

# The Answering Service

## FROM AMERICA'S PROMISE

Answers to questions from Radio and Tape Listeners

No. 2 - Dec 15, 1979

### Question No. 1:

**What is your definition of the Identity message?**

### Answer:

The "Identity message" is the message teaching the true identity of the Biblical Israelites. It is a part of the Gospel of the Kingdom, which concerns the Kingdom of God on the earth.

There are various aspects of the Gospel of the Kingdom, since every kingdom (by definition) must have:

1. A King. This aspect can be called the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the King.

2. A territory over which the King exercises his sovereignty. This begins with the land (here on earth) where Israelites reside, but it will eventually spread until it fills the whole earth (**Dan. 2:35**).

3. A law to define justice and morality in the land, by which that sovereignty is made effective. This is the Law of Moses as interpreted by the Prophets and Apostles (as they were moved by the Holy Spirit) and by Jesus Christ Himself, the Lawgiver.

4. Citizens and their relative duties and positions of authority as defined by Law. This is where the Identity message comes to focus, for we must be able to identify the true Israelites in order to know where the territories lie and the

people God has promised to turn in repentance. On the basis of that promise and that repentance, Israelites are the prime inheritors of the Kingdom.

However, this, also, is where we must learn the place of the other peoples of the earth in relation to Israel. The moment we speak of citizens of the Kingdom, we are speaking of "the Gospel of Salvation", which has both a national and a personal aspect.

### Question No. 2:

**The Bible says the battle of Armageddon will be fought in the valley of Jehoshaphat. Well, that valley is most certainly not in the U.S. So in the light of that alone, how can we be Israel?**

### Answer:

The "Valley of Jehoshaphat" is mentioned in **Joel 3, verses 2 and 12** in the prophetic destruction of the enemies of Israel at the end of the age. **Revelation 14** should be read with **Joel 3**, since they are talking about the same event, and John even uses the same terminology. (Compare the "reaping of the earth" symbolism of **Joel 3:12-14** with **Revelation 14:15-20**.)

It is clear from **Revelation 14:8** that John is speaking of the end-time destruction of "Babylon," so Joel must be speaking of Babylon, as well. So our question is this: *Will this last battle be fought against*

*the literal armies of the ancient city of Babylon?*

Our answer is, NO. **Jeremiah 51** prophesies against the ancient city of Babylon, telling us that it would be destroyed and would never be inhabited again. This has, literally, been fulfilled. However, that same prophecy describes another "Babylon" called in Revelation "Mystery Babylon." It is a prophetic Babylon, a NEW Babylon — not the old city, but one which has carried the religious, economic, and political principles of that ancient city to our modern day. It is now a SYSTEM, not a city, and it rules over the kings of the earth every bit as much as the ancient city did.

So, if the armies do not have to invade Israel from the ancient city of Babylon, then why must we assume that the invasion must be against the ancient land of Palestine and the ancient valley of Jehoshaphat? The fact is, the invasion is of the land where the Biblical Israelites are located. We can prove from history that the Jews in Palestine are NOT the Biblical Israelites, and we can, also, prove that the nations of western Europe and America (and others) ARE descended from the tribes of Israel.

In **2 Samuel 7:10** the prophet Nathan told King David at the height of the old Israel empire that God had appointed a place to plant Israel, where they would "move no more." That was not the old land, since they were "moved" later to Babylon and Assyria in the captivities. Thus, it had to be a NEW LAND. That necessitates a new "valley of Jehoshaphat," as well. And the only way we can know positively where this new "valley" is, is to know where the real Israelites have been regathered and where Bible prophecy centers today.

**Question No. 3:**

**What is the relationship between the Church, Israel, and non-Israelites in the Kingdom of God?**

**Answer:**

The word "Church" is one of the English translations of the New Testament Greek word *ekklesia*, which means "the called-out ones." The word has a general usage, sometimes unrelated to the "church" as we know it. For instance, in **Acts 19:32, 39, and 41** *ekklesia* is translated "assembly" in reference to the idolatrous silversmiths that Demetrius had called together to organize a mob against Paul. They were anything but Christian!

