

News and Current Events :: Newly elected Iran President says Israel should be wiped out**Newly elected Iran President says Israel should be wiped out - posted by Compton (), on: 2005/10/27 22:49**

President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad calls nation (Israel) a 'blot': This is why the Islamic state must not get nukes, the White House says

TEHRAN, Iran - President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad declared Wednesday that Israel is a "disgraceful blot" that should be "wiped off the map" - fiery words that Washington said underscores its concern over Iran's nuclear program.

Ahmadinejad's speech to thousands of students at a "World without Zionism" conference set a hard-line foreign policy course sharply at odds with that of his moderate predecessor, echoing the sentiments of Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, the founder of Iran's Islamic revolution.

The United States said Ahmadinejad's remarks show that Washington's fears about Iran's nuclear program are accurate.

(http://www.sltrib.com/cj_3155317?rss) Full article

(<http://abcnews.go.com/International/wireStory?id1257857&CMPOTC-RSSFeeds0312>) Arab nations remain silent

(http://news.yahoo.com/s/afp/20051027/wl_mideast_afp/mideastiranisrael_051027115802) Israel steps up demands for UN to expel Iran

Re: Newly elected Iran President says Israel should be wiped out - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2005/10/27 22:56

Quote:
-----JERUSALEM (AFP) - Israel intensified demands for Tehran to be expelled from the United Nations amid an international outcry over a call by Iran's president for the Jewish state to be wiped off the map.

Brothers and Sisters these are crucial times, we need to be in pray for Israel. What to say about a religion that condemn the desire to eliminate a whole nation of people, is islam (iran) better then hitler?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/28 6:08

Do I dare step into these troubled waters?

I am certainly not supporting Mahmoud Ahmadinejad here but I think we need to listen to what is being said. Folks put together Iran's determination to be a nuclear power and this kind of rhetoric and make conclusions which are just as inflammatory as Ahmadinejad' speeches.

Ahmadinejad is anti-zionist. That means he is opposed to what the United Nations did in establishing an Israeli sovereign state. Israel, as a nation state, was 'put on the map' by a political process. Is it conceivable, theoretically, that the 'nation state' could be 'wiped off the map' by a political process? It may be significant that Ahmadinejad spoke of 'wiping Israel off the map' rather than of 'wiping out Israel', as posted above.

There are those who hold the view of a 'Greater Israel' which believes that the nation state of Israel should push out its borders to the limits established by (<http://www.all-creatures.org/sermons98/map-05.html>) King David. That would take it right into the heart of Syria. It is hardly surprising that her neighbours become nervous as such a possibility. It is also verses such as...[^]"In the same day the LORD made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates:[^]" (Gen. 15:18, KJVS)...which fuel some of this fear. Have a look at the implications of this on a (<http://ancienthistory.about.com/gi/dynamic/offsite.htm?sitehttp://www.bible.ca/maps/>) map. and then find the "Successive World Kingdoms: Persia, Babylon, Assyria 640-500 BC" map.

Is Ahmadinejad dangerous? yes, of course and needs to be watched but it needs to be remembered too that it is 'Zionism', as a territorial expansion policy, that has been at the heart of the Middle East controversy rather than 'anti-semitism'.

News and Current Events :: Newly elected Iran President says Israel should be wiped out

Traditionally, Islam and Judaism have been much more able to co-exist than Christendom and Judaism. (Please note that I said 'Christendom' NOT 'Christianity'; the two are quite different)

Re: Prayer for Iran - posted by Compton (), on: 2005/10/28 7:17

Quote:
-----It may be significant that Ahmadinejad spoke of 'wiping Israel off the map' rather than of 'wiping out Israel', as posted above.

I agree, it is well worth noting that my version of the headline unwittingly made Mahmoud Ahmadinejad sound like he was wanting genocide rather than elimination of a state.

Quote:
-----Traditionally, Islam and Judaism have been much more able to co-exist than Christendom and Judaism.

I'm reading a book called Constantine's Sword (James Carroll) that takes a hard look at Christendom's sorry treatment of Jews...it's an unpleasant but informative read. Perhaps because the author is Catholic, he doesn't make as clean a distinction between Christendom and Christianity as I might.

