

## SHOULD WE SUPPORT ISRAEL

### *Part One*

Well, I really didn't have anything on my heart most of the week, but yesterday morning I got an email from a guy named Robert Begnaud (pronounced: *Be-know*). I had an email discussion back in 2007 with Mr. Begnaud regarding my view of National Israel. He thinks that anyone who supports the Jews or the Jewish State of Israel is a deceived "Dispensationalist".

Mr. Begnaud had listened to a recording on my web site at that time and felt it was his duty to correct my gross error. The recording was an interview I had given to Tamar Yonah, a Jewish radio hostess who has a radio show on Israel National Radio. She had interviewed me as a Christian who loves and supports Israel, and during that interview I said that we encourage the Jews to *fight* for the land God has given them.

I don't know if Mr. Begnaud misunderstood my comments about fighting to keep the land God had given them, or if he truly thinks God wants the Israelis *not* to defend themselves when attacked, so the surrounding Arab nations can carry out their desire to slaughter every Jew in that whole area. But when I say the Jews should fight to keep the land God has given them, I don't mean that they should invade neighboring Arab states and take *their* land. I simply mean that they should *defend* the land they have *won* during the defensive wars they have fought, all of which were started by their Arab neighbors.

At any rate, my comment about the Jews fighting to keep the land irritated Mr. Begnaud because such comments not only go against his view of the Jews in general, they go against his view of Christianity. While corresponding with me about this issue, he also wrote to a mutual friend of ours and tried to convince him that I was teaching gross error. But my friend rejected his "proof" that I was deceived and rebuked him. He told him that he was misjudging me over a single point. In his response to that rebuke, Mr. Begnaud wrote:

"I really do not think that you or Dan know my real beef with the recording on his site. **You couldn't possibly think that a Christian should encourage a secular state to go to war for the purpose of land?** Are not Christians to be peace makers? That is no simple disagreement is it? I have not judged the entire man as you think."

You'll find that this idea is the basis for a lot of the arguments Anti-Israel Christians use. The idea is that since Israel is a secular state, and since the Jews are still in unbelief, they do not deserve the support of Christians. Christians are not supposed to give political support to (or be involved with) pagan nations, including the secular nation of Israel. And of course, Christians should never support war—neither wars of *defense* or wars of aggression. Thus, his comment about how wrong it is for Christians to "*encourage a secular state to go to war for the purpose of land*".

After Mr. Begnaud emailed me and told me how deceived I was for thinking the Jews were still special, or for thinking that the current State of Israel had anything to do with the fulfillment of Bible prophecy, or for supporting a secular political state, I wrote him a long email back, using plenty of Scripture to clarify my position. Unfortunately, he rejected everything I wrote. But he wanted to keep debating the issue. Once it became clear that he would not listen to anything I had to say and that he wanted to *continue* to correct me, I wrote him and told him he was a religious nut-case and ended the conversation.

I haven't heard from him since then—until recently. Apparently he has started a blog talk show and he keeps sending invitations out by email in order to get more people to tune into that show. For some reason, he put me on that list. The current subject of his blog talk show is Israel. Also, he wrote an article about his view of Israel and posted it on his site. Then he sent the link to that article to his mailing list.

Now, it just so happens that earlier this week I ran across another article regarding Israel by a Baptist minister who uses similar arguments to convince Christians that they should not support the current Jewish State on a political level. This is par for the course for a lot of Christians nowadays, so it doesn't get me too upset. But the thing that got my attention was the fact that this article was posted on a web site whose owner *claims* to be pro-Israel. That did upset me because I hate liars and hypocrites. By posting such an article, the guy who runs that web site is demonstrating his hypocrisy and the deceitful way he operates. The name of the article was "*Israel—An Evangelical Idol*" and the guy who wrote it is a pastor named Rick Frueh.

Since the article from this pastor and the one from Mr. Begnaud were filled with deception and lies, and since I didn't really have anything on my heart to share, I thought I would take the opportunity this week (and maybe next week too) to demonstrate how easy is it for seducing spirits to *use the Scripture* to warp the minds of God's people regarding the subject of Israel and the Jews. Mr. Frueh begins his article by saying:

"I believe that God has a plan for the Jewish people in the future. All those who believe in Jesus at the end will be saved, and **it appears** as though Scripture **gives us a hint** at such a coming event. And that event **just may be** a fulfillment of a divine covenant. Until then, the secular nation called 'Israel' **should be left to God** and not become a rallying point for Christians."

Anyone with spiritual eyes and ears will recognize the voice of the Serpent in these words. This guy is saying the same thing the Serpent said to Eve 6000 years ago—"Hath God said"? Notice how he phrases his words. He said "it appears" as though the Scripture "gives us a hint" at such a coming event and that event "just may be" a fulfillment of a divine covenant. Sorry Mr. Frueh, it doesn't just "appear" that the Scripture gives us a "hint" that such an event might take place. It tells us directly and very frankly that such an event will take place.

