. gaal, kinsman redeemer; the next of kin who is able to redeem or buy back a relative's property which has been sold ... The Redeemer in all these passages is identified as God Himself, or the Messiah.

Now to quote from *Matthew Henry's Commentary*, volume 3, pages 109-10, on this passage:

The word is Goël which is used for the next of kin, to whom, by the law of Moses, the right of redeeming a mortgaged estate did belong, Lev. xxv. 25. Our heavenly inheritance was mortgaged by sin; we are ourselves utterly unable to redeem it; Christ is near of kin to us, the next kinsman that is able to redeem; he has paid our debt, satisfied God's justice for sin, and so has taken off the mortgage and made a new settlement of the inheritance. Our persons also want a Redeemer; we are sold for sin, and sold under sin; our Lord Jesus has wrought out a redemption for us, and proclaims redemption to us, and so he is truly the Redeemer. ... He is a living Redeemer. As we are made by a living God, so we are saved by a living Redeemer, who is both almighty and eternal, and is therefore able to save to the uttermost. Of him it is witnessed that he liveth, Heb. vii. 8; Rev. i. 18. We are dying, but he liveth, and hath assured us that because he lives we shall live also, John xiv. 19. ... There are those that through grace have an interest in this Redeemer, and can upon good grounds, call him theirs. When Job had lost all his wealth and all his friends, yet he was not separated from Christ, nor cut off from his relation to him: "Still he is my Redeemer." That next kinsman adhered to him when all his other kindred forsook him, and he had the comfort of it. ... Our interest in the Redeemer is a thing that may be known; and where it is known, it may be triumphed in, as sufficient to balance all our griefs: I know (observe with what an air of assurance he speaks it, as one confident of this very thing), I know that my Redeemer lives.

Now we shall see what the *Adam Clarke's Commentary on the Bible*, Abridged by Ralph Earle, page 447, has to say about this passage, Job 19:25:

*I know, yadati, I have a firm and full persuasion, that my redeemer, goali, my "kinsman." he whose right it was among the ancient Hebrews to redeem the forfeited heritages belonging to the family (Lev. xxv. 25: Num. xxv. 12; Ruth iii. 13); but here it must refer to Christ who has truly the right of redemption, being of the same kindred who was born of woman, **flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone.***

That's a good one Mr. Adam Clarke, "**flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone**" !!! That spells race!!! The next quote we will use is from the *Concise Bible Commentary* by W. K. Lowther Clarke, page 479:

Even so my case may go by default. But I know that my Vindicator (God, Heb. goel, next-of-kin charged with legal obligations) lives and in my place will stand on the dust of the grave. My skin will have decayed away but apart from the flesh, as a disembodied spirit I will be summoned to hear my vindication spoken.

I shall see God on my side and not estranged from me. This makes good sense, but there are other interpretations. A.V. "in my flesh" cannot be right.

We have another reference which we can take from *The Interpreter's One-Volume Commentary On The Bible* by Charles M Layman Editor, page 246:

"Redeemer" is better rendered as "vindicator." The Hebrew word refers to the next of kin who has the duty of avenging the blood of a brother or protecting his title to property after his death. The role of the vindicator is to insure justice for his own kinfolk, bound to him by ties of blood.

By this time we should be starting to see what this thing of "Redemption" is all about. We are going to move on now to another passage, Luke 1:68:

*Blessed be the LORD God of Israel; for he hath visited and **redeemed** his people.*

Now we shall take a quote from *Matthew Henry's Commentary* on this one, volume 5, page 593:

He has wrought out redemption for them: He has redeemed his people. This was the errand on which Christ came into the world to redeem those that were sold for sin, and sold under sin; even God's own people, his Israel, his son, his first-born, his free-born, need to be redeemed, and are undone, if they be not. Christ redeems them by price out of the hands of God's justice, and redeems them by power out of the hands of Satan's tyranny, as Israel out of Egypt.

Next we shall see what the Jamieson, Fausset & Brown, *Commentary On The Whole Bible*, page 990, has to say about has passage:

*There is not a word in this noble burst of divine song about his own child; like Elisabeth losing sight entirely of self, in the glory of a Greater than both **Lord God of Israel** — the ancient covenant God of the peculiar people. **visited and redeemed** — i.e., in order to redeem: returned after long absence, and broken His long silence (see on Matt. 15:31). In the Old Testament, God is said to "visit" chiefly for judgment, in the New Testament for mercy. Zacharias would, as yet, have but imperfect views of such 'visiting and redeeming,' saving from and delivering out of the hand of enemies" (vss 71,74).*

The Believer's Bible Commentary by William MacDonald has this to say on page 1373 about this passage:

*Praise to God for what He had done. Zacharias realized that the birth of his son, John, indicated the imminence of the coming of the Messiah. He spoke of Christ's advent as an accomplished fact before it happened. Faith enabled him to say **God had already visited and redeemed His people** by sending the Redeemer. Jehovah had **raised up a horn of salvation** in the royal house of ... **David**. (a horn was used to hold oil for anointing kings; therefore it might mean a king of salvation from the kingly line of David. Or it might be a symbol of power and thus mean "a powerful Savior."*

Now for a quote from the Adam Ckarke's *Commentary on the Bible*, Abridged By Ralph Earle. This one is found on page 856:

Blessed be the lord God of Israel; for. Zacharias praises God for two grand benefits which He had granted to His people. (1) He has visited them (2) He has

ransomed them. God visits His people in the incarnation of Jesus Christ; therefore this Christ is called by Him "Jehovah the God of Israel." Here the highest and most glorious character of the Supreme Being is given to Christ. He hath ... redeemed. "He hath made a ransom" — laid down the ransom price. Lytroo signifies particularly to "ransom a captive from the enemy, by paying a price." The following remarkable passage from Josephus, Ant., b. xiv., b. xiv, c. 14, sect. 1, fully illustrates this meaning of the original. "Herod, not knowing what had happened to his brother, hastened to ransom him from the enemy, and was willing to pay a ransom for him, to the amount of three hundred talents." Sinners are fallen into the hands of their enemies, and are captives to sin and death. Jesus ransoms them by His own blood, and restores them to life, liberty, and happiness.

We should be starting to get the feeling of this subject. We should be starting to understand what Redemption is all about. We should be starting to understand the necessity of kinsman Redemption. The next passage we are going to pay attention to is Colossians 1:13:15:

*13 Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear son: 14 In whom we have **redemption** through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins: 15 Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature.*

Let's see here what *The Interpreter's Bible*, volume 11, page 160 has to say about this passage. There really isn't all that much that can be found in *The Interpreter's Bible* that can be quoted, but even they, once in a while, get something right. This is one of those few times:

***Redemption** in the N.T. has almost wholly lost its primary sense. It originally meant the regaining of an article put in pledge by repayment of the loan for which it was given in pledge; or the taking title through payment of a stipulated sum for a piece of family property which was in danger of being alienated; or securing the release of captives or of booty in return for a money payment. In Jewish (Israelite) usage, however, it had come to mean the deliverance of God's people, whether the storied deliverance from Egypt in the days of Moses, or the deliverance from Assyrian or Babylonian captivity which the prophets had proclaimed; looking beyond these historic events, it was used of the messianic deliverance for which the nation hoped. In this usage the idea of ransom or payment of a price all but disappeared; the thought is of a deliverance accomplished by a mighty act of divine power.*

You can be sure that "Redemption" has not lost its "primary sense" in the New Testament; its just that the theologians have mutilated it to the point where it is no longer recognizable. The "Churches" no longer preach true Redemption! They are trying to convert all of the niggers and slant-eyed Mongolians, and its not going to work! You see, it is necessary that they have a "kinsman Redeemer" and in that they don't qualify! We should also mention that in the above passage the words "through his blood" was not in the original script. It is not really in error as there are enough other Scriptures to verify this fact, but in this particular passage, somebody added it. The point is, though, if they would take the liberty to add something here,

What might they add somewhere else that might not be correct? The next passage to look at here will be Hebrews 9:12, 15, 22:

*12 Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal **redemption** for us. ... 15 And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the **redemption** of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. ... 22 And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission.*

There is an interesting thing here about the goats that were used for sacrifice. Actually only one of the goats were sacrificed while the other one was turned loose. We should remember that it was Yahshua who became the scapegoat for us (Leviticus 16:7-10). Jamieson, Fausset & Brown, *Commentary On The Whole Bible*, has this to say on page 1421:

Christ's death is symbolized by the slain goat; His resurrection to life by the living goat sent away.

Another interesting comment by this same reference book is as follows:

His death is the inaugurating act of the new covenant, and of the heavenly sanctuary. ... His entrance into the true Holy of Holies is the consummation of His once-for-all-offered sacrifice of atonement: ... henceforth, His reappearance alone remains to complete out redemption.

The Adam Clarke's *Commentary on the Bible*, Abridged by Ralph Earle on page 1269 has more to say on this passage:

Eternal redemption. A redemption price which should stand good forever, when once offered; and an endless redemption from sin, in reference to the pardon of which, and reconciliation to God, there needs no other sacrifice. It is eternal in its merit and efficacy.

We should remember here that the reason the goats could not atone for sin is because they were not "kin." We find a comment in, *A Commentary On The Bible*, by Matthew Pool, volume 3, page 851, the following concerning these passages in Hebrews 9:12, 15, 22:

But this God signified to Israel, that without the blood of Christ his son, and the Testator of his testament, shed as a sacrifice, to purchase and procure both remission and the Spirit, there could be neither pardon of the guilt of sin, and removal of the punishment, nor purging the filth, or renewing the nature of the sinner, his blood being the inestimable price purchasing both for them.

