THE LEGACY OF HATRED CONTINUES

A Response to Hal Lindsey's *The Road to Holocaust*

Gary DeMar
and
Peter J. Leithart

Institute for Christian Economics • Tyler, Texas

Distributed by Dominion Press • Fort Worth, Texas

American Vision is a Christian educational and communications organization. American Vision publishes a monthly newsletter, *The Biblical Worldview*, which is edited by Gary DeMar. For more information about American Vision, write: American Vision, P.O. Box 720515, Atlanta, Georgia 30328.

Published by Institute for Christian Economics, P.O. Box 8000, Tyler, Texas 75711.

Printed in the United States of America

Typesetting by Thoburn Press, Tyler, Texas

ISBN 0-930464-29-X

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Other books by Gary DeMar

God and Government:
A Biblical and Historical Study, 1982

God and Government:
Issues in Biblical Perspective, 1984

God and Government:
The Restoration of the Republic, 1986

Ruler of the Nations:
Biblical Blueprints for Government, 1987

The Reduction of Christianity:
A Biblical Response to Dave Hunt, 1988
(with Peter Leithart)

Surviving College Successfully:
A Complete Manual for the Rigors of Academic Combat, 1988

Something Greater Is Here, 1988

The Debate over Christian Reconstruction, 1988

You've Heard It Said, 1989

Paying for the College of Your Choice, 1990

Other books by Peter J. Leithart

A Christian Response to Dungeons and Dragons:
The New Age Catechism, 1987
(with George Grant)

PUBLISHER'S FOREWORD

by Gary North

Even a fool, when he holdeth his peace, is counted wise: and he that shutteth his lips is esteemed a man of understanding.

Proverbs 17:28

"Bantam doesn't know one thing from another when it comes to Christianity."

Hal Lindsey[1]

Hal Lindsey made a terrible mistake. He wrote *The Road to Holocaust* (1989). Bantam Books also made a terrible mistake. They published it. Gary DeMar and Peter Leithart show in this little book just how big a mistake these people made. I believe the correct term is *humongous*.

No one made Mr. Lindsey write it, but now that he has done so, his free ride ends. He will finally learn what criticism from competent theologians is all about. It will not be a pleasant experience for him; people at his age seldom are given public thrashings. You are about to read one.

For twenty years, Mr. Lindsey had received a nearly free ride, intellectually speaking. Scholars within the Christian community have paid almost zero attention to his books. You cannot easily find references to his writings in the footnotes of dispensational theologians, let alone non-dispensationalists. Mr. Lindsey was

1. Hal Lindsey Tape Ministries, audiotape #217, "The Dominion Theology Heresy" (1987).

from the beginning considered a paperback book writer without any scholarly intentions or credentials. Because of this, hardly anybody challenged him when he made theological mistakes, and those who did were little-known authors.[2]

Now he has written a hardback book, but without C. C. Carlson to ghostwrite it for him.[3] This was a strategic error on his part, even if his early royalty checks do cheer him up.

Why did he do it? I am not a psychiatrist. Also, when I tried to contact him before it was published, he refused to answer my letters. I was going to ask him why he did it. So, I will take a guess. I think he did it because David Chilton exposed him publicly as a man who had gotten in way over his head intellectually.

Mr. Chilton did this in an appendix to his book on biblical eschatology, *Paradise Restored.*[4] All that Mr. Chilton did was to point out that Mr. Lindsey's published criticisms of postmillennialism were utterly without merit theologically. Mr. Chilton was simply defending himself and other postmillennialists from what were in fact preposterous accusations. It was not an unprovoked attack. But Mr. Lindsey had never faced a serious scholarly critic before who could write as effectively as Chilton did, and it unnerved him.

Not initially, however. I handed Mr. Lindsey a copy of *Paradise Restored* at the Christian Booksellers' Association convention in early 1985; the book had been on the market for only about a week. Mr. Lindsey obviously did not read it. (I doubt that he even remembers this, but I did it in front of a witness.) We heard nothing from him. Zero. Then, about two years later, Constance Cumbey showed a copy to him.

At that point, any competent Bible student could have become a one-prediction prophet. It was clear what would happen next,

---

2. I have in mind two very good books, *Hal Lindsey and Biblical Prophecy* (1978), by Rev. C. Vanderwaal, and *Is This Really the End?* (1972), by Rev. George Miladin.

3. Remember: *The Late Great Planet Earth* by Hal Lindsey (with C. C. Carlson).

4. David Chilton, *Paradise Restored: A Biblical Theology of Dominion* (Ft. Worth, TX: Dominion Press, 1985), Appendix A. It was to refute this appendix that Mr. Lindsey devoted his 1987 audiotape #217, "The Dominion Theology Heresy."

that is, how he would respond. Mr. Lindsey, according to Proverbs 29:9, was predictably going to make one of two responses: laughter or rage. In his case, it was rage.

The product of that rage is *The Road to Holocaust.*

Going to Your Brother (Matt. 18:15-17)

We learned late in 1988 that he was writing a manuscript on us. Gary DeMar and I both tried to contact him to discuss the matter. He refused to respond. I sent him two registered letters; no answer. I have the postal receipts; his office did receive both letters. In the second letter, I even asked for the names of his church's elders, so that I could pursue the matter according to Matthew 18:15-17. No answer. I had my lawyer request from his publisher a copy of the manuscript. My request was refused. So, I am publishing this response.

In President Nixon's day, this kind of behavior was called *stonewalling.* It did not work for Mr. Nixon, either. When your intended victims have access to a printing press, it never does.

Then his book appeared, with the word *holocaust* in the title. *Holocaust*! As in "the slaughter of the Jews." This is an outrage. It may sell books in secular humanist book stores, but it is still an outrage.

Cheap Shot

This was a true cheap shot. It was the dying effort of an intellectually beaten man: the accusation that his critics are all "unconscious" anti-Semites. I do not mean just postmillennial critics; I mean (as his book plainly says) *all* Christians who do not share his premillennial, pre-tribulational, dispensational eschatology. In other words, he accuses every Christian in church history prior to 1830, when pre-tribulational dispensationalism was first preached.[5]

---

5. Clarence B. Bass, *Backgrounds to Dispensationalism* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1960), chap. 5.

Is this the work of a man who is dealing with biblical texts faithfully? Would any dispensationalist writer other than Hal Lindsey have been so rash? Will any other Christian leader come to his defense and assure us that he is right on target?

He singles out David Chilton, me, Rousas J. Rushdoony, and others who share our views. We are *the* anti-Semites. He had said this before, on an audiotape issued by his organization in 1987, which was still being issued in 1988: "The Dominion Theology Heresy," tape #217. On that tape, the lawyers at Bantam Books did not control him; he did not say that we are "unconscious" anti-Semites, as he does in his book. He said this loud and clear:

> "Man, this is one of the things that's dangerous. This is the most anti-Semitic movement I've seen since Adolph Hitler."

Not "one of the most"—*the* most. Christian charity, thy name is not Hal Lindsey.

This time, he got Bantam Books to help him say it again, though more mildly, to a far larger audience. Bantam gave him a "bully pulpit" for flagrant misrepresentation.

With a sensational title like *The Road to Holocaust*, it may sell well. This is what Mr. Lindsey sold throughout the 1970's: sensationalism. And also prophecies that never come true. But then his market dried up. He did not write a best-seller in the 1980's.

On the other hand, *The Road to Holocaust* may be Mr. Lindsey's last gasp. Maybe Christians are tired of the sensationalism. Maybe they are tired of being manipulated. If this book fails to hit the best-seller charts and stay there, Mr. Lindsey will have to content himself with declining book royalties from his pile of aging paperback books, filled with prophecies that did not come true. The "days of wine and roses" will be over. When a man reaches age 60, this is a scary prospect.

A Truly Boring Book

If you had been called the publisher of the most anti-Semitic movement since Adolph Hitler, I think you would sit up and take notice. You would read everything in the book, line by line. But

not if Hal Lindsey had written the book. Why not? Because *The Road to Holocaust* can accurately be described as chloroform in print. I was its target, yet it nearly put me to sleep. (Please, whatever you do, don't smoke in bed while reading this book!)

It is not just that he got his facts wrong, page after page (as *The Legacy of Hatred Continues* proves); it is that Hal Lindsey, without C. C. Carlson to ghost write his material, is boring! The man just can't write. Not even the sensationalism of a series of preposterously false accusations can make *The Road to Holocaust* read well.

What went wrong? In *The Road to Holocaust*, Mr. Lindsey pretends, late in his career, to be a serious Bible scholar. He even includes endnotes (endnotes are footnotes for lazy typesetters), though not nearly enough of them, given his slavishly heavy reliance on a little-known book, *Dominion Theology: Blessing or Curse?* (That book is also a very poorly researched effort, as Dr. Greg. L. Bahnsen and Dr. Kenneth L. Gentry have demonstrated in their book, *House Divided*, also published by the Institute for Christian Economics.)

The result of his attempted scholarship is a disaster. Let me give you a representative example of Mr. Lindsey's attention to detail. He writes a book attacking a movement co-founded by Rousas John Rushdoony, author of over two dozen scholarly books. Throughout his book's endnotes, Mr. Lindsey repeatedly refers to "John Rousas Rushdoony." Incredible! He does not even know the man's name! Yet he attacks the man's life's work.

Did he read any of Mr. Rushdoony's books? Has he even *seen* one of them? Or did he rely faithfully on photocopies of a few passages from Rushdoony's books that were sent to him by some unnamed researcher who actually did most of the work on this book? I suspect the latter. I think I know who the researcher is; I just don't have *cold, hard* facts to prove it. But so many of Lindsey's mistakes appeared earlier in *Dominion Theology: Blessing or Curse?* that I have my suspicions.

The Road to Holocaust has the jumbled, plodding style of a manuscript written by a bleary-eyed college student who stayed

up too late the night before, drinking a gallon of coffee to stay awake, in order to get his term paper handed in on time. He should have waited.

No one apparently had time to proofread the book. Where were Bantam's editors when Hal Lindsey needed them? And where was C. C. Carlson?

I can well understand why he refuses to debate any of us. He can say whatever he wants to a captive audience that does not read carefully—just as he clearly does not—but he cannot publicly defend himself theologically from those whom he has publicly attacked. So he hides. He goes on vacation. He will not debate.

This is not the sign of a man who is confident about his theological position. This is the sign of a man whose book royalty income was falling, and who grew desperate.[6]

If Mr. Lindsey had ever possessed a reputation as a serious Bible student, *The Road to Holocaust* would have finished it. If you think I am exaggerating, just read this little book.

Here Is My Advice

Hal, it is time to retire. In fact, you're about one book too late already. Maybe three. Just because the Rapture did not take place when you said it would is no reason for you to try to revive your stalled career with a sensational crusade of innuendo and phony endnotes against those whose only "crime" is that they do not share your views on the Rapture.

---

6. Just for the record, I do not accept royalties from my theological books, nor do I accept a salary from the Institute for Christian Economics. I donate my time: about 40 hours a week. I mention this only to head off certain counter-arguments.

PREFACE

"Anti-Semitism." The word conjures up thoughts of Nazism, Adolf Hitler, and gas ovens. In our day "anti-semitism" is real, with swastikas painted on synagogues and verbal epithets hurled at Jews by the Ku Klux Klan and so-called "white supremacists." Purging our land of such an evil will not be accomplished by accusing someone of "anti-Semitism" when there is not a shred of evidence to support the claim. Hal Lindsey has labeled anyone who does not agree with him on the issue of eschatology as "unconsciously anti-Semitic." Lies and slander will accomplish nothing.

We pursued all the means at our disposal to meet with Hal Lindsey over the "anti-Semitism" charges he makes in his poorly researched book *The Road To Holocaust* and directs against amillennialists, historic premillennialists, and postmillennialists, especially Christian Reconstructionists. He would not meet with us. We were told that "Lindsey is not interested in talking about it. His basic word is write a book in response" (personal letter to Gary DeMar from a professor at Dallas Theological Seminary, March 17, 1989).

We believe that Hal Lindsey is wrong in making eschatology the test of orthodoxy. As we will point out in *The Legacy of Hatred Continues*, the problem is not eschatology but ethics, obedience not expectations. "Anti-Semitism" crosses all eschatological lines, just as love for the Jews crosses all eschatological lines. Hal Lindsey is fostering a legacy of hatred among his Christian brethren and among those who desperately need Jesus Christ: the Jews.

A number of Christians wonder why we spend time answering our critics. We're caught in a Catch-22 situation. If we don't an-

swer our critics, then there remains the presumption of guilt: "You can't answer your critics because what they say about you is true." If we do answer, we're accused of being contentious: "Why are you dividing the already grievously divided body of Christ?" A quick reading of the New Testament will show that the Apostles were zealous for truth. That's our goal as well. We want to preserve a legacy of truth and love so those dead in their trespasses and sins might embrace Jesus Christ as their Lord and Savior. We are asking Hal Lindsey to do the same. *The Road to Holocaust* is a holocaust on the reputations of his brothers and sisters in Christ. Hal Lindsey should apologize to those he defames, repent of his false accusations, and have the book pulled from the market.

INTRODUCTION

by Gary DeMar

> As a reputable publisher which has published many other books by Reverend Lindsey, we are confident that, when the book becomes generally available in the normal course of events and you and your clients do see a copy, it will be found to be free of defamatory content and to merely express the opinions of Reverend Lindsey derived from his exhaustive study of the published literature of Dominion Press and its various affiliates.
>
> —Associate General Counsel for Bantam Books, publisher of Hal Lindsey's *The Road to Holocaust.*

> The first to plead his case seems just, until another comes and examines him (Proverbs 18:17).

Let's test the assertion of Bantam Books by surveying easily discoverable facts that do not require any interpretation. How "exhaustive" was Reverend Lindsey's "study of the published literature of Dominion Press and its various affiliates"? Under the heading **The Leaders of the Movement**, Hal Lindsey writes:[1]

> • "Gary North earned his doctor's degree in economics from the University of California-Riverside." **False.** Gary North earned his doctor's degree in *history.*

1. Hal Lindsey, *The Road to Holocaust* (New York: Bantam Books, 1989), pp. 33-34.

- "It is rumored that [Greg Bahnsen] read Dr. Rushdoony's works as a boy." **True**. It's a rumor. Rumors have no place in scholarly works. Bahnsen did *not* read Rushdoony's works as a boy.
- Gary DeMar is "the head of the Institute of Christian Government in Atlanta." **False**. Gary DeMar is president of American Vision in Atlanta. What Hal Lindsey fails to tell his readers is that American Vision was started by a *Jewish* Christian!
- James Jordan is "the pastor of the Reconstruction Church in Tyler, Texas." **False**. There has never been any institution called the Reconstruction Church in Tyler, Texas. Mr. Jordan is not a pastor. He attends a Presbyterian Church in America congregation.

Most of these inaccuracies and others were also recorded in *Dominion Theology: Blessing or Curse?*[2] Actually, they are repeated in *The Road to Holocaust* since they first appeared in *Dominion Theology.*[3]

Further Examples of "Exhaustive Study"

Let's look at three more examples. First, R. J. Rushdoony is quoted a number of times in *The Road to Holocaust.* Did Hal Lindsey actually *read* the books or did he "lift" these references from another book? (We have our suspicions as to the book from which he lifted them.) Remember, Bantam claims that Lindsey did an "exhaustive study of the published literature of Dominion Press and its various affiliates." Then why does Rousas John Rushdoony's name read John **Rousas** Rushdoony in *every* footnote?

Second, Lindsey writes of Rushdoony (the only quotation from Rushdoony's 849 pages of *The Institutes of Biblical Law*): "The love affair the Reconstructionists have with the Law permeates their writings.[4] Rushdoony adds, 'So central is the Law of God,

---

2. H. Wayne House and Thomas Ice, *Dominion Theology: Blessing or Curse?* (Portland, OR: Multnomah Press, 1988).

3. For an indication of negligent scholarship found in *Dominion Theology: Blessing or Curse?*, see Greg L. Bahnsen and Kenneth Gentry, Jr., *A House Divided: The Break-Up of Dispensational Theology* (Tyler, TX: Institute for Christian Economics, 1989), p. 83, note 72.

