

Keys to David's Throne



**By
Willie Martin**

Keys to David's Throne

By Willie Martin

IT SEEMS LIKE THERE IS ALWAYS SOMEONE OUT THERE ALWAYS TEACHING A DIFFERENT GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM. One such person is Garrison R. Russell in his book "Son Placing," where he says on page 290: "The Sons of God are not descendants of Abraham or Israel, or Adam." if you have this man's book, it is highly recommended you scrutinize very carefully every word he says. From what has been observed from his book thus far, it is filled with half-truths and downright lies.

As we have reported before Queen Elizabeth II's husband, Philip, was of questionable blood and how all the children from that union are unfit to take the Throne of David, which the British throne represents. It has been said: "...from the news I notice the queen-mother of England is dead. I'm fully persuaded Elizabeth II is the last pure-blooded descendant of David left to sit on the throne, while Philip Mountbatten and his heirs are of questionable blood presenting prophecy problems."

Then again in lesson #50 I reiterated: "in the last lesson, I briefly mentioned that the queen-mother of Britain had died. I believe that this is a major mile-marker in time as to where we are today on Yahweh's time-clock. I would remind you that Scripture says in no uncertain terms that there would always be a descendant of David on a throne somewhere until Messiah's Second Advent. Conceivably, this could mean; if the present Queen Elizabeth II were to have a heart attack and die, and our Redeemer has not returned, the promise to David is a lie and our bible is untrustworthy.

I also pointed out that Queen Elizabeth II's husband was of questionable blood, and because Elizabeth had taken an unsuitable mate, thus violating Yahweh's Law of kind after kind, her children by that marriage are unfit to take the throne." (I.e., Shuha vs. Tamar, Genesis 38) Some are of the opinion that if the Queen were to suddenly die, the throne could be

transferred to another branch of the family. That would be the usual process, but those who make that statement don't take into account there were only be three "overturns," Ezekiel 21:27, and all three have already happened (i.e., Jerusalem to Ireland, to Scotland, to England). Queen Elizabeth II undoubtedly represents the last surviving pure-blooded heir to the throne on behalf of the third "overturn." Let's now document why the tainted-blood offspring of Elizabeth by Philip, are unqualified to take that throne.

Philip was of the line of Battenberg until the name was changed to Mountbatten. Quoting from two encyclopaedias on the background of the Battenberg side of Philip's lineage:

The Encyclopaedia Britannica (1963), volume 3, page 281:

"Battenberg, the name of a family of German counts, which died out about 1314, whose seat was the castle of Kellerburg, near Battenerg, in Hesse. The title was revived in 1851, when Alexander (1823-1888), a younger son of Louis II, grand duke of Hesse, contracted a morganatic marriage with the Polish lady, Countess Julia Theresa von Hauke (1825-1895), who was the created countess of Battenberg. In 1858 the countess and her children were raised to the rank of princes and Princesses of Battenberg, with the title of Durchlaucht, or serene highness.

"In 1917 the eldest son of this union, Louis Alexander (1854-1921), who had become an admiral in the British navy, was created Marques of Milford Haven—and, at the request of King George V, the members of the family who lived in England renounced, in 1917, the German title of prince of Battenberg and adopted the surname of Mountbatten. The second son, Alexander Joseph (1857-1893), was elected Prince Alexander I or Bulgaria in 1879—Henry Maurice, the third son, married on July 23, 1885, Beatrice, youngest daughter of Victoria, queen of England, became a naturalized Englishman and was appointed governor of Casrisbrooke. He died at sea on January 20, 1896, of a fever contracted on active service with the British troops during the Ashanti War. The fourth son, Francis Joseph (1861-1924), married in 1897 Anna, daughter of Nicholas I, prince

of Montenegro, and was the author of *Die volkswirtschaftliche Entwicklung Bulgariens von 1879 bis zur Gegenwart* (1891).

“The only daughter of the princess of Battenberg, Marie Caroline (1852-1923), married in 1871 Gustavus Ernest, prince of Erbach-Schöberg. Princess Alice of Battenberg (born 1885), daughter of Prince Louis Alexander, and Victoria Eugénie (Princess Ena of Battenberg; b. 1887), only daughter of Prince Henry Maurice, were both married before 1917, the former to Prince Andrew of Greece and the latter to Alphonso XIII, king of Spain. Prince Henry's youngest son, Maurice o Battenberg, was killed in action near Ypres on October 27, 1914...”

For another witness from the Encyclopaedia Americana (1991), volume 3, page 356: “Battenberg—is a title of nobility taken from the name of a village near Marburg, West Germany. A family of counts held the title until it died out in 1314. In 1852, upon the morganatic marriage of Prince Alexander of Hesse-Darmstadt to Julia Teresa, countess von Hauke, the latter received the title of countess of Battenberg. The countess and her children were raised to the rank of princes and princesses in 1858. Their descendants retain the title until World War I, when those living in England Anglicized it to Mountbatten.”

Now Let's Examine the Evidence

It seems that we have a castle by the name of Kellerburg, near a town called Battenberg in an area known as Hesse in Germany. It also appears that there was a family of German counts that lived there until they all died out in 1314. That area seems to have been settled mostly by Kelts in early times. Did the family physically die out, or did the succession of royal authority die out? It makes a lot of difference.

Be that as it may, it also appears that this heir apparent, Alexander, married a Polish lady. Again, one must ask the question, what kind of ladies might one find in Poland at that time (actually Warsaw)? Then, we are told there was a “morganatic marriage” arranged between this Polish lady named Julia Theresa von Hauke and Alexander. Interestingly, we have another morganatic marriage to compare with that of Alexander to Julia Theresa

von Hauke. The party was Constantine Pavlovick (1779-1831) grand-duke and cesarevitch of Russia, born to Paul Petrovich and Mary Feodorovna. His grandmother, Empress Catherine II, arranged for his marriage to Juliana of Coburg, which failed miserably. Later, he fell in love with a Polish lady, Johanna Grudzinska, and signed a paper resigning all claim of succession to the throne. Question: Why wasn't Alexander required to sign a similar paper? Or did he?