I don't know if you were angling this direction Ron, but for me the scariest part of this scenario isn't Ahmadinejad, but the Western reaction to him...For me, his rhetoric doesn't make me concerned about what Iran might do in the region...but of what we might do in the region.

Although I've never considered Islam to be a "live and let live" kind of religion, (despite what political correctness insists) I feel a real need to pray for Iran. My prayers are not for them only...I need prayer as well so that I can see the Mideast through the eyes of Jesus and not through the eerie green night-vision lens of American military policy.

MC

Re: - posted by Eli_Barnabas (), on: 2005/10/28 10:50

I wouldn't be too sure.

Psalm 83

*"O God, do not keep silence; do not hold your peace or be still, O God! **For behold, your enemies make an uproar; those who hate you have raised their heads. They lay crafty plans against your people; they consult together against your treasured ones. They say, "Come, let us wipe them out as a nation; let the name of Israel be remembered no more!" For they conspire with one accord; against you they make a covenant-- the tents of Edom and the Ishmaelites, Moab and the Hagrites, Gebal and Ammon and Amalek, Philistia with the inhabitants of Tyre; Asshur also has joined them; they are the strong arm of the children of Lot. Selah. Do to them as you did to Midian, as to Sisera and Jabin at the river Kishon, who were destroyed at En-dor, who became dung for the ground. Make their nobles like Oreb and Zeeb, all their princes like Zebah and Zalmunna, who said, "Let us take possession for ourselves of the pastures of God." O my God, make them like whirling dust, like chaff before the wind. As fire consumes the forest, as the flame sets the mountains ablaze, so may you pursue them with your tempest and terrify them with your hurricane! Fill their faces with shame, that they may seek your name, O LORD. Let them be put to shame and dismayed forever; let them perish in disgrace, that they may know that you alone, whose name is the LORD, are the Most High over all the earth."***

I recently spoke with a Canadian Muslim and in the conversation he said, "I don't hate Jews... I hate Israelis. They should all be killed." And he was dead serious. Don't be deceived.

In Christ,
-Eli

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/28 12:07

Quote:
-----I recently spoke with a Canadian muslim and in the conversation he said, "I don't hate Jews... I hate Israelis. They should all be killed." And he was dead serious. Don't be deceived.

This was the point that I was making. In one sense Islam's quarrel is not with Judaism as a religion but with the Israeli nation state and its aspirations. The problem is that Israeli-ness and Islam are both nations which have 'territory' at their heart. The Muslim cannot technically concede territory. If an area which has been Muslim is conquered the whole Muslim world is under a debt to 'liberate it'. This is the dilemma over Iraq.

The current Iraq situation is the Palestine-Israel scenario all over again. I am not blaming the politicians in this, I am just trying to understand an entirely different mind-set. There are Israeli's of course who have the same problem that 'religiously'; they cannot 'concede' territory. To do so is 'sin'. The dilemma is that for the Muslim to leave the territory which was once Muslim under non-Muslim control is also 'sin'.

Your Canadian Muslim was stating a doctrinal truism for Islam, as I understand it. The quarrel is not with Judaism but with the Zionist-Israelis. I am not passing judgement here either, just trying to understand what is happening.

As regards, MC's comment, I am often distressed at the way the media are constantly on the hunt for 'breaking news'; the more outrageous the better. The consequence is that inflammatory interpretations are put on statements because it is more interesting news when a confrontation is scented. I grow increasingly suspicious of government 'spin'. Every new detail is scanned as another prospective missile in the conflict. MC, I do share an underlying anxiety that those who say 'something must be done' may decide that they are the ones to do it.

Re: comments - posted by Smokey (), on: 2005/10/28 12:55

Verrrrrrrry interesting..

Can anyone here document a single case when the Islamic world petitioned the UN to "politically" wipe Israel off the earth?????????

Things are really getting weird here. Greg :-)

Re: - posted by groh_frog, on: 2005/10/28 13:39

Not getting weird- do you guys know the history of Islam? It's a religion founded in blood.

A good example- you know the little red caps that shriners wear? They're called fezzes. Well, fezzes were created when Muslims sacked the city of Fez, slaughtering Christians until the streets ran red with blood. The participating Muslims dipped their hats in the blood to wear as a badge of honor, called a fez.