It should be noticed here, that in dying, Yahweh left us His Last Will and Testament —He left it to His family —no one else! We got everything! I guess you know He didn't give any of it to the niggers or other races. And the mixed-breeds don't get anything either! Who else, but us, would you expect Him to leave it to? There sure are a lot of Israelites today trying their best to give it to someone else! One commentator, Clarke's *Concise Bible Commentary*, page 910 picks up on this idea:

*Scholars are not agreed on the meaning of the word **covenant**. In ordinary Greek it also means "will", "testament."*

Now that we have covered this Hebrews, chapter 9 pretty well, let's move on to Galatians 3:13:

*Christ hath **redeemed** us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.*

Now this verse is not saying what a lot of people think it says. Many read this verse and think, we are no longer under the Law but under grace. It is speaking of a portion of the Law, not the whole Law. When we understand that, then we can understand this verse. Let's go on here to see what the various commentators have to say. We will start with Adam Clarke's *Commentary on the Bible*, Abridged by Ralph Earle, page 1159:

Christ hath redeemed us. "Hath bought us with a price"; viz., His blood, or life. Being made a curse for us. Being made an Atonement for our sins; for whatever was offered as an atonement for sin was considered as bearing the punishment due to sin, and the person who suffered for transgression was considered as bearing the curse in his body. Therefore in the same day in which a criminal was executed it was ordered that his body should be buried, that the land might not be polluted; because he that was hanged, which was the case with every heinous culprit, was considered accursed of God, Deut. xxi. 22-23.

This reference speaks of Deuteronomy 21:22-23 and we really should take a look at it as it will help fill in some of the details of this thing:

22 And if a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree: 23 His body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt in any wise bury him that day; (for he that is hanged is accursed of God;) that thy land be not defiled, which the LORD thy God giveth thee for an inheritance.

You will notice here that this is what happened at Yahshua's crucifixion, He took the curse that was on us upon Himself and was placed in His grave before sundown that day. Let's check again with Adam Clarke's *Commentary on the Bible*, Abridged by Ralph Earle, page 219 for more on this:

His body shall not remain all night upon the tree. Its exposure for the space of one day was judged sufficient. The law which required this answered all the ends of public justice, exposed the shame and infamy of the conduct, but did not put to torture the feelings of humanity by requiring a perpetual exhibition of a human being, a show prey to the most loathsome process of putrefaction. For he that is hanged is accursed of God. That is, he has forfeited his life to the law; for it is written, "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them"; and on his body is the execution of the sentence of the law, the curse was considered as alighting; hence the necessity of removing the accursed thing out of sight.

Now let's see what *Matthew Henry's Commentary* has to say on Deuteronomy 21:22-23 which is in turn a reference to Galatians 3:13. This is found in volume 1, page 813:

A law for the burying of the bodies of malefactors that were hanged. ... The hanging of them by the neck till the body was dead was not used at all among the Jews (Israelites), as with us; but of such as were stoned to death, if it were

for blasphemy, or some other very execrable crime, it was usual, by order of the judges, to hang up the dead bodies upon a post for some time, as a spectacle to the world, to express the ignominy of the crime, and to strike the greater terror upon others, that they might not only hear and fear, but see and fear. Now it is here provided that, whatever time of the day they were thus hanged up, at sun-set they should be taken down and buried, and not left to hang out all night; sufficient (says the law) to such a man is this punishment; hitherto let it go, but no further. Let the malefactor and his crime be hidden in the grave. Now, 1. God would thus preserve the honour of human bodies and tenderness toward the worst of criminals. The time of exposing dead bodies thus is limited for the same reason that the number of stripes was limited by another law.

Again the Jamieson, Fausset & Brown *Commentary On The Whole Bible*, page 157 comments thusly:

22, 23. if a man have committed a sin ... and thou hang him on a tree — *Hanging was not a Hebrew form of execution — gibbeting is meant — but the body was not to be left to rot or be a prey to ravenous birds: it was to be buried “that day,” either because the stench in a hot climate would corrupt the air, or the spectacle of the exposed corpse bring ceremonial defilement on the land.*

The following we find in *The Interpreters Bible*, volume 2, pages 462-3 (actually two quotations):

22-23. If a man has been proved guilty of a capital charge and is put to death (usually by stoning), as an additional disgrace and lesson to the community his body might be hung up (or perhaps impaled) for all to see after his death (cf. Josh 8:29; 10:26-27; 1 Sam. 31:10; 2 Sam 4:12). As an object accursed of God, the body must be taken down and buried by evening so that the land may not be defiled with that which is taboo or unclean.

*22-23. **Community in Guilt.**— That the body of one who had been executed was to be publicly hanged was no mark of cruelty or sadism, or even of vengeance or the desire to deter other malefactors. It came from the recognition that he whose sin was worthy of death had defiled both himself and his community. No man sins to himself. What we do involves others, and the group bears the shame of our wrongdoing. ... Even Jesus Christ was not exempt from the truth that we are members one of another. “Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me” (Matt. 25:40).*

Now we come to a quote in the Peake’s *Commentary on the Bible*, page 976, which has a correct statement concerning Galatians 3:13. Let’s see what it says:

So, if men were left to the Law, they would (being sinners) fall under its curse. But Christ intervened on our behalf, and by his death on the Cross took upon himself the curse pronounced in Dt. 21:23, in order that, ... the Gentiles (and we know who they are) might inherit the blessing of Abraham, which Paul identifies with the promise of the Spirit, to the fulfilment of which he has already appealed.

Now we have a better idea of just what this “Redemption” is all about. We are beginning to see how it is accomplished through the Law. The Law has been

satisfied. Now we shall go to another passage on this subject of Redemption, Psalm 130:7-8:

*7 Let Israel hope in the LORD: for with the LORD there is mercy, and with him is plenteous **redemption**. 8 And he shall **redeem** Israel from his iniquities.*

The Believer's Bible Commentary by William MacDonald has this to say about this passage:

*So **Israel** is encouraged to **hope in the LORD**. Three reasons are given. First, His **mercy** is unchanging. Then, His **redemption** is **abundant** in its supply. And finally His willingness to **redeem Israel from all his iniquities** is assured. The Psalm opened in depths of gloom. It closes with a vibrant call to trust in the God for whom no problem is too mountainous, no dilemma too complex.*

This was the only good comment that I could find on this passage. The next passage we are going to consider is Isaiah 43:1, 3:

*1 But now thus saith the LORD that created thee, O Jacob, and he that formed thee, O Israel, Fear not: for I have **redeemed** thee, I have called thee by thy name; thou art mine. 3 For I am the LORD thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Savior: I gave Egypt for thy **ransom**, Ethiopia and Seba for thee.*

First, here, we will go to the *Matthew Henry's Commentary*, volume 4, page 234.

But now, fear not, O Jacob! O Israel! I have redeemed thee, and thou art mine. Though many among them were untractable and incorrigible, yet God would continue his love and care for his people, and the body of that nation should still be reserved for mercy. ... They are God's workmanship, created by him unto good works, Eph. ii. 10. He has created them and formed them, not only given them a being, but this being, formed them into a people, constituted their government, and incorporated them by the charter of his covenant. ... They are a people of his purchase: he has redeemed them. Out of the land of Egypt he first redeemed them, and out of many another bondage, in his love, and in his pity. ... They are his peculiar people, whom he has distinguished from others, and set apart for himself: he has called them by name, as those he has a particular intimacy with and concern for, and they are his, are appropriated to him and he has a special interest in them. ... He is their God in covenant. ... When the forces of Sennacherib, that they might be diverted from falling upon Israel, were directed by Providence to fall upon Egypt, Ethiopia, and Seba, then God gave those countries for Israel, and showed how precious his people were in his sight.

We have more on this in the Jamieson, Fausset & Brown, *Commentary On The Whole Bible*, page 563:

Egypt for thy ransom — *Either Egypt or Israel must perish; God chose that Egypt, though so much more mighty, should be destroyed, in order that His people might be delivered; thus Egypt stood instead of Israel, as a kind of "ransom." The Hebrew, kopher, means properly "that with which anything is overlaid," as the pitch with which the ark was overlaid; hence that which covers over sins, an atonement.*

Now for a quote from the Adam Clarke's *Commentary on the Bible*, Abridged by Ralph Earle, on this verse:

I gave Egypt for thy ransom. This is commonly supposed to refer to the time of Sennacherib's invasion; who, when he was just ready to fall upon Jerusalem, soon after his entering Judea, was providentially diverted from that design, and turned his arms against the Egyptians, and their allies the Cushean Arabians, with their neighbors the Sabeans, probably joined with them under Tirhakah. See chap. xx and chap xxxvii. 9. Or as there are some reasonable objections to this option, perhaps it may mean more generally that God has often saved His people at the expense of other nations whom He had as it were in their stead, given up to destruction. Kimchi refers all this to the deliverance of Jerusalem from the invasion of Sennacherib. Tirhakah, king of Ethiopia, had come out to war against the king of Assyria, who was thereupon obliged to raise the siege of Jerusalem. Thus the Ethiopians, Egyptians, and Sabeans were delivered into the hands of the Assyrians as a ransom for Israel.

As we go along here, you will get a better understanding of this thing called "ransom" or "Redemption." The next verse we are going to scrutinize is Matthew 26:28:

For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.