Let's investigate what is meant by a "morganatic marriage." From The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language (1969), we read this: "Morganatic .—adj. Of or pertaining to a type of legal marriage between a man or a woman of royal or noble birth and a partner of lower rank, in which agreement is made that any titles or estates of the royal or noble partner will not be shared by the commoner or by any of the offspring. (New Latin *morganaticus*, from Medieval Latin *matrimonium ad morganaticam*, 'marriage for (no dowry but) the morning-gift' (i.e., the husband's token gift to the wife on the morning after the wedding night), from Old High German *organ*, morning.."

Elizabeth II and Philip Mountbatten have same Great-Great-Grandmother. The marriage of Philip Mountbatten to Elizabeth II was a tragedy of the utmost magnitude, and is only part of the story. While they both had a great-great-grandmother in common the bad blood came through Louis Battenberg, and in turn through Julia Theresa von Hauke, not Victoria. Julie Theresa von Hauke (the Polish lady's) father's name was Maurice von Hauke who had married Sophia of Lafontaine. Alexander Louis George Frederick Emil contracted a "morganatic" marriage to Julie Theresa von Hauke and had the following children:

- (1) Mary Battenberg;**
- (2) Louis Alexander Mountbatten,**
- (3) Alexander Joseph Battenberg;**
- (4) Henry Maurice Battenberg, and,**

(5) Francis Joseph Battenberg.

The bad blood followed down from Julie Theresa von Hauke to her son Louis Alexander Mountbatten, to his daughter Victoria Alice of Battenberg, to her son Philip Mountbatten (Queen Elizabeth II's husband), to his son Charles, Prince of Wales (whose very tell tale appearance defies all reasonable doubt of a "Jewish" bloodline connection). Here is what the book *Kings & Queens Of England* by David Willamson says on page 121:

“Not long after the royal family's return to England, the princess's engagement to Lieutenant Philip Mountbatten, RN., was announced. He was born in Corfu on 10 June 1921, and like her was the great-great-grandchild of Queen Victoria, being the only son of Prince Andrew of Greece and Denmark and his wife, Princess Alice of Battenberg.”

Because this may be somewhat confusing, we will show you that alleged bad bloodline from a different perspective:

- * Julia Theresa von Hauke
- * Louis Alexander Mountbatten
- * Victoria Alice of Battenberg
- * Philip Mountbatten
- * Charles, Prince of Wales

Thus, we will repeat what was said before: The present Queen Elizabeth II is the last pure-blooded Israelite of the Tribe of Judah, of the House of David, to sit on David's throne, and she has no legitimate heirs to take her place. We challenge anyone to prove otherwise without an additional "overturn."

From the book *Mountbatten* by Philip Ziegler, ©1985, pages 21-22: "Prince Alexander of Hesse, Mountbatten's grandfather, was the third son of Grand Duke Louis II and godson to the Tsar of Russia. When his sister married the Tsarevich, the future Tsar Alexander II, it seemed both sensible and in keeping with the national tradition that Alexander of Hesse should take service in the Russian Army. He achieved distinction, and had

a regiment of the Lancers named after him and was awarded the Cross of St. George. The Tsar intended him as a husband for his niece and his future in Russia promised to be secure and prosperous. For Alexander, however, at this stage of his life at least, security and prosperity did not count for much.

He fell in love with Julie Hauke, one of his sister's ladies-in-waiting, a Polish girl who, if hardly a nonentity (nobody), was not from a family sufficiently grandiose to justify so princely a match. The Tsar indignantly forbade the marriage. Alexander went to England to forget, remembered, returned to St. Petersburg and in 1851 eloped with Julie to Warsaw and thence to Breslau where he married her.

“This impetuous escapade effectively exiled him from Russia. It did little to improve his standing in his native Hesse. His elder brother, now Grand Duke Louis II, was almost as outraged as the Tsar, but felt that he could hardly let Alexander starve. An uneasy settlement was reached. Alexander was allowed to retain his status as a royal prince of Hesse; the defunct title of Battenberg; a pleasant town in the north of the Grand Duchy, and the quality of countess was conferred to his wife; any children of the marriage, through without claim to the throne of Hesse, would at least be of the same rank as their mother.

Even this qualified disgrace did not last long. In Serene Highness and four years later the couple returned to Darmstadt. A new house had been born; royal, after a fashion, but bearing about it a faint aura of wildness and irregularity—There had always been much to-ing and fro-ing between the courts of Great Britain and of Hesse, and this was intensified after the marriage in 1862 of the future Grand duke Louis IV to Queen Victoria's daughter Alice.”

From this, we can clearly see that indeed all heirs of Julie Hauke were disqualified as royal members entitled to the throne. The Almighty's promise to David was a seedline promise. Therefore, take away the element of seedline, and we have nothing. The only way we have access to the Kingdom is through the seedline Promise to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob/Israel. If one cannot claim that kinsman seedline Promise, there is

no Redemption in Messiah's blood. As Hebrews 12:8 says, we are either "sons" or we are "bastards."

The Key of David

It is absolutely impossible to comprehend Yahweh's promise to David, that he would never lack a man to sit on the throne, unless we understand "the key of David," (1 Kings 8:2; 2 chronicles 6:16; Psalm 132:11-12). Because Zedekiah was the last Biblically recorded descendant of David to sit on that throne at Jerusalem, it would appear the Almighty reneged on that promise. Mr. H. Graber (who uses the title of Dr.) In his book *How Holy Is Your Bible?* Pages 180-181, says the throne of David is no longer "physical" but is now a "spiritual throne." He summed it up this ways: "So since Jehoiakin, the kingship, the 'everlasting throne of David' has been and is SPIRITUAL! (Until the second advent!)" He then quotes several passages out of context in an attempt to prove his point. Had Graber had any understanding of the "key of David" he could not have made such an irrational conclusion.

Before discussing "the key of David," let's read the passage where it is first found in Isaiah 22:15-25:

"Thus saith Yahweh El of hosts, Go, get thee unto this treasurer, even unto Shebna, which is over the house, and say, What hast thou here? And whom hast thou here, that thou hast hewed thee out a sepulchre here, as he that heweth him out a sepulchre on high, and graveth an habitation for himself in a rock? Behold Yahweh will carry thee away with a mighty captivity, and will surely cover thee. He will surely violently turn and toss thee like a ball into a large country; there shall thou die, and there the chariots of thy glory shall be the shame of thy lord's house.

