

CHRISTIAN IDENTITY AUSTRALIA EPISODE #8

"Bible Battle Royal: Grace vs the Law vs Faith vs Works"

G'day, fellow Israelites, and welcome to episode eight of Christian Identity Australia, a podcast, and you're listening to it, aimed at Christian patriots living in that great south land we all know and love. Or used to love before the race traitors in our government ripped up the White Australia Policy and flushed it down Gough Whitlam's dunny. I'm Obadiah 1:18, commandant of The Christian Identity Forum dot net—be a member there or be square—and I am your host.

Christian Identity is a biblical theology that identifies the white European peoples as the Israelites of the Old and the New Testaments, and the Jews as the Israelites of neither Testament. What CI teaches is the exact opposite of what mainstream churches teach. According to mainstream churches, the Jews are God's chosen people, and Christ died to redeem every member of every race on planet Earth. But according to CI, and the Bible, Jews are satanic imposters pretending to be God's chosen people—and doing an unbelievably bad job of it—and Christ died to redeem only the Israel sub-group of the white race. The Israelites were the only people whom God gave His law and thus the only people who needed redeeming. Where there is no law, there is no sin.

If you'd like to learn more about Christian Identity, visit the Christian Identity Primer section of my forum, where you'll find a number of downloadable books that cover the various aspects of CI in detail, or you can read the forum's statement of faith. I posted the statement of faith in triplicate, which makes things a lot easier if you want to read it more than once.

The Next Odd Background Noise You Hear on Your Landline Will Probably Be Me

Last year, I was trying to Photoshop a halfway decent logo for my blog, Christian Identity Australia dot org, when I made the mortifying discovery that *Christian Identity Australia* abbreviates as CIA. For an anti-ZOG website like mine, that's not a good look.

I've been accused of many different things by some of the pro-white movement's most conscientious slanderers over the years, but working for the CIA has not been one of them. I have been accused, however, of working for the FBI, so maybe I should have called my blog Formerly British Israel.

I've also been accused of being a homosexual. This is quite a common accusation leveled at blokes who've been involved in the Christian Identity branch of the Movement for a number of years as I have. If the slanderers are to be believed, there are more poofers per square meter in CI than there are in the Village People's dressing room. What all these alleged homos are supposed to see in Christian Identity is a mystery to this alleged homo. I was under the impression that sodomites liked their meat young and tender, not old and tough. A Google image search of the term *Christian Identity* will come up with one pic after another of men with more middle-age spread than a 30-year high school reunion. Homos would be better off infiltrating Hillsong or even their local chapter of the Rosicrucians.

Please don't take that as a knock against the slanderers. They've done the hard yards. They've put in the miles. They know what they're doing. Maybe in the future, as a mark of respect for

their assiduous efforts to unite Christian Identists and improve CI's atrocious public image, I'll rename my blog Fiercely Anti Gay.

Like pretty much everybody in the Movement, I've been called a Jew on occasion. Which means I could always change the name of the blog to Just European Whites or, if I wanted to incorporate the Obie's-gay-that's-why-he-preaches-CI theory, Keen Intelligence Kills Evil Propaganda Of Objectionable Forbies.

Audio clip: Rhonda was warned!

Show rundown

Enough with the foolish jesting. In this action-packed episode, I'll be taking a melancholy trip down memory lane with the aid of a dreary Ozploitation flick. I'll be looking at the Bourke Street Massacre from an angle guaranteed to get me death threats from the panelists on *The Project*. I'll be comparing Scripture with Scripture and heretic with heretic to answer that age-old question: are we saved by grace or by obeying the law? And I'll be playing one of the top-ten Oz rock classics of all-time. Talk about a chestnut of a song.

Audio clip: "Leaps and Bounds"

Snapshot and a post-White Australia Policy Melbourne

One of the worst Australian movies ever made, *Snapshot*, was released on Blu-ray this year. *Snapshot* was an exploitation movie or Ozploitation, as we Aussies like to call them, shot, but not fatally, in Melbourne in 1979.

The 1970s saw a revival in the Aussie film industry, which had been in a vegetative state for a couple of decades. Most of the Aussie films produced in the '70s fell into one of two categories: dramas set in Australia's past, like *Mad Dog Morgan* and *The Getting of Wisdom*, and Ozploitation, like *Alvin Purple* and *Snapshot*.