The whole reason that we are at war right now is because of the Muslim "jihad", or battle against "evil", namely, those who aren't Muslim, or who don't live, eat, and dress like Middle Eastern culture would warrant.

I don't mean to sound bitter, but I guess I am. Frankly, it's a disgusting religion that detracts from the glory of the Lord. So many are deceived, and willing to die for a false hope. Something to pray about.

Grace and Peace...

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/28 13:44

In the interests of historical accuracy all Arab states opposed the petition of Palestine in 1947. There is an interesting and informative article (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1947_UN_Partition_Plan) here. This is the record of the original voting. The 33 countries that voted in favor of UN Resolution 181: Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Belarus, Canada, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Liberia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Sweden, Ukraine, South Africa, USSR, USA, Uruguay, Venezuela.

The 13 countries that voted against UN Resolution 181: Afghanistan, Cuba, Egypt, Greece, India, Iran, Iraq, Lebanon, P

akistan, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Turkey, Yemen.

The ten countries that abstained: Argentina, Chile, China, Colombia, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Honduras, Mexico, United Kingdom, Yugoslavia.

Re: - posted by markm, on: 2005/10/28 20:21

I was listening to the Brother Andrew sermons on this site (<http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/viewcat.php?cid38>) link) and this quote jumped out at me concerning the Russians rolling through Poland: "If we do not go to the heathen with the Gospel they will come to us, as occupation armies."

I'm compelled to post it, but I don't fully understand the implications of saying such a thing in a thread about Islam. All I know is that many devoutly religious people are living under a large burden of legalistic guilt and they are craving a freedom only the Gospel can bring.

At what lengths will God go to make sure that those who seek Him will find Him? Is the only way to prevent a physical war to do a preemptive spiritual strike?

Re: Newly elected Iran President says Israel should be wiped out, on: 2005/10/30 18:55

bro mikey,

Thank you for posting that. I saw that on the day, and wanted to post it. When I read that, it suddenly came to me, "they have it, Iran has nuclear weapons".

They would never publicly speak this way if they didn't. Israel will not tolerate this for long....we'll see that familiar "Breaking News" logo, and then.....

Re: Bro Ron, on: 2005/10/30 19:10

are you an apologist for the islamists in Qom Iran? (asked with a smile, so you don't misinterpret my tone, coz I love you, you anti-zionist brit...lol)

I don't know what to make of your writing except to say that anti-Zionism seems to be hereditary in the UK....."oh no, we're not against the Jewish people, we're just against Zionism".

Kicking against the goads, are we mate?

Israel would not exist today were it not for the Hand of God, how do you think such a tiny nation has navigated a life amidst such large and virulent enemies?

by power of arms alone?

because of American support?

Baruch HaShem.

everlasting covenant is just that.

anti-Zionist is anti-Israel is anti-Jewish.

the meaning of "wiping Israel off the map" is abundantly and significantly clear. They are not talking of political processes in Iran in regards to Israel, they used the word "fire".

Re: - posted by groh_frog, on: 2005/10/30 23:17

I don't think that's right, Neil.

Paul says that when the Jews rejected Christ, essentially rejected God, the message was given to the world. Those who accept Christ are the 'New Israel'. It's not about heredity, but about being 'Christ's family'.

Grace and Peace...

Re: - posted by Eli_Barnabas (), on: 2005/10/31 9:14

I know what you are saying, Neil, and I agree with you.

Hi Frog,

Scripture nowhere does say that we are the new Israel. In fact, we are the grafted branches and in the end the Lord will restore Israel and we will all be one people under God.

-Eli

Re: - posted by groh_frog, on: 2005/11/1 2:32

Hey, Eli.

I'll have to look around, and try to find the scripture that that may come from. The way I understood it, is that if you read on, it talks about how well the natural branches can be grafted back on. Basically, the root of Christianity is in the Old Covenant, and those who follow Christ are those branches. Now, Israel has the history, and would fit well with the roots, but they rejected Christ, which is why the message was given to "all men". Now God's "family" is not in family lineage, or a country, but those who follow him.

