# CHRISTIAN ZIONISM – HOW DECEIVED CAN YOU GET?

### By Dr. Stephen E. Jones & John Tyler

Unless otherwise noted:

Scripture taken from the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD BIBLE® ("NASB")
© Copyright The Lockman Foundation 1960, 1962, 1963, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1995. Used by permission.

Published by: God's Kingdom Ministries 6201 University Ave. N.E. Fridley, MN 55432 (USA)

www.godskingdom.org

Permission is granted to freely copy and quote from this paper for non-commercial purposes.

© copyright 2024 All Rights Reserved

### **Table of Contents**

Pretace	l
Chapter 1: The Great Dispute	5
Chapter 2: Jacob's Deception	11
Chapter 3: Two Nations and Two Cities	17
Chapter 4: Justice for Esau	24
Chapter 5: Jerusalem's Fate	30
Chapter 6: Blindness	36
Chapter 7: The British and South African Factor	42
Chapter 8: The United States of America Factor	62
Chapter 9: The Palestinians	69
Chapter 10: The Gaza War	84
Chapter 11: Conclusions	94
Chapter 12: The Way Forward	96
Bibliography	103

### **Preface**

If ever there has been a time for Christians to understand the truth about Zionism and how to interpret current events as they unfold in Palestine and Israel, it is now, because so many are utterly and dangerously deceived in this regard.

However, let us at the very outset deal with the elephant in the room. For those who are not interested in seeking the truth, this paper will be immediately and ferociously branded "antisemitic". Nothing could be further from the facts.

Firstly, what is the actual meaning of the word semitic? The Oxford Dictionary defines it thus:

"Relating to or denoting a family of languages that includes Hebrew, Arabic, and Aramaic and certain ancient languages such as Phoenician and Akkadian, constituting the main subgroup of the Afro-Asiatic family. Specifically relating to the peoples who speak Semitic languages, especially Hebrew and Arabic."

So how is it that antisemitic has now become understood as anti-Jewish? Its present common day usage constitutes mere sloganeering, which can probably be ascribed to the case that Jews so ubiquitously define their identity around victimization.

Secondly, as Christians, we emphatically embrace <u>all</u> peoples of the world, for every human that draws breath on this planet, is a child of God, created in His image and wholeheartedly the object of His love. Our unequivocal duty is thus to love others as we love ourselves. And treat all as equals. Some of course reject this reality, which decision we respect, and, in such instances, we simply move on.

So, we are neither anti-Jewish nor pro-Palestinian. What we are, is anti-anything and anybody that undermines God's understandings and plans for His creation and pro-anything and anybody that aligns with God's understandings and plans for His creation – most of humanity sadly however have no grasp of these understandings and plans!

With that out of the way, lets introduce **Zionism**, generally understood to be a nationalist movement for the re-establishment of a

Jewish nation in Palestine (originally) and (now) the development and protection of what is today called "Israel".

Most people think that Zionism originated in the late 1800's with Herzl's First Zionist Congress.

Theodor Herzl (born 2<sup>nd</sup> May 1860, died 3rd July 1904) was an Austro-Hungarian Jewish journalist / political activist, who today is considered to be the father of modern political Zionism. Herzl formed the so called "Zionist Organization," together with vigorously promoting Jewish immigration to Palestine in an effort to catalyze a Jewish state.

Herzl reached the conclusion that pervasive anti-Jewish sentiment would make Jewish assimilation impossible and thus the only solution for Jews, was the establishment of a Jewish state. In 1896, Herzl published the pamphlet *Der Judenstaat*, in which he elaborated his vision of a Jewish homeland. His ideas soon attracted international attention and rapidly established Herzl as a major figure in the Jewish world.

In 1897, Herzl convened the "First Zionist Congress" in Basel, Switzerland, and was elected president of the Zionist Organization at this congress. He thereafter began a series of diplomatic initiatives to lobby support for a Jewish state, appealing unsuccessfully to German emperor Wilhelm II and then Ottoman sultan Abdul Hamid II. At the Sixth Zionist Congress in 1903, Herzl presented the so called "Uganda Scheme," endorsed by none other than the Colonial Secretary Joseph Chamberlain on behalf of the British government.

The proposal, which sought to create a temporary refuge for Jews in the then British East Africa following the Kishinev (modern day Chisinau, the capital of the Republic of Moldova) pogrom (an organized massacre of a particular ethnic group, in particular that of Jewish people in Russia or eastern Europe in the late 19th and early 20th centuries), was however met with strong opposition and ultimately rejected. Herzl died of a heart ailment in 1904 at the age of 44 and was buried in Vienna. In 1949, his remains were brought to Israel and reinterred on Mount Herzl.

Zionism, however, <u>properly</u> begins with the dispute between twin brothers, Jacob and Esau (born circa BC 1836), some 3859 years ago. Esau, being the oldest, had first claim to the birthright, which included

the title deed to the land of Canaan (as it was called at the time), later Palestine, and more recently known as "Israel".

Yet Jacob too had a claim, based on a prophecy given while their mother was yet pregnant. The twins appeared to fight even in the womb, and so their mother inquired of the Lord to know the reason. We read in Genesis 25:23:

The Lord said to her, "Two nations are in your womb; and two peoples will be separated from your body; and one people shall be stronger than the other; and the older shall serve the younger."

The acrimonious rivalry between the two thus began before they were even born, giving rise to dynamics that would affect the "two nations" throughout their history, till present times in fact.

Zionism, from a Scriptural perspective (which of course is the actual truth), is therefore a dispute over a birthright, which included the title deed to Palestine. Unfortunately, most people who read the story in Genesis remain ignorant of Scriptural law and therefore do not understand the legal consequences of the boys' actions. To compound the problem, most people also fail to study the history of Esau, whose nickname, Edom ("Red") became the formal name of the nation he founded

It is vital in these times, to address Christians globally regarding this original dispute. There are many (Evangelical and Pentecostal in particular) Christians, that believe in a "Godly imperative" to support the cause of the "Jews," the "State of Israel," and the "peace of Jerusalem" – indeed one could go so far as calling these believers, "Christian Zionists", fully persuaded of the "prophetic reinstatement of Israel." Tragically they have adopted one of the greatest deceptions of human history, and in so doing, propagate falsehoods which are seriously damaging to the Kingdom of God and themselves.

Whilst Christian Zionists are dispersed around the globe, they are arguably at their most forceful in the United States of America. In the latter country, their stubborn commitment to "Israel" in general, in no small part contributes to the official stance of the U.S. Government towards the state, namely unwavering and generally unqualified support – literally constituting a lifeline to "Israel". Consider:

- "Israel" would never have been founded in the first instance without U.S. financial and diplomatic support;
- The U.S. has given approximately USD 160 billion to "Israel" in aid since World War II and even now is in the process of arranging a further USD 14 billion package;
- The U.S. runs political interference on behalf of "Israel" at the U.N. Security Council, with the U.S. delegation often being the only one standing in the way of various resolutions;
- "Israel" actively sponsors legislation to ban boycotts against it within the U.S., promoting laws to ensure that strong action is taken against whoever tries to boycott "Israel." Just imagine a foreign government attempting to silence the free speech of U.S. citizens;
- "Israel's" proxy groups, like the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), push regimes to stifle anti-"Israeli" speech under the guise of fighting antisemitism;
- Pro-"Israel" lobbying groups like AIPAC (<a href="https://www.aipac.org/">https://www.aipac.org/</a>), expend tens of millions of dollars on national-level campaigns, each U.S. selection cycle;
- The U.S. brokers normalization agreements between Israel and other regional powers (Saudi Arabia for example), expending precious U.S. political capital in the process and often also involving significant concessions to these nations;
- The U.S. would never extend this level of support to any other nation on planet earth, but Israel, even in consideration of its most stalwart allies over the years.

Israel and the U.S. are undeniably joined at the hip, both as ignorant (or defiant) as the other, regarding the truth about Zionism. How incredibly dangerous – <u>for they are in fact both fighting God Himself and will suffer the inevitable consequences, jointly and severally.</u>

Let no role player, stakeholder or affected party (particularly folk who are presently living in "Israel" right now, whether in so called occupied or unoccupied territory) say that they were not warned!

## Chapter 1 The Great Dispute

Both "Israelis" and Palestinians generally believe that the ancient land of Canaan belongs to them. The average person today knows little (if anything at all) about the origin of this dispute, which surfaced again over a century ago. However, world leaders are well informed about the matter, and they choose sides accordingly.

Non-Christians, whose views are based largely on principles of justice, see the "Israeli" state as the perpetrator of a great injustice to the Palestinians, who were displaced from their homes where they had lived for centuries. Christians usually take a more simplistic view, interpreting Scripture to say that God gave the land to the Jews. Combined with their "Old Covenant" perspective, they are completely indifferent regarding the Palestinian people (even the Christian Palestinians) and thus display their catastrophic ignorance.

The issue really distils to who has the right to claim the land. This question is deeply complex because there are so many Scriptural and historical misunderstandings involved, not least of which, where does it all begin? With the Canaanites in the days of Joshua? With the Muslim conquest in the 7<sup>th</sup> century A.D.? With the Balfour Declaration in 1917? With the UN resolution in 1947? With the establishment of the "Israeli" state in 1948?

In 2023, the war in Gaza brought this question to a volcanic head. To understand the problem, we need to align with all relevant Scriptural prophecies, as well as the laws undergirding these prophecies. The law is not only a moral document but also prophetic.

It is not possible to resolve the Israel-Palestine dilemma today, without knowing the history of Esau-Edom. The true origin of the controversy began with Jacob and Esau, brothers who each claimed a birthright and thus the right to own the land of Canaan.

### The Controversy of Zion

Isaiah 34 is a prophecy of judgment upon Edom. (Esau's nickname was Edom, "Red," as we see from Gen. 36:1). So, we read in Isaiah 34:8 & 9 (King James Version):

### For it is the day of the Lord's vengeance, and the year of recompenses for the controversy of Zion.

The NASB renders the last phrase, "the cause of Zion." The Hebrew word is reeb, "strife, controversy, dispute." The root word (a verb) means "to conduct a legal case or suit." So, this is a prophecy about a legal case in the divine court, where God issues a formal ruling and we see the results thereof in earthly events. Isaiah 34:9 & 10 foretells the outcomes of His verdict:

Its streams will be turned into pitch, and its loose earth into brimstone [sulfur], and its land will become burning pitch. It will not be quenched night or day; its smoke will go up forever [olam, "indefinitely"], from generation to generation it will be desolate; none will pass through it forever and ever [netsakh, "continually"].

We learn from this that Edom was to be judged with fire and brimstone, reminiscent of the divine judgment upon Sodom and Gomorrah. Isaiah lacked the technical terminology or insight to describe a nuclear explosion, but it appears that this is what he was relating. Obviously, such an event has yet to occur, showing that God's judgment upon Edom is reserved for *the end of the age*.

When Judah conquered Edom in 126 B.C., nothing matching Isaiah's pronouncement occurred. The conquered Edomites merely converted to Judaism and, as Josephus puts it, "they were hereafter no other than Jews" (*Antiquities of the Jews*, XIII, ix, 1). The New Standard Jewish Encyclopedia (1970 edition) tells us:

"The Edomites were conquered by John Hyrcanus who forcibly converted them to Judaism, and from then on they constituted a part of the Jewish people" (p. 587).

The Jewish Encyclopedia (1903 edition) tells us:

"From this time the Idumeans ceased to be a separate people, though the name 'Idumea' still existed (in) the time of Jerome" (5<sup>th</sup> century).

The conquest and absorption of Edom/Idumea into Judah is beyond dispute. No credible historian has ever denied this history. Hence, the nation once known as Edom (or Idumea in Greek) ceased to exist forever, although the people themselves survived. For the next

century, men still referred to them as the Idumean branch of Jewry, but after the Roman war, the name gradually died out, and people stopped distinguishing Idumeans from Jews.

The Jewish Encyclopedia, 1925 edition, tells us bluntly:

"Edom is in modern Jewry" (Vol. 5, p. 41).

The significance of this, from a Scriptural standpoint, is that this merger between Judah and Edom means that Jewry now has <u>two</u> sets of prophecies to fulfill. We should add that if the Edomites had been truly converted to God in their hearts by faith, they would have become citizens of the Kingdom. But forcible conversion only incarcerates people in a religion.

In this case, the Edomites received fleshly circumcision, but not heart circumcision. Heart circumcision is the only type of circumcision that has any value to God (Rom. 2:28, 29), and it raises people to a relationship that **supersedes genealogy**. For this reason, any Jew or Edomite who receives heart circumcision is no longer a Jew or an Edomite but is part of the "one new man" (Eph. 2:15) that God is creating in the earth. In God's Kingdom, Paul says, "there is neither Jew nor Greek" (Gal. 3:28), nor is anyone known as an Edomite. All are given new identities and equal citizenship status.

#### Who is a Jew?

The carnal (physical) Edomites were absorbed into Jewry, which itself later rejected Jesus as the Christ (John 1:11), along with His New Covenant heart circumcision. Only a few accepted Jesus Christ as the King of Judah, and these, Paul says, <u>are the real members of the tribe of Judah whom God recognizes</u> (Rom. 2:29; Phil. 3:3).

For this reason, there was a division in Judah between followers of Christ and those who rejected Him. Each group claimed the Dominion Mandate given to Judah in Gen. 49:10. Each claimed to be the heir of the promise. The carnal side, claiming a genealogical connection to Judah, the patriarch, was by far the largest group, but the followers of Jesus were united with the rightful King of Judah, who alone could claim the Dominion Mandate. With the King went the tribe itself, regardless of numbers. One cannot claim to be of the tribe of Judah while rejecting the legitimate King of that tribe.

So, while the Judah-Edom nation in the first century and onward, which rejected King Jesus, continued to be recognized by men as "Jews," God recognized only those with circumcision of the heart, and not in any sense of ethnicity. The church (ecclesia) did not replace the Jews; the church was, in fact, Judah from the start, because they are the only ones who "praise" God in an acceptable manner (*Judah* means "praise"). That is the point of Paul's teaching in Rom. 2:29, saying:

"his praise is not from men, but from God."

<u>In other words, a person's status in the tribe of Judah is not based on recognition from men, but whom God recognizes.</u>

### **Equality under the Law**

To the tribe of Judah many from other ethnic groups were added as they were united to the King by faith. Their right to join the tribe by faith was established from the beginning (Isaiah 56:6-8). The carnal Jews themselves, who based their status on genealogy, built a dividing wall on the temple grounds to keep proselytes (and women) at a distance from God. This was unlawful, for we read in Num. 15:15, 16:

As for the assembly, there shall be one statute for you and for the alien who sojourns with you, a perpetual statute throughout your generations; as you are, so shall the alien be before the Lord. There is to be one law and one ordinance for you and for the alien who sojourns with you.

Regarding observance of the Passover, Exodus 12:49 adds:

The same law shall apply to the native as to the stranger who sojourns among you.

Likewise, the feasts of the Lord were to be kept by all, including foreigners. The Feast of Weeks (i.e., Pentecost) was to be observed by foreigners (Deut. 16:10, 11), as was the Feast of Booths, or Tabernacles (Deut. 16:13, 14). None were excluded.

There were many foreigners who left Egypt with the Israelites under Moses. For this reason, King Jesus "broke down the barrier of the dividing wall" (Eph. 2:14) to re-establish unity and equal justice in the Kingdom. The idea of a "chosen people" based on their genealogy is not Scriptural, for it creates two unequal classes of citizens and gives the flesh dominance over faith.

Hence, those who desire to establish the Kingdom will fall short of the glory of God if they do not recognize this law of God and the work of King Jesus in demolishing the dividing wall. God is working with "one new man"- not with two men who are unequal.

This was one of the major disputes that arose when Jesus Christ came to claim His throne rights in the first century. His rights were contested by the religious leaders of the day, and so for the past 2,000 years this issue has remained unresolved, awaiting a final verdict from heaven.

The argument was described in one of Jesus' parables in Luke 19:12-27, where we see how "a nobleman [Christ] went to a distant country [heaven] to receive a kingdom for himself and then return." We read in verse 14:

### But his citizens hated him and sent a delegation after him, saying, "We do not want this man to reign over us."

When the nobleman returned, He rewarded those who supported His claim to the throne. But as for those who opposed Him, we read in verse 27:

### But these enemies of mine, who did not want me to reign over them, bring them here and slay them in my presence.

In other words, the dispute over the Messiah will be resolved at the time of Christ's second coming. Those who rejected Christ were said to be brought back "here" (i.e., to Jerusalem), for judgment. This too has been fulfilled through Zionism.

We now live in the end time when this is being accomplished. Zionism has provided the motive to bring Christ's **enemies** back to the old land to be judged for opposing His claim as the rightful King of Judah. So, while Zionism is a violation of God's will (in that it treats people unequally), it is all part of God's plan.

The "Israeli" state was given 76 years in which to repent and avoid divine judgment. As of November 29, 2023, it was 76 years since UN Resolution 181, which legally established the so called "two-state solution". The importance of a 76-year cycle in prophecy is a detailed and complex subject of its own, beyond the scope of this document.

Suffice to say that the "Israeli" state, representing Esau-Edom, has been given its 76 years in which to prove itself worthy or not of the birthright and to hold the birthright name, *Israel*. However, only a few individuals have repented (and these, no doubt, will be spared), but the majority have been brought back to the old land **to represent Edom** in its divine judgment.

Make no mistake about this whatsoever – who men call Jews or Zionists (those who spurned and continue to spurn King Jesus, to the extent of arranging his very cruel murder), are actually God's **enemies.** WAKE UP church! Your misguided support of "Israel" is nothing less than treason! What more does "Israel" have to do to prove that they are not worthy of the birthright? If nothing else, recent times have evidenced it unequivocally! Don't presume the only place with rubble will be in Gaza – a greater quantity will lie in your mind and conscience in time to come.

### Chapter 2 Jacob's Deception

Those who believe that the Bible is the Word of God understand that God is the Creator who owns all that He created. The so-called "Holy Land" is not the only piece of real estate that God owns. He is "the God of the whole earth" (Isaiah 54:5). What made the land of Canaan special was its significance as a prophetic type of all nations that would be God's inheritance at the end of the age. There is therefore no such place as a "Holy Land" – all nations will be His inheritance, making a mockery of the misplaced emphasis accorded to Canaan ("Israel") today.

Many religions teach that their path is the right one and believe that God favors the adherents of their religion. For Jews, this means God will give Jews dominion over the earth. The Talmud claims that every Jew will have 2800 (gentile) slaves. Even Christians tend to agree that God has "chosen" the Jews to rule the earth, based upon their genealogy. However, Christians also believe that they themselves will "reign with Christ" (Rev. 20:4), based on their faith. This is a clear case of **cognitive dissonance**. How can both Christians and non-believing Jews be "chosen" to rule?

In 2 Cor. 6:14 & 15 Paul writes:

Do not be bound together with unbelievers; for what partnership have righteousness and lawlessness, or what fellowship has light with darkness? Or what harmony has Christ with Belial, or what has a believer in common with an unbeliever?

All unbelievers should be treated with the greatest of respect and kindness in as much as is possible. But to honor Jews in particular is not only questionable, but also insulting to mankind at large. To assign them Kingdom authority based on a supposed last-minute confession of faith at the end of the age, <u>completely contradicts the Scriptural concept of an overcomer who endures to the end</u>.

The Kingdom of God, nonetheless, sets forth equality and <u>forbids</u> the notion that one's genealogy makes one "chosen." The Apostle Paul makes it abundantly clear in Romans 11 that in the days of Elijah, the only "chosen" ones in Israel were a remnant of 7,000 men (Rom.

11:4, 7). He says that the nation of Israel sought to obtain the promise of God, but only a small remnant obtained it. Genealogy was never the issue. Their faith was the determining factor, and the same is true with other ethnicities. It is faith – not biology – that is counted as righteousness. This is true for all peoples.

