

NO LIBERTY WITHOUT LAW.

Part 2.

The Law Codified.

A well-known writer has stated: *“By and large the great bulk of the White race is staying well clear (of the present world situation). They are turning the responsibility for the preservation of their race and culture over to some unknown ‘they’ while they continue to disparage either the organisation or the person that is standing up and doing battle. Much of this is done quite automatically as a result of deliberate brain-washing. Yet this is what must be overcome, there must be a broad support base for the activists who are willing and able to do battle”.*

For some unaccountable reason there is a strange limitation within the make-up of Western man which causes him to ignore the Laws of God; Laws which are, without a doubt, the very epitome of nature itself. Obviously the choice to date has been to follow political dogmas rather than God’s Way of Life -- HIS LAW.

It is the purpose of these articles to show how this Law should be applied and it is hoped that through this effort to alert people as to the only way out of the present chaos, a renewal of faith in Almighty God will result and to such an extent that the Western countries will throw off not only their lethargy, but the control of the alien who is seeking their destruction.

At all times it should be noted that the Israel people of the Old Testament are to be found today in the Anglo-Saxon people of the West. Thus the Law of the Lord must be applied if true peace and happiness are to become a reality.

The Law Codified - the First Step

To many it may seem unnecessary to study the finer points of the Bible story especially in this day and age when mankind has advanced so far along the road toward self-determination and apparent utopia. These people will maintain that man has reached the place where Almighty God is only necessary to those in need of psychiatric treatment and yet, from all the signs of the times it is more than a little obvious that, in spite of the great scientific advancements man has made, liberty is fast running out. Today, political ideologies are manipulating events so as to provide no choice other than to follow the present socialistic trends. In other words, ‘better red than dead’ and yet - is this really all that the future holds? There still remains, strange as it may seem, the choice of following God and His Laws which are the only true expression of real liberty in which genuine peace will result. As Joshua of old said: “. . . choose you this day, whom ye will serve” (Joshua 24:15). Indeed, this is the day when the true people of God - Israel of the Bible and Anglo-Saxondom of today - must stand up and be counted.

There can be no doubt that the Authority of the Lord Jesus Christ attends the contention that it is 'easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail', and because of the present political wilderness into which the modern descendants of God's Covenant People (the Anglo-Celto-Saxon and Kindred People) have wandered, it behoves these people to re-consider God's Law and to re-discover the Constitutional machinery so graciously given. Subsequent to the national commitment which reverberated around Mount Sinai when "*all the people answered together, and said, All that the Lord hath spoken we will do*" (Exodus 19:8), one finds that the first requirement toward becoming the 'kingdom of administrators' was: "*Thou shalt have no other gods before me*" (Exodus 20:3). This is the centrality of the whole Law and which was a political instrument to which was later added the religious ordinances of propitiatory sacrifices. The prohibition against 'other gods' - sovereigns or rulers - was thus essentially in a *political context* - the religious following as an additional placatory machinery against violation of the Laws thus divinely given.

Having prefaced this primary requirement of no other 'gods' by calling attention to the then recent deliverance from Egypt - "*I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage*" (Exodus 20:2) - God re-asserted His Political Reality by demanding total reverence and obedience to the Constitution about to be given. It should be noted that the very first step toward the nation accomplishing its role as a 'kingdom of administrators' (Hebrew: Kohen) was the requirement that the nation accept His Political Reality as distinct from the specious theology which surrounded the man-created gods of Egypt. The Lord God of Israel had demonstrated the impotence of theological gods which, despite the invocations of the various priesthoods during Egypt's 'day of visitation', remained as inert and sterile as the faith which created them.

Israel had seen this impotence during the ten plagues just as the nation had witnessed the tremendous power of the One Living God Who opened the passage through the Red Sea in order that His People might escape the following Egyptians and thus rendezvous with Him before the Mount of the Law. They had seen too the Power of their God Who changed the bitter waters of Marah, Who provided Manna six days of the week, Who again provided water out of the rock at Rephidim and Who afforded them the victory over the Amalekites - all this branding into the consciousness of the people that they indeed walked under the benevolent protection and benediction of the One True Living God. They had now learned the reason behind the Lord's oft-repeated claim and revelation as 'the Almighty' (Genesis 17:1; Exodus 6:3) and could now appreciate His assertion of total sovereignty and consequently His call to obedience. Since, as He had demonstrated, He was absolute Power, all subordinate and created powers derived their office, power and moral authority from Him and this was to be exercised on His terms and under His jurisdiction. "*Thou shalt have no other gods before me.*"

