

THE SIXTH LAW

(Based on The sixth Law by H.V.B. Herrell that was banned in the USA).

By
Annelize Snyman.



THE SIXTH LAW

By
Annelize Snyman.

If anyone can refute the facts in this publication with counter-facts, we are prepared to cease distribution of THE SIXTH LAW immediately.

IN THE BEGINNING

IT IS SAID THAT THE TEN COMMANDMENTS are laws that are applied in every civilization, regardless of where this civilization is, or who initiated them.

When Moses received the Ten Commandments directly from God on Mount Sinai, the nation of Israel was isolated in the desert. No other nations were close by. Moses did not only receive the Ten Commandments from God, but also the Torah. He was on the mountain for forty days, and it doesn't take that long to write ten lines.

Why were these Ten Commandments so important to God that He personally came down to earth to give them to Moses? If they were just ordinary laws that were already being implemented and followed by other civilizations at that stage, then why did they specially have to be given to Moses?

Between the time when Adam and Eve were formed and the Israelites were in the desert, around 2000 years had passed. During that time God had made a covenant with Abraham, and he had appointed Jacob as the founding father of the nation that God had chosen for Himself.

To understand this idea of **God's Nation**, one must return to the time when the first two people were created.

In Gen. 1:26 we read for the first time that a being was created in the image of God. No others were created in His image. Thus it is understandable that God would select this special being for a special purpose or task.

In Verse 28 He commands this being, or *ADAM* to **subjugate** the earth and rule over it. Therefore God appointed this being to rule under His supervision. On the seventh day God created Eve, his mate. They are also ordered to multiply. All other species were to multiply within their own kind, so it is logical that God would have given Adam and Eve the same order.

In Gen. 2:7 we see a further differentiation between these Adamites and the rest of creation. *God formed Adam and breathed the breath of life into his nose. Thus the human became a living soul.* At that moment a soul was breathed into Adam and Eve with which they could eventually have inherited eternal life.

Because *ADAM* means *person/human*, it is clear that only humans could receive such a soul. It has not been given to any other group.

Every time God created things on the earth during the time of Creation, He created them according to their kind and saw that it was good.

If kinds are to be kept separate, there must be more than one place in the Bible where it is mentioned. We find the first reference of this in Genesis 1 with the creation. The next references are found in Genesis 6, 7 & 8 when Noah was preparing for the Flood. We read there

that God ordered the animals must be taken into the ark *according to their kind* and that they must be released *according to their kind*.

Mention is made in Leviticus 11 of clean and unclean animals, also according to their kind, regarding sacrifices. Leviticus 19 deals with laws and rules for the nation, among others that you may not mix the two kinds.

Leviticus 19:19 – *You shall keep my statutes. You shall not let your cattle breed with a different kind; you shall not sow your field with two kinds of seed; nor shall there come upon you a garment of cloth made of two different kinds of stuff.*

Deuteronomy 22:9 – *You shall not sow your vineyard with two kinds of seed, lest the whole yield be forfeited to the sanctuary.*

God's orders are very clear: Each according to its own kind.

This very important institution should then also be written into the laws of God. Why is there no visible order regarding this in the Bible?

The Ten Commandments are the core of God's Law. Therein are orders that remain for all time and eternity. The Law that is being placed under the microscope is the Sixth Commandment.

EARLY TRANSLATIONS

In this section we are discussing the means of translation and the errors that occurred in the process. Although sounding technical, nonetheless it is necessary to take note of the process through which the books of the Bible were translated. Without that knowledge one cannot determine whether it is correct or wrong.

Translators often deliberately made changes that have been in use for many years. When the Bible was initially translated into English, no dictionaries or lexicons were available at the time. Translators had to make use of their knowledge of their own language, as well as that of the Greek from which they translated. It wasn't always correct, but there was nobody that could tell them it was incorrect. However, with advancing knowledge, the truth can now be made known.

The verses of Exodus 20:14 and Romans 13:9 are translated in most versions of the Bible as: "*You may not commit adultery.*" The word *adultery* was created and is unique to Biblical language. In daily use the word is never used. In the **Greek Septuagint** the word is written as "*interbreed*" **The Anointed Translation of the New Testament** that boasts of containing the TRUE translation of the Ten Commandments, it is written: "*You may not interbreed.*"

The writings we are dealing with here are the **Greek Septuagint** and the **Latin Vulgate**. The first was used in the translation of the Bible shortly after the Gospels were written. The latter came into being centuries later in the Catholic Church and is used in the **New Afrikaans Translation** and which is causing much conflict.

To understand and translate this particular Commandment, we must look at the Greek word that has been translated into Afrikaans as "adultery."

Two words, "*ou moicheusels*" are used in the **Greek Septuagint**. In the **Latin Vulgate**, Exodus 20:14 is translated as "*non moechaberis*" and in Romans 13:9 as "*non adulterabis.*" The Latin word *moechaberis* is of little etymological importance, as it merely depends on the meaning of the Greek word *moicheuo*. *Moechaberis* is a transliteration of the word.

The Latin word mostly used to translate *moicheuo*, is *adulterabis*, a derivative of the Latin word *adultero*. Thus these two words that we must find the true meaning of to understand what the Sixth Commandment really means.

The **Theological Dictionary of the New Testament** gives the meaning of *moicheuo* as: the interbreeding of people and animals of different races. Infidelity within marriage is not mentioned and is also not used as a possible meaning.

Gerard Kittel, the editor of **Theological Dictionary**, was a well-known learned man in German and Greek and was highly praised by the intellectuals. He was someone who knew his languages and whose translations and linguistic skills were highly respected. Thus the definitions in his dictionary can be accepted as closely as possible to the real meaning.

In the old **Greek Septuagint** the Sixth Commandment therefore indicates as “You may not interbreed.” However, the **Latin Vulgate** differs, as therein the word “adultery” as we know it is preferred.

In the **Oxford Latin Dictionary** the meaning of the word *adultero* (with which *moicheuo* is translated) is given as: To mix substances with each other; *adulterate*; to spoil/damage the purity or strength, to corrupt or falsify.

If this meaning is applied to people, then we have to do with “interbreeding.” Our own dictionary (Afrikaans/English) defines the meaning of *unadulterated* (opposite of *adulterated*) as unfalsified, pure, clean. *Adulterate* is defined as falsified, mixing, swindling, false, hybridised. When the word *adulterer* is defined, it changes to *adulterer* – someone who breaks their marriage vows. Hence the basic meaning of the word is then changed or ignored here. It is with translations like these that the first translators must have found themselves foundering, possibly because of political considerations.

When someone tells *lies*, the noun becomes *liar*. They could have used any of the following definitions: swindler, mixer, forger, hybridiser. *Adulterer* is none of these.

The two verses under discussion refers to a deliberate order against inbreeding of the races. It is therefore the whole reason why Satan does not want the Bible to be taken literally. Sublimation suits him down to the ground.

Adultery is translated as being synonymous with breaking one’s marriage vows, but they don’t consider the two meanings well enough. *Adulterated* also means soiled. No translator worth his salt discards a word merely on the basis that he does not agree with the implications thereof. However, this is precisely what the Bible translators did.

THE MASORITE TEXT

From books written about the history of the Bible, it becomes clearly acceptable that the writings that were used by Jesus and His disciples are based on the **Greek Septuagint**, as the **Masorite Text** only appeared on scene some thousand years later around 1000??? AD. The Hebrew therein was edited, changed, and in some places completely rewritten by the Talmudic Jews. This is also where the idea originated that the Jews are the chosen people of God.

Today most Bible translations make use of the Masorite Text and do not follow the Septuagint where the two differ. The general attitude is that Christ and his simple disciples could not speak Greek, hence they could not have written the books of the Septuagint.

However, Christ also did not speak Hebrew - - He spoke Aramaic. So in reality one should translate the **Torah** and other Old Testament books from the original Aramaic. Unfortunately only the New Testament was written in Aramaic.

The spoken word in those days was Greek. The ordinary man in the street spoke Greek and not Hebrew or Aramaic.

Gerard Kittle said in the original German manuscript, **Theologisches Wurterbuch zum Neuen Testament**, the following in German: “auch von Vermisshung von Tier und Mensch oder von Mischung verschiedener Rassen.” (Also about the interbreeding of animal and human, or interbreeding of different races). Kittel refers here about the interbreeding of different races regarding the Sixth Commandment.

The first dictionaries appeared during the 15th and 16th centuries. It was also the time when the first English translations of the Bible brought the Word of God to the man in the street after the Renaissance. These translations were made from the **Latin Vulgate** that is considered by the Catholic Church to be the true Bible.

At that time the language of the intellectuals was Latin and the source of knowledge was mainly the corrupt Catholic Church. However, the Bible had to reach the man in the street and translators had to make use of their own knowledge, or available language and dictionary book sources. Dictionaries and Thesauruses did not contain English translations for Latin words, but solely explanations for Latin words in Latin. They were explanatory dictionaries and not meant for the use of translators. Hence there were no dictionaries available that could be of assistance to the translators. They had to rely heavily on their own knowledge of their mother-tongue. The best of these antique thesauruses is the **Dictionarium seu linguae latinae thesaurus** that was printed by Robert Estienne for the first time in 1531. It was the same with the Greek thesauruses. The only book available was a Greek/Latin dictionary meant for a few people who knew Latin, but who also wanted to learn and understand Greek.

After printing was invented in the middle of the 15th century, many non-Biblical manuscripts were translated into English. Virtually most of these books or manuscripts were translated by Catholic priests or learned people who had been trained by the Catholic Church, or Jews that owned many of the presses.

Thus there were no unbiased translations. The Roman Catholics wanted to promote their views and saw to it that sufficient of those were included in the translations to be used from the pulpits. And the Jews also had their own agenda and motivations to conceal the truth. They wanted to promote the idea that they were the chosen people, and this presented a golden opportunity for them to do so. Therefore all this resulted in some of the most important knowledge was omitted from the Bible.

Because the Jews are a hybridised race, naturally they wanted no reference to a hybrid between two races in a negative sense. It would cause much damage to their agenda to promote themselves as a chosen people. To have it as a Commandment in the Ten Commandments would have meant the end of them.

On the other hand the Catholic Church wanted to expand its borders beyond the white race. The verses that warned against interbreeding were thus an embarrassment to them. Therefore much hard work went into translations that would be acceptable to both Jews and Catholics. Later on these translations would be blindly accepted in the Greek/English-Latin/English lexicons. Dictionaries and lexicons were compiled from these Bible translations and all the errors were included. In turn these lexicons were again used for further translations, and errors that slipped in during the original translations were never removed or corrected. These first lexicons then contained all the theological prejudices of the roman Catholic church, as well as the Judaistic

Jews. Strong's concordance contains the same prejudices of the Protestant English Churches. Apparently no one in this matter was unbiased. However, to get to the truth, one has to push aside all feelings.

In the book, **The Sixth Law** by Pastor V.S. Herrell, the absurdity of this usage is spelled out very clearly. "Following Greek/English-Latin/English dictionaries were often extensions and revisions of previous dictionaries that contain a few extra text references and a slight re-wording of the same definition. An example of this can be found in the present standard reference of the Greek language; the Liddell-Scott Jones **Greek/English Lexicon**. This edition, completed in 1940, (followed by an upgraded volume that was published) was a revision of the eighth edition of the original Liddell-Scott **A Greek-English Lexicon** by Henry Liddell and Robert Scott, edited by Henry Jones and Roderick Mckenzie. The original Liddell and Scott Lexicon published in 1843, was itself based on the **Wurterbuch der grieschen Sprache by Franz Passow**, printed in 1828, which in turn was revised from the **Handwurterbuch der grieschen Sprache** by Johann Gottlieb Schneider. Schneider himself based his lexicon on previous works of some or other sort, and made good use of the **Thesaurus Graecae Linguae**, printed for the first time in 1572 by Henri Estienne II and later revised."

It seldom happens that fresh thought is given to a Greek or Latin word. In this manner errors from previous translations are written into further and new translations.

Herrell uses the word **akeraios** as an example to illustrate this problem.

In the **Anointed Standard Translation of the New Testament** Philippians 2:14 and 15 are translated as follows:

14: Do all things without murmurings and disputings...

15: ... that you may be perfect; of pure blood and **uncorrupted** (*akeraios*), faultless sons of God, in the midst of a perverse and crooked nation, among whom you shine as lights in the world.

Compare quoted verse 15 with the Afrikaans translation: so that you may be pure and upright, children of God without defect amid a crooked and twisted generation among which you shine like lights in the world.

They just don't say the same thing. The latter is the pious, pretty picture that our churches force upon us. The first version is the hard reality, and understandable under the circumstances we find ourselves in. The Afrikaans version is harmless and watered down.

Those familiar with the Greek language know that an alpha is often placed before a word to render an opposite meaning to that word. In the Greek Lexicon, the **Novus Thesaurus Philologico-Criticus** by John Schleuser, published in 1829, Schleuser makes the mistake of accepting that the alpha at the beginning of the word *akeraios* indicates the opposite. The first part of the definition of the word *akeraios* is indicated as follows: *:A keraizen), ...innocentem* ... So we are being told here that *akeraios* is the opposite of *keraizen* and in Latin is harmless. According to the Liddell-Scott Jones Lexicon, the word *Keraizen* means to "destroy, plunder. Hence the opposite would be harmless, untouched, etc.

During the time that the **King James Version** was being translated, this error was still present. This is the reason why this verse leaves a wrong impression.

A New Greek and Latin Lexicon was published by James Donnegan in 1839. He attempted to eliminate such errors as the one above from his book. When we look at the meaning of the word *akeraios* in this lexicon, we immediately see that Donnegan gives it as "unmixed, pure..." he also corrects the origin of the word *akeraios* which, in reality, is the opposite of *keranummi* and

kerao which is the same Greek word. It means to mix *half-and-half*. Yet he does not omit the original wrong meanings of the words which are taken up to further confuse the following translation. Etymologically there is no basis for these meanings.

Liddell and Scott were honest enough to acknowledge that when the word is used in connection with persons, it does mean purity of blood (line). And yet they retained the incorrect meaning. It also gave conflicting messages in further versions.

