



The Burning Bush—Online article archive

"British Israelism" examined and its errors exposed



A series of articles by Rev. Ron Johnstone,
(Minister of Armagh Free Presbyterian Church)
First published in "The Burning Bush," June - November 2000.

Some months ago I was asked to speak at a youth rally to highlight the dangerous teachings of extreme British Israelism. I began by stating that there have been true believers that have held the view that most British people are Israelites and that Jeremiah brought a King of Israel's daughter to Ireland. I did not believe, nor did I know of any ministers in our Church who did. However I clearly said that I would not fall out with those people who held such a view as long their ideas did not go on to contradict important doctrines of Scripture.

I then refuted some of the abominable teachings of extreme British Israelites. These included such doctrines as the claim that the Gospel is only for white people (Israelites) and that white people have a spirit while coloured people do not. That Adam was not the first man but the first white man. That Noah being 'perfect in his generations' meant that he was of pure white descent and that was why God preserved him in the ark during a local, not a worldwide flood. That there is a 29th chapter of Acts which has been discovered relating Paul's journey to England. That the ark of the covenant is buried in the Hill of Tara in Southern Ireland and there is a prophecy that when it is dug up there will be peace in Ulster. I spoke at the meeting of my concern that literature promoting some of these views had been given to Free Presbyterian members who had been invited to British Israelite meetings.

My message was taped and over the next few weeks I received interesting anonymous letters. One claimed to be from a Free Presbyterian and stated "this is what we really believe." Included with the letter was a tape of Pastor James McConnell. On listening to the cassette it became clear to me that the person was indeed wise not to sign their name! The sermon did not convince me of British Israelism but rather shocked me at the lengths to which British Israelites will go to promote their theory. In a vain attempt to prove that Britain really owns Palestine, Pastor McConnell not only misapplied scripture but also contradicted clear statements of God's Word. He put great emphasis on the claim that the word Jew only referred to those from the tribe of Judah in contrast to those of the House of Israel who are now located in Britain and the United States. He maintained it was the Jews who returned from captivity to crucify Christ while the Northern Israelite tribes migrated to Britain and America. He, however, must believe that a few members of tribes other than Judah returned because in a reference to Judas Iscariot he dogmatically states, "Christ chose 12 Apostles and only one of them was a Jew and it was the Jew who betrayed Him."

It is obvious that Pastor McConnell's British Israelite views led him to make such a bold statement. Yet it is strange that the Apostle Paul did not know what Pastor McConnell claims to know because Paul referred to Peter as being a Jew. Gal 2: 14 —"I said unto Peter before them all, If thou being a Jew . . . "



The Burning Bush—Online article archive

I would rather take the Apostle Paul and the Word of God as my authority than Pastor McConnell's statement. I was also sent a large parcel containing books, booklets and leaflets by British Israelite writers including many by Mr Alan Campbell. These were sent anonymously along with a text from Proverbs 18: 13: "He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is folly and shame unto him."

I already possessed and had read many B.I. books but I was grateful to receive these extra publications because they confirmed the dangerous and blasphemous statements being circulated by some B.I. teachers. In one of the booklets Mr Alan Campbell states the following: "One of the most dangerous and deceptive doctrines of Roman Catholicism which has been carried over into our Evangelical and Pentecostal church world is the theory that the Church is the Bride of Christ. This doctrine can be traced back to the Dark Ages when Roman superstition was growing and developing Regrettably this teaching was not abandoned at the Reformation, but was carried over with certain variations into Reformed Theology where it was claimed with equal vehemence that the invisible church made up of born-again believers out of all denominations, constitute the Bride. Such teaching persists to this very day in spite of the vast amount of evidence to prove that the Israel people of the Bible are found today — redeemed and regathered — in the British Isles, the United States and the Old Commonwealth, as the Nation and Company of Nations promised to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, married to Almighty God at the foot of Mount Sinai and spoken of continually throughout Bible Prophecy. It is these people who constitute the National Bride of Christ, as distinct from the Church which is His body ..."

We have no apology to make that we hold to the Reformed and Biblical position that the church, made up of some out of every tribe, tongue, people and nation as described in such passages as Eph 5, is the Bride of Christ. Some will be annoyed that we should highlight such a subject but Matthew 12:37 states "For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned." It is our intention to examine the words that are being circulated by British Israelites in our Province and test such by the Word of God. It will be seen that sadly in their zeal to claim that Britain is Israel some have been led into dangerous and anti-scriptural positions.

"The Burning Bush" June/July 2000.

