



# Our Stand

By John T. Earnest

If you seek the truth,  
You will find it,  
And reality will embrace you.

If you flee the truth,  
It will find you,  
And reality will kill you.

# **Table of Contents**

**Red Pills**

**Purpose, Pandemic, Pathology**

**Zionism and Dispensationalism**

# Redpills

- The Kalergi Plan
- Lewontin's Fallacy
- Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965
- White population of America over the past 60 years
- White population of California over the past 60 years
- American birth rates by race
- FBI Crime Data by Race
- % of Blacks who vote Democrat
- Gun violence by race
- SAT scores by race (controlling for avg. household income)
- List of expulsion of the Jews from various countries
- % of Jews in news media and Hollywood

## Purpose, Pandemic, Pathology

The desire to be part of a group is inherent to human nature. As long as every human possesses attributes or circumstances that may be shared with only a portion of humanity, humans will always create and be members of groups. Some of which can be joined rather easily: U.S. political parties and belief-systems may come to mind. Others require a bit more effort: the physical and athletic ability needed for a sports team, or the appropriate credentials for a job. And still others that we cannot work or choose to be a part of. One cannot make the decision to become a member of the “woman group” for example. Humans are born with either XX or XY chromosomes whether they like it or not (aside from the very rare chromosomal pathologies). And one does not have any say into which family they are born into, or the economic status of one’s childhood. Being a member of these groups and many more are simply out of an individual’s control.

Upon reflection there seems to be an infinite number of groups that one might ascribe to. And although many are arbitrary, groups in general certainly are not. Groups serve an important purpose. If someone informs me that they ascribe to a political philosophy of liberalism (as it is presently understood) I can make some assumptions about what this person believes that are most likely true. For instance, this person probably believes that the government’s efforts should be more focused on social programs, that immigration policies be less restrictive, and that social changes such as homosexual acceptance be pursued. So just from one piece of information (that this person is a liberal) I already know a great deal about what they most likely believe. If someone tells me that their friend is an American football player, I can make the assumption that his friend is tall, muscular, and athletic. As long as one is familiar with the group in question, asserting membership (whether verbally, visually, etc.) is useful in succinctly communicating a plethora of information. And this information can then be used in meriting an appropriate response.

This explains why groups in general are useful to us. But not all groups are as important as others. No one would argue for the weighty impact of life on Earth that arises from the division of those whose favorite color is green versus those who prefer blue. It is also true, however, that the relevance of some groups as compared to others is either debatable or subjective. But there is at least one type of group that is objectively important – that is, regardless of one’s opinions, there is no questioning the reality that few groups are as fundamentally impactful towards life on Earth as this one. And this grouping is that of genetic makeup. But why? Why are ‘groups of genes’ the most important? Why not ‘groups by morals’ or ‘groups by ideologies’? The answer reveals itself in the strongest natural drive and purpose of all life.

The most fundamental drive of every organism, including humans, is to preserve as much of one’s own genetic material in the genepool as possible. Initially, this statement might seem confusing, technical, and detached from common human experience. But by describing the concrete ways in which one preserves their genes in the genepool things should become clearer.

The first, and perhaps most obvious, way of genetic preservation is by simply surviving. By maintaining our bodies through eating, drinking, resting, working, and avoiding bodily injury, we are maintaining the vessel that is both carrying our genes and capable of passing on half of them through reproduction – another means of genetic preservation.

At this point I would like to guard against a misunderstanding that might arise. I am not belittling what some would consider to be ‘transcendent’ human experiences such as emotions, companionship, and love by asserting the supremacy of the fundamental drive of genetic preservation. It is true that these experiences ultimately originate from this drive, but that does not somehow reduce or degrade their significance. On the contrary, ‘transcendent’ feelings of romantic love are significant precisely *because* they encourage humans to pass on half of their genes in recognition that their current genetic vessel will degrade and eventually perish. These human experiences are the amazing means by which this fundamental drive informs us on how to respond to our environment in order to carry out the goal of genetic preservation.

With this potential misunderstanding navigated, we return to the necessities in which this genetic vessel of ours requires to survive: food, drink, space, shelter, energy sources, etc. The problem is that these essential resources are limited. Everyone wants to maintain their own genetic vessel, to raise successful offspring, to have as many resources as possible, and to not only survive, but thrive. But there are not enough resources to satisfy this selfish and insatiable drive for everyone. Thus, competition enters the picture.

Humans discovered very quickly that when it comes to competing against other humans, it is better to have friends than to be alone. If a conflict over resources threatens to become violent, few would dispute the fact that having a group of ten friends behind you is advantageous against a single opponent. If someone has some form of accident or becomes ill and was then incapable of taking care of themselves, having friends who will help is better than being stranded. And although these examples are timeless, there are contemporary examples as well that might be more familiar: a corporation with more manpower, more scientists working on a problem, or even sharing rent for an apartment with some friends.

In fact, if humans were solitary creatures, we would be spending most of our time just trying to fulfill our basic needs for survival. But with the introduction of groups that can pool resources, delegation enters the picture. It becomes someone’s job to acquire the food, it becomes someone’s job to defend the territory, it becomes someone’s job to heal injuries, etc. that never would have occurred if everyone was still busy attempting to eke out a living on their own.

