



# THE COVENANT VISION.

*September/October.*

*1999.*

## Contents.

ISSUE No. **85.**

Editorial.	...	...	...	...	1.
The Heritage of Israel.	...	...	Pt. 11.	...	3.
C.V. News.	...	...	...	...	12.
The Glorified Body.	..	...	...	...	14.
A Walk Through the Gospels.	...	...	Pt. 14.	...	19.
Literature.	...	...	...	...	30.
Faith.	...	...	...	...	31.
Our Protective God.	...	...	Pt. 7.	...	41.

**"Heaven and earth shall pass away:  
But My words shall not pass away."**

# THE COVENANT VISION.

*EDITOR: Pastor Frank W. Dowsett. J.P.*

**I**n presenting this magazine, it is not our intention just to indiscriminately add to the number of Christian journals already available. Our only purpose is to present the Word of God in its fulness as we feel God has revealed it to us, in order that the God of our fathers Abraham, Isaac and Jacob may be glorified.

**It is our firm conviction** that we are living in the very last days prior to the appearing and return of our Great God and Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ.

**We are also convinced** that never before in the history of our nation and people has there been such a need for the "Watchmen in Israel" to sound the alarm in order to awaken God's people to the urgent need to repent, and to return to God with all their hearts, and with all their minds, and with all their strength.

Denominational doctrines and differences are not our concern, and it is not our intention to enter into such arguments. There is not enough time left to waste it on such unproductive, and indeed, destructive, exercises. We are concerned **ONLY** with what we believe the Word of God says and teaches.

**We proclaim** the absolute necessity for all people to accept the Lord Jesus Christ as their own personal Saviour, as the only means to Eternal Life.

**We proclaim** the absolute necessity for the Anglo-Saxon-Celtic people to recognise their identity, their inheritance, and their responsibility, as the literal descendants of God's people Israel.

**We proclaim** the absolute necessity for all who would faithfully serve God to 'receive the power from on high', which can only

(continued on inside back cover)



# Editorial.

## Sowing and Reaping.

**F**rom time immemorial the process of sowing and reaping has dominated the actions and life style of the human race. The farmer sowed wheat, and he reaped wheat. He sowed corn and he reaped corn. It was a pretty simple rule of life, and required nothing more than a commitment to following well tested ways. It provided the simple necessities of life, and was generally fairly unsophisticated.

But times began to change. Industries developed. Politics changed, some for the better, and some for the worse. Money became the be-all and end-all of man's existence. Power and self-aggrandisement became the aim of politics virtually displacing service to the public. Statesmen disappeared, to be replaced by politicians. The name of the game became POWER. The method of accomplishment became GREED. Greed in turn bred compromise, dishonesty and deceit.

The seeds had been sown, and the inevitable harvest was assured. Small businesses became large companies, which in turn were taken over by larger companies. The corner store was sacrificed at the altar of multinational corporations. All this required monumental injections of money, and what started off as a means of simplifying the process of exchanging the necessities of life became a monster which has now reached the stage of strangling everything in its path. Small debts became larger and larger debts, all reaching to such monstrous proportions as to be virtually un-payable.

It is no secret that in order to fool the people and to lull them into a sense of totally false security, our entire nation has now been sold off to pay the International Banksters the billions of dollars of debt which we have accumulated, and which we continue to accumulate through the interest charges at a frightening rate. Most of our national profits now go to foreign companies, who, through traitorous laws, pay minimal, if any, tax. Unemployment has reached plague proportions throughout the western Christian nations, with dishonest governments rigging the system to hide the facts. Have any of our "honest

John" politicians given us any sort of clue as to how we will continue to pay off these massive ongoing and recurring debts once the entire farm has been sold off?

We see the harvest, but how many really understand how it came about? What have we, as a nation, sown in order to reap such a terrible harvest of debt and national destruction?

Of course, we could all sell our homes and businesses and move to fairyland. But nobody seems to know just where that can be found. And at any rate, if we did find it, we would most probably find that it is run by fairies, who wouldn't have any better clues than those who run our present system.

There was a time, which I'm sure many of us would remember, that we were regarded as a Christian country. There were fundamental laws based upon this Christian Faith that were automatically and generally accepted. People from other countries were welcomed and many of them played very important roles in our development. But we still remained essentially a Christian country. Multiculturalism was a word that hadn't even earned a place in our dictionaries. Now we reap the harvest of what we have sown, and have become a country without a specific god of our own, everyone being allowed to worship who and what they please. And we wonder why the God of our fathers doesn't seem to hear us any more. Most people would be very surprised to know that 100 years ago, the National Church of England refused to give communion to any person involved in the banking or insurance professions. Why? Because these institutions breached God's commandment which prohibited the imposition of interest charges applied to debt. But if we go even further back, we find that God not only banned the practice of charging interest, but required that every seven years, ALL debts should be automatically cancelled. On top of this, every 49 years, ownership of all property which had been disposed of to other parties, particularly for inability to meet payments which might have accrued through the breaking of the first two laws mentioned above, automatically reverted to their original owners. Wouldn't that put the cat among the pigeons! But the farmers would still have their farms, and we would still own our own country.

Whether we like it or not, we are still, and always will be, controlled by the inevitable law of Sowing and Reaping. Sow ungodly leaders, and we reap unjust and ungodly laws. Sow greed, and we reap poverty, war, and disease, and human misery.

God's Laws are irrevocable. Disobey them, and we sow disaster. Obey them, and we reap peace, justice, and happiness. Sounds like a pretty good deal to me. □

# The Heritage of Israel.

*By Frank W. Dowsett.*

## Part Eleven.

The Covenant & The Promises. Part 6.

### The Abrahamic Covenant. Part 3.

**I**n our previous issues, we studied the statements of God regarding His Divine plans and purposes for the future, and His selection of the descendants of Abraham as the means through which He was to bring those plans to fruition. That process was one of very deliberate selection. There was nothing random about His selections. Behind every decision there was a reason. Behind every choice there was a purpose. Every aspect of the Covenants which He made with our forefathers was perfect, and without repentance. God does not get confused with the human trait of experimentation. He knows exactly what He wants, and has planned accordingly right down to the very last, and very minutest detail, long before He even created the world itself, in order for that Divine plan to come to fruition. He is not a bit phased by the ineptitudes and stupidity of men who in their self-conceited arrogance, think they can improve

not only on the plan itself, but also on the manner in which it is to be carried out.

The plan is recorded in statements which were irreversible, and non-negotiable Covenants, sworn to upon the sacredness of His own Name.

As we noted, the priorities were clearly enunciated. His first choice was the man Abram, whose name He later changed to Abraham, indicating God's decision to change Abram's position as a "high or honoured father" to that of becoming "the father of many nations". It was a deliberate selection that raised and greatly expanded the standard of Abram's 'fatherhood'.

The next choice was the selection of Abraham's younger son Isaac in preference over his elder son Ishmael. The Divinely selected line of authority was to be continued by and through the younger son, Isaac. As we read in Gen. 17:18-19;

*"And Abraham said unto God, O that Ishmael might live before thee! And God said, Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a son indeed; and thou shalt call his name Isaac: and I will establish my covenant with him for an everlasting covenant, and with his seed after him."*

In Romans 9:7-9; this is clearly reiterated;

*"Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children: but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed. For this is the word of promise, At this time will I come, and Sarah shall have a son."*

And here we have the beginnings of the first seed of opposition and displeasure at God's decision. It inaugurated an animosity that continues right down to the present day, the descendants of Ishmael being predominantly found among the Muslim/Arab community.

The process of selection continued. To Isaac were born twin sons, Esau and Jacob, Esau being the first of the twins to actually be born, thus making him the elder, or heir. But again,



the foreknowledge of God caused Him to select the younger son, Jacob, in preference to the elder son Esau;

*“And not only this; but when Rebecca also had conceived by one, even by our father Isaac;  
(For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth;) It was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger.  
As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated.”*  
Romans 9:10-13.

Again, trouble ensued. We found in our studies how that Esau, in total disregard and disrespect for the birthright which was his by virtue of having been the firstborn, sold this birthright to his younger brother for nothing more than a good feed. And quite frankly, most Anglo-Saxon-Celtic Christians today have done exactly the same. They know nothing, and care less, for the wonderful birthright which is theirs, discarding it for what they see, and are taught, is the emotional food which, whilst giving some form of sustenance on the personal level, has robbed them of the knowledge of the fullness of God's great promises concerning their future. And the division became much more serious. Esau made an oath, following his receipt of his father Isaac's blessing, that because he had been replaced in the order of seniority, He would, after his father's death, kill his brother Jacob. Again, this oath and all-consuming passion has become the hallmark of his descendants, the Edomites, from that time right down to the present day. They have used, and are still using, every dirty trick in the book to displace the true people of the covenant from their God-ordained destiny, and to regain it for themselves.

But setting priorities did not finish there. Some years later, Jacob's son Joseph became the father of two sons, Manasseh and Ephraim, and God again moved to set His seal of selection as to the order of authority. We read in Gen. 48:16-20;

*“The Angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads; and let my name be named on them, and the name of my fathers Abraham and Isaac; and let them grow into a multitude in the midst of the earth.*

*And when Joseph saw that his father laid his right hand upon the head of Ephraim, it displeased him: and he held up his father's hand, to remove it from Ephraim's head unto Manasseh's head.*

*And Joseph said unto his father, Not so, my father: for this is the firstborn; put thy right hand upon his head.*

*And his father refused, and said, I know it, my son, I know it: he also shall become a people, and he also shall be great: but truly his younger brother shall be greater than he, and his seed shall become a multitude of nations.*

*And he blessed them that day, saying, In thee shall Israel bless, saying, God make thee as Ephraim and as Manasseh: and he set Ephraim before Manasseh.*"

Once again we find that the younger was allotted a senior place in God's Divine plans than to that of the firstborn. It is of no purpose to argue about God's decision in these matters. He knows exactly what He is doing, and why, and many of our troubles arise from the fact that we constantly try to change God's priorities to suit our own particular desires, as patriotic and sincere as they may be.

But there is one more act of selection which we need to also understand. This comprises the selection of two particular tribes, or sections of Israel as being allotted higher authority and responsibility than the other tribes. The account is found in Psalm 114:1-2;

*"When Israel went out of Egypt, the house of Jacob from a people of strange language;*

*Judah was his sanctuary, and*  
*Israel his dominion."*

Now, the Divine order was firmly established. Now, the real history of the descendants of Abraham could proceed with total Divine sanction and protection.

All of what has been mentioned above are the statements of God Almighty regarding what He intended doing, and of how He intended doing it. But words without deeds are as worthless as faith without works. It is not enough for us to read about these great promises without knowing exactly, or at least as exactly as we can, the manner in which they were fulfilled. God clearly states in Isaiah 55:11;



*"So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it."*

It is apparent from our studies thus far that very specific statements about very specific peoples are the major subject matter of God's pronouncements. So we must ask ourselves the question, "How are we to interpret these promises made to these specific people if we don't know who these particular people are today, or where they may be found?" And in our studies, let us never forget that on his death-bed, Jacob told his sons that the promises would be fulfilled within them **"in the last days"**. These days were certainly not in the immediate future to when Jacob spoke. They were to transpire in the distant future to when he spoke. This expression, **"the last days"**, occurs 8 times in 8 verses throughout the Scriptures. In every case, it refers to the days which comprise the end of this age. There are several similar expressions used, such as **"the end of the days"**, found in the last verse of the Book of Daniel, and particularly **"the latter days"**, which occurs 11 times in 11 verses.

