

From: David & Marie Ewing

RE: Reply to Pastor Arthur Purvis and the leadership at Christ Fellowship Church

Neither I or Marie want to return to the CFC Church at this time. We both feel the CFC Church leadership has inappropriately tainted our name, and turned many people in the Church against us for no good reason. Shortly after we first started attending Christ Fellowship Church 'CFC', I met with Pastor Arthur, and explained to him what I thought about the idea of the Caucasian race being the true Israel or 'Lost Tribes' of Israel.

He didn't have a specific problem with the idea at that time, and didn't agree or disagree. He simply hadn't stated he'd only heard that idea before and hadn't specifically looked into the message or really studied it to bear it out. We feel if CFC was going to censor us from talking about the Israel message, they should of told us shortly after that conversation, not waited 3 years to all of a sudden say we have to renounce our beliefs if we want to keep coming to CFC. There was little doubt at that time, that if what I told him was what I truly believed, then those thoughts were going to come out in conversation at the church at some point in the future.

Marie is more interested in getting a home Bible study group together again, as we were doing before we started attending CFC. It's my contention we should simply go to another Church with the Israel message. Here's my scriptural analogy for thinking that way:

In [Act's Chapter 2 - Chapter 4](#), Peter and John are specifically mentioned, but it says in [Acts 2:14](#) "Peter, however, standing up with the eleven." So Peter and John were the ones doing the most talking here, even though at least eleven Apostles were present. It says in the same verse they're addressing "all men residing in Jerusalem." That day was on the "celebration of the day of Pentecost", as it says in [Acts 2:1](#).

They convince a certain part of the crowd that those present (over 3000) made a critical mistake by crucifying Jesus as it notes in [Acts 3:37-42](#), where it states, "there were added 3000 souls". I submit that had the Apostles not gone to the crowd and spoke out about the truth, all 3000 that they saved that day would of continued believing the lie they believed and consequently may of never of been enlightened to the truth of God's word.

If we believe we should be more like Jesus, and more like the Apostles in speaking the truth, then shouldn't we also go where the largest masses of 'deceived' people congregate and speak out about the truth? I'd like to point out that to the first crowd he called them; [2:22](#), "Men of Israel"; [2:29](#), "brothers"; [3:36](#), and "the whole House of Israel", etc.

So these weren't just any people. Those are all racial terms. The "House of Israel" specifically, **cannot be construed in any other way EXCEPT IN RACIAL TERMS!** Just shortly thereafter, in [Acts 3:1](#), "Peter and John were going up to the Temple at the hour of prayer, 3 o'clock in afternoon."

Again he states in [Acts 3:13](#), "the God of our forefathers" .., that's racial; in [4:25](#), "You are the sons of the prophets" .., that's racial; "and of the covenant which God executed with our forefathers, saying to Abraham" .., that's specifically racial; "AND **BY YOUR HEIR SHALL ALL THE FAMILIES OF THE EARTH BE BLESSED**". **That's absolutely and explicitly racial!** Abraham's posterity .., but more precisely as it discusses over and over in scripture, only a specific posterity through Jacob / Israel, and excluding Esau **his own brother**.

Are these people being discussed, just whosoever believes in Jesus Christ? This is an exclusive club **defined by genealogy** that through them were all the families of the earth to be blessed! If we were all just one big happy family in Christ then there would be no reason to single out this specific group of people who will do things to bless others.

And what happened next? [Acts 4:1](#), They were taken into custody or 'arrested' as it says, under the authority of the priests and Sadducees. Then all the rest of the elders came in the next day, and held a trial. It seems Peter and John upset the leadership of the 'Church'! They were threatened (twice) by the 'Church' leadership to say nothing more about Jesus crucified. **They were censored**. To talk about Jesus to someone who maybe doesn't know much of anything about him, you have to teach the Bible from beginning to end. No part of the Bible should be censored, no matter what it talks about.

