

LYING TONGUES

*These six things doth the LORD hate: yea, seven are **an abomination** unto him:
A proud look, a lying tongue, and hands that shed innocent blood, An heart that
deviseth wicked imaginations, feet that be swift in running to mischief, A false
witness that speaketh lies, and he that soweth discord among brethren.*

Proverbs 6:16-19

Last week we heard Dr. Michael Brown talk about With God On Our Side—an 82-minute propaganda piece that poses as a “documentary” about Christian Zionism and its impact on the Israeli/Palestinian conflict. Unfortunately, Mr. Brown didn’t touch many of the details of the film. Once you realize just how many lies, half truths, distortions, and deliberate mis-representations this film contains, there’s no doubt it was *planned* to be a propaganda film, not a fair and balanced documentary. Not only does it portray Israel as born in original sin and *solely* responsible for the Israeli/Palestinian conflict, it provides a model by which Evangelical Christians can ignore Palestinian rejectionism and terrorism in good conscience.

The centerpiece of the movie is its narrator, Christopher Harrell, a young graphic designer who grew up in a very pro-Israel church culture. Suddenly he discovers that there are *two* sides of the story. His whole life he has only been exposed to the Israeli perspective. Now he feels compelled to hear the Palestinian perspective in a renewed search for “truth”. As he comes to understand and accept the Palestinian narrative, he’s purged of his simplistic, knee-jerk support for the Jewish people and the State of Israel.

In the first few scenes of the movie, with stained glass windows in the background or while sitting in a pew, Christopher undergoes a kind of dark night of the soul, struggling with his conscience and his incomplete understanding of the Israeli/Palestinian conflict. Then he goes on a *literal* journey to the Holy Land, where he meets a number of “experts” who explain the history of the conflict to him, and by extension, the audience. He also travels to the West Bank to see first hand the “crimes” the Israelis have committed against the Palestinian people—the biggest one being the installation of the security fence.

Pretty soon he has an “epiphany” and realizes Christians should *not* be fanning the flames of the conflict (the way Christian Zionists do by supporting the policies of Israel). Instead, they should be more “neutral” (ie, more accepting of the Palestinian narrative) and act as “peacemakers”. By the end of the movie Christopher has arrived at a more mature understanding of his faith and how he, as a Christian, should respond to the conflict. In one of the last scenes of the film we see him walking along a concrete portion of the security fence, confident in his new-found understanding. He now feels called to help end the conflict by being a peacemaker (ie, broadcasting the Palestinian view).

At this point in the film you almost expect him to start quoting the apostle—“*When I was a child, I spoke like a child, I thought like a child, I reasoned like a child; when I became a man, I gave up my childish ways*” (I. Cor. 13:11)—the childish ways of course being guilt over the Holocaust, automatic support for the Jewish people and Israeli policies, and indifference to Palestinian suffering. The irony of the film is that it propagates Christian Palestinianism, which is an exact mirror image of the Christian Zionism. Empathy with the suffering the Israelis have experienced for the last 60+ years of Palestinian terrorism is replaced with guilt over Palestinian suffering (at the hands of Israelis). And of course that suffering is presented as a challenge to the Christian faith in a manner akin to the Holocaust.

The totally one-sided support for the Palestinian cause, which is so evident throughout the film, causes the viewer to be indifferent to the safety and well-being of Jews. Even though the film's commentators *say* Christians should be neutral peacemakers, the *real* message that comes through with crystal clarity is that Christians should side with the oh-so-innocent Palestinians and *ignore* those unpleasant aspects of Palestinian ideology and behavior like murder and terrorism, their constant rejection of Israel's right to exist as a Jewish State, or the Jew hatred and Nazi antisemitism that's pumped into the brains of their children from the day they're born.

As far as one's obligations to *the Jews*, well, one of the "experts" does say Christians need to ask forgiveness for centuries of antisemitism (which produced the Holocaust). But having gotten that little detail out of the way, we should tell them that if they won't embrace Christianity (and turn the other cheek), they can at least do a better job of living up to the *ethical demands* of their faith when it comes to the treatment of Palestinians.

The only people in the film who speak directly about Palestinian terrorism are Christian Zionists like John Hagee (Christians United for Israel) and Malcom Hedding (International Christian Embassy in Jerusalem). But unfortunately, these two men are portrayed as war-mongering nut cases whose views can't be trusted. No one else in the film says a word about Palestinian terrorism.