4. Is Lindsey saying that Christians should not love God's law? Wouldn't this be contrary to Psalm 119:97-99?: "O how I love Thy law! It is my meditation all

that the demands of the law are fulfilled as the necessary condition of grace.' In other words, we earn grace by keeping the Law."[5] But Lindsey only quotes half of Rushdoony's sentence, and Lindsey does not inform his readers that he has made a cut by adding an ellipsis after "grace." Here is Rushdoony's *full* statement with the missing section in italic: "So central is the Law of God, that the demands of the law are fulfilled as the necessary condition of grace, *and God fulfills the demands of the law on Jesus Christ.*"[6] Rushdoony asserts what the Bible teaches: *Jesus* fulfilled all "the demands of the law": "God made [Jesus] who knew no sin to be sin on our behalf, that we might become the righteousness of God in Him" (2 Cor. 5:21). Lindsey's chopped quotation makes it sound like Rushdoony is saying that *sinners* must earn their salvation by keeping the law. Lindsey goes beyond poor scholarship to deception.

Third, nearly 90 books have been published by writers identified with Christian Reconstructionism. (Rushdoony's two-volume set of *The Institutes of Biblical Law* alone is over 1,600 pages!) This does not count the hundreds of newsletters and tapes published over the years. How many books does Hal Lindsey cite? Twelve! Eight of the twelve books are only quoted once! And we've just seen that one of those quotations is chopped and distorted. The others are mere extractions that are used to put the worst out-of-context slant on the author.

There is no mention of Rushdoony's works on eschatology (*Thy Kingdom Come: Studies in Daniel and Revelation* and *God's Plan for Victory: The Meaning of Postmillennialism*) or the issue of *The Journal of Christian Reconstruction* on the Millennium. And conspicuously absent is any mention of the two appendixes in *The Debate over*

---

the day. Thy commandments make me wiser than my enemies, for they are ever mine. I have more insight than all my teachers, for Thy testimonies are my meditation." Are we to conclude, based on the dispensationalist's view of the law, that Psalm 119 is no longer applicable during the so-called "church age"? How about Psalm 23? What about the Book of Proverbs?

5. Lindsey, *Road to Holocaust*, p. 157.

6. Rousas John Rushdoony, *The Institutes of Biblical Law* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1973), p. 75.

Christian Reconstruction where the charge of "anti-Semitism"[7] is answered in full. Neither will the reader find reference to James B. Jordan's article "Christian Zionism and Messianic Judaism" in *The Sociology of the Church.* Lindsey's chapter on the law ("Israel in the Present: Rejected," Chapter 7 in *The Road to Holocaust*) is loaded with misrepresentations, the worst I have ever read. His portrayal of Christian Reconstructionists as "The Modern-Day 'Pharisees' " who "mix Law and Gospel" is reprehensible. An honest study of Rushdoony's *Institutes of Biblical Law* (Vol. 1) and Greg Bahnsen's *Theonomy in Christian Ethics* and his *By This Standard* will thoroughly refute Lindsey's caricature of what he maintains Christian Reconstructionists believe. Reconstructionists do not believe that man is saved by keeping the law.

Can Lindsey Be Trusted?

While such inaccuracies do not necessarily nullify Lindsey's critique of Christian Reconstruction, they ought to make one question how accurate Lindsey will be in *interpreting* what Christian Reconstructionists are saying. If he can't get easily documented facts correct, readers have a right to question Lindsey's interpretation of data he gathered for *The Road to Holocaust* as it relates to the "anti-Semitism" charge and other charges not dealt with in this short book.

The Limited Design of This Book

The Legacy of Hatred Continues is an attempt to deal with Lindsey's suggestion that anyone who is not a dispensational premillennialist is "anti-Semitic." Lindsey has chosen Christian Reconstruction as his whipping boy. How well did he do his research? Bantam Books tells us that Lindsey's opinions were "derived from his *exhaustive*

---

7. "Anti-Semitism" is in quotation marks because the word has different meanings for different groups. Jews and Arabs are Semites. They have common ancestors (Shem and Abraham). We are using "Anti-Semitism" as it is commonly used today: Anti-Jewish attitudes or actions. We believe this is the way Hal Lindsey wants his readers to understand the term.

study of the published literature of Dominion Press and its various affiliates." We will test that claim in the following chapters.

Most of Lindsey's other charges have been answered in numerous Christian Reconstruction publications, publications that Lindsey has ignored.

For a rebuttal of Lindsey's interpretation of Matthew 24 and the recent development of the aberrational dispensational premillennial eschatology, see Gary DeMar, *The Debate over Christian Reconstruction.* For a discussion of the theology of Christian Reconstruction, a comprehensive definition of terms, a discussion of the kingdom both biblically and in the history of Christian thought, the place of the law in the Christian's life, and a study of eschatology in the history of the church, see Gary DeMar and Peter Leithart, *The Reduction of Christianity: A Biblical Response to Dave Hunt.* For the dating of the Book of Revelation, see Kenneth Gentry, Jr., *Before Jerusalem Fell: Dating the Book of Revelation.* For most everything else, see Greg L. Bahnsen and Kenneth Gentry, Jr., *House Divided: The Break-Up of Dispensational Theology.*[8]

Is Only Dispensationalism Anti- "Anti-Semitic"?

The most serious charge made by Lindsey is that only dispensational premillennialism can save the world from "anti-Semitism," and that all other millennial positions are inherently "anti-Semitic." Lindsey writes:

> The purpose of this book is to warn about a rapidly expanding new movement in the Church that is subtly introducing the same old errors that eventually but inevitably led to centuries of atrocities against the Jews and culminated with the Holocaust of the Third Reich. I do not believe that the leaders of this new movement are consciously anti-Semitic—their historical predecessors were not either. But just as their historical counterparts did, they are setting up a philosophical system that will result in anti-Semitism.[9]

---

8. These books can be ordered from Dominion Press, P. O. Box 8204, Ft. Worth, Texas 76124.

9. Lindsey, *Road to Holocaust,* p. 3.

You see, Christian Reconstructionists, who are predominately postmillennial, are not "consciously anti-Semitic," but their views will lead to "anti-Semitism." Hal Lindsey apparently claims to be clairvoyant. This is slander and defamation of character and borders on libel, especially when he *hides* the truth about the Christian Reconstructionists' position, as we shall see!

But don't breathe a sigh of relief if you're not a postmillennialist. Amillennialists and historic premillennialists get the same treatment. For the amillennialist, the reasoning goes something like this: Martin Luther was "anti-Semitic." Martin Luther was amillennial. Adolf Hitler shared Luther's views on the Jews. Adolf Hitler killed six million Jews. Therefore, amillennialists are unconsciously "anti-Semitic," and their eschatology could lead "Israel and us" to another holocaust.

We will contend that dispensational premillennialism leaves the Jews without hope prior to the rapture. Dispensational premillennialism has made a radical distinction between the church and Israel with the result that God has forsaken Israel until *after* the church is raptured. This is standard dispensationalism. There can be no special status for Israel during the "Great Parenthesis," the mythical period of time in which Hal Lindsey and other dispensationalists believe we are living. Israel has no future until *after* the rapture when there will be *no* Christians living on the earth for a period of time.

On the other hand, postmillennialism is the only millennial view that has a plan for Israel *before* the rapture, a view that has a long history in the church. Postmillennialism is *dependent* upon the *conversion* of the Jews. **Hal Lindsey never tells his readers of postmillennialism's belief in a mass conversion of Jews. To support any Jewish pogrom or holocaust would pull the keystone from postmillennialism.** Why has Hal Lindsey failed to alert his readers of our position?

The dispensationalist Hal Lindsey has a real problem on his hands. With no favored status for Israel until *after the rapture*, he must find a way to divert attention from the "unconscious" "anti-

Semitism" of his system.[10] The best way to do this is to blame his most articulate and formidable critics: Christian Reconstructionists. Tell a big enough lie about them—their system is inherently "anti-Semitic"—and people tend to believe it. After all, "Who would tell such an outrageous lie?" Hal Lindsey would.

How to Disagree

Christians have always had disagreements over theology. The letters of the apostles to the first-century churches were designed to clear up doctrinal confusion, error, and heresy. The letters are well reasoned, and, of course, they are truthful. Scripture and history are not perverted by these men just so a doctrinal point could be won. The apostles were after *truth.*

Disagreements about what the Bible teaches still abound. The problem, however, is with us, not with the Bible. The Bible speaks clearly while we see through a glass darkly (1 Cor. 13:12).

---

10. Keep in mind that we are not charging either conscious or unconscious "anti-Semitism" to anyone. We are simply following Lindsey's *methodology* to prove a point: With a mix of quotations, perverted history, and a bit of dishonesty anyone can be portrayed as "anti-Semitic." Consider the following: A conference was held on Jewish evangelism at Willowbank, a conference center in Bermuda. The Willowbank Declaration proclaimed in part: "We affirm our commitment to the Jewish people and our desire to share the gospel with them." The consultation went on to state in their Declaration that proposing "a moratorium on the evangelizing of any part of the human race" (including Jews) is "unchristian, unloving, and discriminatory." Do you consider this to be "anti-Semitic"? No?

> But the document was promptly blasted by James Rudin, a rabbi and national interreligious affairs director of the American Jewish Committee. He called it a "blueprint for spiritual genocide" and expressed the hope that it will be "repudiated by Christians everywhere."
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> Even though the paper repudiates "past persecutions of Jews by those identified as Christians" and pledges resistance to "every form of anti-Semitism," Rudin denounced it as "shot through with the ancient Christian 'teaching of contempt' for Jews and Judaism." *World* (May 20, 1989), p. 12.

From the Jewish perspective, *evangelism* is "anti-Semitism."

Christians should not shrink from debating other Christians. Efforts to remove error from the Church of Jesus Christ is a lifelong process. We should always be pursuing "sound doctrine" (1 Tim. 4:6; Titus 1:9). Contemporary Christians who disdain debate are not familiar with New Testament Christianity or the early Church apologists and councils which gave us the great creedal formulations of Nicea (A.D. 325) and Chalcedon (A.D. 451), or the later confessions of Westminster (1643-47) and Savoy (1658).

But there is a proper way to debate: (1) Represent your opposition's position accurately; (2) tell the truth about your own position; (3) present the facts of both Scripture and history reliably; (4) do this all to the best of your ability.

Hal Lindsey and Truth

Hal Lindsey has been a popular author since the publication of his first book, *The Late Great Planet Earth*, selling over 25 million copies in 100 printings.[11] While Lindsey's other books have sold well, they have not had the impact of his first blockbuster. It was *The Late Great Planet Earth* that made Hal Lindsey the Jeane Dixon of dispensationalism: He predicted the year of the rapture of the church! Like Jeane Dixon, Lindsey was wrong.

Lindsey's latest book is *The Road to Holocaust*. With highly inflammatory cover copy, Hal Lindsey defames and maligns Bible-believing Christians who happen to disagree with him on a number of biblical doctrines, in particular eschatology and Christian attitudes toward Jews. And he uses a New Age and Occult publisher to do it.[12] Why do we think *The Road to Holocaust* needs to be answered?

- Lindsey is a popular author many people trust. When Lindsey speaks, unfortunately, millions of Christians listen.

---

11. Gary Friesen, "A Return Visit," *Moody Monthly* (May 1988), p. 30.

12. Here are some Bantam Book titles: *Dance of the Spirit: The Seven Steps of Women's Spirituality, Healing Visualizations: Creating Health Through Imagery, Quantam Healing: Exploring the Frontiers of Mind/Body Medicine, Case for Reincarnation, Channeling, Comparative Crystal Guidebook, Natural ESP.* If you would like a catalog from Bantam, you can write to them at 666 Fifth Ave., New York, New York 10103.

(This used to be the case. We're not sure that this is true today. This is why we have only come out with a booklet response.) If he is grossly unfair in his representation of a position different from his, then millions of Christians may be equally misinformed and will go about maligning fellow Christians based on misrepresentations and distortions fostered by Mr. Lindsey.

- *The Road to Holocaust* is filled with a great number of deceptions, falsehoods, and outright lies regarding Christian Reconstruction. If a reader thinks he has gotten a fair and accurate appraisal of Christian Reconstruction from *The Road to Holocaust*, he will be woefully disappointed.
- Hal Lindsey has turned the topic of Israel's place in prophecy into a charge of "anti-Semitism" for anyone who does not believe his unusual and aberrational interpretations of Scripture and history. Reconstructionists, who are predominately postmillennial, are not the only ones who come under Lindsey's condemnation. He includes amillennialists and historic or classical premillennialists as holding to a millennial perspective that invariably, in Lindsey's mind, leads to "anti-Semitism." He is so emphatic about his assertions that he maintains that postmillennialists, amillennialists, and historic premillennialists "could lead us—and Israel—to disaster."[13]

Does Hal Lindsey Believe the Bible?

The Bible is our instruction book. Christians are obligated to follow its procedures for handling disputes. When I first learned of the publication of *The Road to Holocaust*, I immediately contacted a professor at Dallas Theological Seminary (Lindsey's alma mater and the premier dispensational seminary in the world) to ask if he would mediate a meeting between Hal Lindsey and me. The purpose of the meeting would be to help Hal Lindsey to gain a better understanding of the postmillennial position regarding the present and future restoration of Israel. Through a number of well-informed friends, we learned that *The Road to Holocaust* would

13. The dust jacket's front cover announces: "Unchecked, the Dominion Theology movement among Christians could lead us—and Israel—to disaster. . . ."

border on slander and would be filled with numerous inaccuracies, both biblical and historic. After reading the book, we soon learned that our initial fears had been justified.

Two years ago Hal Lindsey, in a taped critique of "Dominion Theology," lamented the fact that in all the years that people had written responses to his books, no one had ever come to him to get a more accurate representation of his position. Lindsey said:

> After I read [*Paradise Restored* by David Chilton] (I'm mentioned several times in here, and that doesn't bother me, the fact that [Chilton] did not call and talk with me). You know, they all criticize Dave Hunt because he didn't first go to them and talk to them before he wrote about them. *I've had whole books written about me, and not one of them had ever come to me. . . .* I don't care. I'm a public person, and the minute you write a book, then you should be open for someone else to take it apart, and they do, believe me. I don't care, the only thing I don't like is when they start using character assassination and when they start saying you're stupid, and things like that, or they take this "talking down" tone, I don't appreciate that. But if they analyze what I've said according to the Scripture, that's their right, and their duty.[14]

After hearing this, I assumed that Hal Lindsey would welcome the mediated one-on-one exchange. The professor at Dallas Theological Seminary wrote the following in response to my request:

> Bad news! Lindsey is not interested in talking about it. His basic word is write a book in response.

I sent another letter to Mr. Lindsey, following the procedures outlined in Matthew 18 and Galatians 6:1, asking him why he did not want to meet over this most serious charge of "anti-Semitism." No reply was forthcoming.

Matthew 18 and Galatians 6:1 are clear. Before accusations are made public, an attempt at personal reconciliation is a prerequisite. Lindsey's book makes serious *ethical* charges: "anti-

---

14. Excerpted from Hal Lindsey, "The Dominion Theology Heresy," #217. Hal Lindsey Tape Ministries, P.O. Box 4000, Palos Verdes, California 90274.

Semitism" and the potential for a holocaust. This is more than a debate over the timing of Jesus' Second Coming. Such charges demand the outworking of Matthew 18 and Galatians 6:1.

You might respond: "Well, you wrote a book attacking Dave Hunt. Why should Thomas Ice, H. Wayne House, and Hal Lindsey give you an opportunity to see their works before they are published?" First, Peter Leithart and I did not write a book attacking Dave Hunt. We did not charge him with any ethical lapses. Second, with the publication of *The Reduction of Christianity*, Peter Leithart and I sent a preliminary draft of the manuscript to Dave Hunt to give him an opportunity to correct any misrepresentations of his views. He wrote back telling us that he did not have time to respond and to publish it as is. We would debate after its publication, he wrote. This same courtesy was not extended to Gary North and me when we requested a copy of *Dominion Theology: Blessing or Curse?*, authored by H. Wayne House and Thomas Ice, so we could prepare for a public debate on the topic of Christian Reconstruction where Ice was one of the participants along with Dave Hunt (April 12, 1988).[15]

Postmillennial Reconstructionists have been free and open with their works, making them available for all to see and critique. Dispensationalists Ice, House, and Lindsey have been notorious in clothing their work in CIA-like secrecy. What do they have to hide? Are they not interested in truth?