[Acts 4:19-20](#), there is 'no power' from God except to "tell what we have seen and heard." All those things they've seen and heard are in our scriptures today from the beginning to the end of the Bible. All scripture is for profit and no one has a right to censor any part of scripture even if it causes a division among the members. If they do, they could loose their

'power' from God. Verse: 19 says, "Decide whether it is right in the presence of God to listen to you rather than God." I'm simply asking the same thing. Were they in 'rebellion' to the Church leadership or were they obeying God's command? Which should I DO? Should I ignore errors in scripture being preached or should I speak out. When the pastor or elder continues in their error, what is the process exactly within CFC or any other church to root out these errors? When I gave them the evidence, I don't know that anybody spent more than 30 minutes of their time seriously looking at it, much less applying any critical thought processes to it.

What is proper today if I plainly see Church leadership teaching something that is not biblically correct? I came to the Pastor from day one with this message, and the fact that I believed what he was teaching as it applies to identity of Israel was wrong. I've maintained that stance all along and made it known to all of the Church leadership.

I contend that I'm not in rebellion to God, in fact, ALL OF YOU ARE IN REBELLION! Prove me wrong through Scripture and I'll listen. I offered you 550 pages of well researched proof from [angloisrael.com](http://angloisrael.com), and that's backed up by many quotes from documented resources. There are many more books I could provide that easily substantiate the facts in contention. I will not, and do not have to be coerced in to believing I'm wrong, just because some other church at some point in time use to teach this message, and now they're not. That is not the least bit definitive! A real study of scripture might be definitive if the church leadership ever had the time.

But I digress. In Acts 5:17, again they were arrested and hauled before the Senate. In 5:29, Again it says, "Peter and the apostles", "God ought to be obeyed rather than men." So according to 'Peter and the apostles', the heads or elders of the church do not have the right to censor the word of God just because some church members may come to believe something differently than what the leadership is teaching, and because of this new found scriptural knowledge, these members might possibly leave the church.

Same verse, "The God of our forefathers", that's racial. Look at Acts 5:35-39, and one of the Pharisee's named 'Gamaliel' has a revelation! He states that if this doctrine they're teaching is from men, it will be wrecked. However, "if it is from God, you will not be able to crush it; and perhaps YOU MAY FIND YOURSELVES THE OPPONENTS OF GOD."

Better yet, let's just study this word and prove it up or disprove it. CFC has never really brought any scripture out to disprove what I claim. They arbitrarily called it a false teaching from what I understand is based on the fact that for one, they don't think it's necessary to teach these things. Also the fact that a few can't handle the message, so it divides the church, and that's bad. If a message divides the church, it doesn't matter whether it's scriptural, or whether it's true. God is love, so we can't be divided and still love each other. Therefore, their idea I suppose is that this message is not profitable because it doesn't produce fruit.

I don't see how you can expect to produce fruit, while being intellectually dishonest with people at the same time. Like calling Moses a Jew, or Abraham a Jew, when 'Jews' as we refer to them today, didn't even exist at that point in time. Being dishonest with people is not the preferred way to teach them about Jesus, and certainly God wouldn't approve of any dishonesty.

The most important example of humbling oneself, and going to the church to teach a message of truth no matter the personal sacrifice, or the fact that the people you're speaking to are totally at odds with you, is this. Look at what it says about Saul in [Acts 9:22](#). Soon after he was converted it says he "refuted the Judeans inhabiting Damascus, PROVING THAT HE WAS THE MESSIAH." Proving it with what? He must have been by using whatever scriptures they had available at that time. The Torah, maybe?

[Acts 17:3](#), "discussed with them FROM THE SCRIPTURES, illustrating and PROVING that the Messiah must suffer, and rise again from the dead; and that this Jesus, whom I proclaim to you, is the Messiah." Again, what scriptures? If the leaders of the synagogue (church) of that day claimed that they believed in the scriptures, but didn't believe in Jesus; and Paul was proving from the exact same scriptures that they were wrong; then was he wrong in going to the synagogues or (churches) and proclaiming the truth, even though the elders, and professors, and priests, and all the leaders were against his teaching?