=====

The first article in this series caused quite a stir amongst those who would see themselves as defenders of the teaching of British Israelism. A perusal of some recent entries in the Guest Book on our Burning Bush" website would confirm this. Despite the attempts to intimidate and silence Rev. Ron Johnstone, we are pleased to present his second article in the series. Opponents may huff and puff and make derogatory remarks but such comes far short of an answer to the charges laid against the unscriptural notion that Britain is Israel.
The Editor.



The Burning Bush—Online article archive

THE DANGERS OF BRITISH ISRAELISM

We have already underlined the fact that there are and have been some believers who have espoused a form of British Israel teaching which has not led them to deny basic and fundamental doctrines of scripture. However that does not contradict the sad fact that many of those who have started down a British Israelite path have been led into serious doctrinal error. That danger is exemplified by what is probably the most professional North American 'Identity' web site on the Internet. At the beginning this group's statement of faith appears to be very orthodox. They state they believe in the Trinity, the Deity of Christ and Justification by faith alone. However they go on to say they believe that those among Israel who believe will be saved! They believe that Satan has a seed upon earth known as the Jews. They state that coloured people have no spirit and therefore cannot know salvation. In their listing of books and tapes there is a category for those, 'who can handle strong meat.' This listing includes books viciously attacking the 'Negro' and Jew and also those who maintain that Adam was not the first man but the first white man. Noah and his family were preserved during a local flood because they were the only family with pure white blood in that particular area of the world. Such nonsense clearly demonstrates the dangerous nature of extreme BI teaching and how unwary people can be drawn into blasphemous doctrines.

One Free Presbyterian who was invited to meetings held by Mr Alan Campbell told me they were given a book by this British Israelite teacher to show them why BI teaching was so important. An American, Sheldon Emery wrote 'Paul and Joseph of Arimathea'. While it contains vicious attacks on preachers (such as our own ministers) who do not hold to British Israelite views, the most serious thing about the book is the blasphemous teaching it contains. It was written to prove that 'our Race, the White Race, is God's Chosen Race.' There are many racist attacks upon the Jew and coloured people, for example—
"Christianity being OBVIOUSLY a religion ONLY of the White Race." "Many of our ancestors, and many present day Bible scholars believe the Negro to be the "beast of the field" of the Bible." Vicious and unfactual derogatory comments are made against Africans and also upon missionaries who went to evangelise such and the churches which sent them. We in the Free Presbyterian Church have missionaries in Africa and every member should be disgusted and righteously angry at such vile literature. The author goes as far as to maintain that the name gentile does not refer to non-Israelites but to Israelites who were scattered throughout Europe. That Paul spent his entire ministry preaching to the White Race is proof he understood the White Race to be BOTH the "gentiles" (Israelites in the European dispersion) and the "children of Israel" (the Israelites in Judea who had retained the name Israel). Only one Race has ever answered to His voice, the Caucasian Race." The writer argues that the modern day Jews are descended from the Canaanites and have been allowed to, "come into this wonderful land, and to defile it WITH THE SAME SINS OF CANAAN!" LSD and other drugs are claimed to be produced in Palestine by Jews in order to corrupt the White Israelite youth. The Mafia is claimed not to be Italians but actually Sicilian Jews! The book also contains what purports to be the 29th chapter of Acts which details how Paul came to England to preach. (Capitals as in the book.) Mr A Campbell has published a booklet entitled, 'The Bride of Christ.' In it a strange view of the Atonement is put forth. He ar-



The Burning Bush—Online article archive

gues that the Northern Kingdom, Israel had committed adultery and was divorced from the Lord. Under the Law the penalty for adultery was death and he therefore argues that 'Israel once divorced...it was impossible to return to God again as long as the husband who wrote the bill of divorcement lived. Only by his death could the divorced wife be released from the penalty of the law.' He then goes on to state that Christ shed His blood to annul the bill of divorce. I do not suggest that such extreme views are held by all that hold to a form of BI teaching. Such teaching would be abhorrent to them. However we must warn that such literature is available in Northern Ireland and we must condemn such and publicly and vigorously disassociate from it. We must solemnly warn those who start down the path of British Israelism of the grave danger that they could become more and more open to such false teaching as that described above.

Another danger, arguably not as serious as that above, is that those holding a British Israelite view see proofs for their theories where none exists. This has led leading exponents of the theory to claim that the Japanese are Israelites (Heritage of the Anglo-Saxon Race by M H Gayer published by Covenant Publishing Co.) The writer informs us that many Japanese names sound like Hebrew names. That the 'Samurai' came from Samaria. We are told the names Dungannon and Dundalk prove that the tribe of Dan passed through Ireland. (Dan being changed to Dun.) One writer states that the Irish are descendants of the tribe of Dan and that is why they like to sing, 'O Danny Boy'! Sadly some are impressed by such foolishness. A question to ask is, 'Does the fact that Birmingham ends in 'Ham' prove the English are descended from Ham?' One of the first exponents in England gave as one of the proofs that 'the smoke and fire coming up from the cities and furnaces of our land are like the pillar cloud of Israel.'