It must surely be self evident that if God made these wonderful promises to specific people, to be fulfilled in the "latter or last days", then the people to whom the promises were directed must be in existence during these "last or latter days". Furthermore, they must be recognisable in terms of the promises made to them. If this be not so, then what is the use of prophecy? Remember, all these Abrahamic Covenants were in fact prophecies, in that they foretold events and conditions future to the time at which they were spoken. So if the people to whom these covenants or prophesies were made exist today, then how is it that there is such utter confusion in recognising them for who they are? What's the use of trying to make head nor tail of the promises to Israel if we don't know who or where Israel is today? What's the use of trying to understand the promises made about the descendants of Esau, the Edomites, or the descendants of Ishmael, if we don't know who or where they are today? It's no wonder that the great majority of Christians today almost completely ignore prophecy and put it into the "too hard basket". Theological teaching these days, and for many, many years in the past, has taught two alternative answers to this matter of identification in regards to the people and nation of

Israel. The first one is that the nation of Israel became so sinful and wicked that God decided that He could do nothing more for them, and revoked the covenants made to them and gave them to what they call "the church". As far as I am personally concerned, this is blatant blasphemy. Fancy the hide of these people getting up in their various pulpits and teaching about the love and faithfulness of God, and even at times reading the passage from Malachi which says "I am the Lord. I change not", and then, without a single twinge of conscience tell their congregation that God has in fact changed His mind.

The second alternative is that the people known today as the Jews are the nation of Israel, and are entitled to inherit all these wonderful promises. I've heard of the practice of selective rationalisation, but this really takes the cake. Our Lord Jesus Christ Himself referred to these people as "the children of their father the devil", "liars", "murderers", "thieves", "whitewashed tombstones", "the synagogue of Satan", and in the clearest of terms told them that they were "not my sheep"!!! But four or five years in our present Theological Cemeteries, (sorry, Seminaries), suddenly transforms them into "God's Chosen People".

But try telling the people the real Biblical identity of God's people and you get crucified. And we wonder why we are in such a mess. How on earth can anyone make any sense out of God's promise to Abraham that He would make his seed to be a great nation and company of nations, when they are told that these people are either "the church", or "the people of His curse", neither of which are a great nation and company of nations?

Perhaps it's appropriate at this point of our study to have a closer look at the statements made in this last sentence, as I'm sure that those to whom this teaching is new could be somewhat confused, if not offended by what I have suggested. Let's start with the "church" theory. Ask yourself the question, "Is 'the church' a great nation and company of nations today"? To answer this question with any reasonable sense, we should define the actual meaning of the two words "church" and "nation".

The English word "church" is derived from the Greek adjective *kyriakos*, meaning "the Lord's house", that is, "a Christian place of worship". In the New Testament however, the Greek word *ekklesia* is mostly used, meaning a local

congregation of Christians as distinct from a building. Every time we meet together as an assembly to worship God, irrespective of whether there be two or three, or two or three hundred, we form a 'church' or congregation. Now has anyone ever heard of such a gathering being referred to as "a nation or company of nations"?

What then is the definition of the word "Nation"? The Greek word used is *ethnos*, which means "people living under common institutions; A race; People having a common descent." All occurrences of the word 'nation' in the New Testament are translated from this one Greek word. Do all people meeting together as an assembly to worship God derive from the same race, and have common ancestry? Of course they don't. To think, let alone teach otherwise, is to show a gross ignorance of the meaning of Biblical terminology. It is this type of theology that has bred confusion and division throughout God's people. The promise to our father Abraham was never that he would become the progenitor of a conglomerate of people from different racial ancestry. His descendants were to be a race of people, derived from a common ancestry, living under a common institution, with the strictest of instructions forbidding them to intermarry with people of other races.

But let us return for a moment to the subject of "the church". The word itself is not used in the Old Testament. The equivalent word in the Hebrew is *qahal*, which means "an assembly". In studying any subject, I have always followed the principal of "the law of first reference". If we look at the first time a particular word or phrase, or even doctrine, is used, we find the principal meaning of that reference. When we examine the word "church" using this principal, we find that the first time it is used in an historically chronological sense is in Acts 7:37-38;

*"This is that Moses, which said unto the children of Israel, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear. This is he, that was in the church in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in the mount Sina, and with our fathers: who received the lively oracles to give unto us."*

Thus we see that the entire nation of Israel was referred to as "the church". The entire nation was "a called out  
THE COVENANT VISION

assembly". But that fact does not in any way constitute an excuse, let alone any authority to replace the nation as a race of people with common Israelite ancestry, with an assembly of people with mixed ancestry which assembles together in worship. Now please do not misunderstand me. I am not saying that every one of the 77 times the word 'church' is used that it relates only to Israel as a nation. What I am pointing out is that Israel, as a nation, was the original party to which the term was applied. But we find that in every instance where the particular message is directed to a Christian congregation, the 'church' to which reference is made is an assembly within various groups of Israel people. You will not find one instance where the word 'church' is used of foreign, non-Israelite people. From the internal and historical evidence within every book of the New Testament, we find that they were all directed to, and about, God's Israel people, whom Paul assures us, were NOT cast away. To illustrate my point, the word "brethren" which is translated from the Greek "*adelphos*" throughout the entire New Testament, means, "a near kinsman, based on identity of origin; people of the same nationality." The apostle Paul, for instance, addresses every one of his epistles to those whom he calls "brethren" - people of the same racial origin as himself. And he most certainly leaves us in no doubt as to his racial identity in his statement recorded in Romans 11:1;

*"I say then, Hath God cast away his people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin."*

Concerning the 'church', we read in Ephesians 1:22-23, and Colossians 1:18 that "Christ is the head over all things to the church, which is His body", and "He is the head of the body, the church". It must be fairly obvious that this passage is not referring to our present denominational churches or Christian organisations. Nor can it be spiritualised and applied to our Lord Jesus Christ. He is the HEAD, not the BODY. The word "body" means, "The necessary medium for the possession and manifestation of life." So applying these definitions on a national basis, we find that "Christ is the head of His called out assembly or nation of Israel, which is His chosen medium through which He manifests life." On the personal level we find that those who have qualified for Eternal Life through

repentance and their acceptance of the Lord Jesus Christ as their eternal offering for their sin, become members of His body. But just as there are many different members of our human body each with differing levels of importance, so there are also different levels which will be applicable to those who are qualified to be members of His Kingdom. Some will be citizens. Others will be rulers, having attained to the "Higher Calling" of which Paul spoke. I wonder if we have seriously considered marriage as set forth in the Bible. We are told that when a man and woman marry, they become one flesh. But this does not change the man from still being a man, nor the woman from remaining a woman. The body of the husband still remains as his own body. It does not become the body of his wife. On this basis, we realise that those who are "the body of Christ" are in fact a part of the BRIDEGROOM, not just a part of the BRIDE. The Bride is Israel, the nation. The Body consists of the rulership over that nation, with Christ as the Head, together with those who will rule and reign with Him. But each party, both the Bride and the Body, are still part of the overall Kingdom. God never ever intended, nor did He ever intimate, that one would supplant the other. They were always intended to supplement each other in the fulfilment of the promise made to our fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

So how, we may ask, did this seeming mix up occur in our present teaching and understanding of what God's Word quite clearly states? What may be more to the point is, why has there been such a concerted and paranoid attempt made over many centuries to change the terms of the Covenants which God made and swore upon His own Holy Name? Furthermore, why is it that those who prefer to believe the plain statements of the Scriptures and who identify the actual recipients of these Covenants so mercilessly persecuted and ostracised today? People who deny the existence of God don't get derided and persecuted in this way. You can be the greatest scoundrel on the face of the earth, and many church folk will give an arm and a leg to convert you to Christ and tell you of the wonders of His Word. But mention anything about our Israel Identity, and you became an instant target for every form of abuse that can be imagined. And many of us can talk from experience, because we've been there. God has not changed His mind, and cast away His people whom He foreknew, and we will, God willing, proceed with this interesting study in our next issue. □

# C.V.NEWS.

**I**n our previous issue of C.V.News, we commented on the real possibilities that lie before us in respect to coming events, significantly associated with the first few weeks of September. This marked the beginning of the Hebrew Civil New Year, commencing with the day of the Feast of Trumpets. I think that we can safely say that our expectations have not been in vain. I believe that we can no longer ignore the warnings that are being fulfilled all around us, and that we must, if we have any degree of faith in God's promises, prepare ourselves for a final time of trouble, almost certainly more severe than we have ever experienced in our lifetime.

The enemy continues to attack us personally. As you will read in other sections of this edition, the leader of the Anti-Discrimination Commission of the B'nai B'rith, Mr. Ben Moshe, has publically declared that the Israel Identity Movement is the most dangerous movement in Australia, even more so than the League of Rights, the Klu Klux Klan, and any other group he can get his claws into. He has named our Covenant Vision Ministry as the leader of the Identity groups in Australia, and has nominated me personally as Australia's leading Identity figure. I might add, that these are his opinions, not necessarily those of other Identity groups or believers. But the fact remains that we have now been placed at the very top of the list as far as opposition from this evil enemy is concerned, and can expect to become the focus of their main attacks. So it is only natural then that we can expect more flack from the same source. But as one of our supporters once wrote me, that during the Second World War, pilots always knew when they were right over the target as soon as they saw the flack heading their way.

Let me assure every one of you that we are not in the least concerned, nor are we intimidated in any degree, at what the enemy might have in mind. The promise of God is still as real and assuring as when He first gave it, "That when the enemy came in like a flood, He will raise up a standard against them." An important part of that standard will be the constant and dedicated prayers and support of all those who would stand with us in these last days.

Between this and the next edition of the C.V. Betty and I have planned a short holiday, with some friends looking after our home whilst we are away. We intend that our meetings will continue as usual. We will be able to renew fellowship with a number of our members and supporters along the way, and expect to speak at one meeting at least. We don't expect that this will affect the mailing of the next issue, but if it is a little later than usual, you'll know why.

There is one thing that we would like to request of you. We are constantly receiving contributions which are just described as 'donations'. But we are finding that in a few instances, they are meant to be renewals of subscriptions, with the balance to be applied as a donation. We don't usually cross reference the records to check on this situation, and just record the gift as a donation, with the result that now and then we send out a renewal notice which becomes a little confusing to the sender, who naturally thinks that the subscription has been paid. It would be a great help if you could advise if your gift includes your annual subscription, in order to eliminate any misunderstanding. For our part, we intend in future to automatically apply a portion of your gift as being a renewal of your subscriptions if they are due in the very near future, so as to avoid any problem, unless we receive advice to the contrary. This will be noted on your receipt which will be included with the following issue.

We must also advise that Australia Post has eliminated Seamail postage of all letters and small parcels to all countries outside Australia as from the beginning of October this year, which includes this issue of THE COVENANT VISION. This means that all our mail must now be paid for at Economy Airmail rates. Because of the extra cost that is involved, we must request that those who now receive our magazine freely by seamail, now contribute something to at least cover the postage involved. We might point out that every magazine costs us A\$2 to produce, plus the new postage of A\$2.00 each to New Zealand, and A\$3.00 each to the rest of the world, making a total of A\$4.00 each to New Zealand, or A\$24 per year, and A\$5.00 each, or A\$30 per year to all other countries. **These costs do not include any profit margin whatsoever.**

(Concluded on Page 56.)



# The Glorified Body.

By Pastor Gray Clark.

Courtesy "Kingdom Tidings."

OPEN BIBLE MINISTRIES.

P. O. Box 92. Belfast. BT5 7SA

Northern Ireland. U. K.

In his epistle to the Romans, Saint Paul states: *"If so be that we suffer with, that we may be also glorified together. For I reckon that the suffering of this present time is not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us"*

*(Romans 8: 17,18)*

**T**he Christian's great hope at the Second Coming of Christ is to receive a glorified body and live in the Kingdom of God. Without a glorified body, to live in the Kingdom is not possible *"for flesh and blood cannot enter the Kingdom of God"* (Corinthians 15:50). The glorified body is a body for the Kingdom. This body is not one that would progress to a glorious state naturally. Once the flesh and blood dies, there is no law of nature that will either restore it or make it glorious. Death of the body is a consequence of sin. It will take an act of God's mercy to change the death of the body into the life of a glorious body. A glorified body is a body changed by God to a state of glorification. It is a body that is glorified. It is of His grace and not of His Law; for, *"with God all things are possible."* (Matthew 19:26). *The Oxford International Dictionary* says of "glorious" that it means *"splendid in beauty and adornment, brilliant, shining, lustrous."* Concerning "glorify" it means *"to render glorious, to invest with glory or radiance."* From these definitions alone, we can see that there is a stark contrast between the body Christians have in this world and the body Christians will have in the next world. Bodies of flesh and blood have never been brilliant, shining, lustrous. What beauty they may have had at birth and youth wanes with age. The glorified body however, will not

deteriorate with age as the Kingdom is ageless and all its makeup.