Keeping the Truth Undercover

Our views concerning the future restoration of the Jews have been published and are on record for all to research and critique. This is why I was surprised to see no reference to *The Debate over*

15. The debate was between Thomas Ice and Dave Hunt (representing dispensationalism) and Gary North and Gary DeMar (representing postmillennial Reconstructionism). Since Dave Hunt was a well-published author, there was an abundance of data by which to evaluate his position. This was not the case with Thomas Ice. He was unpublished. Tapes of this debate can be ordered from Dominion Press, P. O. Box 8204, Ft. Worth, Texas 76124. *The Debate over Christian Reconstruction* is a point by point response to Dave Hunt and Thomas Ice.

Christian Reconstruction and the included appendixes concerning the "anti-Semitism" charge: "The Place of Israel in Historic Postmillennialism" and "To Those Who Wonder if Reconstructionism Is Anti-Semitic," written by a Jewish Christian Reconstructionist. Lindsey fails to even mention these writings in his defamation of postmillennialist Reconstructionists, implying that postmillennialism is inherently "anti-Semitic." Honest reporting means to tell what the opposing view is and then to respond to it honestly. Lindsey's book assumes that no such information exists.

Preview of Chapters

Chapter 1 maintains that Hal Lindsey's previous books should be used as indicators of the reliability of his scholarship. Should he be trusted as competent to analyze the views and scholarship of other Christians? His failed attempts at predicting the rapture should make us wonder.

Chapter 2 shows that a healthy view of God's law is the way the rights and lives of all people are secured. If we obey God's law, then "anti-Semitism" and another holocaust become less and less probable. Unfortunately, as we shall attempt to prove, Lindsey's brand of dispensationalism has no place for God's law during the so-called "Church Age."

Chapter 3 shows how the "Great Parenthesis" of dispensationalism leaves no room for a favored status of the Jews prior to the rapture. Lindsey must depart from conventional dispensationalism to make Israel a favored nation prior to the rapture.

Chapter 4 evaluates Lindsey's assertion that the allegorical interpretation of Origin of Alexandria (A.D. 185-214) started the exegetical ball rolling toward "anti-Semitism." We will show that *premillennialists* prior to Origen developed "the idea that the Israelites had permanently forfeited all their covenants by rejecting Jesus as the Messiah."

Chapter 5 presents a long history of postmillennial attitudes toward the Jews and shows how the conversion of the Jews is foundational to postmillennialism.

Chapter 6 is an article written by Rev. Steve M. Schlissel, a Jewish Christian Reconstructionist, who answers the charge of "anti-Semitism."

1

"HERO OR BUM"?

> In an interview published in *Christianity Today* in April 1977, Ward Gasque asked Lindsey, "But what if you're wrong?" Lindsey replied: "Well, there's just a split second's difference between a hero and a bum. I didn't ask to be a hero, but I guess I have become one in the Christian community. So I accept it. But if I'm wrong about this, I guess I'll become a bum."[1]

Hal Lindsey is rarely quoted in dispensational literature. H. Wayne House and Thomas Ice don't quote him in their faulty critique of Christian Reconstruction, *Dominion Theology: Blessing or Curse?*, even though Lindsey gives it a rousing endorsement. Neither is he quoted by Walvoord in *The Rapture Question* (revised and enlarged in 1979) or *The Blessed Hope and the Tribulation* (1976). *The Late Great Planet Earth* came out in 1970. These dispensational authors and many others ignore Lindsey's prophetic speculations because of his penchant for date-setting.

Hal Lindsey popularized date-setting in *The Late Great Planet Earth*. Yet, many dispensationalists say that they despise date-setting. In 1988, in response to the adverse publicity that dispensationalists were getting over Edgar Whisenant's *88 Reasons Why the Rapture is in 1988*, specifically September 11-13, 1988, many dispensationalists wisely signed an anti-date-setting manifesto.[2]

---

1. W. Ward Gasque, "Future Fact? Future Fiction?," *Christianity Today* (April 15, 1977), p. 40.

2. David A. Lewis writes that "new names of Christian leaders are being added daily. If you wish your name to be added, please let us know." You can write to have your name added: David A. Lewis Ministries, 304 E. Manchester, Springfield, Missouri 65810.

Hal Lindsey does not want to be reminded of his past failed attempts to be America's foremost dispensational prophet. In order to cover himself, Lindsey has created the charge of "anti-Semitism" to divert attention and scrutiny from his failed prediction of a 1981 rapture. How can he do this? By making his critics look even worse. Charge them with a sin that will sell lots of books: "anti-Semitism." But the false prediction remains for all to read.

> The most important sign in Matthew has to be the restoration of the Jews to the land in the rebirth of Israel. Even the figure of speech "fig tree" has been a historic symbol of national Israel. When the Jewish people, after nearly 2,000 years of exile, under relentless persecution, became a nation again on 14 May 1948 the "fig tree" put forth its first leaves.
>
> Jesus said that this would indicate that He was "at the door," ready to return. Then He said, "Truly I say to you, *this generation* will not pass away until all these things take place" (Matthew 24:34, NASB).
>
> What generation? Obviously, in context, the generation that would see the signs—chief among them the rebirth of Israel. A generation in the Bible is something like forty years. If this is a correct deduction, then within forty years or so of 1948, all these things could take place. Many scholars who have studied Bible prophecy all their lives believe that this is so.[3]

The "fig tree" may be an *historic* figure, but Lindsey has not shown it to be a *biblical* figure. The Olive tree of Romans 11 is the biblical figure for Israel. Contrary to Lindsey, Edgar C. Whisenant,[4]

---

3. Hal Lindsey, *The Late Great Planet Earth* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1970), pp. 53-54.

4. Edgar Whisenant has revised his calculations. The rapture, he tells us, will occur on September 1, 1989. "Syria, led by a 26-year-old anti-Christ, will invade Israel three weeks after the Sept. 1 rapture, triggering World War III and seven years of tribulation, followed finally by the return of Christ for a 1,000-year reign of peace. Whisenant said a mathematical error led him last year to mistakenly predict the rapture would happen in 1988." *National & International Religion Report* (June 19, 1989), p. 2. Whisenant is a retired NASA engineer. Aren't we thankful that he did not make "a mathematical error" with NASA trajectory and reentry projections when man went to the moon?

and every other date-setter, "the context of Jesus' words in Matthew 24:32-33 gives no warrant to the idea that Jesus was using the figure of the fig tree as anything more than an illustration of how the Jews were able to tell when summer was near."[5]

Contemporary date-setters like Hal Lindsey use the "fig tree" illustration as a primary indicator for imminent eschatological events. But "orthodox" dispensationalists do not see it this way. Tommy Ice writes:

> Dispensationalism has always affirmed that the signs of the times, the "prophecy clock," would not resume ticking until after the rapture of the church. Therefore, no one could possibly predict the rapture on the basis of events taking place in the current church age because there are **no signs** relating to the rapture. The fruit of date-setting and many contemporary errors has *not* been gathered from the root called dispensationalism.[6]

As much as Ice might want to protest, he has just described modern-day dispensationalism: date-setting with a vengeance. I believe a quick survey of recent dispensational literature would reveal that date-setting has "been gathered from the root called dispensationalism," and Hal Lindsey is the tap root.[7]

The Rebirth of Israel: Winding the Broken Clock of Prophecy

For Lindsey, the rebirth of Israel in 1948 is the key to Bible prophecy. A generation, says Lindsey, "is something like forty years." By adding forty years to 1948, we get 1988. But Lindsey is

---

5. Dean C. Halverson, "88 Reasons: What Went Wrong?," *Christian Research Journal* (Fall 1988), p. 17. For an evaluation of the meaning of the fig tree illustration, see Gary DeMar, *The Debate over Christian Reconstruction* (Ft. Worth, TX: Dominion Press, 1988), p. 143.

6. Thomas D. Ice, "Dispensationalism, Date-Setting and Distortion," *Biblical Perspectives* (September/October, 1988), p. 1. Emphasis added.

7. Dwight Wilson, *Armageddon Now!: The Premillenarian Response to Russia and Israel Since 1917* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1977). Soon to be republished by the Institute for Christian Economics, P. O. Box 8000, Tyler, Texas 75711.

a *pre*-tribulationist. He believes that the rapture will occur seven years *before* Jesus returns the third time[8] to set up His millennial kingdom. This means that the rapture should have occurred sometime around 1981 with 1988 being the year of the Second Coming, give or take a year. But it's been eight years already. This is date-setting with a vengeance. Of course, Lindsey tries to hedge his bets by making qualifications like: "*something like* forty years," "*if* this is a correct deduction," "forty years *or so*," and "*could* take place." Unfortunately, Lindsey's prophetic guesses were not considered guesses by his readers. They took the rebirth of Israel and the forty-year generation scenario as date-setting. Many still turn to the broken clock for comfort and assurance that dispensational theology is still working; it's not.

Gary Wilburn, in his review of the film version of *The Late Great Planet Earth*, seems to agree that the '48-'88 scenario makes up the general thesis of *The Late Great Planet Earth*: "The world must end within one generation from the birth of the State of Israel. Any opinion of world affairs that does not dovetail with this prophecy is dismissed."[9] In his *The 1980s: Countdown to Armageddon*, Lindsey, while still hedging, leads his readers to a pre-1990 climax of history, similar to the modern dispensational prophetic speculator Edgar Whisenant: "Many people will be shocked by what will happen in the very near future. *The decade of the 1980s could very well be the last decade of history as we know it.*"[10] Well, we are about to go into the 1990s.

Why should we take Lindsey seriously on any eschatological issue when his most significant "prediction" has been weighed in the balances and has been found wanting? While Lindsey has not said that we will not see the 1990s, his intimations lead many Christians to believe that the end is quite near, again.

---

8. The First Coming: the incarnation. The Second Coming: the "secret" but noisy rapture when Jesus comes for His saints. The Third Coming: Jesus coming with His saints to set up the millennial kingdom. There may be a Fourth Coming at the end of the millennium.

9. Gary Wilburn, "The Doomsday Chic," *Christianity Today* (January 27, 1978), p. 22.

10. Hal Lindsey, *The 1980s: Countdown to Armageddon* (New York: Bantam Books, 1980), p. 1

Should Lindsey's Scholarship Be Trusted?

Why should people trust Lindsey's scholarship on questions of eschatology (or his evaluation of Christian Reconstruction) when he has been wrong in the past concerning so many prophetic events? Why should we trust Lindsey when he cares very little about his errors?

> In an interview published in *Christianity Today* in April 1977, Ward Gasque asked Lindsey, "But what if you're wrong?" Lindsey replied: "Well, there's just a split second's difference between a hero and a bum. I didn't ask to be a hero, but I guess I have become one in the Christian community. So I accept it. But if I'm wrong about this, I guess I'll become a bum."[11]

Well, Lindsey was wrong, and by his own admission, he should be regarded as "a bum."

The thing that bothers us, and it should bother all Christians, is Lindsey's cavalier attitude about his false predictions. We're told over and over again by dispensationalists that setting dates is out of accord with "orthodox" dispensational teaching. Why haven't dispensational spokesmen like Thomas Ice, Wayne House, and Dave Hunt written works to expose Lindsey as a prophetic fraud?

It's obvious that Lindsey does not represent "orthodox" dispensationalism. But Lindsey's brand of date-setting dispensationalism is the prevailing system. If Lindsey had not intimated at dates, and used the regathering of unbelieving ethnic Israel to their land as the basis for his speculations, *The Late Great Planet Earth* would have been an eschatological publishing novelty. It was the *predictions* that sold the books. Therefore, many who call themselves dispensationalists are really "Lindseyite dispensationalists."

If Tommy Ice is correct that Edgar Whisenant is not a dispensationalist because of his penchant for date-setting, then neither is Hal Lindsey. But if you were to ask a typical dispensationalist to

---

11. Gasque, "Future Fact? Future Fiction?," p. 40.

describe his belief system, it would sound more like Lindsey than Scofield, Pentecost, Ryrie, House, or Ice. To quote Tommy Ice, "By definition, to date-set is to be non-dispensational because it denies the any-moment rapture feature of dispensationalism."[12] So then, what passes as dispensationalism today, according to Ice, one of today's leading dispensational spokesmen, is not dispensationalism. Few sincere premillennialists know the difference.

The Prophetic Cover-Up

When Lindsey's false predictions were pointed out to him, he changed his story. He told us in 1970 that "a generation in the Bible is something like forty years," and "many scholars who have studied Bible prophecy all their lives believe that this is so." Now the story changes.

> In 1977 Lindsey wrote: "I don't know how long a Biblical generation is. Perhaps somewhere between sixty and eighty years."[13]

Has Lindsey revised *The Late Great Planet Earth* to reflect his changes in thinking? He's had one hundred editions to do it. In an article entitled "The Eschatology of Hal Lindsey," published in 1975, Dale Moody wrote: "If the 'Great Snatch,' as Lindsey repeatedly calls the Rapture, does take place before the Tribulation and by 1981, I will beg forgiveness from Lindsey for doubting his infallibility as we meet in the air."[14] It is Lindsey who ought to beg forgiveness for setting himself up as a competent biblical scholar. Hal Lindsey should tell Bantam Books that he wants them to recall *The Road To Holocaust* because of its inaccurate portrayal of Christian Reconstruction and its assertions of "anti-Semitism."

---

12. Ice, "Dispensationalism, Date-Setting and Distortion," p. 3.
13. Gasque, "Future Fact? Future Fiction?," p. 40.
14. Dale Moody, "The Eschatology of Hal Lindsey," *Review and Expositor* (Summer, 1975), p. 278.

2

THE LAW, ESCHATOLOGY, AND "ANTI-SEMITISM"

"Whoever sheds man's blood, by man his blood shall be shed, for in the image of God He made man" (Genesis 9:6).

It's amazing that Hal Lindsey thinks that dispensational premillennialism — an aberrational view of eschatology — will save the Jews from persecution and a possible new holocaust. If tyrants like Adolf Hitler spit at the law of God, then what makes Hal Lindsey think that modern tyrants will not spit at the eschatology of God? In fact, we know that Hitler spat at both the law of God *and* the eschatology of God. Hitler boasted that his "Third Reich which was born on January 30, 1933 . . . would endure for a thousand years, and in Nazi parlance it was often referred to as the 'Thousand-Year Reich.' "[1] Hitler proclaimed a counterfeit law and kingdom to supplant Christianity.

Hitler despised Jesus Christ and His law. Martin Bormann, one of the men closest to Hitler, said publicly in 1941, "National Socialism and Christianity are irreconcilable."[2] Christianity was the great enemy to Hitler: "We know now what Hitler envisioned for the German Christians: the utter suppression of their religion."[3]

---

1. William L. Shirer, *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich: A History of Nazi Germany* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1960), p. 5.
2. William L. Shirer, *The Nightmare Years: 1930-1940*, Vol. 2 of *20th Century Journey: A Memoir of a Life and the Times* (Boston, MA: Little, Brown, 1984), p. 156.
3. *Ibid.*

Mein Kampf Substitutes for the Bible

Mein Kampf was to be regarded as "the most sacred book," containing the "purest and truest ethics for the present and future life of" the German nation.[4] Hitler adopted a nature-based personal and civic ethic founded solely on general revelation without the corrective input of biblical revelation. God's laws were contrary to National Socialism. William Demarest writes:

> A classic example of the claim that knowledge of God and His will is gained from general revelation is found in the ideology of Nazi Germany. Hitler's National Socialist propagandists appealed to the revelation of God in reason, conscience, and the orders of Creation as justification for the Nazi state theology or cultural religion. Biblical revelation in Old and New Testaments was regarded by the Third Reich as a "Jewish Swindle" and thus was set aside in favor of the Nazi natural theology.[5]

There was a strong pagan attachment to "blood and land" and a belief that every people, even the Jews, has "a *Nomos*"[6] that "is the source of morality for the society."[7] In order to make National Socialism work, Hitler had to rid the nation of Christianity. This included the law of God.

God's Law a Help to the Jews

"Biblical revelation was set aside" in Nazism as it is set aside by dispensationalism today (although for very different reasons).

---

4. *Ibid.*, p. 157.

5. William Demarest, *General Revelation: Historical Views and Contemporary Issues* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1982), p. 15.

6. Nazi *Nomos* (Greek: Law) manifests itself in a "divinely prescribed natural constitution." Hitler's views on social theory were a strange mix of the occult, Wagner legend, paganism, and a dash of insanity. Under the leadership of Alfred Rosenberg, an outspoken pagan, "the Nazi regime intended eventually to destroy Christianity in Germany, if it could, and substitute the old paganism of the early tribal Germanic gods and the new paganism of the Nazi extremists." Shirer, *Rise and Fall*, p. 240. Hitler's dream was for a pure race and a pure nation. All competitors would have been exterminated in time. The Jews happened to be the closest scapegoats.