### The Birthright

In the great sibling rivalry between Jacob and Esau, we find that they were twins, but that Esau was born first. Hence, the law gave Esau precedence over Jacob, even though prophecy asserted – even before they were born – that Jacob was God's choice to receive the birthright (Rom. 9:11). So, we read in Gen. 25:23:

### "the older shall serve the younger."

That is, Esau was to be subordinate to Jacob.

In the story, their father Isaac got old and blind and believed that he might not live much longer. So, he decided to bless Esau with the birthright, appearing to have forgotten the earlier prophecy. But the law of God protects the oldest son's right. The law of the hated son in Deut. 21:15-17) specified that no man could deny the right of the firstborn—unless that firstborn son first proved himself to be unworthy.

For example, Reuben was Jacob's oldest son:

### "but because he defiled his father's bed, his birthright was given to the sons of Joseph" (1 Chron. 5:1).

There was no law that said the birthright had to be passed down to the next oldest son. Hence, Jacob's 11<sup>th</sup> son (Joseph) was given the birthright.

1 Chron. 5:2 says:

### Though Judah prevailed over his brothers, and from him came the leader, yet the birthright belonged to Joseph.

At that time, Isaac had no lawful cause to strip Esau of the birthright in favor of Jacob. If Isaac had waited a bit longer, the situation would have changed, and at that point he would have given the birthright to Jacob without violating the law.

As it turned out, Jacob used deception to take advantage of his blind father by pretending to be Esau. In this way, he essentially stole the birthright by lying to his father. Gen. 27:18,19 & 24 says:

Then he [Jacob] came to his father and said, "My father." And he said, "Here I am. Who are you, my son?" Jacob said to his father, "I am Esau your firstborn..." And he [Isaac] said, "Are you really my son Esau?" And he said, "I am."

No doubt Jacob justified his lie by claiming the prophecy given before he was born. He thought his father was about to thwart the prophetic promise of God. But the fact is, he lacked the faith to believe that God was able to fulfill His word without his help. Hence, he fulfilled the prophecy inherent in his own name, *Jacob*, which means a deceiver or usurper.

Jacob was certainly a *believer* at the time, and he enjoyed a level of faith. God often spoke to him over the years. However, he did not truly believe that God was able to fulfill His word without human help. God had to train him for many years until his faith was perfected. When he finally understood the sovereignty of God, he then received a new name, *Israel*, "God rules."

Hebrew names ending in "-el" (God) show God doing the action. Hence, Israel does not mean that Jacob was "ruling with God," as is commonly believed. It means that *God rules*. Jacob-Israel then became a living testimony to this great truth of the **sovereignty of God**.

#### Who is an Israelite?

Jacob received his new name in his 98<sup>th</sup> year. He had lived two Jubilee cycles of 49 years each. He would live another 49 years and die when he was 147. So, two-thirds of his life he lived as Jacob, the deceiver. God chose not to give him the birthright name *Israel* until his faith was perfected and he lost all confidence in the flesh (Phil. 3:3).

Israel is a title/name given to those whose faith is perfected in the same manner. Jacob was not born an Israelite. <u>In the eyes of God, neither is anyone else</u>. One may, of course, refer to Israelites by a lesser definition (a descendant of Jacob-Israel), but God has set a higher standard for those that He Himself calls an Israelite.

For example, we read in John 1:47:

### Jesus saw Nathanael coming to Him, and said of him, "Behold, an Israelite indeed, in whom there is no deceit!"

Many people thought they were Israelites, but Jesus recognized that Nathanael was "an Israelite INDEED" in contrast to being a Jacobite (deceiver). Jesus Himself made this distinction and thereby suggested a deeper truth about who is really an Israelite and who is not. Jesus recognized that Nathanael's faith was of a higher quality than that of His other disciples. Hence, he was truly an Israelite by the highest definition of the term.

### The National Judgment upon Israel and Judah

Moses told the nation of Israel in Leviticus 26 that if they would be obedient to His laws (as they had sworn to follow in Exodus 19:8), God would bless them (Lev. 26:3). But if they were disobedient, God would bring judgment upon them (Lev. 26:14). If the people were to persist in disobedience to His laws, <u>God vowed to expel them from the land</u> and to put them under the authority of wicked men to teach them the horrors of unrighteous rulers.

In fact, God said that He would expel them in the same manner that He had expelled the Canaanites, *and for the same reason*. Deut. 8:20 says:

Like the nations that the Lord makes to perish before you, so you shall perish; because you would not listen to the voice of the Lord your God.

God stated clearly in Lev. 26:21-24:

If then, you act with hostility against Me and are unwilling to obey Me, I will increase the plague on you seven times according to your sins... And if by these things you are not turned to Me, but act with hostility against Me, then I will act with hostility against you; and I, even I, will strike you seven times for your sins.

Again, God said in Lev. 26:32 & 33:

I will make the land desolate so that your enemies who settle in it will be appalled over it. You, however, I will scatter among the nations and will draw out a sword after

### you, as your land becomes desolate and your cities become waste.

The solution, of course, is repentance and to agree that God was righteous in His judgments. They would have to cease from their hostility against God and His law, before being allowed to return. Lev. 26:40-42 says:

If they confess their iniquity and the iniquity of their forefathers, in their unfaithfulness which they committed against me, and also in their acting with hostility against Me—I also was acting with hostility against them, to bring them into the land of their enemies—or if their uncircumcised heart becomes humbled so that they then make amends for their iniquity, then I will remember My covenant with Jacob, and I will remember also My covenant with Isaac, and My covenant with Abraham as well, and I will remember the land.

Some centuries later, God's judgments reached a climax when God expelled the 10 tribes of the northern House of Israel (745-721 B.C.) and sent them as captives to Assyria (2 Kings 17:6). They never returned.

About 120 years later, the Babylonians conquered Assyria (612-607 B.C.) and soon thereafter, the Babylonians captured Jerusalem (604 B.C.) and took the southern House of Judah captive to Babylon. Thus fulfilled the judgment of the law in Leviticus 26. Judah, however, was allowed to return after a 70-year captivity, because the Babylonian Empire lasted just 70 years until 537 B.C. It fell to the Persian army, led by King Cyrus the Persian and his father-in-law, Darius, the king of Media.

Darius was put in charge for the next three years (Dan. 5:31) while Cyrus continued with his conquests. When Cyrus finally returned to rule his kingdom personally, Darius returned to Media, and Cyrus issued his famous edict in 534 B.C., allowing the people of Judah to return to the old land. Judah remained under Persian rule for about two centuries, ending when the Grecian Empire under Alexander the Great conquered Persia and assumed power over Judah as well.

The Greek rulers were eventually replaced by the Romans in 63 B.C., and so Jesus was born during the Roman era. Daniel had

prophesied of these four "beast" empires rising in succession. God had raised up all of them as part of the prophesied judgment upon the land for their "hostility" against God.

When Jesus came on the scene, the people had the opportunity to show that they were no longer hostile to God. They were given opportunity to treat the One whom God had sent with respect and to receive Him as the Messiah-King. Had they done so, they would have received the truth, and the truth would have made them free (John 8:32).

Yet they "did not receive Him" (John 1:11), and so they remained under the dominion of Rome.

Later, in trying to set themselves free by force, without first repenting, they only made their situation worse. Rome destroyed Jerusalem and its temple and scattered the Jews throughout many nations. Jesus foretold this in Matthew 24. His parable in Matt. 22:1-14 illustrated how the Jews had rejected His "invitation." Verse 7 tells us the result of refusing His invitation:

But the king [God] was enraged, and he sent his [Roman] armies and destroyed those murderers and set their city [Jerusalem] on fire.

The city was later rebuilt and exists to this day, awaiting its final destruction according to the prophecy of Jer. 19:10 & 11:

Then you [Jeremiah] are to break the jar in the sight of the men who accompany you and say to them, "Just so will I break this people and this city, even as one breaks a potter's vessel, which cannot again be repaired..."

Jerusalem was destroyed by the Babylonian army in 586 B.C. and again by the Romans in 70 A.D. But each time, it was "*repaired*." Hence, there remains a final fulfillment of this prophecy in the future.

In view of the recent war in Gaza (October 2023), we ponder if this will eventually lead to the fulfillment of Jeremiah's prophecy. Time will tell.

Furthermore, the question yet remains as to whether the "Israelis" will repent and fulfill the requirement in Lev. 26:40-42?

Many Christians believe that they will repent and will then accept Jesus as the Messiah. However, Jeremiah 19 says nothing of such repentance, but we know that God is always moved by repentance. So, is this a possibility, or is Jeremiah's prophecy set in stone? We shall answer this question in Chapter 11 – Conclusions.

## Chapter 3 Two Nations, Two Cities

Israel was originally just one man named *Jacob*. The term was later extended to his household—not just his sons but his entire village/city. Recall that Abraham himself, two generations earlier, had 318 men born in his house who were of military age, and these were sent to rescue his nephew, Lot. Gen. 14:14 says:

When Abram heard that his relative had been taken captive, he led out his trained men, born in his house, three hundred and eighteen, and went in pursuit as far as Dan.

If we include their families (women, children, and older men), Abraham's "household of faith" (Gal. 6:10) must have numbered at least 2,000 people. None of them were descendants of Abraham but were Abraham's seed by faith alone.

Two generations later, Jacob-Israel moved to Egypt at the invitation of Joseph. Gen. 46:1 says that "Israel set out with all that he had" and "took their livestock and their property" (Gen. 46:6). It is not likely that he left the herdsmen in Canaan. If there were about two thousand people in the early days of Abraham's sojourn, how many were there two generations later in the time of Jacob? A minimum of ten thousand perhaps?

These went to Egypt with Jacob, though only his immediate family ("from the loins of Jacob") was numbered in Exodus 1:5. By the time they left Egypt under Moses, they numbered about six million. Most of these Israelites were not directly descended from Jacob-Israel. Jacob's sons were the leaders of the tribes, but most of the Israelite tribes were not actual family members. They were of the household of faith and therefore they could be called *Israelites*.

In other words, <u>Israel had become a nation of an unknown</u> <u>number of ethnicities</u>, and Israel is often referred to as a nation. Many years later, Isaiah tells us that foreigners were welcome to join the nation of Israel (Isaiah 56:6) as equal citizens of the Kingdom. Their status is clarified further in the New Testament, especially through the ministry of the apostle Paul with his teaching on "one new man."

The modern notion that one is an Israelite only if he can trace his genealogy back to Abraham or Israel has **no Scriptural foundation whatsoever**. The term is **national**, **not racial**.

### Confusing Israel and Judah

### One of the most egregious mistakes that Christian Zionists make, is by confusing Israel with Judah.

After the death of Solomon and a dispute over high taxes without representation, ten of the tribes refused to recognize Solomon's son, Rehoboam, as their king (1 Kings 12:16). The kingdom was divided, and this created a problem. Which group had the legal right to retain the name *Israel*? Jacob had given his name *Israel* to the sons of Joseph (Gen. 48:16). These became the heads of the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh, both of which revolted against Rehoboam after Solomon's death. So, the northern tribes retained the name *Israel*. The remaining two tribes had to pick an alternative name, settling upon the name of the dominant tribe, *Judah*.

Only those in unity with the sons of Joseph could call themselves Israelites from that point forward, and all the prophets reflected this. The modern term, Jew, is short for Judah. When the nation was divided, the Jews were no longer (national) Israelites. It is only when the prophets spoke of a future reunification that the Jews could be termed Israelites.

Yet when the Assyrians conquered Israel and deported them to Halah, Habor, and by the river Gozan (2 Kings 17:6), never to return to the old land, the Jews increasingly began to think that they had replaced the Israelites in the matter of the birthright. After all, God had *divorced* the house of Israel (Jer. 3:8; Hosea 2:2). But Judah could not replace Israel, because there are numerous prophecies of Israel's restoration and remarriage—most notably in Hosea 2:19:

### I will betroth you [Israel] to Me in faithfulness. Then you will know the Lord.

This prophecy was not about Judah but about Israel. In fact, Hosea's unfaithful wife, Gomer, played an active role in the prophecy, because the Assyrians knew Israel by the name *Gomer* (i.e., Gomri, Gimirri, or Beth-Ghomri). Hence, Hosea was prophesying about Israel while his unfaithful wife was a prophetic pattern of unfaithful Israel in real life.

#### Dr. A. Neubauer wrote in 1888:

"The captives of Israel exiled beyond the Euphrates did not return as a whole to Palestine along with their brethren the captives of Judah; at least there is no mention of this event in the documents at our disposal" (The Jewish Quarterly Review, 1888, Vol. 1).

The first-century Jewish historian, Josephus, wrote this about them:

"Wherefore there are but two tribes in Asia and Europe subject to the Romans; while the ten tribes are beyond Euphrates till now; and are an immense multitude, and not to be estimated by numbers" (Antiquities of the Jews, XI, v, 2).

The Israelites were still identifiable during the first century, but they lived hundreds of miles north of the land of Judah. We get the impression that their population far exceeded that of the Jews in the land of Judea, although they were known officially by other names. This tended to hide their identity.

Much could be said about this, but the point is that the Jews and Israelites were/are not the same people, though in modern times the Jewish state has taken for itself the name "Israel" without first being reunited with the tribes of Joseph.

As we have seen already, a good example of such misidentification can be seen in church expositions of Jer. 18:1-10 regarding the Potter and the clay. The passage is about the House of Israel (Jer. 18:6), pictured as wet clay that was marred in the hand of the Potter. The Potter beat down the jar and remade it into a new vessel, prophesying how God would eventually reconstitute the nation of Israel.

Modern Christian Zionists incorrectly point to the Jewish state as the fulfillment of this prophecy. They fail to take note that the prophet gave a second prophecy about Judah and Jerusalem.

Jer. 18:11 to the end of chapter 19 is the parallel prophecy that applies to Judah and Jerusalem. This is the prophecy that Christian Zionists exclude from its application to the modern Jewish state. After issuing a prophetic judgment upon Judah and Jerusalem,

Jeremiah the prophet was instructed by God to smash the jar in the valley of Ben-hinnom (Jer. 19:10 & 11).

This valley outside of Jerusalem was known in Greek as *Gehenna* and became a prophetic term illustrating the fate of Jerusalem. The jar itself was irreparable.

This is the real fate of Jerusalem. <u>The wet clay of the House of</u> Israel is NOT the present Jewish state which men call "Israel."

#### Two Jerusalems

The Hebrew word for Jerusalem is Y*erushalayim*. It literally means two Jerusalems. The ending, -*ayim* is a <u>dual</u>. They also have another ending -*im*, which makes a word <u>plural</u> (more than one).

The Old Testament prophets never explain the distinction between the two Jerusalems. One must study Galatians 4 or Revelation 21 to distinguish between the two cities. John in particular quotes Isaiah's description of the restored Jerusalem but applies it to the New Jerusalem.

Zechariah is probably the most difficult to understand. He moves seamlessly from the earthly city to the heavenly city. As a rule, when the prophets speak of Jerusalem as a wicked city, it is speaking of the earthly city which attracts divine judgment; when they speak in terms of glory and restoration, it is speaking of the heavenly city.

We would not expect Jews to agree with this, of course, even though the ancient rabbis debated the question of why Jerusalem carried the dual ending, -ayim. The distinctions are unclear until the New Testament reveals this. Christians, however, have no excuse for their ignorance, seeing that they claim to have New Testament understanding.

The underlying principle behind this is seen also in the fact that our "old man," carnal in nature, must die to make way for the "new man" to be raised in glory. God is not going to save the "old man." He has already sentenced him to death, and this will not change. Salvation is about being begotten by the Spirit, which creates a "new man," or a new creature, something distinct from the old man that was begotten physically by our fathers.

So also, it is with the two Jerusalems. The old has been sentenced to death; the New Jerusalem has replaced the old city.

### The Cursed Fig Tree

Matthew 21:18 & 19 reads:

Now in the morning, when He was returning to the city [Jerusalem], He became hungry. Seeing a lone fig tree by the road, He came to it and found nothing on it except leaves only; and He said to it, "No longer shall there ever be any fruit from you." And at once the fig tree withered.

Jesus had been looking for fruit on the "fig tree" of Judah during His entire ministry (Luke 13:6-9). He found "leaves only," which are no substitute for fruit. One cannot eat fig leaves. In fact, fig leaves have been a problem since Adam (Gen. 3:7). Fig leaves represent a false covering for sin and shame. It is self-justification that carries no legal weight in the divine court. In a later dispensation though, leaves will "heal" the nations (See Revelation 22).

The nature of Jesus' curse indicated that the Judah fig tree would *never* bring forth fruit. Yet later, Jesus prophesied that this fig tree would indeed return to life. Matt. 24:32 & 33 says:

Now learn the parable from the fig tree; when its branch has already become tender and <u>puts forth its leaves</u>, you know that summer is near. So, you too, when you see all these things, recognize that He is near, right at the door.

It is almost universally recognized in the church that the Jewish state, founded in 1948, fulfills this prophecy. Agreed. It has indeed come back to life. But the question is whether this tree will bear fruit or just *more leaves*—which occasioned Jesus' curse in the beginning.

There are individuals who surely bear fruit in Jerusalem, but as a nation represented by the fig tree, Jesus' prophecies give no indication that it would bear fruit. In other words, Jerusalem and the Israeli state as a whole, will not repent and turn to Christ. In fact, if the city and the "Israeli" state itself were to repent, the case could be made that Jesus prophesied falsely!

#### Cast Out the Bondwoman

Paul tells us in Gal. 4:22-26 that Abraham had two wives, a bondwoman, and a free woman. The bondwoman he identifies as the

earthly Jerusalem; the free woman is the heavenly city. The children of the bondwoman are the unbelieving Jews, <u>along with all who consider the earthly city to be the "mother church."</u> These are called children of the flesh (Gal. 4:29), that is, people who were born of earthly parents in a natural way. But we, as believers, have a different mother, called "the Jerusalem above... our mother" (Gal. 4:26).

Paul's conclusion, quoted from Gen. 21:10, is given in Gal. 4:30:

But what does the Scripture say? "Cast out the bondwoman and her son; for the son of the bondwoman shall not be an heir with the son of the free woman."

Christian Zionists continue to petition God for Jerusalem and the "Israeli" state to be the heir of the birthright. They cite Psalm 122:6, "*Pray for the peace of Jerusalem*," without asking themselves, **which Jerusalem**?

The name of the city is derived from the Hebrew word *shalom*, "peace." Hence, to pray for the peace of Jerusalem is to pray that the city will fulfill the calling inherent in its name. But the prophets renamed the city, "*Bloody City*" (Ezekiel 24:6, 9; Nahum 3:1) on account of its violence toward the innocent and its human sacrifice.

It is for this conduct of consuming blood (as it were) that Jerusalem lost its status as the City of Peace and was replaced by a second city by the same name—the heavenly Jerusalem. The Apostle Paul comments on this in Galatians 4, telling us that the earthly Jerusalem represents the Old Covenant, while the heavenly Jerusalem represents the New Covenant. Allegorically speaking, these two cities were represented by the two wives of Abraham: Hagar and Sarah.

Those Jews who rejected the Mediator of the New Covenant opted to remain under the Old Covenant, which was instituted at Sinai. This identified Jerusalem with Sinai in Arabia, Paul said. Arabia was the inheritance of Ishmael, the father of the Arabs. Hence, by remaining under the Old Covenant, the Jews unwittingly placed Jerusalem under the legal jurisdiction of the Arabs.

There are legal consequences to our decisions. It was only a matter of time before God honored the Jewish decision and allowed the Arabs to take possession of the city and the entire land of Palestine. The Arabs conquered the land in the seventh century, although their right

and title was disputed by the Christian Crusaders for the next few centuries.

Edomite Zionism then added a third demand on Jerusalem and Palestine. The present conflict is mostly between Esau (Jews) and Ishmael (Arabs), with much of Christendom siding with Esau-Edom.

If you haven't figured out the difference between two nations and two cities by now, even the most stunted logic would indicate that you will land up misguided!

## Chapter 4 Justice for Esau

Prior to 1948, most Christians supporting Zionism believed that the Jews would repent and turn to Christ before they could "return" to the old land. When this did not happen, they thought their repentance would occur after  $3\frac{1}{2}$  years (i.e., about 1952). This was based on the belief that the war that broke out in 1948 was the start of a 7-year "Great Tribulation." Some taught that Christ would return in the middle of this "Tribulation."