*Now if **the fall of them** be the riches of the world, and **the diminishing of them** the riches of the Gentiles; how much more **their fulness**? For I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office: If by any means I may provoke to emulation them which are my flesh, and might save some of them. For if **the casting away of them** be the reconciling of the world, what shall **the receiving of them be**, but life from the dead?*

*Romans 11:12-15*

*For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness in part is happened to Israel, **until** the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. And so **all Israel shall be saved**: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob.*

*Romans 11:25-26*

It's very clear by the context of these passages that the "*them*" Paul is referring to are the physical descendants of Jacob or the nation of Israel. The "fall" of them and the "diminishing" of them is contrasted with "their fulness". The "casting away" of them is contrasted with "the receiving of them".

Paul goes on to say that blindness "in part" has befallen Israel *until* a certain point in time. Regardless of how you define that point in time, the idea Paul is conveying is crystal clear. The Jewish nation, the Jewish people as a whole, will remain blind "in part" until a certain point in God's redemptive program. Then "all Israel shall be saved" because the Deliverer will turn away ungodliness from Jacob. The term "Jacob" is a specific reference to *ethnic Jews*.

Mr. Frueh also says that until the time comes when the Jews turn to Jesus, the secular State of Israel "*should be left to God and not become a rallying point for Christians*". In other words, Christians should not be the least bit interested in what happens to the Jews over in Israel.

*For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance. For as ye in times past have not believed God, yet have now obtained mercy **through their unbelief**: Even so have these also now not believed, that **through your mercy** they also may obtain mercy.*

*Romans 11:29-31*

It's important to understand what Paul actually taught regarding the attitude Gentile believers should have towards unbelieving Jews. Notice that it was through Israel's unbelief (in Jesus) that we Gentiles received mercy from God. They didn't show us mercy. They showed us contempt and viewed us as unclean animals. It was the attitude of the Jews towards God and His Messiah that brought mercy to us. But when it comes to them being shown mercy, the situation is very different. It is not though our faith or unbelief towards God or His Messiah that the Jews will obtain mercy. It is though our mercy to them that they are to obtain mercy. Paul is saying we are to show the unbelieving Jews mercy, regardless of their present spiritual condition.

If Paul had only asked us to "love" the Jewish people we might have an excuse to remain isolated from them (as Mr. Frueh says we should). You don't really have to get too involved with someone in order to "love" them. You can love people from a safe distance. But in order to show someone mercy you have to take an interest in them, you have to care about their welfare. In other words, in order to remain detached from the Jewish people (as Mr. Frueh says we should), we must intentionally ignore the heart-cry of the apostle Paul, which was that saved Gentiles would have mercy on his kinsmen according to the flesh.

*As concerning the gospel, they are **enemies for your sakes**: but as touching the election, they are **beloved for the father's sakes**. For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance.*

*Romans 11:28*

Paul also said unbelieving Jews are enemies of the Gospel for our sakes. That means, they were broken off the Good Olive Tree in order to make room for us. But concerning their *election* they are still beloved "for the father's sakes". That means, for the sake of the Patriarchs, God still loves them. We have often heard people quote Romans 11:29, but very few times have we ever heard it quoted in context. The context of that statement

has to do with the election of the *Jewish people*. The gifts and calling of the Jewish people are without repentance. For Abraham's sake, God still loves them. He doesn't just love them like He loves the whole world, so that He gave his only begotten Son for all sinners. He has a *special* love for them for the father's sakes, even in their unbelief. Paul uses the term "beloved". He said the Jews are still *beloved* of God. Look at the way this term is used throughout the New Testament and you will see that it's a special kind of love. It's an intimate spiritual love that exists between Christian brethren.

Why does Mr. Frueh tell Christians to do just the opposite of what Paul asked us to do? Why does he tell us we should remain unattached and uninterested in what happens to the Jewish people? On what does he base such an unscriptural and callous view? Well, further on in his article, he says:

"...just because the Scriptures gives a future glimpse into God's redemption for the living Jews in the end as they believe in Jesus, that **does not mean we should get involved, much less take sides**, concerning the support of Israeli causes. **Their cause is not ours**...Examine and digest the words of the Apostle Paul and you will find he viewed 'Israel' **as a people and not as a nation to defend**. It was always in the context of ethnicity and Paul's heart was their redemption, not protecting their national borders. His words toward Israel were never geographic and he never stepped into the remedy for Roman occupation. Paul would never have formed any alliance with unbelieving Jews, and in fact, they hated him. **And since we are against interfaith dinners and alliances, why is this any different?** Unsaved Jews in this age are no more lost than the Arabs that hate them. The final covenant eschatology concerning Israel is in God's hands, but Paul would never have thought that his fellow countrymen had any wisdom since they have not the Spirit. **When we rally with such people we inadvertently give them the idea that they are alright with God, or at least we dull the edge of evangelism** (interfaith dinners)."

Their cause is not ours?

What is their "cause" anyway? Their most basic cause is simply to survive! Their cause is to keep from being slaughtered by the 500 million Muslims that surround them—and we are supposed to remain unconcerned and uninvolved in *that* cause? Is *that* how we are supposed to show Paul's kinsmen mercy? By preaching the gospel to them while they are being butchered to the last man, woman and child by fanatical Muslim animals?