Again, I'll look up some of the supporting scripture, but tell me what you think.

Grace and Peace...

Re: grafted branches - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2005/11/1 9:51

bro Groh_frog

this is from the Letter to the Romans which you mentioned in your last response. again this is using the KJV which which is well accepted by many.

1 I say then, Hath God cast away his people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin. 2 God hath not cast away his people which he foreknew. Wot ye not what the scripture saith of Elias F40? how he maketh intercession to God against Israel, saying, 3 Lord, they have killed thy prophets, and digged down thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life. 4 But what saith the answer of God unto him? I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal. 5 Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace. 6 And if by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work. 7 What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for; but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded F41 8 (According as it is written, God hath given them the spirit of slumber, F42 eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear;) unto this day. 9 And David saith, Let their table be made a snare, and a trap, and a stumblingblock, and a recompence unto them: 10 Let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see, and bow down their back alway. 11 I say then, Have they stumbled that they should fall? God forbid: but rather through their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles, for to provoke them to jealousy. 12 Now if the fall of them be the riches of the world, and the diminishing F43 of them the riches of the Gentiles; how much more their fulness? 13 For I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office: 14 If by any means I may provoke to emulation them which are my flesh, and might save some of them. 15 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? 16 For if the firstfruit be holy, the lump is also holy: and if the root be holy, so are the branches. 17 And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, F44 and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree; 18 Boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. 19 Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken of

f, that I might be grafted in. 20 Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not highminded, but fear: 21 For if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee. 22 Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off. 23 And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in: for God is able to graft them in again. 24 For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree which is wild by nature, and wert grafted contrary to nature into a good olive tree: how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree? 25 For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness F45 in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. 26 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: 27 For this is my covenant unto thee, when I shall take away their sins. 28 As concerning the gospel, they are enemies for your sakes: but as touching the election, they are beloved for the fathers' sakes. 29 For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance. 30 For as ye in times past have not believed F46 God, yet have now obtained mercy through their unbelief: 31 Even so have these also now not believed, F47 that through your mercy they also may obtain mercy. 32 For God hath concluded F48 them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all.

Paul says in vs 5 that there is a remnant which will be saved according to grace which is among the Jews. and then he says that the salvation by grace is available to the Jews and some took hold of it while the rest were blinded. Paul preaches the gospel to the Gentiles that they may accept it and the glory of God may be made manifest so that the Jews may be "provoked to jealousy" so as to seek after this salvation by grace through Christ and not by works.

Then Paul says that we gentiles are the branches which have been grafted into the tree because some of the original branches were cut off. We are grafted in because we believe in the saving work of Christ He also says that WE BE NOT HIGH-MINDED BUT BE AFRAID because if God didn't spare the natural branches, HE CERTAINLY WILL NOT spare us if we don't hold onto the belief of salvation through Christ.(vs 17-22)Also Paul says that if even the wild branches were grafted in, how much more then will the natural ones be grafted in? (vs 24) And in verse 25 Paul explains why the Jews have been blinded, so that the full number of gentiles may be saved. He says that ALL Israel will be saved. So this means that we as gentiles are NOT the "new Israel" we are not Jews descended from Isaac who begat Jacob who then was named Israel. Now all Israel here doesn't mean every Jew, but rather every Jew who takes Jesus to be the messiah and accepts the offer of salvation by Christ for Christ said in John 14 vs 6: **14:6 Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me**

Which means that whosoever doesn't believe in the salvation of Christ will not get to the father but will go to hell. Just as surely as there will be representatives of every tongue tribe and nation in heaven, so shall it be in hell also.

Israel has always been God's chosen nation, His very bride, we as gentiles are the church, Christ's bride. we aren't Israel and this portin of the letter to the Romans proves that. let us listen to the word of God as given to Paul and not boast or be highminded because the rejection of Christ by the Jews is for our own sake that we may obtain salvation also keepin g in mind that if God didn't spare the natural branches, He certainly will not spare a wild one...

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/11/1 15:29

Quote:
----- don't know what to make of your writing except to say that anti-Zionism seems to be hereditary in the UK....."oh no, we're not against the Jewish people, we're just against Zionism".

