

WATCHMAN'S TEACHING LETTER

Monthly Letter #195 July 2014; Teacher Clifton A. Emahiser
1012 N. Vine Street, Fostoria, Ohio 44830 / emahiser.christogenea.org

TO THOSE WHOM THE COVENANT BELONGS

A NON-UNIVERSAL CULTURE AWARENESS INSTRUCTIONAL PUBLICATION

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

A MONTHLY TEACHING LETTER

This is my one hundred and ninety-fifth monthly teaching letter and continues my seventeenth year of publication. Since WTL #137, I have been continuing a series entitled *The Greatest Love Story Ever Told*, and have been expanding on its seven stages ever since: (1) the courtship, (2) the marriage, (3) the honeymoon, (4) the estrangement, (5) the divorce, (6) the reconciliation, and (7) the remarriage.

THE GREATEST LOVE STORY EVER TOLD, Part 53, THE RECONCILIATION (i.e., Redemption):

While we are on the subject of "reconciliation", it will be well to review an essay I wrote some years ago:

THE LIE OF UNIVERSALISM, #1

With this essay, we are going to scrutinize a spurious, non-Biblical doctrine called, "universalism." The idea of "universalism" actually started with the Edomite-jews and, therefore, falls under the category of "the leaven of the Pharisees." Later, this doctrine was adopted by the "universal" Catholic Church (a church that assigns genetically pure White Israelites to a burning purgatory, while mollicoddling the worst kind of impure mamzer [i.e., crossbred bastard] sewer people among their congregation). Today, "universalism" is taught generally throughout all the mainstream churches of all denominations. One surely would think that such a doctrine would not be found in Israel Identity, for upon discovering our heritage as Israelites, we would understand we are the only people of the Book. Unfortunately, there are those who have dragged this "mainstream" Pharisaical doctrine into the Israel Identity Message. Foremost among these are Stephen E. Jones and Jory S. Brooks.

Upon learning that Dave Barley (a supposed Israel Identity pastor) had invited an Arab to speak at his assembly, William Finck sent Barley a letter condemning such a blatant sham, which Barley conveniently claimed he never received. Whereupon, I took it on myself to circulate an open letter identical to the Finck had sent to Barley. That is when all hell broke loose. Barley in turn wrote a 12 page letter defending the Arab invitation in his: *America's Promise Newsletter*: Dave Barley, Pastor; P.O. Box 157, Sandpoint, Idaho 83864, (208)265-5405: January/February 2004; Section I of III: *From the Pastor's Desk in part*:

"... With that said, let us begin. You are apparently angry that I believe that an Arab can be saved and experience the salvation of Jesus Christ. Although I don't mean

to further anger or frustrate you, I also believe that all peoples of the earth can also partake of the salvation of Christ Jesus. I believe that the Word of God supports this conclusion ...” Then Barley cites: 1 John 2:2; John 12:32; Luke 3:6; Philippi. 2:10-11; Psalms 65:2; 1 Timothy 4:10; Col. 1:16-20 to support his faulty out-of-context hypothesis!

Not surprisingly, Stephen E. Jones and Jory S. Brooks are also against the teaching of the two seeds of Genesis 3:15, and fall into the category of antichrist, anti-seedliners. Ironically, the doctrines of “universalism” and “anti-seedline” are co-companion teachings, for when one is adopted, the other soon follows on its heels.

In a brochure entitled *The Hebrew Foundation of Christ's Church*, Jory S. Brooks attempts to bring non-Israelites into the Kingdom. In a diagram in column 4, he tries to show there is a “physical” Israel and an “allegorical” Israel. Then under the subtitle “Israel's Relation To The Church”, he says the following:

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

This statement is totally unscriptural and is a lie right out of the pits of hell, and “Dr.” Stephen E. Jones holds a Masters in subterfuge. Not only does Jones teach universalism, but he is a vicious antichrist, anti-seedliner (antichrist in-the-sense that he denies the Satanic seedline that was to bruise the Messiah, and if He was not bruised, then we have no Salvation). Universalism is also antichrist inasmuch as it nullifies both the Old and New Covenant which our Kinsman Redeemer died for. If, as both Brooks and Jones imply, non-Israelites can come under those Covenants, then He is no longer a “Kinsman Redeemer.” There is no such thing as “universal Redemption.” Since Jory S. Brooks uses Isaiah 56:3-8 as justification for such a supposed interpretation, let's take a look at it:

“³ Neither let the son of the stranger, that hath joined himself to Yahweh, speak, saying, Yahweh hath utterly separated me from his people: neither let the

eunuch say, Behold, I *am* a dry tree. ⁴ For thus saith Yahweh unto the eunuchs that keep my sabbaths, and choose *the things* that please me, and take hold of my covenant; ⁵ Even unto them will I give in mine house and within my walls a place and a name better than of sons and of daughters: I will give them an everlasting name, that shall not be cut off. ⁶ Also the sons of the stranger, that join themselves to Yahweh to serve him, and to love the name of Yahweh, to be his servants, every one that keepeth the sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant; ⁷ Even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer: their burnt offerings and their sacrifices *shall be* accepted upon mine altar; for mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all [*White Adamic Israelite*] people. ⁸ Yahweh Elohim which gathereth the outcasts of Israel saith, Yet will I gather *others* to him, beside those that are gathered unto him.”

Had Brooks and Jones ever read Hebrews 11:11-13, they would have known who the “strangers” of verses 3 and 6 of Isaiah 56 are:

“¹¹ Through faith also Sarah herself received strength to conceive seed, and was delivered of a child when she was past age, because she judged him faithful who had promised. ¹² Therefore sprang there even of one, and him as good as dead, so *many* as the stars of the sky in multitude, and as the sand which is by the sea shore innumerable. ¹³ These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of *them*, and embraced *them*, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth.”

Had Brooks and Jones checked Genesis 23:4 they would have discovered that Abraham called himself a “**stranger**”. Had Brooks and Jones ever read 1 Chronicles 29:15, they would have discovered that David said:

“**For we are strangers before thee, and sojourners, as were all our fathers: our days on the earth are as a shadow, and there is none abiding.**”

Additionally, had they ever investigated Psalm 39:12 they would have read:

“**Hear my prayer, O Yahweh, and give ear unto my cry; hold not thy peace at my tears: for I am a stranger with thee, and a sojourner, as all my fathers were.**”

We must understand that once the northern Ten Tribes had been divorced by the Almighty along with most of Judah, they were cut-off from the Covenant and became **estranged** to Him. The tribes, being cut-off from the Covenant, became like a “**eunuch**” or a “**dry tree.**” For that period, Israel’s seed had been cut-off, so figuratively, the simile of a “**eunuch**” is appropriate. Upon understanding that Israel was the “**eunuch**”, there is no longer a conflict with Deut. 23:1. This passage is not talking about bringing non-Israelites under the Covenant, but quite the opposite. Once Yahshua died for our Redemption, we were then brought back under the New Covenant, which includes only the House of Israel and the House of Judah, (Jeremiah 31:31; Hebrews 8:8).

Some may argue that the “stranger” in Isaiah 56:3 & 6 is #5236 instead of #1616. When Israel was divorced, they became equivalent to non-Israelites until

Yahshua purchased them back, so #5236 is not out of order in this passage. Jamieson, Fausset & Brown's *Commentary*, page 582, on this passage describes #5236 thus: "the man – *Hebrew, enosh*, 'a man in humble life', in contradistinction to *Hebrew, ish*, 'one of high rank.'" In this sense the meaning of *enosh* is very fitting, for Israel was humbled when she was put away and punished, Deut. 28:44. That verse reads:

"He shall lend to thee, and thou shalt not lend to him: he shall be the head, and thou shalt be the tail."

To show that the divorced Israelites were considered "**strangers**", all one need do is read Ezekiel 14:5: "**That I may take the house of Israel in their own heart, because they are all estranged from me through their idols.**"

Then in Ephesians 2:12 & 19: "**That at that time ye were without Messiah, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without Yahweh in the world Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellowcitizens with the saints, and of the household of Yahweh.**"

Again in Colossians 1:21: "**And you that were sometime alienated and enemies in *your* mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled.**"

Also we must consider 1 Peter 2:11: "**Dearly beloved, I beseech *you* as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul.**"