We are going to quote first here on this verse from the *Matthew Henry's Commentary*, volume 5. We are going to quote from pages 392 and 550:

The Old Testament was confirmed by the blood of bull and goats (Heb. ix. 19, 20; Exod. xxiv. 8); but the New Testament with the blood of Christ, which is here distinguished from that; It is my blood of the New Testament. The covenant God is pleased to make with us, and all the benefits and privileges of it, are owing to the merits of Christ's death. ... It is shed for the remission of sins, that is, to purchase remission of sins for us. The redemption which we have through his blood is the remission of sins, Eph. i. 7. The new covenant which is procured and ratified by the blood of Christ, is a charter of pardon, an act of indemnity, in order to a reconciliation between God and man; for sin was the only thing that made the quarrel, and without shedding of blood is no remission, Heb. ix. 22. It was instituted to be a ratification of the covenant made with us in him, and a sign of the conveyance of those benefits to us, which were purchased for us by his death; and therefore he broke the bread to them ..., and said, Take, eat of it: he gave the cup to them, and ordered them to drink of it. ... Apply the doctrine of Christ crucified to yourselves, and let it be meat and drink to your souls, strengthening, nourishing, and refreshing, to you, and the support and comfort of your spiritual life. ... The Israelites were forbidden to go out of their houses the night that they ate the passover, for fear of the sword of the destroying angel, Exod. xii. 22, 23. But because Christ, the great shepherd, was to be smitten, he went out purposely to expose himself to the sword, as a champion; they evaded the destroyer, but Christ conquered him, and brought destructions to a perpetual end.

For more on this verse, Matthew 26:28, let's go to the Adam Clarke's *Commentary on the Bible*, Abridged by Ralph Earle, page 825:

By new testament, many understand nothing more than the Book commonly known by this name, containing the four Gospels, Acts of the Apostles, apostolical Epistles, and the Book of Revelation; and they think that the cup of the new testament means no more than merely that cup which the Book called the New Testament enjoins in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The original which we translate the new testament and which is general title of all the contents of the Book already described simply means "the new covenant." Covenant signifies an agreement, contract, or compact between two parties by which both are mutually bound to do certain things on certain conditions and penalties. It answers to the Hebrew berith, which often signifies not only the covenant or agreement, but also the sacrifice which was slain on the occasion, by the blood of which the covenant was ratified; and the contracting parties professed to subject themselves to such a death as that of the victim in case of violating their engagements. In this place our Lord terms His blood "the blood of the new covenant"; by which He means that grand plan of agreement, or reconciliation, which God was now establishing between himself and mankind, by the passion and death of His Son, through whom alone men could draw nigh to God. Which is shed (poured out) for many. Often used in sacrificial sense in the Septuagint, to "pour out" or "sprinkle" the blood of the sacrifices before the altar of the Lord, by way of atonement.

The next Scripture we are going to use is Luke 24:21. This is a very moving passage as the followers of Yahshua were so very sure that He was the Messiah, and with His death they were discouraged and wondering if they could have been mistaken after all. This is what it says:

*But we trusted that it had been he which should have **redeemed** Israel: and beside all this, to day is the third day since these things were done.*

Let's see what *Matthew Henry's Commentary* has to say about this one, volume 5, page 837:

Here is an intimation of their disappointment in him, as the reason of their sadness: "We trusted that it had been he who should have redeemed Israel, v 21. We are of those who not only looked upon him to be a prophet, like Moses, but, like him a redeemer too." He was depended upon, and great things expected from him, by them that looked for redemption, and in it for the consolation of Israel.

Now we will take a comment from Jamieson, Fausset & Brown, *Commentary On The Whole Bible*, page 1023:

we trusted...— *They expected the promised Deliverance at His hand, but in the current sense of it, not by His death. **besides all this** — not only did His death seem to give the fatal blow to their hopes, but He had been two days dead already, and this was the third.*

By this time we should be starting to see how involved this subject of "Redemption" can get. It is probably one of the most misrepresented subjects as presented by today's "Churches"! What we are trying to do here is: we are trying to clear up any such misrepresentations that may have been mistakenly taught in the past and put them aright. The next Scripture we shall endeavor to shed some light on is John 1:29:

The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.

Here the word “Redemption” is not used, but it is implied. Now we will quote from some different commentaries and see what they have to say. We will start with Adam Clarke’s *Commentary on the Bible*, Abridged by Ralph Earle, pages 899-900:

The next day. The day after that on which the Jews had been with John, v. 19. Behold the Lamb of God. This was said in allusion to what was spoken in Isa. liii. 7. Jesus was the true Lamb or Sacrifice required and appointed of God, of which those offered daily in the Tabernacle and Temple, Exod. xxix, 38-39, and especially the paschal lamb, were only the types and representatives. See Exod. xii. 4-5; I Cor. v. 7. The continual morning and evening sacrifice of a lamb, under the Jewish (Israelite) law, was intended to point out the continual efficacy of the blood of atonement; for even at the throne of God, Jesus Christ is ever represented as a Lamb newly slain, Rev. iii. v. 6. But John, pointing to Christ calls Him emphatically the Lamb of God.

The next reference we will use is found in *Matthew Henry’s Commentary*, volume 5, page 861:

That Jesus Christ is the Lamb of God, which bespeaks [of] him [as] the great sacrifice, by which atonement is made for sin, and man reconciled to God. Of all the legal sacrifices he chooses to allude to the lambs that were offered, not only because a lamb is an emblem of meekness, and Christ must be led as a lamb to the slaughter (Isa. liii. 7), but with a special reference. [1.] To the daily sacrifice which was offered every morning and evening continually, and that was always a lamb (Exod. xxix. 38, which was a type of Christ, as the everlasting propitiation, whose blood continually speaks. [2.] To the paschal lamb, the blood of which being sprinkled upon the door-post, secured the Israelites from the stroke of the destroying angel. Christ is our passover, 1 Cor. 5:7. He is the Lamb of God.

Let’s try another one here from the *Believer’s Bible Commentary* by William MacDonald, page 1470:

***The next day** after the visit of the Pharisees from Jerusalem, **John** looked up and **saw Jesus coming toward him**. In the thrill and excitement of that moment, he cried out “**Behold! The Lamb of God who bears the sin of the world!**” The lamb was a sacrificial animal among the Jews (Israelites). God had taught His chosen people to slay a lamb and to sprinkle its blood as a sacrifice. The lamb was killed as a substitute and its blood shed so that sins might be forgiven. However, the blood of the lambs slain during the OT period did not put away sin. Those lambs were pictures or types, pointing forward to the fact that God would one day provide a **lamb** who would actually take away the sin.*

From *The Interpreters’ One-Volume Commentary On The Bible*, page 710, we get this:

*The title of Christ as **Lamb of God** is peculiar to this gospel and to Rev., in which however, a different Greek word for “lamb” is used (e.g. Rev. 5:6; 14:1; 15:3; 19:7). ... One thinks at once of the Passover lamb (Exod. 12:5), for the gospel is explicit in dating the death of Jesus on the afternoon of the “Preparation” day, when the paschal animals were slaughtered (18:28; 19:14). ... The gospel*

shares with Paul an interpretation of Christ as “our Passover” who is sacrificed for us (cf. 1 Cor. 5:7-8).

Now to take a quote from the Peake’s *Commentary on the Bible*, Edited by Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley, page 847:

The origin of the term ‘Lamb of God’ is disputed. There may be reference to (a) the Passover lamb (Exod. 12) sacrificed at the annual festival, but not regarded as expiatory; (b) the lambs sacrificed daily in the Temple (Exod. 29:38-46); (c) the goats used on the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16:21f.), one of which carried away the sins of the people into the wilderness; (d) the lamb mentioned in the description of the Servant of the Lord in Isaiah 53:7; (e) to the lamb which plays a part in apocalyptic imagery (e.g. Rev. 14:1) and represents the Messiah who purifies his people. In view of John’s interest in Jesus as the true Passover, it is probably best to suppose that the Passover lamb forms the background of the metaphor (cf. 1 C. 5:7), though it may also have been affected by Isa. 53; There is no need however to suppose that ‘lamb’ mistranslates an Aramaic word that should have been rendered ‘servant’.

While these comments on the “Lamb of God” are quite good, these commentators don’t seem to see why it was necessary to have this sacrificial lamb in the first place —they do n’t seem to pick up on the fact that Israel had played the whore with paganism and prostituted herself as an harlot and sold herself as a whore would for hire to strange religions and therefore it was necessary for Yahweh to give her a bill of divorce because she had been unfaithful —that by the Law the only way Yahweh could remarry Israel would be if her first husband were to die —that under the law only a kinsman could redeem her from the servitude she had sold herself under — and that is why Yahweh in the form of man allowed Himself to be led as a lamb to slaughter to pay the price of Israel’s transgression.

I could, at this point, go on indefinitely on the subject of Redemption. I have not even scratched the surface with what I have presented here. The reason I have presented this discourse on Redemption so emphatically is to show you there is no Redemption outside of Israel. James Bruggeman, try as he may, can never make it any other way. Once Redemption is fully understood, it leaves no room for Universalism. Yahweh designed Redemption for one people only and if you’re are not of that people, there is no Redemption for you! Now we shall get back to James Bruggeman’s presentation on cassette tape, “History of the Doctrine of Universalism”:

In order to prove to you that that is the case, we will show you today that “orthodoxy” was not always orthodoxy. That means that what is commonly accepted teaching in Christianity today concerning the fate of all men, particularly the wicked, was not always commonly accepted teaching. You see, orthodoxy changed over time. That which was once heresy is now orthodoxy and that which was once orthodoxy is now “heresy”. You all have heard the saying how that in wartime, or after a war, “To the victor goes the spoils.” And part of the spoils of war is that the victor gets to write the history books — to tell how the “good guys” won. Well the same applies in the religious world. The political infighting among the various factions of “Christianity” over which doctrine is correct has not always resulted so that those with the correct doctrine win. The Dark Ages, when the

Roman Catholic Church held sway, is proof enough of that. So just because something is “orthodox” does not mean it is biblically correct.

