



The Sword & The Plow

Newsletter of the Bimillennial Preterist Association

Vol. X, No. 7 – August 2008

Lights Out on Liberty

Mark Steyn

Editor's Note: Reprinted from Imprimis a publication of Hillsdale College, based upon a speech by the author March 13, 2008. Imprimis is available free from Hillsdale College upon request.

On August 3, 1914, on the eve of the First World War, British Foreign Secretary Sir Edward Grey stood at the window of his office in the summer dusk and observed, “The lamps are going out all over Europe.” Today, the lights are going out on liberty all over the Western world, but in a more subtle and profound way. Much of the West is far too comfortable with state regulation of speech and expression, which puts freedom itself at risk. Let me cite some examples: The response of the European Union Commissioner for Justice, Freedom, and Security to the crisis over the Danish cartoons that sparked Muslim violence was to propose that newspapers exercise “prudence” on certain controversial subjects involving religions beginning with the letter “I.” At the end of her life, the Italian writer Oriana Fallaci – after writing on the contradiction between Islam and the Western tradition of liberty – was being sued in France, Italy, Switzerland, and most other European jurisdictions by groups who believed her opinions were not merely offensive, but criminal. In France, author Michel Houellebecq was sued by Muslim and other “anti-racist groups” who believed the opinions of a fictional

character in one of his novels were likewise criminal.

In Canada, the official complaint about my own so-called “flagrant Islamophobia” – filed by the Canadian Islamic Congress – attributes to me the following “assertions”: America will be an Islamic Republic by 2040. There will be a break for Muslim prayers during the Super Bowl. There will be a religious police enforcing Islamic norms. The USS Ronald Reagan will be renamed after Osama bin Laden. Females will not be allowed to be cheerleaders. Popular American radio and TV hosts will be replaced by Imams.

In fact, I didn’t “assert” any of these things. They are plot twists I cited in my review of Robert Ferrigno’s novel, *Prayers for the Assassin*. It’s customary in reviewing novels to cite aspects of the plot. For example, a review of *Moby Dick* will usually mention the whale. These days, apparently, the Canadian Islamic Congress and the government’s human rights investigators (who have taken up the case) believe that describing the plot of a novel should be illegal.

You may recall that Margaret Atwood, some years back, wrote a novel about her own dystopian theocratic fantasy, in which American was a Christian tyranny named the Republic of Gilead. What’s to stop a Christian group from dragging a dotting reviewer of Margaret Atwood’s book in front of a Canadian human rights court? As it happens, Christian groups

tend not to do that, which is just as well, because otherwise there wouldn't be a lot to write about.

These are small parts of a very big picture. After the London Tube bombings and the French riots a few years back, commentators lined up behind the idea that Western Muslims are insufficiently assimilated. But in their mastery of legalisms and the language of victimology, they're superbly assimilated. Since these are the principal means of discourse in multicultural societies, they've mastered all they need to know. Every day of the week, somewhere in the West, a Muslim lobbying group is engaging in an action similar to what I'm facing in Canada. Meanwhile, in London, masked men marched through the streets with signs reading "Behead the Enemies of Islam" and promising another 9/11 and another Holocaust, all while being protected by a phalanx of London policeman.

Thus, we see that today's multicultural societies tolerate the explicitly intolerant and avowedly unicultural, while refusing to tolerate anyone pointing out that intolerance. It's been that way for 20 years now, ever since Valentine's Day 1989, when the Ayatollah Khomeini issued his fatwa against the novelist Salman Rushdie, a British subject, and shortly thereafter large numbers of British Muslims marched through English cities openly calling for Rushdie to be killed. A reader in Bradford wrote to me recalling asking a West Yorkshire policeman on the street that day why the various "Muslim community leaders" weren't being arrested for incitement to murder. The office said they'd been told to "play it cool." The calls for blood got more raucous. My correspondent asked his question again. The policeman told him to "Push off" (he expressed the sentiment rather more Anglo-Saxonly, but let that pass) "or I'll arrest you." Mr. Rushdie was infuriated when the then Archbishop of Canterbury lapsed into root-cause mode. "I well understand the devout Muslims' reaction, wounded by what they hold most dear and would themselves die for," said His Grace. Rushdie replied tersely: "There is only one person around here who is in any danger of dying."

And that's the way it's gone ever since. For all the talk about rampant "Islamophobia," it's usually only the other party who is "in any danger of dying."