Deuteronomy 28:43 proclaims that Israel would become lower than the *stranger* and humbled below the *enosh*. Since only Israelites were given the Ten Commandments, Isaiah 56:3-8 could only be speaking of Israel and Judah. The Almighty never commanded any non-Israelites to keep His Sabbath, as keeping His Sabbath is a sign that we are under His Covenant. Verse 1 says: "**...for my salvation is near to come, and my righteousness to be revealed.**"

It would seem that this is referring to the First Advent. If so, this passage is speaking of the Gospel being presented to the true Israelites at their new home in Europe. Naturally, part of the Gospel would concern itself with keeping the Sabbath. Then verse three comes into play: "**Neither let the son of the stranger, that hath joined himself to Yahweh, speak, saying, Yahweh hath utterly separated me from his people: neither let the eunuch say, Behold, I *am* a dry tree.**" When we understand that this verse is speaking of Israel, and Israel only, it is a very impressive verse. Here, "the son of the stranger" [Israel] is not to say: "**Yahweh hath utterly separated me from his [*my*] people, neither let the eunuch [*Israel*] say, Behold, I *am* a dry tree.**" Had our Kinsman Redeemer not paid the price for us, we were doomed to remain a "dry tree." With the race-mixing that is going on at the present time, we are headed in that direction, for hybrid-mamzer-bastards are quickly becoming fastened to our Israelite family trees. And, Brooks and Jones are not helping us any by preaching "universalism."

Verse 4 speaks of taking hold of the Covenant. As Yahweh's Covenant is a closed corporation, only Israel and Judah qualify as parties thereto. In fact, no others need apply! Then in verse 5, Yahweh gives us his promise:

“Even to them [lost Israel] will I give in mine house and within my walls a place and a name better than of sons and of daughters: I will give them an everlasting name, that shall not be cut off.”

Here, we Israelites of Israel and Judah are the “**sons**” and “**daughters**”. Then the promise is made to give us an “**everlasting name**” that shall never again “**be cut off**”. Again, in verse 6, Israel is referred to as “**the sons of the stranger**”. Then in verse 7, another promise is given to Israel:

“Even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer: their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine altar; for mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all people.”

Though now our burnt offerings and sacrifices are in a different form, all our efforts to advance the Kingdom are recognized by Him. The “**holy mountain**” can only be the Israel nations where He has planted us. Furthermore, the only way our nations can be holy (set apart) is to be racially pure; a holy people for a holy (set apart) nation. Then, and only then, can “**mine house**” be called “**an house of prayer for all [Israelite] people.**”

Then in verse 8 it says: “**Yahweh Elohim which gathereth the outcasts of Israel saith, Yet will I gather others to him, besides those that are gathered unto him.**”

As the prophet was prophesying concerning a small remnant that later remained at Jerusalem, the “**others**” would be those dispersed into Assyria, and then into Europe and the United States and other Israel countries. There is no place for non-Israelites in Isaiah 56:3-8!!! “Dr.?” Stephen E. Jones, HA!!!

In this same brochure by Jory S. Brooks, under the subtitle “Can God’s Promise Be Broken?”, he agrees with M.R. DeHaan, saying this: “Dispensationalist scholar, M.R. DeHaan, correctly pointed out the purpose of Israel being a chosen people: ‘To lead all the rest of the nations to Him.’ God promised to Israel in Isaiah 49:6-8, ‘I will also give thee for a light to the nations, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth.’ This is a promise by God that Israel would be His worldwide agent in salvation. It is indisputable that salvation concerns faith in Jesus Christ ... In the Abrahamic Covenant, God promised in Gen. 22:16-18, “By myself have I sworn, saith the LORD, for because thou hast done this thing, and not withheld thy son, thine only son: That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven ... And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed ...’ But as we saw in Isaiah, Israel was indeed promised to be a Spiritual blessing to all nations on earth”

It would appear that if a Scripture can be taken out-of-context, there are a lot of false teachers out there ready, willing and eager to do it! As we observe this, we can know beyond all doubt this concept of “universalism” is coming from both Stephen E. Jones and Jory S. Brooks. Stephen E. Jones has several other disciples wind-sniffing his scent like the “swift dromedary” and “wild ass” of Jeremiah 2:21-25. As there are several false premises involved in Brooks’ suppositions, they need to be addressed. As one of the Scriptures cited by Brooks out-of-context is Isaiah 49:6-8, let’s read it:

“⁶ And he said, It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles [*sic Israel Nations*], That thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth. ⁷ Thus saith Yahweh, the Redeemer of Israel, *and* his Holy One, to him whom man despiseth, to him whom the nation abhorreth, to a servant of rulers, Kings shall see and arise, princes also shall worship, because of Yahweh that is faithful, *and* the Holy One of Israel, and he shall choose thee. ⁸ Thus saith Yahweh, In an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in a day of salvation have I helped thee; and I will preserve thee: and give thee for a covenant of the people, to establish the earth, to cause to inherit the desolate heritages.”