Before we get ahead of ourselves praising the benefits of groups, there are pertinent disadvantages that need to be mentioned as well that, albeit do not outweigh the advantages, do prevent our societies from becoming utopias. These disadvantages arise from the same fundamental drive that necessitates groups in the first place. See, the selfish desire to have as many resources as possible still remains at an individual level. So although groups compete against each other, there is also some competition and conflict within the group itself. How are the resources to be distributed? Who is to decide? How much selfish desire is a member willing to set aside in order to still partake in the benefits of the group? There is certainly a balancing

act at work and the answers may be different for everyone. Just as there are similarities that lead to group formation, there are also differences and selfish desires that can lead to potential disputes and even fracturing. The smaller a group is, the less likely this is to be a problem. But the larger a group becomes, the harder it is for everyone to get along and agree with each other because of the sheer amount of differences.

But our focus is not on just any group. When it comes to the fundamental drive of genetic preservation, surviving and contributing in a group is not only the most effective strategy towards maintaining one's genetic vessel, it is also a means of protecting and promoting shared genes outside of one's genetic vessel – that is, humans who are the most genetically similar to the individual in question. And there is no group of people more genetically similar than the group that arises naturally as a result of reproduction: the family.

It is not hard to grasp the convenience of the family as a genetic grouping. Proximity is a prerequisite to reproduction and a given in raising offspring. Human parents do not have children and then simply leave them to fend for themselves. Compared with other species, human children take an immense amount of time and energy to fully mature. And parents (who have a vested genetic interest in the success of their children) will raise, nurture, and provide for them despite the length of time and effort. In fact, most human parents maintain close relationships with their offspring well past maturity, as well as siblings with each other. Parents, children, and siblings all have a vested interest in both working together and taking care of each other.

Now this might seem absurd to someone who has cut off or been cut off from their family, or someone whose family relations are less than ideal. But just because disputes and even fracturing exist in families – whether from selfish desire or a perceived threat to the well-being of one's genetic vessel (real or imagined) that outweigh any possible benefits – families in general remain more cohesive than all other groups by far.

But the family is not the only genetic grouping that boasts of great benefits and cohesion. There is also a much larger genetic grouping that, although not quite as cohesive as the family, provides greater benefits along with profound advantages. This genetic grouping consists of thousands of extended family members who genetically diverged from the rest of humanity. Like every other creature, natural selection and the unique environmental pressures of various geographies led to distinct categories of humans. Categories which can be identified by physical characteristics, language, culture, behavior, intelligence, and (most importantly) the various genetic markers that distinguish humanity. These easily identifiable genetic categories are called nations or, more broadly, race.

The benefits of the genetic grouping of race are similar to that of the family. Both arise naturally through proximity and reproduction, and both have been innately recognized by humans to be the best strategy towards genetic preservation for millennia. Just like with families, competition against other races gives the incentive for members of the same race to work together. And although the members of one's race may not share the same amount of genes as one's direct family, they certainly share more in common as compared to every other race. Despite the



persistence of Lewontin's Fallacy, it is impossible for a European to be more genetically similar to an African than any member of the European race.

But although the benefits between race and family are similar, when it comes to race these benefits are magnified due to the immense size of the group. As mentioned previously, the larger the group, the more manpower to defend territory, solve problems, and work towards a common goal. The larger the group, the more delegation can take place leading to ever greater advancements. Individuals can now benefit their group and, by extension, themselves by spending time exclusively researching medicine, inventing better weapons, or even composing beautiful music. All of these advancements put a nation or race at an advantage over its competitors.

It is important to mention that although the fundamental drive to competition are the primary *reasons* that family and race are unified genetic groups, there are many *means* in which the fundamental drive facilitates this unity. When it comes to the family, these means include things like compassion, altruism, forgiveness, and rule-following. But because of the drastically larger size of the race as a group, genetic preservation must manifest unity through means much more complex than simple inter-personal compassion in order to prevent fracturing. Instead, nations and races require complex structures of law, government, education, and military in order to remain unified.

It is this unity of race specifically, however, that seems to have been forgotten these past few decades. Forgotten not by everyone, but by the European (or White) race only. In fact, this pathological thinking has not only become *prevalent* in the European race; it has become *pandemic*. Just as survival, reproduction, and families have their respective pathologies, – namely suicide, asexuality, and severely dysfunctional relationships – so also does race. But unlike suicide and dysfunctional families, this pathology masquerades as a philosophy that will improve the human condition and launch mankind into unprecedented advancements, success, and unity. Unfortunately, this philosophy is based entirely on misinformation and human arrogance in direct opposition to the reality of the world we live in.

In its simplest form, this pathology manifests itself as the idea that the races should not fight for their own interests as a group but should rather view all races as sharing a common humanity. And it is these interests of humanity that should take precedence. In short, humanity matters; race does not. Initially, this idea might seem very attractive. After all, wouldn't it be better for all of us to stop the fighting caused by racial competition and to instead band together as a common humanity? This is like asking why humanity cannot just share resources to put an end to all poverty. The idea sounds nice in principle but the goal is completely unrealistic. But whereas mitigating poverty through social programs and charity is moral and well worth the effort – despite the understanding that poverty itself will never be eliminated in this present, evil age – attempting to mitigate racial fighting by refusing to defend and promote one's race is not only ineffective, but extraordinarily harmful.

Remember that the need to form genetic groups in the first place arises because it is the most effective strategy of competing for limited space and resources. Thus, families work together

because of competition against other individuals and families. Nations and races form countries because of competition from against other nations and races. And finally, humanity forms a united genetic group because of competition against . . . who? What other organism is there that is even remotely capable of competing against humanity? Sure, there are plenty of organisms that can harm us, but there is no other genetic threat large enough to necessitate the immense amount of effort that would be required to unite humanity. Natural disasters and some particularly dangerous pathogens might warrant some international cooperation, but hardly enough to even slightly diminish natural competition.