By 1953, it was clear that this belief was incorrect. So, their focus shifted to a "post-tribulation" view, assuring all that the Jews would repent in 1955. This too failed to materialize.

Thereafter, they began teaching that the Jews had to return first and that they would turn to Christ at some point in the future. This is still the common belief at present (2023).

As shown earlier, the law in Lev. 26:40-42 makes it clear that God will "remember" His covenant only when they cease their "hostility" toward God. Does this mean they must first become devout Jews according to the standards of Judaism? That, of course, is what Jews believe. But from Jesus' viewpoint, it is about reversing their hostility toward Himself, which hostility is one of the major themes of the New Testament.

Isaiah 12:2 says (literally), "God is my Yeshua... for Yah Yahweh ... has become my Yeshua." In other words, the Lawgiver, identified as Yahweh, was incarnated as the Son of God in earth and has therefore "become my Yeshua." Hence, to be hostile to Jesus (Yeshua) is to be hostile to Yahweh as well. So, Jesus said in John 15:23:

### He who hates Me hates My Father also.

The point is that the law of tribulation in Leviticus 26 does not allow the exiled Israelites (of any tribe) to return to the land prior to the end of hostilities. So how is it then that God allowed Zionism to succeed?

The answer is found in the fact that the word *Jewry*, ever since 126 B.C., has included the nation of Esau-Edom (Idumea). They have two sets of prophecies to fulfill. God allowed Zionism to succeed

initially so that justice could be given to Esau, who had been deprived of the birthright through Jacob's deception in Genesis 27. <u>God did not allow them to return on account of any ancient Jewish claim to the land</u>. They returned only because of Edom's pursuit of justice.

### Isaac's Prophecy to Esau

After Jacob had secured the birthright from his blind father, Esau arrived with venison to feed his father and to receive the same birthright. But he discovered that it had already been passed to Jacob. He appealed for justice, and so we read in Gen. 27:40, King James Version:

And by thy sword shalt thou live, and shalt serve thy brother; and it shall come to pass, when thou shalt have the dominion, that thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck.

A yoke is a sign of servitude. Esau was to remain under Jacob's "yoke" for an unspecified amount of time. But this condition was to be reversed "when thou shalt have the dominion." This is a reference to the Dominion Mandate, which was one of the two main elements of the birthright along with the fruitfulness mandate. (See Gen. 1:26-28.)

Essentially, this prophesied that Jacob would have to return the birthright to Esau at some point. Obviously, this was due to the deceitful and unlawful way in which Jacob had obtained the birthright. God could not leave such lawlessness unpunished, nor could God give Esau and his descendants genuine cause to accuse Him of injustice. Hence, Isaac's long-term prophecy was fulfilled in 1948 when the British flag ("Union Jack") was lowered and replaced by the "Israeli flag." Jack is short for Jacob, and the British thus represented Jacob in this prophetic action.

The Jewish state, then, was established, not to fulfill the promises to the House of Israel, nor even to allow Judah to return, <u>but to give</u> <u>justice to Esau-Edom</u>. Edom thus received the birthright, and with it came the birthright name, *Israel*. <u>In the long run, Edom will not be able to retain the name Israel or the land, because Edom is not called to hold the birthright.</u> The prophecy given prior to his birth shows that clearly in Gen. 25:23, which says, "the older shall serve the younger."

Yet in the short term, the older son was to break off the yoke of his younger brother to restore the lawful order that Jacob had violated through his deceit. So, from the perspective of the law and prophecy, 1948 marked the time when the "dominion" passed from Jacob back to Esau.

This was to give Esau the opportunity to prove himself unworthy, so that he could be disinherited lawfully. Esau, we believe, was given 76 years to hold the dominion, and, thus, the 2023 conflict in Gaza could very well be the beginning of the end of Esau's dominion.

#### Esau's Zionism

Jacob and Esau each claimed the Old Covenant promise of inheriting Canaan. Esau's claim was based on the fact that he was the oldest; Jacob's demand was based on the prophecy given while they were yet in the womb. They fought even before they were born (Gen. 25:22), and this too prophesied of a long-term struggle.

From Esau's perspective, he was the victim of injustice on account of Jacob's deceit, and so he "bore a grudge against Jacob" (Gen. 27:41, 42) and even sought to kill his brother. Nonetheless, Esau's descendants (Edom) had to settle for nearby territory southeast of Canaan, even while coveting the Promised Land. The Edomites made an alliance with Mount Seir and later took over that land (Joshua 24:4).

Centuries later, Israel and Judah were both removed from the land for their continual sin against God. The Edomites saw this as an opportunity to replace them and take the land as their inheritance. Ezekiel 35 is a prophecy "against Mount Seir" (vs. 2) and "all Edom" (vs. 15) for rejoicing when Israel and Judah were taken captive and removed from the land.

Ezekiel 35:10 & 11 says:

"Because you have said, 'These two nations and these two lands will be mine, and we will possess them,' although the Lord was there, therefore as I live," declares the Lord God, "I will deal with you according to your anger and according to your envy which you showed because of your hatred against them..."

The two nations and lands in question are Israel and Judah. The Edomites seemed to believe that they would never return from exile, giving them the opportunity to fulfill Isaac's prophecy to Esau. But God did not like their "anger" and "envy" and "hatred." Though the Israelites themselves never returned, the Judahites were allowed to return after 70 years in Babylon, so that the Messiah could be born in Bethlehem of Judea, according to the prophecy in Micah 5:2.

Again, we read in Ezekiel 36:5:

... therefore, thus says the Lord God, "Surely in the fire of My jealousy I have spoken against the rest of the nations and against all Edom, who appropriated My land for themselves as a possession with wholehearted joy and with scorn of soul, to drive it out for a prey."

This implies that Edom received assistance from "the rest of the nations" in appropriating "My land." It is hard to say if this took place during the Babylonian captivity, but it seems to fit very well with what took place in 1948 when the United Nations assisted the Zionists in appropriating ("dividing") a portion of that land for themselves.

The U.N. had tried to implement a two-state solution, but neither side was willing to give up any portion of the land. War broke out, and many Palestinians were driven from their homes, farms, and villages, and crowded into "temporary" refugee camps such as Gaza. The Israelis gradually implemented tight control of their food and power supply to make life as miserable as possible, hoping that the Palestinians would emigrate "voluntarily" to other countries and leave the land to "Israeli" settlers.

Some did indeed leave, but most of them stayed. After 75 years of oppression and mistreatment, Gaza finally erupted on October 7, 2023.

Mal. 1:2-4 is another prophecy of Edomite Zionism:

"I have loved you," says the Lord. But you say, "How have You loved us?" "Was not Esau Jacob's brother?" declares the Lord. "Yet I have loved Jacob' but I have hated Esau, and I have made his mountains a desolation and appointed his inheritance for the jackals of the wilderness." Though Edom says, "We have been beaten down, but we will return and build up the ruins," thus says the Lord of hosts, "They may build, but I will tear down; and men will call

### them the wicked territory, and the people toward whom the Lord is indignant forever."

When God stated, "I have hated Esau," He was protecting Esau's rights as the hated firstborn son, according to the law in Deut. 21:16. The status of a hated son strengthened Esau's case in the divine court, ensuring that Jacob would have to return the birthright to his older brother. For this reason, Edom was able to say, "We will return and build up the ruins."

God did not contradict this, but says, "They may build, but I will tear down." The King James Version is more emphatic, saying, "They shall build, but I will throw down."

Edom's Zionist aspirations, then, are temporary, yet very real. If the Palestinians had been aware of this prophecy (and believed it), their lives would have been extremely difficult but more bearable in the knowledge that it would be limited in time. Not knowing the Scriptures, they were concerned only about justice for themselves. They did not understand what God was doing, nor did they understand the justice of God toward Esau on account of Jacob's deception.

### True Zionism (Sionism)

While the church continues to expect a mass conversion of Jews to Jesus Christ, their expectation is based on the errant belief that the Jews are the Israelites and that Zionism fulfills the prophecies that were actually given to the lost tribes of Israel. Furthermore, when the prophecies speak of "the return", they fail to see that returning to God cannot be accomplished by a change of address. If a carnal man moves to a new location, he is still carnal.

The prophets record the words of the Lord often saying, "Return to Me." It is always an appeal to repent, not to change one's address. Mal. 3:7 asks, "How shall we return?" The answer is found in ceasing to rob God (vs. 8) and to cease being "arrogant against Me" (vs. 13). Nothing here is said about changing one's domicile. Zionism was necessary in the plan of God to accommodate Esau's plea for justice. True Zionism however is a return to God and to a state of righteousness. This is certainly not evident in the state of "Israel."

The New Testament establishes Mount Sion (Hermon) as the place of Sonship, for it is where Jesus was transfigured and where the divine pronouncement was given, "This is My beloved Son, with whom

*I am well-pleased*" (Matt. 17:5). All who rally around His Majesty, King Jesus at Mount Sion, have come to a different mountain. Heb. 12:18-22, King James Version, says:

For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched [i.e., Sinai], and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words, which voice they that heard intreated that the word should not be spoken to them any more... But <u>ye are come unto Mount Sion</u>, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem...

Mount Sinai corresponds to the earthly Jerusalem, Paul tells us in Gal. 4:25. That was the Old Covenant Mount, of which Jesus said in John 4:21:

... "Woman, believe Me, an hour is coming when neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem will you worship the Father."

We have a better mountain in which to worship God, for we are to worship Him in spirit and in truth (John 4:24). Our mountain is Mount Sion, which is Mount Hermon, the place where Jesus was transfigured. Deut. 4:48 says:

.... from Aroer, which is on the edge of the valley of Arnon, even as far as Mount Sion (that is, Hermon).

Those who think that a third temple will be built in Jerusalem, where all will go to worship God in the age to come, will be sorely disappointed. Christ has come to a different mountain, the heavenly Jerusalem from which He rules. The book of Hebrews speaks of better things, and we ought to align ourselves with these New Covenant changes, so that we can truly think according to the mind of Christ.

To end this chapter on a very defining note, we quote from the book of Hebrews 12: 16 & 17:

See that no one is sexually immoral, <u>or is godless like Esau</u>, who for a single meal sold his inheritance rights as the oldest son. Afterward, as you know, when he wanted to inherit this blessing, he was rejected. Even though he sought the blessing with tears, he could not change what he had done.

## Chapter 5 Jerusalem's Fate

So far, we have shown the nature of Jewish Zionism and its place in prophecy.

The Judah-Edom merger in 126 B.C. ensured that the nation would have to fulfill two sets of prophecies, both of which point to Zionism. The Judah branch is represented by the fig tree that Jesus cursed but which was to come back to life and bring forth "leaves" (Matt. 24:32), but no fruit.

The Edomite branch was Zionistic from the beginning, given Esau's desire to acquire the birthright and the land itself.

While Judah was forbidden to return from exile until it had ceased its "hostility" to the Messiah, Edom had a legitimate claim to the birthright on account of Jacob's deceit. Hence, the Jewish state was allowed to be established as "Israel" in 1948, not because they were of Judah—or even Israel—but because they were of Edom.

The modern representatives of Jacob, set forth by their flag, the "Union Jack," gave the birthright back to the spiritual descendants of Esau-Edom to allow them time to prove themselves stubborn and rebellious.

God then treated Edom <u>as if</u> they were chosen people. He allowed them to take on the name of Israel, even though they were not of the House of Israel. Whenever they were attacked, He protected them to ensure that they would indeed have the full period allotted to them.

Hence, they defeated their enemies in 1948-1949, 1956, 1967, and in 1973. Some even reported miraculous victories in battle. If this is so, it only proves how God honors the birthright, even if temporally held by Esau-Edom. **The key, however, is to know that Edom's claim is not permanent**. The prophets make this very clear, dating back to the word given before the twins were even born (Gen. 25:23).

The question then is how does this end? Will God continue to protect and empower the Jewish state of Esau-Edom and make the earthly Jerusalem the capital of the Kingdom? <u>Clearly not</u>. Yet God's protection since 1948 has emboldened them. They assume that God's

protection will remain upon them forever, because they do not consider the prophecies directed to Esau-Edom.

### The Controversy of Zion

Isaiah 34 speaks of divine judgment upon Esau-Edom and upon the nations in general. The prophet implies that the nations are led by Esau-Edom. Isaiah 34:2 says,

For the Lord's indignation is against all the nations, and His wrath against all their armies; He has utterly destroyed them, He has given them over to slaughter.

Verses 4 and 5 continue:

And all the host of heaven will wear away, and the sky will be rolled up like a scroll; all their hosts will also wither away, as a leaf withers from the vine, or as one withers from the fig tree. For My sword is satiated in heaven, behold it shall descend for <u>judgment upon Edom and upon</u> the people whom I have devoted to destruction.

This prophecy against Esau-Edom is fulfilled in the sixth seal, recorded in Rev. 6:13 & 14:

.... and the stars of the sky fell to the earth, as a fig tree casts its unripe figs when shaken by a great wind. The sky was split apart like a scroll when it is rolled up, and every mountain and island were moved out of their places.

It is clear, then, that Isaiah's prophecy about Esau-Edom was not fulfilled in 126 B.C. when Judah conquered and incorporated them into Judaism. It has a future fulfillment in our time, and the language suggests that it is linked to Jesus' prophecy of the fig tree in Matt. 24:32.

Isaiah 34:8-10 continues:

For the Lord has a day of vengeance, a year of recompense for the cause ["controversy," King James Version] of Zion. Its streams will be turned into pitch, and its loose earth into brimstone, and its land will become burning pitch. It will not be quenched night or day; its smoke will go up forever [olam, "indefinitely"]. From generation to

### generation it will be desolate; none will pass through it forever and ever [netsakh, "continually"].

This appears to describe a nuclear event, where men would then be unable to "pass through it," due to residual radiation. Isaiah obviously lacked the language to describe radiation, so he used terms that were available to him—"burning pitch," and "brimstone." This is NOT good for Esau-Edom, and by knowing from history (as confirmed by The Jewish Encyclopedia itself) that "Edom is in modern Jewry," we are compelled to see that the Israeli state is in great danger of a nuclear (or if not nuclear, some other apocalypse of similar magnitude) event of some kind. The "Israeli" people ought to take Isaiah's warning very seriously and move away from danger i.e. leave "Israel."

#### The Fate of Jerusalem

Isaiah 29:1-6 gives us another glimpse of what appears to be a nuclear event in its prophecy of the fate of Jerusalem:

#### Woe, O Ariel, Ariel the city where David once camped.

Ariel has a double meaning: (1) "Lion of God" and (2) "the hearth of God" (fireplace). It is a poetic name for Jerusalem, "where David once camped."

# I will bring distress to Ariel, and she will be a city of lamenting and mourning; and she will be like an Ariel ["hearth, fireplace"] to me.

Notice how the prophet uses the double meaning of Ariel to set forth his prophecy. God Himself was speaking through the prophet, saying, "I" will do this to Jerusalem:

### I will camp against you encircling you, and I will set siegeworks against you, and I will raise up battle towers against you.

As the prophet will explain shortly, God will use foreign armies in the siege; yet God is the One commanding those armies. He takes full credit for this war. It is important to know which army God leads. He does not picture Himself as the great Defender of Jerusalem. He is, instead, the One laying siege to the city. So, what will be the outcome of this battle?

Then you [Jerusalem] will be brought low; from the earth you will speak. And from the dust where you are prostrate your words will come. Your voice will also be like that of a spirit from the ground, and your speech will whisper from the dust.

This pictures Jerusalem as the loser, not the victor. The city is pictured as a dead man whose voice whispers from an underground tomb. The city's hostility toward God did not change at the last minute, as so many have predicted. In other words, Jerusalem is God's enemy. Isaiah 63:10 explains how this is so:

But they rebelled and grieved His Holy Spirit; therefore, He turned Himself to become their enemy, He fought against them.

Most Jews and Christians alike seem to think that God would never become the enemy of Israel or Judah. Yet Lev. 26:40-42 makes it clear that they would become hostile to God, and for this reason, God brought in foreign armies to destroy their cities and exile the people. Moses himself warned them in Deut. 8:19 & 20, saying:

It shall come about if you ever forget the Lord your God and go after other gods and serve them and worship them, I testify against you today that you will surely perish. Like the nations [of Canaan] that the Lord makes to perish before you, so you shall perish, because you would not listen to the voice of the Lord your God.

So it is that in the final siege of Jerusalem at the end of the age God presents Himself as the Commander of the foreign armies that will lay siege to Jerusalem. God "turned Himself to become their enemy, He fought against them." Why? Because of their "hostility" toward Him, that is, Jesus Christ.

So, Isaiah 29:5 continues:

But the multitude of your [Jerusalem's] enemies will become like fine dust, and the multitude of the ruthless ones like the chaff which blows away; and it will happen instantly, suddenly.

Most Bible teachers assume that Jerusalem's "enemies" are the foreign armies that God is leading in the siege. This leads them to believe that God will destroy His own army and save Jerusalem at the last minute. But the prophet has already told us the fate of the city in the previous verse.

We must understand God's definition of His "enemies" that is revealed in Isaiah 63:10, which is based on Lev. 26:40-42 and Deut. 8:19, 20. The "enemies" of Ariel (as the Lion of God) are the inhabitants of Jerusalem itself, those Zionists who have taken over the city where David once camped. And it is for this reason that God lays siege to the city, using foreign armies.

So, when the "Israelis" took over Jerusalem in 1967, they unknowingly set themselves up to fulfill Isaiah's prophecy. God's enemies are in Jerusalem, and it is for this reason God has laid siege to the city. Isaiah 29:6 goes on to say:

From the Lord of hosts, you [Jerusalem] will be punished with thunder and earthquake and loud noise, with whirlwind and tempest and the flame of a consuming fire.

This sounds like a nuclear explosion with its "loud noise" and "whirlwind" and "a consuming fire." It can be seen as a more detailed description of what we read in Isaiah 34:9 & 10.

#### No Spoils of War

It was common throughout history for a victorious army to loot the conquered territory. The army was rewarded with "the spoils" of war. (See Heb. 7:4.) However, in the case of the conquest of Ariel-Jerusalem, the destruction of the city is so complete that the victorious army was not to receive any spoils of war (more than likely there would be none to have in any event).

Isaiah 29:7 turns God's attention toward the army that He was leading in the siege of Jerusalem, giving us a very unusual prophecy. It says:

And the multitude of all the nations who wage war against Ariel [led by God, of course], even all who wage war against her and her stronghold, and who distress her [See verse 2], will be like a dream, a vision of the night. Most Bible teachers fail to understand this. The city is to be destroyed. But what of the army that God used to destroy the city? Well, it will be "*like a dream*:"

It will be as when a hungry man dreams—and behold, he is eating; but when he awakens, his hunger is not satisfied, or as when a thirsty man dreams—and behold, he is drinking, but when he awakens, behold, he is faint and his thirst is not quenched. Thus, the multitude of all the nations will be who wage war against Mount Zion.

What? No great destruction upon the destroyers of Jerusalem? No divine indignation visited upon them? What is this "dream" that is prophesied?

Well, what is the dream of the foreign armies who oppose Zionism? Is it not to regain control of the city of Jerusalem and the entire land itself? Is it not to reverse the effects of Zionism? But if no one can pass through that land, then how can they achieve their objective? It will be "like a dream," where one wakes up only to find that he is still hungry and thirsty.

In other words, NO ONE WILL ULTIMATELY GET THE LAND, because it will be uninhabitable.

This, Isaiah says under inspiration from God, is the end of the Zionist project. Neither the Edomites nor the Ishmaelite Arabs will be able to claim the land. Hagar-Jerusalem and all children of the flesh will be "cast out" (Gal. 4:30) in favor of the Isaac company, the children of the New Covenant, the heavenly Jerusalem (Gal. 4:26, 28).

## Chapter 6 Blindness

As we have seen from Isaiah 29:1-8, the prophet had a vision of the destruction of Jerusalem which appears very much like a nuclear explosion. He does not tell us specifically whether this would be the full end of the city's existence. However, we may surmise this from the fact that the victorious foreign armies (led by God) will not achieve their goal ("dream").