Translators have no problem to correctly interpret the word *akeraios* in non-Biblical books. In Edward P. Coleridge's translation of **Phoenician Woman** by Euripides, it is written on page 942-943: Now you are the only survivor or the seed of that sown race whose origins are from both maternal as well as paternal are pure/unadulterated; you and your sons.

Akeraios has been translated here as being *pure in origin*.

Unfortunately translators are being dishonest when it comes down to Bible books. It seems they are not so much interested in the truth as in a pretty and pious book from which they can extract daily readings of their own meanings.

Let us look at Barnabas 3:6: So then, brethren, the Patient One knew beforehand that the nation that He prepared in His loved one, must be encouraged in racial purity..."

According to Coleridge it is a correct translation of *keraiosune*. Other translators such as Kirsopp Lake used the word "guilelessness" which is totally ridiculous. The reason for this is that such translators will do anything to be politically correct.

However, political correctness no longer has any value. One must continue digging deeper and deeper to discover the truth.

ADULTERY

It is no hard and fast fact that the Sixth Commandment refers to adultery. To tell the truth, when one looks at all the previous meanings of relevant words, then adultery is the last thought to come up on one's mind. Right from the beginning of the Bible the descendants of Adam are warned against interbreeding. Thus it can be expected that it will be referred to again later on.

Let us return to the two words used in the Greek Septuagint in this Sixth Commandment. The two words are *ou moicheuseis*.

The prefix *moich-* before any Greek word belongs to the family of words referring to falsify, tampering or watering-down. The meaning given in translations thereof are also usually in the line of falsifying, tampering and watering-down. However, falsifying carries the connotation of lowering, destroying purity or changing. *Adulteration* or *falsifying* is the process in which something as added to something else to minimise it, to degenerate it, or to mix things up. It is said as follows in **The Sixth Law**: When one speaks of people being falsified in the physical sense, we can only speak about race-mixing, or at least the family trees that are being mixed, thus causing confusion in the family regarding fatherhood.

The general meaning given to these family words is to hybridise or mix, or to hybridise the races. The second meaning given to them is to mix or corrupt the seed lines. The thought of mixing is necessary to really understand the meanings and etymology of this *moich-*family of words.

The earliest Patrician writers did speak of illegitimate marriages. It had nothing to do with divorce. It is a meaning that has been wrongly written by translators. Throughout the years the

wrong meaning has been changed from the pulpits and drummed into Christians. In that way attention was distracted from the real meaning of the word.

When the first translations were made, it was highly improbable that the man on the street would ever discover the fraud. How could they have known at the time that anyone would be able to study Greek and Hebrew and learn to read and write it?

In the **Comprehensive Lexicon** by John Pickering (1847) the meaning of the word *moichidios* is given as bastard, spurious. Here it does not refer to an illegitimate child, but a mulatto (coloured) as we know it. This is a mixture of two races.

In the **Lexicon Manuale** of Cornelius Schrevel of 1796, the meaning of *moichidios* given as *adulterinus*. In turn this is explained as *adulterated* (false or contaminated) in the Oxford Latin Dictionary. Lewis and Short added: ‘not full-blooded.’ If something is not full-blooded, then it means that other blood is present and is thus hybridised.

A very general mistake being made is that the Greek, in which the Bible is written, differs from the normal Greek of the time in which it was written. People like saying that a special language was used in the Bible. However, that is not so. There is no special Biblical or ecclesiastical Greek. Greek words do not suddenly have a different meaning merely because they are used in the Bible.

Pastor Herrell says the following in **The Sixth Law**: “During the 17th and 18th centuries, scholars accepted that seeing the Greek of the New Testament does not agree with any of the great classical dialects of Greek used in antique literature, in some way or another it differed and was specialised, and so only the words in the Bible could have special meanings.

That was the basis behind the translation of the **King James Version** in very showy Elizabethan English and the Lutheran in High German. Neither one of the two were spoken in England or Germany before the translation of these Bibles.

However, in the late 19th century a great roll of papyrus rolls was discovered, of which many were reflective of the general written language of the first century. These papyrus rolls contained everyday things like letters, lists, contracts, receipts, etc. What was also discovered was that the form of Greek used in these rolls was the same as the Greek of the New Testament, now named *Koine* Greek of General Greek. So in reality the New Testament was written in what was generally termed “street” language.”

So the manner in which Aristotle or Socrates understood a Greek word was the same manner in which the man in the street understood it, otherwise their writings would have been useless. After all, they wanted to reach the man in the street to convince him of their beliefs. Therefore there was no lofty language in which the Bible could have been written. The style might have differed, but certainly not the language.

A.L. Peck translated Aristotle’s book **Historia Animalum**. In No. IX:32.6-10 the following is written: Also another kind of eagle is the so-called true-bred. *They say these are the only true-bred birds altogether; for the other kinds are mixed and adulterated by each other, including the eagles and hawks and the smaller birds.*

There we have it again – *adulterated* – or, translated *adultery*. It just doesn’t fit. One gathers from the context that here interbreeding or hybridisation is being referred to and not adultery or divorce. It can only mean that what is pure may not be destroyed. The use of the word and its meaning in context will be the same elsewhere. The meaning of the word **does not** change. The fact that it is also used in the Bible makes no difference.

This word, adulterated, is the translation of the word *memoicheutai*, is a derivative of the word *moicheuo*. It can also be translated as cross-breeding or hybridisation, which in fact it is.

When checking a word in the dictionary, one usually finds more than one meaning for that specific word. Depending on the context in which the word is to be used, one decides which word is the correct one. If the wrong word is chosen, the meaning cannot be changed to accommodate the changed ideas of the translator. Many words also have various meanings that sometimes differ radically from each other.

D’Arcy Wentworth Thompson went so far as to translate *moicheuo* as “corrupt through interbreeding of different species.” These translators realised that *moicheuo* referred to mixing between various kinds. This same word is then also used in Exodus 20:14 in the Ten Commandments and the same is used in Romans 13:9.

We must also take note that *genos* is translated as *sort* or *kind*, which, if applied to humans, refers to race. *Gnesios* then refers as to “*belonging to the race.*” Donnegan defines *gnesios* as “feature of a race; of pure race.”

Gnesiotes means descended of pure heritage. All the lexicons agree that *gnesios* is the opposite of *nothos*, which means *hybrid*. If *moicheuo* refers to race in all other contexts, then why would a root meaning suddenly change when it appears in Bible texts? Then there is no consequence...

There are always those unscrupulous people who will attempt to hide the truth because it is not politically correct to announce the truth. During the first translations of the Bible, the Jews could not put their stamp on it. Hence the first translations would have been somewhat more honest than later versions.

Only later when Jerome, who was strongly influenced by the Jews, took the **Latin Vulgate** in hand, did the Jewish influence begin to bite. The old Latin texts before his time were correctly translated and were used by the early Latin-speaking Christians. The original Greek dictionaries also contain Latin definitions.

Moichas is translated as *adultera* in Latin by Henri Estienne II of the 16th century in the **Thesaurus Graecae Linguae**. The word would be *adultery* in English. Once again the same words appear in Exodus and Romans.

This Greek/Latin lexicon is the basis of all lexicons and dictionaries. Three lexicons were searched for the meaning and declensions of the word *moichas*. (Old = **Oxford Latin Dictionary**; NLD = **Lewis Short’s A New Latin Dictionary**; and NCDLL = **Leverett’s A New and Copious Dictionary of the Latin Language**. The word was also looked up in the **Afrikaans/Engelse Woordeboek** of Bosman, Van der Merwe and Hiemstra just to give the Afrikaans meaning.)

Adulter (OLD) – impure, adulterated, mixed, cross-bred, debased. (NLD) - a Bastard.

Adulteration (OLD) – adulteration (NCDLL) – the corrupting of anything by base mixture

Adulterator (OLD) – One who counterfeits or debases; (NCDLL) - One who adulterates, debases, lessens the value of a thing by base admixtures. (AEW) - vervalser (counterfeiter).

Adulteratus (OLD) - mixed, adulterated, produced by cross-breeding, of mixed descent or origin.

Adulterinus (OLD) - Adulterated, impure, adulterine, bastard, interpolated, foreign. (NLD) – Not full-blooded, that has assumed the nature of something foreign. (NCDLL) Not thoroughbred, not full-blooded.

Adulterium (OLD) - the blending or mixing of different strains or ingredients, mixture with alien elements, adulteration, contamination. (NLD) - An ingrafting. (NCDLL) - Debasement by foreign admixture.

Adultero (OLD) - To mix (a substance or kind) with another, adulterate, to give a variety of appearance to, change, to corrupt, debase. (NLD) – To pollute, to falsify, give a foreign nature to a thing, (A Large Dictionary, Holyoke) – To mingle.

Adulterate (AEW) – the meaning is indicated as falsified, mixed, false, stigma, bastardised.

With *adulteress*, a derivation of adultery, all reference to race is removed and only the meaning of adultery remains. Suddenly the basic meaning of the word has disappeared! The adultery that the Ten Commandments warns us about is adulteration across the colour bar. It is a Commandment that embodies RACE.

From the foregoing it becomes clear that there are few other meanings in the definition of *Moichos* as to mix or interbreed. The word is also blatantly translated incorrectly in the Afrikaans Bible as adultery – breaking one’s marriage vows. The word *moichos* has little to do with divorce. The word does not appear anywhere as definition.

Some of the very old lexicons do contain the translation as “adultery” as we understand it, but is shown only in a secondary sense and not in a primary sense. That means the main definition refers to “mixing” and not “adultery” or breaking of marriage vows. It would be very dishonest to say that the word in which it is used in the Bible means adultery because it is given as definition. However, *divorce* appears nowhere as definition of *moichos* in any of the lexicons.

In The Sixth Law Herrell cites one verse in four different translations of Hebrews 12:8. He compares them to illustrate how various translators interpret one particular section and translates it then. This is also the way in which Bible translations became corrupt over a period of centuries.

The first quote is found in the **Anointed Standard Translation of the New Testament**: Heb. 12:8: But if you are without chastisement, of which all have become sharers, then you are mongrels, and not sons.

Effectively it says that all Adamites must be chastised or disciplined, meaning that if you are not chastised or disciplined, then you are a mongrel. The Greek word for mongrel is *nothos*.

In the old Latin text the word is translated with *nothos*, meaning a mixed seed-line, mixture, mongrel. This meaning is obtained from Lewis-Short’s Latin Dictionary.

The word *adulterinus* is found in the same quotation and which means “not full-blooded,” “not true to seed-line.”

So it is clear from these examples that when these Latin words are used in the **Vulgate**, or in old Latin, the meaning is carried over to the above and has nothing to do with a divorce, or being unfaithful to one’s spouse.

ADULT-WORDS

The main meaning of words in Latin belonging to the *adult*-group has to do with cross-breeding or mongrelisation between groups. The word is applied to cross-breeding between animals,

mixing of two or more substances into one, mixing or changing of metals, and then metaphorically for counterfeiting or forging, or fraud in the sense that the appearance of one of the above is changed and being offered as genuine. Thus it can also be used in situations of corruption of seed-lines within the same race. Like the Greek family word, *moichos*, this *adult*-family also emphasises the mixing of seed-lines, or causing confusion in seed lines that imply mongrelisation. Effectively it means the contamination of purity.

The author of **The Sixth Law** takes the following from Horatius' **Epode XVI:34** and translated from the Latin by Lord Lytton:

**“When nature’s self become unnatural
And, love reversing all its old conditions,
Tigers woo does, the kite pairs with the dove;
When into scales the he-goat smooths his fleeces
And quit the hill-top for the briny seas.”**

Lord Lytton translated the word *adultero* with *pairs*, indicating mixing, race-mixing, mixing of the species. In this context Horatio uses these sentences to say that he will return to Phillipi when the laws of nature have changed, in other words, never. That is why he uses examples of a tiger mating with a doe, or a kite (falcon) with a dove, or a goat that changes into a fish, etc. These are all against natural laws. He uses the Latin word *adultero*, meaning mongrelisation or crossing. It is the same word that is used in the Sixth Commandment, meaning to mix two different kinds with each other; to mongrelise. It is also the same word used in the **Latin Vulgate** to translate the Greek word, *moichao* in the New Testament in Matt. 5:32.

Pastor V.S.Herrell, author of *The Sixth Law* said: “But is there any internal proof in the Vulgate or the Old Latin texts indicating without any doubt that the translators of those variations specifically wanted to put forward the meaning of *adultero* as being to *mongrelise* when they used it? The truth is that 2 Cor 2:17 contains irrefutable evidence of this fact. This verse reads in **Anointed Standard Translation of the New Testament** as follows: *For we are not as many who adulterate the Word of God, but as of racial purity, but as of God, we speak in the Anointed in the sight of God.*

The word *adulterate* is translated here for the Greek word *kapeleuontes* which means to hybridise. In the Vulgate and other old Latin texts this word is translated with the Latin verb *adultero*, which proves that the translators understood the Latin word *adultero* and the Greek word *moichao*. Thus they used the word *adultero* as referring to mongrelisation or mixing and not unfaithful in the marriage.”

The translators of the Afrikaans Bible were way off the track here:

II Cor. 2:17: *For we are not like many that **trade** with the word of God; but as from **sincerity**, but as from God, in the presence of God, we speak in Christ.*

In the original text there is not even a vague reference to the word trade/trading. It is also not one of the definitions of the word *adulterate*. At most it could have been translated as *weakening* or *mixing*.

In the case of *sincerity*, the original purpose of using the word was to indicate racial purity. A thoroughbred horse is racially pure. It has nothing to do with the characteristics of being sincere.

CHANGING OF MEANING

One has to take into consideration that Afrikaans does not have the rich vocabulary of older languages. Translators of the Afrikaans Bible were faced with huge definition problems. For

example, in English we read *commit adultery*, meaning being unfaithful to your spouse with someone else. One also gets *adulterate* that is translated into Afrikaans in the “**Tweetalige Woordeboek**” (Bilingual Dictionary) written by Bosman, Van der Merwe and Hiemstra as being counterfeit, wangling/tampering with, diluted, mixed, watered down, and defined as counterfeit, contaminated, false, mongrelised. There is NO reference to being unfaithful to a spouse.

With adultery the definition is being unfaithful to one’s spouse, immorality, idolatory, prostitution. The the Biblical definition is added: being unfaithful (to one’s spouse), breaking one’s marriage vows. And this is again translated as marriage, matrimony, wedlock.