And I will drive thee from thy station, and from thy state shall he pull thee down. And it shall come to pass in that day, that I will call my servant Eliakim the son of Hilkiyah: And I will loth him with thy robe, and strengthen him with thy girdle, and I will commit thy government into his hand: and he shall be a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and to the house of Judah. And the key of the house of David will I lay upon his

shoulder; so he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open. And I will fasten him as a nail in a sure place; and he shall be for a glorious throne to his father's house. And they shall hang upon him all the glory of his father's house, the offspring and the issue, all vessels of small quantity, from the vessels of cups, even to all the vessels of small quantity, from the vessels of cups, even to all the vessels of flagon. In that day, saith Yahweh of hosts, shall the nail that is fastened in the sure place be removed, and be cut down, and fall; and the burden that was upon it shall be cut off: for Yahweh hath spoken it."

Immediately, we must clear up a misconception may make concerning this passage, as they apply this directly to our Messiah. Yes, it does apply to our Saviour, but we need to keep it in its proper context, as the key of David (nail) of verse 25 is to be "removed"... "cut down"...and "fall." That is hardly a picture of our risen victorious Redeemer! Thus, it is vital we discover the identity of the "the nail that is fastened in a sure place." Essentially, this passage is making a contrast of two men diametrically opposite each other. Their names are Shebna and Eliakim. One is like a rolling ball, the other like a very secure peg (or nail). In other words, one is very unreliable, and the other very dependable. Once grasping the extreme differences in character represented here, we can begin to comprehend what is being said. For a commentary on this Scripture, we will now quote from The Book of Isaiah by Sir George Adam Smith, vol. 1, pages 330-332:

"...If there is any reason, it can only be this, for putting the second section of chapter xxii, which advocates a change of ministry in the city (vv. 15-22), so close to the first, which sees ahead nothing but destruction of the State (vv. 1-14).

"The mayor of the palace at this time was one Shebna, also called minister or deputy (lit. of use to the king). That his father is not named implies perhaps that Shebna was a foreigner...and he has been plausibly supposed to be the leader of the party then in power, whose policy was the Egyptian alliance, and whom in these latter years Isaiah had so frequently denounced as the root of Judah's bitterness. To that unfamilied intruder, who had sought to establish himself in Jerusalem, after the manner of those days,

by hewing himself a great sepulchre, Isaiah brought sentence of violent banishment: Behold, Yahweh will be hurling, hurling thee away, thou big man, and crumpling, crumpling thee together. He will roll, roll, thee on, thou rolling-stone, like a ball thrown out on broad level ground; there shalt thou die, and there shall be the chariots of thy glory, show shame of the house of thy lord. And I trust thee from they post, and from they station pull thee down (18f). This vagabond was not to die in his bed, nor to be gathered in his big tomb to the people on whom he had fostered himself. He should continue a rolling-stone. For him, like Cain, there was a land of Nod (land of wandering); and upon it he was to find a vagabond's death." (I would say that George Adam Smith is right on the money! From this we can see the characteristics of Shebna. Continuing, we will observe those of Eliakim:

"To fill this upstart's place, Isaiah solemnly designated a man with a father: Eliakim, the son of Hilkiyah. The formulas he uses are perhaps the official ones customary upon indication to an office. But it may be also, that Isaiah has woven into these expressions of even greater promise than usual. For this change of office-bearers was critical, and the overthrow of the 'party of action' meant to Isaiah the beginning of the blessed future. And it shall come to pass in that day that I will call My servant Eliakim, the son of Hilkiyah; and I will clothe him with thy robe, and with thy girdle will I brace him, and thine authority will I give into his hand, and he shall be for a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and to the house of Judah. And I will set the **KEY OF THE HOUSE OF DAVID UPON HIS SHOULDER**; and he shall open, and none shut: and he shall shut, and none open. And I will hammer him in a peg in a firm place, and he shall be for a throne of glory to his father's house. (Isaiah 22:20-23) Thus, to the last, Isaiah will not allow Shebna to forget that he (like Cain) is without root among the people of god, that he was neither father nor family.

"...This very year we find Eliakim in Shebna's post, and Shebna reduced to be secretary.—Catching at the figure, with which his designation of Eliakim closed, that Eliakim would be a peg in a solid wall, a throne on which the glory of his father's house might settle, Isaiah reminds the much-encumbered statesman that the firmest peg will give way if you hang too much on it, the strongest man be pulled down by his dependent

and indolent family. They shall hang upon him all the weight of his father's house, the scions and the offspring—all the least vessels, from the vessels of cups to all the vessels of flagon. In that day, rede (counsel, advise) of Yahweh of Hosts, shall the peg that was knocked into a firm place give way, and it shall be knocked out and fall, and down shall be cut the burden that was upon it, for Yahweh hath spoken.

“So we have not one, but a couple of tragedies. Eliakim, the son of Hilkiyah, follows Shebna, the son of Nobody. The fate of the overburdened peg is as grievous as that of the rolling stone. It is easy to pass this prophecy over as a trivial incident; but when we have carefully analysed each verse, restored to the words their exact shade of signification, and set them in their proper contrasts, we perceive the outlines of two social dramas, which it requires little imagination to invest with engrossing moral interest.”

We should definitely take much interest in what is being said here. Curiously, the author was supporting Two Seedline doctrine without being aware of it. Inasmuch as the Bible teaches Two Seedline form beginning to end, it would be difficult for anyone to avoid, yet some try. It is noteworthy that Shebna was unable to show his family line. We shouldn't be surprised as this as nowhere in the chronicles is it recorded who Cain's father was. Of one thing we can be quite sure, nowhere in all Scripture is Adam recorded as Cain's father. We are also told that Shebna was like “a ball” or “rolling stone.” Isn't it amazing that we had a so-called musical group during the hippie revolution by that very same name. That George Adam Smith makes a comparison between Shebna and Cain is simply outstanding. Surely, a better comparison couldn't be made of a “vagabond” to a “ball” or “rolling stone.” It should be noted also that Shebna was a man of pride which is a common trait among the descendants of Cain.