So *ekklesia* carries with it the connotation of PURPOSE. In other words, we should keep in mind the purpose of the calling and that there are different callings, with different races, nations, and individuals.

The *ekklesia* ("Church") was in existence long before the day of Pentecost. **Acts 7:38** says that there was an *ekklesia* in the wilderness, referring to Israel that had been "called out of Egypt."

Jesus used the term 3 times in **Matthew 16:18** and twice in **Matthew 18: 17**. This, too, was before the day of Pentecost, and the "Church" to which Jesus referred was the congregation of Israel, or their representatives (the jury that was called out to judge the dispute).

**Hebrews 2:12** is a New Testament quotation of **Psalms 22:22**. Hebrews uses the Greek word *ekklesia* ("Church"), while the Old Testament equivalent is *qahal* (usually translated "Congregation").

So we can conclude that the nation of Israel is a body of called-out ones, or *ekklesia*.

Although Israel is a church, so also are the believers within Israel. Both have a calling, and both are distinct and important. Israel has a national calling, while the true Christian believers in Israel have a special calling to lead Israel to God. We should not limit the word *ekklesia* to one body of people, because the Scriptures apply it in different ways.

To limit the word to mean ONLY BELIEVERS does violence to the calling of racial Israel. To limit the word to mean ONLY ISRAEL AS A RACE OR NATION destroys the calling of the believers of both Israel and non-Israel. There have always been non-Israelites who had faith in Christ. This was true in the Old Testament (read the book of Jonah, where Nineveh repented, both "man and beast" in verse 8, as well as in the New Testament in **Matthew 15:21-28** with **Mark 7:26,27**). On the other hand, there have always been unbelievers in Israel for the prophets to denounce. Will God bless unbelieving Israelites along with the believers? Will God curse all non-Israelites, automatically, because they are not of the Israel Church? Absolutely not!

Perhaps the best Bible statements concerning the relationship of Israel with the rest of the world come from Jesus, Himself:

1. Matthew 13:44. "Again, the Kingdom of heaven is like unto treasure (Israel — **Ex. 19:5**) hid in a field (the world — **Matt. 13:38**); the which when a man (Christ — **Matt. 13:37**) hath found, he hideth (**Psalms 83:3**), and for joy thereof goeth and selleth all that he hath (**John 3:16**), and buyeth that field (the world). "

So Jesus says that in order to obtain the treasure, he buys the whole field in which the treasure is hidden. And that field is the whole world! Israel is the special object of attention, but the whole world benefits from that transaction.

2. **Matthew 15:21-28**. In this passage a woman of Canaan sought help from Jesus. In verse 24, Jesus answered her: "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel."

This "put-off" shows clearly that she was not an Israelite woman. She still persisted, though, and Jesus said again, "It is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast it to dogs." This verse is clarified in Mark's version. **Mark 7:27** says, "Let the children FIRST be filled; for it is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast it unto the dogs."

So the reason Jesus was putting off this woman, was because He was called to preach to Israel FIRST. Note that Jesus did not utterly cast her out. It was a matter of PRIORITY, not total exclusion. And at the woman's continued persistence and humility, Jesus granted her request on the basis of her faith.

This present age is one in which God is dealing MAINLY with Israel. He is giving "bread" to the children first. After Israel has repented, and after Jesus has remarried her, then we will see a much greater fulfillment of Isaiah 2 and Micah 4, during which time the Law will go forth from Zion and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem. Where will it go? To the rest of the world ("the field").

For further study, obtain our tape #7213 entitled, GOD WILL BLESS ISRAEL TO CONVERT THE WORLD.

**Question No. 4:**

**What is the difference between the Catholic church and the Protestant churches?**

**Answer:**

There are very few Protestant churches left in the world. They have largely been replaced by what are known as Fundamentalists, Pentecostals, Liberals, and many other various sects. They may still refer to themselves as "Protestant," but they hold very few (if any) of the major doctrines of the original Protestants of the Reformation.