7. Richard V. Pierard, "Why Did Protestants Welcome Hitler?," *Fides et Historia* (Spring 1978), p. 15.

But where are the laws that protect life found? In the Bible, especially in the Old Testament. Where are the laws protecting minorities found? In the Bible, especially in the Old Testament. What would have saved the Jews from virulent persecution down through the ages? A belief in the abiding validity of the law of God found in both the Old and New Testaments and held sacred by the people and the nation's leaders. Throughout the Old Testament law, the weak and the stranger are given protection:

- The unborn are protected in Exodus 21:22-25.
- The stranger is protected in Leviticus 24:22.
- All life is protected in Exodus 20:13.
- Property is protected in Exodus 20:15 and 22:1-12.

A repudiation of God's law, especially the case laws of Exodus, opens the door to all sorts of atrocities, not unlike those in our own nation (e.g., abortion, homosexuality, child abuse, and "anti-Semitism").

Why does Hal Lindsey think that eschatology is the answer to "anti-Semitism"? He has repudiated the law of God as the standard by which we all ought to live. All he has left is eschatology. Eschatology is the wrong emphasis, however. What saves Jews from persecution? For that matter, what saves any individual or group from persecution? Renewed hearts and minds and respect for the law of God.

Lindsey claims that "anti-Semitism" has been fostered by *Christian* scholars, although unintentionally and even unconsciously. Lindsey writes that the precursor to an "anti-Semitic" philosophy, Origen of Alexandria (A.D. 185-254), "was not an evil man," that he "was a scholarly Christian philosopher with a courageous faith who lived a humble and ascetic life."[8] If Origen was a "Christian" who had the Holy Spirit and the law of God written on his heart, as all Christians do, then why, as Lindsey claims, does "anti-Semitism" arise in a culture made up of such men?

All Christians have the Holy Spirit within them. Lindsey tells us that the "Holy Spirit gives the believer the desire to follow

8. Hal Lindsey, *The Road to Holocaust* (New York: Bantam Books, 1989), p. 7.

God's will, and then gives the power to perform it. But He does it from the inside."[9] And Christian Reconstructionists agree. Why isn't this enough to stop Christians from being consciously or unconsciously "anti-Semitic"? If God's Spirit working in us will not do it, then what makes Lindsey think that God's eschatology will accomplish what God's Spirit cannot do?

"God's will" is God's law. But Hal Lindsey wants the Christian to distance himself from the law of God because of the possibility of "legalism." But to distance oneself from God's law is "lawlessness," not grace. Scripture tells us that "sin is lawlessness" (1 John 3:4). How do you know when you are sinning? How do you know when a person is being "anti-Semitic"? The law tells you. Legalism is the belief that we are *justified* by the law. Lindsey is confusing legalism with obedience.

Lindsey tells us that **"The Holy Spirit Did Not Come to Help Us Keep the Law."**[10] Who then does help us keep the law, whether that law is written on the heart or written in the Bible? (Actually, they're the same law. God only has one law.) Jesus said, "If you love Me, you will keep My commandments" (John 14:15). Love for Jesus is manifested through obedience to His commandments. Love toward my neighbor, Jews included, is measured by obedience to the Ten Commandments (Rom. 13:8-10). But I can't live up to the commandments, and neither can I love my neighbor as I ought. Jews are my neighbors. The Holy Spirit helps me to live a godly life so I will not hurt my neighbors (Jews included). "Love does no wrong to a neighbor" (Rom. 13:10). But love and godliness are not subjective. Paul quotes the sixth commandment in Romans 13:9: "You shall not murder."

Lindsey complicates this whole "anti-Semitism" issue because he cannot reconcile his dispensational view of the law with plain common sense and biblical truth. Let me lay it out so a first-grade student can understand it.

---

9. *Ibid.*, p. 154.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 158.

What's the solution to "anti-Semitism"? Love your neighbor as you love yourself. How do we know when we're loving our neighbor? The Bible tells me (don't steal; don't murder; don't covet; don't slander; etc.). What is it called when the Bible tells me what to do and what not to do? Obedience. Is God's law good? Yes, when one uses it lawfully, such as the protection of people and the punishment of evil men like "anti-Semites" (1 Tim. 3:8). If everybody followed God's law, would this be good for the Jews? Yes! *They might even see the love of Jesus in us so that they might glorify our "Father who is in heaven"* (Matt. 5:16). Remember, "faith without works is dead" (James 2:26). Scripture does not say that faith without a dispensational eschatology is dead. Now, that wasn't so hard, was it?

Marcion Lives

Hal Lindsey and dispensationalists in general have a low regard for the Law of God,[11] similar to the views of the arch-heretic Marcion (second century A.D.). "Marcion stressed the radical nature of Christianity *vis-à-vis* Judaism. In his theology there existed a total discontinuity between the OT and the NT, between Israel and the church, and even between the god of the OT and the Father of Jesus."[12] Dispensationalist teaching is similar to Marcion's radical discontinuity between the Old Testament and the New Testament and his radical distinction between Israel and the church. How did this affect the Jews?

---

11. Hal Lindsey is a wee bit schizophrenic on this point. He states the following: "I'm very much involved in urging Christians to be politically active. I'm very much for Christians' being active and running for government, seeking to bring *Judeo-Christian* morality into our various governments." Hal Lindsey, "Week in Review," Trinity Broadcasting Network (June 5, 1989). "*Judeo-Christian*" morality includes Old Testament biblical law. In the midst of his diatribe against Christian Reconstruction, Lindsey nullifies his entire thesis by stating this obvious Reconstructionist distinctive: "It is correct to say that Biblical Law should serve as a *pattern* for civil law as John Calvin taught." Lindsey, *Road to Holocaust*, p. 157. He wants a "pattern" but no "blueprint." What is this supposed to mean, and how does this differ from what Reconstructionists are saying?

12. W. Ward Gasque, S.V. "Marcion," *The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church*, J. D. Douglas, gen. ed. (rev. ed.; Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1978), p. 620.

> One consequence of Marcion's rejection of the Old Testament was hostility to the Jews. Both Roman Catholicism and Lutheranism [and we could add dispensationalism, G.D.], which were much more critical of Old Testament Law than the Reformed tradition [of which Christian Reconstructionists are a part, G.D.], are also more inclined to anti-Semitism. The rejection of the authenticity and authority of the Old Testament by nineteenth-century liberalism was followed by virulent anti-Semitism, especially in Germany.[13]

So then, it's the "rejection of the Old Testament" that brings on "hostility to the Jews," the very thing that Lindsey castigates Christian Reconstructionists for promoting. If there is one group that has shown an almost total "rejection of the Old Testament," it's dispensationalists. Dispensationalism teaches that the law is no longer obligatory during the so-called "church age." Consider the following unbelievable bit of nonsense written by a prominent dispensationalist:

> Donald Grey Barnhouse, a giant of a man in free grace, wrote: "It was a tragic hour when the reformation churches wrote the Ten Commandments into their creeds and catechisms and sought to bring Gentile believers into bondage to Jewish law, which was never intended either for the Gentile nations or for the church." He was right, too.[14]

Hitler: Free From the Law

The sixth commandment reads: "You shall not murder" (Exodus 20:13). Germany was a "Gentile nation." The sixth commandment is "Jewish law, which was never intended for the Gentile nations." Dispensationalism creates an environment for any despot to do what he wants, even murder, since Jewish law, the Old Testa-

---

13. Harold O. J. Brown, *Heresies: The Image of Christ in the Mirror of Heresy and Orthodoxy for the Apostles to the Present* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984), p. 455, note 38.

14. S. Lewis Johnson, "The Paralysis of Legalism," *Bibliotheca Sacra* (April/June, 1963), p. 109.

ment, was never intended for the Gentile nations. Hitler murdered millions of Jews, but what law would Hal Lindsey use to judge him? The Ten Commandments? But that's "Jewish law."

"O How I Love Thy Law" (Psalm 119:97)

The Reformed theonomic postmillennialist takes issue with Johnson, Barnhouse, and Lindsey. It was a blessed hour when the Reformation churches wrote the Ten Commandments into their creeds and catechisms and sought to bring *all* nations under God's law. It was a tragic hour when dispensationalism erased them. By bringing all nations under God's law, they will be driven to despair in their own impossible self-effort to please God, and they will then be led to faith in Jesus, embracing His perfect life and shed blood as the only hope for redemption.

The Postmillennialist Has the Answer

Lindsey believes that dispensational eschatology is the answer to the "anti-Semitism" problem. Christian Reconstructionists believe that the outpouring of God's Spirit, the proclamation of the gospel, the conversion of sinners, obedience to God's law as a standard of behavior in response to His gracious redemption, and the conversion of the Jews *before* the rapture are the answers. The Jews, and all people, because they are created in the image of God, are protected by the law of God. Remove the law of God, and you remove this protection.

3

DISPENSATIONALISM'S FUTURE HOLOCAUST

> Convinced that a nuclear Armageddon is an inevitable event within the divine scheme of things, many evangelical dispensationalists have committed themselves to a course for Israel that, by their own admission, will lead directly to a holocaust indescribably more savage and widespread than any vision of carnage that could have generated in Adolf Hitler's criminal mind.[1]

> The purge of Israel in their time of trouble is described by Zechariah in these words: "And it shall come to pass, that in all the land, saith Jehovah, two parts therein shall be cut off and die; but the third shall be left therein. And I will bring the third part into the fire, and will refine them as silver is refined, and will try them as gold is tried" (Zechariah 13:8, 9). According to Zechariah's prophecy, two thirds of the children of Israel in the land will perish, but the one third that are left will be refined and be awaiting the deliverance of God at the second coming of Christ which is described in the next chapter of Zechariah.[2]

John Walvoord, a leading dispensationalist spokesman, writes that dispensationalism interprets the future judgments of Revelation as a "scene of devastation of divine judgment and human iniquity" which will be "without parallel in the history of the world. According to Revelation 6:7, the judgments attending the opening

1. Grace Halsell, *Prophecy and Politics: Militant Evangelists on the Road to Nuclear War* (Westport, CT: Lawrence Hill & Co., 1986), p. 195.

2. John F. Walvoord, *Israel in Prophecy* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan/Acadamie, [1962] 1988), p. 108.

of the fourth seal involve the death with sword, famine, and wild beasts of one fourth of the world's population. If this were applied to the present world population now approaching three billion, it would mean that 750,000,000 people would perish, more than the total population of North America, Central America, and South America combined."[3] Hal Lindsey supports this interpretation, affirming that during the tribulation there will be "*death on a massive scale.* It staggers the imagination to realize that one-fourth of the world's population will be destroyed within a matter of days. According to projected census figures this will amount to nearly one billion people!"[4]

Now, let's see if we've got this right. Two-thirds of the Jews living in their land are killed, and one-fourth of the population of the world is wiped out. And Lindsey is worried about the *possibility* of "anti-Semitism"? The futuristic and unwarranted literalistic interpretation of these passages forces the dispensationalist to predict the greatest holocaust the world has ever seen, all in the name of dispensational premillennialism! Is it any wonder that Hal Lindsey wants to paint non-dispensational premillennialists as holocaust-oriented? He must cover up the inevitable holocaust predicted by dispensationalism.

What's Sauce for the Goose Is Sauce for the Gander

Do you see how dispensationalists can be made to look bad with a few quotations strung together? Who comes off looking "anti-Semitic" now? What would Jewish groups in Israel say to Hal Lindsey if they knew that he teaches that two-thirds of their population will be slaughtered—a "fact" based on a dispensational interpretation of Scripture? If evangelism is considered to be "anti-Semitic," then what will this tribulation-holocaust be called?

Our point in opening this chapter in this way is to show how we should *not* argue. Lindsey has used inflammatory language to

3. *Ibid.*, p. 110.

4. Hal Lindsey, *There's a New World Coming* (New York: Bantam Books, [1973] 1984), p. 90. Emphasis in original.

prejudice his readers against Christian Reconstruction. Nowhere do dispensationalists tell their supporters how the views of some dispensationalist writers could be construed as "anti-Semitic" if Lindsey's methodology were used on them.[5] Lindsey has selectively quoted church history so that his readers are never shown evidence that most Christians believed that the promises made to Israel were continued in the Church, made up of Jews and Gentiles, long before Origen (see Chapter 4 below). Lindsey does not tell his readers that the postmillennial position is the only millennial position that has a place in prophecy for the Jews before the rapture (see Chapter 5 below).

The Rapture Problem

The pre-tribulational rapture is the key to dispensational eschatology. The pre-tribulational rapture separates dispensationalism from other forms of premillennialism as well as amillennialism and postmillennialism. This is what makes it a "fourth view" of eschatology.[6] According to dispensationalism, prior to the rapture, *Israel has no prophetic significance.* But Lindsey changed all of this with the publication of *The Late Great Planet Earth* in 1970.

Standard dispensationalism has always taught that the prophetic time clock stopped ticking when Israel rejected their Messiah. This put the 70th week of Daniel in the distant future. That final week makes up the seven-year tribulation period that we hear so much about and over which there is much controversy. This has led to a controversy over the timing of the rapture. Is the rapture before (pre), during (mid), or after (post) the tribulation?

---

5. Arno C. Gaebelein, who had a tremendous ministry to the Jews, and was an editor for *The Scofield Reference Bible*, could be made to sound like an "anti-Semite" if we were to follow Lindsey's perverted methodology and apply it to Gaebelein's *The Conflict of the Ages: The Mystery of Lawlessness: Its Origin, Historic Development and Coming Defeat* (New York, NY: Our Hope, 1933), pp. 64, 71, 72, 76, 79-81, 90-92, 95-99, 103, 147-50.

6. Robert G. Clouse, ed., *The Meaning of the Millennium: Four Views* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1977).

The Parenthesis

According to dispensationalism, *Israel has no prophetic significance in God's program until the church is raptured prior to the seven-year tribulation period* (Daniel's 70th week). This is the dispensational view as espoused by E. Schuyler English:

> An intercalary period of history, after Christ's death and resurrection and the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, has intervened. This is the present age, the Church age. . . . *During this time God has not been dealing with Israel nationally, for they have been blinded concerning God's mercy in Christ.* . . . However, God will again deal with Israel as a nation. This will be in Daniel's seventieth week, a seven-year period yet to come.[7]

According to dispensationalism, God is now dealing with His church, His "heavenly people." God is *not*, according to dispensationalism, dealing with Israel, His "earthly people." The promises made to Israel are "postponed." Technically speaking, with this perverse dispensational view in mind, there can be no such thing as "anti-Semitism" as Lindsey describes it! The Jews are like everybody else: They are lost in their sins until they embrace Christ as their Lord and Savior. "Anti-Semitism," according to the dispensational view, is no different from anti-Japanese, anti-Italian, anti-Arab, anti-Irish, or anti-German attitudes. Jews are not God's chosen people this side of the rapture. *This is the dispensational view!*

Consider this as well. If the promises to Israel as a people and nation are postponed, as dispensationalism teaches, then the land promise, and the promise "those who bless you, I will bless," also have been set aside, until the prophetic clock begins to tick with the rapture of the church. Treating Jews with special care or persecuting them will impress God in no special way. He is not obligated to keep a promise that has been postponed. Hal Lindsey wants to have it both ways: Israel's not significant until after the

---

7. E. Schuyler English, *A Companion to the New Scofield Reference Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972), p. 135. Emphasis added.

rapture, but we need the nation of Israel before the rapture in order to sell dispensationalism to the uninformed.

Other dispensationalists have understood the dispensational problem of what to do with national Israel before the rapture. Stan Rittenhouse has written the following about present-day Israel in his *"For Fear of the Jews"*:[8]

- "Today's Israel is not of Christ but rather that of the Devil" (p. 45)
- "The Israel of today is a Satanic counterfeit" (p. 169).
- "Israel must first be destroyed" (p. 179).
- "A curse has been put on Israel" (p. 7).
- "Israel will again be made desolate" (p. 8).
- "Today's Israel is not of God" (p. 9).
- The "Star of David" is "a powerful symbol of the occult" (p. 14).