A common claim often repeated as true, is that some English words are really Hebrew terms. Some go as far as to claim that there are many Hebrew words in English, so therefore we are descended from Israel. However there are more Arabic words in English. So we must be Arabs and not Israelites! Many BI writers have stated that 'British' is in fact two Hebrew words meaning 'Covenant man.' This is then sadly accepted by the readers and then repeated as a proof for the theory. In a tape I was sent, Pastor James McConnell repeats this claim and challenges anyone to refute it. (Since the first article appeared I have received criticism for referring to Pastor McConnell's public statements. I find this sad. When I was asked to speak on BI I never mentioned him. I was then sent a tape of his preaching on BI in which he repeatedly challenged anyone to refute his comments. In the last edition of The Burning Bush I quoted his words exactly alongside the words of the apostle Paul. Not one of the critics has even attempted to contradict the point I made. I am not attacking Pastor McConnell's person. Nor do I mean to imply that he holds the extreme views highlighted earlier in this article. However, since I was sent the tape by a person claiming to be a Free Presbyterian who stated this is what they believed, I have a right to state where I disagree with the comments made.) Critics have already poured scorn on my mental ability. So I will make it clear that I do not claim to be a Hebrew scholar. (I did study Linguistics in USA, specialising in the area of the comparison of different languages. I then worked on languages in Papua New Guinea. Hebrew was required study in the Theological Hall of our Church, which I attended.) I have spoken with those who are recognised as proficient in Hebrew and as yet I have not met one who gives credence to such a view



The Burning Bush—Online article archive

that 'British' means 'covenant man'. Recently while in North America I sought the views of a professor of Hebrew who has taught in a Fundamentalist seminary since 1976. I was not surprised that he found such a claim amusing. The claim is made because 'Brit' sounds a little like the Hebrew word for covenant, 'Berith'. (It also sounds like other Hebrew words, one referring to a false god.) And 'Ish' in Hebrew is one of the words for man. However the construction in Hebrew of 'berith-ish' would be meaningless. The concept 'covenant man' is not in Biblical Hebrew. The noun covenant is never given in Biblical Hebrew an adjectival force. The term 'ish' is used in names such as 'Ishbosheth' meaning 'a man of shame'. However the Hebrew idiom for man of the covenant, if it occurred, would be 'ishhabberith' or some phrase even farther removed from 'British'. British is the old Celtic 'Bret' (a Briton) plus the familiar suffix 'ish', which is used to form adjectives in many languages such as German and Dutch. N H Parker, Professor of Hebrew, McMaster University, Ontario has written that the idea that 'berith ish' ' might mean 'covenant man' is preposterous.' Of the suffix in British he states, 'To persist...to identify it with the Hebrew word 'ish' (man) might well be described as childish and foolish.' Again Pastor McConnell and others have repeated the idea that 'Saxons' really means 'Isaac's sons.' It is claimed that if the 'I' is dropped from 'Isaac' and the suffix 'on' is added we have 'Saxon' or the 'son of Isaac.' They refer to Genesis 21: 12 "for in Isaac shall thy seed be called." But that text does not say that a nation would be called Isaac, even if Saxon did mean Isaac, which it does not. The text says that his seed should be called IN Isaac. In Romans 9: 6-8 Paul refers to this very passage as also does Hebrews 11: 18-19. In neither case does it speak of people being called 'Isaac'. In Genesis 21 God was telling Abraham that the promise made to him that in his seed all nations of the earth would be blessed (a prophecy fulfilled in Christ) should come through Isaac and not Ishmael. If the verse did mean, as British Israelites claim that Abraham's descendants through Isaac would be called 'Isaac's sons' or 'Saxons' then surely all the 12 tribes would be called by that name! The claim repeated by BI teachers that the ancient group of people known as the 'Scythians' were in fact Israelites who came from Assyria across Europe and became the 'Saxons' has been discredited. Yet it is still repeated as 'proof' that the British people are Israelites. I was sent copies of the BI magazine, 'The Ensign Message'. As proof that the 'Scythians' were Israelites they state: " Now the name for Scythian in the Assyrian language was 'Iskuzal', but there has been no explanation for the initial 'I' unless it be that the name was derived from 'Isaac.' The Israelites may well have called themselves Isaaca, or house of Isaac..." If you take time to read carefully such reasoning you will realise that it is no wonder the Encyclopaedia Britannica states...."The theory (of British-Israelism) ... rests on premises which are deemed by scholars - both theological and anthropological - to be utterly unsound"

We will look (DV) next time at some scriptures that are used as 'proof texts' by British Israelites.