Let us now examine the history of the doctrine of universal reconciliation. And after we have finished sketching the history of this doctrine, we shall then proceed, in further messages, to expound this doctrine in great detail from the Scriptures themselves, and you will see there is a great abundance of Scripture verses which support this teaching. And we’ll do more than that; we will also set forth the opposing positions and bring forth the verses which our opponents would use to support their position. And, then, that way you can compare and make up your own mind about which position makes more sense biblically. We are not afraid of being challenged about this teaching. And, in fact, I did much research to deliberately — look for — to deliberately seek materials which supposedly show the falsehood of the teaching of universal reconciliation. And thus, at some point, and we probably won’t get there today — we will bring forth the objections of the detractors and see how well founded they actually are.

Now for those of you who have just recently joined our tape ministry, I must caution you that you are obviously hopping aboard in the middle of what has been a fairly long series of Bible studies. And, in fact, as I said before, its more like a series of series. Because not only have we finished a ten tape series dealing with the matters of free will, and predestination, and a host of related topics, but even before we began that ten part series on *The Sovereignty of God*, we have been laying some groundwork — we had been laying some groundwork with eight or ten prior messages as I mentioned before the tape started, the teachings on the Jubilee and so forth. And teachings on the doctrine of hell. So if you are new, please do not dismiss this doctrine of universal reconciliation out of hand without making a thorough study of the subject. Remember the wisdom that God gives us in Proverbs, chapter 18 — you don’t need to turn there — verse 13 — you probably have heard it before — “He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is folly and shame unto him.” In other words, listen to the whole story. And I would suggest to those just joining us, that the place to begin is with our two part message entitled, “How long is forever?” It concerns the doctrine of the ages. In fact, its subtitled, “The Doctrine Of The Ages.” And how the word, forever and everlasting and the term forever and ever in our English Bibles often convey a false meaning. But just to briefly refresh the memories of those of you who have heard the ten tapes on the *Sovereignty of God*, let’s turn in our Bibles to the book of Romans, chapter 5, and we want to read verse 12. This is the verse we expounded upon in the final message of that ten part series, and it is the verse which was bungled in the translation in both the King James Version and nearly all English translations. And we took great pains in that message to explain and prove to you how and why it is a mistranslation. So just to call that up from your memory banks now, let’s look and read verse 12 of Romans 5:

Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin;
and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.

This is an extremely critical verse. It tell us that because of the sin of our first father, Adam, that all of humanity inherited, What? — death. Notice, it does not say that we inherited original sin. And then I pointed out the very important phrase at the

end of that verse the words, “for that” are a mistranslation in the King James, and it is similarly mistranslated in most other English versions as well. But the correct rendering, and I hope you have scratched that “for that” out — the correct rendering from the Greek, “on which” or “upon which” meaning death. In other words, we sin because we have death in us. Its not the other way around where we die because we personally sin. No, we are dying because we were born that way — because we have death in us which is imperfection. That’s why we sin. Then, remember, that we looked at this also at a legal standpoint — in other words, Adam sinned —and because Adam sinned, God gave Adam the death penalty. But not only did God give Adam the death penalty, He also gave us the death penalty because of Adam’s sin. In other words, God imputed Adam’s sin to us. God considered us as being guilty of Adam’s sin. And this sounds unfair — and it is — for a period of time. God is holding all of mankind guilty for Adam’s single sin. We are all born a dying because of a sin that we did not personally commit. There’s no question about it, it is temporarily unjust, but we haven’t heard the whole story yet.

So, How will God rectify this temporary injustice. Well, the solution is only a couple of verses further down where Paul tells the rest of the story. Let’s now read verse 18&19: (and I am going to insert a couple of nouns or proper names so you know who its talking about here)

18 Thereby as by the offence of one (man, Adam) judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one (man, that’s the second Adam, Jesus Christ) the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. 19 For as by one man’s disobedience (Adam, the) many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one (Jesus Christ) shall (the) many be made righteous.

Now your Bible might not say “the many” but that is what it says in the Greek, and you might wonder why its talking about “all men” in verse 18 and only “many” in verse 19. And as I pointed out before, the difference is, that all men did not become sinners through Adam — because Jesus Christ did not become a sinner from Adam’s sin. So that’s the exception, otherwise it would be all. So that’s why Paul says “many”, meaning everybody except Jesus Christ. And so by the obedience one shall the same “many” be made righteous, meaning all men except Jesus Christ — because He was already righteous. Now we are not going to take the time to analyze this any further here as we did in much greater detail in tape 10 of that series because we are just summarizing here. A careful study of these last two verses, though, reveals the clear teaching that everyone, that every single person who was made a sinner due to Adam’s fall will be made righteous eventually. Does that exclude anyone? No. Therefore, in short, everyone will ultimately be saved. Now isn’t that a great gospel? Isn’t that just about the best good news that anyone could ever hope or ask for?

No, that is not “the very best good news” I ever heard of!!! If the Kingdom is going to be made up of all these other races including the Jews, then, Yahweh, please count me out —that is my prayer! Now Bruggeman is correct on a couple of things here; (a) he correctly identifies Adam as the first man and (b) he identifies the second Adam as “Jesus Christ” in this passage. But the error which he supports his premise on is faulty as he believes that “all men” came from Adam regardless of

race. The only people that ever came from Adam are the White people. For a moment, let's take a look at what we have here in this passage. The word in Greek here is #444. This term is used better than 350 times in the New Testament and can mean almost any kind of man or woman. So, then, we are only interested in the kind of "man" Paul was talking about here. If you will notice in the King James center reference on Romans 5:18, it will take us to Hebrews 2:9 which says:

*But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour, that he by the grace of God should taste death **for every man**.*

Just who is it speaking of when it says "for every man"? Again, if you will check out the center reference in the King James Bible on Hebrews 2:9, it will take us to Philippians 2:7-9, and we will read that passage now:

*7 But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was **made in the likeness of men**: 8 And being **found in the fashion as a man**, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. 9 Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name.*

It would appear here that the Savior didn't just take on the "likeness" of any kind of man. He was often called the "son of man" which means son of Adam. Yahshua didn't take on the "likeness" of a black nor was He "fashioned" like a Mongolian. We should not lose sight that Yahshua died as a substitute for us and therefore could only be of us. *Matthew Henry's Commentary*, volume 6, page 897 sums it up this way:

... not only bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh, but spirit of his spirit — brethren by the whole blood, in what is heavenly as well as in what is earthly. ... Christ is not ashamed to own this relation; he is not ashamed to call them brethren, which is wonderful goodness and condescension in him, considering their meanness by nature and vileness by sin; but he will never be ashamed of any who are not ashamed of him.

It is only we Anglo-Saxon and related peoples who are flesh of His flesh and spirit of His spirit. Therefore these other races do not have Redemption! —They are not kin! Anyway, let's get back to James Bruggeman:

There are some, of course, who's first reaction upon hearing that all will be saved — their first reaction is one of anger and bitterness toward the wicked. Its the attitude of, well, if those blankedy blank SOB's are going to be saved also, then, Why am I trying so hard to be a good Christian? Why should I try to be Mr. or Miss Goody Two shoes and miss out on all the fun that I could be having by deliberately pursuing a life of sin? It doesn't seem fair. The wicked get to have all the fun in life, And then they get saved to boot? Is that what you are telling me? And so, sometimes, a person with that attitude will reject the Idea of universal reconciliation simply because they do not understand that the sinners will not get away with their sin, and the wicked will not get away with their great wickedness. No, they will be punished and judged for their sins and wickedness. But in the final consummation, they, too, will be converted and saved. We'll talk more about that later. There are many many more verses and passages which support this doctrine of universal

salvation, or universal reconciliation and we will come back to them in further messages. But, for now, we need to move on and present the historical sketch of this doctrine. And for this portion of the message, I'm going to be drawing upon a number of sources and I am not going to take the time to orally footnote them all for you. I just don't want to make this a real tedious thing. Its going to be probably be boring enough by quoting a bunch of historical quotations here. But I do want to make special mention of one particular source.

In tape 10 or the Sovereignty of God series, you might recall, I strongly encouraged my listeners to obtain a copy of Stephen Jones' outstanding book on this subject which is entitled "Creation's Jubilee." We've got a stack of them back on the table, and we would suggest a ten dollar offering for the book. But I want to mention, at this point, that I'm indebted to the work done by Stephen Jones and Michael Warft in a previous book entitled the "Sovereignty of God and the Destiny of Man." Anybody here read it? Its not surprising because the book was written 18 years ago and has long been out of print — I don't know anyplace where you can get it. But that particular book has an entire chapter devoted to the history of the doctrine of universal reconciliation. So I don't see any point in reinventing the wheel since they have done such an excellent job of covering the material. But I have obtained and verified many of their sources which are standard Church histories and biographies of Church fathers and other works like that. So what this portion of the message will show is that the doctrine of universal reconciliation was actually the majority belief of Christians for at least the first five years of Christianity. As early as the second century A.D., though, there were three different doctrines being taught concerning the final state of the wicked, and consequently each of the three views was vying for the position of orthodoxy, as it were. By the way, this reminds me, that about six years ago when I first taught concerning the falsehood of the hellfire doctrine in my message entitled "Death, Hell and Your Mortal Soul", I was quiet frankly surprised that after that series I received no correspondence or no feed back from anybody inquiring, Well just what is the final state of the wicked? I thought surely, that when I demonstrated that there is no such thing as eternal hellfire, that surely some people would wonder, well, then, what happens to the wicked if they don't fry and fry and roast and toast for ever and ever? But no takers. But in hind sight, I suppose — I suppose that everyone assumed that the only other alternative is the doctrine of the final annihilation of the wicked. You see, this great and marvelous truth of the Scriptures of Universalism had been declared heresy centuries ago. And is almost never mentioned in modern churches , and its even hard to find in many standard church histories except in the most oblique references.