I'm in the process of taking this video apart *piece by piece* and exposing the many lies and distortions it contains. Every time someone on the screen lies, I stop the movie and insert a screen that contains the truth. It's turning out to be quite a project and might not be done for another week or so but when it's done I'm going to upload both the *original* and the *annotated* versions to my web site. You can watch the original version first and see how many lies and distortions you can recognize. Then you can watch the annotated version and see how many you *missed*. You'll probably be surprised. This is a dangerously subtle piece of propaganda! Since I'm going through the video very thoroughly, I'll just highlight some of the more obvious lies and misrepresentations tonight. The film opens with the following passage of Scripture taken from "The Message":

...while Joshua was there near Jericho: He looked up and saw right in front of him a man standing, holding his drawn sword. Joshua stepped up to him and said: "Whose side are you on, ours or our enemies?" He said, "Neither. I am commander of God's army".

Joshua 5:13-14 a

In other words, God is not on the side of any particular nation or people group in matters of war. This idea is then transferred to the current situation in the Middle East. Just as God (supposedly) wasn't on the side of either the Hebrews or the Canaanite in the Old Testament, so today, He (supposedly) isn't on the side of either the Palestinians or the Israelis and that's how *we* should be as Christians. What the producers of this film fail to mention is that just a few verses later, God makes it clear that He *is* on the side of the Hebrews. Not only does He command them go to war against Jericho, He gives them the battle plan for victory!

And Joshua fell on his face to the earth, and did worship, and said unto him, What saith my lord unto his servant? And the captain of the LORD's host said unto Joshua, Loose thy shoe from off thy foot; for the place whereon thou standest is holy. And Joshua did so. Now Jericho was straitly shut up because of the children

*of Israel: none went out, and none came in. And **the LORD said unto Joshua, See, I have given into thine hand Jericho, and the king thereof, and the mighty men of valour. And ye shall compass the city, all ye men of war, and go round about the city once. Thus shalt thou do six days. And seven priests shall bear before the ark seven trumpets of rams' horns: and the seventh day ye shall compass the city seven times, and the priests shall blow with the trumpets. And it shall come to pass, that when they make a long blast with the ram's horn, and when ye hear the sound of the trumpet, all the people shall shout with a great shout; and the wall of the city shall fall down flat, and the people shall ascend up every man straight before him.***

Joshua 5:14 b - 6:5

The whole premise of the film—which is that we should be “neutral” regarding the Israeli/Palestinian conflict because God is neutral towards it—is based on a deliberate misrepresentation of the Scripture.

Next are some scenes from a John Hagge rally and the narrator, and young graphics artist named Christopher, describes how as a pastor’s kid he was encouraged to support Israel and to love the Jewish people. He says his family was surrounded by people who “romanticized“ and “idealized” Jewish culture—which is exactly what you see the Christians at the Hagge rally doing. Then he says:

“There was even one year when we celebrated Hanukkah. I’m not sure **why** we did that. We’re not Jewish. We’re just this normal American Midwestern family.”

In the next scene we find out *why* they did it as Christopher’s parents share that they were basically following the “church culture” at the time, and the pro-Israel sentiments that had been “passed down to them”. The father says they just accepted what they were “taught” without question.

It becomes clear that their pro-Israel attitude was not based on a clear understanding of, or a commitment to, the teaching of the Scripture regarding the issue. They just did what everyone else in their church circle was doing. Since their pro-Israel attitude was not based on the Word of God, when a view was presented to them that was more compelling on an *emotional* level (ie., Palestinian suffering), they had no problem abandoning their original views. In the next scene, we see Christopher in a church, struggling with his conscience and he says:

“Of course we should be thankful to the Jewish people because they gave us our scripture and our savior, and our faith, and I think that’s why it’s so painful to see the current conflict and the terror. It **seems** that there’s so many people against Israel, it **seems** that as Christians, we should stand by Israel.”

Christopher says it “seems” Israel is standing alone and it “seems” that Christians should stand by Israel. He can’t bring himself to say Israel is alone and that Christians should stand with the nation because if he said that, people might start to sympathize with Israelis and we can’t have that! The whole point of the film is to get Christians to sympathize with the oppressed and suffering Palestinians so they will *stop* supporting Israel.

Next comes the definition of “Zionism” according to Rev. Stephen Sizer, the anti-Zionist Vicar of the Anglican Church of England. I’m not going to write out precise quotes from the people interviewed in the film because you will see them talking for themselves when I upload the videos. Instead, I’ll just paraphrase them so you get the gist of what they are saying.

Mr. Sizer says Zionism was originally a political movement but Christian Zionists use the Bible and prophecy to justify its ideology of racism, ethnic cleansing, property theft and other evils. He also says Zionism causes Jews to think they have a right to “much of the Middle East”.