Despite this wealth of experience and notwithstanding their voluntary commitment to 'do' all which the Lord had spoken, it is a matter of Biblical history that these people, so richly endowed, broke this first requirement within a few days of receiving it. While Moses was on the Mount with the Lord, the people built and worshipped the molten calf claiming 'these be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt' (Exodus 32:4). This incredible lapse appears to be totally inconsistent with all that had transpired only a few days earlier and yet the bald facts are that Israel certainly made and worshipped the molten calf. In seeking an answer to this infidelity one notes that within the disciplinary judgment which followed that ". . . Moses saw that the people were naked; (for Aaron had made them naked unto their shame among their enemies)" (Exodus 32:25). The usual picture of an orgy in

nudity which is painted by most teachers in respect of the worship of the molten calf derives its origin from these words which, as shall be seen, are a very loose translation and tend to divert attention from the true significance of the text. It is certainly not intended to 'white-wash' the Israelites - they were weak and easily persuaded just as are their modern descendants - but the picture of nude Israelites prancing before the image of the calf obscures the fact that influential 'enemies' were in the midst of the people. The literal translation of this verse as provided by Joseph Magill in the English-man's Hebrew-English Old Testament and verified by Rabbi Hertz in Pentateuch and Haftarahs reads: "And when Moses saw the people that it was broken loose, for Aaron had let it loose for a disgrace (derision) among their opponents . . ."

Who were these 'opponents'? It is inconceivable that they comprised remnants of the Amalekites who had been routed in Israel's first national conflict with other nations for these people were anathema to Israel being the object of God's sworn enmity from generation to generation (Exodus 17:16). The only other people, apart from Israel itself present before the Mount of the Law, was the 'mixed multitude' which had left Egypt with Israel at the commencement of the exodus (Exodus 12:38). If one considers the later parable spoken by the Lord Jesus Christ concerning the 'wheat and the tares' (Matthew 13:24-30 and 36-43), while its context may appear to indicate the Christian dispensation, the principle of sowing a disruptive influence among the 'children of the kingdom' is certainly Satan's modus operandi whenever the Lord God put into operation a machinery of correction. Prior to Sinai, indeed as Israel began the trek to Canaan, the Lord had made provision for this mixed multitude in that He provided specific commands as to their place in Israel, but it would appear that then, as now, the wisdom of the Lord's Directives was considered harsh and unrealistic - of which, more later.

Forty years later when a new generation of Israelites had grown up in the wilderness, Moses re-instructed the people concerning the Law and, as always, re-emphasised the First Commandment as central and basic to the whole Law. "Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God is one Lord. And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart: And thou shalt teach them diligently to thy children, and shall talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes. And thou shalt write them upon the posts of thy house, and upon thy gates." (Deuteronomy 6:4-9)

In this statement, apart from re-emphasising the centrality of God to His Law, Moses instructed the people concerning the procedures whereby this priority might be observed thus including day to day practices in which the individual is brought face to face with reminders of God at all times. It should be noted that these procedures are not found in the actual Law, but were added by Moses who, knowing his people, provided the necessary incentives whereby the Lord God of Israel was kept in remembrance before the people. Thus, whatever may be said about Moses and the procedures which he laid down, it cannot be said that he ever deviated from the First Commandment in its purest form. The centrality of God within all aspects of the nation's life became his obsession and rightly so too for a nation committed to the role of witnessing to God (Isaiah 43:10) must of necessity have God as the centre of its life.

None can accuse Moses of engendering an attitude in which the people accepted that they were God's Chosen People and therefore subject to His favouritism without any responsibility on their part. Moses said: "*And now, Israel, what doth the Lord thy God require of thee, but to fear the Lord thy God, to walk in all his ways, and to love him, and to serve the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul; and to keep for thy good the commandments of the Lord, and his statutes, which I command thee this day*" (Deuteronomy 10:12-13). Thus, in this and indeed throughout his leadership of the Covenant People, Moses insisted on the totality of God's Sovereignty and demanded Israel's complete dedication to the observance of the Law as the expression of the nation's love for its God.