In fact, one might hypothesize that if a genetic threat appeared that was more than capable and willing to eradicate humanity (the plot of many alien invasion stories) that the human genetic group would be much more unified in order to more effectively compete against this serious genetic threat. Not only would humanity be more unified, but racial competition would most likely diminish as well – albeit not entirely. As it stands right now, however, no such threat exists.

Thus, the largest and most relevant genetic group necessitated by competition remains to be race and not humanity. It does not matter whether or not one believes or wishes that humanity's interests should come before racial interests. There will never be enough races to adopt this position to facilitate change because they all recognize that there is no threat serious enough to warrant it. And as it turns out, the only race that has adapted this pathological thinking is the White race and its respective countries: countries of the European continent; parts of Asia; and the more recently conquered lands such as the United States, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, etc. Every other race recognizes that racial interests come before 'humanity's' interests. They understand how damaging and self-destructive the pathological thinking of 'race does not matter; humanity does' really is.

When one thinks that 'race does not matter,' it is logical to not be too concerned with other races gaining a foothold in one's own countries. After all, we are all humans. One does not need to look far to see the results of this pathological thinking in White countries. Non-Whites are allowed to legally immigrate to White countries in unprecedented numbers; the borders of many White countries are inadequately defended; non-Whites are allowed to become citizens and own land in White countries; and perhaps most incredibly of all, are allowed to influence political decisions such as elections. On the other hand, practically all non-White countries severely restrict immigration, make it nearly impossible for outsiders to either become citizens or own land, and certainly do not allow immigrants of other races to influence their political process. So while many White people think that race does not matter, all of the other races sure seem to think it does.

Non-Whites are not only defending their race's interests in their own countries. They are also promoting their own interests in the White countries that let them in – all at the expense of White people. Regardless of whether or not a non-White immigrant is conscious of this double standard is irrelevant. By simply occupying a single country, reproducing in it, and using its resources and social programs, non-Whites are not only geographically displacing Whites, but are also using up limited resources that could have helped White people instead. (And to make matters worse, Hispanics and Africans in the United States are a significant net drain on tax

revenue – that is, they contribute little in taxes yet significantly consume from social programs.) It does not matter if a non-White immigrant thinks that ‘diversity is our strength.’ The fact is that that motto only seems to hold any weight in White countries. No one is advocating for more White people in Africa. Or that Mexico needs more White people. Or that China is not diverse enough. No, it is only in White countries that ‘diversity is our strength.’

So Whites not only have to compete against non-White countries, now they must also compete against non-White races for the limited space and resources within their very own countries. And if that was not bad enough, Affirmative Action programs and the like slant the favor towards non-Whites. All of this and yet most White people are not even lifting a finger to defend themselves from these genetic threats.

What is the end result of all this? If the answer was not obvious enough then the following illustration should bring the point home. This situation can be compared to soccer teams competing against each other. Each soccer team represents a race. Now, the White soccer team does not discriminate between team players and this, passes the ball to whomever. Meanwhile, the various non-White teams only pass the ball to players on their own respective teams. In this scenario, it is anyone’s guess as to who will win more games, but it is certain that the White team will lose over and over again. As long as White people refuse to play for their own team they will lose the soccer tournament. But unlike soccer, losing the genetic tournament does not just result in some unhappy fans – it results in extinction.

White people who believe that race does not matter will be crowded out of their very own countries and eventually go extinct. This is racial suicide. Regardless of one’s opinions on the morality of suicide in certain circumstances, it is generally accepted that suicide is very unfortunate and should be avoided. And for a race that has contributed more advancements in technology, biblical theology, art, science, and government than any other, ‘tragic’ would not even begin to describe this race’s extinction.

At this point, someone who ascribes to the suicidal philosophy that race does not matter might argue that we simply have to teach every single race to think in this manner. Whites are just the first race to adopt this philosophy. The other races will soon follow suit and, once they do, racial competition will become a thing of the past. Unfortunately, this is impossible. Suppose every race is taught to put aside their own genetic interests and humanity is finally able to cut the red ribbon for this new utopia. All it takes for it all to come crashing down is for just one race to begin promoting its own genetic interests. It does not even have to be the majority of the race. Even a small group of people working together is enough to tip the scales and unbalance everything. And given that the single most powerful drive of humanity is genetic preservation, this mutiny is not only likely, but inevitable.

In fact, the White race’s current situation testifies to this truth. Although this pathological thinking has been very prevalent among Whites for almost a century now (and culminating in the last decade), as the ramifications begin to make themselves manifest and the threats towards genetic preservation become ever more obvious and serious, in the last five years alone an astonishing number of Whites have begun to reverse their thinking. And as the threats to the

White race only get worse, more and more White people will take measures to preserve themselves. The races will never adopt this philosophy. And the ones that do will either quickly reject it once the threats become visible or reject it too late and perish.

Others who promote this philosophy take a different approach. Instead of arguing that every single race must be persuaded, they assert that all the races should simply race-mix until there is only one hybrid race remaining. Setting aside the fact that most members of every race would resist this plan for reasons of genetic preservation, race-mixing does not create a unified race. It does the opposite. It produces a child who is neither the race of his mother nor that of his father. It introduces a new race that is different from all others. A race which must now compete in order to survive. A mulatto is not of the same race as an African nor that of a European. And none of these are the same as a mestizo. Race-mixing does not beget unity. It only leads to more division and unnecessary conflict.