Snapshot is a stillborn thriller about a model, played by Sigrid Thornton, who's stalked by a homicidal fan. As a piece of cinema, it has about as much going for it as bathroom mold. But it's not a total loss. For starters, it features a cameo appearance by Bob Brown performing songs from his classic album, *Captain Rock's Buried Treasure*. One of the songs from the album, "Home Among the Gum Trees," turned up years later in a badly mutilated form as the theme to *Burke's Backyard*. Bullamakanka, the group who performed the theme, should have got twenty-five years to life for what they did to that song. If I ever find a CD of the album, I'll play the original version on the show. I think it was released only on vinyl though.

But what, for me, makes *Snapshot* worth viewing is that it was set in Melbourne before diversity stormed in and trashed the place. It's not the only flick to have been shot here in happier, whiter days. *On the Beach* predates *Snapshot* by twenty years, but it was filmed in 1959 when I was still in my mum's tum, so I never got to experience that even whiter iteration of Melbourne.

When 1979 rolled around I was a young man of nineteen who knew the city and its predominately white demographics like the front of my bell-bottom trousers. This was five years after the White Australia Policy had been rescinded. The government was careful not to let too many non-whites, mostly Asians, into the country too soon, because it wouldn't have survived the voter backlash. It bided its time until the early 1980s when it opened the

immigration floodgates much wider. Then what had been a barely noticeable trickle became a glaring, gushing torrent. Us white Aussies, bar the usual leftists, weren't too pleased about this. None of us had voted to see Asians in every nook and cranny of our cities and suburbs, though hate crime laws and a stepping up of pro-multicultural agitprop in the mainstream media stymied our outrage.

I'm going to buy the *Snapshot* Blu-ray because, as I watch Siggy flee down the streets and laneways of inner-suburban Melbourne, I'll have a high-definition reminder of how white those suburbs were almost forty years ago and how sparsely populated they were compared to today. There were no dense forests of ugly high-rise apartment buildings teeming with Asians and Indians. Outside of a Chow shop, one rarely saw Asians, and Indians, probably my least favorite race of people, next to Jews, were an even rarer sight. I believe the expression is "my, how things have changed."

Nineteen Seventy-Nine was the last, glorious gasp of racial homogeneity for Melbourne—and Australia as a whole. I should say semi-racial homogeneity, since Australia had growing populations of Jews, Southern Italians, Greeks and "the traditional owners of the land," many of whom had produced offspring with our people. Notwithstanding, Melbourne and other Australian cities were, for the most part, still pleasingly white. White enough for the quisling spivs in government to smear with third-world feces as quickly as the political climate of the day would allow.

I feel sorry for this current crop of white Aussies. They never got to experience a white Australia and, short of Christ returning in the foreseeable future, never will. Having to go to schools crowded with Asians, Arabs, and Licorice Allsorts or work for companies where at least two-thirds of the staff are non-white is now typical for the majority of them. If it hadn't been for hate speech legislation and the multicultural yammering they're subjected to in and out of the classroom, they'd be marching on parliament to drag the creators of the rampaging, racially diverse Frankenstein Monster into the street to mete out some Hammer-Horror justice.

But there will come a tipping point for our people. When the alien influx becomes so great that they're supplanted in the workplace by non-whites, who, in a shocking turn of events, prove no less bigoted than us Nazis, preferring to hire their own kind instead of whites; and when they're harassed and discriminated against daily by a majority population that's as European as a Zulu uprising, then those of our race who've been holding out for a solution to the death of white civilization that doesn't involve divine intervention will finally realize they've been holding out in vain and call upon Yahweh to help them regain what sin caused them to lose.

I suggest that all white Aussies, but especially those who were born from, say, 1980 onwards, get a hold of some of the Australian movies or TV series of the '70s that were set in Melbourne or other Australian cities to see just what we lost and how gloriously beautiful it was. YouTube has plenty of them. Some, Alvin Purple for one, are a bit on the raunchy side, so you might want to give those a miss.