However, the word *adultero* is used in the original text that has absolutely nothing to do with marriage. The idea of marriage was written in by later translators.

However, what if they did NOT make a mistake, but simply encountered a problem with Afrikaans because it does not have as many definitions as the older languages? Let us say they did try to translate *adulterate* as closely as possible to the real meaning? Then one can read the Sixth Commandment as follows:

“*You may not destroy that which is genuine.*” In other words, you must not destroy the genuineness or authenticity of something. You may not contaminate or mongrelise it.

But why is there such a difference in meaning between *adulterate* and *adultery*? They both originate from the same root word? The fault or change could have crept in during the early years of lexicons. Later dictionaries and lexicons were built from the first ones. They were expanded, yes, but never reduced, thus any errors that originated in the original ones remained afterwards. That is also the reason why there is such a difference between *adulterate* and *adultery*.

In the **Oxford English Dictionary** the definition of the word *adultery* is given as *adulteration* (mongrelisation), *debasement* (falsifying) and *corruption* (rotten, impure). A note has also been added to this definition which reads that many Christian writers had previously used the word to indicate intercourse between Christian and Jew. That is natural race-mixing. In 1609 Ben Johnson used the word as being synonymous to mongrelising and counterfeiting.

Below the verb *adulterate*, it reads: “*replaced by: To commit adultery.*” This means that *adulterate* and *to commit adultery* had the same meaning during that time and either could have been used. It was still the same during translation of the **King James Version**.

However, is it permissible to get divorced or commit adultery? If the Sixth Commandment has nothing to do with committing adultery, does that give the green light?

NO! Read Deut. 22:22-27: *If a man is found lying with the wife of another man, both of them shall die, the man who lay with the woman, and the woman; so you shall purge the evil from Israel.*

If there is a betrothed virgin, and a man meets her in the city and lies with her, then you shall bring them both to the gate of that city and you shall stone them to death with stones, the young woman because she did not cry for help though she was in the city, and the man because he violated his neighbour’s wife; so you shall purge the evil from the midst of you.

But if in the open country a man meets a young woman who is betrothed, and the man seizes and lies with her, then only the man who lay with her shall die. But to the young woman you shall do nothing, in the young woman there is no offence punishable by death, for this case is like that of a man attacking and murdering his neighbour, because he came upon her in the open country, and though the betrothed young woman cried for help, there was no-one to rescue her.

Pastor Herrell writes about this section of the Bible in **The Sixth Law**: “This indicates a classical example of what people call adultery or infidelity in marriage. It describes a man who has intercourse with a married woman, as well as with a girl who is engaged to another man. What is interesting is that nowhere in this section mention is made of the word related to the *moich*-family of words. Why did the author not do this? Perhaps he knew that this was about wrongs committed within race-relations and has nothing to do with wrongs across the colour bar.

Why did the author of Deuteronomy not refer to the Sixth Commandment? Why then did he not at least use the same word as in the Sixth Commandment if this was in fact banning infidelity in marriage? The Ten Commandments were the laws given to the people by God and surely that would have been the most important thing that He could have quoted?

The truth is that the Sixth Commandment has nothing to do with infidelity in marriage, but rather with the corruption of the seed line. It can occur between two gene lines within one race where the one has a weaker gene than the other, or it can occur between two different races.

Also take note that the above continuously mentions that the woman who belongs to your neighbour is under discussion. In the Bible your neighbour is defined as someone of the same race as yourself. In other words, your neighbour (nearest) is a fellow White Adamite. It is for this reason that the *moich*-family of words is not in use here. This is about transgressions within the borders of one race. I merely mention the case of the Good Samaritan to indicate who your nearest/neighbour is.

In Luke 10:29 Christ asks: Who is my neighbour?

Therefore Christ is asked to explain, to spell it out who the disciples' neighbour is, for at that moment He was having a conversation with them. So he tells of a man travelling from Jerusalem to Jericho when thieves attacked him. They undressed him and beat him half to death and left him lying there. First a priest (Israelite) came along, then a Levite (also an Israelite), but neither stopped to help him. Only the Samaritan felt sorry for the man and helped him.

This parable was asked of the disciples as a sort of riddle. There could only be one answer. Christ asked: “Which of these three do you think was the neighbour of him who was attacked by thieves?”

The answer is well-known: the Samaritan. Why didn't Christ say: “No, all of them were his neighbours, but only the Samaritan showed him compassion? Why was his neighbour only one of the three? Why not all three?”

The Levite and the priest were not of the same nationality as the man who was robbed. Therefore they were not his neighbours.

Your neighbour – the one who resembles you.

The adultery mentioned in Deuteronomy, and which is punishable by death, is something that happens within racial context. If it happens with a woman from another race, that that would be the action as described with the *moich*-family wording, and is also the action that is punishable by death.

Therefore what is described here is not what is described in the Sixth Commandment. However, provision for that is made in The Tenth Commandment. We read in Exodus 20:17: You may not covet your neighbour's house, you may not covet your neighbour's wife, or his manservant, nor his maidservant, or his ox, or his ass, or anything that is your neighbour's.

Here the woman is included in the desires, but the word *epithumeiseis*, meaning desire/coveting, is used. This includes all sexual crimes mentioned in Deuteronomy. The rest of this Commandment indicates lust to the point of greed towards others' possessions.

Romans 13:9: The Commandments, *"You shall not commit adultery; You shall not kill; You shall not steal; You shall not covet... And you shall love your neighbour as yourself."*

This part with the verses beforehand and afterwards describes how one should act towards another. It deals with love for your neighbour.

Those are social and welfare laws. Even the one: "You shall not covet" is translated with the word "*covet*" by George M. Lamsa from the Aramaic. It means you must not be greedy or miserly. Covet in that sense means an unholy desire for money, power and prestige – pure greed.

The Sixth Commandment: "You shall not commit adultery" is mentioned in both the Old and New Testaments, thus it cannot be passed off as being Old-Testamentic. It if does mean that you may not divorce your husband, then virtually half the world's population is guilty of breaking that law.

However, divorce is not a death-deserving sin. There are various references to divorce in the Word. In Matt. 5.31 it was said during the sermon on the mount: "It is also said, 'Whoever divorces his wife, let him give her a certificate of divorce.'"

Nowhere in the Word is there any reference to punishment that was meted out because people got divorced. So this Commandment must have meant something else and the error slipped in during the time of the first translators.

REPETITION

When God gave the Israelites the Ten Commandments, they were trekking through the desert. These were the first laws given to them and were aimed at maintaining order among the people. Every commandment is clear and self-explanatory. In a nutshell they go like this:

1. You may have no other gods before God.
2. You may not worship other gods.
3. You may not use God's Name in vain.
4. You must keep holy the Sabbath day.
5. Honour your father and mother.
6. You may not MONGRELISE.
7. You may not kill.
8. You may not steal.
9. You may not bear false witness.
10. You may not be greedy.

If there were only Ten Commandments, why would God then repeat one of them? If the Sixth Commandment referred to adultery, as well as the Tenth Commandment, then it is a repetition. Why are there not two Commandments against murder/killing?

No, there is no repetition. The Sixth Commandment forbids the mixing of races.

Where they were in the desert, Moses read the Ten Commandments to the people. Many years later it was read again from the Book of Moses to the nation. Neh. 13:1 & 3 says: “On that day they read from the Book of Moses in the hearing of the people; and in it was found written that no Ammonite of Moabite should ever enter the assembly of God... When the people heard the law, they separated from Israel all those of foreign descent.

The Ten Commandments were read to them and on those grounds those of mixed blood were removed from Israel. Why would they have done it if there was nothing in the law, stating that mongrelisation was not wrong? They understood the Sixth Commandment correctly: You may not MONGRELISE. After that they removed those of mixed blood from Israel. Thus the Ammonites and Moabites were not whites.

The atheist, Talmudic Jews are now, and were fully aware of the real meaning of the Sixth Commandment. Because they were a total mongrelised nation, they had to make a plan to give themselves the opportunity of being accepted as the “selected nation of God.”

Their chance came when they gained admission to the *Masoretic Text*. There they could begin spreading the lie that the Sixth Commandment had in actual fact to do with infidelity in marriage, and nothing to do with prohibiting a mixture of the races. Thus they also managed to contaminate the Christian churches and theologians with this lie.

Leviticus 20:10 is usually quoted as an example in the Bible where these Greek words are defined as infidelity in marriage. Brenton translated it as follows:

“Whatever man shall *commit adultery* with the wife of a man, or whoever shall *commit adultery* with the wife of his neighbour, let them die the death, the adulterer and the adulteress.

However, Brenton did a poor translation, but even in this poor translation we can see that this verse is superfluous. It seems as if the wife of the neighbour and the wife of the man are not the same; as if the neighbour and the man are totally different from each other. If it were not so, the author would not have repeated it so pertinently.

However, both aspects of the *moich* word are highlighted here. The one is infidelity and the other is mongrelisation. In the Afrikaans translation the meaning of the *moich* word is being totally ignored. The theologians’ viewing of the word is preferred and not the true meaning thereof. Thus a different meaning is attached purely because it is used in the Bible. The translators probably thought that there should be no such reference to such terrible things in the Bible. To them it was beyond the pale.

The following is a translation of the same text where the meaning of the word *moichao* is used as it appears in the best lexicons: “The man that shall mongrelise with the woman of a man, or that shall pollute the seedline with the wife of his neighbour, let them die the death, the mongreliser or seedline corruptor and the female mongreliser or seedline corruptor.

It is interesting to note that the word *man* in the phrase *wife of a man* is translated for the Greek word *andros*, a general term used for a male as opposed to *anthropos*, the word that is reserved in the Bible for white Adamic men. The fact that there is a distinction between the two means that there is a visible difference between them. This is directed at the whole male and it tells

him clearly that he may not have intercourse with women from other races. (Extraction from **The Sixth Law**).

Much important information has been lost through weak and twisted translations. People blindly believe what they see in print, and it makes it difficult to wake them in order for them to think for themselves. Then there are also the theologians who are held in high regard and are followed without questioning anything.

The translation dished up for us in Hosea 4:2 is probably one of the weakest: There is swearing, lying, killing, stealing and committing adultery; they break all bounds and murder follows murder.

The word *moichos* is used here again. Here it is translated as adultery, but as we have already seen, the meaning is tied to race mixing, blood contamination. The phrase: *murder follows murder* is actually ridiculous. Only the translators will know what exactly they meant by it. Murder/a bloodbath has to do with the slaughter of people, whether in a mass murder, war, revolution or any type of riot. However, this part of Hosea deals with the rottenness of the nation and priestly position, because love is no longer found among them. There is no mention of war here.

In the Greek Septuagint the verse is translated into English as follows: Cursing and lying and stealing and murder and mongrelisation pour out in the earth, for they mix blood with blood.

The word *mongrelisation* is usually translated with the word *adultery* that is translated for the Greek word *moichos*. As we know by this time, *moichos*, wherever it occurs in the Bible, always refers to race-mixing. Here too it is defined as *mixing blood with blood*.

Because knowledge is always expanding at the end of time, the time in which we now live, and we will be getting more answers to questions, the Talmudic Jews and Judaic Jew had to try and find explanations for the misleading statements they had written into the Bible. They allege that in antique times nobody noticed any differences between the races, and they further allege that they never mentioned or wrote about it because it was of no importance.

Of course the Jews don't expect white Christians to go digging to seek the correct answers. However, fortunately people are beginning to wake up. More and more pertinent questions are being asked because the world is obviously heading for disaster. People want to know why this is so, and whether they had been following the right path throughout the centuries. We are looking for statements.

If the Bible had been correctly translated from the beginning, racial purity would have been an integral part of Christianity. Because the Jews had written the lie into our Bible, mongrelisation was not considered a sin, and the Sixth Commandment in the Bible is blatantly transgressed without any prick of the conscience.

However, in Heb. 10:16 the Word says that these words are written in the heart. In other words, a person instinctively knows the difference between right and wrong. If that Law is written in your heart, you will also realise that mongrelisation is against the word of God, and if it is not written there, you will find no fault with it.

CLASSICAL TIMES

Black and other non-white people were not always scattered all over the earth. Modern historians' hobby is to sell lies and twist the facts of history in order to be politically correct. Especially Americans are known for dishing up falsehoods to kids at school so that they will become politically correct later on. They teach kids that the first person who said there is a racial

difference between black and white, was one Johann Friedrich Blumenback back in the 18th century. Of course, that is absurd.

The racial differences have always been there and will always be so. There are only references to blacks in the old writings because they were not part of Western civilization at the time. Even then they were regarded as alien invaders.

Several authors from ancient times had written about the differences in races. In his book, **Natural History**, Book VII, **The Man**, Pliny described in detail the racial differences and characteristics. Herodotus discussed the differences between races in Ethiopia in his book, **Book VII**. Strabo wrote about geography, and in his writings discussed the different races and nations in each country. There are very few writers who did not make mention of the differences between races. The Bible refers to different nations, and when one goes back into history, we find that those nations also differed racially.

The Greeks and Romans were chiefly made up of white cultures. Non/whites were seldom, if ever, seen among them. Blacks were so strange that Pliny said about them: "But who believed the Ethiopians existed before they were seen? ...Looking at someone from another race, a stranger is scarcely a member of the human race!" (NH VII.6) They were so alien to him that he could hardly describe them as being human. He made this remark because he was so surprised at the difference between the two races.

Many Greeks and Romans had never even seen anything like a black. It was a rare sight, therefore they never had a problem of race-mixing, as they never had any blacks to mongrelise with. That is then also the reason why race is not discussed in detail in the Bible. They were not recognised as being part of the nation of Israel. Seeing that the Bible deals with Israel, it does contain warnings about race-mixing, but no descriptions of what other races looked like.

Horatius praised Republican Rome in his **Ode 4:5:21** in which he said: "The pure (uncontaminated) home is not mongrelised through illegal sexual relationships; law and usages have driven out the forbidden mongrelisation; mothers are praised for the children that resemble them; revenge follows shortly on the heels of guilt."