The body that God glorifies for the Kingdom is one of brightness. Daniel and Matthew teach this truth. Daniel said of resurrection: *"And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life."* (Daniel 12:2), and of the glorified body: *"And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever."* (Daniel 12:3). In referring to the glorified body, Matthew said: *"Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the Kingdom of their Father"* (Matthew 13:43). A body that shines bright as the sun is a quality of the glorified body.

The glorified body is a product of the resurrection. Upon the time of the resurrection, the Christian receives his glorified body by the grace of God. St. Paul instructed the Corinthians of this when he wrote then and said: *"So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption: it is raised in in-corruption; it is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power. It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body."* (I Corinthians 15:42-44). This passage of scripture not only reveals the timing of the glorified body; but it gives a contrast between the body we live in now, corrupted; and the body that will be received at the resurrection, incorrupted. The glorified body is for Christians who are dead or alive at the Second Coming of Christ (I Thessalonians 4:15-17). Those who are dead or asleep will be resurrected to a glorified body and those who are alive will be translated to a glorified body. The raising is the resurrection and the in-corruption is the body that is glorified. This change of the body takes place at the first resurrection (Second Coming of Christ). Paul said of that: *"Behold I show you a mystery; We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible"* (I Corinthians 15:52). At this resurrection the glorified body is received from God. *"For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle (body) were dissolved, we have a building (glorified body) not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this (earthly body) we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not for that we*

*would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality (earthly body) might be swallowed up of life (glorified body)."*

(II Corinthians 5:14).

This glorified body is not naked, but clothed in the supervestment of immortality. (*Tertullian*) The language, "*clothed upon*" (II Corinthians 5:4) of this scriptural passage implies a change of raiment for the body of our birth. That change of raiment is the glorified body that is spiritual and immortal. Just as the soul of this body continues into the next world, the body in which it lived in this world will change raiment from natural to spiritual (I Corinthians 15:42-44).

This glorified body for the world to come is whole. When Christians died and went to the grave, their bodies were imperfect: diseased, infirm, injured, of missing organs and other body parts. In the grave, the body slowly decomposes until nothing remains, except lingering bones and teeth. The resurrection body will be whole in its integrity. Its nature will be as it would have been before the fall of Adam, without injury. This will also be true of those who are translated. Injuries and imperfections that were present in the earthly body will not be present in the glorified body. The resurrected or translated body will be a perfect body. An incorruptible body is one without fault or is unimpaired. The body of in-corruption is a fully repaired body that had been wasted by sin, disease, injury, and death. This incorruptible glorious body is remade from flesh and blood to bring it to a state fit for eternity, and therefore, no longer corruptible flesh and blood. Whereas death results in total corruption or imperfection of the flesh and blood body, the resurrection results in the total in-corruption or perfection of the body. Adam and Eve went from their Paradise body to flesh and blood. All in Christ will go from this to a glorious body. At the Second Coming of Christ *"the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed."* (I Corinthians 15:52). What is changed is that the imperfect body becomes the perfect body; the glorified body.

More can be learned about the integrity of the glorious body by looking into Old Testament examples. The cases of the Old Testament are illustrations for the learning of all Christians who read of them. The Bible says of these cases; *"Now all*

*these things happened unto them for ensamples: and they were written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come.*" (I Corinthians 10:11). Old Testament examples are future figures of ourselves, the glorified body that we shall receive. These examples or cases are our proof of the integrity and perfection of the body at the resurrection.

The Israelites lived 40 years in the wilderness; yet, their shoes and clothes never aged. (Deuteronomy 29:5). The glorified body will not age. It will remain for eternity, world without end. The three Hebrew children lived through the fiery furnace *"upon whose bodies the fire had no power, nor was an hair of their head singed, neither were their coats changed, nor the smell of fire had passed upon them."* (Daniel 3:27). If their bodies of flesh and blood were so protected, can we not see how great the glorified body will be; for how can it be less than this example of the fiery furnace? Daniel, living through the lion's den, also establishes further evidence of the integrity of the glorified body. Recall that Jonah lived three days inside a whale and was ejected unharmed. The integrity of the body was preserved throughout his stay in the digestive juices of the whale's stomach. All these examples are predictive of the future integrity of the glorified body.

Joy and peace are more qualities of the glorious body. Isaiah wrote: *"And the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads: they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away."* (Isaiah 35:10).

In addition to joy and gladness; *"God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes."* (Revelation 7:17). Now we see that the glorified body will be free of sorrow and experience only joy.

The book of the Revelation elaborates further on this point when it says of the resurrected, glorified body of the Christian: *"And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things are passed away."* (Revelation 21:4). These noteworthy qualities of the glorified body are a gift from God. In a practical sense however, we should note that the causes of pain and suffering

will not be present in the Kingdom of God on earth. The things that afflict the body of flesh and blood will not be present in the Kingdom. Sin nature will be gone. The devil and his army will be in the Lake of Fire (Revelation 20:10) along with death and hell (Revelation 20:14). Not only will the glorious body be glorified, but it will be living in a world totally foreign to this world of ours. It will be a world in the presence of God, a perfect world for a perfect body.

The bodily desires of this flesh body of ours shall be absent in the glorified body. Our current physical drives for food, water, and procreation will be gone. When pain and sorrow go, the body needs to go. Absence of food leads to hunger pains, and the absence of water leads to death. With no more death there is no need of food or water. As there will be no more dying, there will be no need to reproduce the race. We will *"neither marry nor are given in marriage"* (Luke 20:35). We will be *"equal with the angels"* (Luke 20:36). Matthew wrote it this way when he said; *"For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven."* (Matthew 22:30). Angels are spirit beings, although they have physical bodies. In this sense, the glorified body is a *"spiritual body"*. (I Corinthians 15:44). One day we will become like the angels inasmuch as we will also have eternal glorified bodies.

The resurrection body of the Christian will be glorified. This glorified body will be perfect and brilliant, without any pain. It will be without corruption, and immune from the ageing process. All the pains of the flesh will be absent. It will be a body fully redeemed for the Kingdom. The redeemed of Adam's Race who will be in the Kingdom, will have glorified bodies and will enjoy eternity in a new world.

WITH ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS TO  
THE CHURCH OF ISRAEL.  
SCHELL CITY, MISSOURI.



# A WALK THROUGH THE GOSPELS.

## PART 14.

By Bruce Horner.

### THE LATER JUDEAN MINISTRY.

#### THE COMING OF JESUS TO THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES CREATES INTENSE EXCITEMENT CONCERNING THE MESSIAHSHIP.

#### Part One.

I am using the personal translation of John's Gospel by F.F.Bruce and much of his wisdom.

In the words of Dr.Robinson, in his Harmony, "We now have to deal with the most perplexing question in harmonistic study, the proper disposal of the mass of material furnished by Luke in 9:51 - 18:14. McClellan discusses ten schemes, pushes them all aside, and then suggests another which is no more convincing and equally complicated. Nothing can be attempted here but a presentation of the chief points in this endless discussion. All the principal plans for arranging this part of Luke proceed on one or the other of the following ideas." Then he gives us three major methods, each with examples of why the method is favoured.

Baker's Harmony gives us a very similar discussion, emphasizing the difficulties involved, and actually refers to Dr.Robinson in a complimentary way, but explains why he does not, nevertheless, follow his chronological order by, for instance, placing the Mission of the Seventy before Jesus "steadfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem."

Very briefly, the three arguments are these:-

1. Some hold that this portion of Luke is neither orderly nor chronological. Hence many of the incidents, here recorded as apparently belonging to the last six months of the Saviour's ministry, in reality are to be placed earlier. They are put here as a sort of summing up of things not mentioned elsewhere. So Robinson and others. This is followed by a brief discussion of things which might well contradict this.
2. Others refer the entire narrative (**Luke 9:51 - 18:14**) to the last journey of the Saviour to Jerusalem to the Passover and see a triple reference to the same journey arguing for triplications in Luke. Others prefer to understand it as meaning the journey to the Feast of the Tabernacles or Dedication. Some would combine this idea with the unchronological plan, mentioned first. Arguments that the journey was continuous and the last one to Jerusalem are added.
3. The combination of Luke's narrative with that of John . Wieseler was the first to point out a possible parallel between Luke and John. John gives us three journeys, - The Feast of Tabernacles (**John 7:2ff.**), the journey to Bethany at the raising of Lazarus (**John 11:17f.**), the final Passover (**John 12:1**). Luke likewise three times in this section speaks of Jesus going to Jerusalem, **9:51; 13:22; 17:11**. Hence it would seem possible, even probable, that their journeys corresponded. If so, **John 7:2 - 11:54** is to be taken as parallel to **Luke 9:51 - 18:14**. This plan is followed by various modern scholars.

I mention these facts, not because the everyday reader needs to know them, but rather that we should all be aware of the difficulties involved, and that the scholars have not been able to resolve those difficulties.

Obviously, there is an answer, because they cannot all be right, but I, for one, am very aware that I cannot supply it.

**John 7:10** is important. It says, *But when his brothers had gone up to the festival, then he himself also went up, not publicly but as it were in secret.*



## JESUS AND HIS BROTHERS (John 7:1-9)

Let us go back a few verses.

**John 7:6-8** *So Jesus says to them,, 'My time is not yet present; but your time is always ready. The world cannot hate you, but it hates me, because I bear witness about it, to the effect that its works are wicked. Go up to the festival yourselves; I am not going up to this festival, because my time has not yet been fulfilled.'*

As to his mother in Cana of Galilee Jesus had said, *'My hour has not yet come'* (John 2:4), so now he makes a similar reply to his brothers. (F.F.Bruce tells us that the noun there was *hora*; here it is *kairos*, 'appointed time'.) When the time appointed for him by the Father came, to go up to Jerusalem and be 'shown to the world' in a more profound sense than they had any conception of, then he would go, but not until then. But for people who had no such awareness of living from moment to moment in sensitive rapport with God's directing will, one time was as good as another: 'your time is always ready.'

The brothers had urged him to show himself to 'the world', but Jesus now speaks of the world in another sense - the sense given to the term in the prologue to John's Gospel, where 'the world' failed to recognize the eternal Word when he came into the world (John 1:10). This failure to give him the recognition and welcome to which he was entitled was not a matter of mere indifference but of positive antipathy. This antipathy was directed not only against himself but also against any who **did** believe in him, thus demonstrating that they were not 'of the world' (see John 15:18-25).

Those who, like his brothers, did not believe in him did not experience the world's hostility, How could they? They belonged to the world.

Let the brothers go up to Jerusalem, then: those whose time is always ready can go up anywhere any time. But he whose will was regulated by the Father's will would not move until that will was shown.

**John 7:9** *Having said this, he himself stayed on in Galilee.*

The third-century Neoplatonist Porphyry, who wrote a work *Against the Christians* in fifteen books, argued that it was a mark of irresoluteness for Jesus to stay in Galilee, and then to go to Jerusalem after all a few days later. The Evangelist's point is rather that the whole incident marks his steadfast resolution not to run before the Father's guidance nor yet to lag behind it.

### **EXCITEMENT AT THE FESTIVAL (JOHN 7:10-13).**

**John 7:10**     *But when his brothers had gone up to the festival, then he himself also went up, but as it were in secret.*

The Father's signal was given after the brothers left for Judaea. Jesus' going up to Jerusalem '*as it were in secret*' is in marked contrast to his brothers' insistence that he should court publicity. The time when it would be proper for him to make a public entry into Jerusalem had not yet come; six months later it came (cf. **John 12:12 ff.**). But now he bade farewell to Galilee, never to see it again before his death. That he was accompanied by at least some of his disciples on this secret journey to Judaea is highly probably, although they are not expressly mentioned here.

**John 7:11**     *The Jews, then, were looking for him at the festival and saying, 'Where is that man?'*

Meanwhile the scene shifts to Jerusalem. The 'Jews' who were looking out for him were members of the Sanhedrin, who hoped that, if he came to the festival, they might have an opportunity to arrest him this time. So they said, 'Where is that man?' Galilee, where he had spent the past year, was ruled by the tetrarch Herod Antipas and was not under their jurisdiction, but in Jerusalem they held the chief executive power in Jewish affairs, subject to the overriding authority of the Roman Governor.