So as I was saying, it was early in the second century that three different views were competing for the position of orthodoxy in the early Church. They are as follows, number one, The doctrine of eternal hellfire, and this is certainly the most prominently held doctrine in today's Judao-Christian world concerning the eternal fate of the wicked. Generally, because there are, you know, variations — but generally it teaches that those who refuse to accept Jesus Christ, and those who never heard of Jesus Christ, are going to be assigned to everlasting torture and torment and pain and agony in the fires of hell. The second contender was the doctrine of the final annihilation of the wicked — and this comes in a weak second in terms of popularity in modern Christianity. But this doctrine holds that those who

do not accept Christ and likewise those who never heard of Him will be raised in the resurrection to face condemnation and punishment that being they're executed and their lives are snuffed out for ever more, no more life for them — period. And the third contender, of course, is the doctrine of universal reconciliation. This is the belief that all men will ultimately be saved. And many, if not most, also hold to the idea that all other fallen creatures will likewise be saved. Once again, though, the Universalist without exception also believe that the wicked will be punished for their sin. They will not get a free ticket to the Kingdom of Heaven.

We should really take a look at what Bruggeman is saying here as this brings up a very interesting point. If the wicked will actually be converted in the end and they must pay for their crimes, then some of these Jews are going to have to die several times. Some of these Jews who have financed some of these wars where hundreds of thousands of White men, women and children have been slaughtered, the only way justice could be done would be to execute these Jews and then raise them from the dead to execute them over and over again for each person they have had a hand in killing. Remember, Bible Law commands it. Then, How are they going to have to pay back double for all the monetary crimes they have committed? If you were to put them out into the field and make them work off this debt, it would take hundreds of thousands of years to complete. No, Mr. James Bruggeman, I don't buy your bull crap about the wicked being converted in the end. Maybe Mr. James Bruggeman buys all of the comments in the various Bible commentaries that we are "adopted" into the Kingdom and therefore we are all "spiritual brothers." This is absurd.

Now the doctrine of universal reconciliation is, of course, the least well known today — the least popular view of the eternal state of the lost in modern Christianity. But remember what I said, what was once orthodoxy in now "heresy", and what was once heresy is now "orthodoxy". And for most of you people here, knowing what you do about the current rule or reign of the religion Mystery Babylon in Christendom — Does it not make perfect sense, then, that the doctrine of eternal hellfire is orthodoxy? In other words, everything is upside down, Right? So it makes perfect sense.

Let's begin our historical overview with the era of the Apostolic fathers. Now the term "Apostolic fathers" refers to those who were either disciples of the apostles or who were contemporary with the apostles, or they were second generation Christian leaders. And the first thing I need to point out about the writings of the early Church fathers and the Apostolic fathers is that they were much more concerned with the practical aspects of Christianity than they were with putting out a lot of heavy doctrinal teaching and dissertation back then. And the reason for that is that during those first couple of centuries, they were much more concerned with getting the Christian people learned and skilled or leading lives of virtue in every day practical matters. They were concerned with how Christians should live — more so than they were with telling what was going to happen to the lost in eternity. Remember, also, that those early Christians were very concerned with the simple idea of survival because of the very ferocious persecutions — many bloody persecutions that they were enduring in those early centuries. Because of all that, it is often difficult, then, to determine exactly what the Apostolic fathers and some of the early Church fathers did believe on many points of theology. Apparently, in the

relatively brief writings of the Apostolic fathers, not once has anyone found where anyone of them expounded upon the common Universalist Bible passages. One point that has become clear to many scholars, though, is that these Apostolic fathers did not believe in the so-called “immortality of the soul.” But it wasn’t too long after that, that this false notion took deep root the Church. As we have pointed out before, the idea of the immortal soul arose from Greek philosophy and the ancient pagan Mystery religions before that. It is diametrically opposed to the Hebraic and biblical concept of the mortal soul. The Bible says, “the soul that sinneth, it shall die.” No such thing as an immortal soul that lives on after you die. So the writings these Apostolic fathers, namely Clement of Rome, Polycarp of Smyrna, Ignatius of Antioch, Papias of Hierapolis, Barnabas of Alexandria and Hermes of Rome, all of them taught the Hebraic concept of the mortal soul. In the book “History of Christian Thought”, Paul Tillic, “The Apostolic fathers did not believe in the immortality of the soul — there is no natural immortality, otherwise it would be meaningless for them to speak about immortal life which Christ offers. They believed that man is naturally mortal.”

These early Church — or early fathers of the Church did not believe in or teach the everlasting hellfire doctrine, although they make no explicit and totally clear statements either way they must have been, then, either final annihilationist or Universalist. And we believe they were Universalist for a number of reasons. Namely, number one; Some of these fathers were either contemporaries of or disciples of the Apostles Paul and John whose writings are filled with “Universalism”, which we have only sampled so far, and as we will show in more abundance in further studies. Second reason; These Church fathers never wrote of death, destruction or punishment of the wicked as being (a) of no consummation or end (and I am not going to trouble you with the Greek words for these items I’m listing), but (a) they never spoke of it as being no consummation or end, (b) they never wrote of death destruction or punishment of the wicked as being endless and (c) insoluble (d) unintermittent or (e) imperceptible. The fact was, there were five Greek words (those were the English translations) — there were five Greek words which they could have used to convey the idea of endless death or endless torture and punishment, but they didn’t. Just like the apostles did, they chose to use the Greek word “aionos” or its various form which we translate as aeon which means “age abiding” or “age lasting” or “pertaining to the ages”, meaning having an end. And most of you will remember that we discussed this in great detail how that Greek word aion and its various forms over the centuries came to mean eternal and everlasting in its English translations via the Latin Vulgate — and we covered that in our two part message subtitled “The Doctrine of the Ages.” A third reason why we believe that many, if not most, of the Apostolic fathers were Universalist is because there are passages in some of their writings which certainly hint a “Universalism.” For example, Clement of Rome wrote this in his epistle to the Corinthians:

“Let us contemplate him with our mind. Let us gaze with eyes of our soul on his long suffering plan. Let us consider how free from wrath he is towards all his creatures.” (That was from 1st. Clement 19:3.)

| **STOP!, HOLD IT!, STOP!, WE HAVE PROBLEMS!** |

I don't know who James Bruggeman is trying to kid here, but my copy of 1st. Clement 3:19 does not read at all the way Bruggeman says it does. As a matter of fact, nowhere in all of 1st. or 2nd. Clement can any such rendering be found. My copy of 1st. and 2nd. Clement is from *The Lost Books Of The Bible and The Forgotten Books Of Eden*. You really should get a copy of this book to prove to yourself that what I am saying is true as then you will know Bruggeman is lying. You can find 1st. Clement 3:19 on page 131, and this is the way my copy reads:

| 1st. Clement 3:19 |

| *3 For having received their command, and being thoroughly assured by the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ; and convinced by the word of God, with the fulness of the Holy Spirit, they went abroad publishing, That the Kingdom of God was at hand.*

This is a far cry from what Bruggeman is trying to get across. It proves, as a Bible researcher, Bruggeman cannot be trusted. Whether Bruggeman made this one up on his own, I don't know, for he may be parroting Stephen E. Jones who I proved beyond all reasonable doubt that he was a deliberate liar. I will now review the lie that Stephen Jones tried to foster in his book, "*The Babylonian Connection*."

Well, we have one more thing about Stephen E. Jones. This item will really show Jones up for what he is. If a man is a liar, he should be exposed as a liar! It is my own personal opinion that Jones is a liar and as such he cannot be trusted with "Identity" teaching. If a man lies once, he will lie again. I am going to show you where Jones told a downright lie and he used subliminal suggestion in doing it. We will find it in his book, "*The Babylonian Connection*", on page 154 and it reads as follows:

}} "*Liberty under God's Law is our God-given inheritance. When Protestant reformers of 400 years ago discovered this liberty, they forsook the Papal dictatorship. God opened their eyes to the truth of His Word, and they rejected the serpent's lies taught by the Catholic church. Martin Luther wrote:*

}} "*My hope is built on nothing less* }}
}} *Than Jesus' blood and righteousness;* }}
}} *I dare not trust the serpent's lie,* }}
}} *Concerning immortality.* }}
}} *On Christ the solid Rock I stand,* }}
}} *All other ground is sinking sand.*" }}

When I read this over, the words seemed familiar —they just kept going through my mind. I kept asking myself, Where Have I heard them before? Well, I kept going over and over them and then some familiar music began to come to me. It took me about 10 minutes to begin to recognize the melody that went with the words, but I couldn't think of the name of the song. I proceeded to go and find some old hymn books and started to see if I could find the song that matched the words. I probably was the better part of an hour doing this after I found my song books, and I was probably at least an hour in just finding the books. I didn't seem to have much luck in the indexes of the hymnals, so I just leafed through the pages one at a time. While I was searching, the words that seems to come to me were: "I dare not trust the sweetest

(something), but (something something) Jesus' name." Finally I found it; the name of the song was "The Solid Rock." and in some song books it is just "Solid Rock." But the words "*the serpent's lie, Concerning immortality*" were not there! Apparently Jones changed these words in order to prove his thesis.