This philosophy is not a philosophy but a pathology. Its promulgation is dependent on ignorance and misinformation and it wreaks havoc on the people whose minds it consumes. Acceptance of this philosophy can only ever lead to one thing and one thing only: racial suicide. To believe that race does not matter is to fight an uphill battle against natural, human biology, not to mention the single most powerful and fundamental driving force of every single lifeform in existence. This is not a battle that one can win. And the fact that this pathology can convince people otherwise (so much so that it became a pandemic among the White race) reveals how truly horrifying and destructive these lies really are.

If the belief that 'race does not matter' is a lie, then what is the truth? If racial suicide of the White race is abhorrent, a race-blind utopia is impossible, and race-mixing an ineffective solution, what is reality and how should we respond to it? The reality is that due to the fundamental drive of genetic preservation, the separate races will always struggle and compete against each other. The proper response is to accept this immutability and come up with solutions that accommodate fallen human nature instead of going against it. And the solution that works best is by no means a new one. History has vouched for it time and time again.

The solution that both embraces the fundamental drive and mitigates unnecessary conflict is for countries to be racially and ethnically homogenous. In this way, racial competition will no longer exist within countries and will, instead, only occur between them. With race relations no longer an issue, countries can now spend their time and efforts pursuing more productive matters. Races are now responsible for their own countries and have the self-determination to decide whatever direction they choose to take it in *without* interference or subversion from competing races. Members of the same race now have the opportunity to share in the benefits and jobs of a cohesive community. Just as common grace established the blessings of fellowship with family, so it is also with race.

I remember discussing this topic with a Christian brother once and him telling me how pessimistic I was. At the time, I did not know how to respond except telling him that this is simply the way things are; that the common curse has made it so that we must compete against each other to survive. After some time and thought, however, I would now expand upon my answer.

Yes, racial conflict exists because of the common curse and will continue to exist until the Lord Jesus Christ returns. But does that make the struggle to preserve one's race meaningless?

Is it meaningless to protect and defend a race that has contributed and will continue to contribute so many life-changing technological advancements; theological contributions; the most beautiful and awe-inspiring paintings, music, sculptures, and architecture; and advancements in medicine, law, and government? Without the European race there would never have been a George Washington, or a Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Martin Luther, John Calvin, Newton, Tesla, Mozart, Bach, Beethoven, Chopin, Socrates, Homer, and so many more. If the European race went extinct, how many future brilliant minds would the world have lost?

Is it meaningless to base every action and decision upon the benefits of one's White father? Or White mother? Or one's White siblings, children, aunts, uncles, cousins, grandparents, and friends? Is it wrong? Is it immoral? Is it unlawful to love one's family? Or one's race? To defend one of the greatest legacies in existence? On the contrary, aside from honoring Jesus Christ there is no other cause that is as worthy or honorable as serving the European race.

In light of this truth, I will continue to defend and promote this great and noble race, even at my own expense. I will fight for my genes: for my race, for my family, and for myself. The real question is, will you?

# Zionism and Dispensationalism

## *Jewish Corruptions of Christ's Gospel*

Christian brothers,

I want you to be aware that the single most harmful error in the churches of America today is the promotion of classic dispensationalism by heretic Jewphiles. This serious error is not only completely unbiblical and offensive to those enlightened by the Spirit, but is used by the Zionists as an abominable tool to deceive Christ's flock into supporting the Jewish antichrist's very own Tower of Babel. Most of these views are the result of improper exegesis of Revelation and Daniel by those who force contemporary presuppositions of assumed linear chronology and literalness of symbols onto an ancient, apocalyptic genre of literature. It is impossible to responsibly interpret these Scriptures if one fails to understand the genre of the literature, the original audience, the historical context, and the terms, symbols, allusions, and figures of speech that were employed *at the time of writing*. Only *after* taking note of these things can one then more fully benefit from the Spiritual truths exhibited in the Scriptures, either by the examples of past redemptive-historical events (1 Cor. 10:11) or by direct application to us presently.

Citing Scripture, the Westminster Confession states, "This covenant [of grace] was differently administered in the time of the law, and in the time of the Gospel (2 Cor. 3:6-9): under the law it was administered by promises, prophecies, sacrifices, circumcision, the paschal lamb, and other types and ordinances delivered to the people of the Jews, all foreshadowing Christ to come (Heb. 8-10) (Rom 4:11) (Col 2:11-12) (1 Cor. 5:7); which were, for that time, sufficient and efficacious, through the operation of the Spirit, to instruct and build up the elect in faith in the promised Messiah (1 Cor. 10:1-4) (Heb. 11:13) (John 8:56), by whom they had full remission of sins, and eternal salvation; and is called the Old Testament (Gal. 3:7-9).

Under the Gospel, when Christ, the substance (Col. 2:17), was exhibited, the ordinances in which this covenant is dispensed are the preaching of the Word, and the administration of the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper (Matt 28:19-20) (1 Cor. 11:23-25): which though fewer in number, and administered with more simplicity, and less outward glory, yet, in them, it is held forth in more fullness, evidence, and spiritual efficacy (Heb. 12:22-27) (Jer. 31:33-34), to all nations, both Jews and Gentiles (Matt 28:19) (Eph. 2:15-19); and is called the New Testament (Luke 22:20). There are not therefore two covenants of grace, differing in substance, but one and the same, under various dispensations (Acts 15:11) (Rom. 3:21-30) (Ps. 32:1) (Heb. 13:8)." To suppose under the evidence of Rev. 7:1-8 that the NT dispensation will be reversed or in tandem with the OT dispensation in the future is to hold Christ the substance in contempt, and to misinterpret who the 144,000 sealed of Israel represent. On multiple occasions throughout Revelation, John uses OT allusions and applies them symbolically to his relatively Gentile audience, thereby signifying that many of the Spiritual truths and promises given to Israel in the OT are now applicable to the Church. The NT church can read the OT and identify with much of it. They can identify with the false prophet Balaam leading the Israelites astray because, in the Asian churches, the Nicolaitans were doing the same thing (Rev. 2:14-16). When the Holy Spirit