As happened so frequently throughout His Ministry when questioned and even challenged concerning priorities in loyalty, the Lord Jesus Christ merely pointed to the Scriptures with the simple statement '*It is written*' (Matthew 4:4). When questioned about the 'great commandment in the law', He replied: "*Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul and with all thy mind*" (Matthew 22:37) - a direct quote from the Law which was the responsibility of Israel. Ignoring the context in which the original statement was made as well as the exclusiveness embodied in the phrase 'the Lord thy God', most teachers of today, in their obsession with the social gospel contend that the Lord's priorities were wrong when He said: "*And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.*" Today it is claimed that 'loving thy neighbour as thyself' is the ultimate expression of 'loving the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind' irrespective of whether or not the interpretation of 'neighbour' accords with that indicated by God in His Word. If modern teachers were indeed sound workmen studying to show themselves approved unto God, they would heed the words of the Lord Jesus Christ and 'search' or 'work out' (Greek: ergo) the Scriptures, accepting this as the yard-stick for faith instead of compromising God's Truth for a mess of coloured pottage. The word 'neighbour', in both the Old and New Testaments, carries the same meaning and does not, by any stretch of imagination, cover the brotherhood of man. The *ra'ah* or 'neighbour' is specifically defined as one of the same family, clan or race and to force it out of its context is to do violence to the words of the Bible and the context in which they appear.

God, Israel and the Strangers

Many today have discarded the Old Testament record because it contains many aspects and demands which are unpalatable and certainly incompatible with what men conceive as the actions and requirements of God. In this way, just as did the Egyptians of old, they are creating a God Who is amenable to the urgings of people and who accepts worship and service which they offer Him. It would appear that the fact of God having specifically issued positive Directives - it should be noted that these were not procedures framed by Moses or any man - means absolutely nothing. Men have the unparalleled temerity to discard the command of the Ever Living God and to replace this with some emotional, socialising platitude, the operation of which would be the very antithesis of that which fell within the phrase: '*Thus saith the Lord*'.

As has just been stated, many of God's Directives are unpalatable to those who think that their attitudes, governed by their love for God, are acceptable to Him regardless of whether they accord with what He has laid down in His Law. One of these 'unpalatable' concerns relationships between people. When, on the occasion of the exodus from Egypt, ". . . a mixed multitude went up also with them . . ." (Exodus 12:38), the Lord made positive provisions for their place in the community which were ratified and added to when the whole body of Law

was codified at Mount Sinai. It will be noted that the night of Israel's deliverance was to be observed by the 'ordinance of the Passover' (Exodus 12:43) and in the subsequent account, this 'mixed multitude' was divided into those who could eat and those who could not. For instance, in verse 43 the following restrictive command appears. "And the Lord said unto Moses and Aaron, This is the ordinance of the Passover: There shall no stranger eat thereof." In verse 45, a similar prohibition appears: "A foreigner and an hired servant shall not eat thereof"; while in verse 48, a stranger, upon circumcision, is permitted to join in and eat the Passover. This is admittedly confusing, but is a confusion arising out of the translation and not the original text. In the Hebrew of the text quoted above there are three different words, and in other portions of the Old Testament, six variants of the same words have been treated as though they meant the same thing. Ignoring the different Hebrew words, the translators indulged in over-simplification by providing one English word as the translation of six different Hebrew words. In the text of Exodus 12, three different words appear and are (1) *Nokriy*, (2) *Toshabh* and (3) *Ger*, two of which are forbidden to eat the Passover while the third, attendant upon his acceptance of circumcision, is permitted to join Israel.

The Context of These Words

Remembering that there were 'opponents' with Israel at the foot of the Mount when the nation violated the First Commandment, may it not be that they could be identified by the Hebrew word which separated those who could and could not eat the Passover? If one considers the first 'stranger' (verse 43) who could not eat, one finds that this is the *nokriy* which Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible defines as "alien, foreigner, outlandish, strange, stranger: man or strange woman". Here too one finds an over-simplification for throughout the Old Testament this word is used in a specific manner and covers Canaanites, Moabites, Ammonites - the product of incestuous relationships - as well as those who, in Deuteronomy 23:2, are referred to as 'bastards, or the product of miscegenation'. It would thus appear that among that 'mixed multitude' which accompanied Israel in the Exodus there were either Canaanites, Moabites, Ammonites or those of mixed or spurious origins.