It matters not into which language the above verse is translated as the meaning remains the same. Translators thereof have often tried explaining that it pointed to moral purity, but that is a lie. It deals with physical racial differences and has nothing to do with the spiritual. Horatius pertinently refers to mothers being praised for the children that resemble them. Morality is not something that is visible from outside in order for someone to remark on it. Only a racially pure child can resemble its mother or parents.

Sexual relationships is pertinently mentioned, so there is no doubt that this is about a physical matter. The sexual act is physical and not spiritual. Why are mothers praised that their children resemble them if race is not the issue here?

There are also those who will say that these writings do not make racists of the authors. Racism is nothing more than differentiation between races. It cannot be reasoned away that there are different races on earth. By differentiating between them, a person automatically becomes a racist. So anyone who says that there is a visible difference between a Chinese and a black is then a racist. If these authors of ancient times differentiated between races, then they were racists!

RACISM IN THE BIBLE

In Ezra 8 & 9 we read the story of Ezra's return to Jerusalem. In the English Bible of 1898 which contains the Apocrypha, translated for Oxford and Cambridge Universities, Ezra 9:1 reads as follows: The people of Israel and the priests and the Levites have not separated

themselves from the people of the lands, doing according to their abominations... (2) For they have taken of their daughters for themselves and their sons, so that the holy seed have mingled themselves with the peoples of the lands; yea, the hand of the princes and rulers have been chief in this trespass.

The Greek word *allogenes* is under the magnifying glass here. L.S. Jones defines it as “of another race” and gives no other explanation for it. The reason for this is that the word is made up of two Greek words: *allos*, meaning *other* and *genos* meaning *race*. Hence there can only be one meaning for *allogenes*, viz. of another *race*.

It is significant that the phrase *from another race* does not appear anywhere in any of the above verses, although it is used in the original language. The definition of *allogenes* is also verified by E.A. Sophocles in the Greek lexicon of the Roman and Bizantyne periods. However, the word is only found in the Bible and later Christian reading matter. So the Bible created this word, but the translators of the old texts did not accept it as being politically correct and they changed the meaning – this despite the fact that the word is clearly defined as “*being of another race*.”

Let us now look at the relevant words in the Greek Septuagint as indicated in **The Sixth Law**: (1) The nation of Israel and the rulers, and the priests and the Levites, they have not separated themselves from the nation **of another race** (*allogenes*) of this land, nor the impurity (*akatharsia*, that is used for both physical and spiritual impurity) from the nations. (2) For both they and their sons have lived with their daughters, and the separated seed is mixed (*epimige*) with the nations **of another race** (*allogenes*) of this land; and from the beginning of this trouble, the leaders and the great men have been partakes of this lawlessness.

In the first English, as well as the present Afrikaans translations the word *allogenes* is totally ignored. There is only made mention of the *nations of these lands*. All reference to the race of these nations has been omitted so that mention is only made of the *holy generation that mixed with the nations of these lands*. Now it sounds as if this holy nation, of any race or colour, mixed itself with other nations of any race or colour.

Which makes one want to ask: “So, what?” Why was Ezra so upset? Spiritual mixing is not irreparable?

Blood-mixing cannot be “fixed.” Mongrelisation causes permanent damage to the gene pool of a pure, uncontaminated nation. It is for this reason that Ezra was angry and upset. The gene of the half-breeds would eventually spread throughout the whole nation and that would have also completely changed the genetic composition of the Nation of Israel. The physical characteristics that made them Israelites would eventually disappear.

Continuing from verse 10, it reads as follows in the Greek Septuagint: “For now you have crossed over your commandments (the Sixth Commandment in particular), which You gave by Your hand of Your servants the prophets (Gen. 15:16 and Deut. 9:5) saying the land which you go into to receive as inheritance is a land that has been mongrelised (*molusmus* – the Afrikaans translation speaks of impure) with the mongrelisation (again *molusmus*, Afrikaans translation reads impurity) of those of another race (*allogenes*; Afrikaans translation only speaks of nations, while the word has only one definition, viz. **of another race**) of the land, and they have filled it with their impurity (*akatharsia* – both physical and spiritual impurity).

Ezra 10:2 reads as follows in the Afrikaans Bible of 1954: *Then Seganja, the son of Jehiel, of the sons of Efam, began speaking and said to Ezra: We acted unfaithfully towards our God, marrying foreign women from the nations of the lands, but yet there is hope for Israel in this matter.*

They acted unfaithfully by disobeying the law of God. Now answer this question: **In what manner did they disobey the Law if no mention is made of mongrelisation? Is it not the Sixth Commandment – You may not MONGRELISE!!**

It reads as follows in the Greek Septuagint: Esdras, we have failed before the Master; we have lived with women of another race (*allogenes*) from the nations of this land, and now all of Israel is above. Let us make an oath to the Master that we will remove all our women which we have taken of another race (*allogenes*), with their children, like you have decreed, and so many as do obey the law of the Master.

They undertook to obey God by removing the women and children of another race in their midst. One can only obey if it is ordered. **To remain racially pure, was therefore an order from God whom they now wanted to obey.**

Once again we see that the Afrikaans version blatantly ignores the word *allogenes*. The definition thereof is not written in any section in any manner.

In Ezra 10, 10:11 Ezra stands up and addresses the nation: And Ezra the priest stood up and said to them: *“You have trespassed and married foreign women, and so increased the guilt of Israel. Now then, make confession to the Lord, the God of your fathers, and do His will; separate yourselves from the peoples of the land and from the foreign wives.”*

Once again here is no reference to race. The picture is totally different in the Greek Septuagint: You have crossed over the law (referring to the Sixth Commandment) in living with women of another race (*allogenes*) thereby increasing the failures of Israel.

Israel’s sin was not only that they were contaminated by the religions and usages of foreign nations, but that they also mixed white blood with that of another race. It is against the law of God and has to first be rectified before expecting to be blessed. This law we are speaking about is the Law of Moses, the Ten Commandments, of which the Sixth Commandment says: You may not mongrelise!

That was a terrible sin during that time. It was so serious that it was decreed that foreign women and children had to be killed as proof of regret. It was so serious that even the names of the wrongdoers were immortalised in Ezra 10 in the Bible.

PESTILENCE

Numbers 25 tells us what gave caused the outbreak of a plague among the Israelites. Twenty-four thousand died of this plague before the cause was eliminated.

In Numbers 25:6 we read about the Israelite man who had taken a Midianite woman as his wife. He brought her to the meeting of the nation while the nation was mourning at the entrance of the assembly tent over this plague they could do nothing about.

Pinehas was in the meeting, and he saw the Israelite man, Peor, and his Midianite wife, Cozbi, together. He immediately knew what that meant. Here was the cause of the terrible disease that the Israelites were suffering from, and he knew what to do about it. He got up and killed both of them with his spear. After that the disease abated.

The disease was caused by mongrelisation. God allowed twenty-four thousand Israelites to die. He expected his nation to discover the sin by itself and to stop it. Mongrelisation at that time was – and is still against God’s decree as He handed it down to Moses in the Ten Commandments.

Pinehas was not punished for killing Peor, a fellow-Israelite, and the black woman, Cozbi, with him. God honoured him and his descendants by promising him an eternal priesthood. That is significant, for a priest has to tell the nation what is right and what is wrong.

In Numbers 25: 17&18 God orders Moses to treat the Midianites, and the nation from which Cozbi came, as enemies and to kill them:

Harass the Midianites and smite them, for they have harassed you with their wiles, with which they beguiled you in the matter of Peor, and in the matter of Cozbi, the daughter of the prince of Midian, their sister, who was slain on the day of the plague on account of Peor.

Even the king of Midian was dismayed over this wrongdoing by Peor. There is a law that says one may not mongrelise, and God does not leave these wrongdoers of His law unpunished.

EZRA

Pinehas' grandson, Ezra, was confronted with the same problem. Mongrelisation had become quite common and children were born out of these mixed marriages, so God decreed that every one – men, women and their bastard children – had to be removed.

Pastor Herrell writes the following in **The Sixth Law**: *“One part that he had surely read to them from the Pentateuch was the section from Deuteronomy 7: 1-5 – When the Lord your God brings you into the land which you are entering to take possession of it, and clears away many nations before you, the Hittites, the Girgashites, the Amorites, the Canaanites, the Perizzites, the Hivites and the Jebushites, seven nations greater and mightier than yourselves, and when the Lord your God gives them over to you, and you defeat them; then you must utterly destroy them; you shall make no covenant with them, and show no mercy to them. You shall not make marriages with them, giving your daughters to their sons, or taking their daughters for your sons, for they would turn away your sons from following me, to serve other gods; then the anger of the Lord would be kindled against you, and He would destroy you quickly. But thus shall you deal with them: you shall break down their altars, and dash in pieces their pillars, and hew down their Asherim, and burn their graven images with fire.”*

Before commenting further on this particular section, we must first disprove on particular lie that is more or less going through the thoughts of the average Judiac Jew; they are telling themselves: “That was the Old Testament, that was when God was still mean, but now God loves everybody and is no longer a God of war and revenge.”

However, God chose Israel among all the other nations as He said in Deuteronomy 7:6. He also says it in Exodus 19: 5-6 and again in Deuteronomy 14:2 and Deuteronomy 26:18. These are quotations from the Old Testament, but let us see what is being said about Israel in the New Testament:

In 1 Pet. 2:9 it clearly reads: 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.

In the **Anointed Standard Translation** the first part of this verse reads: But you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a separated nation, a people for possession... This comes from the New Testament. Peter, who wrote this, is the disciple of our Messiah of whom He said in Matt: 16:18 – And I tell you, you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church, and the powers of death shall not prevail against it.

Peter knew the truth very well and what God wanted from His nation. God does not change, neither does Christ. God does not go back on His word.

Heb. 13:8 – Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today and forever.

Christ also knew that His Gospel would cause much strife and discord. His message was not one of eternal peace. He knew what lay ahead. In Matt. 10:34 we read: Do not think I have come to bring peace on earth; I have not come to bring peace, but a sword. The He goes further to say that He came to **create conflict** between a man and his father, etc.

So, is it correct to speak about a God who only has love for all and expects from us to live in peace with everybody? God's laws, decrees and orders is aimed at keeping His nation separate from other nations in order to keep His nation pure. Christ knew that would bring about much trouble, strife and discord. Nonetheless He expects Israel to obey God's laws, and one of them is the Sixth Commandment: **DO NOT MONGRELISE**.

James 1:17 clearly states that with God "there is no shadow of change." That means exactly what it says: What God has ordained or said, remains the same and will not change.

Now we remember that God ordered the Israelites to kill all the hybridised/mongrel nations and curse them with the ban. They had to be totally annihilated. They were not allowed to enter into any agreement with these dark nations. They were not to intermarry with them and also show them no mercy. In Ezra 8:85 the Israelites were also not to seek any peace with them for all eternity.

Deut. 23:6 also says: You shall not seek their peace or their prosperity all their days.

MARRIAGE AND PASSOVER

One of the first arguments brainwashed Christians come to light with is that the Israelites were not allowed to marry someone of a different *religion*. But then why had people to be killed? Why could the lives of babies not be saved and raised according to the beliefs of the Israelites? Even the adults could be persuaded to accept the Israelites' beliefs. However, religion was not the reason, but because God wanted to prevent Israel from interbreeding with other nations.

When they entered Canaan, the order was to ban the people of that land. That meant that everybody had to be killed, and everything belonging to them had to be torched. These seemingly cruel orders from God were necessary to keep His nation racially pure.

In any case the use of the word *allogenes* only applies to race. This section refers to race and racial purity, as well as the preservation of the white race. Translators of the Bible would surely not have used the word *allogenes* if they did not mean it, because the word has only one meaning, viz. *from another race*.

Another argument they like using is that it refers to nationality. The Israelites were not allowed to marry outside their nationality. This is not true. Joseph married an Egyptian girl, Asenath, and their sons, Ephraim and Manasse, were both tribal heads of Israel. Asenath was pure white, although she was not an Israelite.

Some people say that those early Egyptians were black. If that was true, then Joseph's brothers would have recognised him immediately among the darker Egyptians. However, the Egyptians were white and Joseph's vice-kingship was therefore not strange. If Joseph's children were mongrels, God would have expected him to kill them, or send them away as He expected Abraham to send Hagar and Ishmael into exile. No, they were white, and Asenath was also white.

The Israelites were permitted to make proselytes of other whites from other nations. The term *proselutos* is used in the Septuagint, as the meaning is the same as proselytes. This term appears almost 80 times in the Old Testament.

There is not a single argument against evidence that race-mixing is forbidden that is sustainable. There are just too many instances in the Word that forbids race-mixing. Nowhere in the Bible does one find a single case where God approves of race-mixing.

The word *allogenes* also appears in a few other places in the Bible. One such example is Exodus 12:43: And the Lord said to Moses and Aaron: “*This is the ordinance of the Passover; no foreigner shall eat of it.*”

In this translation the translators once again totally ignored the word *allogenes* and replaced it with *foreigner*. However, *allogenes* means *of another race*.

In the Septuagint the verse reads as follows: *And the Master said to Moses and Aaron: this is the law of the Passover; no-one of another race shall eat of it.* That is the Law of the Passover. Here God Himself says it to Moses and Aaron. There can be no doubt. Nobody of another race may partake of the Passover.

In **The Sixth Law** it says: “Does that mean that non-Israelites were not allowed to eat of it like any pro-Jewish priest will tell you? Did the descendants of Asenath, the Egyptian, not eat of the Passover? Did the proselyte women that were non-Israelite whites, of many Israelites during the time of Moses, also not eat of the Passover? Of course they did. BUT – they were not of another *RACE*.”

In Numbers 3:10 we read: And you shall appoint Aaron and his sons that they shall attend to their priesthood, but if anyone else incompetent comes near, he shall be put to death.

Take note of the word *incompetent*. This is the translation of *allogenes*, meaning *of another race*. It has nothing to do with *incompetence*. The word *incompetent* appears nowhere in any dictionary as a definition of *another race*.

In the Septuagint it is written: *And thou shall appoint Aaron and his sons over the tabernacle of witness; and they shall keep their charge of the priesthood, and all things belonging to the altar, and within the veil; and one of another race that touches them shall die.*

Jeremiah 49:17: And all the men and all those of *another race* who have set their face toward the land of Egypt to dwell there, shall be consumed by the sword, and by the famine; and there shall not one escape from the evils which I bring upon them.