Why does Rittenhouse write such inflammatory things about the present state of Israel? Like a good dispensationalist, he believes that "Today is an in-between age which is commonly called the Age of Grace, the Age of the Holy Spirit, or the Church Age (the Church being the body of believers in Christ, the total and complete group, whosoever that may be, Gentile or Jew). During this period in between the First and Second Coming of Jesus Christ, a Satanic counterfeit—political Zionism—masquerading as the State of 'Israel' will be established."[9]

Lindsey's Break with Dispensationalism

Hal Lindsey understands the implications of the older dispensationalism. It leads to what Rittenhouse has stated: "A curse has been put on Israel by God and will remain until the Lord Jesus Christ returns and He is accepted by them. 'Behold, I set before you this day a blessing and a curse.' "[10] This is why Lindsey must make Israel important *prior* to the rapture. In 1970 he concocted the following:

---

8. Vienna, VA: The Exhorters, Inc., 1982.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 7.
10. *Ibid.*

> The most important sign in Matthew has to be the restoration of the Jews to the land in the rebirth of Israel. Even the figure of speech "fig tree" has been a historic symbol of national Israel. When the Jewish people, after nearly 2,000 years of exile, under relentless persecution, became a nation again on 14 May 1948 the "fig tree" put forth its first leaves.
>
> "Jesus said that this would indicate that He was "at the door," ready to return. Then He said, "Truly I say to you, *this generation* will not pass away until all these things take place" (Matthew 24:34, NASB).
>
> What generation? Obviously, in context, the generation that would see the signs—chief among them the rebirth of Israel. A generation in the Bible is something like forty years. If this is a correct deduction, then within forty years or so of 1948, all these things could take place. Many scholars who have studied Bible prophecy all their lives believe that this is so.[11]

With this new version of dispensationalism, Hal Lindsey broke with standard dispensationalism on the regathering of Israel to the land as an indicator of prophetic time.[12] He had to make Israel's regathering to the land a fulfillment of *Old Testament* prophecy in order to sell his belief in an imminent rapture. But as fellow-dispensationalist Thomas Ice tells us: "Dispensationalism has always affirmed that the signs of the times, the 'prophecy clock,' would not resume ticking until after the rapture of the church. Therefore, no one could possibly predict the rapture on the basis of events taking place in the current church age because there are **no signs** relating to the rapture. The fruit of date-setting and many contemporary errors has *not* been gathered from the root called dispensationalism."[13] But date-setting sells books, as Hal Lindsey and Edgar Whisenant know.

In *The Road to Holocaust*, Lindsey has used the same perverse

---

11. Hal Lindsey, *The Late Great Planet Earth* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1970), pp. 53-54.

12. Charles L. Feinberg, "The State of Israel," *Bibliotheca Sacra* (October, 1955), p. 319

13. Thomas D. Ice, "Dispensationalism, Date-Setting and Distortion," *Biblical Perspectives* (September/October, 1988), p. 1. Emphasis added.

interpretation of Scripture to foist upon all non-dispensationalists the stigma of being "anti-Semitic," if they do not adopt the new and improved Lindseyite dispensationalism.

Lindsey's Cryptic Postmillennialism

As we will show in Chapters 4 and 5, the only millennial view that has a significant prophetic role for Israel to play this side of the rapture is *post*millennialism. There is so much historic evidence for this in the postmillennial literature that Hal Lindsey is dishonest in not referring to it. Bantam Books informed us that Reverend Lindsey did "his exhaustive study of the published literature of Dominion Press and its various affiliates." An "exhaustive study" would have shown Lindsey that his concerns of "anti-Semitism" are similar to those of postmillennialists because it's in postmillennialism that Israel has a future prior to the rapture. Just from a pragmatic perspective, postmillennialism needs the Jews. Without the conversion of the Jews there are no blessings to the Gentiles:

> Now if their transgression be riches for the world and their failure be riches for the Gentiles, how much more will their fulfillment be! (Rom. 11:12).

Dispensationalists see this verse being fulfilled *after* the rapture. Hal Lindsey *wants to believe* that Romans 11:12 will be fulfilled *prior* to the rapture, thus, there can be no persecution of the Jews or a holocaust. *Postmillennialists have always believed that Romans 11:12 will be fulfilled prior to the rapture.* Also, the postmillennial view of prophecy does not teach that two-thirds of the Jews living in Israel will be wiped out during the so-called "Great Tribulation."

4

THE CHURCH AND ISRAEL: IS LINDSEY TELLING THE TRUTH?

> The man most responsible for changing the way the Church interpreted prophecy is Origen. . . . [H]e powerfully introduced, taught, and spread the allegorical method of interpreting the Scriptures, particularly in the area of prophecy. From this seemingly harmless fact of Church history evolved a system of prophetic interpretation that created the atmosphere in which "Christian" anti-Semitism took root and spread. Using this method of prophetic interpretation, Church theologians began to develop the idea that the Israelites had permanently forfeited all their covenants by rejecting Jesus as the Messiah.[1]

Lindsey begins *The Road to Holocaust* with the argument that the church first got on the road to "anti-Semitism" when theologians adopted non-literal or "allegorical" principles of biblical interpretation.[2] Using this "allegorical" interpretation, theologians began to speak of the permanent exclusion of Israel from the covenant, to apply Old Testament promises to the church, and to refer to the church as the "New Israel." As a result, the Old Testament people of God were left out of God's plans. The church developed a low view of Israel, which paved the way for "anti-Semitism" in the church. The source of this evil was the Alexandrian theologian

---

1. Hal Lindsey, *The Road to Holocaust* (New York: Bantam Books, 1989), pp. 7-8.

2. The terms "literal" and "allegorical" are quite ambiguous. We must confess we are not sure what Lindsey means by "literal" interpretation.

Origen (185-253), who, Lindsey says, was responsible for the acceptance of allegorical interpretation in the church.[3]

In order to assess this argument, we must deal with two separate but related questions. First, what principles of interpretation guided the earliest post-apostolic Fathers? Was Origen indeed responsible for the spread and acceptance of "allegorical" interpretation, or was this method of interpretation popular prior to Origen? Second, we must ask what the church Fathers prior to Origen said about the relationship of the Old Testament Israel to the New Testament church. Did the Fathers of the first two centuries believe the church to be the New Israel?

Biblical Interpretation of the Early Fathers

To assess the church Fathers' approach to biblical interpretation fairly, we must distinguish between allegorical and typological interpretation. The key difference between the two approaches is in their attitudes toward the historical character of the Bible. The allegorical interpreter seeks to find eternal truths in Scripture, and in doing so may either reject the historical meaning of the Bible, or relegate the historical sense to a very secondary place. Typology, by contrast, takes history seriously; typology is based on the idea that Old Testament history prefigured the events of the New Testament. Thus, for example, the allegorical interpreter would search the Old Testament for symbols of virtue or illustrations of philosophical ideas, while the typological interpreter would search the Old Testament for shadowy images of the coming Messiah.[4]

Of course, there are also similarities between allegory and typology. Both approaches search for a "deeper" meaning, either

---

3. Lindsey notes that, despite the evil consequences that he attributes to Origen, Origen was not himself an evil man.

4. On the distinction between allegory and typology, see J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* (rev. ed.; San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row, [1960] 1978), pp. 69-75; Moises Silva, *Has the Church Misread the Bible?: The History of Interpretation in the Light of Current Issues* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1987), pp. 69-75.

philosophical or theological, in the biblical records of historical events. Neither would approach the history of David's reign over Israel, for example, as merely an historical record. The point of making this distinction is to show that there are a variety of "non-literal" approaches to the Bible. Lindsey's simple contrast of "literal" and "allegorical" distorts the more complex reality of the situation.[5]

Pre-Origen Interpretation

Whether we call the church Fathers "allegorists" or "typologists," it is clear that non-literal interpretation was widely used prior to Origen. According to Dan G. McCartney:

> . . . by Origen's time Christian interpretation had developed in all kinds of different directions. Already in the Epistle of Barnabas [*c.* 100] the "Alexandrian type" of allegory had developed. From the scant references we have, apparently the Ebionites developed along legalistic lines. Justin Martyr appears to be synthesizing the typological and philosophical approaches to interpretation, and demonstrates a development of prophecy "proof-texting" as a hermeneutic of apologetics.[6]

McCartney suggests that "Most Christians were probably in between, caught on the one hand by a desire to maintain the historical reality of the gospel events, and on the other by a need to experience the gospel in a modern [contemporary] way."[7]

A few examples will suffice to show that non-literal interpretation existed in a fairly developed form prior to Origen.[8] First, we may look at "Barnabas's" interpretation of the number 318, the

---

5. On the various interpretive approaches in the third century, see Dan G. McCartney, "Literal and Allegorical Interpretation in Origen's *Contra Celsum*," *Westminster Theological Journal* (Fall 1986), pp. 282-87.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 285.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 286.

8. In fairness, Lindsey appears to be saying that Origen was responsible for "systematizing" allegorical interpretation, and for spreading it throughout the church. He does not assert that Origen invented allegorical interpretation. Still, we shall illustrate that non-literal interpretation was common among the early church fathers, many of whom were premillennial, a fact that undermines Lindsey's major claim.

number of trained men that Abraham had in his household (Gen. 14:14). This epistle was written around 100 A.D., long before Origen was born.

> What, then, was the knowledge given to him in this? Learn the eighteen first, and then the three hundred. The ten and the eight are thus denoted—Ten by I, and Eight by H. You have [the initials of the name of] Jesus. And because the cross was to express the grace [of our redemption] by the letter T, he says also, "Three Hundred." He signifies, therefore, Jesus by two letters, and the cross by one.[9]

J. N. D. Kelly writes that "Barnabas" believed that "the fatal error of the Jews was to let themselves be beguiled by the literal sense of Scripture."[10]

Irenaeus (*c.* 130-200) provided this interpretation of Moses' marriage to an Ethiopian woman in his *Against Heresies* (*c.* 180-85):

> . . . by means of the marriage of Moses, was shown forth the marriage of the Word; and by means of the Ethiopian bride, the Church taken from among the Gentiles was made manifest; and those who detract from, accuse, and deride it, shall not be pure. For they shall be full of leprosy, and expelled from the camp of the righteous.[11]

In the West, Clement of Rome (*c.* 30-100) found in the story of Rahab a prophecy of the redemption by Christ:

> Moreover, they gave her a sign to this effect, that she should hang forth from her house a scarlet thread. And thus they made it manifest that redemption should flow through the blood of the Lord to all them that believe and hope in God. Ye see, beloved, that there was not only faith, but prophecy in this woman.[12]

---

9. "Epistle of Barnabas," IX. In *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Alexander Roberts and John Donaldson, eds., 10 vols. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, [1885] 1981), vol. 1, p. 143. The bracketed interpolations were added by the editors of *Ante-Nicene Fathers*.

10. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, p. 66.

11. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, IV. XX. 12. In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 1, p. 492.

12. Clement of Rome, "First Epistle to the Corinthians," XII. In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 1, p. 8.

Our point is not that we necessarily agree with these interpretations; rather, we wish to show that non-literal interpretation was used by the church Fathers prior to Origen.[13] Indeed, Origen's approach was itself less objectionable than many maintain. The problem with Origen lay not so much in his allegorical method, but in his attempt to fit the Bible into a Platonic philosophical mold.[14] If Hal Lindsey is correct that non-literal interpretation leads to "anti-Semitism," then the church has been on the road to "anti-Semitism" since the very first century.

Several other points are worth noting here. First, Lindsey drastically oversimplifies post-Origenist biblical interpretation when he claims that Origen's method was dominant by the latter fourth century.[15] By the fourth century, in fact, theologians of the Antiochene school had reacted against the extreme allegorism of Origen. Kelly notes,

> The chief theologians concerned in this were Diodore of Tarsus (*c.* 330-*c.* 390), Theodore of Mopsuestia (*c.* 350-428) and Theodoret (*c.* 393-*c.* 460), but practical illustrations of the Antiochene method are to be found in the sermons of such a preacher as John Chrysostom (*c.* 347-407). Despite differences of emphasis, the whole school was united in believing that allegory was an unreliable, indeed illegitimate, instrument for interpreting Scripture.[16]

These theologians, particularly Chrysostom, were hardly minor figures. Origen was indeed an important figure, but, contrary to

---

13. Lindsey may reply that these examples are fully within his definition of "literal interpretation." If so, we are completely at a loss to understand what Lindsey means by "literal," and suggest that he stop using such confusing terminology.

14. For critical yet appreciative assessments of Origen's interpretive method, see McCartney, "Literal and Allegorical Interpretation"; Silva, *Has the Church Misread the Bible?*, pp. 58-63. Both stress that, despite his philosophical approach and his departures from orthodoxy, Origen defended the historical sense of Scripture, tried to reconcile the historical and allegorical senses, attempted to interpret Scripture with Scripture, and was respectful of the church's tradition.

15. Lindsey, *Road to Holocaust*, p. 9.

16. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, pp. 75-76.

Lindsey's claims, his allegorical method was not universally adopted.

Second, if Lindsey's view of the early church's history is correct, then the main creeds of the church are put in doubt. The Ecumenical Councils of the church, which formulated the orthodox doctrines of the Trinity and the Person of Christ, were held *after* Origen. If "Origen's system of interpretation dominated the Christian scene" by the fourth century, and if Origen's system was fundamentally misguided, then the creeds themselves are based on flawed interpretive principles. Again, we find that Lindsey's accusations, if they have any validity, must be leveled against the whole Christian church and against the basic doctrines of the Christian faith.

The Church and Israel in the Ante-Nicene Fathers

W. H. C. Frend writes that "Until the close of the New Testament period, the church claimed to be Israel and wrote to the synagogues of the Dispersion accordingly." Within the first several centuries A.D., however, the church came to be dominated by Gentiles; thus, "after circa A.D. 100 there was less of a tendency for Christians to claim to be Israel and more of a tendency to contrast Christianity and Judaism as separate religions."[17] Kelly agrees with Frend: From the earliest times, "the Church is regarded as the new, authentic Israel which has inherited the promises which God made to the old."[18] Jaroslav Pelikan describes the common idea that the Old Testament prefigured the coming of Christ, and adds, "This commonplace in Christian literature, aimed at demonstrating that the church had now become the new and the true Israel, may well have antedated the Gospels themselves."[19]

---

17. W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of Christianity* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1984), pp. 121, 124.

18. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, p. 190.

19. Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*, 5 vols. (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1971-1989), vol. 1: *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600)*, p. 16. Pelikan's entire discussion of the relations between Judaism and Christianity in the first three centuries A.D. (vol. 1, pp. 12-27) is excellent.

This conclusion is precisely the opposite of Lindsey's. Lindsey asserts that the idea of the church as a New Israel developed only after Origen, while Frend, Kelly, and Pelikan assert that this was the view of the earliest post-Apostolic writers. When Lindsey disagrees with three recognized authorities on early church history, we have reason to wonder if Lindsey has done his homework. Lindsey's entire argument depends on his assertion that there was a major change in the interpretation of Scripture, and in the church's view of Israel, after Origen.[20] We shall show that from the beginning theologians said that the church was the new, authentic Israel, heir to the promises of God.[21]

---

20. It is interesting that church historian David A. Rausch mentions Origen only in passing in his discussion of the Ante-Nicene roots of Christian "anti-Semitism." *A Legacy of Hatred: Why Christians Must Not Forget the Holocaust* (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1984), pp. 20-22. Of course, Lindsey claims that "the most important factor in this chain of the development of 'anti-Semitism' has been overlooked by almost everyone," so we should not expect to find other scholars who agree with Lindsey's view. *The Road to Holocaust*, p. 7. Rausch's book includes many quotations from theologians who lived and wrote before Origen, all of whom say, in one form or another, that the church is the New Israel. It is odd that Lindsey himself refers to Rausch's book (pp. 23-24), but still tries to maintain, against Rausch's evidence, that the idea that the church is the New Israel began to develop after Origen. Either Lindsey did not read Rausch's book completely (which casts doubt on the exhaustiveness of his research), or he deliberately ignored those sections of Rausch's book that undermined his thesis (which casts doubt on the honesty of his research).

21. The only evidence that Lindsey offers for the views of the Apostolic Fathers on the relationship of Israel and the church is a quotation from J. L. Neve's *A History of Christian Thought*. After a lengthy quotation, Lindsey asks us to "Note carefully the following crucial facts from this quote." The second fact he wants us to note is that "although the early church rightly believed that the Jew must believe in Jesus as the Messiah to be saved in this age, they firmly believed that Israel was yet to be redeemed as a nation and given her unconditionally promised Messianic Kingdom." *Road to Holocaust*, p. 10. But the quotation from Neve says nothing whatsoever about the Jews. And Lindsey quotes no early fathers who say that Israel will be redeemed. Perhaps some church Fathers did say this; we don't claim familiarity with everything the church Fathers wrote. But clearly Lindsey has read his own eschatology into the Neve quotation, and he provides absolutely no evidence of the views he says were held by the Apostolic Fathers.