I wonder if Mr. Sizer has looked at a map of the Middle East lately.



The “Middle East” is a very large geographical area! Only a complete idiot (or a premeditated liar) would say the territory the Jews claim as their own is “much” of the Middle East”. This is the kind of perversion you run up against again and again in the film.

Mr. Sizer’s contention that Zionism is a political movement dressed up in religious garb and using Bible prophecy as a justification for its evil purposes is just as false as his accusation about the Jews wanting to possess “much” of the Middle East. The fact is, Zionism is a *Biblical* mandate for the Jewish People. It may have a political dimension and territorial aspirations but it springs from a *Biblical* narrative, not a geo-political, racist narrative. It was the God of the Bible—not a politician or a political party—who put it into the hearts of the Jews to return to *their* land.

In addition, it was the Old Testament prophets, not 20th century Christian Zionists, who predicted the re-gathering of the Jews to their ancient homeland at the end of days. This is what the Vicious Vicar and his fellow Jew-haters can't stand to face. Since they believe the lie of "Replacement Theology" they utterly reject the idea that the Bible predicts an end-time re-gathering of the Jews to *their own* land in the last days.

Next, Ron Dart, a professor at Eraser Valley University, mentions Genesis 12 and says: "*What does it mean to 'bless' Israel?*" Then he gives the audience a philosophical lesson on the ethics of "prophetic" Judaism. According to him, the essence of prophetic Judaism is an *ethical vision* which places the treatment of strangers, aliens, widows and orphans in Israel *above* the blessing of territory or land. He says that within the tension of the ethical vision and the blessing of the land, the ethical vision is the higher priority because it's at the heart of who God is. God is more interested in how the Jews treat other people than He is in how much territory they possess.

First of all, I don't think those who follow Judaism would agree with Mr. Dart's statements. The heart of Judaism, as I understand it, is a relationship with God. It's not the same kind of relationship we Christians experience but it's a relationship nonetheless. That's the whole idea behind the term "covenant". God not only made covenant with Abraham and his descendants forever, He gave them a *specific* land as part of that covenant. Mr. Dart's view of Judaism reduces God's covenant relationship with His chosen people to religious humanism.

Prophetic Judaism is ethical but its central core is a covenant between the God of the Bible, the Jewish people, and the land He gave them. Sorry Mr. Dart but God is not an ethical concept—much less a *self-destructive* ethical concept that commands Israel to put the welfare of its enemies above its own survival! God is a Person, and He gave Israel a land. Indeed, He gave Israel a land which already had indigenous people groups. People like the Kenites, the Kenezites, the Kadmonites, the Hittites, the Perizzites, the Rephaim, the Amorites, the Canaanite, the Girgashites and the Jebusites had already been living in that land for centuries.

But wait. There's more. Not only did God give the Hebrews someone else's land, He told them to "ethnically cleanse" the land! That's right. God instructed the Hebrews to either drive the *original* inhabitants out or kill them. HE can do that you know, because He's sovereign over His creation. He can give any portion of this earth to whoever He likes, any time He likes. Since God is Holy and no darkness dwells in Him, it was not unfair or unjust for Him to give somebody else's land to the Hebrews. Neither was he unjust when He told the Hebrews to ethnically cleanse that land.

What do you think the United Nations would have done if they had been around in Joshua's day? They would have done the same thing they are doing *today* regarding the Israelis and the Palestinians. They would have passed hundreds of sanctions not only against the Hebrews, but against *the God* of the Hebrews because they are filthy humanists who do not recognize or acknowledge God's sovereignty. They are self-righteous hypocrites who judge God and everyone else by their own humanistic standards which are rotten to the core.

The nations have demonstrated over and over again that they hate not only the Jews but the God of the Jews; and the left wing "Christians" who made this film, along with those who participated in it, are filled with that same God-hating. They are of the same spirit as the world and they will burn along with the world. Mr. Dart simply echos the world's view of Israel and the world's idea of justice regarding Israel. He thinks the Israelis should be more concerned about the welfare of the Palestinians that are under their control than they are with the defense of their own land. According to him, their *ethical duty* of treating the stranger, the foreigner, the widow, and the orphan with justice is more important than holding on to territory or even their own survival.

Therefore, his answer to the question—“*How should we bless Israel?*”—is very simple. We should bless Israel by pressuring them to deal with the Palestinians in a more humane and just manner; even if doing so brings about their own destruction.

