

Newsbytes

The First Watch

No. 761

March 2, 2016

Since 2001

Newzbytes is a ministry of Calvary Chapel of Appleton

www.ccapleton.org

“Let us be alert to the season in which we are living. It is the season of the Blessed Hope, calling for us to cut our ties with the world and build ourselves on this One who will soon appear. He is our hope—a Blessed Hope enabling us to rise above our times and fix our gaze upon Him.” Tozer

Syrian conflict starting to resemble a mini World War III

by Utopia: the Collapse / via Sydney Morning Herald

February 2016 – SYRIA - The Syrian conflict is on the verge of resembling a mini-World War III. Since World War I, never have as many actors with rival agendas and operations been involved in a conflict as they are in that of Syria. If this conflict is not contained and resolved soon, it carries the potential to result in direct military clashes, either by accident or by design, between some of the main regional and international actors, with horrendous global ramifications. World War II was fought between two clearly defined opposite alliances. This was also largely the case with the subsequent Korean and Vietnam wars, and any of the Middle Eastern conflicts as well as the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan in the 1980s until the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War as we know it.

With the Cold War bipolar stability gone, the 2001 and 2003 US invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq respectively saw a clear shift in America's position to one of unilateralism as a means to conflict resolution. America's bitter Afghan and Iraqi experiences helped President Barack Obama reverse America's policy approach to multilateralism, with a clear aim of not only retrenching America's involvement in the Iraqi and Afghan conflicts, but also giving primacy to diplomacy and to distant controlled military operations by such means as air (including drone) attacks. This approach has had mixed results. It has proved instrumental in securing a resolution of the Iranian nuclear dispute and in keeping a conflict-ridden Afghanistan afloat. Otherwise, it has failed to stem the tide of Muslim extremism, as was first exemplified by Al Qaeda's 9/11 terrorist attacks on the US.

It has also made no difference to the ongoing Iraqi, Syrian, Libyan, Yemeni, and Israeli-Palestinian conflicts, which have generated more favorable conditions for the growth of more extremist groups, such as the so-called Islamic State (IS), and massive human tragedies. In the process it has deeply disillusioned all those forces who once regarded the US as a supporter of freedom and democratic change, especially in the wake of the “Arab Spring” uprisings, and concurrently also discomfited the US's traditional conservative Arab allies, led by Saudi Arabia. The latter could no longer have full confidence in the US as a security provider and embarked on a process of counter-revolution measures against the Arab Spring.

Although IS is repeatedly presented as the biggest threat to regional and global security and civility, enabling an array of outside actors to act against it in the Levant, it is the Syrian situation that poses the most formidable danger. Syria today is not just fragmented between the dictatorial and uncompromising government of Bashar al-Assad in Damascus and various extremist and moderate opposition groups. It has also been injected with various rival regional and international actors that have come to the aid of these forces – all in the name of fighting IS. Two international coalitions are at work in Syria: one is, led by the US, and includes many of America's Western allies and regional friends in opposition to the Assad regime; another is the rival Moscow-Tehran-Baghdad-Damascus-Hezbollah axis that wants to ensure the survival of the Assad regime against not just IS, but all opposition forces.

The member states of each coalition are not entirely united in their purpose. For example, in the case of the US-led coalition, whereas the main actor and its Western allies have grown to be more wary of IS and the Russian-led axis, the same cannot be said to be entirely true about the regional components of the coalition. Saudi Arabia and its Arab partners are most concerned about the possible success of the axis that could further strengthen Iran's Shia sectarian and geopolitical influence in the region. Turkey shares this concern, as it is deeply

troubled by Russia's Syrian military adventure, given Ankara's historical distrust of Russians, and also by any development that could enable the Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK), which has been fighting for the self-determination of Turkey's substantial Kurdish minority, to gain support from Syrian and Iraqi Kurds. Whilst relations between Ankara and Moscow, and between Riyadh and Tehran, have hit rock bottom, Saudi Arabia and Turkey have lately announced that they will dispatch a joint military force to Syria to "fight IS" – something that Tehran has vowed to oppose.