On the contrary, we see that Eliakim was the very anti-type of Shebna. He knew who his father was. Eliakim, rather than being a rolling-stone was a man of stability; one who could be counted on in time of trouble. Additionally, Eliakim was humble man without self-glorifying pride. In short, these two men were 1800 opposite in nature in every respect. These men were not kings in themselves, but were given the power of the king's office. One of their responsibilities was to keep track of David's genealogy

to make certain it was kept pure. Because Isaiah 22:24 speaks of David's "offspring" in close relation to "vessels;" no doubt the term "vessels" is referring to David's descendants. Often people are likened to "vessels," (2 Corinthians 4:7)

Prophecy Concerning David's Key

Now that we understand that the words "peg" and "nail" are other words for "key," let's consider the prophecy found in Isaiah 22:25:

"In that day, saith Yahweh of hosts, shall the nail that is fastened in the sure place be removed, and be cut down, and fall; and the burden that was upon it shall be cut off: for Yahweh hath spoken it."

It should be immediately evident that this verse is not speaking of Messiah, although we are told (in Revelation 3:7) that He possesses that "key." Rather, verse 25 is speaking of Eliakim, the chief steward of the king. The next question we must ask is: Where is the "sure place" the "nail" was to be fastened? There are two periods in history which simply don't fit the criteria. They are the periods from David as king to Zedekiah, and from the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple until the time of our Redeemer. The only other "sure place" would be the British throne from Jeremiah until the present time. Is there, then, any place in history that threatens to weaken the stability of that "nail" that it might be "cut off?"

Yes there is, and it's as plain as the nose on a "Jew's" face. To fit those criteria, the situation must return to a king's advisor similar to Shebna, a "rolling-stone" descendant of Cain. By this yardstick, it can only be Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield, sometimes called "Dizzy." Benjamin was born in 1804 and died in 1881. He lived during the reign of Queen Victoria, born 1819, death 1901. She took the throne June 28, 1838. She married her first cousin, Prince Albert of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, 10 February, 1840. Upon the death of Prince Albert 14 December, 1861, at the age of 42, the serpent in the form of Benjamin Disraeli moved in. We cannot fully grasp the manoeuvring that was developing at that time unless we understand Disraeli's background. For that, we will give you

and abridged paraphrase from the book "Disraeli" by André Maurois: In the year 1290, on All Saints' Day, King Edward I expelled the "Jews" from England. It was the time of the Crusades, and the monks were crying, 'get rid of the infidels.' those "Jews" who survived that onslaught took asylum in France. There in 1306, King Philip the Fair being pressed for money, confiscated their belongings and thrust them towards Spain. Upon the persecutions in Spain, they moved to Venice and Amsterdam, and back to France once more. After much confusion under Cromwell and the Puritans, at the close of the 17th century, a small community of Portuguese and Spanish Jews was re-established in London. Among these returnees was the Disraeli family. Benjamin's father, Isaac, spent most of his time at libraries and the British Museum.

Upon the advice of Sharon Turner, the great Anglo-Saxon historian, Isaac, and his family were "converted to Christianity," and "baptized." After problems with his schoolmates, Benjamin, at the age of 15, returned home to utilize his father's library, reading a wide variety of subjects. Vigorously, he read details on the secret societies; the Vehmgerichte, the Council of Ten, and the Jesuits, reading and rereading the life of St. Ignatius Loyola. Following a boring attempt at law practice, he reverted to writing and travelling, after which he entered politics, which his "baptism" helped to facilitate.

Upon the death of Queen Victoria's husband, Prince Albert, Disraeli immediately bombarded her with a barrage of flattering letters to which she responded enthusiastically, and that relationship continued to Disraeli's death. Therefore, in essence Disraeli (counterpart of Shebna) became the Queen's chief steward. From the book "Disraeli" by André Maurois, pages 288 and 290:

"...Downstairs he would come, and she would receive him with such delight that for an instant he thought she was going to embrace him. So full of smiles was she that she looked younger, and almost pretty. She twittered and glided about the room like a bird. She was happy. She had recovered her Minister, the only Minister who gave her confidence in herself. For the Queen had had a difficult life. She had been unpopular, very unpopular. She had seen people in London turn their backs on her

carriage in the streets. First it was because of Lord Melbourne; and then it had been poor Albert, whom the public would not pardon for being a German; and then the Queen had been reproached for her mourning, and not one of her Ministers had defended her...

“Sometimes when they were alone, the Minister’s compliments became flowery and almost direct. But the Queen excused him when she recalled that he had Eastern blood. The Queen loved the East. She delighted to have (him)...standing behind her chair, and at the head of her Realms this ingenious and sentimental Grand Vizier.

“She invited him everywhere. She asked him to come and see her at Balmoral, where life was simpler and more free. Unfortunately, the guest was often ill. The long journeys fatigued him. The Queen sent her physician, the famous Sir William Jenner, to Mr. Disraeli’s sick-room. Sir William insisted on the Premier keeping his bed. In the morning the Queen came to see him. ‘What do you think,’ he wrote Lady Chesterfield, ‘of receiving your Sovereign in slippers and a dressing-gown?’ Seeing him so weak, she became maternal. Their relations became entirely human. She talked to him of Albert; he told her of Mary Anne. Minister and Sovereign had both found happiness in marriage, in the past, and here was one more bond between them.”

A few years ago, the Christian Vanguard of Metairie, Louisiana, published an article showing that Disraeli had gotten to Queen Victoria and convinced her that the Anglo-Saxons and the “Jews” were the same people, and that they were permitted to intermarry. I sure wish I still had that issue. Inasmuch as Sharon Turner was a personal friend to the Disraeli family, it makes sense. The Israel Identity Message, through the efforts of John Wilson and Edward Hine, became very popular during that period. Therefore, the Christian Vanguard article is very plausible. Interestingly, Wilson and Hine were also unaware that today’s “Jews” are not Israelites. The Demise of The Throne As We Know It.

In 1948 there was something significant that happened in England which was a catastrophic tragedy of the greatest magnitude. And, once that appalling disaster manifested itself, it could never be corrected, for there

simply is no remedy once such a thing takes place. On November 14, 1948, Charles Philip Arthur George (a “Jew;” a descendant of Cain) was born to Queen Elizabeth II by her non-Royal husband, Philip Mountbatten. By that birth, the “nail” of Isaiah 22:25 was “removed,” “cut down” and there was a great “fall.” It marked the end of David’s Monarchy on that Throne until the rightful “Shiloh” comes. Absolutely none of Philip Mountbatten’s issue are Biblically, lawfully qualified to be crowned to that dignity. The day Charles was born brought death to that Great Royal line of kings. With the advent of Julia Theresa von Hulke, the “seed of the serpent” of Genesis 3:15 entered that Royal line. Additionally, it should be noted that Julia Theresa von Hauke’s shield has no Israelite symbols as do other royal members. Hers’ is what appears to be a cartwheel on a red background; indeed, a befitting emblem for a “rolling-stone” upon Satan’s colour, RED!