Next, Stephen Sizer says that Israel’s tourism economy is largely manipulated by pro-Israel tourist agencies and guides to minimize access to PA areas. According to him, Israeli guides try to keep visitors and pilgrims away from Palestinians lest they accidentally become exposed to the Palestinian narrative so there are many Biblical sights these visitors miss.

Mr. Sizer conveniently *fails* to mention the fact that Israeli tour guides are *forbidden* to enter PA areas or that those guides cannot guarantee the safety of the tourists in those areas. Mr. Sizer is a habitual liar and an Islamic apologist. He didn’t make these accusations out of ignorance. He is very aware of the situation over there. It was a deliberate attempt by him to deceive the viewer with half truths.

Next, Gary Burge, a professor at Wheaton College says that tourists who visit Israel are on the receiving end of a sophisticated information flow that is designed to paint the Palestinians in a bad light. He also says the Palestinians should not be defined by Hamas or the PA Authority.

Well, as Christians we are to follow the teachings of the Lord Jesus and He said: “Ye shall know them by their fruits” (*Matt . 7:16*). In other words, we are to look at what people *actually* do, not what they *say* they do. It’s easy to say Hamas does not represent the aspirations of the Palestinians who live in Gaza but what were the actual deeds of those Palestinians with regards to Hamas? The fact is, the Palestinians *themselves* voted Hamas into power back in 2005 in a free election.

What about today? Maybe they were tricked back in 2005 and they are just now realizing it. What are the *actions* of the Palestinians with regards to Hamas right now? I don’t see any Palestinians protesting any of Hamas’s policies towards Israel, do you? I don’t hear any Palestinians protesting against Hamas’ adamant refusal to ever recognize Israel as a Jewish State, do you? I don’t see Palestinian protesters out in the streets, denouncing Hamas’ policy of firing rockets indiscriminately into *civilian* population areas of Israel, do you? I don’t see Palestinians marching in the streets, demanding that Hamas change its official Charter, which repeatedly calls for the destruction of Israel, do you?

Mr. Burge has obviously decided to ignore the Hamas Charter but you can be sure the majority of Palestinians in Gaza have not only read it, but are in agreement with it. Some of the more relevant excerpts are:

The **Preamble** says it all: “*Israel will exist and will continue to exist until Islam will obliterate it, just as it obliterated others before it*”.

Article 6 establishes the official goal of Hamas: “*The Islamic Resistance Movement is a distinguished Palestinian movement, whose allegiance is to Allah, and whose way of life is Islam. It strives to raise the banner of Allah over every inch of Palestine*’

Article 11 describes the exclusive Muslim nature of the entire land of Israel: “*The land of Palestine is an Islamic Waqf [Holy Possession] consecrated for future Muslim generations until Judgment Day. No one can renounce it or any part of it or abandon it or any part of it.*’

Article 13 establishes again that the entire land of Israel is Islamic land and concludes that: *“Since this is the case, the Liberation of Palestine is an individual duty for every Muslim wherever he may be!”*

Article 15 calls all Muslims in the land of Israel to wage Jihad: *“The day the enemies usurp part of Muslim land, Jihad becomes the individual duty of every Muslim. In the face of the Jews' usurpation, it is compulsory that the banner of Jihad be raised!”*

Article 13 plainly states that peace agreements are simply war tactics. *“[Peace] initiatives and so-called peaceful solutions and international conferences are in contradiction to the principles of the Islamic Resistance Movement... Those conferences are no more than a means to appoint the infidels as arbitrators in the lands of Islam... There is no solution for the Palestinian problem except by Jihad. Initiatives, proposals and international conferences are but a waste of time, an exercise in futility!”*

Article 7 & 32 present classical Islamic anti-Semitic incitement: *“The Day of judgment will not come about until Muslims fight Jews and kill them. Then, the Jews will hide behind rocks and trees, and the rocks and trees will cry out: ‘O Muslim, there is a Jew hiding behind me, come and kill him!’”*

Article 32 *“Zionism scheming has no end, and after Palestine, they will covet expansion from the Nile to the Euphrates River. When they have finished digesting the area on which they have laid their hand, they will look forward to more expansion. Their scheme has been laid out in the ‘Protocols of the Elders of Zion.’”*

The day I see Palestinians in the streets, calling on Hamas to change its Charter so the Palestinians can make peace with Israel, that’s when I’ll believe Hamas does not really represent their views and aspirations.

Next, Ben White, an anti-Israel British journalist, says the nature of the “Israeli occupation” has to do with restriction, permits, roadblocks etc., and that all these things “ruin” the lives of the Palestinians. Well, first of all, that’s an exaggeration. Restrictions, permits and roadblocks do make life more difficult for the Palestinians but these things don’t “ruin” their lives. Being shot, stabbed to death, or blown to pieces is what “ruins” people’s lives and that’s exactly what would be happening to many Israelis if there were *no* restrictions, permits or roadblocks to limit Palestinian terrorism!