One reason Mr. Frueh can say "their cause is not our cause" is because theologically he is a Dispensationalist. In his view, God has two separate programs for National Israel and the Church and never the twain shall meet. Since the Jews have their own program, we should let them in God's hands. We have nothing to do with them or their "cause" as long as they are not "Christians" (remain in unbelief). Like most of today's Christians, this Baptist pastor is *incapable* of understanding what the apostle Paul taught about the Jews and the Church in the New Testament. He has gone to a seminary and been brain-washed with error, and now he is teaching that same error to anyone who listens to him.

Though he is a Dispensationalist, he has no idea what the "dispensation of grace" is all about! He thinks he does. He assumes that he knows what the "dispensation of grace" is all about but in reality he has no idea what it's about. Like the rest of his Evangelical comrades, he thinks the dispensation of grace is all about "believing" in God, with or without works. And in case anyone thinks I may be exaggerating on this point, let me assure you I'm not. When I read his article, I decided to email him and ask him a few simple questions about "belief". I used a pseudo-name and the first question I asked him concerned the requirements of justification:

Dear Pastor Rick,

“Some of the people in our Bible study have been asking questions about justification and sanctification. Right now we are discussing what is **required** to be **justified**. Is the requirement for justification belief **alone**, or is it by belief **plus** something (ie, repentance)?

Thank you in advance for any help you can give me.

God Bless  
Eliza J. Rigby

His answer was:

“The only requirement for justification is faith, and it must be by faith alone.

*Gal.2:16 - Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.*

In fact, it is a dangerous thing to add anything to faith in Christ.

*Gal.5:4 - Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace.*

**Repentance just means to change your mind** (metanoia). Therefore "Repent and believe" is an exhortation to change your mind and believe. Sanctification is the process of drawing closer to Christ through obedience, the Word, and prayer. It means to be set apart for God's use. It is different than is justification.

God bless all of you,  
Rick”

Of course, this is exactly the kind of answer I expected. Like so many of today's Evangelical leaders, Mr. Frueh doesn't think sorrow for sin (ie, repentance) is necessary for salvation. He thinks all you have to do to be saved is “believe” the gospel with the brain. Therefore, he must *re-define* the term “repentance” as something other than how the Scripture defines it. He says the term repentance simply means “a change of mind”. However, the *real* question I wanted to ask him was the next one. I emailed him back and said:

“Hello Again Pastor Rick,

Wow! Thank you for responding so quickly.

That's the answer I gave in our Bible study. The problem is, a brother keeps saying that if belief is the **only** requirement for justification, then how can there be any **fake** (ie, unregenerate) people in the churches? Doesn't **everyone** who attends church "believe" the gospel?

I had no answer for him. What would **you** have said?

Thanks Again & God Bless.  
Sister Eliza”

His answer was the following:

“Only God can know the heart, but the tares will grow with the wheat and God forbids us to pluck up the tares because we might destroy the wheat.

**We can only assume by a person's lifestyle**, but only the Lord knows who are His.

The Bible says that there will be some who are saved and lived so carelessly that their whole lives will be burned and they will suffer loss but their souls will be saved.

There are also those who lived like a Christian but in reality they were never saved.

Again, let each man answer to God for himself.”

Rick”

Again, this is the typical Evangelical response. No one can be sure who is saved and who is not saved because “belief” is the only requirement for salvation. Belief validates itself. We can’t use the presence or absence of works (or spiritual fruit) to judge whether or not a person is genuinely saved because works are not mandatory! They are encouraged and they are expected—but they are not mandatory. If works were mandatory, then salvation would be not be based on grace *alone*. It would be based partly on grace and partly on works.

Mr. Frueh’s religion —and I say “religion” because it is not Biblical Christianity—is based on belief *alone*. As I said, his understanding of the age we are now living in is this: under the “dispensation of law” God’s people (the Hebrews) had to believe in God and obey Him (ie, that is obey His Law). But we are living under another dispensation, called the “dispensation of grace”. Under this dispensation, God’s people (the Gentiles) only have to believe in God. They should obey Him but they don’t have to obey Him because under this dispensation, salvation is by grace alone, not by works. Now compare this definition of the dispensation of grace with what the apostle Paul actually wrote in the New Testament:

*If ye have heard of **the dispensation of the grace** of God which is given me to you-ward: How that **by revelation** he made known unto me the mystery; (as I wrote afore in few words, Whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ) Which **in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men**, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit; **That the Gentiles should be fellowheirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel.***

*Ephesians 3:2-6*

Now you tell me: what exactly is the dispensation of grace, according to Paul’s definition? First, he said that God has instituted a new dispensation called grace. Next, he said this dispensation was a *mystery* that God had not revealed during the preceding dispensations or ages. Then he said the Spirit of God revealed this mystery to him by direct, supernatural revelation and he proceeds to give a short explanation of what the dispensation of grace is. This is his definition: that the Gentiles have become “fellow-heirs” (of the promises) along with the Jewish people. Not only have we become fellow-heirs with them, we have also become part of them. We have become part of the “same body (nation and people) by the gospel”.