"The Burning Bush" August/September 2000.

=====

These articles continue to cause quite a stir amongst those who would see themselves as defenders of the teaching of British Israelism. We have had to bar certain entries from our



The Burning Bush—Online article archive

Guest Book on "The Burning Bush" website, because our opponents have taken to using libellous attacks upon members of the Bob Jones family, university faculty and anyone who has had contact with them, in an attempt to discredit what is said in these articles.

It has been repeatedly stated that Bob Jones IV is presently pursuing a degree at Notre Dame University in USA. I understand that he did for a time undertake studies at that Roman Catholic institution but left it some time ago before completing the course. It has also been stated that he is to be the next President of Bob Jones University. That too, according to my information, is untrue.

It has been alleged that because some members of the BJU faculty prefer the Minority Text to that used by the translators of the KJV, they are evil men. While I do not agree with the views of these faculty members, I cannot call them evil men. I readily acknowledge that they possess a much greater knowledge of the subject of textual criticism than I do. Nevertheless, I believe them to be mistaken and that on the basis of the writings of others of equal or greater scholarship.

But even if all connected with Bob Jones University were rogues and Ron Johnstone and I were liars, it would not suffice to answer what is said in these articles simply to state that of us. Do we reject the statement: Jesus of Nazareth . . . I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God because it was uttered by a demon-possessed man? I think not! Red herrings may appear substantial to the dull of mind but they can never be an answer to truth. These attacks but underscore the inability of Blers to answer from the Bible the objections to their notions laid down in these articles. Those proponents of British Israelism who have trivialised the issue by bombarding our Guest Book with schoolboyish sneers and jibes tell us much about the substance of their views and the sincerity with which they hold them. We are pleased to present Rev. Ron Johnstone's third article in this series, confident that our detractors will still be unable to answer what is said except perhaps to continue their deceitful tirade. The Editor.

=====

Since the last article, I have received abuse for 'attacking Mr Campbell'. I would urge that the article be reread, as I did not anywhere attack his character. I stated facts. We have every right and indeed a duty to examine the published beliefs of others. Others have freedom to teach their particular views in their own churches. To show why we reject certain doctrines that are contrary to our own position is only construed as bigotry by those who have no real confidence in their own position or who are unable to answer in a sane and sensible way. To some, it seems justifiable for people to attack our sincerely held views on what the Bible teaches about the tribes of Israel, but immediately we examine British Israelite views we are accused of all kinds of evil motives. Such an attitude is very far removed from true Protestantism.

challenge

Few enjoy having their views challenged. We realise then that some will not be happy at the articles. Yet Mr Campbell has written against our beliefs. For instance, every Free Presbyterian minister and elder has taken a solemn vow to teach that the Church is the 'Bride of Christ'. Yet Mr Alan Campbell states clearly in his writings that this is a deceptive Roman



The Burning Bush—Online article archive

Catholic heresy. When the Westminster Confession and the views of Calvin, Luther and Knox are described as a carry over from Roman Catholic heresy we have every right to object.

racism

As I write this article, Mr Campbell's British Israelite site still carries an article by Sheldon Emery. He is the writer who openly states that the gospel is not for coloured people but only for the 'White Israel Race.'

BRITISH ISRAELITE 'PROOFS'

Many BI's claim that the term 'Jew' is not used to denote descendants of all the tribes of Israel. That is, while Jews descending from Judah are Israelites not all Israelites are Jews. They generally teach that when the 10 tribes of the Northern Kingdom were carried into Assyria they did not return to their land but were scattered and lost. Judah, the Southern kingdom was then carried into Babylon and a remnant later returned.

We believe that the Bible does not support such a view. Rather members of all the tribes returned to the land of Israel and were there in New Testament times.

Teachers of BI claim the 10 tribes were 'lost'. Yet James wrote to the 12 tribes scattered abroad. These were obviously members of all the tribes who were living outside the land of Israel. They were not 'lost' but were scattered and therefore living outside the Promised Land.

When Paul went on his missionary journeys he would go first to the local synagogue to address his fellow countrymen.

If the term Jew can be shown to have become synonymous with Israel then the major foundation of BI claims is swept away. Contrary to BI claims we believe the term Jew did come to be interchangeable with the term Israelite.

Consider the following verses in the New Testament.