Secondly, what is the “nature of “Israeli occupation” anyway? Why is Israel occupying the so-called West Bank to begin with? The nature of the Israeli occupation is that it’s the result of the Jews winning a *defensive* war. It’s also the result of consistent Palestinian rejectionism.

The Arabs who came under the control of Israel as a result of the Jews winning that war in 1967 refuse to make peace with Israel. This means that technically (and legally) the Palestinians are *still* at war with the Israelis and most of them act like it. They refuse to make peace with Israel; they send suicide murders into Israel to blow women and children to pieces; they kidnap and torture Israeli soldiers; they fire rockets into civilian population areas yet the morons who made this movie expect Israel to act they are *not* at war!

At a certain point in the film the focus turns to the supposed history of the Palestinians in the land. Various experts are interviewed to prove that there has been a thriving “Palestinian community” in Israel for 2000 years. Salim Munayer and Ilan Pappé, for example, both claim that the Palestinians had a 2,000 year history of culture in the

area. They deny that a major portion of the Palestinian Arab population of Palestine arrived in conjunction with the first and second Jewish *Aliyah*. It's interesting to note that historians and travelers to the area, like Mark Twain, completely missed this "thriving Palestinian community" when they were there. Listen to Mr. Twain's description of the land in 1886, years before the *first* modern wave of Jewish Aliyah (immigration):

"Palestine sits in sackcloth and ashes. Over it broods the spell of a curse that has **withered its fields** and fettered its energies. Where Sodom and Gomorrah reared their domes and towers, that solemn sea now floods the plain, in whose bitter waters no living thing exists - over whose wave-less surface the blistering air hangs motionless and dead; **about whose borders nothing grows but weeds**, and scattering tufts of cane, and that treacherous fruit that promises refreshment to parching lips, but turns to ashes at the touch.

Nazareth is forlorn; about that ford of Jordan where the hosts of Israel entered the Promised Land with songs of rejoicing, one finds only a squalid camp of fantastic Bedouins of the desert; **Jericho the accursed, lies a mouldering ruin**, today, even as Joshua's miracle left it more than three thousand years ago;

Bethlehem and **Bethany**, in their poverty and their humiliation, have nothing about them now to remind one that they once knew the high honor of the Savior's presence; the hallowed spot where the shepherds watched their flocks by night, and where the angels sang Peace on earth, good will to men, **is untenanted by any living creature, and unblessed by any feature that is pleasant to the eye.**

Renowned **Jerusalem** itself, the stateliest name in history, **has lost all its ancient grandeur, and is become a pauper village**; the riches of Solomon are no longer there to compel the admiration of visiting Oriental queens; the wonderful temple which was the pride and the glory of Israel, is gone, and the Ottoman crescent is lifted above the spot where, on that most memorable day in the annals of the world, they reared the Holy Cross.

The noted **Sea of Galilee**, where Roman fleets once rode at anchor and the disciples of the Savior sailed in their ships, was long ago **deserted** by the devotees of war and commerce, and **its borders are a silent wilderness.**

Capernaum is a shapeless ruin.

Magdala is the home of **beggared Arabs.**

Bethsaida and Chorazin have vanished from the earth, and the "desert places" round about them where thousands of men once listened to the Savior's voice and ate the miraculous bread, sleep in the hush of a solitude **that is inhabited only by birds of prey and skulking foxes.**

Palestine is desolate and unlovely. And why should it be otherwise? Can the curse of the Deity beautify a land?"

The Innocents Abroad, Chap. 56

There were Arabs (including Arab Christians) living in the land—nobody denies this. But there was *never* a thriving *Palestinian* community in the land. As a matter of fact, until 1967 the Arabs who lived in the land refused to be called "Palestinians". They preferred to be called Arabs. From the late 1800's till 1948, the only people who embraced the "Palestinian" designation were Jews.

Next, Al Janssen of Open Doors International says there has been a Christian community in the land all the way back to the Book of Acts. In fact, he claims there were *Arabs* in Jerusalem on the Day of Pentecost who heard the Gospel and believed. This is the kind of revisionist nonsense that characterizes the entire film. There is no truth in his statement, either historically or Biblically. In Jerusalem, on the Day of Pentecost, they were *all* Jews from different nations and tongues.