War on the Homefront

I wrote my book *America Alone* because I wanted to reframe how we thought about the War on Terror – an insufficient and evasive designation that has long since outlasted whatever usefulness it may once have had. It remains true that we are good at military campaigns, such as those in Iraq and Afghanistan. Our tanks and ships are better, and our bombs and soldiers are smarter. But these are not ultimately the most important battlefronts. We do indeed face what the strategists call asymmetric warfare, but it is not in the Sunni triangle or the Hindu Kush. We face it right here in the Western world.

Norman Podhoretz, among others, has argued that we are engaged in a second Cold War. But it might be truer to call it a Cold Civil War, by which I mean a war within the West, a war waged in our major cities. We now have Muslim "honor killings," for instance, not just in tribal Pakistan and Yemen, but in Germany and the Netherlands, in Toronto and Dallas. And even if there were no battles in Iraq and Afghanistan, and if no one was flying planes into tall buildings in New York City or blowing up larinas, buses, and nightclubs in Madrid, Long, and Bali, we would still be in danger of losing this war without a shot being fired.

The British government recently announced that it would be issuing Sharia-compliant Islamic bonds – that is, bonds compliant with Islamic law and practice as prescribed in the Koran. This is another reason to be in favor of small government: The bigger government gets, the more it must look for funding in some pretty unusual places – in this case wealth Saudis. As *The Mail on Sunday* put it, this invocation marks "one of the most significant economic advances of Sharia law in the non-Muslim world."

At about the same time, *The Times* of London reported that "Knorbert the piglet has been dropped as the mascot of Fortis Bank, after it decided to stop giving piggy banks to children for fear of offending Muslims." Now, I'm no Islamic scholar, but Mohammed expressed no view regarding Knorbert the piglet. There's not a single sura about it. The Koran, an otherwise exhaustive text, is silent on the matter of anthropomorphic porcine representation.

I started keeping a file on pig controversies a couple of years ago, and you would be surprised

at how routine they have become. Recently, for instance, a local government council prohibited its workers from having knickknacks on their desks representing Winnie the Pooh's sidekick Piglet. As Pastor Martin Neimoller might have said, "First they came for Piglet and I did not speak out because I was not a Disney character, and if I was, I'd be more of an Eeyore. Then they came for the Three Little Pigs and Babe, and by the time I realized the Western world had turned into a 24/7 Looney Tunes, it was too late, because there was no Porky Pig to stammer, "Th-th-th-that's all folks!" and bring the nightmare to an end."

What all these stories have in common is excessive deference to – and in fact fear of – Islam. If the story of the Three Little Pigs is forbidden when Muslims still comprise less than ten percent of Europe's population, what else will be on the black list when they comprise 20 percent? In small but telling ways, non-Muslim communities are being persuaded that a kind of uber-Islamic law now applies to all. And if you don't remember the Three Little Pigs, by the way, one builds a house of straw, another of sticks, and both get blown down by the Big Bad Wolf. Western Civilization is a mighty house of bricks, but you don't need a Big Bad Wolf when the pig is so eager to demolish the house himself. I would argue that these incremental concessions to Islam are ultimately a bigger threat than terrorism. What matters is not what the lads in the Afghan cave – the "extremists" – believe, but what the non-extremists believe, what people who are for the most part law-abiding taxpayers of functioning democracies believe. For example, a recent poll found that 36 percent of Muslims between the ages of 16 and 24 believe that those who convert to another religion should be punished by death. That's not 36 percent of young Muslims in Waziristan or Yemen or Sudan, but 36 percent of young Muslims in the United Kingdom. Forty percent of British Muslims would like to live under Sharia – in Britain. Twenty percent have sympathy for the July 7 Tube bombers. And, given that Islam is the principal source of population growth in every city down the spine of England from Manchester to Sheffield to Birmingham to London, and in every major Western European city, these statistics are not without significance for the future.

Because I discussed these facts in print, my publisher is now being sued before three

Canadian human rights commissions. The plaintiff in my case is Dr. Hohamed Elmasry, a man who announced on Canadian TV that he approves of the murder of all Israeli civilians over the age of 18. He is thus an objective supporter of terrorism. I don't begrudge him the right to his opinions, but I wish he felt the same about mine. Far from that, posing as a leader of the "anti-hate" movement in Canada, he is using the squeamishness of a politically correct society to squash freedom.

As the famous saying goes, the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. What the Canadian Islamic Congress and similar groups in the West are trying to do is criminalize vigilance. They want to use the legal system to circumscribe debate on one of the great questions of the age: the relationship between Islam and the West and the increasing Islamization of much of the Western world, in what the United Nations itself calls the fastest population transformation in history.