Audio clip: "Psycho Killer"

The Bourke Street Massacre

On the 20th of January this year, a racially mixed nutcase by the name of Jimmy Gargasoulas drove a car he'd stolen, at high speed, down a footpath in Bourke Street, in the heart of the Melbourne central business district. Gargasoulas, who was fleeing the police, gunned the car through the Bourke Street Mall, which is a section of Bourke Street that only trams and pedestrians are allowed to use. He did this at just after 1:00pm on a Friday, when the mall was crowded with shoppers and city workers on their lunch break. He killed six people and injured twenty-eight.

Here is a list of the dead: Matthew Si, who was of Chinese extraction, Zachary Bryant, a baby who was part Malaysian, Thalia Hakin, a young Jewish girl (good riddance), a Japanese man, whose name I don't know, Bhavita Patel, a woman of Indian extraction, and Jess Mudie, a young white woman. Out of all the people who were killed only one was white. What does this tell us about present-day Melbourne? It tells us that non-whites outnumber whites by a factor of six to one. Toto, I don't think we're in 1979 anymore.

Bear in mind that the people Gargasoulas killed were entirely random. They just happened to be on the footpath when he sped down it. So the six-to-one ratio of non-whites to whites would be fairly accurate, certainly accurate for the CBD. I visit the city of Melbourne about once a month and can tell you that it is overrun with non-whites. They are everywhere. Often I have to have a good look around just to find one or two white people. Forty years ago, it was the exact opposite. I could walk several city blocks and not see a single non-white.

The non-white-to-white ratio will of course differ from city to city and from suburb to suburb. For example, there are working-class suburbs of Melbourne, like Footscray and St. Albans, where the ratio of non-whites to whites is as high as eight to one or even higher. Then there are upper-class suburbs, like Jolimont and Ivanhoe, where the ratio is five to one, in favor of whites. But as non-whites grow more affluent and numerous, there will be a sharp decline in the number of whites in those more exclusive suburbs, and that ratio will be reversed.

All of Australia's major cities are experiencing this demographic carpet bombing, but Melbourne has been hit the hardest. Sydney isn't far behind though. And when bomber command in Canberra is done, every city and every suburb of the Great South Land will be a smoking ruin just like good old Melbourne town.

On a future edition of the show, I'll discuss how imperative it is that we abandon the multiracial deathtraps that our cities and suburbs are fast becoming for a better, safer life in the country. I'll discuss where to live and where not to live, because not all Aussie country towns are equal. Some are chockers with Muslim invaders. And it was reported recently that our government is eager to spread the racially diverse love by doling out large numbers of newly arrived non-whites to regional areas. You can bet Bangladesh to a bout of dysentery that the country towns selected will be white enough to make the average pollie break into a cold sweat.

Audio clip: "I Fought the Law and the Law Won"

Grace vs the Law vs Faith vs Works

One of the great theological questions is are we saved by grace or by obeying the law? For mainstream churchgoers the answer is clear-cut: we are saved by grace because, according to

their teachings, the law was done away with on the Cross. But if the law no longer applies to us, at least those of us who are Christians, why does Yahweh in Jeremiah 31:33 state that He will place His law in His people's hearts, and why does the Apostle Paul in Romans 2:15 confirm that this is indeed where it is? The law must be pretty darn important if Yahweh saw the need to make it a part of us, even after the Cross. Which means that (a) the law has not been done away with, and (b) we still must obey it. Moreover, Christ never said He came to abolish the law. He said He came to fulfil it (Matthew 5:17), that is, to make it complete. When something has been completed, we don't scrap it, do we? We put it to use.

Not unexpectedly, the majority view of the Christian Identity community in relation to this issue is the exact opposite of mainstream churchianity's. Some Christian Identists believe that we are saved through obedience to the law. But if salvation comes from obeying the law, what happens when we disobey it?

Obviously, to disobey the law is to sin, and I doubt that anyone in Christian Identity, even some of the theology's more *eccentric* adherents, would consider himself one-hundred percent sin free. All of us, no matter how observant we may be to keep the law, sin from time to time; it's unavoidable. It's unavoidable because the law is perfect (James 1:25) and we're not (Ecclesiastes 7:20). If we were, Yahshua would have been able to give Calvary a miss.

So if we're saved by obeying the law but disobey it on occasion, how and by what divine mechanism are we saved?