Next, the film focuses on the issue of the West Bank and its history. Christopher says that after the war, when the West Bank ended up in Jewish hands, the international community (U.N.) called on Israel to immediately withdraw from *all* the territories they had taken. Norman Finkelstein, an anti-Zionist, self-hating Jew, is interviewed and presented as an expert on the legalities of U.N. Resolution 242. He claims the resolution states that it is inadmissible to acquire territory by war. Then he says—as if talking to all Israelis—“...*you conquered the West Bank, Sinai, the Golan in the course of a war and you have no right to that territory, so you have to withdraw fully, completely, unambiguously*”.

Of course Mr. Finkelstein distorts and misrepresents UN Security Council Resolutions 242 (from 1967) and 338, (from 1973), which is based on Resolution 242. While these resolutions do call for Israel to withdraw from territory if conquered, they do *not* call on Israel to withdraw from THE territory, or from ALL territory they had acquired as a result of their victories. The authors of these two resolutions intentionally left the words “the” and “all” out of them because they realized border adjustments would have to be made because the pre-1967 border was indefensible.

Eugene V. Rostow, Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs between 1966 and 1969 and one of the men who drafted Resolution 242, said the resolution calls on the parties to make peace and it allows Israel to administer the territories it occupied in 1967 until “*a just and lasting peace in the Middle East*” is achieved.

In other words, at the time Resolution 242 was drafted, it was widely recognized that balancing the ideas of territorial return and “secure and recognized boundaries” for Israel would mean that Israel would *not* be forced to withdraw from 100% of the land it captured.

The British UN Ambassador at the time, Lord Caradon, who introduced the Resolution to the UN Council, said: “It would have been wrong to demand that Israel return to its positions of June 4th, 1967, because those positions were undesirable and artificial. After all, they were just the places where the soldiers of each side happened to be on the day the fighting stopped in 1948. They were just armistice lines. That's why we didn't demand that the Israelis return to them.”

The United States' UN Ambassador at the time, former Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg, has stated that: “The notable omissions—which were not accidental in regard to withdrawal—are the words “the” or “all” and the “June 5th, 1967 lines”...the Resolution speaks of withdrawal from occupied territories *without defining the extent* of withdrawal. [This would encompass] less than a complete withdrawal of Israeli forces from occupied territory, inasmuch as Israel's prior frontiers had proved to be notably insecure.”

Another distorted claim by Mr. Finkelstein is that Judea and Samaria are “occupied” territories. The whole world may call them occupied territories but actual legal realities are quite different. Technically and legally, Samaria and Judea (the West Bank) are “disputed” territories because nobody has legally “owned” them since the end of the British Mandate in 1948. There has never been a *legal adjudication* of that area.

The film goes back to current Palestinian suffering. A Palestinian Christian named Ayman tells stories of the first *Intifada* (Arabic for uprising). The term Intifada refers to two periods of recent Arab rioting against Israel. They included stoning, fire bombing, shooting, stabbing, cafe and bus bombings and lynching of Israelis who somehow found themselves in Palestinian areas. Mr. Ayman tells how tough it was to get to school or to a job during those periods. She says: “We had a lot of problems; we experienced harassment, violence, persecution”.

Excuse me but those kind of difficulties will arise when Israelis are being wounded and killed by Palestinians. What are the Jews supposed to do? Turn the other cheek? Let the Palestinians kill them? Difficulties that arise in a time of Palestinian uprising are due to that uprising, not the meanness of the Israelis. After blaming the Israelis for all the difficulties that naturally arise when Palestinians initiate an Intifada against Israeli civilians, she has the audacity to say: “We are trying to convey to the world that we are a people who wants peace.”

What a sick joke!

Finally, the attention of the film becomes focused on the Security Fence and all the suffering it causes the Palestinians. Malcolm Hedding (ICEJ) is given a few moments to explain that the Separation Fence was put up to stop terrorists attacks in Israel and that it has succeeded. The “Wall” (as all these Israel-haters like to refer to it) has stopped over 98% of all terrorist attempts since its completion.

Of course, the makers of the film dismiss what Mr. Hedding says. Instead, they interview various experts who claim that the *real* reason Israel built the Wall was to expropriate (ie, steal) Palestinian land. Risa Zoll, one of the leaders of the Jewish *Btsalem* organization, tells how some Palestinians have died as a result of not being able to cross the barriers. She relates how one pregnant woman lost her baby at one of the check points because she didn't get through in time to the Jewish hospital.