Catholic theology teaches that Christ's work for us has made the gift of the Holy Spirit available to believers. (So far so good.) But then, it teaches that in order for a sinner to be justified, he must receive an INFUSION of righteousness (grace) by the Holy Spirit. *God, then, pronounces the believer righteous, because of the work that the Holy Spirit has done in him.*

In other words, Catholics teach that a man is justified before God only when the Holy Spirit has given that man a righteous nature. The so-called "Holiness movement" that adopted this doctrine calls it "sinless perfection."

Most of the Protestant reformers were once devout Catholics, and they tried, with all their might, to apprehend enough holiness in their lives in order that they could know that the Holy Spirit (by grace!!) had indeed given them an infusion of righteousness. However, being honest men, they recognized that the "old man" was still present. They only found sin in their hearts in the form of pride, selfishness, unbelief, unresponsiveness to God's love, and lack of faith; and they finally despaired of ever being justified before God.

God then revealed to them from **Romans 1:17, chapters 3, 4, and 5**, and other Scripture that righteousness was IMPUTED to them, rather than INFUSED into their nature. It was the imputation of Jesus' righteousness, not any "new" righteousness of their own, that made them acceptable to God.

With this new light came, also, the realization that one need not be inherently immortal (that is, have an immortal soul, or nature) to be acceptable, either. Most of the Reformers (except for Calvin and his followers) viewed the immortal-soul doctrine as just another error of the Catholic doctrine of self-worth, as opposed to justification by the worth of Christ.

The third major distinction between Catholic and Protestant theology was the doctrine of the priesthood of the believer. The Protestants taught there was one God and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus (**1 Tim. 2:5**), and that any "priest" (Pope) insinuating himself between men and God was an "antichrist" (their words).

These three major distinctions have been almost-entirely lost, especially in the last century. The doctrine of the entire "holiness movement" (Pentecostal, Nazarene, Methodist, C & M A, etc.) as well as many other churches, all teach the old Catholic doctrine of an infusion of righteousness in one form or another.

The Catholic doctrine of immortality is taught by nearly all churches, including such as the Mormon "church"; which, also, adds that man preexisted in heaven before Adam was created.

Many, also, teach that the believer must join their church or denomination, be baptized by an organization minister,

and follow and support the head (or heads) of the organization. Thus, although they may name no "Pope," they have made their organization the Pope (or "antichrist").

Doctrinally speaking, there is little difference between the Catholic and most so-called "Protestant" churches, today. Most must be considered false churches.

**Question No. 5:**

**Will Protestants and Catholics unite to form a world church that will attempt to suppress all other religions?**

**Answer:**

These churches are already largely united, doctrinally speaking. Most preaching on this subject is based upon the futurist interpretation of Revelation, in which soon the "antichrist" will rise and form a world church and kill anyone who refuses to join it. But if that is the case, then why worry at all? After all, according to most futurist theology, the church will not be here anyway during the oppressive reign of the "antichrist."

We do not believe that this great united church will be any worse than the World Council of Churches is today. For one thing, too many Christians have already been forewarned of such a day and would not join. Many have been taught that this is somehow connected with the "mark of the beast," so they would be fearful of losing their salvation by joining such an organization.

This interpretation of the future "world church of the antichrist" has been used for two related purposes. First, it blinds people to the fact that the "antichrist" is already ruling the world; and secondly, it gets people to join "the true church" (meaning their own, of

course) as a means of controlling the people.

**Question No. 6:**

**The Bible has a lot to say about the wicked. Their monstrous greed and selfishness is running rampant. What is God doing about these criminals?**

**Answer:**

Those wicked criminals happen to be God's servants, according to the Scriptures. All that greed and selfishness is well described by the prophet, Joel, where they are called locusts, cankerworms, caterpillars, and palmerworms, "my great army which I (God) sent among you" (**Joel 3:25**). These wicked people are the worms and parasites that do nothing but feed themselves greedily.