These people were not permitted to enter the congregation of the Lord (Deuteronomy 23:2-3; Nehemiah 13:1) nor were they permitted to participate in the year of release when indebtedness was cancelled (Deuteronomy 15:1-4). It is significant that the *nokriy* is singled out specifically as one from whom usury may be obtained, for in Deuteronomy 23:19-20 it states: "*Thou shalt not lend upon usury to thy brother; usury of money, usury of victuals, usury of anything that is lent upon usury: Unto a stranger (nokriy) thou mayest lend upon usury; but unto thy brother thou shalt not lend upon usury.*" The Canaanite who falls within the scope of this word thus differentiating between a dweller in Canaan and one who is descended from the son of Ham (Genesis 9:22) is forbidden in terms of marriage (Genesis 24:3) and is therefore subject to separation from Israel in a very real sense.

Ruth - the Nokriy

While it may appear strange to intrude the story of Ruth at this stage, it becomes necessary when one realises that the word *nokriy* is intruded in the Hebrew text in connection with this ancestress of the Davidic household. The implications of this are surely clear, particularly in the light of the genealogy of Matthew 1:5 where Ruth is named in 'the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham . . .' (Matthew 1:1). Bearing in mind that a Moabite 'shall not come into the congregation of God for ever' (Nehemiah 13:1), one is confronted with the problem of Ruth who is generally called a Moabitess. Unfortunately

space does not permit the full history of Ruth showing that she was domiciled in Moab and not descended from Lot's relationship with his own daughters - attention must be focused on her relationship as a nokriy. As she fell before Boaz in the gleaning fields she said: "*Why have I found grace in thine eyes, that thou shouldst take knowledge of me, seeing that I am a stranger (nokriy)?*" (Ruth 2:10). Boaz himself responds in such a manner as to cast serious doubts on the scribe's integrity when copying from the older manuscript for Boaz claims: ". . . *I am thy near kinsman: howbeit there is a kinsman nearer than I*" (Ruth 3:12).

The point to note here is that a nokriy had no privileges under Israel Law and being forbidden to enter the congregation of the Lord, could not be involved in so intimate a mechanism as that of the kinsman-redeemer which is set out in Leviticus 25:48- 49 and which limits its function to the Israel people. The nokriy, in terms of the usage of this word throughout the Old Testament, being no kindred of Israel has no rights or privileges which immediately indicates some error when being associated with Ruth.

Whatever is the reason behind God's Directives concerning the nokriy - and the history of Israel and the molten calf appears to provide some basis for the prohibition - one should bow to the wisdom of the Lord and be obedient to Him.

The next type of 'foreigner' forbidden to eat the Passover (Exodus 12:45) is the person who is called the toshabh who too was numbered among the 'mixed multitude' which left Egypt with Israel. This word, in the Hebrew text, is not used very often but appears when denoting a person whose legal status is inferior to that of an Israelite. From the record of Leviticus 22:10 it would appear that the toshabh had freedom in the matter of access to the priests, but was forbidden to 'eat the holy thing' and with no recourse to circumcision as the means of gaining legal status wherein he could be a partaker in the privileges enjoyed by Israel. In Leviticus 25:45-46 it is stated that the children of the toshabh could be bought as perpetual slaves and that the year of release or Jubilee, did not apply to them. Harsh prohibitions indeed, but then the wisdom of the Lord far outweighs any substitute which men may seek to make.

The third type of 'stranger' mentioned as being present among the mixed multitude is the ger or in its plural form, gerim. This term has two applications and is used in connection with (a) an Israelite living outside the geographical locality inhabited by Israel and thus, with the passage of time neglected such things as circumcision etc., and (b) anyone descended from Noah who did not come under the classification of the nokriy or toshabh. It will be noted in Exodus 12:48 that the ger who submitted to circumcision was permitted to eat the Passover and that in Leviticus 24:22, this ger is then admitted to all the privileges and responsibilities of an Israelite. "*Ye shall have one manner of law, as well for the stranger (ger), as for one of your own country: for I am the Lord your God.*" Unless one returns to the original Hebrew text it is absolutely impossible to follow the mechanics of God's Law for the liberties taken in translating the text lead to confusion such as is apparent in the account of the mixed multitude in Israel as they left the land of Egypt. In this, as has been seen, one section of 'strangers' is definitely prohibited from eating the Passover as were the 'foreigners' while other 'strangers', upon circumcision, were granted full political liberty in the Israel community.