In other words, through the Gospel, we Gentile believers have been *joined to* the Jewish people. We did not replace them as God's chosen people but have become *part of* them. The Jews are now *our* people. The land of the Jews is now *our* land. The heritage of the Jews is now *our* heritage. The destiny of the Jews is now *our* destiny. This is the plain meaning of what Paul said, both here and in many other places.

Mr. Frueh does not understand what the Scripture says about our relationship with the unsaved Jew should be. He thinks the unsaved Jew is just like the rest of unsaved humanity. There is no difference in his mind between an unsaved Jew and an unsaved Italian, between an unsaved Jew and an unsaved German. His *theology* has blinded him to the truth. Like the majority of today's theologians, he can accept the idea that Gentile Christians have become fellow-heirs and partakers of *some* of the promises God made to the Jews. But he cannot believe that we have become fellow-heirs and partakers of *all* the promises God made to the Jews. Neither can he believe that we have been made *part of* the Jewish people.

Like most of today's theologians, preachers and Bible teachers, Mr. Frueh accepts that the *spiritual* aspects of the promises God made to Abraham belong to Gentile Christians. But he rejects any and all the *literal* aspects of those promises. All the literal aspects of the inheritance that God promised to give to Abraham are viewed in a strictly literal, ethnic Jewish context. They remain Jewish promises to the Jewish people alone. But all the spiritual aspects of that inheritance—such salvation, receiving the Holy Spirit and so forth—have become Gentile promises, made to a Gentile Church that is destined to spend eternity in a Gentile heaven. Christians just don't want anything to do with the literal people, the literal land, or the literal commonwealth of natural Israel.

We could understand such a blatantly unscriptural position if Paul wouldn't have put that little phrase, "the same body" in his *definition* of the dispensation of grace. For you see, there is no way to spiritualize this truth away—though people try to spiritualize it all the time by saying that the "body" to which we have been joined is merely the spiritual body of Christ. But Paul was not talking about the spiritual body of Christ. He was talking about a *national* body. He was referring to a *civil* commonwealth.

*Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands; That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world: But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us...Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellowcitizens with the saints, and of the household of God; And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone*

*Ephesians 2:11-14 & 19-20*

Paul told us to remember that we were once aliens from *the commonwealth* of Israel, but now in Christ Jesus we have been "made nigh" by the blood of Christ. As a result of being in Christ, we are no more strangers and foreigners but *fellow-citizens* with the saints and of the household of God.

Here again, one has to grossly distort the intended meaning of Paul to maintain that the subject being discussed is the joining of the Gentiles to the spiritual body of Christ. He is clearly telling us that we have been joined to a

literal people, a commonwealth. You see, our failure to remember what we formerly were, and who we have been joined to as a result of faith in Israel's Messiah, has caused incalculable damage, both spiritual and physical, to Jews and Christians alike. It is precisely our failure to remember *this* point in Paul's theology—that we have been joined to a literal people, a literal nation and a literal land—that has blinded the eyes and deafened the ears of the Church for many centuries. Please look carefully again at what Paul said in the above passage and answer some very basic questions:

- (1) What is the subject being discussed?
- (2) What were the Gentiles “aliens” and “far off” from?
- (3) What have those Gentiles been “made nigh” to?

The subject of this passage is the fact that at one time, we Gentiles were “aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenants of promise”. Do you see that? We were aliens from the commonwealth of Israel. What exactly is “the commonwealth of Israel”? Is Paul referring to the body of Christ, the mystical Church, or is he talking about an actual commonwealth as the term suggests?

The Greek word that is translated “commonwealth” is “*politeia*” (pol-ee-ti'-ah). It comes from the Greek root-word, “*polity*”, from which we get our English word “politics”. This word is only used in two places in the entire New Testament, here and in Acts 22:28. There, Paul was about to be tortured by the Romans to find out what he did to inflame the Jews of Jerusalem into a riot. He told the inquisitor that he was a Roman citizen in order to halt the questioning. The centurion told the chief captain that he was a Roman and the captain asked him if this was true. He said yes. Then the captain, doubting him because it was not easy to be made a citizen of Rome, said, “*with a great sum obtained I this freedom*”. With a great sum obtained I this “*politeia*”.

Freedom is synonymous with citizenship. With a great sum of money he purchased his Roman citizenship, which made him a free man. Being a citizen of any commonwealth enables an individual to participate in the political process and confers on him a host of privileges that “strangers” and “aliens” do not possess. When Paul said we have been made part of the *politeia* of Israel, he meant that we have been made *citizens* of the Jewish nation. He meant that we have been made part of the Jewish commonwealth. We now have all the rights and privileges of natural-born Jews.

Throughout the New Testament, the Greek terms for citizen and commonwealth mean, to be citizens of *literal* communities. With regards to the plain usage of the terms, there is no basis to suggest that the commonwealth to which Paul referred should be understood as anything other than the literal Jewish Commonwealth, the Nation of Israel. From *what* are we no longer strangers and foreigners? From the commonwealth and the covenants of Israel! The subject of Paul is the joining of believing Gentiles to the commonwealth of Israel.