God has sent them among us in order to judge us for our refusal to obey His Law (**Ezekiel 5:16,17**). These wicked people THINK that they are doing this just because they want to rob us and get rich off our labor, but they do not understand that God is the One who is directing them to do this against us (**Isaiah 10:5-7 and vs. 13-15**). **Ezekiel 38:4** tells us that God is actually putting hooks into their jaws and dragging them to America to rob us. All of this is because we have refused the Law of God, and thus we are under the curses of the Law for disobedience.

Fortunately for us, the Bible, also, tells us that one day this plunder will all end in their final destruction. This will occur as soon as our nation repents and turns to His Law. It is a great comfort to know that all these wicked enemies are under the absolute control of the God who loves us. We know then that God has the power to stop them at the exact moment He has planned to save us.

### Question No 7:

**In Acts 9:7,8 we read that when God struck Paul down on his way to Damascus [resulting in Paul's conversion], his companions heard the voice of God but saw no one. However, when Paul recounts the story in Acts 22:9, he says that the others saw the light, but did not hear the voice. How do we resolve this apparent contradiction?**

### Answer:

Assuming that the Bible does not contradict itself, we can only conclude that **Acts 9:7** means that Paul's companions heard a sound, but could not distinguish the words that were being spoken to Paul. Thus, they heard not the voice. In **Acts 22:9** Paul means that his companions did indeed hear the sound of the voice, though they did not understand the words.

We have another example in Scripture where God's voice from heaven was heard, but the people did not understand the message. It is found in **John 12:28-30**, where Jesus prays, "Father, glorify thy name. Then came there a voice from heaven saying, I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again. The people therefore that stood by and HEARD IT, said that it thundered; others said, An angel spake to him. Jesus answered and said, This voice came not because of me, but for your sakes."

So we see that in this case, the people again heard the voice, but many thought it was thunder. They "heard" the voice, but they did not really hear it either.

The word "voice" in both John 12 and Acts 9 comes from the Greek word *phonay*. It can refer to a sound of any kind, not just vocalized sound. For example, in **Acts 2:2** on the day of Pentecost, "there came a sound (Greek: *echos*) from

heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house, where they were sitting." Then in verse 6, reading from a literal translation, it says, "Now this voice (Greek: *phonay*) having come, the multitude came together and were confounded." The multitude heard the sound of this "wind" and saw how it seemed to fill this particular house where the disciples were meeting, and so they gathered around the house to see what was happening. Verse 2 says that this sound resembled a rushing wind, but verse 6 calls it a "voice," *phonay*, the same term used in Acts 9 and 22.

### Question No. 8:

**I understand that so-called "converted Jews" use the name "Yashua" instead of Jesus Christ. Is that not proof that the name "Yashua" is the correct name, rather than Jesus Christ?**

### Answer:

It is more likely proof of the opposite. We believe that almost all "Christian Jews" are deceivers. This is immediately suspected when one examines their preaching and "testimonies." They spend most of their time and effort praising the Jewish people and telling their "gentile" listeners in a thousand different ways that Jesus was a Jew and the Jews are God's Chosen People. Also, Jews are taught from childhood never to utter the name of Jesus Christ, who they are taught was the bastard son of a Roman soldier and Mary. They are taught that "Jesus Christ" is the false god of the Christians and that the Christians are the enemies of the Jews. If they do say the name "Jesus Christ," they are always to spit, so that in so doing they wash their mouth out with spittle and are cleansed from uttering such a "blasphemous name."

On one of Merv Griffin's shows he asked a guest to read the next announcement. The guest, a Jew, looked up and said, "Oh, you would ask me to say that," and remained silent. Griffin then had to read it himself, and it turned out to be an introduction of another guest, including his last starring role, which was in "Jesus Christ, Superstar." The Jew, apparently, refused to read it, because it contained the Name "Jesus Christ."

It hardly makes sense to accuse Jews of avoiding a "false" Name of our Saviour, whom they hate. They would more likely hate the true Name, just as they hate His own Person. Our conclusion is that the use of "Yashua" by these deceiving "Christian Jews" is so they can avoid saying the true Name as much as possible, while still deceiving Christians.

---