

# The Answering Service

## FROM AMERICA'S PROMISE

Answers to questions from Radio and Tape Listeners

No. 1 - Nov 1, 1979

### Question No. 1:

**Why do you teach that interracial marriage is forbidden in the Bible? After all, Moses married a Negro, and the Bible even says that Miriam was cursed with leprosy for criticizing him.**

### Answer:

The passage in question is **Numbers 21:1**, which says, "And Miriam and Aaron spake against Moses because of the Ethiopian (Heb. Cushite) woman whom he had married; for he had married an Ethiopian (Heb. Cushite) woman.

The verse does not say that Moses married a Negro. Cush was a son of Ham, the son of Noah. The theory that Moses married a Negro is totally dependent upon the speculation that God's curse upon Ham turned him black. However, **Gen. 9:18-27**, where God cursed Ham and Canaan, says only that they would be servants to Shem and Japheth. Further, we know from secular history that the black race was in existence long before the days of Noah.

The Egyptians were Hamitic people, also, and their paintings and ancient records clearly show them to be white-skinned; until they eventually intermarried with non-white people, such as the Hittites, who were driven south from Armenia.

Note that **Numbers 12:1** indicates that Moses "had married" this Cushite woman some time previous to Miriam's criticism. Moses did not necessarily marry her, while he was leading Israel in the wilderness. It could have been before the Exodus. According to Bullinger's *The Companion Bible*, "Arabia was in the land of Cush." He says that this woman was probably Zipporah, the daughter of Reuel (that is, Jethro), the priest of Midian (**see Exodus 2:21 and 3:1**). Bullinger further suggests that since Zipporah was living in or near the land of Cush, she could have been considered a "Cushite", not by descent, but by street address.

The connection between the Midianites and the land of Cush is well known to Bible scholars. According to Sir R. Burton's, *The Land of Midian Revisited*, "Mt. Sinai or Horeb was in or in close proximity to, Midian." (See: Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. 2, p. 366, under "Midian".)

We, also, know from **Genesis 25:1-4** that the Midianites were descended from Abraham, through his wife Keturah. **Verse 4** says that they settled east of Canaan. They, apparently, were squeezed out of that area by the Moabites and Ammonites, for we later find them in the Sinai desert. In fact, Josephus tells us that after Moses fled Egypt, "he came to the city, Midian, which lay upon the Red Sea, and was so denominated from one of Abraham's sons by Keturah....."

(Antiquities, 2,11,1). So there is a good possibility that this "Cushite" woman was either Zipporah or someone else living in this general area — not from modern-day Ethiopia in Africa, although this area was, also, settled by white people for a long time.

The land of Cush, also, figures prominently in the Book of Jasher, and it is described as a place in the Sinai as well. For example, the Cushites are seen fighting the children of Aram and the children of the east. Furthermore, when the Cushite king dies, he is buried "to the north of the land of Egypt" (72:26). He would hardly have been carried the entire length of Egypt, which was enemy territory, and buried in the north of Egypt!

The account continues by claiming that Moses was given Adoniah, the widowed queen, to wed. If this account is true, or at least if it has a grain of truth to it, then this would be the woman in question referred to in **Numbers 12:1**. There is no reason to think that she was black or even that she was from Africa. Nevertheless, Jasher informs us that Moses refused to live with Adoniah, even though he married her, because she was descended from Ham, whom God had cursed (Jasher 73:31-36).

So the conclusion of the matter is this: Whether **Numbers 12:1** refers to Zipporah or to Adoniah, there is no reason to assume that this was an interracial marriage. There is absolutely no evidence to prove that she was anything but white. Therefore, no one can justify interracial marriage by saying that Moses married a Negro.

### Question No. 2:

**Does Song of Solomon 1:5, 6 tell us that one of Solomon's wives was a Negro?**

### Answer:

These verses read: "I am black, but comely, O ye daughters of Jerusalem, as the tents of Kedar, as the curtains of Solomon. Look not upon me, because I am black, because the sun hath looked upon me; my mother's children were angry with me; they made me the keeper of the vineyards; but mine own vineyards have I not kept."