All this points to the burgeoning of an ominous situation that could easily lead to military clashes between various outside forces on the ground, as there has already been one between Turkey and Russia. In the event of such a development, the US and its allies will be forced to back Turkey and Saudi Arabia, especially given the status of Turkey as a critical NATO member. The Syrian conflict is not just highly complex and tragic; it has now also reached a very dangerous peak, with too many competing fingers in its conflicted pie. It has so far defied a viable political resolution. However, for a resolution to work, it has to be based on an interlocking national, regional, and international consensus. Otherwise, Syria's killing fields, and its destruction and human suffering are set to continue to haunt the world, but also more dangerously may result in a wider regional and international crisis.
–Sydney Morning Herald

Putin encircles Turkey in massive troop buildup: Obama administration remains silent

by Utopia: the Collapse / via Washington Post

February 2016 – TURKEY - Russian President Vladimir Putin's plans in the Middle East are becoming clearer. In a bid to exact revenge on Turkey and in an attempt to split the NATO alliance, Russia is rapidly building up pressure on NATO's southern flank. The new Russian satellite state of Armenia on Turkey's northeastern border is now hosting a massive Russian troop build-up with the recent signing of an air defense agreement between Russia and Kremlin. Along with the build-up of Russian air assets in Syria, Russia selling Iran billions in sophisticated weapon systems, and Russia's support of Kurdish units along Turkey's southern border, Mr. Putin has encircled Turkey in a classic pincer movement

Forbes writes, Make no mistake: The Russian military presence in Armenia represents a dagger pointed at the heart of NATO as the Armenia-Russian alliance strengthens. But while Moscow is rattling its sabers, Washington remains silent. Last August, The Moscow Times reported that President Putin told Turkey's Ambassador to Moscow to "tell your dictator President he can go to hell along with his ISIS terrorists and I shall make Syria to nothing but a 'Big Stalingrad.'" Histrionics aside, the intent is clear. Russia views Turkey as a hostile state and it will not back down.

Turkey has played into Putin's hands by turning a blind eye to ISIS fighters infiltrating into Syria to fight against Turkey's enemy Assad and by shooting down a Russian fighter jet. Turkish President Erdogan's penchant for oppression and his obvious desire to build another Sunni Islamic state is disturbing. However, this does not mean NATO, and especially the United States, can ignore Russia's aggressive expansion and threatening behavior. President Obama has been outmaneuvered by Putin in the Middle East and obviously doesn't care. Whether Obama has a diabolical agenda or is just incompetent will now have to be sifted through and settled by historians. However, the next American president will have a big job to stand up to Putin's obvious dreams of empire.
–Washington Times

Iran uses Syrian truce to deploy hundreds of Palestinian terrorists on Golan border

DEBKAFfile Exclusive Report February 27, 2016

Under cover of the Syrian ceasefire that went into effect Saturday, Feb. 27, and the Russian air umbrella, Iran's Revolutionary Guards Corps finally managed to secretly install hundreds of armed Palestinian terrorists on the Syrian-Israeli border face-to-face with the IDF's Golan positions.

This is reported exclusively by DEBKAFfile's military and intelligence sources.

These Palestinians belong to Al-Sabirin, a new terrorist organization the Iranian Guards and Hizballah are building in the refugee camps of Lebanon and the Gaza Strip. Their agents clandestinely recruited the new terrorists from among young Palestinians who fled the Yarmouk refugee camp outside Damascus and sought refuge in Lebanon. Hizballah organized their return to Syria through south Lebanon – but not before training and arming them for penetration deep inside Israel to carry out mass-casualty assaults on IDF positions, highways and civilians. So Iran and Hizballah have finally been able to achieve one of the most cherished goals of their integration in the Syria civil war, namely, to bring a loyal terrorist force right up to Israel's border.

Israel's military planners went to extreme lengths to prevent this happening. Last December, Samir Quntar, after being assigned by Tehran and Hizballah to establish a Palestinian-Druze terror network on the Golan, was assassinated in Damascus.