Did Paul and all the Apostles that were repeatedly kicked out of the synagogues (or churches), for speaking out about this subject, contrary to what the leaders told them to do, which was to and I paraphrase - 'not talk about it anymore to any of their members'; did they commit a sin by going against the leadership? Were they in rebellion?

Are you kidding me! [Acts 17:11](#), "they accepted the message with hearty good-will, examining the Scriptures daily, so as to verify the statements." So Paul's statements and were verifiable through scripture, whether the leaders of the synagogues (or churches) liked it or not. (As is my analogy by the way). And again in [Acts 28:23](#), "persuading them about Jesus, both from the law of Moses and the prophets."

They were using "the law of Moses and the prophets." So let's see. Which is more important? The truth of the scriptures, or what the leadership of the synagogues (or churches) want to teach? Hmm. True love is telling someone the truth, correct? Letting their 'brothers' be misled about scripture, because the leadership objected would be a much bigger sin, than the false 'sin' of going against the leadership's wishes.

So, what I get out of this is that **if the leadership is right**, going against them would be a sin. But **if we can 'verify through the scriptures' that the leadership is wrong, then we've committed no sin**. The leaders might crucify us like they did some of the Apostles, but we haven't committed a sin by going against the leadership, as long as we can prove our point through the scriptures. Am I missing anything?

[Acts 18:6](#), "demonstrating to the Jews that Jesus was the Messiah." This time they abused him and he said, "**Your blood be upon your own heads; I am guiltless.**"

So that's the point. We have an obligation to our 'brothers' to go to the synagogues (or churches), and speak up for the truth of God's word even if it is contrary to ALL of the leadership of that institution. We're just following the example Jesus and the Apostles set. As long as we have the scripture to back it up, we've committed no sin. In fact **if we didn't, we might have blood on our own hands** by knowing they were being taught incorrectly, and not speaking out about it.

In fact in [18:9](#), God says to Paul, "**Fear not, but speak out, and do not keep silence; because I am with you, and no one shall attack to injure you.**" He was told to go against the leadership of the synagogues by God himself! The leaders were wrong! Paul was not in rebellion and I submit, neither are we unless you can offer something definitive to the contrary!

[Acts 18:28](#), Apollos was also, "proving by means of the Scriptures that Jesus was the Messiah." If all the Apostles could prove - 'by means of the Scriptures that Jesus was the Messiah', then the leadership could too. They were reading exactly the same scriptures, correct? The leaders were wrong, and we are commanded along with Paul to, "Fear not, but speak out, and do not keep silence." **Rather IF we kept silent, THAT would be a sin!**

Here's a thought. God can send strong delusion on people for their past sins. You might remember the Prophet Mikhail and the fact that an angel with lying lips somehow caused all of the Priests to give false information to the Kings to go into battle. Did they know what they were saying was wrong? I doubt it. They were deluded. They probably thought the information they were giving was accurate. At the very least today, we have the ability to look back on history, consider all types of supporting documentation that we've gathered over 1000's of years to compare with our scripture, and come to a conclusion based on the preponderance of evidence.

A man that's been coming to the same church for 4 years, and involved himself in helping out wherever he can, should at the very least be given the consideration by the leaders to thoroughly examine the evidence presented. There is a process mentioned in scripture to correct those that are speaking falsely. Surely, it can be applied to all Church members including leadership, because it can't be profitable that some of the Church leadership might possibly be teaching a false message even if by accident or ignorance.

There may be other examples, but I'm thinking of [Matthew 18:15](#) where it indicates that we should settle issues among ourselves. If it can't be settled then take 1 or 2 others along with you to settle the matter. If not, report it to the assembly. Who is the assembly? Is that not the body of the Church, the members? I would happily argue my point in front of the CFC Church. I think more would agree with me than not, if I was given sufficient time to explain my side of the issue. This obviously can't be done in an hour!