While it does not come within the account of those categorised as the mixed multitude, the Hebrew word zuwr also translated as 'stranger' in the Authorised Version should be noted. It is used in the sense of something that is abominable to the Lord and generally something alien. This point is driven home very forcibly when one considers the devolution in Ephraim, the Birth right tribe which came to view God's Laws as a 'strange thing'. "*Because Ephraim*

hath made many altars to sin, altars shall be unto him a sin, I have written to him the great things of my law, but they were counted as a strange (zuwr) thing” (Hosea 8:11-12). In this sense, it is apparent that the word zuwr indicates something foreign or alien and repugnant to the Lord - a feature which emerges when one considers the usage of this word in connection with the children produced through miscegenation (Hosea 5:7). The prophet Isaiah writes of the ‘strangers’ (zuwr) who desolated both cities and land of Israel (Isaiah 1:7) while Jeremiah pin-points the amazing and fatal attraction which the zuwr had and has for Israel. “How canst thou say, I am not polluted, I have not gone after Baalim? see thy way in the valley, know what thou best done: thou art a swift dromedary traversing her ways . . . Withhold thy foot from being unshod, and thy throat from thirst: but thou saidst, There is no hope: no; for I have loved strangers (zuwr), and after them will I go” (Jeremiah 2:23-25). From this it is very apparent that Israel’s downfall results from its attraction to both people and things which have a detrimental effect on the nation in terms of God’s Purpose in them.

In Summing Up

The First Commandment - “*Thou shalt have no other gods before me*” - may thus be seen as central to the national way of life for Israel. It demands total obedience and requires the complete rejection of anything which falls outside of or in opposition to *‘thus saith the Lord’*. The word ‘gods’ in this text is elohiym which, without the article, is usually associated with rulers in varying degrees. The First Commandment - if one accepts it - is total dedication to the Directives which follow and one is required to *‘love the Lord thy God’* by keeping His Commandments - even if they revolutionise one’s concepts; even if they lose friends and create enemies; even if it means running contrary to so-called world opinion. Israel’s task today is to learn the lesson of the past concerning priorities particularly when it comes to relationships - whether peace with God is more important than peace with men. The fatal attraction of others has always been Israel’s downfall because the nation and individuals within that nation allow their emotions to govern them instead of the wisdom of God’s Directives as revealed in His Law. One could wish that there was a more graceful way of saying things, but there is a point which needs to be made here. There are a lot of people who are able to isolate themselves from the reality of the present world problem. They will not accept that a great deal of the present trouble in the world is race and that the only real threat to the ultimate goal of those who are seeking world dominion - A ONE WORLD STATE - is the White Anglo-Saxon race. Nor can they see that the future of mankind will be decided by this generation. If the battle is lost now - there will be nothing left.

The Law of the Lord mitigates against universal participation. Stringent safe-guards against Israel’s integration with other nations are provided for with different types of people catered for in various ways. Previous comment has been made on the three types of ‘strangers’ nokriy, toshabh and zuwr - all of whom fall under the strictest controls and prohibitions. The gerim however, subsequent to acceptance of circumcision, was permitted to enter the Israel congregation with all the privileges of Law participation. Thus, it is patently obvious that the Law itself could not attract other nations, whereas obedience to it with its promised attendant blessing, certainly could. This is precisely the picture which Moses presented when he exhorted his people to keep God’s statutes and judgments for the attendant blessing associated with obedience to this would earn the acclaim of the nations: “*Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people*”.

The operation of the statutes and judgments in Israel will have the effect of establishing the centrality of God in the nation for Moses continues to reflect on the consequences of this

obedience by stating: *“For what nation is there so great, who hath God so nigh unto them, as the Lord our God in all things that we call upon him for?”* (Deuteronomy 4:7). This, of course, gives substance and meaning to the statement recorded in Isaiah 43:12 in which God said: *“I have declared, and have saved, and I have shewed, when there was no strange god among you: therefore ye are my witnesses that I am God”*. Israel could and can only witness to God through obedience to His Directives which are recorded in the Law of the Lord.