Unfortunately these things will happen in the kind of situation that has evolved but the fact is, Israel cannot allow Palestinian women who appear to pregnant to just waltz through a checkpoint without making sure she is in fact pregnant. There have been instances when Palestinian women who looked pregnant were actually suicide murderers. But of course, that reality is never mentioned. The valid reasons for many of Israel's policies are totally ignored or brushed off as mere Israeli propaganda.

How come no one ever to asks *why* Palestinians have to go through Israeli checkpoints in order to get to a hospital in the first place? Do Palestinians choose to go to *Jewish* hospitals because they get *free* treatment? Well, that may be part of the reason. But a bigger part of the reason is because there are no *Palestinian* hospitals. That's right. The nations have been giving billions of dollars to the Palestinians every year for the past 30 years and yet, there are no hospitals in Palestinian-governed territory.

Whose fault is it that there are no Palestinian hospitals?

Is it Israel's fault that Palestinian leaders are nothing but a bunch of thieves. Is it Israel's fault these corrupt leaders take the money that's supposed be used to build schools and hospitals and either spend it on missiles or pocket for themselves? Why is Israel always the bad guy when somebody can't make it to a Jewish hospital in time? Why do the nations blame Israel for the fiscal *irresponsibility* of Palestinian leaders? Why don't the nations who are giving all those billions of dollars to Hamas and the PA Authority threaten to cut off all that aid if they don't start using those funds to build hospitals and schools for the Palestinian people?

At the end of the film the issue of prophecy and Scripture comes into focus. Stephen Sizer says we run into trouble when we try to apply Scripture to historical events. He makes reference to foolish people who prophesied that Hitler, or Gorbachev or Saddam Hussein were the Antichrist and he uses this as a basis to discount or throw out all literal or futuristic prophetic understanding.

Sizer's Replacement Theology has not only led him into Jew-hatred, it has led into humanism as well. God is the God of history. What kind of Christians would we be if we didn't see everything through the lens of Scripture? What other lense does Mr. Sizer suggest we look through? The lense of the United Nations? The lense of the Muslim Arab world? The lense of a God-hating secular world?

The fact that there have been Christians for the last 1,500 years who have mistakenly assumed they were living in the last days does not negate the fact that at some point in history Christians *will* be living in the last days. Because of the doctrinal error they have embraced, people like Mr. Sizer have to ignore many of the prophecies which have been fulfilled in the last 140 years concerning Israel and the Jews because if they didn't their whole theological house of cards would come crashing down on top of their heads.

Next we hear from Salim Mainer, who shares how he has experienced rejection from Christians in America who love Jews but didn't want to shake his hand because he is a Palestinian. He says their theology causes them to reject their brothers because they do not fit their end time theology. Assuming that Mr. Mainer's account is actually true, the actions of the person who "rejected" him cannot negate the Biblical mandate for the Church to love the Jewish People and to stand both in prayer and deed in the restoration of Israel.

Next, Gary Burge says Christians have endorsed an Israeli policy that has created the largest refugee population in the world and he chastises the Church for not recognizing this terrible situation. As always, people like Burge live in a world that has nothing to do with reality or historical facts so they always find a way to blame Israel for *everything*. During the entire film, the Palestinians were never held accountable for anything. Sorry Mr. Burge but Christians are not endorsing an Israeli policy; we are endorsing *God's policy* when it comes to the Jews returning to their land in the last days. If you feel this policy is unfair to the Palestinians I suggest you take your complaints to God because it's His "policy" you are having a problem with.

Next, Salim Mainer says that Christians are confusing and mixing the State of Israel and the Jewish people and this should not be done because God loves the Jews, but He does not love the Jewish State. Well, Mr. Mainer, when the Bible says over 150 times that God will bring His people back to their own land, it's pretty hard to separate them from the land they have returned to.

Next, Gary Burge comes back to accuses the Church of not raising the question: *Is the modern State of Israel the same people who are descended from Abraham?* This is a common tactic of anti-Semites, Israel-bashers and anti-Zionists. They propagate all kinds of theories that say there are no longer any real Jews left in the world. According to them, the Jewish bloodline has been so corrupted, and Jews have intermingled and intermarried so much with Gentiles, nobody can be sure they are a real biological Jew.

I covered this whole issue in another message last year. Let me just say that if there are no longer any *real* Jews, then you might as well chuck your Bible in the trash because God says repeatedly in *that* Bible that in the last days, He intends to "gather" the same people He "scattered". If there are no more biological Jews to gather today, then prophecy will fail, God is a liar and your salvation is a worthless fable.