No this woman was not a Negro. Compare her with "Cinderella." In verse 6 she tells us why she was "black" — "because the sun hath looked upon me." In other words, she had a "healthy tan," which back then was considered to be the mark of a low-class working girl. The word "black" is from the Hebrew word *shachowr*, which means "dusky or swarthy."

Notice that **verse 6** explains that she was blackened by the sun, because her brothers made her take care of their vineyards, and she could not take care of her own (that is, herself, her complexion).

### Question No. 3:

**I've sent Identity material to many radio and television ministers who preach false doctrines. It seems like all my efforts are in vain. What should I do about it?**

### Answer:

Before you can teach anyone, you must somehow establish common ground or win confidence. This is very difficult to do by mail, especially with those who don't know you. With radio preachers it is even more difficult, because they are out to

teach you and build their ministries with contributions. They are not generally geared to learning from you, unless it will increase their support (Le., be profitable). Recently, we heard from the ghost-writer of a multi-million dollar evangelistic organization, who wrote that the evangelists never go beyond the "milk" (Le., personal salvation message), because large ministries cannot be built by teaching in -depth Bible doctrine. They are more interested in building their ministries than in teaching our people the Word of God. They believe that if they would accept the Identity and other truths and then preach them, they would lose their support and their ministries. It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich minister to enter the kingdom of heaven. (That verse is from the JOV — the Jones Opinionated Version.)

**Question No. 4:**

**I read in a book that Adam came down from heaven and that we existed prior to our formation on the earth. The account of creation tells us that Adam was "formed," while everything else was just "created." Dr. Wesley Swift says that the word "formed" really means "to bring forth as an offspring or issue of the Most High God." What do you think?**

**Answer:**

The Hebrew word translated "formed" in **Genesis 2:7** is *yatsar*. It simply means "to potter." If Dr. Swift's definition is correct, then we must also assume that "every beast of the field and every fowl of the air" (**Gen. 2:19**) is, also, the offspring or issue of the Most High God. They, too, were "formed," and the Hebrew word is identical. Other things that God said were "formed" (*yatsar*) were the leviathan (**Ps. 104:26**) and graven images (**Is. 44:9**). Are we to assume that all these animals and

idols preexisted in heaven before creation? If not, then one cannot logically use *yatsar* to imply preexistence for man either. The Scriptures are very clear that Adam (not just his body) originated in the dust of the ground. In fact, Adam was even named after the ground. The Hebrew word for ground found in **Gen. 2:7** is *adamah*. God formed Adam from the dust of the *adamah*.

**Question No. 5:**

**What does the Bible mean when it talks about the "Son of God," and the "sons of God?"**

**Answer:**

The term "son(s) of God" has a basic meaning, but it, also, has quite a few different applications. The phrase is used in Eastern cultures even today to refer to those who have no earthly father, especially of orphans.

The term was applied to Christ, because He had no earthly father. This may be taken in at least two different ways. First, some may have called him by the term to indicate that His supposed father Joseph had died while Jesus was young, thus making Him an orphan in their eyes. Secondly, this could be a reference to the fact that Jesus was born of a virgin and had no earthly father right from the beginning.

The term is used in **Job 38:7 and 32** in reference to the star constellations, which were animals and persons pictured in the stars. Since they were the creation of God, having no earthly father, they are called "sons of God."

Perhaps the most important usage of the term as far as the Identity message is concerned is Christ's marriage to Israel at Mount Sinai. Jesus Christ is the Groom;

Israel is His Bride. Jesus promised to bless, honour, and protect her, and to give her many children (**see Gen. 12:1-3**), while Israel promised to submit to His authority in obedience to His Law (**Ex. 19: 6-8**).

It is important that we recognize that Israel as a political entity and corporate unit is the Bride, while the individual Israelites are the offspring of that marriage relationship, or children of Israel and of God.