Ephesians 2:8-9 (Amplified)

8. For it is by grace [God's remarkable compassion and favor drawing you to Christ] that you have been saved [actually delivered from judgment and given eternal life] through faith. And this [salvation] is not of yourselves [not through your own effort], but it is the [undeserved, gracious] gift of God;

9. not as a result of [your] works [nor your attempts to keep the Law], so that no one will [be able to] boast *or* take credit in any way [for his salvation].

Could the Bible make it any clearer than this that we are saved by grace and not by slavishly keeping the law? That's a rhetorical question, because the only possible answer is no. And in an ideal world, one where the simplicity of Yahweh's Word is accepted with childlike faith as it ought to be rather than challenged at every turn by murmuring skepticism, the grace versus the law debate would end right there. But, alack and alas, an ideal world this is not.

For Christian Identist subscribers to the salvation-by-obeying-the-law doctrine, the solution to reconciling Ephesians 2:8-9 with verses like Matthew 5:17 is not to reconcile it but to reject it utterly—and the Apostle Paul along with it. Some people who claim they're CI even go so far as to dismiss all of Paul's writings, which make up a sizable chunk of the New Testament, on the grounds that he never learned at the feet of Yahshua and, consequently, is not a genuine apostle.

I have a suggestion for these people. Pile on weight, don't stop until your walk has become a pronounced waddle and it's physically impossible for you to cross your legs, get your barber to give you the most unflattering short-cropped haircut he can muster, bathe only once a month and if you don't reek of BO when you leave the house, go back in and try to do ten military push-ups, raid opportunity shops for the drabest, poorest-fitting clothes you can find and wear them everywhere, even to bed, buy yourself a megaphone, preferably one that emits

a deafening squeal every time you switch it on, then verbally abuse Christians, White Nationalists, and anyone remotely conservative at rallies in support of abortion, gay rights, or mass Islamic immigration, because at some point you turned into a stark raving feminist. Feminists detest Paul because he stands between them and preaching a sermon from a Church pulpit; hence, they dismiss his words as an insult to hermeneutic intelligence.

Listen carefully now: Paul *was* an Apostle. His calling was confirmed by Christ, Ananias (Acts 9:10-15), the Apostle Peter (2 Peter 3:15-16), and many anointed elders, teachers, and helpers in the early church. As further proof of this, Christ, in Revelation 2:2, commends the Church at Ephesus for being able to identify false apostles, yet Paul wrote an epistle to the Ephesians, and in chapter one, verse one refers to himself as an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God. So how come neither Christ nor the Ephesians, who could spot a false Apostle quicker than you can say "Russ Walker" didn't single out Paul as the numero uno false apostle of the day? Do you think maybe it was because he was an apostle?

Paul wrote Romans, First and Second Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, First and Second Thessalonians, First and Second Timothy, Titus, Philemon, and possibly Hebrews. The word *sin* appears in his writings—and I'm including Hebrews—a grand total of 128 times. Why would he mention sin so frequently if he believed that grace negated the law? After all, sin means transgression of the law, does it not?

Now, the anti-Paul mob might argue that he wrote of sin only in the sense that the law has been superseded by grace. Well, that theory is easily tested.

Romans 8:12

Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof.

1 Corinthians 6:18

Flee fornication. Every **sin** that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication **sinneth** against his own body.

1 Timothy 5:20

Them that **sin** rebuke before all, that others also may fear.

These verses prove that Paul believed that Christians can sin. Either he had come down with a major dose of cognitive dissonance or he recognized that Calvary had not turned the law into a museum piece.

Romans 6:14

For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace.

People who object to Paul and his supposed attempts to devalue the law cite the preceding verse as proof that he was an antinomian. But where in that or any other verse does he urge the Romans or another group of Christians to disregard the law? *Not under the law* means that they would no longer suffer its penalty because they were under Yahweh's grace. *Grace* means "His unmerited favor." What Paul was trying to get across to the Roman church was far from being a new or heretical doctrine. Salvation by grace through faith rather than by adherence to the law makes its presence felt in the Bible long before the first mention of Saul of Tarsus in the Book of Acts.

Genesis 6:8

But Noah found grace in the eyes of the LORD.

Exodus 34:9

And he [Moses] said, If now I have found grace in thy sight, O Lord, let my Lord, I pray thee, go among us; for it *is* a stiffnecked people; and pardon our iniquity and our sin, and take us for thine inheritance.