Right away, all the universalists jump on the sentence: **“I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth”**, and apply it to non-Israelites. Had Brooks and Jones continued to read verse 9, it would have been more apparent who the “Gentiles” of verse 6 were: **“That thou mayest say to the prisoners, Go forth; to them that are in darkness, Shew yourselves. They shall feed in the ways, and their pastures shall be in all high places.”**

To see who the “Gentiles” are that Isaiah is talking about, we need to go to Romans 9:23-26: **“²³ And that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory, ²⁴ Even us, whom he hath called, not of Judah only, but also of the Gentiles [*Israel nations*]? ²⁵ As he saith also in Osee [*Hosea*], I will call them my people, which were not my people; and her beloved, which was not beloved. ²⁶ And it shall come to pass, *that* in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people; there shall they be called the children of the living Elohim.”**

If one will go to Hosea 1:10 and 2:23, one will discover that the “Gentiles” of both Romans 9:24 and Isaiah 49:6 are no other than the divorced and put away and punished lost sheep of the House of Israel. To claim these so-called “Gentiles”, in these passages, are non-Israelite people is a lie of dastardly proportions, and there is no room for “universalism” here.

These are similar to the “Gentiles” spoken of in Matthew 4:14-15 which says:

“¹⁴ That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias [*Isaiah*] the prophet, saying, ¹⁵ The land of Zabulon and the land of Nephthalim, by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles; ¹⁵ The people which sat in darkness saw great light; and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up.”

This area was occupied by Benjamites at the time of the Messiah, from whom He got all His disciples except one.

There is also Luke 2:25-32 which spells out that the “Gentiles” in that passage are identical to Israel:

“²⁵ And behold, there was a man in Jerusalem, whose name was Simeon; and the same man was just and devout, waiting for the consolation of Israel: and

the Holy Ghost was upon him. ²⁶ And it was revealed unto him by the Holy Ghost, that he should not see death, before he had seen Yahweh's Messiah. ²⁷ And he came by the Spirit into the temple: and when the parents brought in the child Yahshua, to do for him after the custom of the Law, ²⁸ Then took he him up in his arms, and blessed Elohim, and said, ²⁹ Master, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word: ³⁰ For mine eyes have seen thy salvation, ³¹ Which thou hast prepared before the face of all people; ³² A light to lighten the Gentiles [*Israel Nations*], and the glory of thy people Israel."

You will notice that Luke didn't record Simeon saying anything about waiting for the consolation of any non-Israelites in this passage. That excludes any other subject except "the consolation of Israel" to and including verse 32. Therefore when it says "all people" in verse 31, it is speaking of "all Israel people". Then in verse 32, it might appear to some that it is speaking of two subjects: (1) Gentiles, and (2) Israel. In the first place, it should have been rendered Nations, not the Latin term Gentiles. But one might argue the word "and" is used between two phrases making it two different subjects. The English term "and" is #2532, and is *kaí* in the Greek and is a copulative conjunction. Richard A. Young, in his *Intermediate New Testament Greek*, page 62, shows the rule under the subtitle: "*The Article with Nouns Connected with kaí [and in Greek]*". "When two nouns are separated by *kaí* and each noun has its own article, the author intends a distinction between them. When the two nouns are separated by a *kaí* and only the first has an article, the author intends for the reader to group the two nouns together in some fashion [Granville Sharp] stated: 'When the copulative *kaí* connects two nouns of the same case, [viz. nouns (either substantive or adjective, or participle) of personal description respecting office, dignity, affinity, or connection, and attributes, properties, or qualities, good or ill,] if the article, or any of its cases, precedes the first of the said nouns or participles, and is not repeated before the second noun or participle, the latter always relates to the same person that is expressed or described by the first noun or participle: i.e. it denotes a further description of the first named person.'" As the Greek article does not appear before both nations and Israel, there are not two different subjects involved. In other words, nations [Gentiles] and Israel are identical. Thus, there is no Biblical support of "universalism" at Luke 2:25-32!