Ezekiel 44:9: Therefore thus says the Master God: No one of *another race*, uncircumcised in heart and uncircumcised in flesh, shall enter into My sanctuary, of all the children of those of *another race* that are in the midst of Israel.

And the following verse in Malachi also contains the word *allogenes* like the previous two quoted verses:

Malachi 4:1 – For behold, a day comes burning as an oven, and it shall consume them; and all those of *another race*, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble, and the day that is coming shall set them on fire, says the Master Almighty, and there shall not be left of them root or branch.

In our Afrikaans translation it is written: For behold, the day comes and it burns like an oven. Then all the **audacious** and all who do wickedly shall be stubble and the day that is coming shall set them on fire, says the Master Almighty, and there shall not be left of them root or branch.

Audacious – that is a senseless and meaningless translation. In this verse anyone can be audacious, but God is much more precise whom He judges. He always makes it very clear.

If the original references about race were left in the Bible, if they were not removed, we would have understood the Word of God more clearly. It would have been necessary to grab at spiritualisation for lack of something better.

During the time when the first books of the New Testament were written, the old Baal Priesthood was still the religion of the day. With the founding of the Catholic Church, changes came about. The Catholic Church wanted to expand in order to multiply their wealth, but to do that, they had to adapt the Bible.

All the verses containing the word *allogenes* clearly state which place other races occupy against Israel. However, other nations are envious of that which God does for His nation, which is why they want to be included in the blessings of Israel at any cost. There are also ecclesiastics who would like to take advantage of the situation and who would do anything for money and fame.

HALF-BREEDS/MONGRELS

When speaking of other races, does that include half-breeds or mongrels? In a sense they are not a race.

In Zechariah 9:6 we read: A mongrel people shall dwell in Ashdod, and I will make an end of the pride of Philistia.

The Septuagint states it thus: And those of another race will dwell in Azotas, and I will bring down the pride of the Philistines.

Take note that the Septuagint constantly speaks of *'those of another race.'* Different words with different meanings are used in Afrikaans. The Greek word *allogenes* has been translated here with the Hebrew word *mamzir*.

The only other place in the Bible where the word *mamzir* is used, viz. Deut. 23:2-3, has been translated with words that have a totally different meaning.

Deut. 23:2-3 – Those born of an illicit union shall not be admitted to the assembly of the Lord, even to the tenth generation, none of their descendants shall be admitted to the assembly of the Lord. No Ammonite or Moabite shall be admitted to the assembly of the Lord.

In the Afrikaans translation the same meaning has been used: *No mongrel shall be admitted to the assembly of the Lord.*

The Afrikaans New Translation has now also joined this distortion by saying: *'Nobody born of an illicit union' will be admitted.* The New Translation has been done from the Latin Vulgate which is a false version of the Word of God.

In a sense this disallowed connection has been correctly translated, but then it has to be understood correctly. It can only be the connection between a man and woman of different races that is being spoken about, for both Ammonites and Moabites were mongrel nations.

"Until the tenth generation" is an expression used by the Israelites to indicate that it would never happen.

Mamzir, translated as being from an inadmissible relationship, actually means *from another*

race. The ministers are quick to explain that there is no mention of race, but that it actually means *from an inadmissible relationship*. But how do you define an inadmissible relationship?

Today anything goes. Nowadays no relationship is inadmissible. That is why they refer back to the Bible and explain that illegitimate relationships were inadmissible at the time. Also relationships between man and daughter-in-law, etc, which was inadmissible and apparently that is what the word *mamzir* refers to.

But is it correct? If we look at Bible history and in particular the story of Jephthah, (Judges 11) one gets a good idea of which people were excluded in the Passover celebrations.

In Leviticus 20:12 and 18:15 it is said that the word *mamzir* refers to incest. However, that is a lie. In this case it is Judah who had sex with Tamar, and Peres was born out of this union. However, Tamar was Judah's daughter-in-law and this was not incest. The children of Aaron are the descendants of Peres, so *mamzir* does not refer to incest, because Aaron and his sons acted as priests and leaders of the nation, and if *mamzir* refers to incest, then they were born through incest. The word *mamzir* is used in this respect. So what their ancestral grandfather did was not seen as *mamzir*, for they were allowed at the Passover feast.

Jephthah was a hero to the Israelites, although he was the son of a prostitute, as well as an illegitimate child. But he was also a great hero. However, his family did not see it quite that way. Despite his hero status with the nation, he was eventually driven out in exile due to the fact that he was the illegitimate son of a prostitute. Yet in the book of Hebrews he is named as one of the great men of Israel who rescued the nation from the mongrelised Ammonites.

These same Ammonites are being referred to in Deut. 23:3 – No Ammonite or Moabite shall enter the assembly of the Lord.

It is these Ammonites and Moabites that are being referred to; not to Jephthah, even though he was born as an illegitimate child from an *adulterous* relationship. According to our modern definition or the word *adultery*, Jephthah was born out of an inadmissible relationship.

Pastor Herrell writes about this in **The Sixth Law**:

“Which brings us to Wisdom 3:16 and 19 (LXX) which reads in Brenton's poor translation: As for the children of adulterers, they shall not come to their perfection, and the seed of the unrighteous bed shall be rooted out ... for horrible is the end of the unrighteous generation.

And in a better translation of the same verse:

Children of mongrelisers will not be perfect and the seed of an illegal bed shall disappear... for horrible is the end of the illegal race.

According to this piece, a mongrelised race was regarded as being illegal and they would eventually disappear.

According to the modern definition of *adultery*, Jephthah should have been killed, but he wasn't. The real meaning is that all the *mongrels* would be killed.

This verse does not speak about the children born out of illicit relationships or of prostitutes. If that was the case, then Jephthah would have been counted among them, and the Bible would have contradicted itself. The reference here is to mongrels, a contaminated gene-pool that was going to be destroyed. Like Jephthah, other children born out of illicit relationships had no say in their births. Now, it can be reasoned that mongrelised children also had no say in their births. However, with the latter the racial genes were destroyed and changed. It is for this reason that

they were not allowed to continue existing. As it is said in Malachi, no root or branch will remain of them. However, children born out of illicit relationships, but of one race, is a different matter. They are accepted by God.

According to Deut. 23:2-3, a mongrel may not enter the assembly of the Lord. The word *mischling* is used in the German Lutheran Bible, where we have the word mongrel. These two words have the same meaning, viz. *halfbreed*, *mongrel*. That is the word that is translated for the Hebrew word *mamzir*.

Two very old dictionaries, Francis Gouldman's **A Copious Dictionary** (1674) and Thomas Holyoke's **A Large Dictionary** (1677) both give the meaning of *mamzir* and *moichos* as being synonymous. They are usually translated as *adulterous* and mean *race-mixing*.

God ordered the nations to destroy the mongrel races, those of mixed breed. There must also never be peace between the Israelites and these mongrel races. Thus it is clear that God's orders that He would even use force to prevent the Israelites from mongrelising.

Adding to this racial question, Josephus, a famous historic author, is also mentioned. In his book, *Contra Apion*, Thackeray's translation of 1:7 tells of the usage among whites to examine the ancestry of a prospective bride or bridegroom to determine whether they were pure white, or not. Purity of race was to be given preference above that of wealth or any other advantage. Josephus writes that the Israelite – NOT Jew, had to marry someone who was pure white. No mention is made of language, culture or belief. The sole concern was purity of race.

It was usage among the Israelites to examine the ancestry of certain people. Why examine the ancestry if racial purity was not the issue?

Leviticus 21 speaks of the purity of the priests. Verses 13 – 15 tells about the choice of a woman by a priest: And he shall take a wife in her virginity. A widow, or one divorced, or a woman who has been defiled, or a harlot, these he shall not marry, but he shall take to wife a virgin of his own people, that he may not profane his children among his people, for I am the Lord who sanctify him.

The translation of the 1898 English Bible states the verses as follows: And he shall take a wife in her virginity. A widow, or one divorced, or a profane woman, an harlot, these he shall not take; but a virgin of his own people shall he take to wife. And he shall not profane his seed among his people: for I am the Lord which sanctify him.

In place of *profane* the word *polluted* is given in a footnote. The two words can be changed around if chosen to do so. In the 1963 Webster Home Dictionary the word: *pollute* is defined as *defile, render unclean, taint and corrupt*. *Corrupt* is a word that is used as something that has been contaminated and impure.

The descendants of the priests had to be pure and not contaminated with foreign genes. Therefore they had to be pure in spirit, as well as race. They were not allowed to marry women outside of their nationality, and the ancestry of those women had to be examined before they could get married.

If purity is so important to God that He prescribes it to the priests, that He told Ezra to order the nation to remove the mongrels from the nation, that he sends a plague to kill 24 000 because a white and a black entered together in the Assembly of the Lord, that He spells it out in so many words that coloureds may not enter in the Assembly of God... if it is all so important for God, would He then not have written it into the Ten Commandments?

Purity applied especially to the priests. After all, they were the example for the nation to follow. The correct translation of Lev. 21:13 reads as follows: He will take for himself a virgin woman of his own race.

The heart of this matter with the priests is race – not nationality of tribe, but race.

LATIN TRANSLATION

The Greek word, *nothos*, appears only once in the New Testament, but it is necessary to know what it means. The old Afrikaans translation of Hebrews 12:8 reads: *If you are left without discipline, in which all have participated, then you are illegitimate children and not sons.*

It makes no sense to say someone is an illegitimate child, thus not a son. Illegitimate in this sense is meaningless. The Greek word is *nothos*. The English translation of the Bible of 1898 reads as follows: *But if ye are without chastening, whereof all had been made partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons.*

The word *bastards* was used to translate the word *nothos*. *Nothos* is defined as “*bastard, baseborn, cross-bred.*” G.W.H. Lampe defines the word *nothos* as “*bastard, adulterated, cross-bred*” in **A Patristic Greek Lexicon**.

It is not difficult to see that *nathos* means bastard. Cross-bred also means bastard. Until recently the word *bastard* was defined in the Oxford English Dictionary as “*a person of mixed breed.*”

All the lexicon authorities allege that the word *nothos* is the opposite of *gnesios*. *Gnesios* means “*belonging to the race,*” and is derived from *genos*, meaning race. Donnegan’s *Lexicon* defines *gnesios* as “*peculiar to race, or pure race.*” He gives his definition of *gnesiotes* as “*purely descended.*”

It is only during the past few decades that the real meaning of the word *bastard* has been watered down to an illegitimate child. Our Afrikaans translation of “*baster*” instead of *bastard* is nearer the truth.

The old **Lutheran Bible** of 400 years ago uses the word *bastarde* to translate *nothos*. The definition of the word *bastarde* in the **Deutsch/Englisches Worterbuch** of 1956 agrees with the English word *bastard*. However, the meaning of this word has been watered down over the past 50 years.

However, the **Lutheran Bible** has taken the same road that the Afrikaans translations took. To fit in with changing political views, many important passages that were still found in the old **Lutheran Bible** of 400 years ago have now changed. One of those is the verse under discussion. The modern Lutheran Bible now translates the word as *outcasts*. This definitely does not have the same meaning as *bastard*.

Let us take a look at Matt. 1:1 in a few translations. The word under discussion is shown in italics:

English Translation of the 1898 Bible: the book of *the generation* of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham.

The Afrikaans Translation of 1954 is the same as that of the English version above.

The **Anointed Standard Translation of The New Testament**: the book of *the race* of Jesus Anointed son of David, son of Abraham.

In the **Lutheran Translation** of 400 years ago, the word *geburt* was used. This means birth, or racial origin. The meaning of *genealogy* (family tree, pedigree, family knowledge) is also added as a footnote in the 1898 English Translation. Today the word *geschichte* is used in the Lutheran Bible. This means *story* or relating.

It is clear even for the layman that the translators were trying hard to cover something up without making it too obvious. There is little agreement in the words that are used to translate *nothos*.

The word on Hebrew is genesis, which – according to the dictionary – means *pedigree of people of the same race or nature*. It boils down to the history of the birth of this group under discussion, viz. the descendants of Adam and Eve.

In the **Apocrypha** book, **The Wisdom of Solomon**, chapter 4:3, the following is an accurate translation in the Septuagint: But the multiplying *race* of the ungodly will not be of great number, nor gain power through *mongrels* propagating, nor will that race be allowed to advance, nor accomplish a secure foundation

Alternatively, the 1970 edition of the **Apocrypha** reads: *But the swarming progeny of the wicked will come to no good; none of their bastard offshoots will take deep root or firm hold.* **(The Sixth Law).**

In the English Translation of 1898 it reads: But the multiplying *brood* of the ungodly shall be of no profit, and with *bastard* slips they shall not strike deep root. **(The Sixth Law).**

Unfortunately there is no Afrikaans translation that we can use as comparison. The second quote from the English Translation is once again unclear and senseless. The meaning of the verse in the first translation is very clear. It refers to RACE, and not to someone born out of wedlock.

What it says is that people of mixed race will not be many, and will not reach great heights through mongrelisation, and that race will also not be allowed to take root, go forward and achieve great things.

MOSES AND THE CUSHITE WOMAN

People who approve of mongrelisation are quick to point out that Moses had a *Cushite* wife. In Num. 12:1 we read: *Miriam and Aaron spoke against Moses because of the Cushite woman he had married, for he had married a Cushite woman.*

Correct. Her name was Adonia and she was the widow of King Kikianus of Cush who had died. Moses took her as wife as it is written in **The Book of the Upright (Book of Yasher)**, chapter 72:37.

The only reference to her in the Bible was she was the reason that Miriam became leprose. No background is given.

The story is set out in detail in **The Book of the Upright**. Moses was eighteen when he fled out of Egypt after having slain the Egyptian. He wandered around and eventually reached the enclosure of Kikianus, the king of Cush, where he defended his own city, Cush.

In his (Kikianus') absence, Balaam, out of revenge because he was not taken along to fight in the war against Aram and the children of the East, incited the Cushites against their king, Kikianus. They raised the walls higher, dug water furrows, and kept snakes with magical powers in one corner. On his return, Kikianus found himself up against his own people, and the only way out was to fight to enter again.

That was when the young Moses arrived and remained outside the city for nine years. After Kikianus' death the met decided to appoint another king that would help them enter the city without a battle. They elected Moses as their king.