Barnabas

Long before Origen, Christian writers were asserting that the Church was a New Israel. The Epistle of Barnabas (*c.* 100) said that the covenant is not "both theirs [ethnic Israel's] and ours [the church's]," since "they [the Jews] finally lost it, after Moses had already received it."[22] Later, "Barnabas" asked whether "this people [the church] is the heir, or the former, and if the covenant belongs to us or to them." In answer to this question, "Barnabas" mentioned several Old Testament episodes in which the younger son replaced the oldest son as heir, the obvious implication being that the church (the younger son) has become heir.[23]

Justin Martyr

Justin Martyr, a premillennialist, made the same point even more explicitly in his *Dialogue with Trypho* (*c.* 160):

> For the true spiritual Israel, and descendants of Judah, Jacob, Isaac, and Abraham (who in uncircumcision was approved of and blessed by God on account of his faith, and called the father of many nations), are we who have been led to God through this crucified Christ, as shall be demonstrated while we proceed.[24]

Justin argued later in the same work that the prophets foretold the removal of Israel and the blessing of another Israel.[25] Again, "As . . . Christ is the Israel and the Jacob, even so we, who have been quarried out from the bowels of Christ, are the true Israelitic race."[26] Justin explicitly said that the promise of land made to Abraham is fulfilled in the church's inheritance of heaven: "along

---

22. Epistle of Barnabas, IV. In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 1, p. 138. The editor points out that there is a textual question about whether this passage should read "the covenant is ours" or "the covenant is both theirs and ours." With the editor, we agree that the latter is more in keeping with the context. The bracketed interpolations were added by the editors.

23. *Ibid.*, XIII. In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 1, p. 145.

24. Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho*, XI. In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 1, p. 200.

25. *Ibid.*, CXXIII. In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 1, p. 261.

26. *Ibid.*, CXXXV. In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 1, p. 267.

with Abraham we shall inherit the holy land, when we shall receive the inheritance for an endless eternity, being children of Abraham through like faith."[27] These statements are especially significant, since Justin was a premillennialist.

Irenaeus (*c.* 180)

Irenaeus, another premillennialist, found a type of the church and Israel in the rivalry between Jacob and Esau:

> . . . [Jacob] received the rights of the first-born, when his brother looked on them with contempt; even as also the younger nation received Him, Christ, the first-begotten, when the elder nation rejected Him, saying, "We have no king but Caesar." But in Christ every blessing [is summed up], and therefore the latter people has snatched away the blessings of the former from the Father, just as Jacob took away the blessing of this Esau. For which cause his brother suffered the ploys and persecutions of a brother, just as the Church suffers this self-same thing from the Jews.[28]

Tertullian

Around 200 A.D. Tertullian explained how the Jews had become ruined by their turning from God:

> In former times the Jews enjoyed much of God's favor, when the fathers of their race were noted for their righteousness and faith. So it was that as a people they flourished greatly, and their kingdom attained a lofty eminence. . . . But how deeply they [the Jews] have sinned, puffed up to their fall with a false trust in their noble ancestors, turning from God's way into a way of sheer impiety, though they themselves should refuse to admit it, their present national ruin would afford sufficient proof.[29]

Clement (*c.* 90)

Even as early as Clement of Rome, there were hints of the church as New Israel theme. Clement urged his readers to draw

---

27. *Ibid.*, CXIX. In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 1, p. 259.
28. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, IV. XXI. 3. In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 1, p. 493.
29. Tertullian, *Apology*, 21. Quoted in Rausch, *Legacy of Hatred*, p. 22.

near to God, "who has made us partakers in the blessings of His elect." He went on to quote from Deuteronomy 32:8-9, a passage that deals with Israel's election as God's people and His portion and inheritance.[30] It seems that Clement was thinking of the church as the elect nation of God; if this was his thought, it would imply that the church is in the New Covenant what Israel was in the Old. This is how Kelly reads this passage in *1 Clement*: "Clement of Rome sees in its [the church's] election the fulfillment of the prophecies that Jacob should become the Lord's portion and Israel the lot of His inheritance."[31] If this interpretation of this passage is correct, Clement was applying Old Testament prophecy to the church, something that Lindsey says began several centuries later.

Again, the point of these quotations is not that we agree with every formulation. In particular, it is wrong to see the episode of the Golden Calf as a definitive breach of the covenant, as Barnabas seems to have argued. Irenaeus was correct that the Jews rejected the covenant when they put to death the Lord of the Covenant. The point, however, is that Origen was not the first theologian to say that the church is the New Israel, and that the promises given to Israel in the Old Covenant now apply to the church. Again, if Lindsey is correct that this view of the church's relation to Israel leads to "anti-Semitism," his charges must be directed to the whole of Christian theology until the mid-nineteenth century development of dispensationalism.[32]

As the church gradually became dominated by Gentiles, the urgency of the question of the church's relation to Judaism and

---

30. Clement, "First Epistle." In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, vol. 1, pp. 12-13.

31. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, p. 190.

32. David Rausch, more consistent in this regard than Lindsey, refers to "two millennia of Christian Anti-Semitism." *A Legacy of Hatred*, ch. 2. Lindsey, trying to protect his view that the earliest church Fathers were dispensational premillennialists, asserts without a shred of evidence that early Christian views of Israel were more sympathetic than post-Origenist views. It is an ironic fact that Origen was one of the few church fathers who learned Hebrew and who had face-to-face encounters with Jewish biblical scholars. Pelikan, *Emergence of the Catholic Tradition*, p. 21.

the Old Testament waned somewhat. Thus, the designation of the church as the true Israel was used less frequently. Pelikan summarizes the question superbly: "No title for the church in early Christianity is more comprehensive than the term 'the people of God,' which originally meant 'the new Israel' but gradually lost this connotation as the Christian claim to be the only true people of God no longer had to be substantiated."[33]

Conclusion

Let us summarize the two major points of this chapter. First, Lindsey asserts that Origen was responsible for the spread and acceptance of "allegorical" interpretation in the church. We have shown that "allegorical" interpretation was used by Christian theologians prior to Origen, and that Origenist allegorism was not universally adopted. Second, Lindsey argues that the church began to understand herself as the New Israel only after Origenist interpretive principles had become widespread. We have shown that the earliest post-Apostolic theologians referred to the church as a New Israel, and as the heir of God's covenant promises.

Lindsey's accusations of potential "anti-Semitism" against "Dominion Theologians" depend on the accuracy of his historical survey in Chapter 1 of *The Road to Holocaust*. But his historical survey is full of falsehoods and oversimplifications. As a result, Lindsey's accusations, if correct, apply to the whole church and the whole of Christian theology.

Does this mean that non-dispensationalist views of eschatology have no place for the Jewish people in prophecy? On the contrary, postmillennialism has always emphasized the importance of Israel's conversion to Christ, as we shall show in the next chapter.

---

33. Pelikan, *Emergence of the Catholic Tradition*, p. 26.

5

POSTMILLENNIALISM AND THE SALVATION OF THE JEWS

[E]ven the Jews will be provoked to jealousy. Paul cited Deuteronomy 32:21 concerning the Jews: "But I say, Did not Israel know? First Moses saith, I will provoke you to jealousy by them that are no people, and by a foolish nation I will anger you" (Romans 10:19). The Gentiles have received the great blessing. "I say then, Have they [the Jews] stumbled that they should fall? God forbid; but rather through their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles, for to provoke them to jealousy" (Romans 11:11). This becomes a means of **converting the remnant of Israel in the future**, and when they are converted, Paul says, just think of the **blessings** that God will pour out on the earth, given the fact that the fall of Israel was the source of great blessings for the Gentile nations. "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?" (Romans 11:12). When the Jews received their promise, the age of blessings will come. When they submit to God's peace treaty, the growth of the kingdom will be spectacular. This is what Paul means by his phrase, "how much more." This leads to stage **ten**, the explosion of conversions and blessings. If God responds to covenantal faithfulness by means of blessings, just consider the implications of widespread conversions among the Jews. When the fulness of the Gentiles has come in, then Israel will be converted (Romans 11:25). The distinction between Jew and Gentile will then be finally erased in history, and the kingdom of God will be united as never before.[1]

---

1. Gary North, *Unconditional Surrender: God's Program for Victory* (Tyler, TX: Geneva Press, 1981), p. 199.

Hal Lindsey accuses "Dominion Theologians" of paving the way for "anti-Semitism" because they do not, in Lindsey's judgment, give a prominent place to the Jewish people in their interpretation of prophecy. Apparently, Lindsey believes that only dispensationalism gives the Jews an important place in God's future plans. Most of those whom Lindsey labels "Dominion Theologians," however, are postmillennialists. Contrary to Lindsey's accusations, postmillennialism has always given a prominent place to the Jews in its interpretation of prophecy. This is especially true in postmillennialists' interpretation of the crucial passage, Romans 9-11.

The purpose of this chapter is two-fold. First, we will show that Christian theologians did address the question of Israel's future before the nineteenth-century development of dispensationalism, and that many of these men were working with a postmillennial framework. Second, in the course of proving this, we will provide evidence that the postmillennial view is not "anti-Semitic," even in the very vague sense in which Lindsey uses the term; on the contrary, historic postmillennialism gives the Jews a very prominent place in prophecies of the latter-day glory of the church.

Postmillennialism denies, however, that the Jews can be members of God's people apart from their conversion to the Messiah. The Jews will be saved, the postmillennialist teaches, only by faith in Christ, repentance, and entrance into the life of the Body of Christ. As Iain Murray says, "Puritans did not believe that there are any special and unfulfilled spiritual promises made to Israel *apart from* the Christian Church."[2] Moreover, unlike dispensationalism, historic postmillennialism teaches that Israel will be converted before Christ's Second Coming.

Early Reformed Interpretations

During the sixteenth century, in the Reformation and immediate post-Reformation period, several theologians addressed the

2. Iain Murray, *The Puritan Hope: Revival and the Interpretation of Prophecy* (London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1971), p. 77.

question of Israel's place in God's plans for the future. Theodore Beza, John Calvin's successor in Geneva, taught, according to English theologian Thomas Brightman, that the world would "be restored from death to life againe, at the time when the Iews should also come, and be called to the profession of the Gospel." Martin Bucer, the reformer of Strassbourg who had a direct influence on English Puritanism, wrote in a 1568 commentary on Romans that Paul prophesied a future conversion of the Jewish people. Peter Martyr Vermigli, who taught Hebrew in Strassbourg and later at Oxford, agreed.[3]

Peter Toon describes the transmission of this interpretation from the Continent to England, Scotland, and America:

> . . . the word 'Israel' in Romans 11:25ff., which had been understood by Calvin and Luther as referring to the Church of Jews and Gentiles, could be taken to mean 'Jews', that is non-Christian Jews whose religion was Judaism. Beza himself favoured this interpretation of Romans 11 and he was followed by the various editors of the influential *Geneva Bible*, which was translated in Geneva by the Marian exiles during the lifetime of Beza. In the 1557 and 1560 editions short notes explained that 'Israel' meant 'the nation of the Jews' but in later editions (e.g. 1599) the note on Romans 11 stated that the prophets of the Old Testament had predicted a future conversion of the nation of the Jews to Christ. Through this Bible and the writings of the Puritans (e.g. William Perkins, *Commentary on Galatians*, and various books by Hugh Broughton) the doctrine of the conversion of the Jewish people was widely diffused in England, Scotland, and New England.[4]

This emphasis fits neatly into the postmillennial scheme: The latter-day glory of the church will be inaugurated by the conversion of the Jews to Christ; this is what Paul meant when he said

---

3. Quotations from J. A. DeJong, *As the Waters Cover the Sea: Millennial Expectations in the Rise of Anglo-America Missions, 1640-1810* (Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1970), p. 9.

4. Peter Toon, "The Latter-Day Glory," in *Puritans, the Millennium and the Future of Israel: Puritan Eschatology 1600-1660*, Peter Toon, ed. (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1970), p. 24.

that the conversion of the Jews would be "life from the dead" (Romans 11:15). There were other views of Paul's prophecy available at the time of the Reformation. As Toon notes, Calvin and Luther taught "Israel" in Romans 11 was the church. Another school of interpretation understood Romans 11:26 ("all Israel shall be saved") not as a future dramatic conversion of the Jews but as the gradual conversion of the Jews throughout history. It is significant that this latter view was "almost uniformly rejected by English and Scottish exegetes of the Puritan school." They favored instead the view that the Jews would someday be converted in mass.[5]

Scottish and English Theologians on Israel's Future

In England, the place of the Jews in prophecy was a prominent issue in the seventeenth century, and, significantly, this was true among postmillennial Calvinists. Iain Murray summarizes the seventeenth-century concern for Israel in this way:

> The future of the Jews had decisive significance for them because they believed that, though little is clearly revealed of the future purposes of God in history, enough has been given us in Scripture to warrant the expectation that with the calling of the Jews there will come far-reaching blessing for the world. Puritan England and Covenanting Scotland knew much of spiritual blessing and it was the prayerful longing for wider blessing, not a mere interest in unfulfilled prophecy, which led them to give such place to Israel.[6]

Murray's book, among others, provides abundant documentation of the postmillennial concern for Israel, of which we can cite only a small portion. Scottish theologian Charles Ferme, writing sometime in the late sixteenth century, argued that Paul indicated "when the fulness of the Gentiles shall have been brought in, the great majority of the Israelitish people are to be called, through the gospel, to the God of their salvation, and shall profess

5. Murray, *The Puritan Hope*, p. 64.
6. *Ibid.*, pp. 59-60.

and own Jesus Christ, whom, formerly, that is, during the time of hardening, they denied."[7]

In a 1635 letter the Scottish theologian Samuel Rutherford expressed a wish to live to see the conversion of the Jews:

> O to see the sight, next to Christ's Coming in the clouds, the most joyful! Our elder brethren the Jews and Christ fall upon one another's necks and kiss each other! They have been long asunder; they will be kind to one another when they meet. O day! O longed-for and lovely day-dawn! O sweet Jesus, let me see that sight which will be as life from the dead, thee and the ancient people in mutual embraces.[8]

The English preacher and theologian Thomas Brightman, developed, in Toon's words, "the first important and influential English revision of the Reformed, Augustinian concept of the millennium."[9] In this revision, Brightman emphasized the conversion of the Jews. In *A Revelation of the Revelation* (1615), Brightman argued that the fall of the Turkish empire would be followed by "the calling of the Jews to be a Christian nation," an event that would lead to "a most happy tranquillity from thence to the end of the world."[10] His 1635 Commentary on Daniel 11-12 bore the subtitle, *The restoring of the Jewes and their callinge to the faith of Christ after the utter overthrow of their three last enemies is set forth in livelie colours.*[11] Brightman believed that the Jews would be restored to Jerusalem and that "the Jewish Christian Church w[ould] become the centre of a Christian world."[12] He found Scriptural support for this conclusion in Daniel 12:2-3 and Revelation 20:11-15, both of which described "the rebirth of a Christian Israelite nation."[13]

---

7. Quoted in *ibid.*, pp. 64-65.
8. Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 98.
9. Toon, "The Latter-Day Glory," p. 26.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 27.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 30.
12. *Ibid.* Toon's words.
13. *Ibid.* Toon's words. Toon notes that "Brightman's eschatological scheme may be described as a form of postmillennialism since, and this is important, he expected Christ to return in glory only at the end of the second millennium and at the end of the age" (*ibid.*, p. 31).