Twelve months before that, on Jan. 18, an Israeli air strike hit an Iranian-Syrian military party surveying the Golan in search of jumping-off locations for Hizballah terror squads to strike across the border against Israeli targets. The two senior officers in the party, Iranian General Allah-Dadi and Hizballah's Jihad Mughniyeh, were killed. The hubbub in the run-up to the Syrian truce, coupled with Russia's protective military presence, finally gave the Islamic Republic and its Lebanese proxy the chance to outfox Israeli intelligence and secretly bring forward a terrorist force to striking range against Israel.

This discovery was one of the causes of Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu's urgent phone call to President Vladimir Putin Wednesday, Feb. 24, two days before the ceasefire went into effect. He reminded the Russian leader of the understandings they had reached regarding the deployment of pro-Iranian terrorists on the Syrian-Israeli border. He also sent emissaries to Moscow to intercede with Russian officials. Putin's answers to Israel's demarches were vague and evasive, on the lines of a promise to look into their complaints.

He also tried to fob Netanyahu off by inviting President Reuven Rivlin for a state visit to Russia. Putin promised to use that occasion for a solemn Russian pledge of commitment to upholding Israel's security in a tone that would leave Tehran in no doubt of Moscow support for the Jewish state. The Rivlin visit has been scheduled for March 16.

But it is clear that the prime minister and defense minister Moshe Ya'alon were too slow to pick up on the new terrorist menace Iran had parked on Israel's border. Now their hands are tied, say DEBKAFfile's sources. An IDF operation to evict the pro-Iranian Palestinian Al-Sabirin network from the Syrian Golan, before it digs in, would lay Israel open to the charge of jeopardizing, or even sabotaging, the inherently fragile Syrian ceasefire initiated jointly by the US and Russia.

Peter Schiff: Federal Reserve only delaying financial collapse

by Utopia: the Collapse

February 2016 – ECONOMIC NEWS - Peter Schiff, CEO and chief global strategist for Euro Pacific Capital, is sounding the alarm bells once again. In a recent interview on Fox Business, Schiff warned that as long as the Federal Reserve keeps bluffing that it's going to raise interest rates, its easy money policies have only delayed an inevitable financial collapse. He went so far to say that there will be a stock market crash if Fed Chair Janet Yellen continues to pretend that the economy is in good shape by raising interest rates. (Source: "Fed Is Trying Everything They Can to Delay the Day of Reckoning," YouTube, February 12, 2016.)

Schiff said that the Federal Reserve waited too long to raise interest rates. The December 2015 0.25% increase in its target funds rate is the first rate hike since June 2006. As a result, Schiff said that there is "going to be a bigger disaster" in the U.S. economy and stock market than otherwise, had the Fed raised rates earlier. Schiff added that the stock market is already in a bear market and there is only "hot air" beneath it. Schiff argues that the markets will keep falling until the Fed admits that the U.S. economy is in trouble. "The problem for the Fed is that they are

now in this credibility box, which I thought they were smart enough to avoid when I thought they wouldn't raise rates at all," Schiff said. "But apparently I overestimated their intelligence. They were actually dumb enough to raise rates a little bit and think it wouldn't matter. It matters a lot." (Source: Ibid.)

According to Schiff, the Fed is about to launch "QE4" (a fourth round of quantitative easing) along with rate cuts into negative territory, but he is warning against such a move. Schiff believes the Fed should rule it out completely, since it does not seem to be working in stimulating the economies of other countries like Japan and those in Europe that are testing the negative interest rate policy waters. "What the Fed should do is rule it out outright because it doesn't work," Schiff said. "It's not working in Japan; it's not working in Europe. In fact it's backfiring. Look at what's happening to the European banks. They're getting crushed because of negative rates. So the Fed should rule it out. They are desperate. They are trying everything they can to delay the day of reckoning, but the problem is because they delayed it so long, we have a lot more to reckon with." (Source: Ibid.)

Is the Temple Mount Disappearing Before Our Eyes?

breakingisraelnews.com

Before the eyes of the world, the most contested site in the Middle East has quietly been rearranged by those who most benefit from a shifting of historical and religious narrative: Palestinian Arabs. The Dome of the Rock and the al-Aqsa Mosque, two buildings that are at the center of furious international debate and spates of violence, have traded places in plain sight, and no one seems to have noticed.