According to the culture of the Cushites, it was decided to give Adonia, the late king's wife, to Moses. He had to marry her in order to become king. There was no other option for him and it left him with no choice. He also did not want to return to Egypt, knowing that they would be waiting to kill him. Of course, kingship did not seem so bad, compared with the other possibilities.

We read chapter 76, from verse 3, in the **Book of the Upright**: "In the fortieth year of the reign of Moses over Cush, Moses sat on the throne of the king and Adonia was before him, and all the nobles sat around him. And Adonia, the queen, said to the elders of the king: What have you, the sons of Cush, being doing for such a long time? You probably know that in the forty years this man has been reigning over Cush, he has never approached me, or served the gods of the sons of Cush. Therefore, listen to me, children of Cush, do not let this man reign over you any longer, because he is not of our flesh."

Adonia complained that Moses had never come to her, thus he had never seen her as his wife. She was merely the widow of his predecessor. She was no more than that to him. She also clearly stated that Moses was not of the same race as they were.

After that Menachrus, her son, was made king at her request. The culture of the Cushites was that they first had to kill the reigning king before appointing another king. However, Moses was a good king and he had done nothing wrong, so they sent him away with gifts. In the **Book of the Upright** we read in chapter 76:13: Then Moses went to Midian, for he was afraid of returning to Egypt because of Pharaoh. And he sat by a well in Midian.

Of course, that is where he met Zipporah.

Miriam and Aaron were envious of Moses, and they were aggrieved because they were not honoured as Moses was, despite the fact that he had been married to a woman of another race previously. They considered themselves better than him because he had sinned by marrying a Cushite woman. That should have counted against him, yet he was the leader of the Israelites and had found favour in God's sight. It is for that reason that they used the episode of the Cushite woman against him.

In Num. 12:7 God tells Miriam and Aaron: "*Not so with my servant Moses. He is entrusted with all my house.*"

They were addressed and reprimanded because they envied Moses and wanted the nation to listen to them as the nation listened to Moses. God Himself explains to the two of them how His communication with Moses differs from the way He addresses Aaron and Miriam. In verse 6 God tells them that He speaks to them through dreams and visions. God says in verse 8: "With him I speak mouth to mouth, clearly, and not in dark speech, and he beholds the form of the Lord. Why then were you not afraid to speak against my servant Moses?" Their transgression was that they speak badly of Moses – a man that had been selected by God personally.

Moses was innocent of any wrongdoing before God. Moses was special, and god makes it clear to the two gossipers. It is for this reason that Miriam was punished, not because God wanted to defend Moses' association with the Cushite woman, but because Miriam judged Moses. God knew the circumstances under which Moses was married to Adonia. God knew that Moses had not transgressed any law, because Moses had never slept with Adonia. That was the reason why He wanted Moses to leave Cush.

Moses met a white girl, Zipporah, at Midian, and married her. The episode with Adonia was over and done with. However, the Bible gives to details about his marriage to Adonia, so it is easy for people to point a finger at Moses, as Miriam had done, by saying that he had married a black woman.

FRAUD BY TRANSLATORS.

The **King James Version** is regarded as being the best translation of Bibles. The translator made use of the Hebrew texts, but even then the Bible remains dark in some aspects. The very important statement of how one race should stand before the other has been written out of the Bible to make room for the new theologians to say that we are all the same. The **Anointed Standard Translation** is the only one that highlights the true meaning of the Biblical texts. Let us compare a few examples:

1 Timothy 1:2 reads as follows from the Aramaic translation: *To timothy, a true son of the faith...*

Titus 1:4 – *To Titus, a true son in the common faith...*

The **King James Version** quotes Timothy as: *Unto Timothy, my own son...*

The quote from Titus reads: *To Titus, my own son...*

The **Anointed Standard Translation** quotes the extract from Timothy as such: *To Timothy, a racially pure child...*

The one from Titus: *To Titus, a racially pure child.*

Even Old-Latin translated the Greek word *gnesios* with *germanus*, meaning of pure descent. (*gemanicus*?)

There were many reasons why translations from the bible were twisted. Often it was for political reasons, as it is the case today, why certain words have been translated incorrectly.

One clear example is the translation of the Greek word for homosexual in 1 Cor. 6:9 and Timothy 1:10. In the translation from Aramaic that particular section of the verse is given as such: *For whoremongers, for those who defile themselves with mankind.*

The King James Version: *abusers of themselves with mankind...*

The reason for these two false translation is because King James himself was a homosexual, and the translators did not want to offend him.

The Afrikaans translation reads: *Whoremongers, sodomites...* which is correct...

FROM THE WORD

Today pastors, ministers and priests preach love and tolerance towards other nations and religions. However, if one uses the Word of God as a manual to successfully control the world, then in reality this love and tolerance is evil.

Quite a few places in the Bible speak out against mongrelisation. The one that is also seldom referred to is in Nehemiah 9 & 10. Nehemiah prays to God and intercedes for the nation. He mentions the sins of Israel through the ages and how God punished them, but also showed them mercy and saved them every time. Nehemiah is on the verge of making a covenant with God.

We read in Nehemiah 9:36-37 – *Behold, we are slaves this day; in this land that thou gavest to our fathers to enjoy its fruit and its good gifts, behold, we are slaves. And its rich yield goes to the kings whom thou has set over us because of our sins, they have power also over our bodies and over our cattle at their pleasure, and we are in great distress.*

Nehemiah described exactly the conditions under which the Boer nation finds itself today. It was the same condition under which the Israelites found themselves at the time. An unbearable situation, yet they realised they were being punished because of their wrongdoings. It was for that reason they made a covenant with God.

Not everyone understands these covenants. Many of our own people have no idea what it is about, and they stay out of situations like this. It was the same with Nehemiah, as few of his compatriots understood what the covenant was about. Perhaps they also climbed on to their political podiums to state their views. Whatever the case, not everybody agreed with Nehemiah.

Nehemiah 10:28 refers to those who sided with him. First the Levites, priests and those like them, then as follows: *The rest of the people, the priests, the Levites, the gatekeepers, the singers, the temple servants, and all who have separated themselves from the peoples of the lands to the law of God, (among others, **you may not mongrelise**) their wives, their sons, their daughters, all who have knowledge and understanding.* Those that could or did not understand remained aside. They did not want to be part of the covenant, although they were part of the nation. The rest then participated in the covenant. They undertook to live according to the Law of God and to protect its decrees and rules. Two very important matters are mentioned as part of the covenant:

Nehemiah 10:30: *We will not give our daughters to the peoples of the land, or take their daughters for our sons.* In other words, they undertook not to mongrelise with the nations around them.

Nehemiah 10:31: *And if the peoples of the land bring in wares or any grain on the Sabbath day to sell, we will not buy from them on the Sabbath or any other holy day; and we will forego the crops of the seventh year and the exaction of every debt.* This meant that they would not participate in any trading on the Sabbath.

When this covenant was closed with God, there were already many of mixed blood among the Israelites. They promised to mongrelise no further, But what about those that were already among the nation?

Nehemiah 13:3 *When the people heard the law, they separated from Israel all those of foreign descent.*

However, the verse does not end there. It was written as follows in the original Hebrew: *“...taken from then enclosure and killed.”*

Because the church and translators wanted to spare the feelings of the mixed races, the truth was taken from the Word of God.

After the mongrels were removed from the nation, all those with mixed blood were taken out of Israel and killed. Thus the bloodlines would remain pure for the descendants. If anyone of mixed blood was allowed to remain alive, the Israelites would pity them again later on and bring them back to the enclosure, otherwise the punishment would begin all over again. It was not worth it for the Israelites to keep those with mixed blood among themselves. God’s punishment weighted up too strongly against that.

There are also other places in the Bible where mongrels are named along with the Israelites.

We read in Exodus 12:38: *A mixed multitude went up with them...*

This group of people with mixed blood is not considered as being part of Israel by authors of the Bible. It is spoken of the nation of Israel as being separate from the people of mixed blood. If they were seen as being part of Israel, the author would not have gone to the trouble of differentiating between them and Israel. They only left Egypt with the Israelites, and some of the Israelites probably had children by them, therefore they accompanied them.

However, this group of mixed blood did not understand anything of the promises over Israel. They did not really understand what it was all about and all died in the desert.

Numbers 11:4 mentions this group once again: *Now the rabble among them had a strong craving; and the people of Israel also wept again, and said, "O, that we had meat to eat!"*

It is pertinently mentioned that it was the coloureds that began complaining, and the Israelites also followed in the complaints. If those of mixed blood had not trekked with them, the Israelites would probably not have transgressed against God. Elsewhere in the Bible (Joshua 23:13) Israel is warned against other nations because they would become a **trap** for them.

GOD'S COMMANDMENTS MAKE SENSE.

Why does the Sixth Commandment say we may not mongrelise?

Was this the reason why it was necessary for God to warn Adam's descendants against blood-mixing? Is there any proof in the Bible that a person may not mongrelise?

If the Sixth Commandment reads **YOU MAY NOT MONGRELISE**, then surely it would be evident that mongrelisation is against the will of God? Then there should also be a punishment for doing so.

Let us first look at the time when the earth and its inhabitants were created in order to see what God had in mind.

Gen. 1:24 – *And God said, "Let the earth bring forth living creatures according to their kinds; cattle and creeping things and beasts of the earth according to their kinds." And it was so.*

At this point living creatures were brought forth, but there is no mention of humans yet. These beings were created, each according to its own kind, and because God saw that it was good, we deduce that He wanted to keep them separate – each according to its own kind. They must not mix/interbreed.

The creation of humans was as follows:

Gen. 2:7 – *Then the Lord formed man from the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living being.*

In the original text the word "*adam*" was used for human/person.

The rest are never ever referred to as "people." There are other Hebrew words that are used when speaking of animals. In English the word *man* is used for "*person*." So that is translated as '*adam*' and today we write it as **Adam**.

Gen. 1:26 reads: *And God said: "let us make man in our image, after our likeness, and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth. When speaking*

about these specific beings in the Word, it is referred to as 'adam. They resemble God and are formed according to His image. So, to suggest that the Adamite descended from the animal kingdom, the apes, through evolution, is heresy. Humans were created separately from the animal kingdom.

In the 1898 English translation it reads as follows in Genesis: *Let us make man in our image after our likeness.*

These people are specific beings, called man/person in contrast to animals, fish and birds. It is a being that is descended from out of Adam who was the first human. They are specifically formed that way, they look like their Creator who made them to His own image. They came after all the others had already been created.

Adam, the human/man was *FORMED* and not created as was the case with the others. The earth also did not produce him.

In Genesis 1:24, when the animal kingdom was created, it is said that the *earth brought them forth*. This "bringing forth" is *yatsa* in Hebrew, meaning *go out, appear, break out, bring forth, carry out, escape, give out*. The developed as other animals developed over thousands of years.

Adam is *FORMED* in Gen. 2:7. The word "formed" in Hebrew is *yatsar* and means to *press into a form, to mould into a form like a potter*. Thus he is totally apart and created in a different way. He did not develop like the animals.

This Adam, or person, whose descendants are also humans, was distinguished right from the beginning when he was formed.

Adam's name is used only occasionally in the Bible, but in actual fact, the name Adam should have appeared in every reference to "person/man/human."

It is written in Ezekiel 34:31 *And ye, my flock, the flock of my pasture, are men, and I am your God, says the Lord God*. The Hebrew word used here is 'adam, or Adam. The translation ignores this fact and changes it to "people/men."

The English translation of 1898 is as follows: *And ye, my sheep, the sheep of my pasture, are men*. This is even more misleading because it only refers to the male sex of the Adamites. However, the fact remains that God clearly says here that only His sheep are *people/men* (Adamites).

It is not said of any other nation that they are people. They are referred to by name, such as Ammonites, Jebusites, etc. Only the Israelites are called people. It is also only the Adamite whose descendants through Abraham, Isaac and Jacob became Israelites that are called people.

Where the word man is spoken of, it was translated for the Hebrew word 'iysh as in Gen. 4:1 – it is a MALE person, not necessarily an Adamite.

THE LIVING BEINGS OF THE EARTH

Those that are not Adamites, but look like Adamites – who are they, then? And why may the Israelis not interbreed with them?

There were many nations in existence during the time of Israel of old. They are not part of the Adamites, and thus they cannot be called "humans/people." However, they were those beings with whom mongrelisation could take place, thus changing the gene pool of the Israelites.

Take note that there is a dramatic difference between the creation of the animals and the “*Adam*,” or “*human*.” Throughout Genesis 1 from verses 3-31 is actually a recreation of the original earth that had been left desolate and void by Lucifer.

The Almighty then proceeded to re-create this world. He created through His Word by calling things into being. In verse 24 God also said that the earth must produce *living beings* according to their own kinds. This was the first important grouping. This is a group that was created out of the earth; the earth produced them. It was not a special creation as was the case with Adam later on. They were created through the power of the Word, but Adam was FORMED as a sculptor would form with clay or stone.

The Negroids and Mongoloids are part of this creation that came from the earth. They are not part of the Adamic race. They were not formed together. The Negroids and Mongoloids were produced from the earth long before Adam was specially formed from the dust of the earth. That is why they are not made in the image of God like Adam, according to Gen. 1:26-27. Adam was also specially formed to rule over them. (Gen. 1:28)

These non-Israelite beings that came from the earth developed through evolution. They mixed into various nations. The Word is not in conflict with Science. Anthropologists and Geologists will tell you that while examining fossils, it has been discovered that these pre-adamite “people” had existed for millions of years. Adam has been around for only about 6000 years. The rest have come a far longer way than this.

These other nations were supposed to be the “tail” so that Adam could be the “head,” the rulers over everything the Almighty had made. Adam’s rule is very important to God. Do you know that He says in 1 Corinthians 6:3: “Do you not know that we are to judge angels? How much more, pertaining to life?”

God decreed that the angels were to be serving spirits in favour of the Israelites that will obtain salvation, then do we realise just how important the Israelite is as a ruler for the Almighty.

Hebrews 2:16: *For surely it is not with angels that He is concerned, but with the descendants of Abraham.*

So why is He concerned about the descendants of Abraham? The reason is because they are being led astray by the heathens to mongrelise and not remain pure. The churches do not share God’s concern. The White Adamite does not concern them. No, they are more concerned about the wild living creatures of the open fields that are not created in God’s image.