speaks of the New Covenant through the prophet Jeremiah, he says “For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after these days, declares the Lord: I will put my law within them, and I will write it on their hearts. And I will be their God, and they shall be my people.” Now it is quite obvious that God is speaking here of Christ’s Church, and yet he calls them Israel. Why? Because the original audience of this prophecy understood God’s people at that time as being Israel – the OT church. For them, Israel is synonymous with the people of God. The elect Israelites who read this Scripture would have faith in God’s promise that one day in the future, God will put his law in the hearts of Israel – that is, the people of God, which in the NT is the Church. God spoke to the Israelites in terms they understood. Again, after reading Joel 3:18-21, Amos 9:11-15, Mic. 7:18-20, Ezek. 37, and so many other OT prophecies, it is apparent that these refer to Christ’s people who identify with him as the true Israel who fulfilled the Law and Prophets on their behalf (Matt 5:17) (Eph. 2:11-22 which also reveals that Christ abrogated the ceremonial ordinances under Moses). This exegetical principle of interpreting OT prophecy in light of the advent of Christ is used multiple times throughout the NT Scriptures by the apostles themselves. When Paul refers to the “Israel of God” in Gal. 6:16, he is not referring to Jews, but Christ’s Church. This is especially apparent in light of Gal 3:15-29, which is worth reading at length. Paul uses the term, “Israel of God” to assure his Gentile audience that they are the inheritors of OT promises in Christ, which makes sense, because the whole point of the letter is to convince them they don’t need to listen to the Jewish antichrists who crept into the church and tried to convince them to be enslaved under Mosaic law. And Peter does the same thing in his first letter when he refers to the churches as “the elect exiles of the Dispersion,” using a Jewish term and applying it to the largely Gentile churches. For further proof, Rom. 4:9-25 says the same things.

So, finally, who do the 144,000 of the tribes of Israel represent?

In Rev. 14, the same number is used to refer to those who had “the [Lamb’s] name and his Father’s name written on their foreheads” and “were redeemed from the earth.” This refers to the fullness of the elect from every age. The very fact that the number is 144, or 12x12, is symbolic of the unity of the elect under the 12 tribes of Israel and 12 apostles respectively. This becomes clearer when after the Asian churches read that God has sealed the 144,000 of Israel with the Holy Spirit, immediately after they read that John sees “a great multitude that no one was able to number, from every nation and all tribes, peoples, and tongues, standing before the throne and before the Lamb.” Nowhere is the reestablishment of the nation of Israel mentioned. Likewise, when God says in Daniel, “This horn made war with the saints and prevailed over them, until the Ancient of Days came, and judgment was given for the saints of the Most High, and the time came when the saints possessed the kingdom,” this does not refer to the reestablishment of the nation of Israel and subsequent destruction and salvation of them. It refers to the annihilation of the Church by the Antichrist and subsequent return of Christ, for Paul speaks of this very thing in 2 Thess. 2:3-12. Again, nowhere does Paul mention the reestablishment of Israel. His allusion to Daniel, “So that [Antichrist] takes his seat in the temple of God, proclaiming himself to be God,” as evidence that another temple will be built in Israel is insufficient. Remember, this is an allusion to Dan. 8:11-12, 9:27, and 11:31, in which Daniel speaks to his Israelite audience in terms they understand. Interrupting the ‘sacrifices’ is a metonym for halting ‘worship.’ God’s sanctuary (or temple) being profaned and overthrown is to

say that God's people will be overthrown, for the new and final temple is Christ's people (1 Pet. 2:5) (1 Cor. 6:19-20). For Antichrist to "take his seat in the temple of God" is to delusionally consider himself to be in God's position, with the accompanying consequences of deserving worship from all creation (Rev. 5:13-14) and claims of deity, "proclaiming himself to be God." This interpretation is correct because the beginning of verse four introduces a result clause using the Greek word ὥστε, so the translation is, "the one who opposes and exalts himself against everything called god or any object of worship, *with the result* that he seats himself in the sanctuary of God as God, proclaiming of himself that he is God." This means that to exalt oneself above everything else *is* to claim that one is God – that is, to sit oneself in the sanctuary of God as God. The does not refer to the literal temple; the inner-logic of the grammar prohibits such an erroneous interpretation. To claim deity is to sit in God's temple, which is a metonym of God's unique position as Almighty and dispenser of history (Rev. 1:8). The Westminster divines state, "the infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself: and therefore, when there is a question about the true and full sense of any Scripture (which is not manifold, but one), it must be searched and known by other places that speak more clearly." 2 Thess. 2:3-12 makes Dan. 7:21-22, 8:11-12, 9:27, 11:31, and Rev. 7:1-8 clear.