The world is familiar with the image of the golden dome, which has turned into a symbol of Palestinian national identity through a fraud so seamless that it has gone virtually undetected. The recent wave of violence in Israel rallies behind cries of 'al-Aqsa' and images of the Dome of the Rock. In truth, however, the focus of all this fervor – the gold dome – is not al Aqsa at all.

The gold dome is called Qubbat al-Sakhrah, or the Dome of the Rock. Al-Aqsa is the innocuous silver dome located a few hundred meters to the south. Al-Aqsa is a mosque, a place of prayer. It is the place to which Muslims claim Muhammad was transported overnight from Mecca on a magical creature called al Buraq al Sharif. Muslims do not pray in the golden Dome of the Rock – the so-called "al-Aqsa Mosque". It is a shrine to the rock inside, which was the site of the Holy of Holies in the Jewish Temple.

The Palestinian fraud has spread throughout the Arab world. This symbol of the Dome of the Rock has been taken up as a battle cry against Israel. A chilling video released in August depicted the Iranian army capturing the Temple Mount with a glowing gold dome, and in November, thousands of Iranian soldiers participated in a military exercise that simulated capturing a life-sized plastic replica of the Dome of the Rock, making it undeniably clear that Tehran has set its gunsights on Jerusalem.

In other words, rather than focusing on sovereignty over their own mosque, Muslims are now fighting for possession of the Jewish Temple and the Jewish God in an attempt to delegitimize the Jewish rights to the Mount. Remarkably, this was predicted in the Zohar, a book of Jewish mysticism based on Biblical commentary. It is written in the Zohar that in the sixth cycle of 1000 years, the "Sons of Ishmael" (Arabs) will make war against the Messiah, and will "come and bow down before God at the holy mountain in Jerusalem". The Zohar specifically uses the name of the God of the Jews, and not a generic term or the expression used for non-Jewish worship.

It seemed incredible that the name of a site central to the Israeli-Palestinian political dialogue could be changed in plain sight without anyone taking note, yet this was confirmed by Rabbi Yehuda Glick, founder of the Temple Mount Heritage Foundation, who stated that this deception went even further than just renaming the Dome of the Rock. The Palestinian focus on the Temple Mount was a conscious political decision, he told Breaking Israel News. "Ever since 1997, the northern segment of the Islamic movement started emphasizing the Temple Mount as part of their activity."

The northern branch of the Islamic movement, banned by the Israeli government in 2015, campaigns against any Palestinian concessions to Israel, and organized harassment of Jews on the Temple Mount.

Photographs taken of the Temple Mount in the early 20th century demonstrate clearly that the Temple Mount was

insignificant to Muslims for most of its history. The compound was in a state of complete disrepair. The Dome of the Rock, which only received its gold coating in 1993, was neglected.

“Since 2012, they have been paying people to come to the Temple Mount and block Jewish entry to the compound,” Rabbi Glick explained. “At the same time they publicly started renaming the Temple Mount. Instead of the original term – Haram al Sharif – they referred to the entire mount as al Aqsa Mosque.”

The Temple Mount compound is a trapezoidal area, 37 acres in size. In Biblical times, the Jewish Temples stood where the Dome of the Rock stands today. After offering up his son Isaac as a sacrifice, Abraham named the site “the mount where the LORD is seen” (הַאֲרֵץ הַזֶּה הָיָה לַיהוָה).

The Palestinian Authority claims that Jewish extremists want to change the status quo on the Mount. In fact, the status quo has changed – but very much in their favor. In the 1967 Six-Day War, Israel conquered the Temple Mount from Jordan. The Israeli flag flew over the Temple Mount for just a few hours before Moshe Dayan, chief of staff of the IDF at the time, made an agreement with the Waqf, the Muslim religious authority, giving them supervisory rights over the Temple Mount compound.