Another important Greek term that Paul uses to describe our new relationship to the Jews is “*sumpolites*”. This is a compound Greek term comprised of “*sum*” (with) and “*polites*” (citizen). It literally means “possessing the same citizenship”. It's an obvious reference to the literal, national life of Israel. Yet Vines Dictionary says *sumpolites* is used metaphorically, in a spiritual sense. Oh really? What then were we actually joined to? Paul makes it clear that through the blood of Messiah we have been joined to a people. What people have we become part of? What commonwealth have we become citizens of? The subject of this passage is the joining of the Gentiles to the Jewish people, the Jewish nation, through the blood of the Cross.



I ask again, to *which* Jews have we been joined? Was Paul simply talking about *redeemed* Jews? If Paul were merely discussing the fact that new Gentile believers had been joined to redeemed Jews as part of being joined to the spiritual body of Christ (the invisible Church), then it would be understandable that Mr. Vine views all these terms as symbolic and that they means something mystical.

But you see, Paul is not focusing on being joined to the mystical body of Christ. In addition, none of the terms he uses to explain our relationship to the Jews are ever applied in a mystical sense in the New Testament. What Paul said is very clear—if you are not already predisposed to reject it. He is explaining some of the results of being joined to Messiah. One of those results is that through Him we have been *joined to* His original chosen people (the Jews) and their nation (Israel). Any other interpretation is a biased violation of both the original language and the plain meaning of the text. We have not only been brought near and made part of the body of Christ as a result of faith in Israel’s Messiah, we have been brought near and made part of the commonwealth of Israel!

God’s original purpose in forming the nation of Israel was that He might have a righteous people, a Royal Priesthood (kingdom of priests) that would dwell in the midst of the rest of the nations of the earth and represent Him. He began the formation of His Royal Priesthood with one specific race of people—the Hebrews. But His ultimate intention is to gather sons and daughters from every “kindred and tongue and people and nation” and make them “kings and priests”. They will reign on this earth with Messiah (*Rev. 5:7-10*).

Before God could call people from *every* nation, tribe and tongue, the call to the Priesthood had to be released from the confines of a *single* biological race. After the First Advent of Messiah, the way was made to *continue* the formation of that Royal Priesthood among the Gentiles. The Gospel of the dispensation of grace went forth to the nations and has continued to do so for over 1900 years. People like Mr. Frueh need to realize that God did not change His eternal plan when He inaugurated the dispensation of grace. His purpose for going to the nations and taking out of them a people for His name has absolutely nothing to do with forming a new, eternally separate, Gentile, chosen people. Nor does it have anything to do with the false doctrine of “salvation by faith alone” (with or without works). Every person who has been called from among the Gentiles has been placed by God (through the blood of Messiah) into the *literal* commonwealth of Israel. Moreover, God expects us to obey His commandments, just as the Israelites were expected to obey His commandments!

Why is it so hard for Christians to grasp or accept such an elementary concept as being made part of National Israel? Throughout the Old Testament, Gentiles have been made part of National Israel and have shared the *same* call and destiny as the Hebrew people! This fact should be very familiar to us. It is not a new concept or a deep revelation. It has been clearly explained and repeatedly illustrated for us. Yet we never seem to grasp the simple meaning of what has been recorded. Of course, the person who exemplifies this truth the clearest is Ruth, the Moabitess. Her people were the descendants of incest between Lot and his daughters. Not only were they Gentiles and enemies of Israel, they were forbidden to enter the congregation of Israel forever (*Neh. 13:1*). Ruth’s story is a dramatic preview of the “mystery” that would be revealed to Paul 4000 years later. Not only does she become a full-fledged member of the house of Israel, not only does she partake of the promises made to the chosen people, not only does she become a model of loyalty and faithfulness for all saints in all ages, she ends up being the great-grandmother of King David and an ancestor of Messiah!

Ruth ended up marrying a Judean named Boaz, who happened to be the son of Rahab, the Canaanite harlot who hid the Hebrew spies. Think of it. Boaz, a half Canaanite, marries Ruth, a full-blooded Moabitess, and from them comes Obed, Jesse, King David, and eventually Jesus of Nazareth. Could there be a more graphic illustration of how God makes Gentiles part of His original chosen people?

Non-Hebrews have always been part of the commonwealth of Israel. This is an historical fact. Even while the call to the Priesthood was confined within the Hebrew race, it was still possible for non-Jews to partake of that call. They had to be circumcised and voluntarily bind themselves to Torah observance. Once this was done they were no longer considered “Gentiles” in the technical sense.

Though they did not turn into biological Hebrews, they were still viewed as part of the *nation* and *people* of Israel. That a Gentile can become a full-fledged member of the (literal) commonwealth of Israel is not only an historical reality, it is a present-day reality. Even today, modern Judaism makes room for those who wish to assimilate or convert to that religion. The person who wishes to do so must undergo an extensive time of training. During this probationary time he/she learns what is expected of them. At the end of this time they are baptized and given a new Hebrew name, which signifies that there has been a complete break from their former genealogical and religious heritage. They become fellow-citizens of the present Jewish commonwealth.

