

The Theological Paradox of Israel

I am aware that the following statement, observations, and opinions may seem like the nitpicking of a busybody contrarian. With this prefatory apology please consider, dear reader, the complexity, theologically and emotionally, of the subject matter, admitting to yourself, also, the self-evident fact that confusion surrounds the issues of Israel and Zionism and always has. I have simply attempted to make logical sense of the matter from a biblical perspective, which is the basis of truth and reason.

Israel is a very complex theological problem. This is chiefly because it touches upon modern geo-politics. The subjects of politics and religion are particularly intertwined, and Christian Zionists take them very much to heart. But the authority of a theologian is limited to biblical studies.

If one presumes to pontificate, an endeavor which requires the wisdom of Solomon, in any event, one should be objective and dispassionate in dealing with the salient verses. One must weigh the relative merits of the arguments, the argument of God's-promises-to-the-Jews versus the alienation-of-the-Jews-from-God argument, both of which are legitimate. If one has Solomon's wisdom and the audacity to pontificate, one must be dedicated to justice, justice to God and man; and consider also those verses that are used to rebut the alternate argument.

The filiation of Christian doctrine with the Torah and the Tanakh and even the Jewish people themselves is another level of complication. Christian Zionists also take this to heart. But supersessionists use other weighted scales. Dispensationists and

supersessionists both tend to simplify the issue in an obtuse, heavy-handed fashion, forcing Israel into one or another broad categories. Israel is either inferred to be righteous or declaimed, a rogue state. These conclusions are rendered in an unintelligent manner, with predictable tribalism. They do so at the expense of acknowledging a real complexity. While both make arguments based on scripture, they refuse to admit those biblical facts that are antithetical to their argument, resulting in much collateral damage. The fact is that Israel is a paradox. Christian Zionists use theology to support Israel politically, but this has the effect of 1) inferring the righteousness of the Jews outside Jesus Christ; and, 2) also, in so doing they are inadvertently found supporting universalism; a suggestion which fills them with outrage and chagrin. Protestants, supersessionists, misappropriate sources like Romans 9: 6, for example, as well as other source verses often used to support replacement theology, to demonize Israel.

Christian Zionism's Implied Doctrine

The thesis of the Third Temple books is that there may be a relationship between the world religion of the Tribulation Period and Israel in Temple services. The Temple may become the nexus of the universalist New World Order religion. Christian Zionists may have inadvertently contributed to this universalist effort by passing blanket approval over Judaism. Theologically they have done this by interpreting the prophecies of the “regathering” of the Jews to the land of Israel in our time as a miraculous act of God. This *has the effect* of emphasizing the righteousness of the Jews outside faith in Jesus, whether this is intended or not.

The main thesis of the Third Temple series of books is that the universalism of Mystery Babylon (she who exploits Israel's own version of universalism and his role as intercessor for the nations) may represent a toehold in the Third Temple through which the Antichrist enters. (I propose this possibility in clear acknowledgement of the belligerence of the Antichrist, which must be qualified a bit.) But it was not this theory alone that

caused me to question the major source passages of Christian Zionism. I did not have an ulterior motive of proving a thesis when I pointed out the weakness in the biblical argument. It is simply a biblical observation. Most passages that are cited to support Christian Zionism, that modern Israel is evidence of the prophesied regathering, do not actually support this thesis. Old Testament passages usually identify God the Messiah as the active agent of regathering. More than anything, the realization contributed to the theory. Israel's present regathering of himself in unbelief may allow latitude for a relationship between Israel and Mystery Babylon during the early days of the Tribulation Period. But to suggest that God is inspiring and transporting Jews now, inadvertently contributes to deep-seated confusion, which leads to a series of erroneous conclusions. The ultimate error of which being that Israel is presently righteous.

How is the righteousness of the Jews implied?