I had thought we might have a rational discussion on the matter, but it obviously isn't going to happen, so I'll leave you to carry on this particluar thread without me.

forgive me, on: 2005/11/1 20:24

I didnt mean to seem unrational, it's just that I really DIDN'T know what to make of what you wrote: ie..are you an apologist for the islamists in Iran?...are you anti-Zionist?

Most of the anti-Israel attitude I've seen in the western english speaking world HAS come out of the UK...that was my "hereditary" aside.

I guess I'm one of those who believes that reclaiming the Land is totally Scriptural, and that there is a divine mandate, edict to take the borders of Israel right up to the River.

There are some who call it the West Bank, others who call it the Territories, and those who call it Judea and Samaria, I guess I fall into that latter category.

No, you're probably correct in your assessment, rational discussion is not possible when a feller believes that his world view is rooted in Scripture.

forgive me if I upset you.

neil

Re: forgive me - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/11/2 0:31

Neil, re-wrote this I don't know how many times. And all I could come up with was more of an almost similar smugness which out to tell us both something...

Quote:
-----No, you're probably correct in your assessment, rational discussion is not possible when a feller believes that his world view is rooted in Scripture.

Would suggest you re-read your comments and Rons again, note that he does mention a couple of times what he is seeking to understand and what he is *not* saying, leave the presumptions behind. A rational discussion is possible if the slights and quips can be left out of it.

Re: forgive me - posted by Nasher (), on: 2005/11/2 3:50

Quote:
-----I guess I'm one of those who believes that reclaiming the Land is totally Scriptural, and that there is a divine mandate, edict to take the borders of Israel right up to the River.

Neilgin1, which scriptures are these?

Are you talking about the Mosiac covenant?

i.e. the Old Covenant?

i.e. the Covenant that had to be "taken away" (killed, put to death etc.) so that the New Covenant of Christ's blood could be established?

Re: - posted by Jace, on: 2005/11/2 4:39

To get back to the point of Ahmadinejad of Iran threatening Israel, and believe me that is a threat. He doesn't realise he has given Israel the perfect political excuse to protect themselves, which they were going to do irrespective of what the world thinks when the time comes.

What is Islam's attitude towards Jews? Some would have you believe it's all roses, but lets see what the Qur'an and Hadith have to say.

Qur'an:

calls for war to be made on Jews and Christians until they are either defeated or subjected to humiliating lowliness (9:29)

Hadith:

Sahih Muslim, Book 40, Number 6985:

Mohamed said: The Last Hour would not come unless the Muslims will fight against the Jews and the Muslims would kill them until the Jews would hide themselves behind a stone or a tree and a stone or a tree would say: Muslim, or the servant of Allah, there is a Jew behind me; come and kill him.

As far as trying to differentiate between anti-zionism and anti-semitism, you can dress it up as much as you like but it's still the same thing. Make no mistake Islam is at war with Israel and the Church.

Thanks to Eli-Barnabas for pointing out Psalm 83.

Mike Baalog, on: 2005/11/2 15:37

I am so confused as to what you are saying.

I was saying to Ron that I believe he's right in that he said rational conversation is not possible because I believe buttressed BY Scripture that Israel is well within its BIBLICAL rights to take its boundaries right up to the Euphrates river.

smug? thats you reading stuff into what I wrote.

The church makes big noise how it loves the Jewish people....up until the point where it has a Jew in its collective face.

this whole dialogue, "oh we're not anti-Israel , just anti-zionism" is a rhetorical tool used by the islamists and their supporters and apologists to justify their anti-Israeli, and ultimately anti-semitic worldview.

smug?

Nasher, on: 2005/11/2 15:40

"Your territory will extend from the desert to Lebanon, and from the great river, the Euphrates--all the Hittite country--to the Great Sea on the west.

Joshua 1:4

Re: Mike Baalog - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/11/2 16:19

Quote:
-----No, you're probably correct in your assessment, rational discussion is not possible when a feller believes that his world view is rooted in Scripture.

And would you believe that Ron's is not? That's fine to disagree, but does this above not have an edge to it?

Quote:
-----this whole dialogue, "oh we're not anti-Israel , just anti-zionism" is a rhetorical tool used by the islamists and their supporters and apologists to justify their anti-Israeli, and ultimately anti-semitic worldview.