William Perkins, a leading Puritan teacher and writer, also taught that there would be a future mass conversion of the Jews. Similarly, Richard Sibbes wrote that "The Jews are not yet come in under Christ's banner; but God, that hath persuaded Japhet to come into the tents of Shem, will persuade Shem to come into the tents of Japhet." Elnathan Parr's 1620 commentary on Romans espoused the view that there would be two "fullnesses" of the Gentiles: one prior to the conversion of the Jews and one following: "The end of this world shall not be till the Jews are called, and how long after that none yet can tell."[14]

Speaking before the House of Commons in 1649 during the Puritan Revolution, John Owen, a postmillennial theologian, spoke about "the bringing home of [God's] ancient people to be one fold with the fulness of the Gentiles . . . in answer to millions of prayers put up at the throne of grace, for this very glory, in all generations."[15] Samuel Lee, at one time a member of Owen's church, believed, as he explained in his popular 1677 book, *Israel Redux*, that the Jews would someday return to the land of Palestine.[16]

Creeds and Confessions

Councils of the English and Scottish churches also addressed the question of Israel. The Westminster Larger Catechism, Question 191, displayed the same hope for a future conversion of the Jews. Part of what we pray for in the second petition, "Thy kingdom come," is that "the gospel [be] propagated throughout the world, the Jews called, the fullness of the Gentiles brought in." Similarly, the Westminster *Directory for Public Worship* directed ministers to pray "for the Propagation of the Gospell and Kingdome of Christ to all nations, for the conversion of the Jewes, the fulnesse of the Gentiles, the fall of Antichrist, and the hastening of the second coming of the Lord."[17] In 1652, a group of 18 Puritan ministers and theologians, including both Presbyterians and Independents, affirmed that "the Scripture speaks of a *double con-*

14. All quotations from DeJong, *As the Waters Cover the Sea*, pp. 27-28.
15. Quoted in Murray, *Puritan Hope*, p. 100.
16. Peter Toon, *God's Statesman: The Life and Work of John Owen* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1971), p. 152.
17. Quoted in DeJong, *As the Waters Cover the Sea*, pp. 37-38.

version of the Gentiles, the first before the conversion of the *Jewes*, they being *Branches wilde by nature* grafted into the *True Olive Tree* instead of the *naturall Branches* which are broken off. . . . The second, after the conversion of the Jewes."[18]

The Congregationalist *Savoy Declaration* (1658) included the conversion of the Jews in its summary of the church's future hope:

> we expect that in the latter days, Antichrist being destroyed, the Jews called, and the adversaries of the kingdom of his dear Son broken, the churches of Christ being enlarged and edified through a free and plentiful communication of light and grace, shall enjoy in this world a more quiet, peaceful, and glorious condition than they have enjoyed.[19]

Prayer for Israel's Conversion

Because they believed that the Jews would be converted, Puritan and Presbyterian churches earnestly prayed that Paul's prophecies would be fulfilled. Murray notes that "A number of years before [the Larger Catechism and Westminster Directory for Public Worship] were drawn up, the call for prayer for the conversion of the Jews and for the success of the gospel throughout the world was already a feature of Puritan congregations."[20] Also, among Scottish Presbyterian churches during this period, special days of prayer were set aside partly in order that "the promised conversion of [God's] ancient people of the Jews may be hastened."[21] Puritan Independent Thomas Goodwin, in his book, *The Return of Prayers*, encouraged people to pray even when they failed to see their desires realized. Among the things for which the church should pray were "the calling of the Jews, the utter downfall of God's enemies, the flourishing of the gospel." Goodwin assured his readers that all these prayers "will have answers."[22]

---

18. Quoted in Murray, *Puritan Hope*, p. 72. Interestingly, some of this same language—the phrase "double conversion of the Gentiles" in particular—was used by Johann Heinrich Alsted, whose premillennial *The Beloved City or, The Saints Reign on Earth a Thousand Yeares* (1627; English edition 1643) exercised great influence in England. See De Jong, *As the Waters Cover the Sea*, p. 12.
19. Quoted in DeJong, *As the Waters Cover the Sea*, p. 38.
20. Murray, *The Puritan Hope*, p. 99.
21. Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 100.
22. Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 102.

Eighteenth-Century America

Jonathan Edwards, a postmillennialist's postmillennialist, outlined the history of the Christian church in his 1774 *History of Redemption*. Edwards believed that the overthrow of Satan's kingdom involved several elements: the abolition of heresies and infidelity, the overthrow of the kingdom of the Antichrist (the Pope), the overthrow of the Muslim nations, and the overthrow of "Jewish infidelity":

> However obstinate [the Jews] have been now for above seventeen hundred years in their rejection of Christ, and however rare have been the instances of individual conversions, ever since the destruction of Jerusalem . . . yet, when this day comes, the thick vail that blinds their eyes shall be removed, 2 Cor. iii.16. and divine grace shall melt and renew their hard hearts . . . And then shall the house of Israel be saved: the Jews in all their dispersions shall cast away their old infidelity, and shall have their hearts wonderfully changed, and abhor themselves for their past unbelief and obstinacy.

He concluded that "Nothing is more certainly foretold than this national conversion of the Jews in Romans 11."[23]

Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Reformed Theologians

This view continued to be taught by postmillennialists throughout the nineteenth and into the twentieth century. The great Princeton theologian Charles Hodge found in Romans 11 a prophecy that "the Gentiles, as a body, the mass of the Gentile world, will be converted before the restoration of the Jews, as a nation." After the fullness of the Gentiles come in, the Jewish people will be saved: "The Jews, as a people, are now rejected; as a people, they are to be restored. As their rejection, although national, did not include the rejection of every individual; so their

---

23. Jonathan Edwards, "History of Redemption," in *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, [1834] 1974), vol. 1, p. 607.

restoration, although in like manner national, need not be assumed to include the salvation of every individual Jew." This will not be the end of history, however; rather, "much will remain to be accomplished after that event; and in the accomplishment of what shall then remain to be done, the Jews are to have a prominent agency."[24]

John Brown, a nineteenth-century Scottish theologian, wrote this in his commentary on Romans:

> The apostle [Paul] contrasts the former state of the Gentiles with their present state, and the present state of the Jews with their future state. The past state of the Gentiles was a state of disobedience—their present state, as state of gracious salvation. The present state of the Jews is a state of disobedience—their future state is to be a state of gracious salvation.[25]

The reason for God's rejection of the Jews and for their future restoration is to display both the total depravity of men—both Jew and Gentile—and the pure and sovereign grace of salvation.[26]

Southern Presbyterian theologian Robert L. Dabney included under the category of "unfulfilled prophecy" the "general and national return of the Jews to the Christian church. (Rom. ix: 25, 26)."[27] In a discussion of the premillennial views of the Plymouth Brethren, Dabney argues that "pre-adventism" is "unfavorable to the promise of Israel's ingathering."[28] He went on to explain:

> True, it [i.e., premillennialism] teaches that Israel will be saved after (immediately after), and by means of the advent, but most inconsistently. For first, Paul says, they are to come in

---

24. Charles Hodge, *A Commentary on Romans* (London: Banner of Truth Trust, [1864] 1972), p. 374. See also Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, 3 vols. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1917), vol. 3, pp. 804-13.

25. John Brown, *Analytical Exposition of the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans* (Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson, & Ferrier, 1883), p. 417.

26. *Ibid.*, pp. 418-419.

27. Robert L. Dabney, *Lectures on Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, [1878] 1972), p. 838.

28. C. R. Vaughan, ed., *Discussions by Robert Dabney* (Richmond, VA: Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 1890), vol. 1, p. 211.

> "with the fulness of the Gentiles;" but Pre-adventism expects no such fulness. Second, he says they shall be regrafted into "their own olive tree," which is the visible church. But Pre-adventism holds that Christ's coming will abolish the visible church. Third, where shall unbelieving Israel be put during the terrors of the first resurrection and universal fires which are to destroy all other unbelievers? Last, the scheme is unscriptural in expecting Jews, whom the truth of the word cannot impress, to be savingly impressed by outward catastrophes.[29]

This same view has been taught in the present century by some leading Reformed theologians. One of the high ironies of *The Road to Holocaust* is that Lindsey relies on a *postmillennialist*, the late John Murray of Westminster Theological Seminary, at crucial points in his exegesis of Romans 9-11![30] How Lindsey can then go on to warn about the potential "anti-Semitism" of postmillennialism is a leap of logic that we do not claim to fathom. In any case, Murray wrote this comment on Romans 11:26:

> If we keep in mind the theme of this chapter and the sustained emphasis on the restoration of Israel, there is no alternative than to conclude that the proposition, "all Israel shall be saved", is to be interpreted in terms of the fulness, the receiving, the ingrafting of Israel as a people, the restoration of Israel to gospel favour and blessing and the correlative turning of Israel from unbelief to faith and repentance. . . . the salvation of Israel must be conceived of on a scale that is commensurate with their trespass, their loss, their casting away, their breaking off, and their hardening, commensurate, of course, in the opposite direction.[31]

---

29. *Ibid.*, pp. 211-12.

30. Lindsey, *Road to Holocaust*, pp. 176-77, 189. Lindsey says that Murray's exegesis of Romans 11:16 is "surprisingly accurate" (p. 189). To heighten the irony, Gary North, a leading "Dominion Theologian," admits that he became a postmillennialist under Murray's teaching. North writes: "Before I went further to become a hyper-ultradispensationalist (only Paul's prison epistles are written to the church), I sat in on Murray's class on Romans, in the second semester of my first (and last) year of seminary. His exegesis of Romans 11, coupled with my reading of Revelation 12 in the light of his concept of genetic Israel, converted me to postmillennialism." "Editor's Introduction," *The Journal of Christian Reconstruction*, Symposium on the Millennium (Winter, 1976-77), p. 4.

31. John Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 2 vols. in one (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1968), vol. 2, p. 98.

Many "Dominion Theologians" follow Murray's exegesis of this passage. We quoted Gary North's explanation of the conversion of the Jews at the beginning of this chapter. After citing Murray's exegesis of Romans 11, Ray R. Sutton, the pastor of Good Shepherd Reformed Episcopal Church in Tyler, Texas and author of *That You May Prosper*, explains what he calls the "representative" or "covenantal" view of Israel, which holds that Israel "represents the **conversion** of the world to Christ." Sutton explains further:

> I hold to the [representative view of Israel's future], neither anti-semitic nor zionist. First, according to this position, Israel maintains a special place in the plan of God. It is greatly loved by God. Because of its unique role in the conversion of the Gentiles, it is to be evangelized, not exterminated. It is to be called back to the God of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph, not excluded from a place in the world. It is to be cherished by the Church, the New Israel, not excoriated as a "Christ-killer"; remember, the **whole** world crucified Christ, for above His head were written in **all** the major languages of Jew and Gentile: "King of the Jews."
>
> But second, the representative or covenantal view is not nationalistic. It does not believe there is magic in being a political unit, a nation. Just because Israel has become nationalized has little or nothing to do with its becoming "covenantalized"; in fact, being politicized has always stood in its way of accepting Christ as Savior and more importantly, **Lord**.[32]

The issue, therefore, is covenantal faithfulness to Jesus Christ, not political or racial or cultural commitment.

Conclusion

Many more examples of the postmillennial concern for the conversion of Israel could be cited, but we have sufficient evidence before us to permit to several conclusions. First, postmillennialism does not entail the conclusion that the Jews have no place in God's plan in history. Historically, it has been the amil-

---

32. Ray R. Sutton, "Does Israel Have a Future?" *Covenant Renewal* (December 1988), p. 3.

lennial position that denies a future large scale conversion of Jews.[33]

Second, the concern for the Jews among postmillennialist writers makes "anti-Semitism" unthinkable. There may be "anti-Semitic" postmillennialists, but then there are also "anti-Semitic" dispensationalists. "Anti-Semitism" is not a simple deduction of eschatology.

Finally, Hal Lindsey has seriously distorted his case against "Dominion Theology." He implies that the postmillennial "Dominionists" have no place for Israel, yet he quotes postmillennialist John Murray in his discussion of Romans 9-11. He never informs his readers that leading "Dominion Theologians" refer to Romans 11 as evidence of a future conversion of Israel. As a result of these distortions, his case against "Dominion Theology" loses all credibility.

33. E.g., William Hendriksen, *Exposition Paul's Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1981), pp. 377-82; Anthony A. Hoekema, *The Bible and the Future* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1979), pp. 143-47. We do not at all mean to imply that amillennialism leads to "anti-Semitism."

6

TO THOSE WHO WONDER IF RECONSTRUCTIONISM IS ANTI-SEMITIC

by Steve M. Schlissel

Greetings in our Messiah. I must say that when I was told that reconstructionists are being accused of being anti-semitic, I was somewhat taken aback. Why would anyone, aware of the hopes, let alone the principles, that guide and motivate reconstructionists regard them as anti-semitic?

Perhaps it is because they have encountered certain reconstructionists who are, in fact, anti-semitic. Indeed, there are some who have written things about the Jewish people, especially their history, which ought to be regarded as stupid (at least), but even then not necessarily anti-Jewish. In any event, it would be wrong to extrapolate from the one to the many. That would be, of course, an example of prejudice and bigotry of which, I am sure, most dispensationalists would not like to be guilty.

After all, having at one time been a missionary with one of the largest and oldest dispensational Jewish mission organizations in the world, I have met more than one dispensational anti-semite. But I do not, therefore, conclude that all dispensationalists and their system are anti-semitic. That is clearly not the case. It is the custom of Christian gentlemen to judge by the best of a class, not the worst; to focus on principles in controversy, not persons.

But that we may present a more positive case in the hope that we may put to death the notion that reconstructionism is anti-semitic, consider me, if you please. I was born and raised as a Jew in a city of 2,000,000 Jews. I was circumcised the eighth day, at-

tended Hebrew School, became Bar Mitzvah at 13 years of age, went to shul (synagogue), attended Passover seders all my life (still do each year, with my still unbelieving Jewish family), and have the highest regard for Jewish culture and community. I am, in a word, a Jew! (It may be of passing interest to you that one of my brothers returned to Israel under provisions of law there encouraging Jews to return. He has been there more than ten years and, of course, has served in the military.)

My Jewishness has never been an issue nor an obstacle in my fellowship with Christian reconstructionists. The opposite has been the case. On the other hand, my Jewishness was often seemingly the only thing that mattered in fellowshipping with dispensationalists. On being introduced by dispensationalists to others, it was almost invariably noted that I was Jewish. Not so with Reformed folk.

After my eyes were opened, by the grace of God, to the Messiahship of Jesus our Lord, I attended militantly dispensational congregations. I was nurtured on books by Charles Ryrie, Dwight Pentecost, Hal Lindsey—in short, my fare was from the table prepared by the Moody-Dallas school of theology. It should be noted that I still admire my "instructors" for their deep commitment to Christ, their sincere piety, and their diligent efforts to glorify God. While I no longer subscribe to their theology, I never forget that I, too, was once an ardent dispensationalist.

Now, however, I am what you might call "a rock-ribbed Calvinist," one of the variety which believes that *Covenant* is the motif which alone faithfully serves as an organizing principle of all Scriptural data; Covenant as opposed to *Dispensation*. I believe that the Law of God continues in force as explained in the Westminster Confession of Faith, that all areas of life are to be lived in joyful subjection to it and that the world will one day recognize this, by the sovereign power of the Holy Spirit of God (i.e., I am a Postmillennialist). Yet, no Christian who knows me would for a moment entertain the suggestion that I am anti-semitic.

I am a minister in the Christian Reformed Church in North America. In addition to a Jewish pastor, our local church has

another Jewish Elder, and more than one fourth of our membership is Jewish.

As a minister, I have had numerous opportunities to speak in Reformed and Presbyterian churches not only in the Northeast, but also in the South, Midwest, Southwest, and Canada. In these churches I have presented what seems to me to be the Biblical posture for the church to take toward the Jewish people. This position was summarized by a person dear to the heart of every reconstructionist, John Calvin, in his *Institutes* (IV, XVI, 14).

> (S)alvation depends on God's mercy, which He extends to whom He pleases [Romans 9:15-16]; . . . there is no reason for the Jews to preen themselves and boast in the name of the covenant unless they keep the law of the covenant, that is, obey the Word.
>
> Nevertheless, when Paul cast them down from vain confidence in their kindred, he still saw, on the other hand, that the covenant which God had made once for all with the descendants of Abraham could in no way be made void. Consequently, in the eleventh chapter (of Romans) he argues that Abraham's physical progeny must not be deprived of their dignity. By virtue of this, he teaches, the Jews are the first and natural heirs of the gospel, except to the extent that by their ungratefulness they were forsaken as unworthy—*yet forsaken in such a way that the heavenly blessing has not departed utterly from their nation.* For this reason, despite their stubbornness and covenant-breaking, Paul still calls them [i.e., unbelieving Israel, SMS] holy [Rom. 11:16]. . . . (D)espite the great obstinacy with which they continue to wage war against the gospel, we must not despise them, while we consider that, for the sake of the promise, *God's blessing still rests among them.* Emphasis added.