I am advised on the Greek as follows: For those skilled in Greek, a translation of Luke 2:32 might be stated thus: "A light for a revelation to the Nations and honor of Your people Israel" (with "the" being added), which is a most literal translation, the word "revelation" being from a noun, APOKALUPSIS (apocalypse), and not a verb as the A.V. interpretation implies. It may also be translated "for a revealing of nations and ...". The only variations among the different manuscript editors here concern punctuation, and that is always arbitrary. Looking at Berry, he has "a light for revelation of [the] Gentiles and glory of Thy people Israel", but he is lost inasmuch as he doesn't understand the Israel Message, but was honest about the Greek articles. To some this verse means that the Nations of Israel were to be revealed, and they certainly were by Paul. Those nations being only the nations promised to Abraham by Yahweh.

As I stated before, the word "and" in Luke 2:32 is a "copulative conjunction." The word "copulative" is akin to the word "copulation", like in sexual intercourse. That may

be a homely ribald way to illustrate a “copulative conjunction”, but it implies “a direct connection.” A “conjunction” is a word that joins other words together. The two words in our verse are “nations” and “Israel.” In other words, “nations” [Gentiles] and “Israel” are identical!

In short, both Jones and Brooks evidently don’t know (or don’t care to know) the Greek language (and in particular the Greek article). And we should avoid, at all cost, looking to people like M.R. DeHaan for guidance on this subject as Jory S. Brooks recommended. By not checking the Greek, both Jones and Brooks have perpetrated violent injury to Yahweh’s Word!

“Edomite-jewish” UNIVERSALISM

From *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, an article by Isaac Landman, Ed. NY, 1943:

“UNIVERSALISM AND PARTICULARISM ... Universalism is that theory or doctrine of religion which views the entire universe as a unit, the creation of emanation of one, single, and therefore, God.

“The implications of universalism are far-reaching. It denies absolutely the existence of gods or of supernatural beings or powers other than God Himself. It affirms that He is universal in time as well as in space, eternal. A corollary [logical deduction] of this doctrine of the eternality [having no end] of God, the Creator, is that creation was not momentary, merely at the beginning of existence, but continuous, that accordingly God controls or governs the universe, that divine purpose animates existence and fixes a definite goal for nations and individuals, live, more or less consciously, in accordance with divine purpose, either fulfilling it, and so realizing their destiny, or frustrating it, and so living contrary to God’s will for them. A further corollary of the doctrine of universalism is the unity of mankind, that nations and individuals have relationship with each other, a duty to or a purpose for each other: that all men are children of the universal Creator or Father, are therefore brothers, that mankind therefore constitutes one vast universal family; and that accordingly the duty of man, in fulfillment of eternal, divine purpose, is eventually to achieve this universal family unity, this brotherhood of individuals and nations. This will result in the cessation of all warfare and strife, hatred and competition, injustice and oppression, and the establishment of universal and eternal peace, justice, truth and love. The attainment of this goal by men is God’s universal purpose for His creatures. History is but the record of man’s way of living and of his attempt, or failure to attempt, to achieve this destined goal. In this sense the universal God, eternal in time, is the God of History. All this is implicit in the concept or doctrine of universalism.”

Does any of this sound desirable to you? Is this the kind of world you want for your children? Does this sound like the Kingdom for which our Redeemer died? I don’t know whether you realize it or not, but you have just received a sermon from Satan himself. Look at all the “benefits” he is offering you, at least for a price: (1) a divine purpose for all living men, (2) all nations and men living and fulfilling a divine purpose, (3) discovering God’s will for them, (4) a relationship with all nations and individuals, (5) everyone living for a divine purpose to all men, (6) having only one divine Father or Creator [Lucifer], (7) all men being brothers in a universal family, (8) a divine purpose to

achieve brotherhood, (9) a cessation of warfare, (10) a cessation of strife, (11) a cessation of hatred, (12) a cessation of competition, (13) a cessation of injustice, (14) a cessation of oppression, (15) the establishment of eternal peace, (16) the establishment of justice, (17) the establishment of truth, (18) the establishment of worldly brotherly love. In other words, one giant mass of impure, mongrelized, bastard flesh. All these tenets of universalism amount to a complete surrender to a Luciferian world with the seed of the serpent winning over the seed of the woman.