I feel that if a man is bold enough to make a charge of false doctrine against the Church leadership, then that leadership should even more boldly be willing to help that brother understand if in fact, his belief is in error. One way is by taking some time to sit down and discuss his contentions in a man to man conference, looking at his charges, and offering some logic and scripture to help get at the truth of the matter. If by chance the Church finds it's teaching to be in error as proclaimed, then the Church needs to change

what it teaches, and maybe even publicly repent of its error. Newspapers print retractions, so why is it so hard for Church leadership to state a retraction? There are many churches in this country teaching conflicting thoughts about the same scriptures. They can't all be right.

[Acts 26:23](#), Paul is addressing Festus to wit; "asserting nothing but what the prophets, as well as Moses, declared should come to pass". If what he says is true, then why did the synagogue (or church) leadership have a problem with it? No doubt someone was lying about believing in scripture, and I think we know who it was. They were lying because Jesus himself called them liars. Jesus certainly knew supernaturally whether they were simply ignorant of the truth, or in fact, that they were liars. **How could the leadership be totally blinded by the meaning of scripture to the point they were willing to crucify or stone their own 'brothers'?**

We have Church leadership like that today. Just pick a Church, take some truth of God's word to them and see what happens! If what you point out in scripture just happens to cause a division among the membership, and someone starts talking about leaving, guess who will be the one that has to leave! The one telling the truth I can assure you! Assuming the person telling the truth is simply a member, and not a Pastor or Elder. Pastors or Elders seem to do no wrong, or at least if they do, it seems they rarely if ever are willing to man up to it in front of the 'assembly'!

I like what Romans says, [Rom 1:18](#), "**For it reveals a divine displeasure from heaven upon all wickedness and iniquity of men who pervert the true into the false.**" The claim of the Jews in Israel today being connected to the Israelites of the Bible is one of the greatest perversions of scripture in our day. This false teaching is promoted specifically to destroy our country, and the true Israel (white Anglo-Saxon) nations more than anything else. Most assume this lie is taught through ignorance. I assure you nothing is further from the truth. **Our Founding Fathers believed we were Israel.** That can be demonstrated in the things they wrote. When did that thought change?

Still, if the church doesn't know or understand the truth, then it's our duty to our 'brothers' to go to the churches, and interject whatever truth we can as often as we can, according to the example set by the Apostles who did just that. They had a different message at that time, i.e., Christ crucified. But scripture is scripture. All teachings need to be as accurate as possible.

Not provokingly, but in a spirit of true love. No greater example of this can be found than in Paul's conversion in [Acts 17:34](#) of Dionysius (the Areopagite). As I recall this was the same judge that concurred together with Paul in sentencing Stephen to death. How humble did Paul have to be, to go back and publicly proclaim a message, that he was killing brethren over just weeks or months earlier for proclaiming? A better question might be.., why did God wait so long to enlighten Saul of his error?

Was God too busy to stop him during his first killing of the believers on Christ? He allowed it to happen. He allowed Christian families to be murdered knowing that it was just a simple 'error' in understanding his word. Why allow such a profound error to continue, if he could have stopped it at any time?

A different error continues today. It's just as profound, and I submit it's even much more profound than the error in Paul's day. Today, instead of chasing down and killing one family at a time, we have bombs we can drop on people. We even have nuclear bombs that can kill 100's of 1000's at once. IF WE'RE IN ERROR... THAT'S A PROBLEM!! IT'S HAS THE POTENTIAL TO BE A MUCH, MUCH BIGGER ERROR!