When Christ told the Canaanitish woman that 'I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel,' Matt 15:24, surely He did not mean that He was sent to the 10 tribes that had been lost in Western Europe! He meant that His mission on earth was to His own people who were lost spiritually. He never left the land of Israel during His ministry.

'He came unto His own and His own received Him not.' John 1:11. Was that just to two tribes?

John preached repentance in Judaea (Mark 1:4,5) yet preached repentance 'to all the people of Israel,' Acts 13:24.

Jews "out of every nation" were dwelling at Jerusalem (Acts 2:5). Peter referred to all of these Jews as "men of Israel" (Acts 2:22).

Acts 13: 6 refers to the "synagogue of the Jews" in which Paul preached. In verse 16, Paul called them "men of Israel" and in verse 17 "this people of Israel." In verse 24 he says that John "had first preached repentance to all the people of Israel," in verse 26 he called them the "stock of Abraham," and in verse 33 he referred to the Jews as "us their children"; then, showing that the Jews were the ones to whom he was speaking, verse 42



The Burning Bush—Online article archive

says “when the Jews came out of the synagogue.” So Acts 13 adds up to this: Paul went into the “synagogue of the Jews”; talking to the Jews in their synagogue, he called them “men of Israel,” “this people Israel,” “all the people of Israel,” “stock of Abraham,” and “us their children”; — and then “the Jews came out of the synagogue.”

Yet there are still British Israelites who claim that Jews are not Israelites!

People on the earth at present are described in 1 Cor 10:32 as being Jew, Gentile or of the Church of God. If, as BI teachers claim, the term Jew does not refer to the Israelite then where is the Israelite?

Roms 1:16 — The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation, ‘to the JEW first and also to the Greek.’ Roms 2:9 — ‘The JEW first and also of the Gentile.’ See also Roms 2:10, 14, 17.

In Roms 3:9 — ‘We have before proved BOTH JEWS AND GENTILES that they are ALL under sin.’

To get round this clear teaching of scripture many BI Teachers state that the term ‘Gentile’ actually refers to the ‘10 lost tribes’ who were ‘gentilized’ by living outside the land of Israel! Paul being sent as an Apostle to the Gentiles really means he was sent to the 10 Tribes of Israel and even travelled to Britain to preach to them. Such a twisting of the term ‘Gentile’ is easily disproved.

In Eph 2:11-22, Paul describes Gentiles as being aliens from the commonwealth of ISRAEL (NOT MEMBERS OF IT) but in Christ the wall of division is broken down and believers whether ISRAELITE or GENTILE are one in Christ.

In Galatians 3, Paul speaks of the two groups of mankind as being JEW and GENTILE and emphasises that when they believe, JEW and GENTILE are now one in Christ.

These and other verses prove that the term Jew did come to be used to describe members of all the tribes of Israel.

The most common passage used to draw young Christians into British Israelism is Jeremiah 33:17. “For thus saith the LORD; David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel . . . ”

This passage is often quoted as proof for the British Israelite theory by its propagators. The BI teacher will argue that the passage teaches that the throne of David is to exist continuously forever—through all generations.

They then ask, if so then where is it today?

They claim to have the answer and an appeal is made to the ‘ancient annals of Ireland’ to attempt to prove that Queen Elizabeth now sits on David’s throne.

It is claimed that a Hebrew princess Tephai was the daughter of King Zedekiah of Judah, and therefore heir to the throne of David. The prophet Jeremiah brought her to Ireland to where Israelites had already migrated. They carried with them the stone upon which Jacob slept and upon which Kings of Judah were crowned. This became the coronation stone which until recently was in Westminster Abbey. A chart is produced that claims to trace



The Burning Bush—Online article archive

Queen Elizabeth’s ancestry back to Tephi, to Zedekiah and on back to David. British Israelite speakers love to relate these and other romantic legends. If they just stuck to the legends we would not take issue with them. However we must take issue with them when they misapply scripture to bolster up the ‘ancient legends’.

The text in Jeremiah 33: 17 must be studied in its context. Note 2 things about the context. 1) British-Israelites usually only quote the first part of the covenant, but the covenant continues: “Neither shall the priests the Levites want a man before me to offer burnt offerings, and to kindle meat offerings, and to do sacrifice continually” (Jeremiah 33: 18).

Are there Levites today offering burnt offerings, kindling meat offerings and doing “sacrifice continually?” Notice the similar references in vs. 21, 22. The answer is no! (Some BI writers have claimed the Druids were in fact Levites and that ‘priests’ in the Church of England are doing the work of Levites’.)