Probing More on David’s Key

We will now continue probing more commentary on “the key of David” from Isaiah 22:22-23. For this, we will first use Adam Clarke’s Commentary on the Bible, abridged by Ralph Earle, pages 581-582:

“And the ‘key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder.’ As the robe and the baldric, mention in the preceding verse, were the ensigns of power and authority, so likewise was the key the mark of office, either sacred or civil. This mark of office was likewise among the Greeks, as here in Isaiah, borne on the shoulder. In allusion to the image of the key as the ensign of power, the unlimited extent of that power is expressed with great clearness as well as force by the sole and exclusive authority to open and shut.

Our Saviour, therefore, has upon a similar occasion made use of a like manner of expression, Matthew 16:19 and in Revelation 3:7 has applied to himself the very words of the prophet. A ‘nail.’ In ancient times and in the Eastern countries the houses were much more simple than ours at present. They had not that quantity and variety of furniture, nor those accommodations of all sorts, with which we abound. It was convenient and even necessary for them, and it made an essential part in the building

of a house, to furnish the inside of the several apartments with sets of spikes, nails, or large pegs, upon which to dispose of and hang up the several movables and utensils in common use. These spikes they worked into the walls at the first erection of them, the walls being of such materials that they could not bear their being driven in afterwards; and they were contrived so as to strengthen the walls by binding the parts together, as well as to serve for convince—upon pins worked into the walls on purpose, as above mentioned, Eliakim is considered as a principal stake of this sort, immovably fastened in the wall for the support of all vessels destined for common or sacred uses; that is, as the principal support of the whole civil and ecclesiastical polity. And the consequence of his continued power will be promotion and flourishing condition of his family and dependents, from the highest to the lowest.”

Amazingly, very few have addressed the subject of “the key of David;” including Identity teachers for the most part. Of all the Identity Teachers, one would think that Howard B. Rand would have presented something on it, as he wrote much concerning the importance of the House of David. However, when checking his Index of Scriptural Texts, he skips over Isaiah 22 consistently. Therefore, the references which we are quoting are quite rare. The following material on this passage is from the Commentary On The Whole Bible by Jamieson, Fausset & Brown, page 536:

“**KEY:** emblem of his office over the house to ‘open’ or ‘shut;’ access rested with him. Upon—shoulder; So keys are carried sometimes in the East hanging from the kerchief on the shoulder. But the phrase is rather figurative for sustaining the government on one’s shoulders—nail—sure place; Large nails or pegs stood in ancient houses on which were suspended the ornaments of the family.

The sense is: all that is valuable to the nation shall rest securely on him. In Ezra 9:8 ‘nail’ is used of the large spike driven into the ground to fasten the cords of the tent to. **THRONE;** resting place to his family, as applied to Messiah, the antitype (Luke 1:32, 33) Same image as in vs. 23. It was customary to ‘hang’ the valuables of the house on nails (1 Kings 10:16-17, 21; Song of Solomon 4:4) **OFFSPRING AND THE ISSUE;** rather, ‘the offshoots of the family, high and low’ (Vitranga). Eliakim would reflect

honour even on the latter. **VESSELS OF CUPS**; of small capacity: answering to the low and humble offshoots. **VESSELS OF FLAGONS**; larger vessels: answering to the high offshoots.”

We didn't finish this quotation, as they only pointed to Shebna as the one to be “cut down.” If one will read Isaiah 22:15-25 very carefully, one will discover that both Shebna and Eliakim would ultimately fall; Shebna immediately and Eliakim “in that day.” When the phrase “in that day” is used, it is usually speaking far into the future. We cannot compare Eliakim entirely to Messiah, as after His return, He will never fall. Many commentators have problems with the term “sure place” in verse 25, as they seem to want to apply it to Yahshua rather than the British Throne. Since they are blind to Israel's identity, their misapplication is understandable. The Wycliffe Bible Commentary, page 625, explains Eliakim's dignity quite well:

“**THE KEY TO THE HOUSE OF DAVID** refers to the position of high trust and influence Eliakim was to enjoy as Hezekiah's prime minister (Hezekiah being of David's dynasty). His position would be as secure as that of a NAIL or large peg built into the wall of a house, and his glory and prosperity would be passed on to his family and descendants.”

From this we see that not only the House of David was to endure, but also the House of Eliakim although Eliakim's house would eventually, at some future time, fail. It would appear that Eliakim and his house may have endured for nearly 2500 years. That would be an intriguing thing to track down.

For another interesting comment concerning Shebna, a footnote on page 1045 from The King James Study Bible, published by Thomas Nelson, ©1988:

“(Isaiah) 22:15-25: Shebna is referred to as the **TREASURER** and apparently was the leader of the pro-Egyptian faction in Jerusalem. Thinking his position was secure, he had already ordered a large sepulchre (tomb) to be raised in his memory, instead, Isaiah predicts that he will soon be demoted and will eventually die a pauper in a foreign country.

Shebna was replaced by Eliakim during the reign of Hezekiah, as indicated in 2 Kings 18:18. **THE KEY OF THE HOUSE OF DAVID** refers to the responsibility of protecting the Davidic line.”

For an additional witness, we will use The International Bible Commentary, by F.F. Bruce, page 736:

“No doubt this action typified the man’s (Shebna’s) whole attitude in a self-centred heedlessness of the plight of his country and his fellow-citizens. Isaiah only mentions the tomb in order to emphasize how useless it will be; for God’s plan is that Shebna will die in exile, far from his chosen burial place. Before his death, he will suffer the indignity of demotion from the high post of being **IN CHARGE OF THE PALACE**, i.e., comptroller of the palace. “The vivid comparison of Shebna to a **BALL** (18) is matched by that of Eliakim (20), his successor, to a **PEG** (23) in a wall; Shebna can swiftly be uprooted, but Eliakim will be firmly established in the same office. The importance of the post is indicated, indeed, emphasized, by the description of its authority in v. 22 (a verse which provides the basis for Revelation 3:7).”