Today we know that there are many neighboring countries who want to "push Israel into the sea" and to take the land back. Hence, we can interpret their "dream," as the prophet refers to it, as the desire to reclaim the land. However, this desire will turn out to be just a dream, as no one will be able to inhabit the land when this war is concluded.

The war in Gaza, which began on October 7, 2023, the eighth day of Tabernacles, has continued to escalate and to involve other world powers, including the U.S. For example, on October 26, 2023 the US bombed Iranian targets in eastern Syria, according to Secretary of "Defense" Lloyd Austin:

https://wltreport.com/2023/10/26/world-war-3-erupts-u-s-bombs-syria/?utm\_source=newsletter\_ssp

The U.S. government has had troops in Syria ever since the Pentagon hatched its plan to overthrow seven countries in five years:

https://genius.com/General-wesley-clark-seven-countries-in-five-years-annotated

The Syrian government did not invite U.S. troops to occupy any part of Syria. U.S. troops are there purely to enforce U.S. power politics. On the other hand, the Iranians are in Syria at the invitation of their host. So, the bombing in Syria has no legal basis. The U.S. is simply stealing oil from Syria under the protection of the military, as part of the Pentagon's plan from 2001 to overthrow Syria and six other countries.

It is too soon to see how far this will escalate, but the rising tensions are causing alarm around the world. Some commentators are already talking about the possible start of World War 3. Based on Scriptural prophecy it is indeed likely that the final war will be

centered in the Middle East and the Israeli state in particular. It is the writers' opinion that an all-out nuclear war between the major world powers is not included in prophecy. Hence, this will be a limited *regional* war.

The age to come will not be an age of world fallout. It will be an age where the Kingdom of God will be dominant, and a Golden Age, ruled by the Prince of Peace and the overcomers.

So, when one reads prophecies in Isaiah 29 and Jeremiah 19, we note that these are specifically directed toward Jerusalem and its immediate territory.

What we do know is that this is God's judgment upon the earthly Jerusalem, the city that was supposed to be "the lion of God" but which turned out to be "God's fireplace," as the name Ariel indicates.

#### **Blindness**

After giving his prophecy, Isaiah then reveals God's method to ensure that Jerusalem will indeed be destroyed. He blinds His own prophets and seers so that they do not understand His intent until it is too late to save the city. Isaiah 29:9, 10 says:

Be delayed and wait. Blind yourselves and be blind. They become drunk, but not with wine, they stagger, but not with strong drink. For the Lord has poured over you a spirit of deep sleep. He has shut your eyes, the prophets, and He has covered your heads, the seers.

In other words, the spiritual eyes of the prophets will be shut, and God will put a bag over the head of the seers so that they cannot see. Nothing is said here of *false* prophets. God has done this to all prophets, except, of course, to those of the remnant of grace whose eyes are not blinded (Rom. 11:7, King James Version).

Isaiah 29:11 & 12 continues:

The entire vision [recorded in verses 1-8] will be to you like the words of a sealed book, which when they give it to the one who is literate, saying, "Please read this," he will say, "I cannot, for it is sealed." Then the book will be given to the one who is illiterate, saying, "Please read this." And he will say, "I cannot read."

So, we see that Isaiah's vision of Jerusalem destruction is "a sealed book." One can read a sealed scroll only by breaking the seal, and so far, God has not done this. We know this, because prophets today have no understanding of Isaiah's vision. They twist the words to make it appear that God will intervene at the last minute and save the city from destruction.

But God has blessed us with eyes to see, so that we know the divine plan. We know that God will "cast out the bondwoman and her son" (Gal. 4:30), and that the earthly Jerusalem ("Hagar") will not be the "woman" whose son inherits the Kingdom. The blindness upon the prophets and seers is so complete that it will not be lifted until the city is destroyed. Only then will their eyes be opened, for they will then have to find an explanation for what will appear to be failed prophecy.

Actually, it will be the failure of *their understanding* of prophecy. If they had understood the Autumn feast days, they might have had opportunity to teach the truth about the progression of events surrounding Christ's second coming. If they had grasped Galatians 4, they might have concluded that the earthly Jerusalem is NOT the mother of Kingdom inheritors. If they had comprehended the difference between the two Jerusalems, they might have interpreted Scripture accurately.

But thank God that there will be those who when exposed to the truth, will have eyes to see and ears to hear. God has raised up a body of inheritors in the end times who are able to bear witness to what God is doing in the earth and exercise the Dominion Mandate.

#### Why?

Some may find fault with God for blinding the prophets and seers in this way. But we are given the explanation in Isaiah 29:13 & 14:

Then the Lord said, "Because this people draws near with their words and honor Me with their service, but they remove their hearts far from Me, and their reverence for Me consists of tradition learned by rote. Therefore, behold, I will once again deal marvelously with this people, wondrously marvelous; and the wisdom of their wise men will perish, and the discernment of their discerning men will be concealed."

When the people remain hypocritical, honoring God with their words and their praises but remaining lawless in their hearts, God then blinds His own prophets and seers so that the people will not receive key revelation to understand the plan of God. Jesus quoted Isaiah in Matt. 15:3, 7-9, saying:

And He answered and said to them, "Why do you yourselves transgress the commandment of God for the sake of your tradition? ... You hypocrites, rightly did Isaiah prophesy of you: "This people honors Me with their lips, but their heart is far away from Me. But in vain do they worship Me, teaching as doctrines the precepts [or "traditions" King James Version] of men."

The root issue appears to be *anomia*, "lawlessness," one's disrespect for the law of God. Rejecting any portion of God's word blinds us to the revelation of that word, and this condition is often difficult to reverse. The church as a whole suffers sorely from the spirit of *anomia*, as Jesus prophesied in Matt. 7:21-23, concluding with:

## And then I will declare to them, "I never knew you; depart from Me, you who practice lawlessness [anomia].

Many in the church today teach that the law was put away. They fail to see that the *judgments* of the law brought upon us through sin were satisfied by Jesus' payment on the cross. But in no way did the law cease to be God's standard of righteousness.

Men often teach that Paul put away the law, though he himself wrote in Rom. 3:31:

#### Do we then nullify the law through faith? May it never be! On the contrary, we establish the law.

For this cause, Paul also admonished the church in Rom. 6:19:

I am speaking in human terms because of the weakness of your flesh. For just as you presented your members [body parts] as slaves to impurity and to lawlessness [anomia], resulting in further lawlessness [anomia], so now present your members as slaves to righteousness, resulting in sanctification.

Putting away the law, or despising the law, will result in sin, because "sin is lawlessness" (1 John 3:4). Sin is only sin because it is a violation of the law. Paul says, "where there is no law, there also is no violation" (Rom. 4:15).

The point is that when Israel and Judah became lawless, praising God with their lips but failing to agree with God's nature as expressed in His law, God then blinded the eyes of the prophets and the seers. He did not turn them into false prophets, yet He limited their revelation to lead the people themselves into judgment for their lawlessness.

We see this again in Ezekiel 14, where certain "elders of Israel" came to the prophet to inquire of the word of the Lord. God posed a question to the prophet, asking him if He should give them an answer, seeing that they harbored idols in their hearts. A heart idol is a strong belief or assumption, which gives the seeker the right to accept or reject the word of the prophet. In other words, they are not honest seekers of truth; they seek validation of their already-settled beliefs. They probably inquired about the fate of the nation, believing that God would never allow Jerusalem or the temple to be destroyed.

The answer is found in Ezekiel 14:4, King James Version: "I the Lord will answer him that cometh according to the multitude of his idols." What is the result? Ezekiel 14:5, King James Version says, "That I may take the house of Israel in their own heart, because they are all estranged from Me through their idols." Worse yet, we read in Ezekiel 14:9, "And if the prophet be deceived when he hath spoken a thing, I the Lord have deceived that prophet, and I will stretch out My hand upon him and will destroy him from the midst of My people Israel."

This is a hard word to receive, but it is clear that heart idolatry causes people to hear their own deceptions and reject the word of the Lord. By setting up idols in the heart, they hear the word of those idols, thinking they are hearing the word of the Lord. Men who sincerely think they are worshiping and obeying the true God are, in fact, worshiping an idol of the heart.

When we relate this to Isaiah 29:10, it is very sobering:

.....For the Lord has poured over you a spirit of deep sleep. He has shut your eyes, the prophets, and He has covered your heads, the seers.

Christian Zionists, this is the extent of your deception — you are worshipping an idol of the heart and so too your leaders/prophets who cannot see or hear the Lord, for He has turned them and you over to a ruse (struck you blind), because they/you believe in it rather than the Lord your God.

## Chapter 7 The British and South African Factor

#### Introduction

One of the authors of this paper is South African and a serious student of the relevance of South Africa (both historically and currently), to the present world order. And Palestine is an obvious focal point in that order.

#### **Background**

Firstly, why do we combine Britain and South Africa, in the same chapter – they are after all completely independent nations? Well, for the period of history to which this paper makes specific reference, their affairs were so closely intertwined, that the simplest way to deal with the issues, is conjointly.

Secondly, there is an unusually intense correlation between South African history over the last 130 odd years and that of "Israel." From here on in we shall refer to this phenomena as the "twinning" between the two states, for the sake of convenience.

#### What Predates Semitic?

Since the Jews place so much store on their ancient "entitlement" to the land of "Israel." let us talk "ancient."

The concept of ancient history (as far back as we can possibly know or plausibly construct), is founded in Africa, not the Middle East. With all due respect, Africans understand land (for we are the very womb of life) and to whom it really belongs:

Psalms 24:1-2 "The earth is the LORD's, and all its fullness, the world and those who dwell therein. For He has founded it upon the seas and established it upon the waters." New King James Version

Africa represents 20% of the earth's usable land area and is rich in natural resources including arable land, water, oil, natural gas, minerals, forests and wildlife. The continent holds a huge proportion of the world's natural resources, both renewables and non-renewables.

Africa is home to some 30% of the world's mineral reserves, 8% of the world's natural gas and 12% of the world's oil reserves. The continent has 40% of the world's gold and up to 90% of its chromium and platinum. The largest reserves of cobalt, diamonds, platinum and uranium in the world are in Africa. It holds 65% of the world's arable land and 10% of the planet's internal renewable fresh water source.

#### https://www.unep.org/regions/africa/our-work-africa

Humans first evolved in Africa, and much of human evolution occurred on the continent. The fossils of early humans who lived between 6 and 2 million years ago come entirely from Africa.

#### Southern Africa as a Sub-set of Africa

If continental Africa is a primordial first in creation order, this phenomenon concentrates still further in the Southern sub-continent, not to the exclusion of the rest of the continent, but as a matter of relative weighting.

The San or Saan peoples, are members of various Khoisan-speaking indigenous hunter-gatherer groups that are the first nations of Southern Africa, and whose territories historically spanned Botswana, Namibia, Angola, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Lesotho and South Africa, as they are called today.

Various Y chromosome studies show that the San carry some of the most divergent (oldest) human Y-chromosome haplogroups. These haplogroups are specific sub-groups of haplogroups A and B, the two earliest branches on the human Y-chromosome tree.

Mitochondrial DNA studies also provide evidence that the San carry high frequencies of the earliest haplogroup branches in the human mitochondrial DNA tree. This DNA is inherited only from one's mother. The most divergent (oldest) mitochondrial haplogroup, L0D, has been identified at its highest frequencies in the southern African San groups.

A set of tools almost identical to that used by the modern San and dating to 44,000 BCE was discovered at Border Cave in KwaZulu-Natal in 2012.

A maximum of 120 000 San exists today, predominantly in Botswana, then Namibia, South Africa and a very small quantity in Zimbabwe/Angola.

https://www.news24.com/Green/News/Bushmen-perhaps-theworlds-first-people-20141209

The point being that when it comes to disputes relating to ancient land, South Africa has the credentials to speak to these matters, both from a creation order perspective and as a consequence of the many disastrous political events in its more recent history, which "twin" with the "Israel" / Palestinian issue.

### Like Palestine, South Africa Experienced British Colonialization / Imperialism

Great Britain has over 100 former colonies, located all over the world. The first of these colonies were in North America, being the 13 colonies that would eventually constitute the founding states of the USA. The USA secured its independence from Great Britain in 1776.

The Cape and Natal were British colonies and later the Union of South Africa, constituted by force in 1910, was in effect a British colony until it became a republic in 1961. <u>Palestine, we also know what it is to have a political solution forced upon us with complete disregard for the centuries (even millennial) old inhabitants of the land!</u>

Arguably the most powerful British Imperialist of all times, Cecil John Rhodes, established his economic and political base in Southern Africa, whose influence persists to this day through inter alia the Rhodes Scholarship and carefully planned occultic structures that Rhodes set into place before his death.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cecil\_Rhodes

https://www.sahistory.org.za/people/cecil-john-rhodes

### South African Natural Assets and their Exploitation by Global Imperialists

The three greatest treasure stories of known human history, involve (or in one instance, was reliant upon) South Africa, namely the Cape Sea trade route, diamonds and gold.

It doesn't take much to figure out that since this is an unprecedented phenomenon, Southern Africa is a marker in both ancient and modern times.

Consider the four contemporary revolutions:

Early Industrial Revolution;

Advanced Industrial Revolution;

Data/Financialisation Revolution;

4th Industrial Revolution.

This document cannot be distracted by an essay in support of the following statement, but the wealth of South Africa (concentrated as it was by Rothschild and JP Morgan interventionism), by and large funded the Advanced Industrial Revolution and thus the foundations of the so called "Western" world as we know it today. Not that this was to the benefit of the average South African however, as it regrettably left a legacy of abject poverty for the most part. Palestine, we also know the stench of grinding poverty, from one generation to the next!

#### Three Wars and the Creation of a New World Order

New World Orders don't emerge willingly, they are coerced, militarily, politically or economically (or any combination of the foregoing) and generally at extreme human cost.

The first of these three wars was about gold and the second two (really one war split into two halves with an intervening truce of some 20 years, as it were), a clash of empires.

#### **Anglo Boer War**

The lure of commandeering the greatest gold strike in history, was simply too much for the British Empire. What followed was an indescribable tragedy (how else to describe any war), a summary of which is set out below:

When the fighting began in October 1899, the British confidently expected their troops to victoriously conclude the conflict by Christmas. But this proved to be the longest, costliest, bloodiest and most humiliating war fought by Britain between 1815 and 1914. Even though the military forces mobilized in South Africa by the world's

greatest imperial power outnumbered the Boer fighters by nearly five to one, they required almost three years to completely subdue the tough pioneer people of fewer than half a million.

Britain deployed some 336,000 imperial and 83,000 colonial troops: 448,000 altogether. Of this force, 22,000 found a grave in South Africa, 14,000 of them succumbing to sickness. For their part, the two Boer republics were able to mobilize 87,360 fighters, a force that included 2,120 foreign volunteers and 13,300 Boer-related Afrikaners from the British-ruled Cape and Natal provinces. In addition to the more than 7,000 Boer fighters who lost their lives, some 28,000 Boers perished in the British concentration camps under heinous conditions, nearly all of them women and children.

The war's non-human costs were similarly appalling. As part of Lord Kitchener's "scorched-earth" campaign, British troops wrought terrible destruction throughout the rural Boer areas, especially in the Orange Free State. Outside of the largest towns, hardly a building was left intact. Perhaps a tenth of the pre-war horses, cows and other farm stock remained. In much of the Boer lands, no crops had been sown for two years.

Even by the standards of the time (and certainly by those of today), British political and military leaders committed frightful war crimes and crimes against humanity, crimes for which no one was ever brought to account. General Kitchener, for one, was never punished for introducing measures that even a later British prime minister called "methods of barbarism." To the contrary, after concluding his South African service, he was named a viscount and a field marshal, and then, at the outbreak of the First World War, was appointed Secretary of War. Upon his death in 1916, he was remembered not as a criminal, but rather idolized as a personification of British virtue and rectitude.

In a sense, the Anglo-Boer conflict was less a war between combatants, than a military campaign against civilians – how deeply does that correlate with the "Israel"/Palestinian conflict? The number of Boer women and children who perished in the concentration camps was four times as large as the number of Boer fighting men who died (of all causes) during the war. In fact, more children under the age of 16 perished in the British concentration camps, than men were killed in action on both sides – what words can possibly describe the extent of that crime against humanity!

The boundless greed of Jewish "gold bugs", coincided with the imperialistic aims of British Colonial Secretary Joseph Chamberlain, the dreams of gold and diamond baron Cecil Rhodes, and the political ambitions of Lord Alfred Milner. On the altar of their avarice and ambition, they sacrificed the lives of some 30,000 people who wanted only to live in freedom, as well as 22,000 young men of Britain and her dominions.

At its core, Britain's leaders were willing to sacrifice the lives of many of their own sons and to kill men, women and children in a faraway continent, to add to the wealth and power of an already immensely wealthy and powerful worldwide empire. Few wars during the past one hundred odd years were as avoidable, or as patently crass in its motivation, as was the South African War (Anglo Boer War) of 1899-1902."

http://www.tokencoins.com/boerj.htm

https://www.sahistory.org.za/article/second-anglo-boer-war-1899-1902

https://www.sahistory.org.za/topic/women-children-white-concentration-camps-during-anglo-boer-war-1900-1902

https://www.sahistory.org.za/topic/black-concentration-campsduring-anglo-boer-war-2-1900-1902

To the Jews, we say, "South Africans have had their own holocaust and its scars still run deep" and to the Palestinians we say, "We know what it means to have our children and women murdered, with absolutely no recourse to international justice."

Just one of the many child holocaust victims!



Boer child who died in the Bloemfontein concentration c...

#### WWI

For all its horror, arguably the greatest manifestation thereof was the platform/momentum it provided for the issuance of the Balfour Declaration in 1917, the consequences of which, humanity still lives with today.

#### WWII

For all its horror in turn, arguably its greatest and on-going manifestation, was the momentum it provided for the official end to the British Mandate in Palestine at midnight on May 14, 1948, just ahead of which, David Ben-Gurion declared the establishment of a Jewish state, to be called "Israel".

#### Zionism – A New World Order

Funny thing is that Zionism has never been about the interests of the average modern-day Jew, only about the egregious greed of the elite and the massive centralisation of global wealth and power, thereby enslaving humanity at large.

### South Africa – First Manifestation of The Large-Scale use of the Word "Zionism" in a So-Called Christian Context

What another extraordinary twinning, although Christian Zionism was in fact not about Jewry in South Africa.

John G Lake was a Canadian/American missionary who brought Zionism/Pentecostalism to Southern Africa from 1908-1913, he having been earlier influenced by Charles Parham and also having spent some years in Zion, Illinois. He started the "Apostolic Faith Mission" ("AFM"), by which name it is still known in South Africa today and indeed in other countries in the world. Thus, the very first planting of Pentecostalism emerging from the early 1900s in America, outside of America, but from America, was in South Africa.

Lake is an extremely controversial figure. This paper however does not opine on his ministry, save for its principle outcomes over time in South/ern Africa.

The years 1902 to 1910 were seminal in South African history. The ZAR (Zuid Afrikaanse Republiek, or the Transvaal Republic) and the Orange Free State, had been brutally subjugated in a war entirely directed at stealing Gold and in a manner later described as "methods of barbarism".

This unleashed a torrent of evil and bitterness, never properly addressed during the aforesaid 8-year period, so that when the "Union of South Africa" was eventually proclaimed in 1910 (the first time South Africa came into existence), it had been constructed on the poorest of foundations – pure evil in fact. Palestinians can you relate?

To make matters even worse, it was the British who permitted the formation of the "Union" based on the political exclusion of the majority Black/Mixed Race peoples/Other minorities, and so whilst Apartheid was formalised in name and expanded in statute, by the Afrikaners post 1948, they (the British) were palpably culpable of initiating the origins of this crime against humanity. Thus, one crime against humanity in the Anglo Boer war cascaded into another, only this time on a much larger scale and with consequences that have yet to be resolved – Apartheid in South Africa (26<sup>th</sup> May 1948) and then too in Palestine (14<sup>th</sup> May 1948). Can there be any doubt about the twinning now?