And where did you find this from previous comments here? You said it Neil, no one else. Nor do I find any of the rhetoric in the least helpful.

Re:, on: 2005/11/2 16:47

Quote:
-----And where did you find this from previous comments here?

Ron wrote:

Quote:
-----Ahmadinejad is anti-zionist. That means he is opposed to what the United Nations did in establishing an Israeli sovereign state. Israel, as a nation state, was 'put on the map' by a political process.

so now, as I'm to understand Ron's thinking, God's Hand had nothing to do with the creation of the modern state of Israel, it was merely a "political process", a function of the UN.

That to me is offensive on a number of levels, and to try and "understand" why some vile violent islamist cleric wishes to wipe Israel off the map is the same as trying to divine why Hitler and his minions tried to exterminate our people.

anti-Zionist is anti-Israel is anti-Jewish.

and if one is anti-Jewish, how can they say they follow Jesus? Thats why, no, anyone who is anti-Israel does not have a Scriptural worldview.

I'm sorry if you don't find my rhetoric helpful, I call it the way I see it:

anti-Zionist is anti-Israel is anti-Jewish.

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2005/11/2 17:26

bro Nasher

i asked the question what in the old testament was done away with in the new testament and came to the conclusion that for us to fully understand the new testament, we must understand the old one too. God's promise to Israel concerning the territory was in not revoked by the New Covenant.

the only thing in the o.t. that doesn't apply is salvation by works, all the other promises God made still stand.

Re: Thanks Iran - posted by Compton (), on: 2005/11/3 2:07

President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad may have unwittingly unified and provoked the nations into imposing sanctions on Iran against further nuclear development with his outspoken and ridiculous anti-Israel rhetoric. I think he has weakened Iran's position considerably. Because of the ongoing situation in Iraq, political opportunism over Katrina, and a botched judicial nominee President Bush's credibility to sell the priority of a third front in the mid-east would have been greatly diminished. Additionally, because Americans perceive themselves to be somewhat safe (foolishly?) since 9/11, the American expeditionary spirit would have also been diminished.

In light of this, the Iranian president might have been better off (edit: not the rest of the world) to hold his tongue while continuing to develop nuclear weapons in secret. With his recent warmongering speech Ahmadinejad has shown the west the importance of preventing further nuclear development in Iran. Ahmadinejad has also given Israel the entire pretext needed to bomb suspected nuclear facilities within Iran.

There is actually reason to view this situation with cautious optimism. Iran and Syria were really the last two states on Bushes list of countries that were to be denied nuclear weapons programs. Libya has capitulated, Iraq and Afghanistan have new governments and North Korea appears likely to forswear nuclear ambitions.

For a while I was concerned that a US led "regime change" was inevitable should Iran continue its nuclear development. ..I really don't know. Yet now, the Iranian president has saved US taxpayers billions of military dollars and lives...he has made it impossible for the rest of the world to do nothing. Sanctions and coercion are always a preferred option to engagement, but these options don't work unless there is unilateral cooperation. Perhaps Iran has just polarized the UN members into a nuclear embargo much like Tiananmen Square sparked a longstanding western arms embargo on China.

Well, that's my take on the situation. In this new world of asymmetrical warfare...it isn't the enemy shaking his fist in your face that you've got to worry about...it's the guy you haven't heard from for awhile.

MC

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/11/3 4:14

Quote:
-----God's promise to Israel concerning the territory was in not revoked by the New Covenant.

God's promise to Israel was an integral part of the Sinai Covenant which was finished by Christ's death at Calvary. You may have some stronger evidence from God's promise to Abraham and his blood descendants but Sinai was a 'tenant's agreement' with specific requirements and a fixed period of agreement. "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator." (Gal. 3:19, KJVS) This covenant has been replaced. Whether or not the Abrahamic covenant has continuing relevance is another question but the Sinai covenant 'ended' with Calvary.