Opening and Shutting

Revelation 3:7 says: “And the angel of the church in Philadelphia write; These things saith he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key of David, he that openeth, and no man shutteth; and shutteth, and no man openeth.”

Of all the various Bible commentaries used, the Jamieson, Fausset & Brown Commentary On The Whole Bible has the best interpretation on both this verse and Matthew 16:19 concerning “the key of David.” Their adeptness in pointing out that after both Shebna and Eliakim have failed, then Yahshua the Messiah will supplant them at their position. Please not this as you carefully read their depiction, page 1538:

“**HE THAT HATH THE KEY OF DAVID:** the antitype of Eliakim, to whom the ‘key,’ the emblem of authority ‘over the house of David,’ was transferred from Shebna, who was removed from office of chamberlain

or treasurer, as unworthy of it. **CHRIST, THE HEIR OF THE THRONE OF DAVID SHALL SUPPLANT ALL THE LESS WORTHY STEWARDS** who have abused their trust in God' spiritual (actually physical) house and 'shall reign over the house of Jacob,' literal and spiritual (Luke 1:32-33), 'forever,' 'as Sons of His own house.' (Hebrews 3:2-6) It rests with Christ to open or shut the heavenly palace, deciding who is, and who is not, to be admitted: as He also opens, or shuts the prison, **HAVING THE KEYS OF HELL** (the grave) **AND DEATH** (ch. 1:18)... Through 'the synagogue of Satan' false 'Jews' (vs. 9) try to 'shut' the 'door' which I 'set open before thee;' 'no an can shut it.'"

This same commentary says this about Matthew 16:19, on page 931:

“AND I WILL GIVE UNTO THEE THE KEYS OF THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN; the kingdom of God about to be set up on earth; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt lose on earth shall be loosed in heaven, Whatever this means, it was soon expressly extended to all the apostles (ch. 18:18); so that the claim of supreme authority in the Church, made for Peter by the Church of Rome, and then arrogated to themselves by the popes as the 'legitimate successors of St. Peter,' is baseless and impudent. As first in confessing Christ, Peter got this commission before the rest; and with these 'keys' on the day of Pentecost, he first 'opened the door of faith' to the Jews (true Judeans), and then, in the person of Cornelius, he honoured to do the same to the Gentiles (Israelite nations). Hence, in the lists of the apostles, Peter is always first named. One thing is clear, that not in all the New Testament is there the vestige of any authority either claimed or exercised by Peter, or conclusive against the Romish claims in behalf of that apostle.”

Let me regress here a little and put before you a thought and see what you think. Now we know that David sat on the throne of the Lord for Yahweh said so in 1 Chronicles 29:23:

“Then Solomon sat on the throne of the LORD as king instead of David his father, and prospered; and all Israel obeyed him.”

So if Solomon sat on the throne of the Lord as king instead of David his father, then it must be that David also sat on the Throne of the Lord. Then we see in Jeremiah 3:17:

“At that time they shall call Jerusalem the throne of the LORD; and all the nations shall be gathered unto it, to the name of the LORD, to Jerusalem: neither shall they walk any more after the imagination of their evil heart.”

By this we know that the kingdom of God was here on earth at that time and had been since Moses received the law from Yahweh at Mount Sinai. Therefore, when Christ told Peter that anything that he loose on earth, that he would also be loosening it in heaven, because heaven was on earth. Christ was not speaking of the Heaven of Yahweh but was speaking of the kingdom of God on earth.

Door Slammed Shut on The False “Jews”

Messiah really locked the door tight, never to be opened for the impostor “Jews,” Matthew 21:43. We must point out that we are not speaking of the pure-blooded members of the Tribe of Judah, but the mongrel descendants of Cain and Esau along with other non-Israelite mixtures:

“Therefore I say unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.”

Additionally, our Saviour placed an everlasting curse on the proselytised, racially-mixed nation in Matthew 21:19:

“And when he saw a fig tree in the way, he came to it, and found nothing thereon, but leaves only, and said unto it, Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward for ever.”

Furthermore, while Jeremiah prophesied that the House of Israel would be reworked by the “potter” (Jeremiah 18:6), yet he proclaimed that Judah and Jerusalem would become a broken bottle, never to be made while again, Jeremiah 19:10-11:

“Then shalt thou break the bottle in the sight of the men that go with thee. And shalt say unto them, thus saith Yahweh of hosts; Even so will I break this people and this city, as one breaketh a potter's vessel, that cannot be made whole again...”

Thus, that present-day so-called nation of Israeli will never become a homeland for the Zionist “Jews.” When Yahweh breaks something, it stays broken. It's like Humpty Dumpty on the wall that had a great fall, and all the king's horses and all the king's men will never put that bad-fig cursed nation back together again. And all of those television fundamentalist Judeo-Christian preachers can proclaim the “Jews are God's chosen people,” and that the migration of those misfits back into Palestine is a fulfilment of bible prophecy, until they are blue in the face, and it's not going to change a thing! The Israelis have tanks costing several million dollars a copy on their side fighting against stone-throwing teenagers and boys, and yet the Israelis can't win, and they never will.

Messiah proclaimed this against those false “Jews,” Luke 19:27:

“But those mine enemies (the false jews), which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me.”

The reason today's Zionist “Jews” want Palestine and Jerusalem is another attempt, like Shebna, to usurp the throne and the “key of David.”

Door Opened Only to The True Israel Sheep

The false “Jews” are goats and the True Israelites are His sheep. The door has been slammed shut to the “Jews,” and opened wide to His True Israel Sheep. No other but the sheep need apply, as it is a closed corporation. Messiah told the false “Jews,” in John 10:26-27: “But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep, as I said unto you. My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me.”

In Matthew 15:24, our Savior stipulated the specific purpose of His Mission: **“But he answered and said, I AM NOT SENT BUT UNTO THE LOST SHEEP OF THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL.”**

In Amos 3:2, Yahweh proclaimed to Israel:

“You only have I know of all the families of the earth: therefore I will punish you for all you iniquities.”

Further, we are told in Deuteronomy 7:6:

“For thou art an holy (set apart) people into Yahweh thy El: Yahweh thy El hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth.”