The belief that God will reestablish the nation of Israel or that there will be another dispensation for the Jews is blatantly contrary to Scripture and utterly repulsive. As the Second Helvetic Confession states, "We further condemn Jewish dreams that there will be a golden age on earth before the day of judgment, and that the pious, having subdued all their godless enemies, will possess all of the kingdoms of the earth. For evangelical truth in Matthew, chapters 24 and 25, and Luke 18, and apostolic teaching in 2 Thess. 2, and 2 Tim., chapters 3 and 4, present something quite different." It is the duty of the Christians to correct their brothers from the error of Zionism and the erroneous belief that the Jews deserve any special regard (Jude 23), other than to be properly labeled as antichrists and treated as such (Matt. 7:6) (1 John 5:16) (2 John 7-11).

Regarding eschatology, it is intriguing that the expectations of the Jewish antichrists are, in a way, very similar to those of the saints, although the perspective and ultimate destinies of the two are polar opposites. For the Jews believe that their 'messiah' (who, if he ever actually appears, will most likely be an abusive antichrist if not *the* Antichrist; they already rejected, betrayed, and murdered the true Messiah – that is, Jesus Christ) will only arrive once they have essentially 'conquered the world.' (I'm not kidding, either. This isn't some wild conspiracy theory. This is what religious scholars actually believe.) In their sinful, twisted minds, it is only after subduing every nation under their perverse world government will their 'messiah' (or antichrist) finally appear. Now it is not clear if they will ever succeed, or whether their 'one world government' is the one spoken of in Dan. 7:23, but what *is* clear is that the Holy Spirit expressly states that as the end approaches, persecution will increase and the visible church will essentially be eradicated (Dan. 7:21, 12:7). By the time Christ returns, only a small number of the elect will remain (Matt 24:37) (1 Pet. 3:20) (Luke 18:8). The irony, of course, is that the culmination of evil and the height of persecution of the saints by the antichrists is what provokes Christ's justice and necessitates his return. At the very moment it seems like the Antichrist has won, that is when Christ will appear in his glory to "annihilate [him] with the breath of his mouth and bring to nothing by the appearance of his coming." This is the Day of the Lord described



multiple times in Rev. 6:12-17, 8:3-5, 11:11-13, 11:15-19, 14:9-11, 14:14-20, 16:17-21, 19:19-21, 20:9-10, 20:11-15, and Matt. 24:29-31. After Christ's return and the resurrection of the just and unjust Dan. 12:2, John 5:28-29, 1 Cor. 15:12, 1 Cor. 15:51-53, 1 Thess. 4:13-18 (which happen simultaneously, there is no literal millennium, the millennium is symbolic for the Church age, as Calvin writes, "their fiction is too puerile to require or deserve refutation [...] Those who assign the children of God a thousand years to enjoy the inheritance of the future life, little think what dishonor they cast on Christ and his kingdom") Christ, as Judge of the world (John 5:22), will first open the book of life and acquit the elect in the presence of all (Matt 25:33-34) (Dan. 12:1) (Rev. 3:5) by virtue of his own blood and merit. Then the righteous works of the elect, being righteous because they proceeded from Christ's Spirit but imperfect and defiled because they were wrought by sinful men, are graciously accepted and rewarded before the court in light of Christ's blood covering their imperfections, and are further used as evidence of the genuine faith (James 2:17) and love (John 14:21) of the elect for Christ (Matt 25:21, 31-40) (2 Cor. 5:10) (2 Cor. 8:12) (Heb. 6:10). After this public acquittal of the elect (*not* justification), the elect assist Christ in judging the reprobate angels (1 Cor. 6:3) and men (Matt 12:41-42) under the strict accordance of the law (Matt 12:36-37), in which their consciences testify against them (Rom. 2:15-16) and reveal God to be just in his judgment. Then they are cast into the lake of fire (Isa. 66:24) (Rev. 14:9-11, 19:20, 20:10, 15, 21:8), whereas the elect with Christ inherit the new heavens and new earth (Isa 66:22) (2 Pet. 3:13) (Rev 21:1-4). It is important to note that the resurrection is a *physical* one and the new earth is a *physical* reality. Despite popular misrepresentations, Christianity is not 'platonism for the masses.' The lake of fire in which angels and physically resurrected men are judged (with bodies suitable for eternal judgment) is an entirely separate reality from the perfect new creation the elect enjoy with Christ (Rev. 21:27). God's presence is in both, his wrath in one and his favor in the other. Heaven and hell (Luke 16:19-31), which temporarily house the souls of the dead elect (now made perfect, Heb. 12:23) and reprobate respectively, are replaced at the resurrection with the lake of fire (Rev. 20:14-15) and new creation (2 Pet. 3:10) (Rev. 21:1-2). I mention these things because the representations of Christianity displayed by pop culture are extraordinarily misinformed. The incorrect pagan views of heaven and hell as the kingdoms of God and Satan respectively and of Jesus as some repulsive, pacifist hippie who just wants everyone to love each other is starkly contrasted with the biblical truth of a just, good, and all-powerful God who is sovereign over all and has decreed everything to happen, even the sins of angels and men (Acts 2:23) (Rom. 9:17-18) (Rev. 17:17), and of Jesus Christ as the Son of God, very God and very man, who will judge the world in perfect righteousness. So much for being just some hippie. Satan does a good job of neutering Christianity for the masses (1 John 5:19), but the elect don't listen to them (John 10:3-5). Discuss and teach these things to everyone who will listen. Especially correct misinformed brothers. But always be patient (1 Tim. 5:1-2) (1 Pet. 3:15). If you become contentious then you've missed the whole point and lost sight of Christ. But never submit to false teachers (Gal. 2:4-5) (Titus 1:10-11).