What is done by man in the natural, can certainly be done by God in the spirit realm! If a Gentile can be made part of the commonwealth of Israel today by converting to Judaism, certainly God can graft us into that same commonwealth *through faith* in Israel’s Messiah! It doesn’t matter that today’s Jews would never recognize us Gentile Christians as being part of their nation. The only thing that matters is how God sees the situation—and in His eyes, we have been made part of His original chosen people. This is why, when speaking to the Church at Galatia, which was 99.9% Gentile, Paul had no problem saying to them: “...now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of the promise”.

He said you Gentiles in Galatia who have accepted Israel’s Messiah, through that faith you have become the “children of promise” the same way Isaac was a child of promise. Paul is telling these Gentiles that they are heirs to the same promise Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are heirs to, the same promise the twelve tribes are heir to because we have become part of Israel. Therefore, their cause *is* our cause. Their survival *is* our business because we are *related* to them, even in their unbelief! We are part of their history. We are part of their future. We are partaking in their call and destiny! We have been made part of their nation, their commonwealth!

That is the teaching of Paul, my friends. Unfortunately, this truth has yet to dawn on modern-day Christians because we don’t believe *our* promises have anything to do with *their* promises. We continually translate our promises as spiritual Gentile promises, which have nothing to do with a literal people called the Jews, or with a literal land over in the Middle East; but which instead work out as a Gentile salvation, the end of which is a Gentile heaven with Gentile mansions. This is a monumental lie! It’s the exact opposite of what Paul tried to tell us in the book of Romans.

Since Mr. Frueh refuses to “remember” that in times past he was an “alien from the commonwealth of Israel” and that as a result of accepting Israel’s Messiah he is “no longer a stranger and foreigner but a fellow citizen of the Jewish Commonwealth, he has become a Jew hater. Under the guise of religion he ignores the fact that the Arabs around Israel have every intention of totally destroying that nation. In the name of Christianity he would sit by quietly as every Jew in the Middle East was murdered—just as *the majority* of Christians in the world (also in the name of Christianity) sat by silently when Hitler tried to murder every single Jew in Europe.

Mr. Frueh also says that if we examine what Paul said, we will find that he viewed Israel “as a people and not as a nation to defend”. He says that Paul didn’t go around encouraging new believers to protect the “national borders” of Israel. This is a smoke and mirrors tactic because the people of Israel were not in the same political situation back in Paul’s day as they are today.

First of all, Israel had no borders to protect in Paul's day. The Jewish nation had become part of the Roman Empire. It was a vassal state. The borders of what was once the Nation of Israel were at that point, the borders of the Roman Empire. Israel had no "national" borders to protect or attack. Any foreign nation that attacked Judea, Samaria or Galilee in Paul's day would have been attacking Rome, not Israel.

Secondly, it was never the *official* policy of the Roman government to butcher every Jew in the Middle East. The Romans governed the Jews in that part of the world as a conquered people who were *part of* the Roman Empire. They gave the Jews certain rights and privileges so they could continue to live on the land and farm it, so they (the Romans) could collect taxes on their produce. The Jews were a *source of revenue* for the Romans. As long as they quietly farmed the land and conducted their business, they were allowed to live in relative peace.

The Romans were not obsessed with the annihilation of every Jew on the planet like the Arabs of today are! If during Paul's day, the Roman government had decided to murder every Jew in Palestine, you can be sure that Paul would have been actively seeking ways to save at least a remnant of his kinsmen from such destruction! To think otherwise is to *deny* the deep love and concern he had for them.

Mr. Frueh can *say* he loves the Jews all he likes—he's a liar. Just as he would not stand by silently and let those in his family (whom he really does love) be butchered, so he could not sit back and remain uninterested as Satan-possessed Arabs try to destroy the Jewish people—if he truly loved them. His actions and his doctrine prove that he doesn't love them. Indeed, if every Christian were to listen to his advise, there would be no Jews left to "evangelize" in the last days because they would all be dead!

Mr. Frueh has also conveniently forgotten the fact that while Paul may not have talked about the land or the borders of the land, God certainly did. Not only does the Scripture say very clearly that the Land of Israel is God's land, it also says that God has determined the boundaries and the times of the nations according to *that* land and the people of Israel!

*When the Most High gave the nations their inheritance, when he divided all mankind, he set up boundaries for the peoples **according to the number of the sons of Israel**. For the Lord's portion is his people, Jacob his allotted inheritance.*  
*Deuteronomy 32:8-9 NIV*

*From one man he made every nation of men, that they should inhabit the whole earth; and **he determined the times set for them and the exact places where they should live**.*

*Acts 17:26 NIV*

One of the things both secular humanists and Christian Jew haters like Mr. Frueh have in common is their denial of the Scripture when it comes to the land and the people of Israel. The Scripture states very clearly that God has not only determined the "times" of the nations—that is, when they would appear in history; how long they would last; and what they would do—He also determined the "exact places where they should live". But what is even more astounding (and this is something Gentiles just can't stand!) is that the Lord set those boundaries "according to the number of the sons of Israel". So when it comes to *territorial divisions* (ie; national boundaries) of the earth, the land of Israel is special. That land was reserved for the possession of a people not yet born. It was chosen by God to be the *physical* location on this planet from whence He would display marvelous wonders.