**John 7:12-13**     *There was also much murmuring about him about the crowds. Some of them said, 'He is a good man'; others said, 'No; he leads the crowd astray.' However, no one spoke freely about him through fear of the Jews.*

The distinction is clear between 'the crowds' and 'the

Jews', of whom the crowds were afraid. The 'murmuring' about Jesus took the form of *sotto voce* discussion and disagreement; even in his absence he provided a talking point. What he had done on his previous visit to the capital, and perhaps news of what he had been doing since then in Galilee, formed the topic of excited conversation. What were they to think of him? As some thought of the help and blessing which his works and words had brought to many, they were compelled to the conclusion that here was no public enemy, as the rulers maintained, but a good man. But others maintained that his deeds of mercy and power were simply a smokescreen to cover his real intentions: he was actually an imposter, claiming to be what he was not, and thus misleading the common people. This was the view that gained official currency in orthodox Jewish circles later on: an early tradition quoted in the Talmud says that he was executed on Passover Eve because he was a beguiler who led Israel astray. But, whether they approved or disapproved of him, they did not voice their opinions too loudly or too publicly. The authorities did not wish him to be discussed at all, and any one who disregarded their wishes was liable to feel their displeasure.

### JESUS AT THE FESTIVAL (John 7:14-8:59)

**John 7:14-15**      *When it was now half-way through the festival, Jesus went up into the temple and began teaching. So the Jews were filled with wonder and said, 'How does this man know letters? He has never been trained.'*

If Jesus had gone up with the pilgrims in time for the beginning of the festival, there might have been an attempt to give him such a triumphal entry as he was given six months later. A premature demonstration of this kind would have been specially embarrassing if this was shortly after the Galilean massacre in the temple courts mentioned in Luke 13:1. But he went up quietly, arriving in the city half-way through the festival week, and the people who had been discussing him suddenly realized that he was there among them, teaching in the outer court of the temple (where a number of rabbis had their 'teaching pitches').

As the people, and especially the temple authorities and religious leaders, listened to his teaching, they were amazed.

His mastery of the Scriptures and his power of persuasive exposition were undeniable, and yet he had been trained in none of the great rabbinical schools of the day. How could a man who had not sat at the feet of any of the masters in Israel hold his own so ably with the most gifted teachers of that time? A similar difficulty was experienced a year or so later, when the Sanhedrin, struck by the boldness with which 'unlearned and ignorant men' like Peter and John argued their case, put it down to the fact that they had been companions of Jesus (**Acts 4:13**). Peter and John spoke in Jesus' name, but Jesus invoked the authority of no teacher. The scribes always felt happier when they could quote the precedent of some past teacher but Jesus, now in Jerusalem as formerly in Galilee, *'taught as one who had authority and not as their scribes'* (**Matthew 7:29**). Whence then did he derive this authority?

F.F. Bruce tells us that his knowledge of 'letters' does not mean his ability to read and write; that was no rare accomplishment among Jews. It means his command of sacred learning. The word here rendered 'letters' (*grammata*) was used in **John 5:47** of the 'writings' of Moses.

The Jew's question here, however, is not a direct reference back to the saying of Jesus recorded there (as has sometimes been suggested) but has to do rather with the substance of his temple discourses on the present occasion.

**John 5:46-47** *'For if you believed Moses, you would believe me, for it was of me that Moses wrote. But if you do not believe his writings, how will you believe my words?'*

**John 7:16-19** *Jesus said to them in answer. 'My teaching is not my own; it comes from him who sent me. If any one is willing to do his will, he will know about the teaching, whether it comes from God or whether I speak on my own initiative. He who speaks on his own initiative seeks his own glory, but the one who is true is the one who seeks the glory of him who sent him; there is no wrong in him. Has not Moses given you the law? Yet none of you practises the law. Why do you seek to kill me?'*

All the prophets, as the spokesmen of God, delivered a message that was not their own, but God's. So it was with the greatest prophet of all, who came to 'declare' the Father. As the works which he did were those which the Father had given him

to do (**John 5:36**), so the words which he spoke were those which the Father had given him to speak (cf. **John 3:34**). Yet whereas the prophets said 'Thus says the LORD', Jesus, exercising the authority given to him by the Father, said 'I say to you' - 'Indeed and in truth I tell you'. The form of words in which he makes a distinction between 'me' and 'him who sent me' is found in the Synoptic Gospels (cf. **Mark 9:37** with its parallels **Matthew 10:40**; **Luke 9:48**), but it is more frequent in **John**.

As then, so now it is not simply intellectual penetration that will determine truly whether Jesus' claim to impart the Father's teaching is well founded or not; an attitude of heart is also important. If there be a readiness to do the will of God, the capacity for discerning God's message will follow. Whoever has that readiness of heart will recognize in the teaching of Jesus a message which authenticates itself to spiritual perception and conscience as the truth. A faithful messenger seeks no credit for himself but for the one whose message he has been entrusted. Jesus' whole desire is that those who hear what he has to say should glorify God by believing it, since it is God who has commissioned him.

Having laid down these general principles, with their particular application to his own ministry, Jesus now takes up the threads of debate from his last visit to Jerusalem. On that occasion the authorities tried to bring him to court on a capital charge because of his attitude towards the sabbath law and because of the terms in which he spoke of God as his Father. He defended himself then against their charge of law-breaking by invoking Moses as a witness against them. Moses spoke of him in advance as the coming prophet, yet they gave no credence to Moses' testimony regarding him (**John 5:45-47**). Now he invokes Moses again as a witness against them because, for all their professed veneration for Moses' law, they themselves were guilty of breaking it. Moses' law said 'Thou shalt not murder', yet they were trying to have him put to death.

**John 7:20**     *The crowd answered, 'You are demon-possessed; who is seeking to kill you?'*

By the crowd here we are doubtless to understand those elements in it which were hostile to him - those that accused him of leading people astray (**verse 12**). Perhaps they did not catch

the reference to his previous visit; it seemed plain to them that he was right now speaking publicly in the temple court and that no one was trying to molest him. Hence their surprised comment. He was surely demon-possessed, they suggested, a victim to persecution delusions.

**John 7:21-24** *Jesus replied to them, 'I did one work and you are all amazed because of it. Moses has given you circumcision - not that it comes from Moses but from the patriarchs - and you circumcise a child on the sabbath day . If someone receives circumcision on the sabbath in order that Moses ' law should not be broken, are you angry with me because I made a whole man well on the sabbath? Do not judge by outward appearance; let your judgment be righteous judgment.'*

Jesus explains himself by reminding them of the healing of the cripple at the pool of Bethesda. They might well be amazed at the cure of a man who had been disabled for thirty-eight years, but their amazement was largely mixed with indignation because the cure had been performed on the sabbath. Jesus, however, argues that such an action was specially appropriate for the sabbath day.

The words *dia touto*, 'because of this', come in most versions at the beginning of verse 22, as though the meaning were 'Because of this Moses has given you circumcision' - but this raises the question 'Because of what?' and no answer is forthcoming in the context. It is better to attach them to the end of verse 21, where they make better sense (cf. RSV). The verb 'has given' (*dedoken*) is in the perfect tense because, although circumcision had been 'given' centuries before, it was still validly in being.

The right of circumcision was instituted in Abraham's time (**Gen. 17:10 ff.**) and re-enacted in the law (**Exodus 12:44 ff.**). Each male infant in Israel was to be circumcised at eight days old, and if the eighth day coincided with the sabbath, the law of circumcision took precedence over the sabbath law: the child was circumcised sabbath day or no sabbath day. Jesus argues that if the sabbath law may rightly be suspended for the removal of a small piece of tissue from one part of the body, it cannot be wrong to heal a man's whole body on the sabbath day. This type of argument, in fact, was used by some rabbis to justify medical treatment in a case of urgency on the sabbath,

but Jesus uses it to justify an act of healing whether the case is urgent or not.

It was a very superficial judgment which condemned him for performing such a good deed on the sabbath. Righteous judgment would penetrate beneath surface appearances and judge according to the spirit and purpose of the law.

### JESUS MESSIANIC CLAIMS (John 7:25-31)

*John 7:25-27* So some of the Jerusalemites said, 'Is this not the man that they are seeking to kill? But see, he speaks freely and they say nothing to him. Can it be that our rulers have really recognized that this is the Messiah? But we know where this man has come from. When the Messiah comes no one knows where he is from.'

The debate now moves away from the question of the sabbath law and concerns itself with Jesus' messianic claims. Various opinions are ventilated in the crowd, and there is a good deal of talking at cross purposes. Some might dismiss as madness his charge that an attempt was being made on his life; others knew that the charge was not baseless. But if his life was indeed being sought, that made his boldness the more remarkable, and not only his boldness but also the slowness of the authorities to arrest him or even to prevent him from speaking as he did in public. Why were they so reluctant to intervene? Perhaps (said some) since his last visit to Jerusalem the authorities had received evidence which proved that he really was the Messiah. (This is the first occasion in this Gospel where the idea of his being the Messiah is ventilated in Jerusalem).

But the suggestion that he could be the Messiah, and especially that the authorities has been convinced that he was the Messiah, is immediately scouted. In the discussion which follows, three popularly held criteria of Messiahship are mentioned. The first of these is mentioned in verse 27, and Jesus did not appear to conform to it. It was widely believed that the Messiah, after coming into the world, would remain hidden in some unsuspected place until the divinely appointed time for his public manifestation came. But (said they) this man obviously has not remained hidden until now; everyone knows where he comes from. This is an instance of 'Johannine irony'.



They were thinking of Jesus' Galilean home; to them he was Jesus of Nazareth'. But the Evangelist has in mind a profounder answer to the question whence Jesus came - an answer which comes to expression in Jesus' next words.

**John 7:28-29**     *So Jesus called out in the temple as he was teaching: 'You know me', he said, 'and you know where I am from? I have not come of my own accord, but he who sent me is true, and him you do not know. I know him, because I come from him and it is he who sent me.'*

To their debate, which was carried on in small groups of disputants, Jesus gave a public answer as he continued to teach in the outer court. 'You know me and you know where I come from? You may think you do, but in fact you do not know. I did not come on my own initiative, I was sent by God. I have come from Him who is altogether true, the very source of truth; and when I speak the words which he has given me to speak, I speak the truth. But you do not know him, and therefore you do not really know where I come from.' So the coming of Jesus among men confronts them with the issue of the true knowledge of God. God cannot be known unless heed is paid to the one who is his *Word*.

This claim of Jesus echoes that preserved in the Synoptic record: '*no one knows the Father except the Son*' (Matthew 11:27; cf. Luke 10:22).

Jesus is sent by the Father, he proceeds from the Father; he knows the Father. The language is simple and unambiguous; the claim is august. Jesus asserts afresh his unique relation to the Father, and his hearers cannot miss the implication of his words.

**John 7:30-31**     *So they sought to arrest him, but no one laid a hand on him, because his hour had not yet come. Many members of the crowd believed in him: 'When the Messiah comes', they said, 'will he do more signs than this man has done?'*

The attempt made to arrest Jesus may be that which is more fully described in verse 32, 45 f. It came to nothing, for in the purpose of God the hour for his arrest and passion had not yet arrived (cf. John 8:20; 12: 23, 27; 13:1; 17:1).

# Set No. 15 of Five Taped Studies

by

Frank W. Dowsett.

The Following Messages Continue our Studies in:

## The Epistle to The Hebrews.

### Set No. Nine.

- |   |       |
|---|-------|
| Chapter 11. Part 13. The Faith of Barak.    | #785. |
| Chapter 11. Part 14. The Faith of Samson.   | #786. |
| Chapter 11. Part 15. The Faith of Jephthah. | #787. |
| Chapter 11. Part 16. The Faith of David.    | #788. |
| Chapter 11. Part 17. The Faith of Samuel.   | #789. |

Price:- Including Postage.  
Within Australia. \$22.00  
Overseas:- Economy Airmail, A\$25.00  
Please Use Order Form Overleaf.  
( Page 24 a ).

---

# **ORDER FORM.**

Date:- .....