The facile arguments of the cowardly (((pacifists))) that, "because prophecy states that the Church will be destroyed, we should stand by and let it happen so that Christ will return sooner," is as lazy and irresponsible as they are. Some of them even go so far as to say that we should support the Jewish antichrists to simply speed things along. These are like the hypothetical

brainlets Paul condemns in Rom. 3:5-8: Their condemnation is just. For one, it is not certain if the current Jewish antichrists will even produce the Antichrist, or whether he will come from somewhere else entirely. To make this 'the ends justify the means' argument when the means aren't even certain of producing the end is to justify breaking Christ's commands for nothing. Rather, it is every Christian's duty to love the Church (1 John 4:20) by their actions (1 John 3:17-18) (James 2:15-16), which includes not seeking the welfare of antichrists (1 John 5:16) (2 John 10-11) or letting them subvert the Church (Titus 1:10-14). Instead, Christians are to testify about Christ whether there is persecution or not (2 Tim. 4:1-2). This is an *active* command. To stand by and let the Zionists infiltrate the Church is as sinful as if you were teaching the heresy yourself (2 John 10-11). Therefore, regardless of whether or not Christ's return could be more quickly produced by supporting the Zionists (either actively or passively), the Christian must never engage in such ignorant sin, but must instead, always defend the Church. Christ's return is accomplished through earnest prayer (Matt 6:10) (Luke 18:7-8) (Rom. 8:15) (Rev. 22:20), not earthly tactics (John 18:36) (1 Cor. 1:17-25). That being said, the common association of Christ with a syrupy 'always-peaceful' figure is the product of lazy pacifists who cower behind this idol and use it as a justification for forsaking their Christ-given command to stand up in the face of death and defend the Church (Rev 12:11). Jesus Christ is not a pacifist. Not even close. Even during his humiliation (i.e. his earthly ministry) these sickening 'never-angry-always-peaceful' images don't add up. Christ came not to bring peace but to divide the elect from the non-elect (Matt 10:34-39) (Luke 12:49-53). In Mark 3:1-6, Jesus was justly infuriated with the total blindness and lack of perspective of the pharisees. In John 2:13-17, he was completely enraged with the mercantile, Jewish antichrists for profaning his Father's temple – making a whip and driving them out. And this isn't even to mention *after* his glorification, where he acts as Divine Judge and Warrior (Rev. 19:11-16). Nowhere are Christians ordered to be pacifists. Jesus never told the centurion that he must pick a different profession if he wanted to be faithful (Matt. 8:5-13), and the same thing was true of Peter and Cornelius (Acts 10). Now it is true that Christians must never take personal vengeance into their own hands (Matt 5:38-48) (Rom. 12:14, 17-21) (1 Sam. 25:32-33), but must, instead, appeal to God for justice (Luke 18:7-8). They *should*, however, defend others (1 Cor. 10:23-24) (Esth. 9:16) (Gen 14). It is the duty of Christians to defend the Church from the Zionists by using the Word and church discipline (1 Cor. 5:3-5) (2 Cor. 2:5-11) (Matt. 18:15-20) (1 Tim. 5:20) (Titus 2:15) (and especially 3 John 9-10). And it is the duty of Europeans to defend the Church and their nation from the Zionists by using the sword (Rom 13:4-5) (Esth. 9:16) (Gen. 14) (holy war under Mosaic law does not apply to Christians, Luke 22:49-51, John 18:10-11, 36). Like the patriarchs and the exiled Israelites, Christian Europeans have responsibilities both for the pagan world (Abram fights in a pagan war, Gen 14, Daniel serves pagan kings, Christians "render unto Caesar what is Caesar's") and for the Church and Christ, as opposed to theocratic Israel where culture and religion were one. As Europeans, Christians destroy the Jewish snakes to protect their race. As Christians, Christians promote the orthodoxy of the Church and ressit the idolatries of the pagan world. So whether as Europeans or as Christians, Christians obey Christ and wait faithfully for his return, when he will once and for all make culture and religion one.

The Jews did not enact the genocide of Europeans through subversion and mass migration for no reason. They hate Europeans because they hate Christianity. After the Jews rejected and

murdered Jesus Christ (which was the most heinous sin to date), God collectively hardened their hearts to a degree never seen before (Matt. 13:14-15) (Matt. 27:24-26) (Acts 28:23-31) (Rom. 11:7-10). Over the next couple of centuries, the Jews completely purged Christians from their ranks, and the Gospel was subsequently accepted by Europeans (Gen. 9:27), and to such an extent that the visible church spanned all of Europe and theological developments became the sole accomplishment of Europeans in Christ. In the Jews' sinful eyes, an attack on Europeans is an attack on Christianity. For although the elect come from every race (Gal 3:27-29) (Col. 3:11), the majority of Christ's churches and people have historically been European.