Psalm 23:3 (Amplified)

He refreshes *and* restores my life (my self); He leads me in the paths of righteousness [uprightness and right standing with Him—not for my earning it, but] for His name's sake.

It doesn't matter how watchful we are to keep Yahweh's law, we're going to sin once in a while, whether it be by omission or commission. This is because we are by default sinful beings. We weren't originally, but then Adam and Eve had to go and smear K-Y Jelly all over the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

When Yahweh laid down the law to the Israelites in the Old Testament, He had to make provision for their transgressing it. And transgress it they did with monotonous regularity. The blood of the untold numbers of bulls, sheep, goats, pigeons, and turtle doves that was shed on their behalf could have painted New York City red twice over. Yahweh expected them to sin because they, like every other member of the Adamic race, bar Adam and Eve, were born in iniquity.

Note that in Exodus 34:9 Moses pleaded with Yahweh to "pardon **our** iniquity and **our** sin." Which means that even Moses had sinned. Do the people who think we're saved by obeying the law seriously consider themselves better than Moses? If Moses sinned and needed to seek Yahweh's grace/favor/mercy/forgiveness, which he did, what do these people do when they sin? I'll take a wild guess and say they ask Yahweh to forgive them. But if they have to keep running to Him for forgiveness, how are they saved by obeying the law? They can't be saved by grace *and* the law. It has to be one or the other.

If Paul is alone in and a heretic for teaching salvation by grace, then what on earth is John doing teaching it?

1 John 1:7-8 (Amplified)

7. But if we [really] walk in the Light [that is, live each and every day in conformity with the precepts of God], as He Himself is in the Light, we have [true, unbroken] fellowship with one another [He with us, and we with Him], and the blood of Jesus His Son cleanses us from all sin [by erasing the stain of sin, keeping us cleansed from sin in all its forms and manifestations].

8. If we say we have no sin [refusing to admit that we are sinners], we delude ourselves and the truth is not in us. [His word does not live in our hearts.]

John states that if we obey Yahweh's law, we walk in the light, and that the blood of Yahshua will, as a result, cleanse us from all sin; *cleanses* is in the present tense and suggests that the cleansing process is ongoing. He characterizes those who claim they don't sin as delusional fibbers lacking the living word in their hearts.

We have what seems to be a paradox here. On the one hand, John states that if we obey Yahweh's law, we walk in the light, but on the other, states that if we obey it, the blood of Yahshua cleanses us from all sin. How can we sin if we're obeying the law? Because we can obey it only to a limited extent, not one that would give us a passing grade salvation-wise. To do that, we would have to obey it to the letter 24/7. No one but Yahshua Himself has been able to do this, and He had a terribly unfair advantage: He was Yahweh in the flesh. What hope, then, do we erring mortals have? None, and Yahweh is well aware of this, which is why He makes allowances for those of us who follow His law to the best of our very limited ability. The allowances he makes for us can be encapsulated in one word: *grace*. Every time Yahweh forgives us, has mercy upon us, or answers our prayers He is showing His grace toward us. He is gracious to us because He loves us.

The Hebrew word for *grace* is *chen*. *Chen* comes from a root word, *chanan*, which means "to bend or stoop in kindness to another as a superior to an inferior." This is essentially what Yahweh does whenever He is gracious to us. Grace is His way of giving us a break or cutting us some slack. One could liken it to a bridge He's erected that spans the enormous gulf between the law's perfection and our imperfection. Without it, there would be no way for us to cross the gulf into the promised land of eternal life.

Yahshua made it painfully obvious to the Disciples that to obey the law to a satisfactory degree—satisfactory to Yahweh—was a far harder proposition than even they had realized.

Matthew 5:27-28

27 Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery:
28 But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.

To even ponder breaking the law is tantamount to committing sin. This makes the already insurmountable problem of trying to enter the kingdom solely by obeying every jot and tittle of the Mosaic law even more insurmountable, if that were possible, for who doesn't have a sinful thought every now and then? I'm going to take another wild guess and say that even those foolhardy souls attempting to make it into the kingdom that way are unable to keep their minds entirely free of dirt.