Regathering and Salvation

Christian Zionists, being aware that many salient passages reveal God as the active agent, assume that Jehovah animates Israel. This doctrine is not overt, perhaps not even conscious, but it is implied if the salient passages are taken seriously because they portray the regathering in connection to the salvation of the Jews, an event which precipitates the Second Coming. Present-day emigration is viewed by them as evidence of this. Thus they view the populating of Israel as the prophesied "regathering." But there is a problem with this conclusion. What problem? God does not animate unbelievers. A subtle subtext, which seems to be largely unconscious, is contained in the suggestion that He does. The context of virtually all salient regathering passages is the inception of the Millennial Reign, *when Jews are saved*. To apply those verses to conditions today suggests that Jews are saved in a salvation outside Jesus Christ, an idea which is not a biblical. God may manipulate others, but He only animates believers. In the early days of the Millennial Kingdom, the Lord

Jesus calls, and *they come*, angels assisting in the pilgrimage. I gradually came to realize that many ingenuous, well-meaning Christian Zionists might inadvertently promote ideas of which they are unaware, ideas antithetical to their own doctrine. Of course, some conscientious Christian Zionists account for this by postulating a sequential regathering, the regathering as a rolling start, partly in unbelief and later consummated in belief. But insofar as the regathering is viewed as a miracle of God, in some sense distinct from the title deed (promise) of the land in the Bible (what can be read in Zephaniah 2: 1, for example, as a mandate, but not, strictly speaking, as inspiration) one cannot disentangle both views. The net result is the same. It is ironic that unbelievers understand the doctrine more coherently. They notice the contradiction. This erroneous doctrine, implied and unstated though it is, “Jews righteous in unbelief,” has the effect of promoting not only universalism but also dominionism.

What Form of Dominionism?

Ironically, the dominionism, the theocratic world empire, that is proposed is not even Christian, as it is in the Catholic and Protestant models, but it is wholly Jewish. The implied form of dominionism is contradictory. Instead of *Christendom* (a false doctrine itself), it represents Jewish dominionism. As such, in a manner inverse to the stated purpose of Christian Zionists, it cannot fail to support the antisemitic argument of Jewish world conspiracy. Insofar as theology is used to support the position, Christian Zionist dominionism is an alignment with the false religion of Judaism, which posits a Jewish messianic kingdom without Christ Jesus. In fact, the obviation of the inconvenient truth of Jesus is the main grounds for alignment. And this is a ramification of failing to recognize Israel’s lost condition; the fact that most regathering passages are intimately connected with the salvation of the Jews, their national acceptance of Jesus Christ as Messiah. On some level, the virtues of this are even argued by Christian Zionists: “We must promote false religion

in order to get the Jews to travel to Israel.” Thus God is viewed as the benevolent promoter of false religion.

Let us expound from another angle. As we know Christian Zionism is not merely academic. It manifests with practical teeth. The theological issues of Israel also inevitably touch upon modern geo-politics. Why is this problematic?

Israel is a theocratic state.* From the origins of the secular Zionist Movement to the succumbing of the Ultra Orthodox to the national effort, Zionism has increasingly justified itself in religion. Zionism and the national effort is ultimately based on Judaism. Jewish identity is justified by the Bible, but Judaism has become something else. It is a false religion which denies Jesus Christ and has dominionist aspiration. Dominionism is a religious idea, the goal of which is a theocratic world empire. Zionism is animated by Judaism, which is run by rabbis and priests. (The secular model is not obdurate enough to survive, but religion is a powerful force of social cohesion; and religious fanaticism more so; witness the Jesuits and radical Islamics.) It is sacerdotal. I do not mean to be pedantic, but several words are related to the definition of *dominionism*; the logic is redundant and circular. Dominionism boils down to a theocracy, the rule of priests, which is *prima facie* evidence of a theocracy, the rule of a god. The rationale for theocracy is theocracy. Since an invisible God can only rule through priests, dominionism is sacerdotal. Technically, sacerdotalism is priestcraft, the doctrine that priests are invested with supernatural powers. But practically, it is the doctrine that priests are necessary for salvation. It is a rejection of the High Priesthood of Jesus Christ (Hebrews 7: 22-8, 8: 1, 9: 11-28, and 10: 12-22). The Catholic priesthood, which makes some pretense to the Lord, interposes a series of priests, indeed other ghostly intercessors as well, even between man and Jesus

* This conclusion is established in *The Third Temple: Merging Agendas*. And while the statement may seem wildly hyperbolic, an over-characterization bordering on parody, I maintain it as an essential fact, which is necessary for full comprehension of the prophetic state of affairs. The conception of Israel as a theocratic state may be practically justified in at least two ways: 1) Judaism (Israel's role in establishing the messianic age) and 2) Freemasonry's ideal, which is aligned and sometimes mutually identified with Kabbalism.