After the Almighty divorced Israel, putting her away and punishing her, in the New Testament in 1 Peter 2:9 we read:

“But you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God’s own people, that you may declare the wonderful deeds of him who called you out of darkness into his marvellous light. Once you were no people but now you are God’s people; once you had not received mercy but now you have received mercy.” RSV

These passages should give us an idea to what doors “the key of David” open and shut. No matter how hard some prostitute Judeo-Christianity ministers, and misguided Judeo-Christians try to open the “door” of Israel’s Redemption to other races, they will fail in their effort.

The Interpreter’s Bible Almost Gets Revelation 3:7 Correct

Because this 12 volume work was put together by many contributors, occasionally someone among them was of considerable ability. Although not entirely accurate, the editor on Revelation 2:9; 3:9 did quite well in commenting on pages 394 & 383:

“The Jews, who are really not Jews (Judah, Judeans), are condemned again as **THE SYNAGOGUE** (assembly) **OF SATAN**, as in 2:9. For the author, the True Israel are the Christians, whom Paul considered the spiritual descendants of Abraham (Galatians 3:7), and not the Jews, a theme which

John develops throughout his book. This came to be a familiar feature of Christian apologetic. The anti-Semitism of this letter is more marked, if possible, than that of the letter to Smyrna, for John adds that Christ will make the **JEWS COME AND BOW DOWN (RSV)** or worship (KJV) at the feet of the Christians. In this context BOW DOWN is too weak a translation and WORSHIP too strong; 'do homage' (Moffatt) is better than either, but possibly 'prostrate themselves' is the best rendering here...In view of the competition between synagogue and church, coupled with the Christian's claim that they were the true Israel, it is not surprising, even though the Christians slandered them--Nor is it surprising...that Christians returned this hostility and developed a considerable amount of anti-Semitism so that the Jews of Smyrna are called **A SYNAGOGUE OF SATAN**. We are reminded of a similar attitude in words...attributed to Jesus, 'You are of you father the devil, and you will is to do your father's desires.' (John 8:44) For the author of Revelation there can be no salvation for these Jews who are on Satan's side in the conflict."

Had the commentator used both the words "physical" and "spiritual" descendants of Abraham, he would have been more correct. Also, concerning the idea of the Jews "bowing down" to us; it has never happened, and will probably come about only when they are exposed as counterfeit Israelites, just before they are slain and thrown into the fire. Genetically, all the "Jews" are on Satan's side.

Television News Flash

There was a special news segment on Fox News channel at 9:50 A.M., concerning a topic which they dubbed "Wonder Boy." It was a segment about a boy from Kazakhstan in Russia, a region in central Asia, NE of the Caspian Sea, west of China. Wonder Boy is an excellent exhibit of a throwback of certain men to the animal stage. In fact the doctor, which the commentator was interviewing called people like him "monkey men." Further, they used the term "genetic mutation" in describing him. Asked if he would grow out of this condition, the doctor indicated the condition would "persist" throughout adulthood. He mentioned using hair laser treatment to get rid of the excessive amount of hair. The doctor also mentioned there were other examples like him in Mexico; citing a father

and son in that category. The best description one could give of what was observed of "Wonder Boy" is that he appeared to be a cross between a Mongolian male and a chimpanzee ape, or possibly a capuchin monkey. We are told in the Testament of Reuben 2:18-19, in The Lost Books of The Bible and Forgotten Books of Eden, page 223:

"For thus they allured the Watchers who were before the flood; for as these continually beheld them, they lusted after them, and they conceived the act in their mind; for they changed themselves into the shape of men, and appeared to them when they were with their husbands. And the women lusting in their minds after their forms, gave birth to giants, for the Watchers appeared to them as reaching even unto heaven."

The Book of Enoch 7:1-2 says: "It happened after the sons of men had multiplied in those days, that daughters were born to them, elegant and beautiful. (Genesis 6:1-2) And when the angels, the sons of heaven, beheld them, they became enamoured of them, saying to each other: Come, let us select for ourselves wives from the progeny of men, and let us beget children."

In The Book of Jasher 4:18:"And their judges and rulers went to the daughters of men and took their wives by force from their husbands according to their choice, and the sons of men in those days took from the cattle of the earth, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the air, and taught the mixture of animals of one species with the other, in order therewith to provoke the Lord; and God saw the whole earth and it was corrupt, for all flesh had corrupted its ways upon earth, all men and all animals."

Enoch 68:5:"The name of the second is Kesabel, who pointed out evil counsel to the sons of the holy angels, and induced them to corrupt their bodies by generating mankind."

Jude 6 says: "And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he has reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." (Cross-referenced to 1 Enoch 53) The reason these verses were quoted is to show you, if an angel can change himself into the shape of men and procreate with Adamite women,

undoubtedly he could also change his shape into and ape or monkey and procreate with them. The passage from Jasher almost spells that out; especially the last phrase. Beware of Deception.

Again we repeat the warning concerning the book Son Placing, by Garrison R. Russell. This man's entire thesis is based on John 3:3. By establishing a faulty premise on that verse, he fabricates many erroneous conclusions. On pages 28-29 he says the following:

“The process of spiritual birth takes place in two steps. The first step is your physical, Adamic birth. After your physical conception, gestation, and birth, you become a son of Adam. After this first step, you must complete a second step. This second step is a spiritual birth. Verily, verily I say unto thee Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.”

How then does Russell sidestep Luke 3:38 which says: “...Adam, which was the son of God.” His false premise is, at birth, we are only sons of Adam. Surely, if Adam was the “son of God,” we being sons of Adam would make us “sons of Yahweh” also. What kind of hocus-Picus slight-of-hand is Russell trying to contrive here? With this inaccurate statement, one can begin to see that Garrison R. Russell hasn't the slightest clue what John 3:3 is all about. From this point on, his book goes from bad to worse. The word translated “again” (Strong's #509), in the KJV, should have been “above.” This is indisputable proof showing Russell never checked the Greek meanings. As Emmanuel was also “born from above” (John 3:31) when He was born in the flesh, it is not a “two step process.” In other words, there are some born from above (like we White People) and others who are born of the earth, “earthy” (like the “Jews” and the other races). That is what Yahshua meant when He told the impostor “Jews,” in John 8:23:

“Ye are from beneath; I am from above: ye are of this world; I am not of this world.”