Therefore, in order to defend the perfect beauty of Christ's Gospel from Jewish subversion, it is the responsibility of every church to publicly condemn the serious errors of Zionism and Dispensationalism as heresy, for the following reasons:

1. It is the duty of the Church to promote sound doctrine (1 Tim. 4:6) (2 Tim. 4:1-2) (Titus 2:1)
2. It is the duty of the Church to quell false doctrine (1 Tim. 1:3) (Titus 1:10-14) (Titus 2:15)
3. Zionism and Dispensationalism are not in accord with sound doctrine (Gal. 4:9) (Gal 5:1) (Eph 2:15) (Matt. 28:18-20)
4. To claim that there will be a reversal of dispensations (or a future Jewish dispensation in tandem with the New Covenant) is a regression, and is to hold Christ the substance in contempt. The purpose of the OT dispensation was to provide the context and groundwork for Christ's coming. Therefore, it makes absolutely no sense to return to these types and shadows after Christ himself was exhibited to us (2 Cor. 3:7-11) (Col. 2:17) (Heb. 8-10)
5. The application of OT terms to the NT Church reveals that the same spiritual reality lies behind both of them – the temporary earthly types of the OT and the eternal, heavenly antitypes of the NT – that OT prophecy is fulfilled in the NT Church (Rom. 11:25-26) (Gal. 4:25-26) (Gal. 6:16) (1 Pet. 1:1) (Rev. 21:12-14)
6. The proponents of these views hold that many of the ceremonial ordinances of the Jews will be practiced again at some point in the future, even though Paul labors excruciatingly to dispel such a notion; so much so that much of the NT and an entire letter (Galatians) are devoted to correcting the error (Rom. 4) (Gal.) (Phil. 3:2-7) (Col. 2:20)
7. The belief that another temple should be built rejects the sufficiency of Christ's body as the eternal, climactic fulfillment of typological OT promise, which is unbiblical and unacceptable. (Zech. 6:12-15) (Matt. 27:51) (1 Cor. 6:19-20) (Eph. 2:19-22) (1 Pet. 2:5)
8. The same crassly literal hermeneutical scheme of OT prophecy used by the Zionists to support the establishment of an earthly nation of Israel must also, logically, be used in prophecies that speak of the eternal reign of a man named David, even though Christ is

the one who holds that office. (Jer. 30:9) (Ezek. 34:23-24) (Ezek 37:24-25) (Hos. 3:5) (Luke 1:32-33)

9. In the Zionists' misapplication of typological OT terms, they fail to take into account that God works within history and, therefore, communicates redemptive-historical truths in terms that his original audience understands.
10. These views deceive Christ's flock into placing their hopes for the future in the establishment and prosperity of an earthly, pagan nation of Israel rather than the kingdom of heaven and Christ's glorious return. (Gen. 11:4) (Matt. 24:44) (Matt. 25:13) (Luke 21:27-28) (Rev. 22:20)
11. These errors have easily deceived many laymen into supposing that the Jews are still God's people and can, therefore, be saved outside of Christ's grace through faith, simply by merit of being 'God's chosen people'. This despises both Christ's promises and the legitimacy of the Church, which alone holds the keys to the kingdom of heaven. (John. 8:54-55) (1 John. 2:22) (Matt. 16:18-19)
12. These views commonly foster a spiritually unhealthy admiration and veneration of Jews, leading many believers to improperly treat those of them who 'sin unto death' as if they were Christian brothers. (Matt 7:6) (1 John. 5:16) (2 John. 10-11)
13. These errors are so widespread that in speaking to your average Christian you will find that most all of them hold such opinions. This controversy, therefore, is of sufficient magnitude and imminent relevance and concern for the Church to justify anathematization.
14. The intense level of Paul's anger and strong language against this error reveals the seriousness of the offense. With no other false doctrine does he go so far as to suggest that its proponents should go castrate themselves. There are, therefore, biblical grounds warranting the charges of heresy. (Gal. 5:12) (Phil. 3:2)

I respectfully appeal to the churches to consider these arguments and to publicly condemn Zionism and Dispensationalism. Such views are foreign to Christ's most precious Gospel. They do not belong in our churches. (John. 10:3-5) (1 Pet. 5:2-4)

Know this brothers: the culture you see around you is *not* European culture. Movies, books, politics, news – the psychotic, sex-crazed women; the weak, spineless men; the 'power' of insolent, rebellious women; the self-deprecating 'White' characters; the 'strength' of violent, stupid races; the abominations portrayed as perfectly normal – this is Jewish culture. Look back in history to discover what European culture is. Step into Homer, Robinson Crusoe, Chopin, Beethoven, Napoleon, Hitler, Luther, Calvin, and so much more. Then realize that a vile, spiteful group of people seeks to extinguish the lamp of Europe forever. What will happen to Europe? Where will Europeans go?

Where indeed?

We pray by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ,

That all of the churches agree,

And that there be no divisions among them,

But that they be united in the same mind and the same judgment. 1 - (1 Cor. 1:10)

For the time has come when people do not endure sound teaching, but accumulate for themselves teachers to suit their own passions. 2 - (2 Tim. 4:3)

We pray that the churches teach what accords with sound doctrine, 3 - (Titus 2:1)

and are eager to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

For there is one body and one Spirit,

one Lord, one Faith, one baptism,

one God and Father of all, who is over all and through all and in all. 4 - (Eph. 4:3-6)

But as for false brothers surely brought in,

to them we do not yield in submission even for a moment. 5 - (Gal. 2:4-5)

And for those of the Synagogue of Satan, who secretly bring in destructive heresies, we pray, Lord, that you bring upon them swift destruction, 6 - (2 Pet. 2:1)

for they must be silenced. 7 - (Titus 1:11)

Rebuke those led astray by them sharply.

And they may be sound in faith and not devote themselves to Jewish myths. 8 - (Titus 1:13-14)

Lord, we pray this without ceasing; 9 - (1 Thess. 5:17)

we know you will give justice to your elect, who cry out to you day and night.

You will not delay long over them.

You will give justice to us speedily. 10 - (Luke 18:7-8)

For the prayers of righteous people have great power as they are working. 11 - (James 5:16)

We pray for the strength and deliverance of your European peoples.

And we pray for the unity of their churches and governments. 12 - (1 Tim. 2:1-2)

Amen.