Sinai and Its Aftermath

Notwithstanding the principles of ‘life and good, death and evil’ (Deuteronomy 30:15) which had been written by the Finger of God and given to Moses for transmission to Israel (Exodus 31:18), plus the tremendous demonstration of the Reality of God against the back-ground to the giving of the Law, Israel, with the passage of time, was induced to look upon God’s Law as ‘an alien thing’ (Hosea 8:12). The vast machinery in the national Constitution was discarded by the nation which, on its own admission, spurned God’s Law for regulating inter-racial and inter-national relationships, and deliberately followed after them (Jeremiah 2:55). What was forgotten then as it is today is that while men verbally repudiate God’s Holy Law, this puny act in no way cancels out the effect of disobedience to this which takes its toll whether men like it or not. This point is fully demonstrated in the subsequent history of Israel in the land of Canaan.

The writings of the prophets, uninhibited by so-called public or world opinion which raises a howl of protest when the truth concerning the detrimental effect of inter-racial impingements is mentioned, simply records the bald facts. Isaiah, without any recourse to so-called diplomacy, reports that: *“Your country is desolate, your cities are burned with fire: your land, strangers (Hebrew zuwr, alien) devour it in your presence, and it is desolate, as overthrown by strangers (Hebrew zuwr)”* (Isaiah 1:7). In the plainest of language, the prophet accused the people of violating the Law concerning the alien who had by this time become integrated with Israel and who was then pushing for the abolition of God’s Land Tenure Act. The ‘devouring’ of the land by these aliens, according to Genesis, indicates a conquest and subsequent impoverishment of it and the people. Isaiah’s indictment as with that of Hosea (Hosea 7:9) tells the story of the alien take-over - not through military conquest - but because of the apathy and lawlessness of the people. The national and individual security which the Law of the land provided was thus shattered and the people entered the first stage of national disintegration.

The Land Tenure Act

As the situation in modern Israel i.e., the Anglo-Saxon and Kindred People, is almost identical with that of their forebears in Canaan, it would serve a very useful purpose to reconsider God’s gift of the land and His Directives concerning this.

At the outset, one is confronted with the subject of ownership and the Law makes it very plain that God is the owner. *“The land shall not be sold for ever: for the land is mine; for ye are strangers (Hebrew gerim, legal guests) and sojourners with me”* (Leviticus 25:23). The Hebrew text of this passage is most interesting in that it indicates a prohibition against ‘merchandising the land’ or appropriating it from its original owner.

It is merely a repetition of scriptural fact that God gave to Abraham and his posterity the land of Canaan (Genesis 15:18) and that this land was divided among the children of Israel, each

portion of which became a family inheritance. Before proceeding, it would serve to realise that the land of Canaan was not the only land promised to Israel as an inheritance, for if the nation was to accomplish its purpose in blessing 'all the nations of the earth' and if it was to observe the Law of non-integration, it required territory of its own from which to operate. Provision for this was made in the original allocation of racial and national boundaries for, having assured Jacob-Israel that his posterity would spread abroad to the West, to the East, to the North and to the South (Genesis 28:14) and thus be a 'blessing to all the families of the earth', through Moses, the Lord assured of land inheritances. "*Reflect on the ages of years - Ask your father, who will inform you, your elders, and they will relate, How the Highest allotted the races, when he divided to the sons of man, fixing the bounds of the nations, with a place for Israel's sons.*" Thus, the Land Tenure Act which was laid down in God's Law at Sinai, was not only valid for occupancy of the land of Canaan, but also for the land inheritance subsequent to the removal from that land. Therefore, in all Anglo-Saxon lands as with those of their kindred nations, the same Law obtains.

With no apology for this digression, attention is once again focussed on the machinery which comprises the Law of the land. "*And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Unto these the land shall be divided for an inheritance according to the number of names. To many thou shalt give the more inheritance, and to the few thou shalt give the less inheritance: to every one shall his inheritance be given according to those that were numbered of him. Notwithstanding the land shall be divided by lot: according to the names of the tribes of their fathers they shall inherit. According to the lot shall the possession thereof be divided between many and few*" (Numbers 26:52-56). As each of the tribes were given their inheritance, further Laws guaranteed the security of tenure and while these may appear to be superficial in the extreme, they were designed to afford the maximum security to each family. "*So shall not the inheritance of the children of Israel remove from tribe to tribe: for every one of the children of Israel shall keep himself to the inheritance of the tribe of his fathers? And every daughter, that possesseth an inheritance in any tribe of the children of Israel, shall be wife unto one of the family of the tribe of her father, that the children of Israel may enjoy every man the inheritance of his fathers. Neither shall the inheritance remove from one tribe to another tribe; but every one of the tribes of the children of Israel shall keep himself to his own inheritance*" (Numbers 36:7-9).