This is the same brand of “universalism” being taught by the likes of Stephen E. Jones and Jory S. Brooks. And, Dave Barley, among others, who are perilously tailgating close behind them. [End of citation from my *The Lie Of Universalism*, #1.]

William Finck, after reading a copy of Dave Barley’s August/ September 2003 newsletter, was compelled, out of his Biblical responsibility, to write Mr. Barley, as Scripture instructs. Mr. Barley has since claimed that he never received such a letter, which is very doubtful. Mr. Barley, upon receiving the letter and reading a few lines, probably pitched it in the nearest trash can, thinking, no doubt, he would never again hear from William. Elsewhere we have published William (Bill) Finck’s original letter to Mr. Barley, and also Dave Barley’s reply which was in his January/February, 12 page newsletter, entirely devoted to rebutting Bill’s original letter to him. I had scanned Mr. Barley’s January/February issue, and the contents were produced immediately after Bill’s initial letter to Barley. Following Barley’s very inept “response” to Bill’s letter (who Barley addresses as Mr. Smith), Bill’s very comprehensive reply to Barley’s January/February news letter was presented in its entirety.

Barley stated in part: “What is the issue? Well, believe it or not, the issue is over whether or not an Arab, a non-Israelite can be a Christian, but in reality, it is more than that. It is about the **Everlasting Power** of the accomplished work of Christ upon the Cross.” In Barley’s response to Finck (in order to somehow support his position on universalism), Barley cited Gal. 6:14 which states:

“But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world^{G2889} is crucified unto me, and I unto the world^{G2889}.”

It should be pointed out here that Barley has made an appalling miscalculation in the Greek language, believing that the translated English “world” includes all races of people, including arabs. *Strong’s Greek* describes “kosmos” thusly:

“2889 ... kōsmōs, kos’mos; probably from the base of 2865; orderly arrangement, i.e. decoration; by implication the world (in a wide or narrow sense including its inhabitants, literally or figuratively [morally]):—”

Therefore, the Adamic people are the only race who came into existence in an “orderly arrangement”. All the other nonwhite peoples came into existence through the chaos of miscegenation (racemixing), especially the arabs, whom Barley mollycoddles!

THE WORD “ARAB” IN SCRIPTURE:

The term “arab” in the *Strong’s Concordance* is #'s 6154 and 6151. *Strong’s* defines #6154 as:

“6154 ... ‘ēreb, ay’-reb; or ... ‘ereb (1 Kings 10:15), (with the article prefix), eh’-reb; from 6148; the web (or transverse threads of cloth); also a mixture, (or mongrel race):— Arabia, mingled people, mixed (multitude), woof.”

“**6151** ... ‘**arab** (Chald.), *ar-ab*’; corresponding to 6148; to *commingle*:– mingle (self), mix.”

The root of this verb in *Strong’s* is #6150, and is defined:

“**6150** ... ‘**ârab**, *aw-rab*’; a primitive root [rather identical with 6148 through the idea of *covering* with texture]: to *grow dusky* at sundown:– be darkened, (toward) evening.”

Dave Barley, would you please explain how the arab people are an “orderly *arrangement*”? Inasmuch as the arabs are a mixed race people, their genetics are all scrambled together with several other nonwhite tribes, and thus at war with these other genetic mixtures within themselves. Dave Barley, why do you insist upon fostering an arab-of-the-month club to come to your church, and allow that misfit to stand behind your pulpit? A “misfit” is “a person poorly adjusted to his environment”, and that is exactly what an arab amounts to! Inasmuch as an arab is a mixture of several kinds, he is multiple-minded, or as Scripture states it, James 1:8: “**A double minded man is unstable in all his ways.**” Gen. 16:12: “**And he will be a wild man; his hand will be against every man, and every man’s hand against him....**” The Bible classifies the arabs as a “**hedge of thorns**” at Hos. 2:6!