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2005/11/3 10:52

bro Ron
thanks for the info and correcting me on that. what then is in store for Israel in terms of future restoration in this new covenant? does this mean Israel now has no rights to the territory it is on now as per the Abrahamic covenant or any covenant period? Does the abrahamic covenant then still apply in any way?

not meaning to bombard you with questions just trying to understand it all

Re: - posted by Eli_Barnabas (), on: 2005/11/3 10:52

I recently finished the book **Rees Howells Intercessor** and before he died the Lord put a heavy burden of prayer upon him for the Jewish people, and that God would restore to them the land that was promised to them. This was before the state had actually come about yet.

Needless to say, the College made intercession for the land and for the Jews, and gained the victory of faith for it. Rees was overjoyed. We know that later the state of Israel was re-established. This was a victory of faith and a gift from God!

I seem to remember one of the last things Rees ever said before he died was with regards to this whole issue and how glorious it was that God restored His people's land. In his own words, it was "Glorious victory, hallelujah!"

I'm not sure how many of us are familiar with this man of God, and I am not suggesting Mr. Howell's is the final word on anything, but there is no doubt in my mind this man was completely obedient to the will of God and lived in it daily. There is no doubt in my mind that God has NOT forsaken His chosen people, and has given to them the land promised, by no coincidence (Deuteronomy 4:31).

Jesus will reign in Jerusalem, and all the earth will be amazed.

In Christ,
-Eli

"Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? yea, they may forget, yet will I not forget thee." - Isaiah 49:15

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/11/3 15:59

Quote:
-----not meaning to bombard you with questions just trying to understand it all

Ironman
This list quite a little list of questions. :-)
I do think these forums should be places for discussion so I don't just want to list my own views on these things. The questions would supply 'threads' for many a day.

Quote:
-----what then is in store for Israel in terms of future restoration in this new covenant? does this mean Israel now has no rights to the territory it is on now as per the Abrahamic covenant or any covenant period? Does the abrahamic covenant then still apply in any way?

I think we need to be settled first that the Sinai Covenant is now completed and we then need to think of the implications for that. This Sinai Covenant is also referred to in scripture as the first covenant: Heb. 8:7 (KJVS) For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second.

Heb. 9:1 (KJVS) Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary. It is contrasted with another covenant referred to by Jeremiah as Jer. 31:31 (KJVS) Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: Isaiah and Ezekiel also speak of this 'new covenant' but not under that name. Isaiah says the 'covenant' is a persons. 42:6 (KJVS) I the LORD have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles;

Is. 49:8 (KJVS) Thus saith the LORD, In an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in a day of salvation have I helped thee: and I will preserve thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, to establish the earth, to cause to inherit the desolate heritages; and Ezekiel spells out some of its unique promises: Ezek. 18:31 (KJVS) Cast away from you all your transgressions, whereby ye have transgressed; and make you a new heart and a new spirit: for why will ye die, O house of Israel?

Ezek. 36:26 (KJVS) A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. The writer to the Hebrews says that in designating this second covenant as 'new' God has made the 'first' covenant 'old': "In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away." (Heb. 8:13, KJVS) Vine's says "the word is suggestive of abolition".

These are my reasons for saying that the Sinai covenant has been 'replaced'. That word constantly gets me into trouble but I cannot interpret this verse in any other way. Heb. 10:9 (KJVS) Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. To 'take away' so that something can be put in its 'place' must come close to a dictionary definition of 'replacement'. I think this demands another question; what remains of the Old Covenant according to Galatians and Hebrews?

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2005/11/4 1:02

bro Ron

ok we can agree that the old covenant has been done away with for the new one. i shall look into galatians and hebrews to see what the Lord will show me. it's late so it's sleepy time *yawn* i'll pick it up tomorrow

God bless

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2005/11/4 11:41

bro Ron

as per galatians 3 the covenant of the law has been put away for the covenant based on faith in Christ. what was given/promised to Abraham was not by the law but by faith and so that still stands. at least this is how i understand it. now it's off to see what things the Lord promised to Abraham...

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2005/11/7 0:20

bro Ron

it seems to me that the promise God made to abraham was one which abraham accepted by faith. that covenant is unlike the mosaic one which was law based and replaced by faith in Christ. as far as i can tell that abrahamic covenant was n't replaced and is in effect so Israel is still entitled to all the lands promised to abraham's descendants by God which seems to me to be a lot more land than currently occupied...