2) The promise, “David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel” is referring to Christ. Consider the context: “Behold, the days come . . . ” (v. 14). What days? “In those days, and at that time, will I cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David; and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land” (v. 15). The Branch is singular (i.e. “he”) and does not, therefore, refer to a successive line of kings and queens. This description can only refer to Jesus Christ. (For ‘Branch’ as a title of Christ see Is 4:2; 11:1; Jer 23:5; Zech 3:8; 6:12; Rev 22:16.)

no king no priest

Hosea 3:2 foretold that there would be a period when Israel, “shall abide without a king and without a prince.” In Luke 1:31-33 we read of Christ, “...The Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David, and He shall reign over the House of Jacob forever; and of His Kingdom shall there be no end.” Christ came to be the true King of Israel.

Jer 33:16 — “In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely: and this is the name wherewith she shall be called, The LORD our righteousness.” Neither Judah, Jerusalem nor Great Britain can be said to presently be “saved” or “dwell safely.” Certainly today, Great Britain does not merit the description, “The LORD our righteousness.”

Jeremiah’s prophecy has not failed, for it is referring to Christ Who is the Prophet, Priest and the King. The text is a Messianic text.

British Israelism not only takes promises given to Israel and applies them to Britain and to the United States, but they also take prophecies that belong to the Saviour and apply them to Britain and to the United States!

“The Burning Bush” October 2000.

=====

These articles have aroused opposition, for the most part, of the most inane nature. It has to be said that there was no attempt whatever to answer the points that were made from the Word of God. Rather, attacks on anyone and anything that would serve as a diversion and conceal the failure of the advocates of the folly of British Israelism. Abusive phone calls and e-mails mark the response of



The Burning Bush—Online article archive

most of those who contacted us from the BI camp. Most, but not all were of this ilk. I did talk to one young man who promised that he would convey to Mr. Alan Campbell the open invitation to reply to the articles and have this reply printed in "The Burning Bush." He was very courteous and freely admitted that he was unable to comment on the scriptures brought to his attention. He was told that it was most foolish to commit yourself to a system of teaching about which you really know nothing. I suspect that is the position of most BI disciples. We are pleased to present Rev. Ron Johnstone's fourth and final article in this series and repeat our confidence that our detractors will once again be unable to answer what is said from the Word of God. It is one thing to claim you believe and teach the Bible in a church advertisement or on a web site, but quite another to answer from the Bible that critique which demonstrates that your teaching is anything but Biblical.
The Editor.

=====

This is the last article in the series. This is not because we have run out of material. Space could be given to answer the foolish claims such as that "possessing the gate of their enemies" Gen 22: 17; 24: 60, means Britain owning Gibraltar! Space could also be devoted to answering the "Ensign" magazine's comment about there being a "sub-species of man existing as a humanoid." However it has not been our intention to answer every claim of British Israelites, especially when there was no attempt at refutation of earlier articles. The purpose of the articles has been to warn believers of the dangers of being sucked in to extreme B.I. teaching and thereby making shipwreck of their faith. We have pointed out that not all who hold B I views have gone to the same extreme as others, but nevertheless some have been led into what must be classed as damnable heresies. It would be inconsistent of us to expose the false teachings of the Church of Rome and yet not expose the errors of EXTREME B I teaching when it crosses our path. I did not set out to research B I literature but was alarmed at material that came unsolicited into my possession. It was out of a concern that any Free Presbyterian would be swayed by the strong Protestant claims made by some B I proponents and so give credence to the myths and legends they propagates that I first put pen to paper. Since the first article, more blasphemous anti-Negro and anti-Jewish literature has been sent to us, literature that I never imagined would be circulated among professed evangelicals. It is interesting that writers on British Israelism have pointed out that there have been two different groups in the forefront of promoting the teaching. One has been a group among Church of England evangelicals. The other, more extreme, has been groups of "Oneness" Pentecostals in USA and Australia, some teaching that baptism is necessary for salvation, "soul sleep" and the continuation of the Old Testament dietary laws. It has recently come to our attention that it is claimed that "The Worldwide Church of God", commenced by H W Armstrong, has now renounced its British Israelite teaching, stating it was based on myths and legends.

In his dictionary recommended for use for our Sabbath Schoolteachers, Dr. Alan Cairns has



The Burning Bush—Online article archive

this to say about British Israelism.