No talk on grace and the law would be complete without discussing the crucial role that faith plays in our salvation. Ephesians 2:8 tells us that it's our faith that prompts Yahweh to bestow His grace upon us. *Faith* comes from the Greek word *pistis*, which means "assurance," "belief," and "fidelity." Each of these three definitions reflects a different aspect of faith. *Assurance* denotes confidence, as in a confident reliance on Yahweh to fulfill His Word. *Belief* denotes a mental acknowledgment that Yahweh exists. And *Fidelity* denotes faithfulness, the kind that compels us to follow Yahweh and trust in Him come hell or high water.

Hebrews 11:6

But without faith it is impossible to please him: for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.

Without faith it isn't just extremely difficult to please Yahweh, it is *impossible*. Since it's impossible, how then can we expect to please Him through observance of the law only? Although following the law is a key component of our faithfulness, it is not the be all and end

all, and never could be, because, as already discussed, we cannot be saved by obeying it. The law is simply a measure, or a benchmark, of our faith.

Galatians 6:10-12 (Amplified)

10 For all who depend on the Law [seeking justification and salvation by obedience to the Law and the observance of rituals] are under a curse; for it is written, “CURSED (condemned to destruction) IS EVERYONE WHO DOES NOT ABIDE BY ALL THINGS WRITTEN IN THE BOOK OF THE LAW, SO AS TO PRACTICE THEM.”

11 Now it is clear that no one is justified [that is, declared free of the guilt of sin and its penalty, and placed in right standing] before God by the Law, for “THE RIGHTEOUS (the just, the upright) SHALL LIVE BY FAITH.”

12 But the Law does not rest on *or* require faith [it has nothing to do with faith], but [instead, the Law] *says*, “HE WHO PRACTICES THEM [the things prescribed by the Law] SHALL LIVE BY THEM [instead of faith].”

Paul's remarks about living by faith and not the law are supported by the Old Testament.

Genesis 15:6

And he [Abraham] believed in the LORD; and he counted it to him for righteousness.

Psalms 32:1-2 (A Psalm of David, Amplified)

1 Blessed [fortunate, prosperous, favored by God] is he whose transgression is forgiven, And whose sin is covered.

2 Blessed is the man to whom the LORD does not impute wickedness, And in whose spirit there is no deceit.

Abraham, David, and Paul all obeyed Yahweh's law, but it was their faith, not their obedience to the law, that put them in right-standing with Him. David, for example, knowingly and with pre-meditation committed some grave sins, the penalty for which, under the law, was death, so he was a man who was intimately acquainted with and depended on Yahweh's mercy and forgiveness. Like all of us, David had his fair share of flaws, yet Yahweh called him a man after His own heart and the apple of His eye. Was Yahweh's glowing opinion of David a consequence of an unerring adherence to the law or a steadfast reliance on Him in the face of terrible adversity and his own glaring failings?

Hebrews 11 is known as the heroes of faith chapter of the Bible. It gives us a number of outstanding examples of Old Testament saints whose faith pleased Yahweh. Noah was faithful because he began building the ark long before a single raindrop fell (Hebrews 11:7). Sara was faithful because she believed that Yahweh would enable her to become pregnant, even though she had been through menopause (Hebrews 11:11). Moses was faithful because he chose to live an austere life among his people rather than enjoy a life of luxury as the adopted son of Pharaoh's daughter (Hebrews 11:24). None of these or the other saints mentioned in Hebrews 11 were singled out because they were sticklers for keeping the law, but because they put their trust and confidence in Yahweh when it mattered most. That's why they were righteous in His sight.

James 2:14, 18-23

14 What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? can faith save him?

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

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

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

21 Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar?

22 Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect?

23 And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the Friend of God.

The idea that we are justified by action-based faith seems to contradict Paul's statement that we are saved by grace and not by works. If we can't earn our salvation—and we can't—what do works have to do with saving grace? Perhaps a better question would be what do works have with to do with faith? A lot. Because when we truly believe in something, we act in accordance with that belief. Anything less than that is just lip service. For example, if I were to declare myself an ardent Christian Identist but never did anything to spread the word about Christian Identity, I wouldn't be much of a believer in that theology. I would be someone who was all talk and no action.