1 Corinthians 15: 39 – For not all flesh is alike, but there is one kind for men, another for animals, another for birds and another for fish.

Medical science admits and acknowledges that the Negroids and Mongoloids do not have the same type of blood as the Adamites. The red blood cells of the Negroids are shaped like the sickle moon. For that reason only Blacks can get sickle-cell anaemia which is a type of blood cancer. The Adamite cannot get it because his red blood cells are round.

The examples that God uses to show the nation that apartheid is correct, and that He wants it thus, is the instruction that an ass and a horse may not pull in the same yoke; that they may not wear two kinds of cloth at the same time, that they may not sow two different kinds of seed in the same bed. These things must remain separate, and that is how God finds it acceptable.

In the beginning Adam was alone and without a mate. Genesis 2:20 reads: *The man gave names to all cattle, and to the birds of the air and to every beast of the field; but for the man there was not found a helper fit for him.*

All the creatures that existed were rejected by Adam as a mate. All those that came out of the previous creation, all those who descended from the hundreds of thousands of years on earth – none of those was suitable for Adam.

All the quadrupeds and everything else were given names on this occasion, but at the same time a mate was being sought for Adam. Did God then consider quadrupeds and birds as possible mates for Adam?

Of course not! *Chay* (pronounced kahee) is a Hebrew word with regard to the understanding of *animal*. These creatures also marched past Adam when he was looking for a mate, but he did not want a mate among any of them. He wanted someone who was like him. He saw that there was a difference between them and him.

Then we come to the part where God made Adam fall into a deep sleep so that He could make a mate for him from one of his ribs. Adam immediately accepted her as his mate, for he saw that she was the same as him – *bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh* (Gen. 2:23) – in other words, of the same race.

Nowhere in the Bible do we read about black, or red, or yellow races; nonetheless there were many different nations. References to them are the only indication one has that there were also different “peoples” in earth. Yet nowhere are they referred to as “people,” only their tribal names such as Amalechites, Hittites, Philistines, etc. Wherever the word ‘*adam*’ appears, then it refers to “people.”

So what were those others called if they were not people? How are they referred to, for they were also important, and there should be references to them?

There is mention of a man and a woman, but in this case a man is a ‘*iysh*. A man of another nation is never referred to as ‘*adam*.

More generally they are wrongly referred to as *beasts of the field*, or *living beings*. The latter is closer to the word *chay*. *Chay* also means to *live*, the definition in Strong’s is *living creature or living thing*.

There are several words in Hebrew that are translated with the understanding of *animal*. Afrikaans has only one word, “*dier*,” whereas in English we have *beast* and *animal*, with the added definition of *living thing*.

To understand what is meant by all the names, we must first look at the words being used. One Hebrew word for animal is *bhema*, a quadruped animal. Strong’s Concordance says it is a “*mute beast*.” In other words, it is a beast that cannot speak. Then they also have the word *beher*, meaning *brute* or *monster*. It is evil, but nonetheless a dumb animal. Then there is *zohon* that generally describes any sort of living being that doesn’t belong to any specific group. It is also the word used in Rev. 4:6 that describes the four living beings that have gathered around the throne of the lamb – the lion, the man, the eagle and the calf; all different, but all living beings.

We are going to look at the word *chay*. It means *life*, or a *living creature*. It is incorrect to translate it as an *animal of the field* as has been done. The term “*living being*” should have been used throughout.

Zohon can mean any kind of living being, but *chay* means a specific living being. Generally speaking the translators took the word *chay* and translated it as *wild beasts/animals of the field*, or *wild beasts of the earth*. The correct translation should have been *living beings*.

These beings are mentioned in some places in the Bible – just enough for us to recognise them.

Job 24 tells of beings that behave in a certain manner. *The heading of the chapter reads: Why is there no day of reckoning for the godless people? Examples of their behaviour.* These headings were later inserted by the translators to split the continuing Hebrew text into chapters and to facilitate finding sections in the Bible. This particular one is misleading, as the section does not say anything about godless people. It deals with beings that behave in a godless manner. Nowhere in the section is there any reference to ‘Adam, so it does not deal with people.

What do these beings do?

Much of what they do is unacceptable. Mongrelisation would have introduced their habits and behaviour among the Israelites.

They acknowledge no property rights. Borders mean nothing to them and they move those willy-nilly. If the grazing looks better elsewhere, they move there. They steal a whole herd of cattle and let them graze openly, for they are of the opinion that the cattle are now their property. They steal the ass from the orphan and take the cow from the widow. They knock the poor out of their path. Those who are miserable are afraid of them and hide from them.

Sometimes they do work, only if they are hungry, and they go to their work like wild asses. They live in the wilderness where they get their food. They eat “marog” (pigweed and other edible plants), mopani worms and other foods found in the wilderness. They sleep and go naked during the daytime and do not wear warm clothing. They get wet in the rain as they do not have shelter, and they live in the hills. They shelter against and under rocks against the rain.

Job 24:9 – *There are those who snatch the fatherless child from the breast, and take in pledge the infant of the poor.*

So those that cannot defend themselves against these beings are robbed. They also have no feeling for the poor and destitute, and apparently are cannibalistic and love the flesh of children. For that reason they snatch the children from the mothers. There is no other reason why they do that.

They have no respect for human life. They kill the poor during the daytime and they steal at night. They break into houses at night and they hide during the day. Their eyes are adapted to the dark, so they have no problem seeing at night.

Job 24:17 says: *For deep darkness is morning to all of them; for they are friends with the terrors of deep darkness.* They can see, regardless of how dark it is.

They are enemies of light and like doing things in the darkness. They will murder without any twinge of the conscience in broad daylight, but they use the night to go and rob.

Job 24:15 reads: *The eye of the adulterer also waits for the twilight, saying: ‘No eye will see me,’ and he disguises his face.*

As we have already seen, this word *adulterer* means to contaminate the race, to mongrelise. Here we speak of someone belonging to a particular race that goes out at night to rape someone of another race and mongrelise.

They only work when they are hungry and when they have eaten, lie down and go to sleep. In verse 16 (Job 24) we see reference once again for their love of breaking in and stealing, and when returning from their robbery, they hide away.

Verses 18 and 19 speak of their inability to till the soil. The soil does not deliver a harvest for them. Where they walk, nothing grows. It is as though the soil is cursed.

Verse 20 says they are quickly forgotten and when they die, they are forgotten.

Job 5: 22-23: *At destruction and famine you shall laugh and shall not fear the beasts of the earth, for you shall be in league with the stones of the field, and the beasts of the field shall be at peace with you.*

Here the wild beasts are translated as *chay*. Therefore they can be friendly with you.

It is with these beings that the Israelites may not mongrelise. People can mix with them, therefore the Sixth Commandment reads: you may not mongrelise. The gene pool of the Israelites must remain pure.

PUNISHMENT

Every time Israel transgressed against God's law, they were punished, sometimes very severely. If the Sixth Commandment had to read: You may not mongrelise, then there should also be clear cases in the Bible to indicate where the nation was punished because of mongrelisation. However, this *chay* is also used by God to serve as punishment.

In Ezekiel 29 we read about prophecies against Egypt. Verse 5 tells that Egypt, as a nation, will fall in the open field and scattered so that they will not come together. Then it is said they will be given over to the *chay* as food. Here is a reference to possible cannibalism. These living beings were sent over Egypt as punishment.

Ezekiel 31 compares Egypt with a big tree under which birds and *chay* can multiply. Egypt became black. At first the Egyptians were white as in the time of Pharaoh, but eventually became black. Ezekiel 31:13 says that the wild beasts of the field went and sat on him (Egypt). This is how we know Egypt today. The dark races had invaded the country.

In Ezekiel 14 God also speaks about punishment that He can send out against a nation, in this case Israel.

Ezekiel 14:21: *For thus says the Lord God: How much more when I send upon Jerusalem my four sore acts of judgement, sword, famine and beasts, and pestilence, to cut off from it man and beast.*

In this verse the wild beasts which are being referred to are once again the *chay*. They are a punishment that are being used by God. Where a nation transgresses, God uses one of four great punishments of which one is these wild beasts. In the English translation we read about noisome beasts – noisy beings.

Ezekiel 14:15 – *If I cause wild beasts to pass through the land, and they ravage it, and it be made desolate, so that no man may pass through because of the beasts,*

Both references to wild beasts are the *chay*. At no place in the history of civilization did ordinary wild animals have such an impact on a country that it would render the inhabitants childless. There might be areas in a country that would be unsafe due to wild animals, but when the *chay* appear, then everything changes.

We have already seen what they do as described in Job 24. Those specific characteristics they possess, causes God to use them as a punishment.

BALAAM

Numbers 22-24 tells the story of Balaam who was asked by Balak to curse the Israelites. Balak took Balaam to another place three times so that a sacrifice could be made. Every time God told Balaam to bless the Israelites instead of cursing them. Eventually Balaam returned home and Balak returned to his palace, very frustrated.

Revelation 2:14 reads: *But I have a few things against you; you have some there who hold the teaching of Balaam, who taught Balak to put a stumbling block before the sons of Israel that they might eat food sacrificed to idols, and practise immorality.*

Between Numbers 24:25 and 25:1 we read that Balaam nonetheless advised Balak how to get rid of the Israelites. Numbers 31: 16-18 mentions Balaam again. Israel wages war against Midian and Balaam gets killed in the process. Verse 16 says: *Behold, these caused the people of Israel, by the counsel of Balaam, to act treacherously against the Lord in the matter of Peor, and so the plague came among the congregation of the Lord.*

Balaam's advice and Peor are mentioned in the same breath; it deals with the same subject. Peor was killed because he mongrelised with Kosbi, so Balaam's counsel is also mongrelisation. He advised Balak to intermarry with the Israelites (to be immoral) and invite them in to participate in his idolatry to weaken them and eventually conquer them.

In Numbers 31 the Israelites wage war against the Midianites and Balaam is killed in the battle. However, the Israelites did not kill the women and children, but took them as prisoners. In those times a battle like that could continue for years, and when they eventually returned as victors to Moses with all their booty and the women and children, he was very angry. In Numbers 31:16 Moses told them that these women had been a handicap for the Israelites in the counsel of Balaam. The women had caused the Israelites to commit a breach of faith against God.

Verse 17 is an order based on God's command: *Now therefore kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman who has known man by lying with him.* This sexual relationship with a man was not just an ordinary relationship, this was mongrelisation.

According to Strong, verse 18 reads as follows: Whatsoever woman/little one/to know (or familiar friend)/a male/to lie, to live/male.

A male here is translated for *zakar*, that can be a male of human or animal origin. To *lie* means *having sex*, and to live is translated for *chay*, which we know by this time is a living being that can walk, speak, and work for a wage. Once again *male* in the end is *zakar*, meaning one of the male sex, in this case the *chay*.

So here the order is given that all who had mongrelised with the *chay* had to be killed. Even killing people is not a sin. In verse 19 God orders those that did the killing had to purify themselves for one week and cleanse themselves of sin.

Eleazar speaks to the warriors in Numbers 31: 21: *And Moses and Eleazar the priest did as the Lord commanded Moses.*

Here Eleazar speaks about a law that had been given to Moses that was a command against mongrelisation. Which other Law than the Ten Commandments did God give Moses?

RULE

The Israelite had to rule, and mongrelisation would bring his rule to an end.

Adam was supposed to rule over God's creation. However, before he could do so, Eve transgressed and they were banned from Paradise. However, God's command remained. He and Eve had to multiply and subjugate the earth and its inhabitants and rule over them. If you have to rule over a nation, you cannot afford to fraternise with them. Adam's rule over the earth's inhabitants had to be complete.

Gen. 1:28: *And god blessed them and God said to them: "Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it, and have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air and over every living thing that moves upon the earth."*

King James stated it this way: *And God blessed them, and God said unto them, be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish, and over the fowl of the air, and every living thing that moveth upon the earth.*

The animals mentioned here are once again the *chay*, or living things, meaning living beings of the earth. These can walk and speak. The rule and subjugation is in the strongest sense of the word. The definition of *Kabash* (subjugate) is found in Strong's as *bring into bondage, force, to tread down, to disregard, keep under*. This means Adam was told that he may use any form of force for any kind of resistance that he may come across.

Radah (rule) is defined by Strong's as *reign, rule, tread down*.

Adam had to rule with an iron hand. His descendants had to subjugate the *chay* to the point of trampling them underfoot and rule over them. There was never any talk of equal rights, or sitting together around the conference table. Adam had to subjugate them with force if necessary.

When Adam was created, the others were already on the earth which at that stage belonged to them. They ruled over it. However, with the coming of Adam and Eve, all that changed. Now new rulers appeared on scene and they were given full powers to rule. Their first order was to subjugate the inhabitants of the earth by any manner they saw fit. It was an order, a command given by God they had to execute.

However, Satan put a stop to that. He tempted Eve, but he also had to bear his own punishment for doing so.

Gen. 3:14 – *The Lord God said to the serpent: "because you have done this, cursed are you above all cattle, and above all wild animals; upon your belly you shall go and dust you shall eat all the days of your life.*

"Serpent" is also not correctly translated. It should be *Nachash*. It is the name of this being that God is speaking to. In the translation the name Adam was not changed, so *Nachash* should have stayed the same. It was a proper name and written that way in the original Hebrew. In the old Sumerian language the name *Nachash* means *he who solves the riddles*. According to them he was someone who spoke softly and in a civilised manner.

He is cursed by God among all the inhabitants of the earth at the time. As the evil spirit entered in the madman of Gedara, *Nachash* entered a being that tempted Eve. And in the same manner that Christ exorcised the evil spirits from the man into the pigs, God punished *Nachash* in the same manner by making him enter into a serpent.

It is written in Gen. 3:13: *Then the Lord God said to the woman: "What is this that you have done?" the woman said: "The serpent beguiled me, and I ate."*

This word *beguiled* is translated into Afrikaans as *deceived*. What Eve is really saying is that *Nachash led me morally astray and I did eat. He seduced or tempted her – not really deceiving her.*

Nachash is now cursed among all the living beings. Thus he is one of them, the *chay*. In Gen. 3:1 we read: *Now the serpent was more subtle than any other wild creature that the Lord God had made. He said to the woman: "Did God say: 'You shall not eat of any tree of the garden?"* *Nachash* is being compared with the *chay*, the living beings. Both are crafty, but *Nachash* was more crafty than the living beings.