Please forward **Set No. 15** of Five Taped Messages

By Frank W. Dowsett.  
to:-

Mr./Mrs./Miss .....

Address:- .....

..... Post Code .....

... **Set No. Nine of** Study in Hebrews. A\$ .....

**Overseas subscribers only**, paying by personal  
cheque or International Money Order in local  
currency are requested to add \$5 to cover bank fee.

\$ .....

**Total Enclosed.** A\$ .....

(Please see prices overleaf.)

**(Cheque/Money Order/Cash).**

Please make all cheques and Money orders payable to  
**The Covenant Vision Ministry.**  
( Page 24 b ).



**Set No. 17**  
**of Five Taped Messages**

by

**Pastor Alan Campbell.**

- **Heroes of the Faith - Oliver Cromwell. (#1197)**
- **The Alpha Course. Part One. (#1198).**
- **The Alpha Course. Part Two. (#1199).**
- **Anti-Christ - Past, Present, or Future. (#1206).**
  - **Ulster Without a Vision. (#1214).**

**Price:-      Including Postage. Within Australia.      \$22.00**

**Overseas:- Economy Airmail,    A\$25.00**

**Please Use Order Form Overleaf.**

**( Page 24 c ).**

# **ORDER FORM.**

Date:- .....

Please forward **Set No. 17** of Five Taped Messages

By Pastor Alan Campbell  
to:-

Mr./Mrs./Miss .....

Address:- .....

..... Post Code .....

... Sets of Ps.Campbell's Tapes. No.17 AS .....

**Overseas subscribers only**, paying by personal  
cheque or International Money Order in local  
currency are requested to add \$5 to cover bank fee.

\$ .....

**Total Enclosed.**

**AS .....**

**(Please see prices overleaf.)**

**(Cheque/Money Order/Cash).**

Please make all cheques and Money orders payable to  
**The Covenant Vision Ministry.**  
**(Page 24 d).**

If the prophets of old gave proof that they were God's messengers by the signs which they performed, it was natural to believe that the Messiah would be accredited by even greater signs, which would provide conclusive evidence of his office and mission. But would the signs which the Messiah might be expected to perform be greater than those which Jesus was actually performing before their eyes? Such considerations moved many of his hearers to believe in him; these might include Galilaean pilgrims who had witnessed the feeding of the multitude six months previously, as well as natives of Jerusalem who remembered the healing of the cripple at the pool of Bethesda.

(To be Continued).



## Covenant Vision Fellowship.

*Pastor:- Frank W. Dowsett. J.P.*

You are cordially invited to join us in fellowship and worship at  
our Home Chapel

at

97 Brisbane St., St. Marys, N.S.W.

Sunday Morning at 10.00.  
Wednesday Evenings at 7.30.

Praise and Worship.  
Prayer and Bible Study.

For further information,

Phone (02) 9833-3925, or FAX (02) 9833-4397,

E-Mail: [fdowsett@idx.com.au](mailto:fdowsett@idx.com.au)

Web Page: [homepage.idx.com.au/fdowsett](http://homepage.idx.com.au/fdowsett)

**BOOKS BY**  
**PASTOR FRANK W. DOWSETT. J.P.**

- Prophecy. \$2.00.  
Cameo Studies. \$5.00.  
Cameo Studies. No. 2. \$7.00.  
Through Judgment to Righteousness. \$5.00.  
The Prophetic Ministry of Elijah. \$7.00.  
The Return of Elijah. \$5.00.  
Study in Hebrews. \$5.00.  
The Two Witnesses. \$5.00.  
The Enemy Within. \$7.00.  
The Kingdom of God. \$7.00.  
The 8 Miracles of Jesus. \$7.00.  
The Parables of Balaam. \$5.00.  
The Family of God. \$3.00.  
Did Jesus Fail? \$5.00.  
The Revelation of Jesus Christ. Parts 1 to 4. \$20.00.  
Law and Faith. \$5.00.  
The Jehovah Titles. \$12.00.  
The Feasts of Jehovah. \$8.00.  
The Second Advent. \$8.00.  
The Sons of God. \$5.00.  
Babylon the Great. \$12.00.  
**"The Minor Prophets Series."**  
No. 1. Study in Malachi. \$7.00.  
No. 2. Study in Obadiah. \$5.00.  
No. 3. Study in Habakkuk. \$5.00.  
God's Plan of the Ages. Colour Study Chart. \$1.50.

**Prices include postage Within Australia.**  
**For Overseas, please add 20% for Economy Airmail.**

# FAITH!

## The Stuff of Heroes.

By Pastor Frank W. Dowsett.

### 1. What is Faith?

**T**he Epistle to the Hebrews is, in my opinion, one of the grandest books of our Christian Bible. And apart from its central theme covering the entire glory and majesty of our Lord Jesus Christ, it teaches us more about the subject of FAITH than can be found anywhere else in the Scriptures. The faith of which it speaks is no ordinary faith. It is not a faith based simply on doctrine. It speaks of a faith based on conviction. It is not a faith based solely on miracles, but rather a faith based on absolute impossibilities. The eleventh chapter of this Epistle, on which this and possible subsequent articles in this series will be based, quote seventeen specific instances of faith, all of which had two things in common. Firstly, every person mentioned had a total conviction of the ability of God to do what He said He was going to do, even though in most cases it seemed, from a human point of view, totally impossible. They didn't think in terms of 'miracles'. They just had an overwhelming conviction that God would do what He promised as a normal consequence of the fact that He WAS God. We don't read that they knew that God would perform a miracle in order to achieve what He had stated. They just believed that He would do it. Period. As far as they were concerned, if God promised to do something, then what else would one expect but that He would do it. And that's one of our big problems today. We won't believe that God will, or even can, do something unless He performs a miracle. Thus we find that all too many people today end up worshipping the 'miracle' more than they worship God. In fact, they find that they cannot worship God unless He performs miracles. No miracles, No God. That was certainly not the attitude of our forefathers. Secondly, in every



case quoted, the person mentioned had an unwavering conviction and commitment to proceed on the basis of this faith. They never questioned what God said. They just went on with it, as though it was the most natural thing in the world to do.

So in order not to confuse the popular religious application of faith with that which is defined in God's Word, let us keep in mind these key verses recorded in Hebrews 10:23; and 35-39;

*"Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering; (for he is faithful that promised;)" . . .*

*"Cast not away therefore your confidence, which hath great recompense of reward.*

*For ye have need of patience, that, after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise.*

*For yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry.*

*Now the just shall live by faith: but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him.*

*But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition; but of them that believe to the saving of the soul."*

These verses form a 'bridge' between the "Faith we Profess", and the "Faith by which we Live". Faith alone is not sufficient. It is not the Bible way. We read in James 2:17-20;

*"Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone.*

*Yea, a man may say, Thou hast faith, and I have works: show me thy faith without thy works, and I will show thee my faith by my works.*

*Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well: the devils also believe, and tremble.*

*But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead?"*

The passage to which we referred above teaches us five requirements.

1. **We must hold fast our faith with confidence, or boldness.** We cannot afford to be blown about by every wind of doctrine. We must never lose sight of the fact that what we

believe becomes the foundation of our faith, which in turn, becomes the basis of what we do - our works. This, we are informed, results in us gaining a great recompense of reward. We are very amply repaid for our boldness in direct proportion to the degree of our boldness, which by the way, should never be confused with arrogance.

2. **We are to exercise patience.** This is a basic nature of faith. We must allow God to carry out His will and purposes in HIS time, not as and when it suits us. Patience is a continual growing procedure. This is why we read in II Peter 3:18;

*“But grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.”*

We do not acquire instant perfection in anything. It has to be worked at.

3. **We must maintain our vision of what lies before us,** the return of our Lord Jesus Christ. We read in Habakkuk 2:1-3;

*“I will stand upon my watch, and set me upon the tower, and will watch to see what he will say unto me, and what I shall answer when I am reproved.*

*And the LORD answered me, and said, Write the vision, and make it plain upon tables, that he may run that readeth it.*

*For the vision is yet for an appointed time, but at the end it shall speak, and not lie: though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come, it will not tarry.”*

Titus 2:13 confirms our vision;

*“Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.”*

4. **We must live by our own faith,** not by that of someone else. There is no such thing as ‘proxy faith’. We read in Habakkuk 2:4; *“the just shall live by his faith.”* The quality of our life is proportionate to the level of our faith. The “just”, or “righteous”, must live in accordance with their

faith. And let it be noted that this faith is not static. It is ongoing, and on-growing. We read in Romans 1:17; ***"For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith."*** But faith is not the only thing that grows. Iniquity also grows. As Paul records in Romans 6:19; ***"I speak after the manner of men because of the infirmity of your flesh: for as ye have yielded your members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity; even so now yield your members servants to righteousness unto holiness."*** Never let us forget that God has no pleasure in those who, through iniquity, lift themselves above TRUTH! (Romans 1:18).

5. We must always guard against "drawing back unto perdition", that is, letting our faith lapse. "Perdition" means loss, destruction, and ruin - the loss of all we ever had, or might ever have.

## **So what is this FAITH which we must guard so jealously?**

- a) We read its definition in Hebrews 11:1;

***"Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen."***

Phillips translates this as follows;

***"Now faith means that we have full confidence in the things we hope for; it means being certain of things we cannot see."***

As the apostle Paul expressed it in II Corinthians 4:18;

***"While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal."***

How can we "hope" - have an expectation - for something for which we don't believe? If we are like the Saducees, who didn't believe in a resurrection, how can we have any faith in a

future resurrection of the dead? If we believe that the Kingdom of God is up in heaven somewhere, how can we have any faith in its establishment down here on earth where Christ Himself said it would be?

On the other hand, how can we have "faith" if the things we can see don't instil within us a certainty of conviction regarding what we cannot physically see?

- b) It was the fact that the "elders" - the leaders - held firmly and without wavering to their expectations and convictions as to the absolute faithfulness of God to carry out His stated will and purposes, which became the basis of their reputation.

This was, as Jude recorded,

**"The Faith Once Delivered to the Saints"!**

As we previously pointed out, this was not a faith based on doctrine. It was a faith based upon conviction. It formed the basis of Jude's exhortation as found in the third verse of his epistle;

*"Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints."*

This conviction was absolutely necessary in order to understand our "common salvation", that is, the promise of "the position and condition of safety which pertained equally to all to whom it was promised, as recorded in Matt. 1:21, and Psalm 98:1-3;

*"And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins." . . . .*

*"O sing unto the LORD a new song; for he hath done marvellous things: his right hand, and his holy arm, hath gotten him the victory."*

*The LORD hath made known his salvation: his righteousness hath he openly showed in the sight of the heathen.*

*He hath remembered his mercy and his truth toward the house of Israel: all the ends of the earth have seen the salvation of our God."*

## **2. How Faith is Obtained.**

**T**his is the next important question. It's one thing to know that Faith exists, and even what it is. But how to obtain it can be, to many, quite another matter. The definitive answer to this question is found in Romans 10:17;

*"So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God."*

The word 'hearing' means 'being informed'. And the source of the information must be "The Word of God". Thus, faith can only be obtained by understanding, or being informed by, God's Word. It has very little, if anything, to do with what man says. None of us will ever achieve true faith by listening to, or accepting, ideas and ideologies formulated and expounded by man. Many people, from the earliest times right up to our present day, have postulated upon their own theories of what they think God means when He says something. To listen to some of them, one could be excused for concluding that God really doesn't have a clue as to what is happening, or of what is to happen in the future. What doesn't sound too nice, we sanitise. What doesn't suit the particular doctrine we want to believe, we spiritualise. And those who are not prepared to agree with every fanciful idea that is proposed, we ostracise. Don't worry about what God has to say. The requirement for today is 'Political Correctness'. We must bow down to the will of man, in preference to the will of God. And we wonder why we walk in spiritual darkness.

Throughout the ages, God has spoken to and through many different people, in many different ways, under different circumstances, and on many subjects. This fact in itself has led to many and varied ideas being promulgated, particularly by those who wish to draw attention to themselves by virtue of the

“original” explanations which they expound. They are experts in the manner by which they present themselves as being so clever as to be able to think up all these seemingly complicated methods and calculations just to explain the simple statements of God’s Word. It is for this reason that we must be so very careful in what we accept from modern self-styled prophets. It is a constant warning throughout God’s Word.