James was simply explaining that, when it comes to faith, actions speak louder than words. That's not a departure from the salvation message preached by Paul, just a nod to common sense. Does anyone honestly believe that Yahshua is coming back for a Church that does nothing but sit on its duff all day, whinging about white civilization going to the dogs? Faith may not be a verb but it's a doing word all the same. And that doing must extend beyond merely the things we think and say.

I realize that trying to see grace and the law and faith and works as a smoothly functioning unit can be somewhat tasking, but perhaps this little parable will help. Let's say I owned a large property and needed some landscape gardening done, and I hired you to do the work. But before I did I told you that if you completed the job within eight hours, I'd give you ten-thousand bucks cash in hand, but if you didn't, I wouldn't give you a single cent, and because you were desperate for money, you agreed to those difficult terms.

Come the day you were to do the landscape gardening, you rocked up bright and early and slaved like a one-man chain gang for eight hours. You stopped only to have a drink of water or to take a quick bite out of a sandwich. But, alas, when the eight hours were up, you had completed only ninety-five percent of the work. Unfortunately for you, our agreement was that you had to complete all of the work if you were to be paid.

Sweat cascading down your face, you staggered up to me as I stepped outside to inspect what you'd done, and, barely able to speak you were so spent, said, "Well, Obie, it looks like I'm not gonna get that money." I looked at the unfinished work, at you, at the unfinished work, then at you again, and said, "Oh what they heck, I'll pay you, anyway," and then greased your grateful palm with ten-thousand bucks.

This is the interpretation of the parable. I represent Yahweh. The eight-hour time limit is His law. My giving you the money despite your not having finished the job is His grace. The money is your heavenly reward. Your work ethic is faith. And the amount of labor you did is your works.

When I told you that you had to complete the job within eight hours, I knew I'd given you an impossible task. I knew that not even the fastest landscape gardener in the world could have done all the work in that time. The reason I set the time limit wasn't to scam you out of ten-thousand dollars but to ensure that once you'd put your hand to the plough you didn't turn back; and I could tell by your appearance and the amount of work you'd done that turning back had been the last thing on your mind.

As it would have been unreasonable of me to expect you to do the impossible, I showed you grace by giving you the money. But you didn't receive the money because of your works, since they fell short of my perfect standard. You received it because of your work ethic, your faith, which was demonstrated by the fact that you gave the job your all, and because I was a merciful bloke who cut you some serious slack.

Now, let's say you'd shown up late for the job, and then every time I looked out my window I saw you on your mobile phone or sitting down stuffing your face with food, so that when the eight hours were up, you'd completed only half or less of the required work. Do you think I would have shown you grace then? No, I wouldn't. Your lack of faith and its concomitant lack of works would have dissuaded me from being gracious to you, and you would have come away with nothing. No heavenly reward for you.

You see how it all fits together? The law is the impossibly high standard for obedience set by Yahweh, His grace makes up for the shortfall between its perfection and our imperfection, and our faith, which is supported and substantiated by the things we do, actuates that grace—actuates, but not earns.

A couple of final words on all this. First, being under grace is not an excuse for us to sin.

Romans 3:31(Amplified)

Do we then nullify the Law by this faith [making the Law of no effect, overthrowing it]? Certainly not! On the contrary, we confirm *and* establish *and* uphold the Law [since it convicts us all of sin, pointing to the need for salvation].

We ought to see Yahweh's grace as both a reason for us to obey the law with all our might and main and a reason for us not to beat ourselves over the head repeatedly after we've sinned, provided we have repented. If Yahweh forgives us, who are we to question Him?

And second, without Yahweh's grace, His mercy, His forgiveness, none of us will be spending eternity with Him. The Bible says that Yahweh's mercy endures forever (Psalm 136:1), but that mercy comes with a proviso. In Matthew 6:14-15, Yahshua said: *For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you: But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.*

If we want Yahweh to show us plenty of mercy, we must show plenty of it to others, others being members of our race. That mercy does not extend to race traitors or inveterate deceivers, only to people who lead a mostly decent life. If we're trusting in Yahweh, doing our best to follow His law, and serving His people rather than looking on them purely as a source of income, we can confidently expect to receive a crown of righteousness.

This is the Masters Apprentices with "Turn up Your Radio."

Audio: "Turn up Your Radio"