Not only that, but I found that "**Martin Luther**" **never wrote these words!** I have an old hymnal entitled "The Evangelical Hymnal", published by "Board Of Publication of the Evangelical Church, Cleveland, Oh. & Harrisburg, Pa., Copyrighted 1921." For the song "Solid Rock", page 150, it has "Edward Mote" as the author and "William B. Bradbury" as the composer. From pages XXXIV to XXXVI is found a list of authors. Rev. Edward Mote is listed on page XXXV as the author and flourished from 1797 till 1874. From pages XXXVII to XXXIX are listed composers. William B. Bradbury is listed on page XXXVII as the composer and flourished from 1816 till 1868 and composed 21 melodies including "Solid Rock." **Now Jones is telling an absolute outright bold-faced lie when he says that "Martin Luther" wrote these words, (and Jones changed the words to his own use to boot). Now if "Martin Luther" wrote these words, then Edward Mote is a plagiarist.** In this hymnal the words, "*Used by permission of The Biglow & Main Company, Owners*", is used. This indicates that this company had copyrights against this song and only could be used by their permission. Question: How could "Edward Mote", "William B. Bradbury" and "The Biglow & Main Company" get a copyright on something "Martin Luther" wrote hundreds of years before? Under copyright law, it would be unethical and illegal for Mote to claim authorship if it were Martin Luther's work! **THIS IS A GOOD EXAMPLE OF JONES' CHARACTER AND PROVES HE IS A DOWNRIGHT LIAR, AND THIS IS THE BOY THE "ONE SEED-LINERS" AND "UNIVERSALISTS" ARE PARROTING!!!** Well, anyway, now you know more about Stephen E. Jones!!!!!!

Let's take a look, now, at the true words to this line of the stanza of Mote's poem which was later put to Bradbury's melody:

| "*I dare not trust the sweetest frame, But wholly lean on Jesus' name.*" |
| (Not) "*I dare not trust the serpent's lie, Concerning immortality.*" |

Jones was using "subliminal suggestion" in his deceitful tactic to get you to buy his argument. The average person would say in his/her mind, "Oh yes, I know those words, so Jones has a good point here." "Subliminal suggestion" is a science and is practiced much by the Jews. The question here is: "Who is the Jew behind Jones doing this?" There are several other things about this work of Jones that spells "Jew" like the use of "double-talk." Have you ever observed the Jews on television or in the movies using it? —they are really good at it! They can actually be saying "no" when they mean "yes", and be saying "yes" when they mean "no." Jones employed this tactic throughout this book!

For the record, let's observe what the true words of the song, "The Solid Rock" are:

Stanza #1, |

| *My hope is built on nothing less Than Jesus' blood and righteousness. I*
| *dare not trust the sweetest frame, But wholly lean on Jesus' name.* |

| Stanza #2, |

| *When darkness seems to hide His face, I rest on His unchanging grace. In every high and stormy gale, My anchor holds within the veil.* |

| Stanza #3, |

| *His oath, His covenant, His blood Support me in the whelming flood. When all around my soul gives way, He then is all my Hope and Stay. (By the way, the “whelming flood” is all of these “strange” aliens coming into Israel countries.)* |

| Stanza #4, |

| *When He shall come with trumpet sound, Oh may I then in Him be found; Dressed in His righteousness alone, Faultless to stand before the throne.* |

| Refrain, |

| *On Christ, the solid Rock, I stand; All other ground is sinking sand. All other ground is sinking sand.* |

Notice, here, again, no words about “*the serpent’s lie, Concerning immortality.*” They were added by Jones who also lied about the author and thought you would never notice. It appears, here, that we are not just dealing with one liar, but two, namely Stephen E. Jones and James Bruggeman. It is easy now to see why James Bruggeman is promoting Stephen E. Jones’ work.

Now if you’ll remember in our Sovereignty of God series, part 7 and 8, we, explained the difference between God’s plan and God’s will — very important difference — in Greek it’s the difference between God’s boulema vs. thelema — it’s a vital difference. And here Clement is talking about God’s long range, and he says “long suffering plan” in which He is free from wrath towards all His creatures. Well, another example comes from the epistle Polycarp to the Philippians written about 117 A.D. where he says: “Wherefore girding up your loins, slave to God in fear and truth, leaving the empty prating in that which is of those of much deception, believing into the one rousing our Lord Jesus Christ out of the dead ones, and bestowing to him glory and the throne out of His right hand to whom are subjected all things, celestial and terrestrial. To whom all breath may yet offer divine service. Who is coming, judge of living ones and of dead ones of whose blood God will seek out from ones stubborn to Him.” Kind of a stiff translation — it’s a literal translation, but I think the point is there, to whom are subjected Jesus Christ — to whom are subjected all things on earth and in heaven. In whom, at some point, everything that breathes will yet offer service to that divine one.

| AGAIN, WE HAVE PROBLEMS |

Again, I don’t know where Bruggeman is getting this quotation because the copy I have of The Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians found in The Lost Books of the Bible and The Forgotten Books or Eden do not read this way. As Bruggeman didn’t give chapter and verse we must guess at where he found it. The only passage that seems to even read a little similar is chapter 1, verses 6&7 which reads as follows, and this can be found on page 192:

| *6 Wherefore girding up the loins of your minds; serve the Lord with fear, and in truth: laying aside all empty and vain speech, and the error of many; believing in* |

him that raised up our Lord Jesus Christ from the dead, and hath given him glory and a throne at his right hand. 7 To whom all things are made subject, both that are in heaven, and that are in earth; whom every living creature shall worship; who shall come to be judge of the quick and dead: whose blood God shall require of them that believe in him.

Notice that it reads similar here but nothing about “*To whom all breath may yet offer divine service.*” You can read all four chapters and not find anything like Bruggeman is quoting. We really should read verse 8 here for it will eliminate everyone except Israelites:

8 But he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also raise up us in like manner, if we do his will and walk according to his commandments; and love those things which he loved.

As Israel were the only ones to come under the commandments, that eliminates all other peoples. These other races can break every commandment there is and it is no sin on their part. So Bruggeman has struck out again.

Well, as we have said, all three views of the eternal destiny of the wicked had their proponents in the early centuries of the Church. For example, Irenaeus was the Bishop of the Celtes in Leon, Gall, modern France, Leon is the French pronunciation, we would say Lyons France. So Irenaeus was from Asia Minor and migrated to modern France. But he seems to have taught that the wicked would first be tortured for a long period of time and then finally sentenced to be annihilated. Justin Martyr apparently held a very similar view. And Tertullian of Carthage, though, taught the endless punishment of the wicked — remember that — in Carthage, North Africa. However, in about the second century, a theological school was established in Alexandria by a missionary evangelist named Pantaenus. While not enough of his writings have survived for us to be able to tell which way he stood for sure its undoubtedly clear that his disciple and his successor at the head of that school at Alexandria, a man by the name of Clement of Alexandria, he clearly taught universal reconciliation. Now all told, in the first few centuries of Christianity, six theological schools were known to have existed. They were located at Alexandria, at Antioch, at Carthage, at Ephesus, at Edessa and at Caesarea in Palestine. And of these six, only the one at Carthage taught eternal hellfire. The one at Ephesus taught the final annihilation of the wicked and the remaining four schools all taught universal restoration of all creation. So that is one piece of evidence that universal reconciliation was the majority belief in early Christianity.

Well this falls right in line with the parable of the dragnet. It was predicted beforehand that there would be many people brought into the Kingdom that didn't belong there and that the net would have to be dragged to shore and the bad fish sorted out from the good ones and discarded. So, you see, Yahshua could see all of this “Universalism” coming ahead of time and predicted its impact. Therefore we really should not be surprised at its presence among us today. It is , though, time for this doctrine to come to an end in, our present day.

And we also have it in the authority of two of the most well known of the Church fathers, namely Jerome and Augustine. These men, of course, were not among the

Apostolic fathers, they were born too late, but they were nevertheless pillars of the Church, for better or for worse. Jerome, you will recall, from our Bible version series was the man who produced the version called the Latin Vulgate which has been the primary Bible, or the source of translations of Bibles for the Roman Catholic Church for centuries, they go back to the Latin Vulgate.

*Now here is what Jerome wrote in regard to the present discussion, “I know that most persons understand by the story of Nineveh and its king the ultimate forgiveness of the adversary and all rational creatures.” hum, let me repeat that, “**I know that most persons understand by the story of Nineveh and its king the ultimate forgiveness of the adversary and all rational creatures — all rational creatures.**” Obviously, according to Jerome, the majority Christians in his day, which was the fourth century, believed that the story of Jonah’s reluctant preaching to the Assyrians at Nineveh was a type of the ultimate reconciliation of all things, By the way, the story of Jonah can be instructive to those of us whom I described earlier who might harbor resentment of anger or bitterness at the idea that the wicked will be saved too. You see, Jonah is a type of these people. Christians who just want to let our people in the pearly gates and then lock the gates and let the rest of humanity go to hell, literally. Jonah did every thing he could to avoid going and preaching to those Assyrians. It is as if he said, Lord, those are Israel’s enemies, they hate us — and you want me to go preach to them? What if they pay heed to the message? — and they repent? — then you’ll have to save them! — Lord those dirty rotten no good Assyrians deserve to be tortured forever — or at least killed and never to live again — Lord, you wouldn’t really save them too, Would you? Now, of course, it was God’s plan for Jonah to resist God’s will — for a while — follow me? — But it was God’s ultimate plan that since Jonah did not take the easy route and obey God immediately, Jonah had to learn the hard way, By the way, that too, is a perfect analogy of the wicked — they won’t come to Christ now and go the easy way, so they will have to learn the hard way, via much trial and pain and suffering later called the lake of fire. So, eventually, Jonah became rather unpopular onboard that ship he had hopped to try to go the other way and go to Tarshish which is called Spain today (many believe it is Britain) it is not the whole country, but Tarshish was in modern Spain. So Jonah realized that they were in this terrible storm and were going to be shipwrecked because he was in disobedience to God so he volunteered that knowledge to the captain and said, hey, you know, I think I know why we’re in this trouble — I think you can save your ship and your crew if you just toss me overboard. And sure enough, that’s what happened and the crew and the ship were saved, but Jonah became whale of a meal — or became a meal for a whale — for a while — and then Jonah was upchucked near Nineveh and so he reluctantly began preaching to his enemies — and sure enough they repented and were saved from destruction at that time.*

And that is all that the Assyrians were Mr. James Bruggeman, “*saved from destruction at that time*”! This is salvation, not Redemption!!! Redemption is not salvation and salvation is not Redemption!!! And why was it necessary for Yahweh to save Assyria at this particular time? What time did this event with Jonah take place? If we don’t understand this, we miss the point of the whole story! At this time, (the 8th century, 756 B.C.), we are shortly coming to the period of time when Yahweh is going to use Assyria as “the rod of his anger” against Israel, (Isaiah 10:5).