God’s Word is very clear; it is very concise; it is very positive; and it is very consistent. Not once has God ever contradicted Himself, nor has He ever changed His plans. *“I am the Lord. I change not”* is as true and relevant today as it was since the dawn of time. The dubious honour of ‘helping God out’ by changing what God said into what they think He should have said, has been abrogated by man.

What God requires is that we believe His statements, not man’s. We need to follow the commandments which God has set down for us, rather than the traditions of man. And there’s nothing new in this. Jesus had exactly the same problem at the time of His first advent.

We should also recognise the fact that “believing God” is not necessarily “believing an accepted religious or denominational doctrine.” “Believing God” is not necessarily believing in the teachings of any particular person, irrespective of how wonderful they sound, or how charismatic the personality of that individual may be.

If our faith stems from a belief based on “doctrines”, we could be in serious trouble. As we previously stated, what we eventually believe becomes the basis and criteria of our faith, which in turn becomes the motivation for everything we subsequently do throughout our Christian walk.

Let us consider the following illustrations.

1. Today, man’s teaching is about the essential goodness of man. But when I turn to Romans 7:18 I read *“For I know that in me dwelleth no good thing.”*
2. Today, man’s teaching is the doctrine of evolution. But God’s Word teaches me that He created all things. (See Gen. 1:1; Isa. 45:18; John 1:3; Col. 1:16; etc.)

3. Today, man's doctrine is 'multiculturalism'; that all religions lead us to God. But when I read John 14:6, I find that God's doctrine is that no man can come to the Father but by and through our Lord Jesus Christ.
4. Today, man's doctrines teach us to worship God with rock bands and "pulpit platitudes" and over-emotional excesses. But when I read John 4:24 I find that God's way is to worship Him in spirit and in truth. Whatever happened to reverential awe and respect.
5. Today we are taught to 'adjust' God's Word to suit what we prefer - especially if it's going to augment the offerings. We ignore the exhortation contained in II Timothy 4:2-4; ***"Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables."***
6. Today, many preachers try to convince us that things are getting better, apparently because we have Jesus reigning in our hearts. That's strange to me, as when I read II Timothy 3:1-5, I find the following statements; ***"This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, Without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, Traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away."***
7. And when it comes to God's eternal covenants which He made with our fathers, we are told that; a) When God used the word "forever" to such people as Abraham, He only meant 'for the lifetime of the person to whom He was speaking at the time.' (that was one that a full-time ordained minister threw at me; b) That Israel became so wicked that

God realised that He could do nothing with her and so had to change His mind and give all the promises He had made to a new organisation which He called "the church". And so it goes on ad-infinitum. What ever happened to His Word revealed in Hebrews 6:13-14; *"For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he swore by himself, Saying, Surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee."*

Get your Bibles out and read the certainty of God's wonderful and eternal promises set forth in Jeremiah 31:35-37; 33:17-26. Do they sound like some temporary abortion on God's part to you?

Analyse every one of the above examples and ask yourself this question. Will any of these alternative beliefs alter my faith in any way? Will my future actions, or works be in any way affected by whatever level or degree of faith to which I have attained as a result of these different beliefs? Of course they will. You either believe what God says, or you believe what man-made doctrine wants you to believe. But please don't have the audacity to blame God if things don't turn out as you would wish in your life simply because you chose to believe man's doctrines instead of God's.

## **The Importance of Faith.**

*"But without faith it is impossible to please him: for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him."*  
(Hebrews 11:6)

**A**s we see, we cannot please God, or even approach Him, without possessing faith. It is clear from the above text that there are three absolute, non-negotiable requirements which we must exhibit, in order to demonstrate that we have the necessary faith required to please Him. Firstly, we must believe that God actually exists. This does NOT involve giving mere "lip service" to the concept or possibility of His existence whenever it suits our purpose. It means that we must live our lives in the full assurance and unswerving acceptance and confidence of His everlasting and ever-present existence.



Secondly, we must believe that He is the only true and living God, accepting absolutely no compromise with other religious faiths. Thirdly, we must believe - constantly living in the full assurance and expectancy of - the reward He has promised to those who diligently seek Him with all their hearts. This reward is not to be looked upon as some prize we have won as a result of our own efforts, but rather as a result of our confidence in God's absolute and unfailing faithfulness to perform ALL that He has promised.

**This was the secret behind every incident, and every person, listed in the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews.**

They believed in the absolute existence of the One, Immortal, Invisible God, and lived and breathed an unshakeable assurance in God's ability and intention to carry out, what to them, was the seemingly impossible.

### **This was the stuff or substance of the Heroes of Faith.**

Remember, that all these folk were normal human beings, just like you and me. If we wish to emulate them, and share in their rewards, we must take full heed of the exhortation which we quoted earlier in this study, as recorded in II Timothy 4:1-5;

*"I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom; Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables.*

*But watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry."*



# OUR PROTECTIVE GOD.

By Bruce Horner.

## PART 7.

### THE GLORIOUS REVOLUTION.

**D**uring critical episodes in the history of the British people, especially when they have turned to Him and sought His aid, Almighty God has intervened on their behalf, as our Monarchs and leaders in Church and state have often testified. In this issue we will discuss William II and the Glorious Revolution. There were two events which showed very clearly the Hand of God. One of these has been acknowledged from time to time, but the other is quite forgotten.

To get a proper perspective of the period we must review a little of the history of the time. The Stuart Monarchs were very unsatisfactory in England. They derived from Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots, from her marriage to the weak Lord Darnley, another Stewart from a cadet branch. They were married in 1565, James was born 1566 and Darnley was murdered in 1567. James carried the birthright from King David into the English Crown, becoming James I of England and James VI of Scotland, fulfilling the prophecy of Ezekiel, whereby the two nations of Israel and Judah would become united, with one king ruling over them. This was acknowledged by the City of London at the time, by inscribing the text on an archway erected for him to pass under as he entered the City. He was always afraid of assassination; he wore a padded doublet in case he should be stabbed. Unprepossessing in appearance, weak and deformed in body and called "the wisest fool in Christendom", he nevertheless gave us the King James Bible. His wife was Anne of Denmark, a convert to Roman Catholicism. James sought the friendship of both France and Spain, regardless of their being Roman Catholic. The death of his eldest son, Prince Henry, was regarded as a great loss to the nation. He was a decided Protestant and seems to have given promise of being a good

ruler. The reign of James was marked by the deliverance from the Gunpowder Plot in 1605; the issue in 1611 of the Authorised version of the Bible, and in 1620 the departure for the New World of the Pilgrim Fathers. An unsuccessful attempt was made to marry Charles, the second son of James, who had become heir to the throne, to a Spanish Princess. Finally he married Henrietta Maria, a French Princess and a Roman Catholic. When he came to the throne he copied the French Court and the way in which the French Monarchs had ruled through favourites. His use of Stafford, Buckingham and Laud in this way, and his levying taxation without Parliamentary sanction, brought about in the end the Civil War, and finally his death on the block at the end of the Civil War.

For a while England was ruled by the Great Lord Protector, Oliver Cromwell. It was a rigid rule that the country was not really prepared for. The change had come so quickly. Cromwell was faced with the problem of there not being anyone of the House of Stuart he, or Parliament, could trust. He sought to rule in the fear of God, and England, in foreign policy, became the leading Protestant power in Europe. He was certainly feared and respected on the Continent, but who could succeed such a man?

The recall of Charles II, son of Charles I, seemed the only possible solution. He was at his father's side throughout most of the Civil War and towards the end of it escaped to France, later moving to Holland, where his sister Mary was married to the Prince of Orange. Their son was to become the future William II of England. The execution of Charles I in January 1649 made Charles the *de jure* King Charles II, and in 1650 he landed in Scotland, raised an army of 10,000 men and, after being crowned King of Scots at Scone on 1 January 1651, marched into England, only to suffer an overwhelming defeat by Cromwell's army at the Battle of Worcester.

A price of P1,000 was put on Charles's head and he became a fugitive for six weeks. Eventually Charles made his escape to France, and the next eight years were spent in exile in France, Germany and Holland, engaged in plotting and planning. Cromwell, who had been installed as Lord Protector seated on the Coronation Chair, which was taken from the Abbey to Westminster Hall for that purpose, 3 September 1658, was succeeded in that office by his son Richard. A new dynasty of hereditary Lord Protectors might have been envisaged, but

Richard was not the man his father was, and had no stomach for government. In May 1659 he was compelled to resign by the army, leaving the way open to negotiate Charles's restoration. Charles returned to London on his 30th birthday, 29 May 1660, and was crowned on St George's Day 1661 by William Juxon, Archbishop of Canterbury, the prelate who had attended his father on the scaffold. Charles proved himself an astute ruler, but his foreign policy left much to be desired. He became very much the tool of France, whose Court and Monarchy were extravagant, corrupt and dominated by the policy of Rome and the Jesuits. Charles was now civil head of the English Church, although secretly a Romanist, and was tied to France and French policy and in the secret pay of the French Monarch, Louis XIV, who had given him a pension, enabling Charles to be independent of Parliament, who had withheld money from him. Like the French King, he lived a life of immorality with successive mistresses. He was a highly intelligent man, perhaps the most attractive of all our kings, but devious and wicked.

In 1670 Charles II concluded the Secret Treaty of Dover with Louis XIV. Shortage of money was crucial, and Dunkirk was sold to France for P400,000. Does this sound rather like selling The Commonwealth Bank and Telecom? He had no children of his marriage, but he fathered a large progeny by his many mistresses. The Great Plague of London occurred in 1665, followed by the great fire in 1666. Was this divine retribution?

The Habeas Corpus Act was passed in Charles's reign and Parliamentary government began to develop the party system, Whigs and Tories emerging for the first time. When Charles II was dying a Romish Priest was intruded into the Whitehall Palace, up the backstairs, dressed as a groom, to receive him into the Roman Church and administer the last rites. The arrangements for this were made by his brother, the Duke of York, who succeeded him as James II. Charles II was buried in Westminster Abbey with Anglican Rites. James II was openly a Romanist and, against the advice of some leading members of the Roman Church and the Pope, was set upon the task of bringing England quickly back to Rome. During the reigns of these Stuart Monarchs the Protestant dissenters and the Scottish Covenanters were bitterly persecuted. James I had, by persecution, driven the Pilgrim Fathers across the seas to America. Under Charles I and Charles II, the Puritans, both

within and outside the Established Church, had a time of bitter persecution from the influence of Popery. Bunyan languished in Bedford Jail from 1660 to 1672.

In 1662 the great ejection of Puritan ministers from the Church of England, for not signing the Act of Uniformity, took place. 2000 were driven from their parishes and parsonages. Among them were some of the godliest and most gracious of the Puritans within the Church. With the coming to the throne of the second King James, the persecution was stepped up. Covenanters' blood stained the heather, the torture of the boot was used, and historians write of this as the "Killing Times". James forbade preaching on controversial matters, gagged the preachers, and filled the tutorial chairs of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge with his own Roman Catholic favourites. He rigged the Parliament, filling the seats of the House of Commons with people he could mould to his policies. The bench of Judges was filled with such people, the most notorious of all being Judge Jeffrey's who will ever be remembered, among other things, for his ruthless persecution of the people concerned with the Monmouth Rising.

These policies were regarded very gravely by Englishmen of that day. At first they thought that James would eventually die and Mary, his eldest daughter, the wife of William of Orange, would come to the throne. However, when his second wife, Mary of Modena, gave birth to a son, eventually to be known as "the Pretender", and the prospect of a Roman Catholic, French dominated Monarchy loomed ahead for a long time, many were ready to oppose James. The Duke of Argyle made an abortive attempt to overthrow James in Scotland and he was executed. The Protestant Duke of Monmouth, illegitimate son of Charles 11 and Lucy Walters, made an attempt to gain the throne. This ended in disaster - the Battle of Sedgemoor in Somerset. The awful sequel was the "Bloody Assize" under Judge Jefferies. The effect of this was the almost complete destruction of Protestant dissent in Somersetshire. In the Civil War nonconformity was strong in the area. The transportation of large numbers and the hanging of many without proper trial so destroyed nonconformity that they have never recovered. These rebellions were put down with excessive brutality calculated to destroy Protestantism and Parliamentary Government.