And, if you're a pure-blooded Adamite, you are not of this world either.

Let's now take a look to see what Yahshua was really telling Nicodemus. The word "born," as used in John 3:3, is Strong's #1080. The Complete Word Study Dictionary New Testament, by Spiros Zodhiates, on #1040 says:

"...gennáo—from génos (#1080), generation, kind offspring. To beget as spoken of men; to bear as spoken of women; pass., to be begotten or be born." As we are directed to #1085, Zodhiates says: "...Génos; neut. Noun from...(#1096), to become—Offspring, posterity—Family, lineage, stock..."

One can also verify this with Strong's, but it is necessary to follow-through from #1080 to #1085. Therefore, the aim thrust of John 3:3 is: you must be born of the correct race; the heavenly White Race. If we are a descendant of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob/Israel, we are a "son/daughter" and under that Covenant. Russell entirely dismisses the Biblical fact of the Covenant and brushes it aside as meaning nothing.

Russell Claims Messiah Was Born Spiritually Dead

This is what he said on page 288:

"At the end of his gestation, Jesus Christ was ready for his spiritual birth. Spiritual birth involves the death of the physical body and the resurrection of the spirit...Jesus Christ accomplished this at Calvary's cross."

This is sheer blasphemy and tantamount to the congenital lying impostor "Jews."

Today it is quite well known that conception requires 46 chromosomes. As Mary could by nature supply on 23 chromosomes. The other 23 chromosomes for the conception of Emmanuel would of necessity have come from the Almighty. Further, every cell that developed making up this Man was divided half and half in that manner. By this criteria, every cell in Yahshua's body was half Yahweh el and half Adam man. Russell is implying that the half that belonged to Yahweh was "spiritually dead."

In other words, Russell, like the “Jews,” is proclaiming: “God is dead!” to deny that Yahshua was Yahweh in the flesh is “antichrist.” (1 John 4:3; 2 John 7) Russell claims unreservedly that when Messiah was born He was “spiritually dead,” and needed to be born of the Spirit, page 643:

“Jesus became the physical Son of god when he was born from Mary. But he did not become a ‘spiritually begotten’ Son until his resurrection.”

What is Russell going to do with John :14? That verse says:

“And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us...full of grace and truth.”

Thus, Russell, wittingly or unwittingly, makes himself a deceiving “antichrist.” It's your prerogative should you follow his teachings, but Galatians 1:9 says:

“As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.”

In prophecy, Russell teaches a “future” Millennium. On page 717, in a time chart, he has the attack of Gog and Magog on America a thousand years beyond our time, while we are now in immediate danger. The timing of that attack is revealed for us, for in Ezekiel 39:7 we read:

“So will I make my holy name known in the midst of my people Israel; and I will not let them pollute my holy name any more: and the heathen shall know that I am Yahweh, the Holy One in Israel.”

If the attack of Gog and Magog is a thousand years distant, then according to the context of this passage, so, too, is the Second Advent. Are we to believe our Saviour will not make Himself and Misname known until a thousand years after His Second Advent? If such a thing is true, how much more hell must we endure ahead of us. If we have to wait another thousand years, there won't be any White Israelite people left for Him to come back

to. Again, if such a scenario is correct, then we are going to have to put up with all these foreigners in our Israel-lands for another thousand years. We would highly recommend that Russell scrap his Son Placing book and find another field of endeavour! Reportedly, when, Russell was faced up with the **TWO SEEDS** of Genesis 3:15, he replied: “OH, WE’RE **BEYOND THAT!**”

Garrison R. Russell’s book Son Placing has a date of 1998; then, in 1999 he wrote another entitled The Book of Isaiah, continuing more of his convoluted disarray of Scripture. Russell’s doctrines have C.I. Scofield written all over them. He uses the same theory of dispensationalism as that of the futurists, dividing the time since Adam into six equal 1000 year periods. Had he checked the Patriarchal chronology in the Septuagint text (LXX), he would have found an additional 1469 years to account for, bringing us approximately to 1473 since Adam.

If Russell’s supposition is true, and the LXX chronology is correct, we are not already 473 years past such a Millennium. According to that theory, the Millennium should have started in 473 A.D., and ended 1473 A.D. In his book on Isaiah, he speaks of “the Coming of Christ: the Battle of Armageddon: The Millennium; and The Battle of Gog and Magog.” If Ezekiel 39:7 is correct, that Messiah is not going to reveal Himself until the battle of Gog and Magog, how does one squeeze 1000 years between those two events? It is very difficult to believe that we could live 1000 years with Him and He wouldn’t reveal to us His true name.

Additionally, that condemns us to have to contend with the heathen races for another 1000 years. If one observes the last 50 years of multiculturalism, how are we going to survive another 1000 years? Yet this is what Russell would like us to believe. We still contend the threat of Gog and Magog is now, not a thousand years from now! Most people believing in a future Millennium, when confronted with this fact, will usually retort: “Oh, it’s going to happen two times.” that position is also very difficult to confirm by Scripture, and insinuates the Almighty can’t do it right the first time. The Book of Enoch prophesied there would be people like this writing books; Enoch 104:7-9: “Now will I point out a mystery: Many sinners shall turn and transgress against the word of

uprightness. They shall speak evil things; they shall utter falsehood; create a great creation; and compose books in their own words. But when they shall write all my words correctly in their own languages. They shall neither change nor diminish them; but shall write them all correctly; all which from the first I have uttered concerning them?



Steven Books

**League Enterprises
Suite 3, 3rd. Floor
148 Cambridge Heath Road
London
E1 5QJ**

For books by identity authors –
Kenneth McKilliam, Ria Splinter
and Richard Porter plus many
other subjects and difficult to
obtain books.

<http://www.stevenbooks.co.uk/category/341/Religion>

Contact us for details of audio tapes and articles by:-

Dr. Wesley A. Swift

Rev. Dr. Bertrand Comparet

Rev. William Gale

Captain K. R. McKilliam

Pastor Don Campbell



**THE NEW CHRISTIAN CRUSADE
CHURCH**

CALLING THE PEOPLE OF BRITAIN

At last the bible makes sense!

At last we know its meaning.

Its the book of the RACE