Therefore it is very necessary that Yahweh preserve Assyria for this very important duty. Evidently life in Assyria had reached the point of being like Sodom and Gomorrah and for that reason, and that reason only, iJonah went to Nineveh. Under such conditions, no nation could become “the rod of Yahweh’s anger.” So it was very necessary for Yahweh to save Assyria at the time of Jonah. Later after Yahweh has used Assyria as “the rod of his anger” against Israel, he tells Assyria, Isaiah 10:12:

Wherefore it shall come to pass, that when the LORD hath performed his whole work upon mount Zion and on Jerusalem, I will punish the fruit of the stout heart of the king of Assyria, and the glory of his high looks.

What James Bruggeman is saying about Assyria is pure garbage, about being saved and all of that, and I don’t care how much he quotes Jerome and his Catholic Church which was never a part of Yahweh’s ekklesia. The only reason Yahweh saved Assyria, at that time, is because Yahweh had a job for Assyria to do, and when it was done, Yahweh destroyed them as a world power, and good riddance.

At this point we will discontinue to quote James Bruggeman word for word and start to counter him point by point otherwise this critical review will take forever to complete. Bruggeman next goes on to expound Origen of Alexandria to be one of the greatest early “Church” fathers and theologians of his time and the fact that he was the greatest ever “Universalist.” In the book Who’s Who In Jewish History by Joan Comay, a book which covers “over a thousand biographical entries covering twenty centuries of Jewish history”, on page 280 it lists Origen as: “*Origen 184-253. Early Church Father. Origen was born in Alexandria of a Christian father and perhaps a Jewish mother*” (although they do list him as a non-Jew). It seems here, possibly, Origen may have had a little “serpent” in him. This might possibly be why he came up with all of these strange doctrines! In Origen’s early manhood, he apparently took the passage of Matthew 19:12 literally (cf. KJV) and castrated himself. Now I will take a quote from The Story of Christian Origins by Martin A. Larson who comments on this act on page 336:

Jesus now declares that it were better to pluck out an eye or to cut off a hand than by their possession to place the whole body in jeopardy of hell fire. He is here developing the doctrine that “there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven’s sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.” Even the hand or the eye must be removed, if concupiscence is transmitted through these; but He spoke specifically of those members in which sex-desire is concentrated. He means that if a man cannot free himself from the erotic need, he must commit auto-castration. Let those who can, follow this precept: Origen and thousands of other Christians did so during the early centuries of the Church.

I believe that this act alone should have disqualified Origen as a leader or Bible teacher showing his inability of understanding Scripture along with his impulsiveness. As I understand from my research, Origen regretted this rash decision later. Once this has been done to a man, his whole body chemistry is thrown out of balance along with his thinking ability. If Origen committed a misjudgment on this occasion, How many more times did he misjudge Scriptural matters. Not only did Origen castrate himself, but he recommended it for others.

From his own example and from some of his writings, one can find some of the early principles that spawned the monastic orders. Among other things, Origen was a pacifist teaching that it is not Christian to fight in an army, yet the Scriptures do not teach pacifism. Origen taught that even the devil himself would ultimately repent and be converted. Origen used the Platonic and Gnostic schools of thoughts in his “reasoning”. Origen was supposed to be especially knowledgeable of the Old Testament in his production of the Hexapla, yet he didn’t seem to understand the principles of Redemption contained therein. If he had understood Redemption, then he would have understood that who he called “Christ” was none other than “God the Father.” Yahshua was Yahweh in the flesh. If Yahshua was not Yahweh in the flesh, then we have no Redemption! Origen taught that the “son”, Yahshua, was inferior to the Father, Yahweh. Origen’s most heretical teaching was “Universalism” as Redemption is for Israel only!

Well Bruggeman continues his garbage for the rest of side two of tape number one. At the end of this reverse side of tape number one he quotes 1st Timothy 4:10-11:

~ For therefore we both labour and suffer reproach, because we trust in the ~
~ living God, who is the Savior of all men, specially of those that believe. 11 ~
~ These things command and teach. ~

Then Bruggeman proceeds to make it appear that the “all men” spoken of here means everybody in a “universal” sense. If you will check out what this verse is saying very carefully, it is not speaking of everybody in a “universal” sense. The numbers here in the Greek for “all men” are #3956 and #444 and they do mean “all men.” It is unfortunate that the Greek is not a little more discriminate here. We do have a clue in this verse as to who these “all men” are though. The word “Savior” is the tip off as to who they are. The Greek word for Savior is #4990. If you will check with The Complete Word Study New Testament by Spiros Zodhiates, you will notice that it gives a synonym #3086 (*lutrotes*) which means *redeemer*. Then if we go to #3086 in this same book, we find that *lutrotes* in the Greek means: *to release on receipt of the ransom, Redeemer, liberator*. You can see here that it is getting right back to the subject of Redemption. And as redemption requires a kinsman the “all men” spoken of in this verse are kinsmen Israelites. The same word Savior #4990 is used in Acts 13:23 which says:

| *Of this man’s seed hath God according to his promise raised unto Israel a* |
| *Savior, Jesus.* |

Both of these verses could just as well have used the word Redeemer in the place of Savior. You should be able to see very clearly that when it says “all men”, it is not speaking in a universal sense as Bruggeman tries to make out. In these two tapes he employs this tactic several times. The Amplified Bible does a pretty good job on 1st Timothy 4:5:

| *With a view to this we toil and strive, [yes] and suffer reproach, because* |
| *we have [fixed our] hope on the living God, Who is the Savior (Preserver,* |
| *Maintainer, Deliverer) of all men, especially of those who believe — trust* |
| *in, rely on and adhere to Him.* |

On tape number two, Bruggeman continues to praise and aggrandize the early “Church” father Origen as if he were some kind of god. He also expounds and

eulogizes Augustine, Didymus the Blind, Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa. In doing this Bruggeman is using the opinions of men rather than the word of Yahweh. He is making a “religion” out of the sayings and opinions of the early “Church” fathers. We have to remember that there were no inspired writings after the prophet John.

Of Didymus the Blind, Bruggeman quotes:

There was also Didymus the Blind from 308 to 395 and I will give you just one brief statement from his commentary on 1st Peter 3:

As mankind by being reclaimed from their sins are to be subjected to Christ in the dispensation appointed for the salvation of all, so the angels will be reduced to obedience by the correction of their vices.

The angels? — What angels have vices? Right. Well speaking of the wicked angels and the adversary, here is a sample from Jerome of Latin Vulgate fame. Jerome actually had been a very strong teacher of Universalism until for Church politics reasons he developed a very passionate hatred of Origen and everything Origen stood for. And so, Jerome thus changed his views on Universalism and he sided with Augustine. But listen to this passage from Jerome:

The adversary is, as it were, God's executioner. They who walk not rightly are handed over to the adversary wherefore (notice why) that they may perish perpetually? And where is the mercy of God? Where is the tender father? What the apostle says is this. I have handed over sinners to the adversary, that tormented by him, they may be converted to me.

That's Jerome's loose paraphrasing of 1st Timothy 1:20 by the way. Continuing elsewhere Jerome writes:

Christ will, in the aeons to come, show not to one, but to the whole number of rational creatures his glory and the riches of his grace by means of us. The saints are to reign over the fallen angels and the prince of this world, even to them bringing blessing.

A little later on Bruggeman quotes 1st Corinthians 15:25 and let's pick up on it here:

Now turn in your Bibles to 1st Corinthians, chapter 15, verse 25 and let's read a couple of verses here so you can know exactly the text that Gregory is referring to as I read this next quotation from him. So 1st Corinthians 15, beginning in verse 25.

This, of course, is Paul's great exposition of the resurrection and afterward:

For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.

So concerning the restoration of all creation Gregory of Nyssa wrote this: {

What then is the scope of the word which the apostle authoritatively uses in this passage? That one day the nature evil shall pass into nothingness being altogether destroyed from among the things that are. And that the divine and unsullied goodness shall embrace within itself all intelligent natures. None of those whom God hath made being exiled from the Kingdom of God. When all the

alloy of evil that has been mixed up in the things that are, having been separated by the refining action of the cleansing fire, everything that was created by God shall have become such as it was at the beginning when as yet it had not admitted evil. This is the end (in other words the purpose or the goal) this is the end of our hope that nothing shall be left contrary to the good, but that the divine life penetrating all things shall absolutely destroy death from among the things that are, sin having been destroyed before him by means of which, has been said, death held his dominion over men.

Now in another study, Gregory comments on that same passage of Scripture in this manner:

Where it is said that God's enemies shall be subject to God, this is meant: that the power of evil shall be taken away, and they who on account of their disobedience were called God's enemies, shall by subjection be made God's friends. When all who were once God's enemies shall have been made his footstool because they shall receive in themselves the divine imprint. When death shall have been destroyed in the subjection of all, which is not servile humility, but immortality and blessedness.

Let me comment there for just a minute — kind of off the cuff — he's talking about the Edomites, Right? It doesn't mean that you have to go out and give them a bear hug today — we have to realize that they're still our enemies and God's enemies and He's using them for His purpose. But eventually, God will put His divine imprint in them also, and they will change and be converted and be God's friends also. That's a long way off and that's hard to imagine, but that's what I believe the Scripture teaches. ... All right, anyhow, with that, Is there any question that this great doctor of the Church, Gregory of Nyssa, clearly taught the restoration of all things — Universal salvation? — he most certainly did!