Few are aware that Jews were permitted access to the Temple Mount and all of the buildings in the compound, including al-Aqsa Mosque and the Dome of the Rock, until 2000. However, the status quo changed sharply at the onset of the Second Intifada, when non-Muslims were forbidden from entering the buildings.

In November of 2014, the PA referred to the entire Temple Mount compound as al Aqsa when they announced that the Israeli police were “storming al Aqsa”. The Waqf announcement was picked up by the media, even though it was actually a reference to police entering the Temple Mount compound. The police did not enter the mosque, and it was the first time Israeli security had entered the compound since it was conquered by the IDF in 1967. They did so in reaction to increasing violence against Jewish visitors.

Professor Yitzchak Reiter, senior researcher at the Jerusalem Institute for Israel Studies and author of Jerusalem and its Role in Islamic Solidarity, explained to Breaking Israel News, “The change of name already started to take place in 1984 following Rabbi Shlomo Goren’s claim that the open esplanade is not holy to Muslims, only the two shrines.”

Professor Reiter discovered that in November 2015, the PA printed a photo of the Temple Mount in which “they labelled the Temple Mount as ‘al Aqsa Compound’ while naming the Aqsa Mosque ‘al-Qibli’ (the Southern).”

There is absolutely no precedent for referring to the al Aqsa Mosque as al Qibli. To Professor Reiter, the motive is clear: “Their aim is to clarify their position that the entire compound is holy to Islam as the mosque itself.”

Not only has the international community accepted the sudden change in terminology without comment, but it has actually endorsed the new version of history. In October, UNESCO passed a PA resolution that declared the entire Temple Mount, as well as other Jewish holy sites, sacred to Islam.

Read more at

<http://www.breakingisraelnews.com/62512/temple-mount-disappearing-before-our-eyes-jewish-world/#seo18Rm8VXrCOtcJ.99>

Why True Christianity is Dispensational

In Defense of the Faith

Monday, February 29, 2016

Pete Garcia

Despite the mounting criticism, orthodox Christians are dispensational whether they admit it or not simply due to the very nature of our Scriptures. While many accept this reality and embrace it, many more deny it and vainly attempt theological work-arounds that end up failing on numerous levels. They fail because they are either overly complicated, or overly simplified and fail to grasp the enormity, simplistic intricacy, and beauty of our God’s grand design. Since the Bible in and of itself is Dispensational one thing must first be clarified; what defines

Dispensationalism?

Dispensationalism, as defined by one of the foremost theologians on the subject, the late Dr. Charles Ryrie states; a dispensation is a distinguishable economy in the outworking of God's purpose. Usually, when someone disagrees with your interpretation or doctrinal position on a given subject, the first thing they try and do is accuse one of adding non-Biblical ideas to the Bible. Except, you can't do that with Dispensationalism. Dr. Ryrie continues:

The Greek word *oikonomia* comes from the verb that means to manage, regulate, administer, and plan. The word itself is a compound whose parts mean literally "to divide, apportion, administer or manage the affairs of an inhabited house." In the papyri the officer (*oikonomos*) who administered a dispensation was referred to as a steward or manager of an estate, or as a treasurer. Thus, the central idea in the word dispensation is that of managing or administering the affairs of a household.

The various forms of the word dispensation appear in the New Testament twenty times. The verb *oikonomeo* is used once in Luke 16:2, where it is translated "to be a steward." The noun *oikonomos* appears ten times (Luke 12:42; 16:1, 3, 8; Rom. 16:23; 1 Cor. 4:1, 2; Gal. 4:2; Titus 1:7; 1 Peter 4:10) and is usually translated "steward" or "manager" (but "treasurer" in Rom. 16:23). The noun *oikonomia* is used nine times (Luke 16:2, 3, 4; 1 Cor. 9:17; Eph. 1:10; 3:2, 9; Col. 1:25; 1 Tim. 1:4). In these instances it is translated variously ("stewardship," "dispensation," "administration," "job," "commission"). ([Link](#))