At the time of Lake's ministry in South/ern Africa, a prophetic healing intervention was critically needed (a "repairing of the breach") and with due respect to Lake, he in fact only added to the Apartheid origins, as evidenced by the principle legacy of his work – a Black break-away faction of the AFM in 1919, occasioned by the refusal of

the White leadership to eliminate discrimination (over which discrimination Lake had originally presided) and known originally as the Zion Apostolic Faith Mission. It attempted to emulate the John Alexander Dowie "Zion City", Illinois, in Lesotho.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zion\_Apostolic\_Faith\_Mission\_Church

The Zion Apostolic Faith Mission was destined to later splinter itself. However between the two splinter groups (Zion Christian Church – ZCC, and Zimbabwean Zion Apostolic Faith Mission – ZZAFM), it has become the largest African initiated church operating across Southern Africa.

The ZCC was affected by a leadership succession struggle when its founder passed away and so today, it has split too. According to the 2001 South African Census, its membership stood at a cumulative 4.97 million. Today, the number of ZCC members is most likely between 8 and 10 million (again cumulatively), according to figures provided by Neal Collins from *The New Age* and Alex Matlala from *The Citizen*, two South African newspapers. Doctrinally, the ZCC is a matrix of many influences and the term "Christian" (in its name) should be construed in its ubiquitous context.

#### https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zion\_Christian\_Church

Lake therefore ultimately fathered two "churches" In South/ern Africa – the largely white dominated AFM and the black ZCC/ZZAFM, the latter inevitably adding to the spiritual gravitas of the twentieth/twenty first century Zionistic phenomenon, in whatsoever context this may be construed, the most important perhaps being yet another example of the twinning affect.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John\_G.\_Lake

#### Field Marshall Jan Christian Smuts

By any standards, one of the Twentieth Century's most prominent/influential geniuses and leaders. Albert Einstein was one to recognise this, for example.

Smuts was initially the Attorney General of the ZAR (he being legally qualified) and then in the Anglo Boer war, became a General. He consistently clashed with Milner in the build-up to the Anglo Boer War, as an advisor to President Kruger.

Smuts was an important participant during the development of the Union of South Africa and made personal representations to British Parliamentarians that they should exclude Blacks/Mixed Races/Other Minorities from the franchise, which position ultimately carried the day when the Union was proclaimed.

Despite local opposition and the fact that a mere 12 years before, the Boers and the British had themselves been at war with one another, Smuts supported the notion of joining Britain in WWI. Smuts became a member of the British war cabinet in 1917 till 1919, at the invitation of the then Prime Minster, David Lloyd George, where he was to encounter Milner again.

He was the Prime Minister of South Africa from 1919 to 1924 and then again from 1939 to 1948.

On 24 May 1941 Smuts was appointed a Field Marshal of the British Army, which appointment he carried contemporaneously with being the South African Prime Minister. He was considered to be the most appropriate successor to Winston Churchill during WWII, were anything to happen to the British Prime Minister. This idea was sponsored by Sir John Colville, Churchill's private secretary.

In 1948, he was elected Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, becoming the first person from outside the United Kingdom to hold that position and held it until his death.

Smuts was, furthermore, directly involved in the following:

The only signatory to have personally attended the peace conferences and signed the resulting treaties, terminating the Anglo Boer War, WWI and WWII;

## A major contributor to the architecture of the Balfour Declaration (ironically in tandem with Lord Milner), in support of Lord Balfour;

The author of the League of Nations constitution, a task given to him at the insistence of amongst others, President Woodrow Wilson, with whom he had a most cordial relationship;

Contributor to the preamble of the United Nations constitution.

Smuts' connection with Zionism, is best summarised by an article from the Jerusalem Post, which we quote:

"While I have no objection to Daniel P. Moynihan being honoured by the state of Israel in any way which Gil Troy would deem fit, I take great exception to the fact that Moynihan's name is even mentioned in the same context as that of the late Honourable Jan Christian Smuts."

Smuts was an international statesman of great repute who bestrode the world political stage like a colossus for the first half of the 20th century, while Daniel Moynihan was, at best, thrust onto the world stage for a short period as the United States ambassador to the United Nations. The only commonality I have found, is that prime minister David Lloyd George sent Smuts to Ireland in 1921 for discussions aimed at ending the violence with Irish nationalist leader Eamon de Valera, while 60 years later in 1981, Moynihan, together with other Irish American politicians, Ted Kennedy and Tip O'Neill, established a bipartisan group to promote peace and reconciliation in Northern Ireland. Neither Smuts nor Moynihan were particularly successful in that worthy endeavour.

Gen. Jan Christiaan Smuts was the architect of the Union of South Africa, established in 1910 as a self-governing dominion of the United Kingdom, becoming a totally committed and loyal Anglophile, despite having fought against the British during the Anglo Boer War (1898-1901). Smuts enjoyed a great friendship with Chaim Weizmann, which lasted from their first meeting in London during WWI, until Smuts' death in 1950.

Smuts and Weizmann had much in common, sharing a great interest in science, with Smuts becoming the first president of the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1931. Weizmann was a Zionist. Smuts, as a devoted Christian, held a firm belief in the right of the Jewish people to their homeland in Palestine.

Smuts was partial toward the Jews and Jewish problems globally, being sympathetic to Jewish immigration to South Africa as early as 1910. In 1917, as Minister of Defense, in which capacity he would become a member of the Imperial War Cabinet in Britain, he promised the South African Zionist Federation that he would support the movement for a Jewish Homeland in Palestine. Shortly after his appointment to the war cabinet, he met with, and developed his lasting friendship with Weizmann, and lent his not-insignificant support to

the process and final promulgation of the Balfour Declaration in November 1917.

Following the end of hostilities in 1918, which brought the First World War to an end, a peace conference was held at Versailles in France on January 19, 1919, between the victorious Allied Forces and the defeated Central Powers, which had been led by Germany. The product of this conference was the Versailles Peace Treaty, with the Balfour Declaration granting a homeland to the Jewish people as one of its many clauses – this, at the insistence of Jan Smuts.

Versailles was followed by the San Remo Conference, which lasted from April 19-26, 1920, and was also attended by Smuts. The primary objective of this conference was to ratify the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and to establish the League of Nations. Here again, Smuts insisted that the Balfour Declaration be embodied in the clauses establishing the League of Nations, with Smuts the author of its constitution.

The San Remo Resolution, as well as Article 22 of the newly established League of Nations, incorporated the Balfour Declaration, with the resolution officially designated the Smuts Resolution. This resolution was the basis for the establishment of the mandate system that led to the British Mandate over Palestine and but for the stubborn intransigence of the British Government, should have rapidly led to a self-governing Jewish state in the whole territory between the Jordan River and the sea

This British intransigence and a failure to keep to the terms of the Article 22 as soon as was practical, resulted in the impasse that lasted until the United Nations, successor to the League of Nations, passed the historic partition vote on November 29, 1947. This was not the fault of Smuts, who repeatedly approached successive British governments on behalf of the South African Zionist Federation, protesting the various white papers limiting Jewish immigration to Palestine.

While it must be said that Smuts voted to restrict Jewish immigration to South Africa in 1936, he had a choice of bringing down the coalition government or going along with his coalition partners at this point.

His record prior to that vote and subsequent record, are totally at odds with his support for that contentious Immigration Bill.

Smuts led the move for South Africa to enter WWII as a British ally against the wishes of his coalition partners, who voted against a Declaration of War on Germany. However, they were defeated, leading to the end of the coalition and the establishment of the Reformed National Party, which would win the 1948 election on an apartheid-policy ticket.

The war years saw Smuts once again as an influential member of Winston Churchill's British war cabinet. Churchill had a great admiration for Smuts and valued his opinion above all others. Following the end of hostilities in September 1945, the United Nations was established on October 24, 1945, with the objective of preventing future global conflicts. Smuts was once again present and was the author of the Preamble to the Constitution of the United Nations. Smuts was the only politician to serve in the British war cabinet in both the First and the Second World Wars.

He was the only politician to sign the peace treaties ending global conflict after both world wars and was the only signatory to the establishment of both the League of Nations and the United Nations, a truly amazing record to say the least.

South Africa, with Jan Smuts as Prime Minister, voted in favour of the partition of Palestine to ensure the establishment of a Jewish homeland. David Ben-Gurion made the famous Declaration of Israeli Independence on May 14, 1948, and Smuts granted de facto recognition to the State of "Israel" 10 days later, May 24. His successor, prime minister Dr. D.F. Malan, granted de jure recognition on Israel's first Independence Day, May 14, 1949. Malan later became the first foreign head of state to visit Israel in 1953. *Authors note: How ironical – the apartheid twins already colluding!* 

Smuts is also accused by Troy of being a racist, not without foundation. But his conduct must be judged in the context of his times. Black South Africans definitely had more rights and less restrictions under Smuts than under successive Nationalist Party governments. Smuts acknowledged that the restrictions on blacks had to be reduced, but that this would have to be done under controlled circumstances. Accusations of racism against a South African prime minister for his

actions in the 1940s, based on contemporary standards, is unfair and borders on bias.

The move of the US Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem is vitally important to Israel. There is no denying the significant role Daniel P. Moynihan played over the years, albeit unsuccessfully, trying to influence a succession of presidents to move the embassy. The role played by Moynihan in the move, however, does not remotely bear comparison to the roles played by Smuts in the Balfour Declaration, at the Versailles Conference, the San Remo Conference, the League of Nations and later at the United Nations, regarding the formation of the State of Israel.

Find another street to honour Moynihan, but the German Colony Street honouring Smuts must stay the German Colony street, honouring a great friend of the Jewish people. And let's not forget Smuts Boulevard in Tel Aviv and Kibbutz Ramat Yohanan (Smuts) in northern Israel."

## There can simply be no debate as to how significant Smuts' contribution was to the birth of apartheid "Israel".

https://www.jpost.com/Opinion/Jan-Smuts-given-honor-where-honor-was-due-563333

https://www.sahistory.org.za/people/general-jan-christiaan-smuts https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jan\_Smuts

#### Lord Alfred Milner

Milner was the Governor of the Cape and then High Commissioner of South Africa, appointed by Joseph Chamberlain, Colonial Secretary in the British cabinet at the time. <u>It was he who precipitated the Anglo Boer War</u>, oversaw it and organised reconstruction after the war.

On leaving South Africa in 1905, Speaking to the Bloemfontein Town Council, Milner said: "My work has been constantly directed to a great and distant end – the establishment in South Africa of a civilized and progressive community, one from Cape Town to the Zambezi, independent in the management of its own affairs, but still remaining by its own firm desire, a member of the great community of free nations gathered together under the British flag. That has been the object of all my efforts. It is my object still."

In his farewell speech, delivered in Johannesburg on March 21, 1905, Milner said: "British and Dutch can, without loss of integrity, without any sacrifice of their individual traditions, united in loyal devotion to an Empire-State, in which Great Britain and South Africa would be partners, work loyally together for the good of South Africa as a member of a greater whole. And so, you see, the true Imperialist is also the best South African."

Milner returned to government in England in 1914 to serve on various committees dealing with the First World War and became a member of the War Council in 1916. He became Minister of War in April 1918 and later Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Experience in South Africa had shown Milner that underlying the difficulties of the colonies, was the wider problem of imperial unity. In his farewell speech at Johannesburg, he concluded: "When we who call ourselves Imperialists, talk of the British Empire, we think of a group of states bound, not in an alliance or alliances that can be made and unmade, but in a permanent organic union. Of such a union the dominions of the sovereign as they exist to-day are only the raw material."

Milner was an author of the Balfour Declaration, although issued in the name of Balfour. What measure of fate then that Milner and Smuts became the co-joint principal architects of the Balfour Declaration and the subsequent apartheid states of S.A. and "Israel."

Right until the end of his life, Lord Milner would call himself a "British race patriot" with grand dreams of a global Imperial parliament, headquartered in London. He retired in February 1921, but remained active in the work of the Rhodes Trust, till his death in 1925.

https://www.sahistory.org.za/people/alfred-milner

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alfred\_Milner,\_1st\_Viscount\_Miln

er

#### The Balfour Declaration

It is now apparent what role Smuts and Milner played in the development of the Balfour Declaration and British imperialism in general.

Prior to the declaration, about 8,000 of Britain's 300,000 Jews (2.7%) belonged to a Zionist organisation. Globally, as of 1913 (the last known date prior to the declaration), the equivalent figure was approximately 1% of the Jewish population. Only 24,000 Jews were living in Palestine at the time of the emergence of Zionism within the world's Jewish communities (the last two decades of the 19th century). Zionism was thus a cultivated movement, commencing from a very narrow base, a fact which is not lost on many orthodox Jews.

#### **Brief History Leading to the Balfour Declaration**

Zionist leader Chaim Weizmann, later President of the World Zionist Organisation and first President of "Israel," moved from Switzerland to the UK in 1904 and met Arthur Balfour.

In January 1914, Weizmann met Baron de Rothschild, a member of the French branch of the Rothschilds and a leading proponent of Zionism.

This connection was to bear fruit later that year when the Baron's son, James de Rothschild, requested a meeting with Weizmann on 25 November 1914, to enlist him in influencing those deemed to be receptive within the British government to their agenda of a "Jewish State" in Palestine.

Through James's wife, Weizmann was to meet Rózsika Rothschild, who introduced him to the English branch of the family, which was later to become the most powerful of the Rothschild family branches and a significant Zionism power base.

Foreign Office.

November 2nd, 1917.

Dear Lord Rothschild.

I have much pleasure in conveying to you, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, the following declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations which has been submitted to, and approved by, the Cabinet

His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country"

I should be grateful if you would bring this declaration to the knowledge of the Zionist Federation.

What were British motives behind the declaration?

They believed that expressing support would appeal to Jews in Germany and the United States, given two of Woodrow Wilson's closest advisors were known to be avid Zionists (America was an important war ally). However, American Zionism was still in its infancy – in 1914, the Zionist Federation had only 12,000 members, despite an American Jewish population of three million (0.4%).

They also hoped to encourage support from the large Jewish population in Russia, another important war ally.

The British hoped to pre-empt expected French pressure for an international administration in Palestine.

The Balfour Declaration had long-lasting Consequences

It greatly increased popular support for Zionism within Jewish communities worldwide, and became a core component of the British Mandate for Palestine, the founding document of Mandatory Palestine, which later became "Israel" and the Palestinian territories.

Britain's involvement in the Declaration became one of the most controversial parts of its Empire's history and damaged its reputation in the Middle East for generations, if not up to this very day.

According to historian Elizabeth Monroe, "measured by British interests alone, the declaration was one of the greatest mistakes in its imperial history."

The 2010 study by Jonathan Schneer, a specialist in modern British history, concluded that because the build-up to the declaration was characterized by "contradictions, deceptions, misinterpretations, and wishful thinking", the declaration sowed dragon's teeth and "produced a murderous harvest, which we go on harvesting even today".

The Balfour Declaration is considered the principal cause of the ongoing Israeli/Palestinian conflict, often described as the "world's most intractable conflict."

#### **Brief Post Balfour Declaration History**

Starting in 1920, intercommunal conflict in Mandatory Palestine broke out. The "dual obligation" to the two communities, quickly proved to be untenable.

The British subsequently concluded that it was impossible for them to pacify the two communities in Palestine by using different messages for different audiences. The Palestine Royal Commission, in making the first official proposal for partition of the region, referred to these requirements as "contradictory obligations", and that the "disease is so deep-rooted that, in our firm conviction, the only hope of a cure lies in a surgical operation".

Following the 1936–1939 Arab revolt in Palestine, and as worldwide tensions rose in the build-up to the Second World War, the British Parliament approved the White Paper of 1939 (their last formal statement of governing policy in Mandatory Palestine) declaring that Palestine should not become a Jewish State and placing restrictions on Jewish immigration. Whilst the British considered this consistent with the Balfour Declaration's commitment to protecting the rights of non-Jews, many Zionists saw it as a repudiation of the declaration.

Although this policy lasted until the British surrendered the Mandate in 1948, it served only to highlight the fundamental difficulties Britain had in carrying out its Mandate obligations.

#### https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Balfour\_Declaration

Britain was in fact one hundred percent correct in determining that what would later be referred to as the "two state system" was in fact a contradictory obligation – it was and never will be a sustainable solution. But the damage had already been done, for Zionism was rampant by then and in no small part, arising from the Balfour Declaration. At least Britain acted with some decorum at the end, but the Zionist machine was by that stage waging its own war against Britain – in fact, the original terrorists of Palestine were Zionists!

## The Severing of Diplomatic Relations by South Africa with "Israel"

South Africans in general, have very little for which to thank its present Government (the ANC), and that is an exceptionally polite way of stating the facts.

However, we can certainly be grateful for the principled stand that the S.A. Government has taken in respect of the Palestinian matter – they have severed all diplomatic ties with "Israel" i.e. they will simply not condone the present conduct of the "Israeli" Government. No equivocation – the S.A. embassy in "Israel" has been closed and

likewise the "Israeli" embassy in South Africa. In diplomatic parlance, this is the strongest protest that one can tender. To the best of the writer's knowledge, no other nation in the world has adopted such a clear stance with "Israel" at this time.

The S.A. Government may never know it, but this action has saved South Africa from multiple unknown future negative impacts, because the twinning between the two states has finally been deactivated. There are still some roots which remain, but they will be attended to, make no mistake – more of that in Chapter 12, however.

## Chapter 8 The United States of America Factor

### The Role of Woodrow Wilson in Advancing Early Zionism and U.S. Apartheid

A member of the Democratic Party, Wilson served as the president of Princeton University and as the 34th governor of New Jersey, before winning the 1912 presidential election. President Woodrow Wilson was the 28th president of the U.S. from 1913 to 1921.

As president, he oversaw the passage of progressive legislative policies unparalleled until the New Deal in 1933. He also led the U.S. into World War I in 1917 (<u>the war that gave birth to the Balfour Declaration</u>).

Wilson presided over the passage of the Federal Reserve Act (23rd December 2013), which created a central banking system in the form of the Federal Reserve System (the birth of the U.S. global Apartheid system).

After Germany signed an armistice in November 1918, Wilson and other Allied leaders took part in the Paris Peace Conference, where Wilson advocated for the establishment of a multilateral organization known as the League of Nations (which gave a platform to Smuts and others to advocate for a Zionist homeland).

The League of Nations was incorporated into the Treaty of Versailles and other treaties with the defeated Central Powers, but Wilson was unable to convince the Senate to ratify that treaty, or allow the U.S. to join it.

Wilson suffered a severe stroke in October 1919 and was incapacitated for the remainder of his presidency. He retired from public office in 1921.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Woodrow\_Wilson

#### Initial U.S. Support for Zionism

Backing for Zionism among American Jews was minimal, until the involvement of Louis Brandeis in the Federation of American Zionists (1912) and the establishment of the Provisional Executive Committee for General Zionist Affairs in 1914; it was empowered by the Zionist Organization "to deal with all Zionist matters, until better times come".

Woodrow Wilson, who was sympathetic to the plight of Jews in Europe and favorable to Zionist objectives (giving his assent to the text of the Balfour Declaration shortly before its release) stated on March 2, 1919, "I am persuaded that the Allied nations with the fullest concurrence of our own Government and people are agreed that in Palestine shall be laid the foundation of a future Jewish commonwealth" and on April 16, 1919, corroborated the U.S. government's "expressed acquiescence" in the Balfour Declaration.

Wilson's statements did not result in a change in policy of the U.S. State Department in favor of Zionist aims. However, the U.S. Congress passed the Lodge-Fish resolution, the first joint resolution stating its support for "the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people" on September 21, 1922. The same day, the Mandate of Palestine was approved by the Council of the League of Nations.