In 1685 Louis XIV revoked the Edict of Nantes, issued by his ancestor Henry IV to protect the French Protestants. This sent thousands of refugees across the Channel. They were arriving, many of them in abject destitution, filled with stories of horror and cruel persecution. James was in close touch with Louis and adopting similar measures as far as he could. He had dispensed with Parliament, issuing Orders in Council contrary to the law of the land. By overthrowing the Test Act and other measures that prohibited the appointment of Romanists to places of importance in Government, the Army, Navy and Universities, he filled these offices with Romanists. He was setting the stage for the Papal takeover. He intended to repeal the Habeas Corpus Act which ensured a fair trial in the Courts and wished to raise a standing army.

By this time he was losing support. Many Protestant and Royalist Noblemen and gentry were leaving his side. He turned to the Protestant dissenters, befriended the Quakers and others. He then issued an act of indulgence framed to assist all those who were opposed to the Church of England, especially the Romanists - his friends. He then issued a further declaration of Indulgence and ordered it to be read in churches. The real purpose of this was NOT as some have supposed religious liberty for all, but a weakening of the Church of England to eventually restore Romanism. Sandcroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, became alarmed. He summoned Bishops to London; six came, a remonstrance was drawn up and presented to the King who demanded obedience to his commands. This, these seven Bishops were not, in conscience, able to do. They were arrested and sent to the Tower of London. When later tried in Westminster Hall they were acquitted. The country was wild with delight, and the names of these Bishops should ever be held in remembrance.

The educated Englishman of 1688 was influenced by the Geneva Bible, translated in Geneva during the persecution under Mary 1 (Tudor) and brought into England by the returning exiles in 1563. It was printed later in many editions in England, and was the most common and influential book in our language. It was the book from which the children learned to read. It was read at home, at school and in Church and it had a profound influence. The services in the Churches were taken universally from the Book of Common Prayer of 1662 and they were Protestant. Each year the 5 November was a thanksgiving for

THE COVENANT VISION

the deliverance of James I from the Gunpowder Plot and later the service was revised to include thanksgiving for the landing of William of Orange at Brixham on 5th November 1688. It was not taken from the Prayer Book until 1854. The Royalist gentry who had supported Charles I in the Civil War were largely Protestant.

There were still folk in England whose grandparents had been burned alive under Mary I. The memory of this great persecution was vivid in the minds of many. The unsatisfactory reign of Charles I that had led to the Parliamentary war and the beneficial, if austere, rule of Cromwell, followed by the extravagant, immoral, and traitorous reign of Charles II who was in the pay of the Roman Catholic King of France (Louis XIV), was all fresh in people's minds. The Whig politicians could see but one way of resolving the matter; an invitation to Mary (eldest daughter of James II) to the throne. However, Mary was the wife of William of Orange and would not agree to being Queen without him. William had become leader of the Protestant States in Europe, fighting constantly against France. In 1685 Louis had revoked the Edict of Nantes, and large numbers of Huguenots had fled rather than recant their faith. Many had fled to Holland; some who were professional soldiers had joined William's army. The valiant and capable Marshall Schombergh, who in 1690 fell at the Battle of the Boyne, was one of them.

The acquittal of the Bishops would, but for one circumstance, have strengthened the nation in its resolution patiently to wait till James's death placed his daughter on the throne. On June 10, however, a son had been born to James, and that fact changed the whole situation. The boy would be educated in his father's religion, and England was threatened with a Roman Catholic dynasty in which each successive ruler would, from his childhood, be brought up in the belief that he might break through all legal restraints whenever he could have the approval of judges appointed by himself and liable to dismissal whenever he pleased. It was almost universally believed, without a shadow of foundation, that the child was procured from some poor mother and brought in a warming pan into the Queen's chamber. True or false, there was no doubt that he would be treated as James's heir. Tories were as much disturbed as Whigs at the prospect before them. The doctrine of non-resistance was forgotten, and on June 30, the day of the

Bishops' acquittal, seven important personages, some being Whigs and some Tories, invited the Prince of Orange to land with an armed force to defend the liberties of England.

William would probably not have accepted the invitation if the constitutional rights of Englishmen had alone been at stake; but he had made it the object of his life to struggle against Louis, and he knew that war was on the point of breaking out between Louis and an alliance in which almost every European prince took part excepting James.

This is what Macauley, the famous historian, comments in his History of England.

"The task would indeed have been too arduous even for such a statesman as the Prince of Orange, had not his chief adversaries been at this time smitten with an infatuation such as by many men not prone to superstition, was ascribed to the special judgment of God. Not only was the King of England, as he had ever been, stupid and perverse; but even the counsel of the politic King of France was turned into foolishness. Whatever wisdom and energy could do William did. Those obstacles which no wisdom and energy could have overcome his enemies themselves studiously removed."

He accepted the invitation so that he might bring England into that alliance; and made preparations which could not be hidden from James. James made concessions, abolished the Ecclesiastical Commission, gave back the Charters of the City of London and other corporations, and restored the Protestant Fellows of Magdalen College which had always been a loyal supporter of the House of Stuart. James fitted out a considerable fleet in the Channel under the command of Lord Dartmouth, and augmented the regular army - already the largest any King of England had ever commanded - bringing in Roman Catholic troops from Ireland, while the general impatience for the arrival of William daily grew stronger. But gales blowing obstinately from the west prevented the Prince of Orange from sailing. Of this, Macauley writes: "The weather, it was said, was Popish. Crowds stood in Cheapside gazing intently at the weathercock on the graceful steeple of Bow Church, and praying for a Protestant wind."

The army of Louis was on the southern frontier of the Spanish Netherlands, and William could not stir as long as an invasion of his Spanish allies was threatened. Louis, however, offered James the assistance of his fleet to repel the expected



Dutch expedition. James replied that he was quite able to take care of himself. Louis lost his temper, withdrew his army from the frontier of the Netherlands, and sent it to begin the war with the allies by burning and ravaging the Palatinate.

On October 19 William's forces put to sea, but after about half the distance to England had been covered storms drove his fleet back to Holland again. Meanwhile the events which transpired in England during the delays only strengthened the general desire for deliverance from James's yoke; and eventually on November 1 the prayers of Englishmen were answered and the Dutch fleet put to sea again. Its voyage is thus described by Macauley: "The wind blew fresh from the east. The armament, during twelve hours, held a course towards the north-west. The light vessels sent out by the English Admiral for the purpose of obtaining intelligence brought back news which confirmed the prevailing opinion that the enemy would try to land in Yorkshire. All at once, on a signal from the Prince's ship, the whole fleet tacked, and made sail for the British Channel. The same breeze which favoured the voyage of the invaders prevented Dartmouth from coming out of the Thames. His ships were forced to strike yards and topmasts; and two of his frigates, which had gained the open sea, were shattered by the violence of the weather, and driven back into the river.

"The Dutch fleet ran fast before the gale, and reached the Straits at about ten in the morning of Saturday the third of November. William himself, in the Brill, led the way. More than six hundred vessels, with canvas spread to a favourable wind, followed in his train."

Soon after midday William passed the Straits of Dover and by sunset was off Beachy Head, while King James hastily dispatched troops hither and thither, not knowing where William would land. But again let Macauley tell the story.

"When Sunday the fourth of November dawned, the cliffs of the Isle of Wight were full in view of the Dutch armament. That day was the anniversary of William's birth and of his marriage. Sail was slackened during part of the morning; and Divine Service was performed on board of the ships. In the afternoon and through the night the fleet held on its course. Torbay was the place where the Prince intended to land. But the morning of Monday the 5th of November was hazy. The pilot of the Brill could not discern the seamarks, and carried the fleet

too far to the west. The danger was great. To return in the face of the wind was impossible. Plymouth was the next port. But at Plymouth a garrison had been posted under the command of Lord Bath. The landing might be opposed; and a check might produce serious consequences. There could be little doubt, moreover, that by this time the royal fleet had got out of the Thames and was hastening full sail down the Channel. Russell saw the whole extent of the peril, and explained to Burnet (William's chaplain), "You may go to your prayers, Doctor. All is over."

"At that moment the wind changed: a soft breeze sprang up from the south: the mist dispersed; the sun shone forth; and, under the mild light of an Autumnal noon, the fleet turned back, passed round the lofty cape of Berry Head, and rode safe in the harbour of Torbay."

Burnet, a warm-hearted but garrulous and inquisitive man, began asking William questions about his plans. If there was one thing that William disliked more than another, it was the interference of clergymen in military matters. He therefore looked Burnet in the face, replying only by another question: "Well, doctor, what do you think of predestination now?" Both he and Burnet were convinced that God had himself guided them thus far in safety for the deliverance of His people.

Macauley again writes:

"There was some difficulty about landing the horses; and it seemed probable that this operation would occupy several days. But on the following morning the prospect cleared. The wind was gentle. The water in the bay was even as glass. Some fishermen pointed out a place where the ships could be brought within 60 feet of the beach. This was done; and in three hours many hundreds of horses swam safely to shore.

"The disembarkation had hardly been effected when the wind rose again, and swelled into a fierce gale from the west. The enemy coming in pursuit down the Channel had been stopped by the same change of weather which enabled William to land. During two days the King's fleet lay on an unruffled sea in sight of Beachy Head. At length Dartmouth was able to proceed. He passed the Isle of Wight, and one of his ships came in sight of the Dutch topmasts in Torbay. Just at this moment he was encountered by the tempest, and compelled to take shelter in the harbour of Portsmouth. At that time James, who was not incompetent to form a judgment on a question of seamanship,

declared himself perfectly satisfied that his Admiral had done all that man could do, and yielded only to the irresistible hostility of the winds and waves....”

“The weather had indeed served the Protestant cause so well that some men of more piety than judgment fully believed that the ordinary laws of nature to have been suspended for the preservation of the liberty and religion of England. Exactly a hundred years before, they said, the Armada, invincible by man, had been scattered by the wrath of God. Civil freedom and divine truth were again in jeopardy; and again the obedient elements had fought for the good cause. The wind had blown strong from the east while the Prince wished to sail down the Channel, had turned to the south when he wished to enter Torbay, had sunk to a calm during the disembarkation, and, as soon as the disembarkation was completed, had risen to a storm, and met the pursuers in the face.”

This is what was ordered to be inserted in the Book of Common Prayer to be said on the 5th of November each year.

“Accept also, most Gracious God, of our unfeigned thanks, for filling our hearts again with joy and gladness, after the time that Thou hadst afflicted us, and putting a new song into our mouths, by bringing His Majesty King William, upon this Day, for the deliverance of our Church and Nation from Popish tyranny and arbitrary power. We adore the wisdom and justice of Thy Providence, which so timely interposed in our extreme danger, and disappointed all the designs of our enemies. We beseech Thee, give us such a lively and lasting sense of what Thou didst then, and has since that time done for us, that we may not grow secure and careless in our obedience, by presuming upon Thy great and undeserved goodness; but that it may lead us to repentance, and move us to be the more diligent and zealous in all the duties of our Religion, which Thou hast in a marvellous manner preserved to us. Let truth and justice, brotherly kindness and charity, devotion and piety, concord and unity, with all other virtues, so flourish among us, that they may be the stability of our times, and make this Church a praise to the earth. All which we humbly beg for the sake of our blessed Lord and Saviour.”