Not only do the land of Israel and the people of Israel have a central place in God's plan which can never be changed, God built His plan around *those* people and *that* land—and this fact irritates both the secular humanist and the Christian Jew hater. It irritates the humanist because he thinks he is the only “god” in the universe. He cannot stand to even consider the possibility that he is not in control of earthly events. He wants to sit on the throne and decide who gets what territory, and for how long.

It irritates Christian Jew haters because they think God has built His eternal plan around the Gentile church and they refuse to even consider the possibility that they are not the focus and center of that plan. But it doesn't matter what the humanist and the Jew hater thinks. The only thing that matters is what the Scripture teaches.

*But the land, whither ye go to possess it, is a land of hills and valleys, and drinketh water of the rain of heaven: A land which the Lord thy God careth for: the eyes of the Lord thy God are always upon it, from the beginning of the year even unto the end of the year.*

*Deuteronomy 11:11-12*

*And ye shall sow the eighth year, and eat yet of old fruit until the ninth year; until her fruits come in ye shall eat of the old store. The land shall not be sold for ever: **for the land is mine**; for ye are strangers and sojourners with me.*

*Leviticus 25:22-23*

The land of Israel wasn't special because of who lived on it. When Abraham received the promise to receive that land, demon-worshipping, blood-drinking, child-sacrificing Canaanites dwelt there. It was special because it *belonged to God*. It was special because of the destiny it was destined to fulfil. Long before Abraham was even born, God had been *caring* for that land. His *eyes* were “always upon it, from the beginning of the year even unto the end of the year”. The Scripture makes it clear that this piece of real estate was His—“*The land shall not be sold forever...the land is mine*”.

Because that land was God's land and always will be His land, He told the Jews that they were not allowed to sell the land *permanently* to anyone, including each other. It had to revert back to the original family that God gave it to every 50 years, in the Year of Jubilee. Now, if God was *that* concerned about keeping the land within the original allotted tribes and families of Israel, just think of how He must view the actions of today's Jewish establishment, which has already give the Arabs the Gaza Strip, and is ready to give them half of Jerusalem, the whole West Bank, and most of the Golan Heights!

This is why we say God wants the Jews to fight to keep the land they have won in the wars they have had to fight. God enabled them to win those wars and He expects them to keep the land He has returned to them.

*But if you turn away and forsake the decrees and commands I have given you and go off to serve other gods and worship them, then I will uproot Israel **from my land, which I have given them**, and will reject this temple I have consecrated for my Name. I will make it a byword and an object of ridicule among all peoples.*

*II. Chronicles 7:18-20*

Because the Land of Israel is God's land, He retains the right to give it to whoever He chooses. Even though He took the land away from the Canaanites and gave it to the children of Israel, He warned Israel that if they did not obey Him, He would take the land away from them and give it to somebody else.

*For, behold, in those days, and in that time, when I shall bring again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem, I will also gather all nations, and will bring them down into the valley of Jehoshaphat, and will plead with them there for my people and for my heritage Israel, whom they have scattered among the nations, and parted my land.*

*Joel 3:1-2*

Regardless of how much the Arabs feel the land is theirs—the land is *not* theirs. The land belongs to God. And at the end of days. God still calls unbelieving Jews “my” people. It was God who took the land away from its original inhabitants and gave it to the children of Israel and it was God who sent those same children of Israel into exile twice as punishment for their rebellion against Him, and gave the land to others. In like manner, it is He who has brought those same children of Israel back to the land in our day.

The nations of the world never complained that it was unjust when God drove the Jews out of the land and gave it to the Romans, then to the Byzantines, then to the Catholic Crusaders, then to the Arab Turks, and finally to the British. So they shouldn't complain that He has taken the land from the British and given it back to the Jews! The fact that they cry “foul” is proof that they are all a bunch of Jew haters. When God turned His face from the Jews and allowed the Gentile nations to slaughter them in punishment, the Gentile nations all said “Amen”. But when God turned His face to the Jews again and showed them a little mercy in 1948, those same Gentile nations went berserk—and so did all the Christian Jew haters.

Christian Jew haters like Mr. Frueh, who feel no pity for the Jews, feel great compassion for the Palestinians who would gladly butcher those Jews if they only could. I feel just the opposite! I feel no empathy or pity for the Palestinians, regardless of how much they have suffered because it *wasn't* the Jews who caused their suffering. It was their own hatred and stubbornness that caused them to reject the original U.N. partition plan which granted them self-determination and a sovereign state. It was their own hatred and stubbornness that caused them to start a war they eventually lost. It was their own hatred and stubbornness that caused them to flee the country en mass, thinking that they would return in a few weeks and take possession of all the property of dead Jews.

If people want to cry for the poor Palestinians, that's their prerogative. As for me, I won't shed a tear for them because it isn't the Jews who have perpetuated their suffering these past 60 years. It has been the hatred and stubbornness of their *fellow Arabs* that caused it by giving them no other option but to reconquer the land God has returned to the Jews. It is the insatiable hatred of the Arab states for Israel, and their adamant refusal to recognize her or make peace with her that has caused—and continues to cause—the suffering of the Palestinian people. If they want delivered from their suffering, let the Palestinians turn their guns and their stones and their Molotov cocktails on those who are *causing* their suffering!