If one simply takes the Scripture at face value and uses the normal rules of interpretation i.e....neither being overly literal, nor overly allegorical, but keeping the passage in context with the surrounding subjects, one cannot deny the differing eras and stages man's had to progress from the Garden of Eden until today. Aside from the telescoping view we have of mankind's history on earth from Genesis to Revelation, we can see the changes that Scripture clearly demonstrates how God administrates our affairs while at the same time, allowing for free will. At a minimum (and skipping a lot of divine details), a minimalist has to accept that there are at least two distinct periods of time man has existed in thus far;

1. The time before Christ came.
2. The time after His death, burial, and resurrection.

Given these two, if one were to take that logic one step further, then you would recognize that there is also a future eternal state. This now means that there are three distinct periods of time. But maintaining only three dispensations...grossly ignores and underrates the vast amounts of Scripture provided to us which says otherwise. A normal reading of Scripture demonstrably shows at least seven distinctive eras that are irrefutable if we simply take our Bible at face value:

1. Innocence: Adam and Eve physically walked with God in a state of innocence prior to their fall. (Gen. 1-3)
2. Conscience: Life after the fall of man, and up to the Flood was marked with unusually long life spans, no written Scripture, and abundance of human-angelic interactions. This same group also became so exceedingly wicked and corrupt, God had no choice but to destroy them by the Great Flood. (Gen. 4-6)
3. Promise: Hundreds of years after the flood, God created a nation by the calling of one man, Abram, from out of the land of the Ur of the Chaldeans, to the land of Canaan in which He made covenant with him (Abraham) and his offspring through his son Isaac, and grandson Jacob, of land, seed, and blessing. (Gen. 11:27-25:28)
4. Law: From the birth of a nation (Israel), to the rise of the Patriarchs, Exodus, and subjugation of Canaan (the Promised Land), lineage of the Messiah to Mary. (Gen. 8-Deuteronomy) From the giving of the Law at Mt. Sinai, up to the death of Jesus Christ on the cross. (Matt. 27:51, John 19:30) This includes David, Solomon, the Prophets, Babylonian captivity, and lineage of the Messiah to Mary. (Exodus 19-Gospels)
5. The Church: The current age, beginning from that first Pentecost immediately after the death, burial, and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, until today. This is the time when Christ Himself is building the Church, which is a corporate, multi-membered, multi-generational, singular body, of which Christ Himself is the Head of. (1 Cor. 12:20, Eph. 5:23) This age ends with the Rapture of the Church. (Acts-Rev. 3:22, 1 Thess. 4:13-18, 1

Cor. 15:51-55)

6. The Kingdom: This is preceded by the conclusion of the 70th Week of Daniel, and is initiated at the Second Coming of Christ, when Israel becomes the head of all nations, with Christ at the head of Israel. Nations beat swords into plowshares, wolf and lamb lie together, and lions eat straw, there will be no more war, and all nations pay tribute to the Messiah in Israel. This ends with the Final Judgment of the damned, and then ushers in the Eternal State. (Isaiah 11, 65; Ezekiel 40-48, Dan. 9:24-27, Rev. 20-22)

7. The Eternal State: The Millennial Reign of Christ (1,000 years) is the front porch if you will, of the Eternal State. Scripture does not record much on this, but what we know, is that we will be in our immortal bodies and forever with Christ. (1John 3:1-3, Rev. 21-22)

Minimalists (Reformed/Covenant Theology, etc.) would have you believe that there are only two dispensations, (of course they'd never call it that)...the one before Christ came and the one after. Yet, this structurally has a number of fatal errors which ignore logic and make sweeping assumptions...as if all of the way things are just came to be accidentally.

The first being that Jesus came to fulfill the Law, and He did so perfectly. Yet the law wasn't given to mankind writ large but was given only to the nation of Israel as a conditional (if/then) covenant. But Israel first had to become a distinct people, thus necessitating their calling and separation from the pagan gentiles who surrounded them. Neither was Israel called all at once but through just one man and who through his immediate lineage would come to form the patriarchs of the nation Israel. Thus, we see a progression (or stages) by which God orchestrated His plan to be implemented upon mankind. In other words, there was a plan from the beginning.