During World War II, while U.S. foreign policy decisions were often *ad hoc* moves and solutions dictated by the demands of the war, the Zionist movement made a fundamental departure from traditional Zionist policy and its stated goals, at the Biltmore Conference in May 1942. Previous stated policy towards establishing a Jewish "national home" in Palestine were gone; these were replaced with its new policy "that Palestine be established as a Jewish Commonwealth" like other nations, in cooperation with the United States, **not Britain**. Two attempts by Congress in 1944 to pass resolutions declaring US government support for the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine were objected to by the Departments of War and State, because of wartime considerations and Arab opposition to the creation of a Jewish state.

#### U.S. Support for the Formation of the State of "Israel"

Following WWII, the U.S. became intensively involved in the political and economic affairs of the Middle East, in contrast to the hands-off attitude characteristic of the pre-war period.

During Truman's administration the U.S. had to face and define its policy in all three sectors that gave rise to American interests in the region, namely the Soviet threat, the birth of Israel, and petroleum.

On May 14, 1948, the U.S. under Truman, became the first country to extend any form of recognition to the newly formed State of "Israel". This happened within hours of the Jewish People's Council gathering at the Tel Aviv Museum and David Ben-Gurion declaring the establishment of a Jewish state in Eretz Israel. The phrase "in Eretz Israel" is the only place in the Declaration of the Establishment of the State of "Israel", containing any reference to the location of the new State.

The text of the communication from the provisional government of Israel to Truman was as follows:

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to notify you that the state of "Israel" has been proclaimed as an independent republic within frontiers approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in its Resolution of 29 November 1947, and that a provisional government has been charged to assume the rights and duties of government for preserving law and order within the boundaries of Israel, for defending the state against external aggression, and for discharging the obligations of "Israel" to the other nations of the world in accordance with international law. The Act of Independence will become effective at one minute after six o'clock on the evening of 14 May 1948, Washington time.

With full knowledge of the deep bond of sympathy which has existed and has been strengthened over the past thirty years between the Government of the United States and the Jewish people of Palestine, I have been authorized by the provisional government of the new state to tender this message and to express the hope that your government will recognize and will welcome "Israel" into the community of nations.

Very respectfully yours,

ELIAHU EPSTEIN

Agent, Provisional government of "Israel"

The text of the U.S. recognition was as follows:

This Government has been informed that a Jewish state has been proclaimed in Palestine, and recognition has been requested by the provisional Government thereof.

The United States recognizes the provisional government as the de facto authority of the new State of "Israel".

(sgn.) Harry Truman

Approved, 14 May 1948

#### Post 14 May 1948 Support for "Israel" by the U.S.

From its formation, the U.S. has been an emphatic backer of "Israel." It has played a key role in the promotion of good relations between "Israel" and its neighbouring Arab states (namely Jordan, Lebanon, Egypt, along with several others in the 2020 Abraham Accords), whilst also holding off frequent hostilities from certain other Middle Eastern countries such as Syria and Iran. Relations with "Israel" are a very important factor in the U.S. government's overall foreign policy in the Middle East, and the U.S. Congress has likewise placed considerable importance on the maintenance of a close and supportive relationship.

"Israel" is the largest cumulative recipient of U.S. foreign aid in U.S. history.

In 1999, the U.S. government signed a Memorandum of Understanding through which it committed to providing "Israel" with at least USD2.67 billion in military aid annually, for the following ten years; in 2009, the annual amount was raised to USD3 billion; and in 2019, the amount was raised again, now standing at a minimum of USD3.8 billion.

Since 1972, the U.S. has also extended loan guarantees (a form of indirect U.S. assistance to "Israel", as they enable "Israel" to borrow from commercial U.S. banks at lower rates) to "Israel" to assist with housing shortages, "Israel's" absorption of new Jewish immigrants and its economic recovery following the 2000-2003 recession, caused in part by the Second Intifada.

Moreover, the U.S. is "Israel's" largest trading partner, and "Israel" is the U.S.' 25th-largest trading partner; two-way trade totaled some USD36 billion in 2013. Bilateral trade increased to nearly USD50 billion by 2023.

In addition to financial and military aid, the U.S. also provides large-scale political support to "Israel," having used its United Nations Security Council veto power 42 times against resolutions condemning Israel, out of a total 83 times in which its veto has ever been used. Between 1991 and 2011, out of the 24 vetoes invoked by the U.S., 15 were used to protect "Israel."

Bilateral relations have evolved from an initial American policy of sympathy and support for the creation of a Jewish homeland in 1948, to a partnership that links a small but powerful "Israeli" state with the U.S. attempting to balance influence against other competing interests in the region, namely those of Russia and its allies.

"Israel" is designated by the U.S. as a major non-NATO ally, and was the first country to be granted this status alongside Egypt in 1987; Israel and Egypt remain the only countries in the Middle East to have this designation.

As of 2021, the U.S. remains the only permanent member of the United Nations Security Council to have recognized Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, and moved its embassy to the disputed city from Tel Aviv in 2018. The U.S. is also the only country to have recognized the Golan Heights (designated as Israeli-occupied Syrian territory by the United Nations) as non-occupied "Israeli" sovereign territory, doing so via a presidential proclamation under the then Trump administration in 2019. However, under the subsequent Biden administration, the U.S. State Department's annual report on human rights violations around the world once more refers to the West Bank, Gaza Strip, East Jerusalem, and the Golan Heights as territories that are occupied by Israel.

Nevertheless, in June 2021, in response to a claim by *The Washington Free Beacon* that it had "walked back" its recognition, the Near Eastern Affairs account of the U.S. State Department tweeted that "U.S. policy regarding the Golan Heights has not changed, and reports to the contrary are false."

#### The Three Apartheid States

The word "apartheid" is commonly and correctly associated with a very dark period in South Africa's history. It is an Afrikaans word, derived from the French term "mettre à part", literally translated as "separating, setting apart." Apartheid means a policy that is founded on the premise of separating people based on racial or ethnic criteria.

Such a separation policy simply cannot be implemented in a peaceful fashion, only by the brutal application of power (violence in other words). Ask anyone who opposed apartheid in South Africa at the time of its existence. Apartheid was however terminated in South Africa in 1994 (although its appalling legacy is proving extremely difficult to unwind) but has continued emphatically in "Israel" to this very day – you are hopelessly deceived if you cannot accept that by now.

But "Israel" would wither very quickly without the active collusion of the monster apartheid nation, the U.S. The U.S. practices apartheid? On a scale never before seen on the face of the earth, but in an economic sense (although the economic impacts ripple down with racial overtones often in attendance).

On the 15<sup>th</sup> August 1971, the U.S. committed an act of insolvency, by defaulting on the Bretton Woods system. Instead of the world holding the U.S. accountable, it simply acted as lap dogs. Ever since, the U.S. has traded recklessly under insolvent conditions, and fraudulently represented a piece of paper as value for the exchange of primary goods/supplies and services of real utility – the biggest racket in human history. This off the back of the USD having become the world's reserve currency in the early 1920s. Hey presto! U.S. profligacy, hubris and inefficiencies could be exported via its currency, meaning that the rest of the world subsidized its excesses and were consigned by brutal economic (and military) power, to separation, becoming universal second-class humans economically. It has been long known that the U.S. enjoys an egregiously evil advantage in the global financial system – it is able to conjure value ex-nihilo (out of nothing) and use this "nothingness" to import resources and boost domestic living standards.

Who has bewitched the world that the U.S. acts with such arrogance and impunity, without explicit censure? This can only be

the blindness of the world's prophets arising from U.S. harlotry with Zionism.

However, with the post WWII new world order controlled by Zionists, hardly surprising. But apartheid can never be sustainable and despite the incestuous apartheid collusion between "Israel" and the U.S., it is rapidly coming to an end for both nations. An incomprehensible (for Zionists that is) switch is swiftly approaching!

#### **BREAKING NEWS!**

The House on Tuesday (5<sup>th</sup> December 2023) passed a resolution that says, "anti-Zionism is antisemitism." The chamber's latest piece of legislation conflates criticism of Israel with antisemitism.

The resolution, which is presented as a resolution condemning antisemitism, passed in a vote of 314-14-92. Only thirteen Democrats and one Republican voted against the legislation, while 92 Democrats voted "present" in protest of a line buried in the bill that explicitly claims anti-Zionism is antisemitism.

<u>It is a legislated reality now – the U.S. is a colony of the Zionist world order!</u> Does this qualify as the foolhardiest act of U.S. politicians in U.S. history? It could very well be the case!

# Chapter 9 The Palestinians (God's Promise to Ishmael)

#### Introduction

The Bible gives us the origins of nations that have affected their subsequent history, in some cases, for thousands of years. This chapter addresses the Scriptural history of modern Arabic people. The authors write from a Scriptural perspective, though not necessarily from a so called "Christian perspective". Sadly, Christians are often as ignorant of the Bible as are non-Christians. For this reason, many of the matters addressed in this document will differ from mainstream Christian thought.

We have not found anything in Christian teachings that properly explain the promises that God made with Hagar, the mother of Ishmael. Almost all the focus has been on Isaac, who was Ishmael's half-brother. Yet to truly understand the promise to either son, one must know the promise to the other son. Each provides context and contrast to the other.

As we will set out in this chapter, the Bible (and Scriptural law itself) shows that the land originally called Canaan was given to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. However, the corruption of Abraham's offspring and the worship of false gods caused God to disinherit them and to exile them to Assyria, where they were known by other names, such as Gimirri and Saka. The name changes contributed toward their disappearance from history.

Isaac's disinheritance meant that the land reverted to the second in line to inherit the land. This was Isaac's brother, Ishmael, the father of the Arabs. The Zionists who currently occupy the land base their claim on their genealogy back to Judah, but, as we have already seen, Judah was not allowed to return to that land without first repenting of their hostility to God. They returned under the banner of Edom, which Judah had conquered and absorbed in 126 B.C.

Edom was the nation founded by Esau, Jacob's brother. They were born in the next generation after Isaac and Ishmael, and hence, Edom stood third in line as the inheritor of the land. The Jews claim to be from Jacob, who had been given the name Israel. But this is a complete falsehood. **Zionism is the fulfillment of prophecy regarding Esau, not Jacob**.

## The bottom line is that Ishmael (Arabs) hold the long-term title deed to the entire land of Palestine.

#### **Abraham**

The story of Ishmael begins with his father, Abram. In Genesis 12:1-3 we read how God called Abram (later called Abraham) to leave the land of his birth and to go to a place where God would lead him. Though he did not know at first where this would lead him, he obeyed God. The promise is seen in verses 2 and 3:

And I will make you a great nation, and I will bless you, and make your name great. And so, you shall be a blessing; And I will bless those who bless you, and the one who curses you I will curse. And in you all the families of the earth will be blessed.

Although there remains a possibility that some will be cursed, in the end, "all the families of the earth will be blessed." In other words, any such curse will be reversed by the end of the story. In effect, Abraham's descendants were not the exclusive recipients of God's blessings but were instead stewards for the benefit of others. They were not to hoard the blessings for themselves or selfishly, but they were to be God's agents of blessing.

Abram was promised a son through whom these blessings were to flow to other nations. The New Testament tells us that Abraham's children are those who share Abraham's faith (belief in God's promises) to fulfill Abraham's calling (Galatians 3:7).

There are no true children of Abraham apart from those who bless the world, for they must do the works of their father.

#### The Birth of Ishmael

When Abram and Sarai, his wife, first moved to Canaan, they arrived during a tieme of famine. So, they continued their journey to Egypt, where there was food. Sarai was beautiful, and when Pharaoh

saw her, he took her into his harem, not knowing that she was married to Abram (Genesis 12:14, 15). God then "struck Pharaoh and his house with great plagues" (Genesis 12:17), which caused Pharaoh to question Abram.

When Abram told him the truth, Pharaoh returned Sarai to Abraham. The ancient Book of Jasher tells us that Pharaoh gave Abram gifts, and that he gave one of his daughters to Sarai as a servant. Jasher 15:30 & 31 tells us:

... And Pharaoh took more cattle, men servants and maid servants, and silver and gold, to give to Abram, and he returned unto him Sarai his wife. And the king took a maiden whom he begat by his concubines, and he gave her to Sarai for a handmaid.

Hagar was an Egyptian princess. This is helpful information because the Bible does not tell us how Sarai obtained Hagar.

The story of Ishmael's birth is recorded in Genesis 16. Abram and Sarai had no children, and both were getting old. Finally, Sarai suggested that Abram take Hagar as a wife and raise up a son through her. This was a common practice in those days. Years later, Jacob himself married Leah and Rachel, and each of them provided handmaids to Jacob to increase their family size.

Hagar quickly became pregnant, "and when she saw that she had conceived, her mistress was despised in her sight" (Genesis 16:4). The friction increased between the two women, and "Sarai treated her harshly" (Genesis 16:6). Hagar finally resolved to run away and to return to her father's house in Egypt. We then read:

Now the angel of the Lord found her by a spring of water in the wilderness, by the spring on the way to Shur. He said, "Hagar, Sarai's maid, where have you come from and where are you going?" And she said, "I am fleeing from the presence of my mistress Sarai." Then the angel of the Lord said to her, "Return to your mistress, and submit yourself to her authority."

The angel addressed the root problem, which was Hagar's pride and presumption after conceiving Abram's first son. The solution was to submit to Sarai's authority and let God work out the details. The angel then continued with the conversation to let her know the calling that Ishmael had upon his life.

#### Ishmael's Calling

We read the words of the angel to Hagar in Genesis 16:10-12:

Moreover, the angel of the Lord said to her, "I will greatly multiply your descendants so that they will be too many to count." The angel of the Lord said to her further, "Behold, you are with child and you will bear a son; and you shall call his name Ishmael, because the Lord has given heed to your affliction. He will be a wild donkey of a man. His hand will be against everyone, and everyone's hand will be against him; and he will live to the east of all his brothers."

The name *Ishmael* means "God hears." The root of his name comes from *shem*, "to hear/obey," and *el*, "God." So, he is compared to a donkey, which has big ears and has good hearing. The angel acknowledged the fact that Hagar had been afflicted and mistreated. In fact, this appears to have formed a pattern of abuse that would follow them into the future.

The angel then prophesied that Ishmael's descendants would "live to the east" of the land of Canaan. And so it is to this day, although they have since spread to other places as well.

Then we see Hagar's response, which was prophetic as well. Genesis 16:13 & 14 says:

Then she called the name of the Lord who spoke to her, "You are a God who sees"; for she said, "Have I even remained alive here after seeing Him?" Therefore, the well was called Beer-lahai-roi; behold, it is between Kadesh and Bered.

Hagar's revelation of God was that He was "The God of Vision." The well's name means "The Well of Living After Seeing (Him)." In those days it was commonly believed that anyone who saw God would not live to talk about it. (Many years later, the Israelites were afraid to approach God in the Mount for fear that they would die – see Exodus 20:19.)

The Bible makes it clear that the only way to receive life (immortality) is to approach God who is Life itself. Hence, when God talked to Moses face to face, Moses came off the Mount with his face transfigured (Exodus 33:11).

Many years later, Jesus ascended Mount Sion (Hermon), where He too was transfigured in the presence of His heavenly Father (Matthew 17:2). The Apostle John was one of three who witnessed this transfiguration. He later wrote about Jesus in his Gospel of John 1:4:

"In Him was life, and the life was the light of men."

Essentially, Hagar's revelation prophesied of the day when her descendants too would see God and live – that is, receive immortal life. The well in this case pointed to the "wells of salvation" from which the people would drink.

This well was mentioned in Isaiah 12:2 & 3:

Behold, God is my salvation, I will trust and not be afraid; for the Lord God is my strength and song, and He has become my salvation. Therefore, you will joyously draw water from the springs [or wells] of salvation.

The Hebrew word translated "salvation" is *Yeshua*, which is Jesus' Hebrew name. The New Testament often makes mention of this. For example, when Joseph and Mary brought the infant Jesus to the temple for dedication, an old man named Simeon (whose name means Hearing) prophesied over Him, saying in Luke 2:30:

### "My eyes have seen Your salvation."

Apparently, Simeon had heard revelation from God that the Messiah would be born at the feast of Trumpets, and so he knew that the Boy would be brought to the temple on the 40th day. He also must have had a revelation that the Messiah's name would be Yeshua, "Salvation." Hence, he recognized that Jesus was the Messiah.

Years later, when Jesus went to Jerusalem to keep the feast of Tabernacles (Sukkoth), He prophesied on the last great day of the feast in John 7:37 & 38:

Now on the last day, the great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried out, saying, "If anyone is thirsty, let him come to Me and drink. He who believes in Me, as the Scripture has said [Isaiah 12:3], 'From his innermost being will flow rivers of living water."

This was a reference to the prophecy in Isaiah 12:2 & 3, where the prophet instructed the people to drink from the wells of Yeshua. Jesus/Yeshua took this as a prophecy referring to Himself. All who seek the truth and the Holy Spirit were instructed to come to Him, so that they might become wells of living water that would never run dry.

Jesus also talked to a Samaritan woman at a well, which scandalized the Jews of His time. John 4:9 tells us:

"For Jews have no dealings with Samaritans."

## <u>Jesus, however, was different, for He did not discriminate against non-Jews.</u>

We read in John 4:12-14:

"You are not greater than our father Jacob, are You, who gave us the well and drank of it himself and his sons and his cattle? Jesus answered and said to her, "everyone who drinks of this water will thirst again; but whoever drinks of the water that I will give him shall never thirst; but the water that I will give him will become in him a well of water springing up to eternal life."

This "well of Yeshua" was foreshadowed at the well called Beerlahai-roi, where Hagar received the revelation from the angel. It was the well of living after seeing. The revelation of God and His nature transforms us and springs up within us, bring us into immortal life. Hagar, then, like the Samaritan woman, was promised access to this well of life.

The day comes, then, when the Spirit of God will become a well of life to Hagar and her descendants. This is the promise of God, the hope set before the Arab people in view of the harsh treatment that they have received throughout the centuries.

#### From Donkey to Lamb

The angel told Hagar that her son would be a *pereh awdawm*, "wild-donkey man." This was not to be taken literally, of course. It was a reference to human nature itself, which is derived from Adam,

the first sinner, who passed down mortality to all those after Him. Mortality (death) is man's great weakness which causes him to sin (Romans 5:12).

Yet the Bible provides a way to escape the sentence upon Adam. One must be begotten a second time, not physically, but spiritually by hearing the word of God. This begets a "new man" as we read in Colossians 3:10, existing side by side with the "old man" begotten by our earthly father. The new man reflects the nature of his Father-God, even as the old man reflects the nature of his earthly father.

The divine law depicts this in metaphorical terms. A donkey represents the old man/nature; a lamb represents the new man/nature. According to the law, only a perfect, unspotted lamb was acceptable to God in the laws of sacrifice and offerings. The law instructs men to give God the firstborn of their flocks and herds, but some animals were considered unclean. Unclean animals could not be given to God directly, so they had to substitute a lamb for them.

The same was true of the firstborn sons of men. Exodus 13:11-13 says:

Now when the Lord brings you to the land of the Canaanite, as He swore to you and to your fathers, and gives it to you, you shall devote to the Lord the first offspring of every womb, and the first offspring of every beast that you own; the males belong to the Lord. But every first offspring of a donkey you shall redeem with a lamb, but if you do not redeem it, then you shall break its neck; and every firstborn of man among you sons you shall redeem.

We see here that the firstborn of a donkey had to be redeemed with a lamb – and all firstborn sons of man were to be redeemed. In other words, all the firstborn sons of men, born of earthly fathers, had to be redeemed by a lamb. Why? Because they were spiritual donkeys. To become "the sheep of His pasture" (Psalm 100:3), they had to be redeemed with a lamb.

How? By the principle of substitution. The lamb was a substitute by the principle of unity through identification. Legally, the law no longer saw a donkey but saw only an acceptable lamb. By this law, donkeys became lambs, and the naturally-born sons of men changed their identity and nature into sons of God, making them acceptable to God

All the Old Testament sacrifices were prophetic patterns of something much greater that was yet to come. Every time a lamb was sacrificed to atone for man's sin, the principle of substitution was set forth for our learning. Every lamb prophesied of the "Lamb of God" who was yet to come. So, John the Baptist, when he saw Jesus, said in John 1:29:

### "Behold, the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world!"

He did so by offering Himself up as the great Sacrifice for sin. In so doing, donkeys could be turned into lambs, as recognized by the law of God.