The Church can simply not afford to be in error. But I submit, almost all Churches in our country today are in error, and it's a profound error! Indeed, many Christian people see it as well as I, and they're at a total loss how to correct the error! For us the true identity of Israel is a no-brainer! Most Israel identity believers simply leave the Church and refuse to go back. They all agree that trying to enlighten church leadership to the truth is a lost cause! Rarely is it successful.

But, we see Church leadership preach false doctrine of all kinds, and we're at a loss why someone who commits his life to the ministry, does not automatically get a spirit of truth directly from God himself. After all, why not? Doesn't a ministers intentions and commitments count for something? Saul was zealous for what he 'thought' was God's word. He was educated in scripture. He was certainly intelligent and at the top of his game so to speak. What was the problem with Saul/Paul that God himself had to intervene to get him on the right track?

The scriptures didn't change between the time Saul became Paul did they?

So we should see the same need to go to our brothers wherever they may be assembled now, and most of the largest groups of our 'brothers' just happen to be going to churches. If they were going somewhere else, I'd say lets go there instead. And a football game doesn't count unless we have the mic, and the opportunity to address them about these issues that need to be discussed.

If the leaders say we can't be speaking about these things because it might divide their Church, then I say that's not true. As long as we're talking about scripture, people are going to be divided and see things differently at times. Otherwise you're just teaching a social gospel if there's no disagreements. If we disagree, so what? No church of any size has ALL members in agreement on all scripture. But the proper thing is to discuss it among ourselves. Not to get mad at each other, or run members off.

The real issue at hand is not having blood on our hands. If, I as a Christian am aware of a false teaching in the church, I'm required to speak up about it. To allow a false teaching to continue to a degree that it would delude others, and lead them astray, would be a fraud on my part if I was aware and allowed it to continue without being challenged. We're commanded to speak up about errors in teaching!

Now typically, this should be a simple process to go to a Pastor, Elder, Teacher, etc, that's promoting such misinformation, and discuss it man to man, and come to a consensus what's wrong and why. It might get more involved, and need to include more people, but even small errors in theology should have some process within the church body so that they can be successfully rooted out.

Maybe some things we could agree to disagree on, but major building blocks of scripture like the identity of Israel, cannot be overlooked or cast aside as unimportant. If there is indeed a specific group of chosen people, that are chosen for a specific reason to fulfill God's word, and "by them the rest of the nations of the World will be Blessed"; who they are exactly, and what they are supposed to do is important to the understanding of scripture itself.

From experience, I can tell you with absolute certainty, everyone I have talked to that has discovered the truth of the identity of the '12 tribes scattered abroad', has had their lives changed dramatically by the knowledge of that Revelation. That ONE PEARL of knowledge has opened their eyes

to the truth of scripture from beginning to end, and greatly inspired and renewed their faith to the point they could hardly put their Bible down till they reread it with that truth in mind!

It is a well known fact by many, that in general, most of the people we call Jews today are in reality - atheists. Even the Jews themselves realize through scripture that the prophecies pertaining to Israel after the Assyrian and Babylonian captivities as in Jeremiah for example, have not been fulfilled in their people. If they try to apply these prophecies to themselves, the prophecies are simply not true. Only when these prophecies are applied to the Anglo-Saxon people as a whole, do they suddenly become recognizably true, and are plainly visible throughout history to those who have the wisdom to do some real study.

I hear repeatedly that well it's not so much about the people living in Israel as it is the land of Israel itself. Yeah right. That's because it is so obvious at this point that the Jews have not fulfilled the prophecies pertaining to Israel and aren't ever going to fulfill them, that even when our kids study scripture they can figure that out. So we support the murders of Palestinian Christians with our billions of dollars a year in financial aid to the anti-christ Jews who even publicly claim they don't believe in Christ crucified, and kill the ones that do. That's real logical. Explain that thought again!