Christ, much less between man and God the Father.

Israel is a theological quagmire because Christianity has a filial relationship to the Jews via the Bible ("salvation is of the Jews," John 4: 22). And Jesus and the Apostles were Jews. God also promised the Jews the land, and somehow Christians want to honor this promise. For these reasons, it is almost impossible for Christians to separate the dynamic of religion and politics from Israel. There is a historical connection, in other words, but we must note that it is abstract. The filiation of the religions engenders in Christian Zionists a sense of familial relationship with the person of the Jew, and thus a sense of responsibility to support Israel. But this is not natural. It is an abstraction, in the realm of religion. And it is not spiritual, because unsaved people do not have the Spirit and are not spiritually connected with God. Some Christian Zionist candidly admit these things and qualify the situation thusly: Israel is God's "natural" seed, and the church, His "spiritual" seed. Many Christian Zionist even admit that Jews, generally, are deceived; they argue that they are showing charity as to a wayward brother. Supposedly, God motivates this charity (Genesis 12: 3). But even here, is a complication. Supporting Israel encourages the Jews, but should Christians encourage people in a false religion? What does 2 John 10-1 say?

If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine,
receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed:

For he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil
deeds.

Are not spiritual truths and the religious ideas based upon them more important? Is not personal salvation more important?

It is true that a Jewish population represented in the land, and apparently even national sovereignty, must predicate the Second Coming. But if Israel (Jewish Zionism) is animated by religion, which is evidence of a spiritual principle, even a spirit, it seems conclusive that Christian and Jews do not worship the same god. (I admit that this is a supersessionist and antisemitic argument, but I disavow both positions.) In 1 Corinthians 5:

4-5 the Apostle Paul excommunicated an apparently authentic Christian for flagrant sin. Should Christian Zionists support a false religion and perhaps a false god, even if the idolators are people called by God's name? Second Corinthians 6: 17 forbids affiliation with unbelievers.

Although they would argue the notion, Christian Zionists assume that Jehovah animates Israel, as we have shown (the manifest passages of regathering portray the spiritual condition of the Jews as one of salvation. But biblical and current evidence suggests that this is not the present condition. God may assist in repatriation of the land in the manner in which He manipulated events between heathen nations in the Bible, and this may well be the case. But the Jewish population of Israel can be attributed to things other than miracles, such as the Jewish desire for their ancestral homeland, however much God may have interposed Himself in the process. He certainly has freedom to do so, but the issue under discussion is the biblical support for Zionism. But arguments requiring the insertion of an extra-biblical factor of an unverifiable spiritual apprehension of God's interjection into history, substantial though it may be in truth, necessarily casts the whole affair into the realm of politics. In politics one can believe whatever one chooses, but a Christian's belief should be substantiated by the Bible. The facts that suffice for Christian Zionists, that God made promises to the Jews and that God has loved Israel and presumably still does, are very general, but they are ultimately insufficient to prove a miraculous regathering in our time. It is a belief, an extra-biblical belief, whether true or not, and as such, wholly political. This in itself is not particularly problematic, but it would seem to deny a religious pretext, at least for those dealing honestly and intelligently with the issue.