BRITISH ISRAELISM

A fanciful theory, which holds that Great Britain is really the Israelite tribe of Ephraim, the United States is Manasseh, and the British throne is the throne of David. British Israelism (B.I.) has constructed a theory, which it passes off as history, that makes the British and American white populations direct descendants of the Israelites from the dispersion period. The most plausible arguments advanced for the theory are based on the similarity of a few Hebrew and English words. For example, Saxon is said to be really Isaacson, — son of Isaac; British is said to be two Hebrew words, berith, "covenant," and ish, "man", yielding the meaning "the men of covenant." The Engl part of England is alleged to be the Hebrew "egel", "bullock" because of the widespread sacrifice of bullocks there by "Issacsons," leading to the popular title John Bull.

These arguments are purely imaginary. They are based upon the similarity in sound of a few words and have no foundation in fact. BI's "history" of Jeremiah's escape with Zedekiah's daughter from Egypt to Ireland, carrying the Stone of Scone, is also unattested fancy. The removal of this "stone of destiny" to Scotland and then to Westminster Abbey is all part of B.I. lore. Professor Ramsey, the London geologist, upon chemical examination of the stone pronounced it be "calcareous sandstone of a reddish or purplish colour with heterogeneous pebbles, and of Scottish origin."

The entire theory of the ten lost tribes is a myth also. According to BI, the ten northern tribes were lost and were not included in the regathering with Judah after the exile. But according to Luke 2:36, Anna was of the northern tribe of Asher. In Acts 26:7 Paul mentions the presence of "our twelve tribes," indicating that none of them had been "lost."

B.I exhibits an arbitrary exegesis of Scripture married to a fairy-tale tradition posing as history and has produced "one of the most baseless and absurd varieties of Bible study that the human mind has yet produced" (A Pieters, *The Seed of Abraham*, p.159).

{*Dictionary of Theological Terms* by Alan Cairns, p.68,69}.

DOES THE OLD TESTAMENT SUPPORT B I ?

BI writers often refer to the Assyrian captivity of the Northern Kingdom of Israel which took place from 741BC to 721 BC. They argue that all the people of the 10 tribes were carried away into Assyria and then later set off north and west into Europe. They claim the blessings of Jacob upon Ephraim and Manasseh have been and are being fulfilled in the white citizens of Britain and N America. Some boldly state that NONE out of the 10 tribes returned to Palestine.

However such claims face a major difficulty! The scriptures tell a different story. Years after the captivity, "Hezekiah sent to all Israel and Judah, and wrote letters also to Ephraim and Manasseh that they should come to the house of the LORD at Jerusalem, to keep the Passover unto the LORD God of Israel." 2 Chron 30:1. Further to that, 2 Chron 30:18 states that, "many of Ephraim and Manasseh, Issachar and Zebulun" came to Jerusalem. That would have been a long trip if they had to come all the way from Britain and Ireland! In the year 628 BC, a century after the Assyrian captivity, Josiah called Israel and Judah to



The Burning Bush—Online article archive

observe the Passover. 2 Chron 34:9 records that Ephraim and Manasseh contributed to the repairing of the Temple by Josiah.

If the 10 tribes were in Europe at this time, as B I teachers maintain, how could they also be present at Jerusalem?

In Luke 2:36 it is recorded that the Saviour was seen in the Temple by a prophetess named Anna, of the tribe of Asher. If Asher had disappeared into Europe and lost knowledge of their identity, who had kept the lineage of Anna's family?

BI teachers claim that the appointed "place for My people Israel" referred to in 2 Sam 7:10 is the British Isles. Followers of B I in USA, usually known as "Identity Truth" teach the appointed place is N America. We will not take the space to go into detail on the meaning of 2 Sam 7:10 but rather urge readers to note that the passage specifically mentions the building of Solomon's temple, and "the place" was where the house was to be built (verse 13). Where was the house built? In the "appointed place" the land of Canaan, not somewhere else. Years later Nehemiah said it was the "place" to which Israel returned after their captivity, when God "gathered them from thence" to "bring them unto the place that I have chosen to set My Name there", Nehemiah 1:8-10. One should also note the margin cross reference from 2 Sam 7:10 in 2 Kings 21:7,8 which clearly shows the 'House' referred to is in Jerusalem not in London or New York! One wonders how THE place could be said to be in both Britain and the USA at the same time. It is interesting that though challenged we have still not heard an explanation of how those who travelled from Britain (Ephraim) suddenly became the tribe of Manasseh when they landed in North America. Neither has it been explained how USA (Manasseh) could be blessed if they rebelled against the Royal Israelite throne in England.

Surely every true Israelite should acknowledge the Throne of David. Verses in Isaiah that refer to "isles" are said by B I teachers to mean the British Isles. However in Hebrew the word can be translated "coastlands", "the shore of a mainland or an island coast".