If true Israel or the 12 tribes of Israel mentioned in Revelation are not actually living in the mini State of Israel as it exists today, then what's more important. The land they are living in, i.e., the British Commonwealth and the USA, or the mini State of Israel which is occupied by the anti-christ Jews who publicly claim they don't believe in Christ crucified? Which is more important? Explain to me the meaning of [Rev 2:9](#) & [Rev 3:9](#) if there are any among you with wisdom, because that's who they are and that's who you are supporting! If my logic is wrong, please enlighten me, but this is the very reason why our country is going downhill and has been ever since we started supporting these people.

That thought is undeniable, and further, it was our sister country England that gave them that land. If it's only about the land over there we want, then why hand it over to the non-believers in the first place? If we had the power to give it to them then we could of just as well kept it for ourselves if we wanted it so bad.

There is one thing I'm certain of. God is truth. I sincerely think he has a desire for everyone to know the truth of his word. Therefore, if you have a sincere desire for the truth of his scripture and you appeal to him for knowledge based on that fact; he will give you that discernment if he sees in your heart that truth is paramount over anything else in your life. I assure you that if there is any stumbling blocks in your life to you standing up against anyone on this earth to impart truth because of their title, or their position, or whether it might cost you your job - he will know that, and he might just withhold knowledge from you.

If your prayer is earnest, and you will speak out for truth against anyone that is misrepresenting his word, no matter at what personal cost or sacrifice it may entail for you to stand up for what is right; he will bless you with that knowledge, and much more even than you can digest over the period of years of unlearning any false teachings you were ingrained with in the past. You don't need me to tell you what the truth is. The prayer of a righteous man avails much.

Isaiah 56:10-12, “His watchmen are blind: they are all ignorant, they are all dumb dogs, they cannot bark; sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber. Yea, they are greedy dogs which can never have enough, and they are shepherds that cannot understand: they all look to their own way, everyone for his own gain, from his quarter. Come ye, say they, and I will fetch wine, and we will fill ourselves with strong drink; and tomorrow shall be as this day, and much more abundant.”

I'm not saying our Churches in this country have not helped to spread the word of God worldwide. They have. But at the same time, by allowing false doctrine to be spread as abundantly as the truth they are telling, they've also ultimately participated in bringing certain destruction on themselves. If only a few believe in the truth, and the rest disbelieve, that's not our problem.

Our only concern is that we preach the truth. Jesus didn't preach a social gospel. He went right to the faces of the 'Jews' of his day in the places of leadership and stated, “your father is the Devil.” As I told Pastor Purvis on many occasions, if a man is teaching someone incorrectly that's bad enough. But if he's a Pastor, Elder, or leader within a church, and he's preaching a false doctrine or knowingly allowing others under his authority to do so, then it's worse that he's a Pastor or Elder, not better.

It's not going to go better for you just because of your title or your position of leadership. We expect the truth, and nothing but the truth from all Church leadership. You expect us to repent when we're wrong. Maybe you need to go look in the mirror for awhile and reflect. Certainly NONE of us on this earth will ever teach scripture 100% accurately. But that should always be our goal regardless of who we are. If a brother tells us we're wrong, we should take that seriously. I wouldn't take it lightly myself, but killing the messenger is the wrong way to handle the situation.

I would take note of one thought in scripture because it's repeated in similar fashion many times throughout the Bible. [2<sup>nd</sup> Thessalonians 2:11](#), "And because of this, **God will send to them an energy of error, for themselves to make the falsehood credible; so that in every way those who do not trust to the truth, but on the contrary, approve falsehood, may be condemned.**"

All my quotes are from the 1908 Ferrar Fenton Bible. I don't place an special significance on the Ferrar, except that I along with many others, like the way he's made corrections where he thinks it is warranted; the fact that it's translated direct from the original Hebrew, Greek, and Chaldean languages all by the same person; and though the Old English of the period is a little wordy, it conveys a good sense of the meaning I think; and it's very descriptive. I don't know of a comparable Bible today.

Sincerely,

David & Marie Ewing  
[david@iblamethepastors.com](mailto:david@iblamethepastors.com)