One cannot touch upon the issue of Israel in a theological sense without enormous complication. It seems to be in fact a paradox, the resolution of which leads inevitably to the Devil. Support for Israel can easily be substantiated politically but not theologically. Politically, one can support anyone one choose. And one does not need a religious pretext (despite the fact that political theory, to say nothing of law, has reference to religious

ideas) other than “Israel is a Western-style democracy.” Western-style democracy is usually viewed to some degree as broadly a result of Judeo-Christian mores. But, frankly, “Western-style democracy” can be argued as a purely Hellenistic manifestation with little recourse to Christianity at all; although much ado is often made of the influence of Mosaic Law, for example, and the compassion of Jesus. What is curious is that both the Hellenistic and Judeo-Christian roots may figure in the “beachhead” idea which we discuss in a moment; the common denominator being Hellenistic Neoplatonism, which corrupted both Judaism and Christianity. In other words, Hellenism is more dominant. Not to suggest that authentic Christianity has not been formidable, however. Has it not required the conditioning of the religious pretext, which is merely a superficial social trapping?

Abrahamic Religions

The main thesis of the Third Temple books is that religion and dominionism seem to undergird the New World Order and the struggle for global domination. Dominionist systems are theistic: that is, monotheistic. Since they are predicated by monotheism, the main examples of dominionist systems would be found among the Abrahamic religions: Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Many Muslims are Arabic; the Arabs are genetically related to Jews through Abraham, in addition to appropriating many features of Jewish religion. Judaism not only seems to be a religious bridge of sorts between the East and West, the very matrix of Christianity and also of Islam in a sense; Israel and the Temple Mount in Jerusalem is also geographically located at the crossroads of East and West. Perhaps we should say that Israel is a “wedge,” a beachhead of sorts, either for Occidental invasion of the East, a crusade, if you will, or Oriental defense. Perhaps the “abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet” (Matthew 24: 15 and Mark 13: 14), is the culmination of this struggle for dominion.

Freemasonic designs are also a form of dominionism. In

them the religious goals and political goals are closely aligned. Freemasons desire the Temple Mount as a nexus of the New World Order religion, which is Neoplatonic (pagan), and it is seated within Jerusalem, which they hope will become a utopian international city, and possibly the world capital; which frankly corresponds with Jewish and Catholic ideals.

Incidentally, all forms of dominionism redound to Roman Catholicism because Catholicism is the only cosmopolitan monotheistic religion. It is related to Judaism and Freemasonry through Neoplatonism, of which it is the major purveyor. And dominionism by its nature is antichrist. (Is not the syllogistic conclusion, then, inevitable?) Dominionism by its nature is an attempt to establish a worldly theocratic system in imitation of the spiritual Millennial Kingdom, but also in apposition to it, as an alternative and antagonistic competitor, a counterfeit.

Hypocrisy

In response to the criticism of my Evangelical brethren, Christian Zionists, who protest that these biblical observations hurt their position, I am at a loss. “How can we express the truth without collateral damage,” they say. “We cannot admit that most of ‘regathering’ passages refer to the future without casting aspersion upon Israel? We cannot mention passages in which God’s displeasure for having rejected Jesus are mentioned because it fuels antisemitism.” (Passages such as “. . . wrath is come upon them to the uttermost,” 1 Thessalonians 2: 16.) The simple political fact is that one has liberty to support whomever one chooses. Why does one need a religious pretext? “But God cannot do it alone; He needs our help.” As I suggested earlier, a another as fallacious premise is often implied as well. “We must promote false religion in order to get the Jews to travel to Israel.”

One cannot note these things without being declaimed a Christian Nationalist,* but my record is against dominionism.

* How can Christian Nationalism be anything other than a Jesuit plot?

Evidently, some objectivity on the subject requires a certain level of disassociation. That said, I am not opposed to pragmatic geopolitical decisions. At least the Nietzschean approach is honest. But all theological roads seem to lead to the Devil. Must we clothe errant tribalism in disingenuous religion? Hypocrisy is disgraceful. (Christians are not hypocrites, as per Matthew 24: 51, among others passages; and I would not accuse my brethren of being unbelievers; but Christians apparently can succumb to hypocrisy.) Notwithstanding other definitions, *hypocrisy* is a political motive with religious pretext (excuse). For this reason the crusades are justly condemned as genuine hypocrisy.

Jonathan Malone
January 2026