This is the provision that the angel prophesied to Hagar by calling Ishmael a wild-donkey man. The prophecy pointed to a law that was later to be revealed through Moses by which Hagar's children, and all who are descended from Adam, may be saved. Recall that even the Israelites themselves had to redeem their firstborn sons. Why? Because they were all spiritual donkeys, having a nature that was unacceptable to God.

#### **God Owns His Creation**

Genesis 1:1 says:

#### "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth."

A Creator owns that which He creates by His own labor. Man uses what God creates and adds value to it by shaping and forming trees, rocks, and elements into something useful, and so man is said to own that which he has made. He however only owns the labor which he invested, but God still owns the building materials involved.

His Kingdom consists of all that He created; therefore, His Kingdom includes both heaven and earth. These two dimensions were supposed to function in unity, the earth reflecting the will of heaven at all times. Sin, however, put a division between heaven and earth, because the two began to pull in different directions. God's Kingdom is fully manifested when the earth fully submits to the will of heaven. So, Jesus taught His disciples to pray in Matthew 6:10:

## "Your kingdom come, Your will be done, on earth as it is in heaven."

His prayer will be answered, even if it takes thousands of years to accomplish.

In the course of history, the revelation of God has been progressive. To know God is not something that happens overnight. The same is true with the history of nations. God began teaching men through an elementary education, based on what the Bible calls the Old Covenant. The Old Covenant was designed to teach men the ways of God and to avoid sin. The law defines sin and righteousness, but it does not impart the capacity to be perfect.

#### **Two Covenants**

Broadly speaking, the Old Covenant was man's commitment to obey the laws of God, both in one's personal life and in governing society with justice.

The New Covenant was where God took personal responsibility to bring the entire creation back into alignment with His laws. He was to do this by changing the hearts of men, rather than by trying to force mortal men into compliance.

The Old Covenant is man's vow to God, as we see in Exodus 19:5, 6 & 8:

Now then, if you will indeed obey My voice and keep My covenant, then you shall be My own possession among all the peoples, for all the earth is Mine; and you shall be a kingdom of priests and a holy nation... All the people answered together and said, "All that the Lord has spoken we will do!"...

The New Covenant is God's vow to man, as we see in Jeremiah 31:31-33 & 31:

"Behold, days are coming," declares the Lord, "when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah, not like the covenant which I made with their fathers... But this is the covenant which I will make with the house of Israel after those days," declares the Lord, "I will put My law within them and on their

## heart I will write it; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people."

The first covenant, being based on the will of man (and his good intentions) failed to bring righteousness into the earth, both individually and nationally. For this reason, God exiled Israel to Assyria. Judah's exile to Babylon was temporary, and they were allowed to return after 70 years in order that Jesus Christ might be born in Bethlehem according to prophecy (Micah 5:2). Forty years later, however, Judah too was expelled from the land.

It is evident, then, that a new covenant was needed to fulfill the purposes of God. This was prophesied in Jeremiah 31:31, one which was based on the promise of God. This ensured the success of this covenant, so that God's intention would be guaranteed.

The Apostle Paul tells us in Galatians 4:22-26:

"For it is written that Abraham had two sons, one by the bondwoman and one by the free woman. But the son by the bondwoman was born according to the flesh [natural childbirth], and the son of the free woman through the promise. This is allegorically speaking, for these women are the two covenants: one proceeding from Mount Sinai bearing children who are to be slaves; she is Hagar. Now this Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia and corresponds to the present Jerusalem, for she is in slavery with her children. But the Jerusalem above is free; she is our mother."

A slave wife bears children who are also slaves, according to the law in Exodus 21:4. Paul shows how the Old Covenant is a system of slavery, because when a man vows obedience, he becomes a slave to his own vow. Furthermore, because man is imperfect, there is no way for him to fulfill his vow perfectly, regardless of his good intentions. Every sin, then, puts him further into debt-bondage which he cannot possibly pay off by his labor or his good works.

The New Covenant releases slaves from their slavery, because it is based on God's promise and upon Christ's death on the cross which paid for the sin-debt of the world. Hence, those who believe in the promise of God become the children of Sarah, the New Covenant, and

can join the company of Isaac as free men. One's status is a matter of faith, not genealogy.

In the course of Paul's discussion about this historical allegory, he identifies Jerusalem with the Old Covenant and with Mount Sinai in Arabia, the inheritance of Ishmael. When the Jews (as a whole), rejected the Mediator of the New Covenant, they placed themselves under the authority of Mount Sinai and, by extension, Ishmael and his descendants.

#### **Land Promises**

The land originally promised to Abraham and his descendants ("seed") was the land of Canaan, later known as Palestine. The land was certainly given to the tribes of Israel at the time of Joshua's conquest. However, after repeatedly turning to false gods and sacrificing children to them, God finally expelled them. This tells us that the Israelite claim to the land was not unconditional. In fact, God had warned them through Moses in Deuteronomy 8:20:

"Like the nations that the Lord makes to perish before you, so you shall perish; because you would not listen to the voice of the Lord your God."

The Impartial God showed no partiality toward the Israelites when they followed the example of the Canaanites. The ten Israelite tribes were cast out and never returned. The Jews know this, because for thousands of years they have prayed to be reunited with them. The Jews know that they are not the Scriptural Israelites, even though they chose to call the name of their nation "Israel."

The question facing us today is this: In the absence of the Israelites, who has the next claim to the land? To answer this question, we must trace the history back to the two sons of Abraham—Ishmael and Isaac. Genesis 21:12, 13 tells us:

... through Isaac your descendants ["seed"] shall be named. And of the son of the maid [i.e., Ishmael] I will make a nation also, because he is your descendant.

Hence, Isaac was the primary inheritor of Abraham's estate and calling, but at the same time, God gave a promise to Ishmael as well. Isaac's son, Jacob, was the father of the twelve tribes of Israel, who

were given the land of Canaan. These are the tribes who were later exiled and who never returned. <u>In their absence, then, Ishmael was</u> the secondary inheritor of the land.

A third claimant arrived in the next generation when Esau and Jacob contended for the birthright. We have already discussed this at length in earlier chapters.

Esau is Edom (Genesis 36:8), which was later known in the Greek language as Idumea. Idumea was conquered by Judah in 126 B.C. and subsequently absorbed. The Idumeans then converted to Judaism and, as Josephus puts it, were "hereafter no other than Jews" (Antiquities of the Jews, XIII, ix, 1). The legal implication of this was that from then on, Judah had two sets of prophecies to fulfill, because the nation of Edom had ceased to exist as a separate nation.

Judah-Edom was destroyed by the Romans from 70-73 A.D., the last stronghold being Masada, an Edomite fortress. They were all expelled from the land and were scattered throughout many nations, where they were simply known as Jews. <u>In the interim, the land</u> reverted back to Ishmael's descendants, known as Arabs.

In the late 1800's, some of these Jews formed a movement known as Zionism, by which they laid claim to Palestine.

The law of God, however, blocked Judah from returning until they had repented of their hostility to God. Leviticus 26:40-42 specifically forbids any of the exiled tribes to return while yet in a state of hostility to God – something they have yet to do.

But God had not forgotten that Esau-Edom had a standing case in the divine court, dating back to Genesis 27:40 (King James Version), where Isaac prophesied to him, "when thou shalt have the dominion, that thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck."

In other words, Jacob would have to give back the birthright to Esau to allow Esau to prove himself unworthy, so that he could be disinherited in a lawful manner. God allowed the Zionists to succeed (temporarily) and to supersede Ishmael's claim on the land. Technically, Esau-Edom was third in line to claim the land, because he was born in the generation after Ishmael.

Unfortunately, very few people (if any at all) understand the Scriptural history of Abraham's descendants, and even fewer understood the laws of God which govern inheritances. The bottom line is that the true Israelites had first claim to the land, followed by the Ishmaelites, followed by those Zionist Jews who were (and are) motivated by the spirit of Edom, but again, **only temporarily**.

#### The New Covenant Inheritance

The land of Canaan was never meant to be the inheritance of the sons of God – those begotten by the Holy Spirit through their ears by hearing the word of truth. Regarding the land of Canaan, Moses said in Deuteronomy 8:7:

"For the Lord your God is bringing you into a good land, a land of brooks and water, of fountains and springs, flowing forth in valleys and hills."

At that time, it appeared that the land of Canaan was the ultimate inheritance for God's people. However, this inheritance did not prevent them from worshiping false gods and from departing from the laws of God. **No land inheritance could change the hearts of men**. Something greater was required. Yet God established Israel in the land to show that they were unworthy and that their Old Covenant vows could not be fulfilled, regardless of good intentions.

The people inherited that land under the Old Covenant, based on the will of man. They were yet unaware that this covenant could not succeed and that a new covenant would be required. So, the people of Isaac and Jacob-Israel were cast out and disinherited according to the terms of the Old Covenant, making it necessary to establish a second covenant that was based upon the will and promise of God who cannot fail. This is the main topic of the New Testament, although the prophet Jeremiah spoke of it 600 years earlier in Jeremiah 31:31. In fact, even Moses himself prophesied about the New Covenant obscurely in Deuteronomy 30:6, saying:

"Moreover, the Lord your God will circumcise your heart and the heart of your descendants, to love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul, so that you may live."

This is the great hope of the followers of Jesus. The New Covenant is designed to change one's nature, whereas the Old Covenant commands men to change their behavior through self-discipline. In addition, the land of Canaan/Palestine and

## Jerusalem is the inheritance of the Old Covenant, but the New Covenant gives believers a greater inheritance.

The New Testament book of Hebrews 11:8-10 explains it this way:

"By faith Abraham, when he was called, obeyed by going out to a place which he was to receive for an inheritance; and he went out, not knowing where he was going. By faith he lived as an alien in the land of promise, as in a foreign land, dwelling in tents with Isaac and Jacob, fellow heirs of the same promise; for he was looking for a city which has foundations, whose architect and builder is God."

What "city" is this? The answer is given in verses 13-16:

"All these died in faith, without receiving the promises, but having seen them and having welcomed them from a distance, and having confessed that they were strangers and exiles on the earth. For those who say such things make it clear that they are seeking a country of their own. And indeed if they had been thinking of that country [Canaan] from which they went out, they could have had opportunity to return. But as it is, they desire a better country, that is, a heavenly one. Therefore, God is not ashamed to be called their God; for He has prepared a city for them.

This new "city" is the heavenly Jerusalem – not the earthly city by the same name. Abraham was given a promise from God. It was a New Covenant promise, because it did not originate with Abraham himself. Abraham simply believed that what God had promised, He was able to fulfill.

The land of Canaan was the first step toward the fulfillment of God's promise, but it was not the ultimate goal. Abraham's real inheritance was not the land of Canaan at all but "a better country, that is, a heavenly one." The capital of this better country is the heavenly Jerusalem. Those who share the faith of Abraham are those who have the same vision of this greater inheritance.

To drive home this point, Hebrews 11:15 tells us that if our inheritance had truly been in the land of Canaan, then the exiled Israelites "would have had opportunity to return." To return would

have been relatively easy. Just move back to the old land. But if the true inheritance under the New Covenant were a heavenly city, it would serve no purpose to return to Canaan/Palestine.

Canaan (and later, Jerusalem) was the inheritance under the Old Covenant; as followers of Jesus Christ, we have a greater inheritance under the New Covenant. While Moses was the mediator of the Old Covenant (Galatians 3:19), Christ is the Mediator of the New Covenant (Hebrews 8:6).

The dispute over the land of Palestine is largely a dispute between various forms of Old Covenant religions, of which Ishmael is the king. Christians should never have gotten involved in this dispute, except perhaps as mediators to prevent conflict. And the bottom line is that the land which the Zionists claim as their own is not theirs, except by the Judge's (God) accommodation to give Esau the justice that was due to him. And again, this is only temporal.

In the end, the angel's promise to Hagar at the well means that the Ishmaelite nations will be given the water of life from the Well of Living After Seeing (God). In other words, they too will receive the greater inheritance, the "better country" that Abraham sought. Meanwhile, prior to that time, the land of Palestine still belongs to Ishmael, even though the land had to be returned to Edom momentarily at the end of this present age.

Because of Edom's tendency toward violence and bloodshed, the reign of Edom has resulted in much injustice. Esau-Edom has now proven itself to be unworthy of the birthright and unworthy of the name Israel. As the "Israelis" engage in ethnic cleansing and pursue violence to occupy Gaza, they are proving that they are unworthy of the birthright. This is quickly becoming apparent to the entire world.

It is worth noting that Islamic scholars emphasize the need for Muslims to follow the name of Isa (Jesus), whether spoken or written, with the honorific phrase alayhi al-salām (Arabic: عليه السلام), which means peace be upon him. Isa is mentioned by name or title 78 times in the Quran.

### Chapter 10 The Gaza War



#### Introduction

The Arab-"Israeli" War of 1948 (the so-called War of Independence) broke out when five Arab nations invaded territory in the former Palestinian mandate immediately following the announcement of the independence of the state of "Israel" on May 14, 1948

As a result of this war, the State of "Israel" landed up controlling territory that the U.N. had proposed for the Jewish state, as well as almost 60% of the area which had been originally allocated to the "Arab" state in accordance with U.N. Resolution 181 of 29<sup>th</sup> November 1947, including the Jaffa, Lydda and Ramle areas, Upper Galilee and a variety of parts of the Negev, together with a wide strip along the Tel Aviv-Jerusalem road.

"Israel" further took control of West Jerusalem, which was meant to be part of an international zone for Jerusalem and its environs. Transjordan took control of East Jerusalem and what became known as the West Bank, annexing it the following year, and the Egyptian military took control of the Gaza Strip.

At the Jericho Conference on 1 December 1948, 2,000 Palestinian delegates called for unification of Palestine and Transjordan, as a step toward full Arab unity.

The 1948 war triggered significant demographic change throughout the Middle East. Around 700,000 Palestinian Arabs fled or were expelled from their homes in the area that became "Israel", and they became Palestinian refugees in what they refer to as the Nakba ("the catastrophe"). A similar number of Jews moved to "Israel" during the three years following the war, including 260,000 from the surrounding Arab states.

#### **Background**

Gaza occupies an area of 365 square kilometers with a total common border with Israel of approximately 50 kilometers. It contains approximately 2.2 million people, which makes for a higher-than-average population density, who it must be remembered were all originally refugees of some sorts.

#### Which Came First - the Chicken or the Egg?

The conflict between Palestinians and Zionists has been in the making for over a hundred years. Under these circumstances, the chain of events as to who is responsible for what, is now so blurred that to predicate the legitimacy of one set of actions based on another from the other side, <u>amounts to a revolving door called the "blame game"</u>.

#### **Violence**

Violence is deplorable period! Hamas, Hezbollah and "Israel," STOP IT NOW! It is absolutely too late for any party to try and legitimize violence by trying to ascribe blame (the revolving door referred to above) – JUST STOP.

#### Who has been one of Hamas' Greatest Supporters to Date?

#### "Israel" no less!

We quote from the Times of Israel:

The Times of Israel

By TAL SCHNEIDER 8 October 2023, 3:58 pm

"For years, Netanyahu propped up Hamas. Now it's blown up in our faces.

The premier's policy of treating the terror group as a partner, at the expense of Abbas and Palestinian statehood, has resulted in wounds from which it will take Israel years to heal.

For years, the various governments led by Benjamin Netanyahu took an approach that divided power between the Gaza Strip and the West Bank -- bringing Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas to his knees while making moves that propped up the Hamas terror group.

The idea was to prevent Abbas -- or anyone else in the Palestinian Authority's West Bank government -- from advancing toward the establishment of a Palestinian state.

Thus, amid this bid to impair Abbas, Hamas was upgraded from a mere terror group to an organization with which Israel held indirect negotiations via Egypt, and one that was allowed to receive infusions of cash from abroad.

Hamas was also included in discussions about increasing the number of work permits Israel granted to Gazan labourers, which kept money flowing into Gaza, meaning food for families and the ability to purchase basic products.

Israeli officials said these permits, which allow Gazan laborers to earn higher salaries than they would in the enclave, were a powerful tool to help preserve calm.

Toward the end of Netanyahu's fifth government in 2021, approximately 2,000-3,000 work permits were issued to Gazans. This number climbed to 5,000 and, during the Bennett-Lapid government, rose sharply to 10,000.

Since Netanyahu returned to power in January 2023, the number of work permits has soared to nearly 20,000.

Additionally, since 2014, Netanyahu-led governments have practically turned a blind eye to the incendiary balloons and rocket fire from Gaza. Meanwhile, Israel has allowed suitcases holding millions in Qatari cash to enter Gaza through its crossings since 2018, in order to maintain its fragile ceasefire with the Hamas rulers of the Strip.

Most of the time, Israeli policy was to treat the Palestinian Authority as a burden and Hamas as an asset. Far-right MK Bezalel Smotrich, now the finance minister in the hardline government and leader of the Religious Zionism party, said so himself in 2015.

According to various reports, Netanyahu made a similar point at a Likud faction meeting in early 2019, when he was quoted as saying that those who oppose a Palestinian state should support the transfer of funds to Gaza, because maintaining the separation between the Palestinian Authority in the West Bank and Hamas in Gaza would prevent the establishment of a Palestinian state.

While Netanyahu does not make these kinds of statements publicly or officially, his words are in line with the policy that he implemented.

The same messaging was repeated by right-wing commentators, who may have received briefings on the matter or talked to Likud higher-ups and understood the message.

Bolstered by this policy, Hamas grew stronger and stronger until 7<sup>th</sup> October 2023, Israel's "Pearl Harbor," the bloodiest day in its history - when terrorists crossed the border, slaughtered hundreds of Israelis and kidnapped an unknown number under the cover of thousands of rockets fired at towns throughout the country's south and center.

The country has known attacks and wars, but never on such a scale in a single morning.

One thing is clear: The concept of indirectly strengthening Hamas - while tolerating sporadic attacks and minor military operations every few years - went up in smoke that day (7<sup>th</sup> October 2023).

Just a few days ago, Assaf Pozilov, a reporter for the Kan public broadcaster, tweeted the following: "The Islamic Jihad organization has started a noisy exercise very close to the border, in which they practiced launching missiles, breaking into Israel and kidnapping soldiers."

The difference between Islamic Jihad and Hamas doesn't matter much at this point. As far as the State of Israel is concerned, the territory is under the control of Hamas, and it is responsible for all the training and activities there.

Hamas became stronger and used the auspices of peace that Israelis so longed for as cover for its training, and hundreds of Israelis have paid with their lives for this massive omission.

The terror inflicted on the civilian population in Israel is so enormous that the wounds from it will not heal for years, a challenge compounded by the dozens abducted into Gaza.

Judging how Netanyahu has managed Gaza in the last 13 years, it is not certain that there will be a clear policy going forward."

So Netanyahu and his henchman (be they in politics or civilians who support Zionism by their very existence in "Israel") are prepared to perpetrate another holocaust of sorts, to eliminate

## something (Hamas) they expressly helped create for the sake of expediency, in the first place. How heinous is that?

To What do we Ascribe the Capacity for Hamas being able to so Easily Breach the Border and to Remain there for so Long?

We quote:

#### BY TDB HTTPS://WWW.ARMAGEDDONPROSE.COM/

SATURDAY, DEC 02, 2023 - 21:04

"On October 8<sup>th</sup>, the day after the Hamas attack, I penned an article calling bullshit on the "intelligence failure" narrative that emerged immediately in the aftermath – how could the governing authorities and media confidently call it an "intelligence failure" mere hours after the event? Just like the story line following the 9/11 attacks in Manhattan and DC.

Although I always take the time to carefully weigh evidence before making any definitive statements, as responsible journalists do, I didn't feel compelled to wait or hedge in this case because it was palpably clear from the start, that the narrative was total propaganda and would subsequently be debunked in the coming days and weeks.