I guess I don't have to comment on how ridiculous this last statement by Bruggeman is! It is not scriptural as there are very clear passages that indicate the enemy will be totally destroyed, and at Israel's hand no less. Before I leave this subject, I would like to quote a couple passages of Stephen E. Jones' book, "Creation's Jubilee." On page 51, Jones quotes 1st Corinthians 15:22 which reads:

》》 *For as in Adam all die, so also in [the] Christ all shall be made alive.* 《《

Then on page 52, Stephen E. Jones makes this comment on 1st Corinthians 15:22:

》》 *Verse 22: It is evident that all mankind died in Adam -- no exceptions. In the same manner also shall all be made alive in Christ -- no exceptions. The "all" in both cases parallel each other and are equal in scope.* 《《

What Jones is trying to imply here is that somehow Adam is father of all the races and that is just not true! Only in Adam did all Adamites die and only in Yahshua (the second Adam) shall all Adamites be made alive, its that simple. If you are not an Adamite, you will not be resurrected! It was only into Adam that Yahweh breathed the breath of Life (His spirit). I am not sure how Jones comes to the conclusion that Adam is the father of "all men." Perhaps he believes that Noah's flood was worldwide in scope instead of a local flood and that the different races came from the three sons of Noah; Ham, Shem and Japheth. If such a thing could happen as Noah having black and Mongolian grandchildren, it would be a dangerous to have

children as one would never know just what kind of pictures one would be hanging on the wall! This would be breaking the law of kind after kind! Another passage of Scripture that Stephen E. Jones quotes to support Universalism is Zechariah 14:16-19. Actually Jones quotes verse 9 and then verses 16 through 19. Let's read it as he quotes it on page 50 of his book, "Creation's Jubilee":

9 And the Lord shall be King over all the earth; in that day shall there be one Lord, and His name one. ... 16 And it shall come to pass, that every one that is left of all the nations which came against Jerusalem shall even go up from year to year to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, and to keep the feast of Tabernacles. 17 And it shall be that whoso will not come up of all the families of the earth unto Jerusalem to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, even upon them shall be no rain 18 And if the family of Egypt go not up, and come wherewith the Lord will smite the heathen [nations] that come not up to keep the feast of Tabernacles. 19 This shall be the punishment of Egypt and the punishment of all nations that come not up to keep the feast of Tabernacles.

Now Stephen E. Jones concludes from this that all the other races and people are somehow going to be brought into the Kingdom. What we have to do with this passage is to find out who these "nations", "families" and "heathen" are. First of all, the words "nations" and "heathen" here in the Hebrew is the word #1471 and can mean Israelites or non-Israelites. This word is equivalent to #1484 in the Greek which is "ethnos" and like #1471 in Hebrew means "nations." In the New Testament Greek, "ethnos" or "Gentile(s)" means Israelites 90% of the time! If you will check your Strong's Concordance, you will find that #1471 is translated as "Gentile(s)" 30 times in the Old Testament. In this passage it so happens that #1471 is translated "nations" and "heathen." In Zephaniah 2:9 #1471 is translated "my people" and means "Israelites" (damn the translators). Now this passage of Zechariah 14:16-19 presents some real problems in translation but if you think that Yahweh is going to invite some Egyptians who, since the time of Joseph, are mulattos to an Israelite feast of Tabernacles as Jones and Bruggeman do, you have to be wacky. If you will also check out the word for "family", #4940, you will find out it means "genus", "kind" or "tribe" which are good designations of Israel. Anyway I like the last verse of this passage which says, "and in that day there shall be no more the Canaanite in the house of Yahweh of hosts" (bless the translators on that one). The Scriptures do teach a doctrine called "the restitution of all things", Acts 3:21, but it isn't anything like James Bruggeman and Stephen E. Jones are trying to advance.

A SHORT LESSON IN HISTORY

We cannot understand what was happening during the era of the early so-called "Christian" fathers unless we understand some of the history surrounding that period of time. It is a mistake to believe that the early "Church" fathers because of their close contemporary ties with the Apostles were pure in their teachings of the Gospel. Each of the early "Church" fathers had been influenced by the various religions and philosophies of their day and because of this these isms were absorbed into their writings and catechisms. I wish now to present to you the origins of these religions and how they got incorporated into the "Church." In order to do this, we will have to go back to Alexander The Great (356-323 B.C.).

In *The New Jewish Encyclopedia*, edited by David Bridger in association with Samuel Wolk, Behrman House, Inc. says this of Alexander The Great:

Alexander The Great (356-323 b.c.e.) *Illustrious conqueror of the East, who showed a favorable attitude toward the Jews, whose country he took without much opposition. His conquest of Judea led to the introduction of Hellenism (Greek Culture), which had far reaching influence on the development of Judaism. Many Jews took the name Alexander, and it is considered a Jewish name.*

This should give you some idea who was influencing the undertakings of Alexander The Great. Let's look now into some more aspects of what was happening at this critical period of History. Next I am going to quote to you some excerpts from a book entitled *Forerunners And Rivals Of Christianity — From 330 B.C. To 330 A.D.*, by Francis Legge On page xxvi we read this:

The religions competing with Christianity which are left after this elimination may be classed in three categories. First come the Oriental religions native to countries lying to the south and east of the Mediterranean and therefore mainly outside the sphere of Hellenic culture until after the conquest of Alexander. These religions, born or nurtured in Asia Minor, Persia, and Egypt, so soon as Alexander had carried out his project of the marriage of Europe and Asia, poured westward in a flood which a Roman satirist compared to the Orontes emptying itself into the Tiber, and gained, according to a well-known law in the history of religions, a far greater influence over the minds of men than they had exercised in their native home.

Once Alexander The Great had conquered these new lands, the Greek language was established along with Greek customs. Once everyone was speaking the same language, this left the door open for the spread of the eastern religions into Greece and eventually Rome. Not only was there a spread of these eastern religions, but the idea of marrying Europe with Asia was taken literally as we read on pages 5&6:

He had already wedded — it is said for love — the beautiful Roxana, a princess from Bactria in the Eastern (or Upper) Provinces of his new Empire, and now he took as a second consort, Statira, the daughter of Darius, who as the scion of the last native king of Persia, may be taken as the representative of the western centre. Nearly a hundred of his superior officers and some ten thousand of his humbler followers hastened to follow his example and to receive Asiatic brides with rich dowries assigned them by the Conqueror. ... Alexander set to work with his usual energy to diffuse through his European army strong drafts of his Asiatic subjects in order to cement still further the alliance between the two Continents. Had he lived, it would have been a mixed army of Asiatics and Europeans that he would have led the following year to the conquest of the western world.

Again we read on pages 8&9: |

The generation that had seen Alexander face to face was hardly in its grave before the marriage of Europe and Asia had become a very real and pregnant fact. The importance of this for the history of religions can hardly be exaggerated. ... but it was a better medium for the transmission of metaphysical theories than the founder of any world-religion has ever had at his disposal before or since. ... Anxious to show that they too had a pedigree, the older

nations of the world seized the opportunity to inform their new masters of their own history and traditions; and as all history was in those days sacred history, they thus introduced to the Greeks their gods and their beliefs as to the divine governance of the world. The sacred books of the Chaldeans, of the Egyptians, of the Jews, and no doubt of many other peoples whose records are now lost to us, were translated into Greek.

We should be beginning to get an idea of how these eastern religions started to spread because of Alexander's exploits. On page 20 we further read:

This is a point that it is important to remember, because without it, it is hard to understand the passion for innovation in religious matters which seems for the next three centuries to possess unchecked sway over mankind. It appeared as if Alexander, who indeed had made all things new, had set free the gods of the ancient world to wander from one end of his Empire to the other, and the desire to proselytize appears for the first time in the world's history.

Again on page 26 we read this:

To sum up, then, Alexander united the whole civilized world for the first time under a single head and gave to it a common language and culture. ... By breaking down the barriers which racial and lingual divisions had hitherto set up between different nations of the earth, these conquests led to a great fusion of the religions hitherto professed by them, and thus opened the door to the world-religions which were afterwards to share between them his vast Empire. Before his coming we see the ancient world divided into separate communities each with its own pantheon and forms of worship and neither knowing nor caring greatly about those of its neighbors. But immediately after, all this is changed. The interchange of ideas between East and West has thrown the different religions of the world as it were into a melting-pot, in which the germs of a different grouping of the human race are dimly visible.

I want to take one more quote out of *The World Book Encyclopedia*, volume 1, page 327:

His plans for governmental reorganization aimed to make Asia and Europe one country and combine the best of the East with the West. He chose Babylon as his capital city. To achieve his goal, Alexander encouraged intermarriages, setting an example by marrying a Persian princess himself. He introduced a uniform currency system throughout the empire and promoted trade and commerce. He encouraged the spread of Greek ideas, customs, and laws into Asia.

You can see from all of this how the religions of the East spread because of Alexander's exploits. These religions were absorbed into Greece and eventually the Roman Empire and the Roman Catholic "Church." A question, at this point, should be asked: Do we want to be guided by these early "Church" fathers who were influenced by the religions which came out of the East? I think not! Now the subject of how these eastern religions became absorbed into the Catholic Church is a big one and will require a separate study. "Universalism" is not coming from the Scriptures but from the eastern religions! Alexander The Great was, as all race mixers are, a "Universalist." James Bruggeman and Stephen E. Jones should really love Alexander The Great!

While the Persians were a white people along with others in Asia Minor, some were not, and this set a bad example for others to follow. Israel was instructed to marry amongst their own tribes as much as possible.