The next false charge against Dispensationalism, is that no one ever taught it prior to John Nelson Darby in the 1830's. Having already illustrated that the concept of Dispensationalism is clearly taught in Scripture, let us look and see if the concept of God working through different stages has any historical merit before Darby. Although they disagreed on a variety of things, to include the number of ages, many of the early church fathers also believed in distinct ages in varying degrees, with four dispensations being the most common. Dr. Thomas Ice in citing Larry Crutchfield, quotes in his extensive article A Short History of Dispensationalism:

Crude but clear, schemes of ages and dispensations are found in ante-Nicene fathers such as Justin Martyr (110-165), Irenaeus (130-200), Tertullian (c. 160-220), Methodius (d. 311), and Victorinus of Petau (d. 304). In every major area of importance in the early church one finds rudimentary features of dispensationalism that bear a striking resemblance to their contemporary offspring ("Ages and Dispensations," 398).

Dr. Ice then continues to show how prevalent Dispensational thought was prior to J.N. Darby from the post-Nicene era onwards. Granted, the Middle (Dark) Ages lacked in abundant survivable teachings on the subject, but the Christian world then, was also under the iron fist of Roman Catholicism...and it wasn't only Dispensationalism that suffered censorship, but also Pre-Millennialism, sola scriptura (Scripture alone), sola gratia (grace alone), sola fide (faith alone), owning your own Bible, etc. The point being, is that although J.N. Darby codified 'Dispensationalism', he didn't invent it.

Conclusion

Although this topic has been covered numerous times, and the anti-Dispensational crowd continues to ignore history, I feel as though it's still important to reiterate this from time to time. When one simply takes Scripture for what it actually says, rather than what we want it to say, one is forced to contend with the reality that God has orchestrated different parameters, given the differing circumstances man was under. The method of salvation has never changed (grace through faith), God has never changed, the only thing that did change was the conditions on the ground for man.

From Adam until Job, there was no written Scripture that we are aware of. Man lived for centuries prior to the Flood. Prior to Abraham, there was no Israel. Prior to Moses, the Law had not yet been given to the nation of Israel. Prior to Christ coming, faith was in the One who would come...although they didn't fully understand who or when. We (the collective we), replete with full historical knowledge and a complete Bible, have become not only complacent but overly presumptuous about who and what we think we are.

Last week I laid out how the burgeoning gentile church began to assume the roles and promises of Israel, who since AD70 had been dispersed into diaspora courtesy of the Roman legions. And while it might have made sense to them back then, in the end, God proved faithful in keeping His promises to restore Israel back to the table of nations. (Isaiah 11:11; 46:9-10, Ezekiel 37, Amos 9:11-15, Luke 21:24, Romans 11:25-27)

Critics of Dispensationalism cite their hermeneutical approach as the more “scholarly” one. Evidently, it takes academic grooming to teach one how to completely disregard the literal meaning and redefine it so as to become relevant to their current conditions. Had the early church fathers, such as Justin Martyr or Irenaeus been able to see the rebirth of the nation of Israel some 17 centuries later, I doubt seriously they would have been as quick to conclude that the Church replaced Israel. More often than not, what we see doesn't align itself with what Scriptures state will happen, and many are quick to make assumptions...yet despite the odds and despite the common wisdom of said day will offer, Scripture always comes through as promised.

In closing, I believe that we should model our understanding of Scripture in a literal manner. The prophet Daniel, for instance, understood literally, Jeremiah's prophecy about their captivity being seventy years, and that their time was almost complete. (Daniel 9:1-2) He doesn't attempt to apply some spiritualization or allegorization to the time frame, even though nothing in his current conditions would have led him to believe otherwise. His nation was conquered. Jerusalem and Solomon's temple lay in ruins.

Yet, Scripture records only seventy years they would spend in captivity and seventy they stayed. When Cyrus the Medo-Persian king took over, he allowed the Jews to start going back, because his own name appeared in Isaiah's prophecy (some 150 years earlier) and felt compelled to do so. (Isaiah 44:28) Dispensationalism is true, not because J.N. Darby deemed it so, but because that is the natural flow and outworking of God's word...and no matter what, God's word trumps everything else.

That in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him: Eph. 1:10