As long as the Palestinians break every written agreement they sign, as long as they boast they will destroy Israel the first opportunity they get, as long as they keep teaching their children to murder Jews and to become martyrs in the struggle to liberate Palestine, as long as their TV programs and Radio programs and school text books are filled with anti-Semitic and anti-Israel incitement and propaganda, as long as their religious leaders continue to use

mosques to preach hatred and Jihad and terrorism, as long as they shoot innocent civilians and blow up busses full of children, they deserve to suffer—not only in this life but in the next one as well! And any Christian who supports them deserves the same fate!

What humanists and Christian Jew haters like Mr. Frueh don't seem to be able to grasp is that the issue of Israel's existence has little to do with whether or not the Jewish people are righteous and moral. It has little to do with whether or not they *deserve* to have their own state, or whether or not, as unbelieving pagans they deserve the support of Christians. The issue of Israel's existence has to do with the righteousness of God's character. What is at stake here is God's *honor*. Regardless of Israel's faults, the very existence of a Jewish state glorifies God because it reveals His faithfulness to His promises.

The Lord said He would judge Israel's sin and rebellion by scattering them across the face of the globe. But He also promised not to utterly forsake them. He said that one day He would gather them back to the land from the four corners of the earth. In addition, He also made it clear that He would not do this as a result of any righteousness on *their* part, but “for his great name’s sake”. When it comes to the promise of eventual restoration, the fulfillment of that promise does not depend on the righteousness of the Jewish people.

*For in mine holy mountain, in the mountain of the height of Israel, saith the Lord GOD, there shall all the house of Israel, all of them in the land, serve me: there will I accept them, and there will I require your offerings, and the firstfruits of your oblations, with all your holy things. I will accept you with your sweet savour, **when I bring you out from the people, and gather you out of the countries wherein ye have been scattered; and I will be sanctified in you before the heathen.***

*And ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I shall bring you into the land of Israel, into the country for the which I lifted up mine hand to give it to your fathers. And there shall ye remember your ways, and all your doings, wherein ye have been defiled; and ye shall lothe yourselves in your own sight for all your evils that ye have committed. And ye shall know that I am the Lord, **when I have wrought with you for my name's sake, not according to your wicked ways, nor according to your corrupt doings,** O ye house of Israel, saith the Lord GOD.*

*Ezekiel 20:40-44*

***For my name's sake will I defer mine anger, and for my praise will I refrain for thee, that I cut thee not off.** Behold, I have refined thee, but not with silver; I have chosen thee in the furnace of affliction. **For mine own sake, even for mine own sake, will I do it:** for how should my name be polluted? and I will not give my glory unto another.*

*Isaiah 48:9-11*

*For the Lord will not forsake his people **for his great name's sake:** because it hath pleased the Lord to make you his people.*

*I. Samuel 12:22*

For *His* great name's sake, He did not utterly cut off the Jewish people. For His great name's sake, He kept them as a separate people in all the nations to which they had been driven. For His great name's sake, He did not allow Hitler, and all those before and after him who were driven by that same burning hatred of Jews, to completely expunge them from the planet. For His great name's sake, He gathered them back to the land from all over the world in our day. For His great name's sake, He enabled them to win 4 wars in which they were out-numbered in both men and military equipment, sometimes as much as 10-1.

Israel is a testimony to the faithfulness of God! It is a testimony that He cannot and will not lie. Moreover, the continued existence of a *superior* Jewish state in the heart of the Muslim Arab world is a demonstration that the God of Israel is mightier than the demon-god of Islam. Muslim Arabs know very well the difference between the god they serve and the God of the Hebrews. They mock and insult Jehovah. Yet 500 million of them, with all their wealth and resources, and with all the military equipment they get from Russia (some of which is free), cannot blot out this minuscule country that has blackened the face of Allah and the entire Arab world.

One of the basic arguments Jew haters use to deny the fact that it was the hand of God who brought the Jews back to the land in our day, is that their return could not possibly be the work of God because they have not yet repented or accepted their Messiah. A variation of this argument is *implied* in Mr. Frueh's dissertation when he says the Jews in the land of Israel today are "secular" Jews and the Jewish State is a "secular" state. The implication is that since the Jews have not repented, they do not deserve our support. This just shows the kind of ignorance people like Mr. Frueh walk in. This is what the Scripture says regarding the return of the Jews:

*For I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and **will bring you into your own land**. **Then** will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you.*

*Ezekiel 36:24-25*

Notice that God promised to bring the Jews back to the Land of Israel from all the countries where He had scattered them. He said *nothing* about them having to repent and accept Jesus *first*, before He would restore them to the land. In fact, He clearly predicted that He would bring them back *before* they even repented! He said He would gather them and "then" he would sprinkle them with clean water.

God did not re-establish the Jews in their land and keep His hand of protection on them all this time because they deserve it. Neither did He do it because they are serving Him. He is doing all this for His great name's sake! He is keeping His word to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. He is keeping His word to Moses and Joshua—and every Christian on this planet should be *grateful* that there is a Jewish state in the Middle East because if God would not have kept His promise to the Jews, what assurance do we have that He will keep His promise to us?