However, we read later in the Scriptures that God divorced Israel (**Jer. 3:8**), which served to make all the Israelite citizens illegitimate as far as being sons of God was concerned. This divorce from God also revoked her right to the name "Israel" that God had given to His wife as her "married name." From then on, these descendants of Abraham were just "gentiles." This is why the New Testament writings, especially **Romans 9-11**, call divorced Israel by the term "gentiles." They are legally classified with the non-Israel "nations."

The reason for Israel's divorce was her infidelity, in that she began following the laws of Baal and Molech. In effect, she "married" other gods. Now God's Law in **Deut. 24:1-5** makes it plain that when a husband divorces his wife, and she remarries, he cannot go and claim her again to be his wife. So once divorced and remarried, Israel could not be claimed again by Jesus Christ. That is, unless both her husbands were dead (**Rom. 7:1 and 1 Cor. 7:39**). **Isaiah 53** tells how Christ, the original Husband, died, and **Isaiah 54** tells how Israel thus became a "widow" (**Is. 54:4**). The death of Christ made Him legally eligible to remarry Israel, but the problem is, Israel still had to await the death of Baal, her present husband,

before she is legally eligible to remarry Christ. That is why the "marriage" of the Bride did not take place right after the death of Christ. That event must await the repentance of Israel and the destruction of false religion from her midst.

Now I said all that to make this point: Legally speaking, the descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (that is, the Anglo-Saxons and related peoples as a corporate unit) is NOT the Bride yet. She has been betrothed, but the marriage is yet future. And in the same way, most Israelite individuals are not legally the sons of God. Most of our people still worship Baal and follow His laws. This state of affairs will continue until our people call for the true national repentance prophesied to take place some day, where the people renounce Baal and forsake his laws for those of Christ. In that day Baal will DIE!

But you can become a legal son of God now, by rejecting the rulership of Baal in your life and placing yourself in covenant relationship with Jesus Christ. That means vowing to follow His Law in obedience, just as our forefathers did in Mount Sinai. (Now, if that seems to contradict others things I have said concerning the two covenants, Old and New, it's because I don't have the time to give you the whole story at present. Both Old and New covenants are important in our lives, and the exclusion of either one can be very damaging. We must mainly keep in mind that the Old Covenant is subordinate to the New.)

Those who individually separate themselves from the family of Baal and join the family of Christ are "firstfruits" (**James 1:18**) of the entire nation of Israel: which God will turn because of the New Covenant. You, who are firstfruits, have

become legal sons of God here and now. **John 1:12** says, "But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name." And that means you are expected to renounce the present husband (Baal) of your mother Israel. Now you are sons of God, because you have no earthly father. Your Father is Jesus Christ, who will soon marry the nation itself.

**Question No. 6:**

**The only way I can purchase a house is to borrow the money from the bankers at interest. Is it wrong to do so?**

**Answer:**

It is seldom actually a "good" thing to borrow, even when no interest is involved. However, there are many times when we are faced with two options, neither of which is ideal. So we must decide which one is best. This is where your conscience is very important.

It is Scripturally important that you provide for your family (**1 Tim. 5:8**). I would suggest that as long as you do not attempt to provide a 26-room mansion for your family, that such debt is justifiable. Be prudent, and be practical.

The Law itself does not forbid the payment of usury. It merely considers it to be slavery. The Law only forbids the charging of interest when you loan money to others. In other words, don't put your brother into slavery like Babylon has done to us. The fact is, we are now in Babylon as a nation, whether we like it or not. Under this system, it is often almost impossible to do what is ideally right. We can only do our best, pray that God will remove this yoke from off our necks, and thank God that our justification is based upon the perfect righteousness of Christ, NOT upon our own ability to obey the Law perfectly.

Of course, God has led Pastor Emry in such a way that he does not put America's Promise into debt and then take God's tithe money and pay it out as usury. He, also, has not fallen into the deceitful trap of overextending the ministry and then having to go into debt to pay for it (expecting God to bail us out). Such a misuse of funds is, usually, called "faith" and is standard practice of "faith-ministries." We have a different name for it.