God thus made provision in His Law that the land should continue to be the property of those to whom He had given it and as the family increased, the provision guaranteed an inalienable land inheritance. W.J. Cameron in "Economics of the Bible" puts this matter in a nut-shell when he says: "A child born into the nation of Israel was already provided for. His birth certificate was title deed to his estate. Under our system, estates are inherited by reason of someone's death; under God's law, an estate was inherited by reason of birth. Truly, that may be the difference between our systems - the difference between life and death. In Israel, children were an addition to the wealth of the land not a drain on its poverty". With these facts still fresh in the memory it serves to recall that Moses stated that the Laws of God given to Israel at Sinai were indeed 'life and good, death and evil' and that God's People Israel permitted 'death and evil' to stalk through its society simply because it considered God's Directives an 'alien thing'.

As a land inheritance is so fundamental to the security of the individual within the nation, it is necessary to consider further safe-guards which were imposed by the Lord in His Law. It would appear that within the tribes, families marked the extent of their land by boundary marks for in Deuteronomy 19:14, these marks are inviolate thus ensuring security to the

family who could never be deprived of a means of livelihood. *“Thou shalt not remove thy neighbour’s land-mark, which they of old time have set in thine inheritance, which thou shalt inherit in the land that the Lord thy God giveth thee to possess it.”* In Deuteronomy 27:17, he who removes the land-marks thus encroaching on another’s land is called ‘cursed’ while the same prohibition may be seen in Proverbs 22:28; 23:10 and Job 24:2.

Calvin in his Commentaries on the Four Last Books of Moses draws attention to this Law when he wrote: *“. . . for that every one’s property may be secure, it is necessary that the land-marks set up for the division of fields should remain untouched, as if they were sacred. He who fraudulently removes a land-mark is already convicted by this very act, because he disturbs the lawful owner in his quiet possession of the land; whilst he who advances further the boundaries of his own land to his neighbour’s loss, doubles the crime by the deceptive concealment of his theft. Whence also we gather that not only are those thieves, who actually carry away their neighbour’s property, who take his money out of his chest, or who pillage his cellars and granaries, but also those who unjustly possess themselves of his land”*.

National Demise

As one sifts through the recorded history of the disintegration of the nation in the land of Canaan, it is more than apparent that the whole process was the result of the total break-down of the Mosaic legislation with particular emphasis on those relating to the control of aliens and that governing land tenure. While some may object to the equation of Calvin’s ‘thieves’ with the ‘mixed multitude’ comprising the nokriy and the toshabh the narrative as provided by both Isaiah and Hosea leaves one in no doubt that they contributed in no small measure to the down-fall of the nation. The ‘strangers’ against whom Israel’s Law mitigated, would certainly have no affection for this mechanism and would, at every turn, work for its abolition. The fact that the stranger could not have an inheritance in the land in terms of God’s Legislation would naturally invoke every endeavour to have this repealed and the only process by which this could be achieved would be to get the people to doubt the efficacy of the legislation and, through public clamour, implement a government which took in all people of the land regardless of their racial origins.

The security of land tenure which was assured in the Law of redemption (Leviticus 25:25,48,49) which could be invoked when an Israelite fell on hard times was forgotten and slowly but surely individuals and families were forced into financial bondage to the alien to whom both redemption and the year of release meant absolutely nothing. This, according to Hosea the prophet, was the first stage in the destruction of the nation for he wrote: *“My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge . . .”* (Hosea 4:6). Having forgotten the fundamentals of God’s Law, they became an easy prey to all and sundry who exploited the situation.

The Lord God of Israel, through Hosea the prophet, pin-pointed the violation of the Laws of land tenure as one of the primary causes for the nation’s down-fall in that He said: *“As they were increased, so they sinned against me . . .”* (Hosea 4:7). Even today people will say that the Laws of the land are incapable of perpetuating family ownership of any land for the population increase and the limitation of available land makes the whole structure of Biblical Law impractical. This is no doubt what the aliens suggested in those far-off days for it will be noted that ‘as they were increased’ they sinned against the Lord.