God has never cursed an animal like a dog or lion or horse because they did wrong. They are dumb animals. This type of living being must be held accountable for what he had done. *Nachash* was more crafty than all the others so that he walked upright and could speak to Eve.

Gen. 9:5 – *For your lifeblood I will surely require a reckoning; of every beast I will require it and of man; of every man's brother I will require the life of man.*

It reads as follows in the old English translation of 1898: *And surely your blood, the blood of your lives, will I require, at the hand of every beast will I require it, and at the hand of man, even at the hand of every man's brother, will I require the life of man.*

Man is translated here for *'Adam*. So here the descendants of Adam are being addressed as Adamites, and only their blood will be required by God from other *Adamites*, as well as the *chay*, or living beings of the earth.

Once again *animals* is translated for *chay*, or living beings of the earth, they that walk on two legs and can speak.

Gen. 37:20 – *Come now, let us kill him and throw him into one of the pits, then we shall say that a wild beast had devoured him, and we shall see what will become of his dreams.*

The King James Bible says: *Come now, therefore, let us slay him, and cast him into some pit, and we will say, some evil beast hath devoured him.*

An evil or wild animal – both are translated for the word *chay*, meaning living being. Joseph's brothers had decided to tell their father that Joseph had been attacked and eaten by a wild beast that walks on two legs and speaks. Thus these bipeds eat humans (cannibalistic) and have never changed until today.

In Ezekiel 34 God says that He will save Israel from those who push her away with their horns and shoulders. Then, in verse 25, God says: *I will make with them a covenant of peace and banish wild beasts from the land, so that they may dwell securely in the wilderness, and sleep in the woods.*

Once again the wild animals have been translated for *chay*. We also read in verse 28: *They shall no more be a prey to the nations, nor shall the beasts of the land devour them; they shall dwell securely and none shall make them afraid.*

Here is a reference to cannibalism by the *chay*.

Jonah 3:8 reads: *..but let man and beast be covered with sackcloth and let them cry mightily to God, yes, let every one turn from his evil way, and from the violence which is in his hands.*

Here the word translated for animal is *bhema*, a quadruped, dumb animal. This is one of the examples of how the old Catholic church fathers had to adapt the Bible against their will to the

human opinion. The rest of the verse totally contradicts this *bhema*, because no dumb four-footed animal wears clothes, feels regret, or has hands. One can accept with certainty that in reality the reference is to the *chay*. It is a living being that can walk on two legs and can speak.

Other examples where the text has been tampered with are the five references in the Bible regarding sex with animals: Exodus 22:19; Leviticus 18:23, 20: 15 & 16, and Deuteronomy 27:21 warns against having sex with animals. All these quotes come from the Torah that was given to Moses on Mount Sinai. With the Sixth Commandment nicely watered down, these references also had to be altered from *chay* to *bhema* – from living beings to dumb animals.

OBEDIENCE

God uses this *chay* to particularly punish his nation when they are disobedient. He also insists that Israel does not mongrelise with these creatures/beings.

The first and great Commandment is that you must love the Lord your God. This is the greatest Commandment. Hear what God says to Israel in Joshua 23:11-13-*Take good heed to yourselves therefore, to love the Lord, your God. For if you turn back and join the remnant of these nations left here among you, and make marriages with them, so that you marry their women and they yours, know assuredly that the Lord, your God will not continue to drive out these nations before you, but they shall be a snare and a trap for you, a scourge in your sides and a thorn in your eyes till you perish from off this good land which the Lord your God has given you.*

If Israel is not warned to disobey the Law of God, then what was their sin? Here the nation is being warned about the Great Commandment, namely that they must love the Lord their God. It is said if you love the Lord your God, you must not mix with other nations, and not intermarry with them.

That is why it is a punishable offence to mix with other nations and intermarry with them.

The history of the Adamite race can be traced all over the world, and it will be found that where mongrelisation occurs with the dark races, the pure Adamite will eventually be oppressed and persecuted. At the moment it is especially the case in Europe, England, South Africa and America.

There was a time in the history of Portugal when they were pure white, with light hair and blue eyes. During the time of the Portuguese colonies the men were often away from home a long time. Then, while they were in colonies, chiefly in Africa, they took black women. Later on slaves were exported to Portugal and Europe, and mongrelisation continued even further. Eventually the black gene pool permeated the gene pool of the Portuguese nation, and today we find very few Portuguese who are still pure white.

Portugal descended from its position as a prosperous and progressive country to one of backwardness and poverty. That is the punishment God inflicts on a disobedient nation.

The threat as written in Joshua 23:13 is not idle. Verse 15 says: *But just as all the good things which the Lord your God promised concerning you have been fulfilled for you, so the Lord will bring upon you all the evil things, until He has destroyed you from off this good land which the Lord your God has given you.*

The original Portuguese nation has been almost totally destroyed. God keeps to His laws and punishment, but also His blessings.

There is also the case of Peor and Cosbi that has already been referred to. Twenty-four thousand Israelites died because ONE Commandment had been disobeyed: **YOU MAY NOT MON-**

GRELISE! The keeping of this Commandment is so important to God that He sent this terrible punishment over Israel to bring them to their senses.

An important appeal is made to Israel in Joshua 23:6 – *Therefore be very steadfast to keep all that is written in the book of the law by Moses, turning aside from it neither to the right hand or to the left.* (The Law Book of Moses includes the Ten Commandments.)

Verse 7: *That you may not be mixed with these nations left here among you, or make mention of the names of their gods, or swear by them, or serve them, or bow down yourselves to them.*

Here is a direct reference to the Law of Moses in which it is written that they must not mix with other nations.

One of the problems of mixing with heathen is that their gods will also be worshipped.

While the process of surrender was still ongoing in South Africa, one of the proceedings was opened with prayer. The Hindu and Muslim called to their gods while our church ministers and moderators bent their heads in honour and participated in this ‘prayer.’ When it was the turn of the Christian preacher to also pray to our God, the Hindus and Muslims rudely sat chatting and smoking. The Christian literally bent his knee before the idols.

The Bible was written for Israel and for nobody else. The law that was given to them had to ensure their survival as a nation, pure in race. God is a God of purity; mixing between the species and kinds is not acceptable to Him.

Throughout the years the pastors’ and other preachers’ messages became more watered down, because the translation and opinion around the Bible hides the truth and renders Christianity powerless.

THE ROLE OF THE CHURCH

The order of the Almighty’s creation has been overturned by false preachers, and today we see the exact opposite happening in the modern church. In turn this influences the community and eventually everything is topsy-turvy.

Because these truths are in conflict with the modern church’s levelling theology, the church made sure that it was twisted or hidden for the normal churchgoer. The church is the chief agent helping to overturn the order of creation of the Almighty. God created everything according to its kind and He said it was good. However, the church said no, all the different kinds now had to be mixed together.

A certain moderator of a large church accused a conservative preacher of being a racist. The preacher then asked the moderator to define a racist for him. The moderator replied that it was someone who destroyed races. Then the preacher replied: “But then YOU are the racists. Apartheid theology wants to keep the races separate and so protect them. But your churches that are mixing the races are now destroying them!”

God’s Law is aimed to preserve purity.

The Almighty creates His preferences. It is He who makes the angels spiritual servants; it was He who selected Abraham among all the people of the earth. It was His sovereign decision that Isaac would be chosen and Ishmael rejected. He said He loved Jacob, but hates Esau for all eternity.

God ordered Ezekiel to prophesy against the shepherds of Israel. In Ezekiel 34 he speaks harshly to the shepherds because they did not care for their sheep any longer, and were gathering the fat of the earth for themselves and grazing for themselves. They ruled harshly over the nation (with laws and rules and inapproachable).

In particular the Sixth Commandment was not preached to the nation, for in Ezekiel 34:5 we read: *So they were scattered because there was no shepherd, and they became food for all the wild beasts.*

The wild beasts that are mentioned here are once again the *chay*. The Christians have become the prey of the blacks.

The blame for this catastrophe is laid at the door of the shepherds. They should have seen to it that the sheep did not become scattered among the wild beasts of the field. God does not want His nation to deteriorate under these beings. He takes them to task over this in Ezekiel 34:10 - *Thus says the Lord God: Behold, I am against the shepherds, and I will require my sheep at their hand, and put a stop to their feeding the sheep; no longer shall the shepherds feed themselves: I will rescue my sheep from their mouths, that they may not be food for them.*

This is the general condition of the church today. The churches are becoming empty. In earlier times the congregations were very large, but today thousands are leaving the church. God does not want His sheep to decay under the wild beasts/beings of the field. The shepherds did not do the Will of God, and changed His Sixth Commandment so that the sheep were not aware that they were doing wrong by mongrelising.

The church wants to change God's laws, forgetting that He is sovereign and He decides what He wants.

Knowledge is essential. It is the Christian's way of surviving in a world that is being ruled by heathen Knowledge and wisdom go hand-in-hand.

Proverbs 9:10 reads: *The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, and the knowledge of the Holy One is insight.*

The same thought occurs in Proverbs 1:7: *The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge; fools despise wisdom and instruction.*

Fear of God is the beginning of wisdom and knowledge. Armed with knowledge, wisdom and insight, a child of God can remain standing against any onslaught from Satan. Unfortunately the church has been following another agenda these last few years. The herd was just there to supply money. The preachers did not announce the wisdom and knowledge of God from the pulpits, but lecturing in morals and preaching sermons about man-made laws. The congregations accepted these because they themselves did not seek knowledge and wisdom. They always blindly believed and accepted what the preachers said. That is why it was so easy to lead them to the slaughter.

Isaiah 5:13 says: *Therefore my people go into exile for want of knowledge; their honoured men are dying of hunger, and their multitude is parched with thirst.*

The Afrikaner has become an exile in his own land. He has been banned from ruling himself. He has been banned from his workplace, his school, his living area, yes, even from his own history and everything that is his national identity. A lack of knowledge for the truth has rendered this once proud nation the floor rag of the world.

Knowledge is power, says the adage, and the bible confirms this. In Isaiah 11 we read about how prosperous the government of the Messiah will be. That is where the child will play by the hole of the adder and the lion will eat straw like an ox.

Isaiah 11: 9 says: *They shall not hurt or destroy in all My holy mountain, for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea.*

Knowledge of God's truths and His Laws bring prosperity. That is the message found in Isaiah 11.

The Sixth Commandment of God's Laws says: You must not mongrelise.

If this Law is obeyed once again, prosperity will return and God will drive out the nations before His nation so that His nation will be able to live in peace once again.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Sixth Law; H.V. Herrell

The New Testament according to the Eastern Text, translated from the original Aramaic Sources; by George Lamas, A.J. Holman Company, Philadelphia.

The Illustrated Family Bible according to the authorised version; James Sangster & Co., London

The Book of the Upright (The book of Yasher); Libanon Publishers, Mossel Bay.

Old Translation of the Bible in Afrikaans; Bible Society

King James Version;

Strong's Concordance.

Catholics love images

We know Catholics bow down in front of statues and pray. We know they love to adore the host which is a piece of bread. We know that they pray to the dead as though by doing so it will bring them benefit. We know that they love relics like a dead monk's head. We know that they love their other "sacred" images like pictures of a madonna and naked baby Jesus. Finally we know that they think that there is some benefit of having a Jesus hanging on the cross in their homes so they can visualize the object of their worship. They will vehemently tell you they don't worship these images yet is not hard to find pictures of the pope bowing down before Mary to worship. Protestant Reformers--people who did not want to leave the Roman Church, but who did want to reform the Roman Church--have well documented why they held that the Roman Church did not differentiate veneration and worship. But what about the command to not bow down before these images in the first place?

The Bible says don't even make images

What does the Bible say about worshipping images? It teaches us not to bow to them, not to pray to them and not to pray to any likeness. Most of us know that the Ten Commandments prohibit even making images in the first place and this poses a problem for the Catholic religion. How does it get around this?

THE CATHOLIC RELIGION CHANGES THE TEN COMMANDMENTS!

Even their own Bibles have something that approximates the commandment to not make images, but since the leadership tells their parishioners otherwise, the people are kept uninformed about the truth.

How can they delete a commandment and still have ten?

Some may ask, "If the Catholic religion deletes a commandment how do they still come up with ten commandments?"

Let's compare the Catholic ten commandments to a literal English translation of the ten commandments using the King James Bible. I'll let you take a look first (see if you can figure it out) and then explain...

The Catholic Error* The King James Bible

First Commandment

I, the LORD, am your God...You shall not have other gods besides me. **First Commandment**

I am the LORD thy God...Thou shalt have no other gods before me.

Second Commandment

You shall not take the name of the LORD, your God, in vain. **Second Commandment**

Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them.

Third Commandment

Remember to keep holy the sabbath day. **Third Commandment**

Thou shalt not take the name of the LORD thy God in vain.

Fourth Commandment

Honor your father and your mother. **Fourth Commandment**

Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy.

Fifth Commandment

You shall not kill. **Fifth Commandment**

Honor thy father and thy mother.

Sixth Commandment

You shall not commit adultery. **Sixth Commandment**

Thou shalt not kill.

Seventh Commandment

You shall not steal. **Seventh Commandment**

Thou shalt not commit adultery.

Eighth Commandment

You shall not bear false witness against your neighbor. **Eighth Commandment**

Thou shalt not steal.

Ninth Commandment

You shall not covet your neighbor's wife. **Ninth Commandment**

Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.

Tenth Commandment

You shall not covet your neighbor's house. **Tenth Commandment**

Thou shalt not covet.

Did you see it?

The Catholic religion deletes the second commandment and makes the 10th commandment into two. If you follow them all the way down from the second commandment you'll see the Catholic religion is always one ahead of the King James. Finally at the tenth commandment they break it into two and make it the 9th and 10th commandments. Get out your Bible and compare.

For Roman Catholics the issue is why does this Roman Catholic text fail to translate the command not to make or bow to images? The command is in the Hebrew, why isn't it translated?



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

**"For out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the
Word of the Lord from Jerusalem"
(Isaiah 2:3)."**