**Question No.7:**

**My children are coming home from school now with all sorts of Halloween material. What shall we do about this?**

**Answer:**

Halloween ("All Holy Evening") is the most sacred day of the religion of witchcraft, which is a very popular religion in America and around the world. When the schools promote it, they are promoting this religion, just as they promote Baalism every Christmas with the pagan trappings. You see, only the Christian religion is outlawed in our public schools, and only the Christian trappings are outlawed, as well. The schools actually-promote the religion of Baal and witchcraft.

You might want to fight it on the basis that the schools are promoting religion, and perhaps add teeth to it by asking for equal time in the promotion of Christianity. But in order for you to fight this properly, you have to be able to prove that these things are actually religious rituals.

Hallowe'en, or "All Souls' Eve," is the day before All Hallows, or All Saints' Day. In the pagan religion of the middle ages, November 1st was their New Year's Day and Halloween was New Year's Eve. Winter was coming, and this day honored

the sun god, Samhain, the Lord of the Dead. They believed that this was the time when the dead returned to walk among the living. Hence, we have the "ghost" costumes and masks to portray demons. The people would set out food in little shelters overnight, in order to provide these "ghosts" with food and shelter, for if they failed to do this, these wandering spirits would haunt them, i.e., play tricks on them. Now, if you follow this religion, you will no doubt want your children to perpetuate this tradition by sending them out "trick-or-treating."

Did you ever wonder what black cats have to do with bad luck and Halloween? Cats were sacred in this pagan religion, because they believed that cats had once been human beings, but that they had been changed into cats as punishment for their evil deeds. (They believed in reincarnation.) The black cats were the worst of the offenders. That is why in witchcraft black cats are highly honored and are considered to possess great powers.

Whereas in ancient times they used to use human skulls with lighted candles in them, now they only use "jack-O-lanterns" to get the point across. This is no doubt due to the shortage of skulls that developed when the religion became so popular. It is common knowledge that "satan-worshippers" and those involved in witchcraft use these in their ceremonies to conjure up spirits and "demons." How many of our people blindly follow the religious trappings of witchcraft every Halloween? If anyone had set out a jack-o-lantern of a skull and candle in the days of Moses, they would have been executed immediately for witchcraft. Christians have no business perpetuating that sordid religion.

I have read one publication which promotes Halloween on the grounds that it commemorates the flood of Noah's day, and that we should celebrate that great event of God's righteous judgment upon the earth. Well, it is true that the flood is the origin of the celebration, but as all the trappings clearly show, the celebration is in commemoration of the sinners that died in the flood. Those who died were considered to be martyrs of witchcraft. Halloween is the evening before "All Saints' Day," showing conclusively that this religion honors those who died in the flood as "saints."

On May 13th, 610 A.D. Pope Boniface IV rededicated the Roman Pantheon (pagan temple) to the Virgin Mary and the Christian martyrs, or saints. This day was observed as All Saints' Day until Pope Gregory III changed it to November 1st in 834 A.D. to coincide with the day the pagans had dedicated to their martyrs in the deluge. This was in keeping with the usual Catholic policy to "convert the heathen" by incorporating their religions.

I believe that if you will carefully explain the significance of the Halloween rituals to your children (but be careful not to give them nightmares), and read them **Deut. 18:9-14**, being careful to explain the strange words, they will agree that they should not observe this day.

I know how difficult it is to keep children from the witchcraft of Halloween. My oldest girl is in kindergarten, and they have had to cut out ghosts and match black cats for the past month. I must confess that all this took me by surprise, and I am still contemplating what to do about it. My main concern is whether or not my girl is old enough to handle such a sordid subject explained to her. But also, what shall I do, withdraw her from school for a

month? I can't expect the teacher to suddenly change all her materials to accommodate my understanding that she never had. I believe that the only way to counteract this is to talk to the teachers and principle months ahead of time. Or perhaps a year ahead. In the meantime, I'll try to figure out a solution for next year. I have a feeling, though, that the other parents won't let the school drop this Baalism unless we take it to court and win the case.

---