Even based on the limited evidence available on October 8<sup>th</sup>, basic logic defied the "intelligence failure" story:

- Gaza is among the, if not *the*, most heavily surveilled strips of land on Earth, both from the air (satellite and drone surveillance) and via Mossad spooks on the ground (what the so-called "intelligence community" calls "human intelligence" or "humint" because it *loves* insular jargon);
- Gaza is among the most densely populated strips of land on Earth;
- The Israeli government controls all of Gaza's borders in a total siege-style blockade. Nothing goes in or out without the state's blessing;
- The October 8 operation involved tens of thousands of operatives and a bevy of equipment that would be virtually impossible to move into and around Gaza without detection;

- Hamas clearly had international financial and logistical support, which could not have flowed into the strip without detection:
- Months, if not years of planning went into the operation, including <u>erecting a mock Israeli town inside</u> of Gaza to use for practice. <u>Israeli intelligence literally watched these training sessions from outposts on the border;</u>
- Hamas, sponsored by Iran, had enormous geopolitical incentive to attack when it did, as Israel was on the verge of signing normalization agreements with the Sunni Muslim world that would have threatened Iranian interests, which Israel well understood:
- Netanyahu's historically controversial and unpopular government was barely clinging to power at the time of the attack, the target of unprecedentedly intense and large protests. Bibi himself was on the verge of imprisonment on corruption charges. An excuse to wage what could be framed as an "existential" war and remain in power indefinitely (which has since transpired), was seemingly the only way to remain for Netanyahu and his hardline allies to remain in office and out of prison. This objective necessarily would have required ignoring actionable intelligence.

... And this is by no means an exhaustive list of the reasons that point to the impossibility of Israeli intelligence ignorance of the impending attack and the incentives that all parties involved had to let October 7 play out the way it did.

It subsequently came out that the substantially less powerful Egyptian intelligence, which does not operate in sovereign Israeli territory of the Gaza Strip as Mossad does, knew of the attack beforehand and warned their Israeli counterparts, which went unheeded.

And now we have further vindication.

#### Via <u>The New York Times</u>:

"Israeli officials obtained Hamas's battle plan for the Oct.
7 terrorist attack more than a year before it happened, documents, emails and interviews show. But Israeli military

and intelligence officials dismissed the plan as aspirational, considering it too difficult for Hamas to carry out.

The approximately 40-page document, which the Israeli authorities code-named "Jericho Wall," outlined, point by point, exactly the kind of devastating invasion that led to the deaths of about 1,200 people.

The translated document, which was reviewed by The New York Times, did not set a date for the attack, but described a methodical assault designed to overwhelm the fortifications around the Gaza Strip, take over Israeli cities and storm key military bases, including a division headquarters.

Hamas followed the blueprint with shocking precision. The document called for a barrage of rockets at the outset of the attack, drones to knock out the security cameras and automated machine guns along the border, and gunmen to pour into Israel en masse in paragliders, on motorcycles and on foot — all of which happened on Oct. 7.

The plan also included details about the location and size of Israeli military forces, communication hubs and other sensitive information, raising questions about how Hamas gathered its intelligence and whether there were leaks inside the Israeli security establishment.

The document circulated widely among Israeli military and intelligence leaders, but experts determined that an attack of that scale and ambition was beyond Hamas's capabilities, according to documents and officials."

Now we ask: who was really responsible for the deaths of 1 200 "Israelis"? The Hamas terrorists or an "Israeli" government who looked the other way at the moment critique, for the sake of expediency (yet again)?

## How has the Gaza War Affected U.S. Perceptions of "Israel"?

WASHINGTON, Nov 15 (Reuters)

"U.S. public support for Israel's war against Hamas militants in Gaza is eroding and most Americans think Israel should call a ceasefire to a conflict that has ballooned into a humanitarian crisis, according to a new Reuters/Ipsos poll.

Some 32% of respondents in the two-day opinion poll, which closed on Tuesday, said "the U.S. should support Israel" when asked what role the U.S. should take in the fighting. That was down from 41% who said the U.S. should back Israel in a Reuters/Ipsos poll conducted Oct. 12-13.

Some 68% of respondents in the Reuters/Ipsos poll said they agreed with a statement that "Israel should call a ceasefire and try to negotiate."

About three-quarters of Democrats and half of Republicans in the poll supported the idea of a ceasefire, putting them at odds with Democratic President Joe Biden who has rebuffed calls from Arab leaders, including Palestinians, to pressure Israel into a ceasefire. The Biden administration instead has urged Israel to do everything possible to avoid civilian casualties, something Israel says it is doing.

Israel has so far rejected any talk of implementing longer pauses or a ceasefire, saying Hamas would only use that time to regroup and harden its positions.

In a potentially worrisome sign for Israel, just 31% of poll respondents said they supported sending Israel weapons, while 43% opposed the idea. The rest said they were unsure. Support for sending Israel weapons was strongest among Republicans, while roughly half of Democrats were opposed."

## How has the Gaza War Affected Global Perceptions of "Israel"?

The Gaza crisis has sparked an international outcry that has focused in recent days on the collapsing medical infrastructure in the crowded coastal enclave.

#### Is "Israel" Sensing an Existential Threat?

We simply don't know, **but they should be!** Fighting God has never been a good idea! And since the 76-year period has expired for Esau-Edom, the timing could not be worse. We cannot make this point more emphatically – **Jewish folk on the ground in Palestine, now is a good time to find an alternative address, as in a new country**.

#### How far will God allow this to go?

We have no specific revelation on this question, but it is possible that the conflict will continue to escalate until Jerusalem is destroyed, as foretold in Jer. 19:10, 11 and in Isaiah 29:1-6. Evangelical and Pentecostal Christianity (Christian Zionism) would then be in a state of shock, and many will become disillusioned, thinking that the promises of God have failed. Their support for "Israel" will also probably whither, given the disorientation that will no doubt be prevalent.

## Chapter 11 Conclusions

- The State called "Israel" exists at present only to satisfy God's requirements for justice to be dispensed on behalf of the modern descendants of Esau.
- This however was for a limited time only and that period expired on the 29<sup>th</sup> November 2023.
- During the process of Esau enjoying the benefits of his justice, he has displayed his true nature (at a national scale) and it is not a pretty sight! There is absolutely no evidence of any reconciliation on the part of Esau with God. And it is now altogether too late.
- As emphatic as God was that Esau receive his justice, so too
  is He regarding Ishmael's justice (and his modern
  descendants). God will restore title in the land of Palestine to
  Ishmael, since Israel will never return, and the Jews will be
  ejected.
- However, in a time frame known only to God, the land of Canaan has run its course and Ishmael must prepare to receive the promise made to Hagar, his mother. So too all other peoples of the earth.
- In the interim, Jews must be relocated with the greatest of compassion and the full dignity of the Palestinians restored.
- To the extent that it is at all possible, crimes committed by anyone during the 76-year tenure of Esau's period of justice, must be prosecuted and any found guilty in this process, are to be punished in accordance with righteous law.
- The evils of Zionism are however by no means restricted to Palestine. They have permeated the four corners of the earth

   a world order one could say.
- Zionism is not welcome anywhere in the world.

In closing, we strongly adhere to the view that no one should be forced to adopt our way of thinking. We believe that when men truly know God, they want to follow His ways voluntarily and to the extent that we are capable, it is our hope that we can assist in this process.

So, Isaiah 3:2 prophesies:

And many peoples will come and say, "Come, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; that He may teach us concerning His ways and that we may walk in His paths."

# Chapter 12 The Way Forward

#### **Point of Departure**

As Christians we are instructed to be the "salt of the earth". This entire document would simply amount to nothing more than enlightenment for a few and a source of fierce anger for the majority, without tabling implementable and sustainable solutions. The authors' ministry is in the highways and the byways (not in monasteries), and we would never construct a document like this unless there were readily available mechanisms to rapidly affect change in Palestine, in alignment with the will of God.

#### A Great Shaking

The prophet Haggai had this to say:

"Who is left among you who saw this house (temple) in its former glory? And how do you see it now? Does it not seem to you like nothing in comparison? But now courageous, Zerubbabel,' declares the courageous also, Joshua the son of Jehozadak, the high priest, and be courageous, all you people of the land,' declares the Lord, 'and work; for I am with you,' declares the Lord of hosts. 'As for the promise which I made with you when you came out of Egypt, My Spirit stands and continues with you; do not fear!' For thus says the Lord of hosts, 'Once more, in a little while, I am going to shake the heavens and the earth, the sea and the dry land. I will shake all the nations; and they will come with the desirable and precious things of all nations, and I will fill this house with glory and splendour,' says the Lord of hosts. 'The silver is Mine and the gold is Mine,' declares the Lord of hosts. 'The latter glory of this house will be greater than the former,' says the Lord of hosts, 'and in this place I shall give [the ultimate] peace and prosperity,' declares the Lord of hosts."

A Great Shaking Generates Great Fear

If you can't see the purpose in turbulence, then fear is inevitable and indeed well founded – insecurity abounds when the status quo is threatened. God knows this, thus His injunction to maintain courage despite the apparent circumstances.

A great Shaking Demands a Great Work

A great shaking holds no benefit for spectators (fear breeds passivity) but is pregnant with opportunity for those who plunge into action and busy themselves with shaping new orders and Godly alignments amid the tremors.

A great Shaking Releases Great Treasure

For those who remain steadfast and industrious, this is a time of great rejoicing – it is the time when treasure which has been stored up for the righteous, is prized from the grips of strong men and given to the oppressed. Verily, the first shall be last and the last first.

A great Shaking Releases God's Glory

Now is the time to be constantly alert! For shaking heralds, the pouring out of God's glory (His dominion reasserting itself in good governance and the unfettered workings of creation order). This Glory can never be tarnished!

A great Shaking Releases God's Governance and Peace

Isaiah 9: 6 says:

For unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given; <u>and the government shall be upon His shoulder</u>. And His name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, <u>The Prince of Peace</u>.

A great Shaking Nurtures Righteousness and Justice

Righteousness and Justice are the foundations of God's throne and that of the earth too – as always, foundations are ultimately everything.

These creation order foundations have been seriously compromised by the treason of the First Adam but will be completely restored by the Second Adam. For the present however, we contend with foundations of wickedness and injustice, of the highest order.

Whilst it is only the Second Adam who can reconcile all things to Himself, we are in the interim, required to contest every manifestation of wickedness and injustice we can reach and thus set precedents/standards to which others can aspire and upon which hope can be built. Taking a pro-active, public and even judicial stand against wickedness and injustice in high places, is simply not negotiable for Kingdom overcomers.

A great Shaking Enables us to Redeem National Giftings/Roles

Just like every human ever born was configured by God with a nature, role and function, so too every nation. The current global geopolitical map confers a man designed status on 195 nations. However, God designs nations quite differently. His parameters include inter alia elements like watersheds/water ways/water bodies, geographic extrusions/inclusions, spatial relationships, climatology, general topography, ethnic inclusiveness, strategic anomalies and His special gifts, which are without revocation.

#### A Glimpse of the Way Backward (For Purposes of Contrast)

Left-wing blogger Max Blumenthal, recently tweeted that "We white American Jews are living through a golden age of power, affluence and safety," which he called a "welcome reality", but that this "threatens the entire Zionist enterprise, from lobby fronts like the ADL to the State of Israel, <u>because Zionism relies on Jewish insecurity, to justify itself.</u>" (Emphasis added by the authors).

We further quote an article from the Jeruslam Post, written months before the October Hamas attack.

The Jerusalem Post

By Moshe Dann JANUARY 4, 2023 02:49 (The writer is a PhD historian)

"What if there is no solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict? What if it never ends?

What if the reason for the conflict is a confusion of terminology: that it is not between Arab Palestinians and Israelis, but between Muslim Arabs and Jews – i.e., a religious conflict? The conflict, therefore, is not only about territory, but about Jewish history and the rights of the Jewish people.

The Torah refers to Eretz Yisrael (the Land of Israel) as sacred to the Jewish people, and it has been so since the time of

Abraham. It is the place where Jewish civilization began and flourished for more than a thousand years, where the Holy Temple stood in Jerusalem, where the kings of Israel reigned, where prophets spoke, and one that is documented in texts, archeology, and literature.

For Muslims and Arabs, however, Palestine, its Latin/Roman name, has little significance, history, or culture. During the Crusades, Muslims sought to restore it to their rule through jihad (holy war), vestiges of which persist.

The modern movement called Palestinianism began only after World War I, when claims by the Zionist movement were recognized by the entire international community. In addition to ancient Jewish communities in cities such as Jerusalem, Safed, and Tiberias, Zionist settlements had been established throughout the area.

Attempts to find "solutions" were based on leftist assumptions that to have peace, Israel must make compromises and concessions. This was the basis of the Oslo Accords that legitimized the PLO and created the Palestinian Authority. The "peace process" was a hoax, a hype to bring Arafat and the PLO back to Israel and empower them.

This confused way of thinking persists. It is the basis of what is called the "two-state-solution," (2SS) an independent Arab Palestinian state based on the 1949 Armistice lines, and support for United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA).

In response to threats from the EU, UN, and even the Biden administration, Israel concedes, which always leads to more problems. The IDF, COGAT (Coordinator of Government Activities in the Territories) and police destroyed Jewish property for no rational reason and restrict building in settlements. Israeli leaders (including Netanyahu) went along with the fraud of trying to appease the Palestinians and those who supported them. Why should this absurdity continue? Who does it serve?

Jews who live in Judea, Samaria, and eastern Jerusalem are not "occupying Palestinian territory." It is not "illegal," and there is no basis for this accusation. Jews should be protected and encouraged wherever they live. That's what Zionism means. That's what the new government will hopefully do. Some are opposed, and some call for a "civil war."

Our recent elections indicated that most Israelis want a realistic agenda that ensures their safety and security. Dealing with Palestinian terrorism is our first and foremost concern, and – as many understand, the PA/Hamas are unwilling and unable to stop it. Palestinian identity was and is based on a "one-state solution" – "from the river to the sea." This goal, enabled and facilitated by the Oslo Accords, is why resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict remains elusive.

The most practical and realistic alternative to the 2SS is to recognize Jordan as the homeland of the Palestinians – all of those who want to live in peace. Engaging in and supporting terrorism and seeking Israel's destruction is simply not an option. The conflict cannot be resolved, but it can be ended by understanding why it exists." (Emphasis added by the authors).

The above article quintessentially articulates the impenetrable delusion that is the Zionist paradigm. The concluding statement of Moshe Dann is, however, unwittingly the truth, but obviously for reasons entirely beyond the comprehension of the gentleman concerned (as per the content we have already systematically set out).

#### So where to from Here?

Human nature is fundamentally a self-contradicting mix of both good and evil. This enigma is not exclusive to any ethnic group – it is truly universal. And thoroughly predictable. It will inevitably display persistent stubbornness when confronted with reality, if said reality conflicts with perceived self-interests. Thus, we can say without fear of contradiction, that Zionism will only alter course under extreme duress.

#### From Whence will this Duress Come?

The principal elements are in fact quite simple.

<u>Firstly, God has ensured that justice for Esau-Edom has been</u> served. That season ended on the 29<sup>th</sup> November 2023 – the 76<sup>th</sup>

anniversary of UN Resolution 181. <u>The protection of God has now been removed from "Israel" and in its stead, the judgement of God awaits.</u>

Secondly, Resolution 181 is inherently unlawful and falls to be set aside, void ab initio (Latin for "void from the beginning," meaning that the Resolution was void as soon as it was passed i.e. was never valid). The legal substance behind this statement is going to take extensive papers to set out and it is therefore impossible to create a quick summary for the purposes of this document. But it is a fact (despite the vehement protestations to the contrary that will erupt when certain interests are exposed to the realities). We are in the process of conferring with appropriate legal teams in the jurisdictions of the International Court of Justice, The United Kingdom, the United States of America and the Republic of South Africa, in order to bring applications in parallel for all of the above jurisdictions, to have the Resolution set aside.

# <u>Thirdly, wars are costly affairs – very costly. "Israel" does not have the capacity to fund its delusions. So, wars and delusions stop when the money runs out.</u>

Who is "Israel's" main banker then? Well, no prize for this one — the U.S. of course. But the U.S. is itself irredeemably bankrupt. On August 15<sup>th</sup> 1971, the U.S. committed an act of insolvency when it defaulted on the Bretton Woods system (as per the then President Richard Nixon's word, "only for a temporary period" however). Strangely, "temporary" has thus far turned out to be 52 years and still counting. So, the U.S. has persisted over this time with the pretense of the USD (U.S. Dollar), but when you dig behind the propaganda, all is not well with the U.S economy. Time to apply sanctions on the U.S. we submit. Preposterous you say. Not at all — the U.S. is utterly and hopelessly addicted to infinite credit. Nothing will bring the U.S. and "Israel" to its senses quicker than when one shuts off credit. And how is that to be done? Well, we can't really disclose any detail on this yet, can we, BUT watch this space!

Fourthly, it is not Jordan and Egypt who must be prepared to receive Palestinian refugees. On the contrary, it is inter alia the UK, RSA and the USA (i.e. those who originally supported the growth and livelihood of Zionism) who must be prepared to receive Jews vacating "Israel." And they are not relocating to a

"homeland." There is no homeland for the Jew or the Israelite until they acknowledge their King, His Majesty Jesus, the Christ of God. And even then, this will not constitute Palestine, but the higher order land for which all we who serve the King of Kings, await.

Fifthly, more than adequate funding for the reconstruction and high-level development of Palestine is available. And equally, so too for resettling Jews.

Sixthly, this will all be conducted within a framework of peace and dignity for both Jew and Palestinian. Brave words you say? Not when hard-core economic reality has registered, and people then become really grateful for solutions. The entire transition will also be overseen by a very substantial international and UNBIASED monitoring force, and visibly on the ground. Hardliners or would be disruptors on either side of the political fence, will be dealt with rapidly and very effectively.

Of course, there is much more detail involved, but this is not the place or time to venture down that road – disclose too much now and everything will be sabotaged!

In conclusion, it is our hope and prayer that many others will join us to create a better world for the age to come. It will however have been a great starting point to have settled the single most intractable conflict on earth today.

### **Bibliography**

Antiquities of the Jews, by Flavius Josephus

The Catholic Encyclopedia Online

The Jewish Encyclopedia (1903 edition)

The Jewish Encyclopedia (1925 edition)

The Jewish Quarterly Review, Dr. A. Neubauer, Vol. 1 (1888)

The King James Version of the Bible

The New American Standard Version of the Bible

The New Standard Jewish Encyclopedia (1970 edition), edited by

Dr. Cecil Roth and Dr. Geoffrey Wigoner

The Struggle for the Birthright, Dr. Stephen E. Jones, God's

Kingdom Ministries (2002)

https://amazingbibletimeline.com/blog/esau/

Oxford Dictionary

Wikipedia

Encyclopedia Brittanica

# Other Select Books and Commentaries by Dr. Stephen E. Jones:

Creation's Jubilee

The Laws of the Second Coming

The Biblical Meaning of Numbers 1-40

The Wars of the Lord

The Struggle for the Birthright

The Ten Commandments

Who is a Jew?

Who is an Israelite?

The Purpose of Resurrection

The Barley Overcomers

The Wheat and Asses of Pentecost

The Laws of Spiritual Warfare

The Two Covenants

The Problem of Evil

God's Laws on Restitution

Bible Laws on Righteous Judgment

How to be an Overcomer

The Prophetic History of the U.S.

The Rapture in the Light of

Tabernacles

Deuteronomy (10 volumes)

The Judges

Ruth: Redemption and Sonship

Daniel: Prophet of the Ages (3 volumes)

Hosea: Prophet of Mercy (2 volumes)

Amos: Missionary to Israel Jonah: Prophet of Restoration

Haggai: Prophet of the Greater Temple

Malachi: God's Messenger

Luke: Healing the Breaches (8 volumes)

John: Manifesting God's Glory

Romans (2 volumes)

First Corinthians (4 volumes)

Second Corinthians (1 volume)

Galatians: Paul Corrects the Distorted

Gospel

Hebrews: Immigrating from the Old

Covenant to the New

James to the Twelve Tribes

The First Epistle of John

Jude: Against Gnosticism

The Book of Revelation (8 volumes)