Next, Ron Dart comes on and says that when you get Christian Zionists using the Hebrew Canon to justify the State of Israel, it is a total misuse of Scripture. Quite the contrary, Mr. Dart. It's very clear in Scripture that God will reestablish His covenant people in the land of Israel in the last days. Just a few examples are Ezek. 36:23-24; Jer. 31:1-11; 31:35-37 & 16:14-15. It's a shame you're too proud and blind to see the truth.

Gary Burge, Ron Dart, and Stephen Size all come on and say that Christians who translate Genesis 12 as an mandate for viewing the modern State of Israel are mistaken. They say we need to interpret the blessings of Abraham in the context of Jesus and Paul's teaching that we're *all* children of Abraham by faith. According to them, we need to understand this promise through the grid of the New Testament rather than applying that promise as if the New Testament was never written. For them, Genesis 12 has absolutely no political implications or ramification at this time.

Unlike Replacement Theologians like Size and Burge, Christian Zionists believe the Scriptures are active and alive today. We believe that by acknowledging the truth that God has given the Land of Israel to the Jewish people as an everlasting inheritance we are upholding the infallibility of the Scripture, acknowledging God's sovereignty, and doing our small part in the fulfilment of prophecy. There are 46 passages in the Old Testament where God promises to give the land of Israel to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and their descendants. Since He repeats this promise 46 times, there should be no question of His intent.

Next, Stephen Size trots out one of the (misleading) points he raises everywhere he goes—which is that the New Testament the term “chosen people” exclusively for those who have accepted Jesus as Lord and Savior. He says the term “chosen people” is never applied to a racial group. People like Sizer and Burge refuse to accept the view of God that is presented in Scripture. Instead, they have fashioned their own anti-Israel god and since they serve a false god, they will never understand a God who can have *two* chosen peoples at the same time. The Scripture calls such people “willingly ignorant” (*II. Pet. 3:5*) but I prefer to call them “stupid on purpose”.

First of all, God calls unsaved Jews in the New Testament, “his” people.

Hello?

Why would God call unbelieving Jews *His* people if they were no longer his people? Also, in the New Testament the Greek word that is translated “elect” is synonymous with the English phrase “chosen people”. Being a scholar and a theologian, I find it hard to believe that Mr. Sizer does not know this.

*I say then, Hath God cast away **his people** [that is, the Jews who refused to accept their Messiah]? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin. God hath not cast away **his people** which he foreknew. Wet ye not what the scripture saith...*

Romans 11:1-2

*As concerning the gospel, they [unbelieving Jews] are enemies for your sakes: but as touching **the election**, they [again, unbelieving Jews] are beloved for the fathers' sakes. For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance.*

Romans 11:28-29

As the film draws to a close, Salim Mainer comes on and says Christians should not take sides in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict because when we do we are adding fuel to the fire. Of course, it's quite obvious that both the producers of this film and most of the people interviewed in it have long ago taken the Palestinian side in the conflict but never mind that! According to Mr. Mainer, we Christians should be above the fray.

Asking Christians not to take sides in the Israeli/Palestinian conflict is like asking them to remain lukewarm regarding good and evil. This guy talks as if there is no right or wrong when it comes to the conflict, and that God doesn't really care one way or the other. But God does care because there *is* a right and a wrong when it comes to the conflict and God sides with the right!

Finally, Gary Burge comes on and asks the Christians who are watching the film if they're going to look at the conflict through the lens of prophecy or through the lens of justice? He's not talking about *God's* justice. He's talking about the justice of corrupt, humanistic organizations like the United Nations. He's talking a justice that's devoid of all input from the prophetic scriptures.

This is the heart of the problem with the film. These people, who call themselves Christians, have rejected the prophetic word of God; they have rejected the true justice of God; and they have rejected the sovereignty of God. Instead, they are embracing the word, the authority, and the sovereignty of humanistic justice as embodied in God-hating organizations like the United Nations.

For Christopher Darrell, the question that evolves during the course of the film is: "How can a just God endorse (much less be responsible for) the creation of Israel when the creation of such a state has caused untold suffering and oppression for the Palestinian people?"

The fact that he's even asking such a question shows that he has no knowledge of the God of the Bible. He has no knowledge of the God who destroyed the whole world—including *innocent* little babies—in Noah's flood. He has no knowledge of the God who commanded the Israelites to ethnically cleanse the land of Canaan. He has no knowledge of the God who killed Ananias and Sapphira for telling a single lie. He has no knowledge of the God who created the Lake of Fire to punish His enemies eternally. And he has no knowledge of the God who will eventually cast billions of "good" people, billions of "kind" people, billions of people just like Christopher (who are concerned about "justice" and trying to be peacemakers) into that Lake of Fire.