As has already been seen (Numbers 26:52-56) families received their land inheritance at the commencement of their occupancy of the land and that was determined 'by lot' with the larger families receiving a greater portion and the lesser a portion equal to their needs. Whatever else happened, these land inheritances were secured for the family for it could not be sold nor disposed of so as to deprive them of this basic security. When a family got too large, further land was acquired under a 'lease' system, but here again, the leased land was derived from another family of the same tribe. The lease was negotiated by consent for it was known and accepted by all that in the fiftieth year - the year of the Jubilee (Leviticus 25:8) - all property was returned to its original holder. *"And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof: it shall be a jubilee unto you; and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family"* (Leviticus 25:10). Thus in Israel Law, the family was permitted forty-nine years to re-shape itself and in the fiftieth year, new allocations of land were sought under the lease system and in this way, all family increases were catered for.

It should not be thought that during this period all further leasing was stopped. Far from it, for this would mitigate against a progressive society and stultify initiative. At any time during the forty-nine year cycle, land was leased and as is related in Leviticus 25:15,16, the transaction was governed by law. *"According to the number of years after the jubilee thou shalt buy (lease) of thy neighbour, and according unto the number of years of the fruits he shall sell unto thee: According to the multitude of years thou shalt increase the price thereof, and according to the fewness of years thou shalt diminish the price of it: for according to the number of years of the fruits doth he sell unto thee."* All these law-bound negotiations were designed to establish stability and security in the family while at the same time, they provided for the increase in population in such a way as to provide a living and yet not deprive any of their basic security.

That this was broken down by 'strangers' is all too evident for how else could *'strangers devour your land in your presence'* (Isaiah 1:7)? The Land belonged to Israel having been given by God and while the nation observed His Laws, no stranger or fellow Israelite for that matter, could expropriate another's land. No encouragement was given to large-scale holding of land by either families or co-operatives for the land itself had no commercial value. The 'increase' from the land was its only value and this could only be achieved by hard work and diligent labour. This was recognised in the Law of the tithe in which only the *natural increase*, not the land itself, became the object of the tithe which was a percentage of a man's earnings. Thus speculation in land had no place in God's Law but, with alien influences at work and a lack of knowledge in Israel, speculation became rife which too added its toll to the diminishing economy of the nation. *"Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no place, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth"* (Isaiah 5:8).

The 'devouring' of Israel's land by the strangers left the families in a parlous position. Laws were enacted which broke down a stubborn resistance in which land-taxation finally deprived the people of their God-given security. No Administration, be it provincial or local, had the right to impose taxes for, as has been stated previously, the land itself was worthless being only the means whereby an increase could be realised. However, as a means whereby total control of the people might be achieved, local governments imposed taxes in direct violation of the Mosaic Legislation and, deprived of the knowledge of their rights under this, the families of Israel were finally swallowed up by the alien who had no compunction in depriving the people of their inheritance.

If one correlates the recorded history of the demise of Israel in the land of Canaan as written by both Isaiah and Hosea, the picture of the wisdom of the Lord as found in His prohibitions against the infiltration of the 'strangers' becomes apparent. Isaiah's picture of 'strangers devouring the land' has its sequel in Hosea's record wherein it is stated: ". . . *For they shall eat, and not have enough . . . because they have left off to take heed to the Lord*" (Hosea 4:10). With the acquisition of the land by the strangers to whom the Law of the Lord meant nothing, the feeding of the population was impeded by a further violation the violation of the Sabbath of rest prescribed for the land every seven years (Leviticus 25:1-11). As with today, food was then available but impoverished of all nutrition by a land which had been denied its cycle of rest. Israel indeed had bulk, but the life-giving nutrition was missing - all because a people, to whom the Law of the Lord meant nothing, exploited their position of strength in the land.

With individual and national security undermined through the loss of its land inheritance, it is small wonder that their will to resist the military invasions of both Assyria and Babylon was at such a low ebb and why these powers were able to remove the nation into captivity with such comparative ease. It is small wonder too why modern atheistic forces such as communism and its allied associates in socialism are finding no opposition today when no fundamental security in land tenure exists to motivate resistance to the forces of spiritual and national erosions.

What can we do right now? Our land - and this applies to all Western countries - is being taken away from us either through increased government control or through the manipulation of 'strangers'. To begin with we can 'each one reach one' with facts concerning our rights according to God's Law.

With God's help we can multiply this message and become a force which will defeat the present in-roads being made in our land by the forces of socialistic communism.