William now marshalled his army and prepared for the march on London. Many of the people in the west of England were slow in support of William. The horror of the Battle of Sedgemoor which took place near Bridgewater was yet in their

minds. The hanging corpses of the defeated supporters of "King Monmouth" were vivid memories; the savage way the rebellion was put down and its supporters crushed was never to be forgotten. However the efficient way in which William's army was commanded, the sincere avowal of William, stated on the huge pennant flown from his ship, "The Protestant religion and the Liberties of England I will maintain" assured more and more people that this revolution was one that would bring lasting peace and secure for us nationally our Protestant Constitution. The fact was that many English people were horrified at the prospect of a persecution, such as France was already experiencing, raging in our country. James was already set on the same path as Louis XIV and the prospect was real. After a while the gentry of the counties through which he passed poured in to support him. The doctrine of non-resistance was thrown to the winds. James set out with his troops to combat William. He reached Salisbury, but the officers of his own army and his courtiers deserted him. Amongst those who fled to William was Lord Churchill, afterwards known as the Duke of Marlborough and the greatest soldier of his age. He had received many favours from James, which he now repaid by inciting all those whom he could influence to abandon their king. Amongst these was James's younger daughter Anne, over whom Churchill's wife exercised a most powerful influence, and who now, together with her husband, Prince George of Denmark, fled to William. James, left almost alone, made his way back to London, which he reached on November 27. On the 30th he ordered the preparation of writs for the election of a Parliament, and proposed an accommodation with William, who by that time had reached Hungerford. It was agreed that both armies should remain at a distance of 40 miles from London in order to enable the new Parliament to meet in safety. James was, in reality, determined not to submit. On December 10 he sent his wife and son to France. On the 11th he attempted to follow them, burning the writs and dropping the Great Seal in the Thames, in the hope that everything might fall into confusion for want of the symbol of legitimate authority. There were riots in London, and the Roman Catholic chapels were sacked and destroyed. There was a general call to William to hasten his march. On the 12th, however, James was stopped by some fishermen and brought back to London. William had no mind to have a second royal martyr on his hands, and did everything to

frighten James into an escape. On 18 December James fled London and William arrived at Whitehall. On December 23, with William's connivance, James embarked for France. How to return to a legal system with the least possible disturbance was the problem to be faced. William consulted the House of Lords, and an assembly composed of all persons who had sat in any of Charles's Parliaments, together with special representatives of the City. Members of James's one Parliament were not summoned, on the plea that the return to it of members chosen by the remodelled corporations made it no true Parliament. The body thus consulted advised William to call a Convention, which would be a Parliament in everything except that there was no king to summon it.

On January 22, 1689, the Convention met. The House of Commons contained a majority of Whigs, whilst the Tories were in a majority in the Lords. On the 28th the Commons resolved that "King James II, having endeavoured to subvert the constitution of the kingdom by breaking the original contract between king and people, and by the advice of Jesuits and other wicked persons having violated the fundamental laws and having withdrawn himself out of the kingdom, had abdicated the government, and that the throne had thereby become vacant." This lumbering resolution was unanimously adopted. On February the Lords voted, as the Commons had voted before, that James had abdicated and the throne was vacant.

A Declaration of Rights was prepared condemning the dispensing power as lately exercised and the other extravagant actions of James II, while both Houses concurred in offering the crown to William and Mary as joint sovereigns. As long as William lived he was to administer the government, Mary only attaining to actual power in the event of her surviving her husband. The heirs were also decided. On February 13 William and Mary accepted the crown on the conditions offered to them. The main characteristic of this bloodless revolution was that it established the supremacy of Parliament by setting up a king and queen who owed their position to a Parliamentary vote. People had been found to believe that James II was king by a Divine right. Nobody could believe that of William. Parliament, which had set him up, could pull him down, and he would have, therefore, to conform his government to the will of the nation manifested in Parliament.

The political revolution of 1689 succeeded, whilst the Puritan revolution of 1641 failed, because, in 1641, the political aim of setting the Parliament above the King was complicated by an ecclesiastical dispute which had split Parliament and the nation into two hostile parties. In 1689 there was practically neither a political nor an ecclesiastical dispute. Tories and Whigs combined to support the change, and Churchmen and Dissenters made common cause against the small Roman Catholic minority which had only been dangerous because it had the Crown at its back, and because the crown had been supported by Louis and his armies. The revolution thus achieved was thus far less complete than that aimed at in 1641 against Charles I.

Change to the social institutions was none, whilst change to the political constitution was small and for a single generation. It has been regretted that the moral tone of the men who brought about the bloodless revolution of 1689 was lower than that of the men who brought about the revolution of 1641, and the reason that 1641 failed was due to the fact that the Puritans unwisely attempted to enforce morality by law.

In England the Convention Parliament had, in 1689, made a Declaration of Rights, and now they passed a Bill of Rights. The following is an extract from it.

“Whereas it hath been found by experience that it is inconsistent with the safety and welfare of this Protestant Kingdom to be governed by a Popish Prince or by any King or Queen marrying a Papist.....Every person who is or shall be reconciled to, or shall have communion with, the See or Church of Rome, or shall marry a Papist, shall be excluded and be forever incapable to inherit, possess, or enjoy the Crown or Government of this Realm and Ireland; and in every such case the people of these Realms shall be and are hereby released of their allegiance.” (Act 1, William & Mary, cap. 2, sec.ii, 1689).

The passing of the Bill was a milestone in the political history of the country. With the departure of James II, our last Roman Catholic King, there was the opportunity to establish a Protestant Monarchy. Since then, however, the Convention proved to be difficult and vindictive. William became fed up with both parties, and suddenly prorogued Parliament and then dissolved it. A new Parliament, in which the majority was Tory, met on 20 March 1690, and by confining to four years their grant of nearly half the revenue of the Crown, put a check upon

any attempt of a future king to make himself absolute. Subsequently the grant became annual; after which no king could avoid summoning Parliament every year, as he could not make himself financially independent of the House of Commons. The supremacy of Parliament was thus, as far as law could do it, practically secured.

There only remained the problem of Ireland. On July 1, William defeated James at the Battle of the Boyne, and James fled to Kinsale where he embarked for France.

The campaign dragged on, and William returned to England. In 1691 a Dutch general, Ginkel, was placed in command of the English army, and the campaign progressed well. Limerick was again besieged and this time capitulated. All officers and soldiers who wished to go to France were allowed to immigrate.

This is where the second Act of God took place, and it is rarely mentioned except in the terms of the last sentence. What happened was this:-

Limerick was besieged on three sides. The Irish army was gathered there. William wanted the war ended, and Ginkel was empowered to give favourable terms.

A free pardon was offered to all, but Sarsfield opposed it. French aid might come.

Sarsfield won, and refused the offer. Bombardment opened up again from 60 guns and from the fleet in the river, but the city remained untaken. Ginkel turned the siege into a blockade, and then a traitor showed them a pass over the Shannon River. Again Ginkel offered favourable terms. Again the struggle continued, and then a parley was held and firing ceased. For the third time Ginkel offered his terms and at last Sarsfield accepted them. The terms were to be signed in the presence of the Lord Justices. Sarsfield demanded that. They came post haste down from Dublin and put their signatures to the treaty. The terms were more than liberal, and more than one could expect. Irish Catholics were to have the right to exercise their religion; to have the rights of citizens; to be preserved from all disturbances. By the military articles, the garrison was to march out with arms and guns, baggage, colours flying, drums beating. Officers and men who wished to expatriate themselves were free to do so, and might depart in companies or parties. If plundered on the way, William's government was to make good their loss. Fifty ships were to be provided for their transportation; two men-of-war for the officers. Would the Irish

regiments join France or William? The royal standards of France and England were set up in a field. To one standard or the other each regiment was to proceed. That day, of the 14,000 men of the Irish army, only 1,046 men turned to William's standard.

A few days later a French fleet came up the Shannon. It brought men, money, arms, ammunition, stores and clothing. The news reached Sarsfield. Stunned, he remained silent for a few moments. Then:- "Too late," he said, "the Treaty is signed. Ireland's and our honour is pledged."

Ginkel was alarmed. But his anxiety was soon ended. Sarsfield, the unbuyable, Sarsfield, the man of honour - had forbidden the French to land. Instead their ships were to transport the Irish Regiments to France. Not a man of these saw Ireland again.

It is worth noting at this point that subsequent events were to effect the future of the country even to the present day. Whilst William had been distracted by foes in his own kingdom, Louis had been doing his best to get the better of his enemies.

An invasion on the shores of England was narrowly averted, Marlborough was disgraced and put out of office because of his objection to foreigners being promoted over the heads of Englishmen, and an English victory at sea followed. This was followed, however, by two land victories for the French, and both sides saw that success would follow the side which had most endurance, which meant that money was needed. In 1692, Parliament decided on borrowing 1,000,000*l*. for the support of the war. Kings and Parliaments had borrowed money before, but in the long run they had failed either to pay interest or to repay the principal, so says my Students' History of England, printed in 1902, and this loan is understood to be the beginning of the National Debt, because it was the first on which interest was steadily paid. This, of course, was because it was now the task of the tax-payer to service the debt.

Acting on advice, William sought to bring order into Parliament by, before the end of 1694, discharging his Tory ministers, and filling their posts with Whigs, who now had sole possession of office. The four leading Whigs were consulted on all important matters, and were popularly known as the Junto. Nothing was further from William's thoughts than the introduction of a new kind of government. Nevertheless the formation of the Junto was a great step in advance in the



direction of the modern Cabinet system, because it recognised frankly what Charles 11 had occasionally recognised tacitly, that the growth of the power of the House of Commons was so great that the King could not govern satisfactorily unless the views of his ministers accorded with those of a majority of the House of Commons. It is evident now that this admission would ultimately lead to government, not by the King, but by a Cabinet supporting itself on an organised party in the House of Commons; but ideas grow slowly, and there would be much opposition to overcome before such a system could take root with general approbation.

In 1694 the Bank of England was founded. The growing wealth of the country made it necessary that a place should be found in which money might be more safely deposited than with the goldsmiths, and the new Bank, having received deposits of money, made a loan to the Crown on the security of a Parliamentary promise that interest should be paid till the capital was returned. From such small beginnings.....



## EDITORIAL

(Continued from Page 13.)

As you will realise, this increase is totally out of our control, and we feel obliged to ask all those who receive our publication to do their very best to assist us in this matter, even to subscribing, as we have intimated, something towards the postage if you cannot afford the full subscription. We have no desire to deprive anyone of our magazine.

For those of you who have asked, our health is holding out fairly well, with no further complications to date. Our very grateful thanks go out as usual to all of you who so faithfully and regularly support and assist us in our ministry. We pray for the Lord's continued protection and guidance on you all as we approach that Great Day when we will see Him face to face.



come through the infilling, baptism, and ministry of the Holy Spirit within us.

**We proclaim** the absolute necessity for our nation to return to full obedience to the Law of God as the only way by which we can receive the full blessings of God.

**We proclaim** the absolute necessity for each and every individual Christian to prepare themselves for the greatest event yet to be witnessed on this earth, namely,

## **THE RETURN OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.**

Whilst the production, publication and distribution of this magazine is undertaken as a faith ministry, it is totally dependant on the tithes and offerings of our readers. We are happy to continue sending it freely to all who wish to receive it but genuinely cannot afford to contribute in any way. However, we do request an offering to at least cover the cost of postage, especially for overseas readers. But in order to be faithful stewards of the offerings sent to us, at the end of each year we will be obliged to remove the name from our mailing list of anyone who has not contributed or contacted us within the past year. The financial assistance and prayers of those who read it, and are blessed by it, are therefore vitally necessary for its continuance and growth.

We also invite our readers to send us the names and addresses of any whom they think would be genuinely interested in receiving a sample copy. In this way you can share in the proclamation of the Gospel of the Kingdom, that the name of our Lord Jesus Christ may be glorified.

It is our fervent prayer that you will be blessed and lifted to higher planes of joy and blessing as you study and learn of the wonders of God's Word, and of His boundless and merciful love for each of us.

With our Christian love,

*Frank and Betty Dowsett.*

**Phone:** (02) 9833-3925. **FAX:** (02) 9833-4397.

**E-Mail:** [fdowsett@idx.com.au](mailto:fdowsett@idx.com.au)

**Web Site:** <http://homepage.idx.com.au/fdowsett>

**They that wait upon the LORD  
shall renew their strength;  
they shall mount up with wings  
as eagles;  
they shall run, and not be weary;  
and they shall walk, and not faint.**

**(Isaiah 40:31.)**

**Produced and distributed by  
THE COVENANT VISION MINISTRY.  
P.O. BOX V192, MOUNT DRUITT VILLAGE  
N.S.W. 2770 AUSTRALIA**

**National Library of Australia Number  
ISSN 1031-8135**

**Print Post Approved. PP242587/00039.**

**Printed by Genesis Printing Works. Sydney. (02) 9676-7343.**