Those hearing a debate between postmillennial reconstructionists and premillennial dispensationalists might be interested to know that the existence of the State of Israel was a concern much discussed by *postmillennialists* before William Blackstone (author of the famous late 19th-century Christian Zionist tome *Jesus is Coming*) was old enough to be bar mitzvah!

An article in the *British and Foreign Evangelical Review* in 1857 asked the question in its title: "Will the Jews, as a Nation, be Restored to their own Land?" This question was answered affirmatively; the (unsigned) article concluded that Scripture taught that the Jews must be restored to their land if certain prophecies would be fulfilled. But contra dispensationalism, the article asserted, "*The condition of the restoration . . . is repentance, true religion.* But it is agreed on all hands—with exceptions that need not detain us—that the Jews, as a nation, *will* be converted to Christianity, at some time yet future. The condition *then* will be complied with" (p. 818).

This excerpt highlights the difference between the attitude of the reconstructionist and the dispensationalist toward the nation of Israel. Dispensationalists believe that the Jewish people have a title to the land that transcends virtually any other consideration, including unbelief, rebellion, and hatred toward Christ and His church. Consequently, anti-zionism is equated with anti-semitism.

The reconstructionist, on the other hand, makes a distinction. He believes that the Jewish people may exercise the title only when they comply with the condition of repentance and faith. He has nothing against Jews living in "eretz yisrael" per se, but he recognizes that the far more significant question is Israel's faith. In light of this, it might be appropriate to ask which theological system has the true and best interests of the Jew close to its heart? If one's heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel agrees with the inspired Apostle's as recorded in Romans 10, can he thereby be called anti-semitic?

It is of more than passing interest that the above-mentioned article refers to the Jewish people as "a standing miracle, an ever-existing monument of the truth of prophecy." The author also maintained that, "the Jews, as a nation, *will* be converted to Christianity. . . . This is so clearly taught in the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans that one could scarcely deny it and retain his Christian character" (p. 812). Yet, he felt compelled to offer this disclaimer in a footnote: "It is proper for (the author) to

state emphatically that he has no sympathy whatever with any Millenarian (i.e., Premillennial) theory, and that he considers all such ideas, and especially such as involve the personal reign of our Savior (from earthly Jerusalem), as merely carnal and Judaizing."

As early as 1847 the great Dr. David Brown (of Jamieson, Faussett & Brown fame) wrote of his conviction that the Jews would one day again possess the Land of Israel. But he labored carefully to emphasize the point that whatever occupation of the land they may enjoy outside of Christ, that would *not* be the fulfillment of the promised restoration. Dr. Brown, in his mature years wrote a most stimulating, and characteristically irenic book on the subject. Both dispensationalists *and* reconstructionists would profit from reading *The Restoration of the Jews: The History, Principles, and Bearings of the Question* (Edinburgh: Alexander, Strahan & Co., 1861).

Now, whatever any individual Christian reconstructionist might say, either from ignorance or honest disagreement, it can hardly be maintained that reconstructionism itself is anti-semitic. Calvin's position (as excerpted above) is mine, and I am a "reconstructionist." I can testify that while not every reconstructionist would agree with my position, my views on this issue are not only *accepted* within the reconstructionist world as being perfectly consistent with the system, but sought out.

This being the case, I think it would be best to bury the charge of anti-semitism in the sea of disproved contentions. If you should meet or read a reconstructionist who is, in fact, anti-semitic, please put him in touch with me. And as for me, if I should meet a dispensationalist who really believes that the church's efforts to reach the Jews with the Gospel will be successful, I'll be sure to send him to you so that you can convince him of the futility of his optimism!

It seems to me that this is what has occurred: Some dispensationalists have accepted the unbelieving Jewish expectations of the Messianic Kingdom as correct. They have, thereby, taken sides with Rabbinical Judaism against Christ's "Judaism," or Kingdom. They then cite the existence of the State of Israel as proof of their

assertions, define themselves as the true protectors of the Jews, and, with the arrogance that so often accompanies such pragmatic paternalism, declare that all those who don't agree with their theology are, in principle, anti-semitic. Hogwash (i.e., non-kosher argumentation).

I trust this letter has served to provoke more careful thinking about this most important subject. To be sure, the last word has not been said. It is my judgment that the interpretation of prophecy requires more patience and care than most other areas of theology. This being the case, we are more faithful servants of Christ and the church when we allow latitude in this area, all other areas being orthodox. In this way, it may be that our efforts may turn toward more productive cooperation in achieving what we both desire: glory to God through the conversion of sinners, both Jewish and Gentile.

Steve M. Schlissel
Messiah's Christian Reformed Church
Brooklyn, New York

"Magnify the Lord with me; let us exalt His name together" (Psalm 34:3).

FOR FURTHER READING

by Gary North

"You can't beat something with nothing!" So says an old political proverb. You have just read a critique of Hal Lindsey's *The Road to Holocaust*. Maybe you have at least a few doubts about what he says. But you may not be ready to re-think everything you have always believed about Bible ethics and prophecy. You want evidence that you are not being asked to give up everything, getting little in return. You want evidence that there is something better. You also want evidence that dispensational theology really is incorrect.

That is what this brief reading list will provide: Bible-based evidence. A longer version appears in the book, *House Divided: The Break-Up of Dispensational Theology* (Tyler, TX: Institute for Christian Economics, 1989). But this will surely get you started.

If you are a typical dispensationalist, you have not been told that other eschatological and ethical views are all centuries older than yours, and that a large body of literature, scholarly and popular, has in the past been readily available to Bible-believing Christians. This is part of the great cover-up. Now you know better.

If you refuse to read books, read Psalm 110. Read First Corinthians 15. Jesus sits at God's right hand in heaven. He will remain there until His last enemy is defeated: *death* (I Cor. 15:25-26). Jesus will not return physically until He is ready to put an end to all death—physical death—at the final judgment. Psalm 110 is the Old Testament passage quoted most often in the New Testament, and it was the most widely quoted Old Testament passage until the middle of the second century. It is a verse that cannot be explained sensibly by premillennialism.

A Positive Ethical Alternative: Biblical Law

Bahnsen, Greg L. *By This Standard: The Authority of God's Law Today.* Tyler, TX; Institute for Christian Economics, 1985.

Bahnsen, Greg L. *Theonomy and Christian Ethics.* Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Prersbyterian & Reformed, (1977) 1984.

Jordan, James. *The Law of the Covenant: An Exposition of Exodus 21-23.* Tyler, TX: Institute for Christian Economics, 1984.

North, Gary. *Tools of Dominion: The Case Laws of Exodus.* 2 vols. Tyler, TX: Institute for Christian Economics, 1989.

Rushdoony, Rousas John. *The Institutes of Biblical Law.* Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian & Reformed, (1973) 1988.

Rushdoony, Rousas John. *Law and Liberty.* Vallecito, CA: Ross House Books, (1971) 1988.

A Positive Eschatological Alternative: Postmillennialism

Alexander, J. A. *The Prophecies of Isaiah, A Commentary on Matthew* (complete through chapter 16), *A Commentary on Mark*, and *A Commentary on Acts.* Various Publishers; Zondervan especially. Nineteenth-century Princeton Seminary Old Testament scholar.

Brown, John. *The Discourses and Sayings of Our Lord* and commentaries on Romans, Hebrews, and 1 Peter. Various publishers. Nineteenth-century Scottish Calvinist.

Campbell, Roderick. *Israel and the New Covenant.* Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian & Reformed, [1954] 1981. Neglected study of principles for interpretation of prophecy; examines themes in New Testament biblical theology. A very good, easy-to-read introduction.

Chilton, David. *The Days of Vengeance: An Exposition of the Book of Revelation.* Ft. Worth, TX: Dominion Press. Massive postmillennial commentary on the Book of Revelation.

Chilton, David. *The Great Tribulation.* Ft. Worth, TX: Dominion Press, 1987. Popular exegetical introduction to postmillennial interpretation.

Chilton, David. *Paradise Restored: A Biblical Theology of Dominion.* Tyler, TX: Dominion Press, 1985. Study of prophetic symbolism, the coming of the Kingdom, and the book of Revelation. This is the book that sent Mr. Lindsey into orbit.

Davis, John Jefferson. *Christ's Victorious Kingdom: Postmillennialism Reconsidered.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1986. Biblical and historical defense of postmillennialism.

Gentry, Kenneth L. *The Beast of Revelation.* Tyler, TX: Institute for Christian Economics, 1989. Identifies of the beast in the Book of Revelation. He's dead now, so we can all sleep soundly again.

Gentry, Kenneth L. *Before Jerusalem Fell.* Tyler, TX: Institute for Christian Economics, 1989. Exhaustively researched study on the dating of the Book of Revelation. Ends the myth of the 96 A.D. date. The book had to be written prior to 70 A.D.

Henry, Matthew. *Matthew Henry's Commentary.* 6 volumes. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1714. Popular commentary on the whole Bible.

Kik, J. Marcellus. *An Eschatology of Victory.* N.p.: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1975. Exegetical studies of Matthew 24 and Revelation 20.

Murray, Iain. *The Puritan Hope: Revival and the Interpretation of Prophecy.* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1971). Historical study of postmillennialism in England and Scotland.

North, Gary, ed. *The Journal of Christian Reconstruction*, Symposium on the Millennium (Winter 1976-77). Historical and theological essays on postmillennialism. Out of print.

North, Gary. *75 Bible Questions Your Instructor Prays You Won't Ask.* Tyler, TX: Institute for Christian Economics (1984) 1988.

North, Gary. *Unconditional Surrender: God's Program for Victory.* Tyler, TX: Institute for Christian Economics, (1981) 1988.

Rushdoony, Rousas John. *Thy Kingdom Come: Studies in Daniel and Revelation.* Fairfax, Virginia: Thoburn Press, (1970) 1978. Exegetical studies in Daniel and Revelation, full of insightful comments on history and society.

Sutton, Ray R. "Covenantal Postmillennialism," *Covenant Renewal* (February 1989). Published by the Institute for Christian Economics, P. O. Box 8000, Tyler, TX 75711. Free.

Terry, Milton S. *Biblical Apocalyptics: A Study of the Most Notable Revelations of God and of Christ.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, [1898] 1988. Nineteenth-century exegetical studies of prophetic passages in Old and New Testaments; includes a complete commentary on Revelation.

Postmillennialism and the Jews

De Jong, J. A. *As the Waters Cover the Sea: Millennial Expectations in the Rise of Anglo-American Missions 1640-1810.* Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1970. General history of millennial views; throughout mentions the importance of prophecies concerning the Jews. Out of print.

Fairbairn, Patrick. *The Prophetic Prospects of the Jews, or, Fairbairn vs. Fairbairn.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1930. Nineteenth-century scholar Fairbairn changed his mind about the conversion of the Jews; this volume reproduces his early arguments for the historic postmillennial position, and his later arguments against it.

Hodge, Charles. *A Commentary on Romans.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, (1864). See his exposition of Romans 11. The great Princeton Seminary theologian discusses the conversion of the Jews and the coming of millennial blessings.

Murray, John. *The Epistle to the Romans.* 2 vols. in one. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1968. See his exposition of Romans 11. It was Murray's exposition that converted me from dispensationalism to postmillennialism. Mr. Lindsey quotes him as if Murray had been a dispensationalist. Strange.

Sutton, Ray R. "A Postmillennial Jew (The Covenantal Structure of Romans 11)," *Covenant Renewal* (June 1989). Sutton reports on his conversation with a postmillennial Messianic Jew! Published by the Institute for Christian Economics, P. O. Box 8000, Tyler, TX 75711. Free.

Sutton, Ray R. "Does Israel Have a Future?" *Covenant Renewal* (December 1988). Examines several different views of Israel's future, and argues for the covenantal view. Free.

Toon, Peter, ed. *Puritans, the Millennium and the Future of Israel: Puritan Eschatology 1600-1660.* Cambridge: James Clarke, 1970. Detailed historical study of millennial views with special attention to the place of Israel in prophecy. Out of print.

Works Critical of Dispensationalism

Allis, Oswald T. *Prophecy and the Church.* Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1945. Classic comprehensive critique of dispensationalism. It has never been refuted.

Bacchiocchi, Samuele. *Hal Lindsey's Prophetic Jigsaw Puzzle: Five Predictions That Failed!* Berrien Springs, MI: Biblical Perspectives, 1987. Examines Lindsey's failed prophecies, yet argues for an imminent Second Coming. The author is a Seventh Day Adventist scholar.

Bahnsen, Greg L. and Kenneth L. Gentry. *House Divided: The Break-Up of Dispensational Theology.* Tyler, TX: Institute for Christian Economics. Response to H. Wayne House and Thomas Ice, *Dominion Theology: Blessing or Curse?.* A devastating refutation that leaves modern dispensational theology without a theological leg to stand on. It ends the debate.

Boettner, Loraine. *The Millennium.* Revised edition. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, [1957] 1984. Classic study of millennial views, and defense of postmillennialism.

Brown, David. *Christ's Second Coming: Will It Be Premillennial?* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, [1976] 1983. Detailed exegetical study of the Second Coming and the Millennium.

Crenshaw, Curtis I. and Grover E. Gunn, III. *Dispensationalism Today, Yesterday, and Tomorrow.* Memphis, TN: Footstool Publications, 1985. Two Dallas Seminary graduates take a critical and comprehensive look at dispensationalism.

DeMar, Gary. *The Debate Over Christian Reconstruction.* Ft. Worth, TX: Dominion Press, 1988. Response to Dave Hunt and Thomas Ice.

DeMar, Gary and Peter Leithart. *The Reduction of Christianity: A Biblical Response to Dave Hunt.* Ft. Worth, TX: Dominion Press, 1988. Critique of Dave Hunt, and historical and biblical defense of postmillennialism.

Gerstner, John H. *A Primer on Dispensationalism.* Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1982. Brief critique of dispensationalism's "division" of the Bible.

Kimball, William R. *What the Bible Says About the Great Tribulation.* Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1983. Re-examines the Olivet Discourse and the supposed biblical basis for the notion of a future tribulation.

Kimball, William R. *The Rapture: A Question of Timing.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1985. Exegetical critique of the pre-trib rapture theory.

Poythress, Vern S. *Understanding Dispensationalists.* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan/Academie, 1987. Irenic (i.e., kind of wimpy) interaction with dispensationalism, focussing on hermeneutical issues. Good reading for dispensational theology professors, who may not realize that he is cutting their theological arteries as they read.

The History of Dispensationalism

Bass, Clarence B. *Backgrounds to Dispensationalism: Its Historical Genesis and Ecclesiastical Implications.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1960. Massively researched history of dispensationalism, with focus on J. N. Darby.

McPherson, Dave. *The Incredible Cover-Up.* Medford, OR: Omega Publications, 1975. Revisionist study of the origins of the pre-trib rapture doctrine.

Weber, Timothy P. *Living in the Shadow of the Second Coming: American Premillennialism 1875-1982.* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan/Academie, 1983. Touches on American dispensationalism in a larger historical and social context.

Wilson, Dwight. *Armageddon Now!* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1977. A devastating study of sixty years of failed dispensational prophecies. Find out who the Antichrist really was, decade by decade, 1917-1977! One by one, they died. Each time, they killed off another piece of dispensationalism. Soon to be republished by the Institute for Christian Economics.

Books Critical of Hal Lindsey

Boersma, T. *Is the Bible a Jigsaw Puzzle: An Evaluation of Hal Lindsey's Writings.* Ontario, Canada: Paideia Press, 1978. An examination of Lindsey's interpretive method, and exegesis of important prophetic passages. Out of print.

Miladin, George C. *Is This Really the End?: A Reformed Analysis of* **The Late Great Planet Earth.** Cherry Hill, NJ: Mack Publishing, 1972. Brief response to Hal Lindsey's prophetic works; concludes with a defense of postmillennial optimism. Out of print.

Vanderwaal, C. *Hal Lindsey and Biblical Prophecy.* Ontario, Canada: Paideia Press, 1978. Lively critique of dispensationalism and Hal Lindsey by a Reformed scholar and pastor. Out of print.

General Works on the Millennium

Clouse, Robert G., ed. *The Meaning of the Millennium: Four Views.* Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1977. The four major views of the millennium presented by advocates of each view.

Erickson, Millard J. *Contemporary Options in Eschatology: A Study of the Millennium.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1977. Examines modern views of eschatology, the millennium, and the tribulation.