THE SETTING OF DATES

A characteristic of many BI teachers is the tendency to set dates. This accounts for its attraction to some that love to hear such sensational claims. Hence 1917 is claimed to be the end of the times of the Gentiles and some taught that the generation then alive would not pass away. I received literature from advocates of B I which stated the eclipse of the sun last August was a fulfilment of prophecy. Their proof was that it occurred in the astrological star sign Leo that means Lion. It was therefore a Divine sign that the Age of the Lion of Judah was about to begin!

pyramid

Scores of pages have been sent to Rev Foster by BI teachers that predict certain dates. The pyramid of Giza is referred to as a God-given chart of the end times. It is sad that some believers in Ulster have propagated the myth that the measurements of a pyramid in Egypt are able to tell us dates for the Lord's return. I would strongly urge all young believers in the Free Presbyterian Church to run from professed Christians who make such claims.

The pyramid of Giza has been used by Jehovah Witnesses, Ba'hai and other cults and as



The Burning Bush—Online article archive

well, sadly, by some BIs and by Barry Smith to set prophetic dates.

ADDING TO SCRIPTURE

Some BI teachers have added to scripture. Great emphasis is placed on the Apocrypha. Various teachers claim inspiration for a 29th chapter of Acts which claims that Paul came to London to preach. Others have claimed inspiration for writings to Israelites living in Ireland. I personally received a leaflet urging support for an expedition to the hill Tara in the Irish Republic because it had been prophesied that when the “ark of God” hidden there had been dug up there would be peace in Ulster.

I have received many communications because of these articles. Some are sad, such as the person who stated that we are Israel because the word Scottish is from the Hebrew Succoth and the Scottish people have been wanderers! That writer wrote nothing to refute our statements in the articles.

However, some of the communications I have received have made me righteously indignant. How shocking it is to receive literature defending Sheldon Emery as a man of God. In one of his books the Negro is described as the “Beast of the Field” and Christianity as being a religion ONLY OF THE WHITE MAN.

Even more blasphemous literature has been received which states that the Jews today and at the time of Christ were in fact Edomites. It is actually claimed that the Jew came from a union between Satan and Eve. It is stated they are “genetically” descended from Satan! Some readers may have been incredulous when I highlighted that there was literature being circulated in extreme B I circles in Northern Ireland, which taught that Adam was the father of the white race only. Such teach that there were mongrelised races on the earth before Adam was created. An article carried on Alan Campbell's “Open Bible Ministries” web site contains the following quote. “So the descendants of this Genesis 1 creation of Mankind are not within an Anointed People, or in the Kingdom. Only the Adamic strain, sons of Adam, through Abraham and the one seed from Isaac to Israel (referred to in Galatians 3:16) which is anointed, will qualify as heirs to the promise; the evidence for this statement is supported throughout Scripture.”

This quote is from a ridiculous article in which the writer claims that Bible translators have been wrong to put “Christ ” in verses such as Gal 3:26-28; 5:2-4. The use of the Greek “Christos” which means “anointed” is claimed not to refer to the Lord Jesus Christ but to an “anointed people”. The purpose of this argument is to try and prove, as the above quote shows, that non-Israelite i.e. coloured people are not included in the New Testament promises. The blessings that Paul describes are to be restricted by the writer to the “anointed” race.

“Anointed people” is not a translation at all but a totally unwarranted perversion of what Paul is actually saying.

It is utterly wrong to use the noun “people” with anointed, as the noun “laos” meaning people is not found in Galatians at all! The attempt to show that Paul meant “anointed people” rather than Christ is puerile and unworthy of any person who seeks to be treated as a serious Bible scholar. The entire argument is based on the writer's ex-cathedra pronounce-



The Burning Bush—Online article archive

ment that Paul cannot be allowed to refer to Christ Jesus in the dative case and his arbitrary insertion of “people” after “anointed”.

It is shocking just how far the writer goes to try and prove that the blessings of the gospel are only for Israelites. Sadly, someone who does not know any Greek or grammar may be wrongly impressed by the article on “Open Bible Ministries” Web site. The writer of the article on that web site certainly displays that he does not understand the Greek dative and genitive.

Unlike extreme B Is, we believe with Paul that God hath made of one blood all nations and all men are descended from Adam, Acts 17:26. We believe that the Bride of Christ is the Church made up of some out of every tribe, tongue, people and nation. We in the Free Presbyterian Church have no room for those who teach the blasphemy that Adam is the father of the white race only or who teach the nonsense contained in the above article carried on Alan Campbell’s site.

We can, as Reformed Evangelical Protestants, have differences of opinion on prophetic matters BUT there can be no acceptance of such extreme B I teaching, which leads to such dangerous heresies.

“The Burning Bush” November 2000.