Slippery Slope

Our democratic governments today preside over multicultural societies that have less and less glue holding them together. They've grown conformable with the idea of the state as the mediator between interest groups. And confronted by growing and resistive Muslim populations, they're increasingly at ease with the idea of regulating freedom in the interests of social harmony.

It's a different situation in America, which has the First Amendment and a social consensus that increasingly does not exist in Europe. Europe's consensus seems to be that Danish cartoonists should be able to draw what they like, but not if it sparks Islamic violence. It is certainly odd that the requirement of self-restraint should only apply to one party.

Last month, in a characteristically clotted speech followed by a rather more careless BBC interview, the Archbishop of Canterbury said that it was dangerous to have on law for everyone and that the introduction of Sharia to the United Kingdom was "inevitable." Within days of His Grace's remarks, the British and Ontario governments both confirmed that thousand of polygamous men in their jurisdictions are receiving welfare payments for each of their wives. Kipling wrote that East is East and West is West, and ne'er the twain shall

meet. But when the twain do meet, you often wind up with the worst of both worlds. Say what you like about polygamist in Waziristan or Somalia, but he has to do it on his own diem. To collect a welfare check for each spouse, he has to move to London or Toronto. Government-subsidized polygamy is an innovation of the Western world.

If you need another reason to be Opposed to socialized health care, one reason is because it fosters the insouciant attitude to basic hygiene procedures that has led to the rise of deadly “super-bugs.” I see British Muslim nurses in public hospitals riddled with *C. difficile* are refusing to comply with hygiene procedures on the grounds that scrubbing requires them to bare their arms, which is un-Islamic. Which is a thought to ponder just before you go under the anesthetic. I mentioned to some of Hillsdale’s students in class that gay-bashing is on the rise in the most famously “tolerant” cities in Europe. As *Der Spiegel* reported, “With the number of homophobic attacks rising in the Dutch metropolis, Amsterdam officials are commissioning a study to determine why Moroccan men are targeting the city’s gays.”

Gee, whiz. That’s a toughie. Wonder what the reason could be. But don’t worry, the brain trust at the University of Amsterdam is on top of things: “Half of the crimes were committed by men of Moroccan origin and researchers believe they felt stigmatized by society and responded by attacking people they felt were lower on the social ladder. Another working theory is that the attackers may be struggling with their own sexual identity.”

Bingo! Telling young Moroccan men they’re closeted homosexuals seems certain to lessen tensions in the city! While you’re at it, a lot of those Turks seem a bit light in their loafers, don’t you think?

Our Suicidal Urge

So don’t worry, nothing’s happening. Just a few gay Muslims frustrated at the lack of gay Muslim nightclubs. Sharia in Britain? Taxpayer-subsidized polygamy in Toronto? Yawn. Nothing to see here. True, if you’d suggested such things on September 10, 2001, most Britons and Canadians would have said you were nuts. But a few years on and it doesn’t seem such a

big deal, nor will the next concession, or the one after that.

The assumption that you can hop on the Sharia Express and just ride a couple of stops is one almighty lead of faith. More to the point, who are you relying on to “hold the line”? Influential figures like the Archbishop of Canterbury? The politically correct bureaucrats at Canada’s Human Rights Commissions? The geniuses who run Harvard, and who’ve just introduced gender-segregated swimming and gym sessions at the behest of Harvard’s Islamic Society? (Would they have done that for Amish or Mennonite students?) The Western world is not run by fellows notes for their line-holding: Look at what they’re conceding now and then try to figure out what they’ll be conceding in five years’ time. The idea that the West’s multicultural establishment can hold the line would be more plausible if it was clear they had any idea where the line is, or even gave any indication of believing in one.

My book, supposedly Islamaphobic, isn’t even really about Islam. The single most important line in it is the profound observation, by historian Arnold Toynbee, that “Civilizations die from suicide, not murder.” One manifestation of that suicidal urge is illiberal notions harnessed in the cause of liberalism. In calling for the introduction of Sharia, the Archbishop of Canterbury joins a long list of Western appeasers, including a Dutch cabinet minister who said if the country were to vote to introduce Islamic law that would be fine by him, and the Swedish cabinet minister who said we should be nice to Muslims now so that Muslims will be nice to us when they’re in the majority.

Ultimately, our crisis is not about Islam. It’s not about fire-breathing Imams or polygamists whooping it up on welfare. It’s not about them. It’s about us. And by us I mean the culture that shaped the modern world, and established the global networks, legal systems, and trading relationships on which the planet depends.

To reprise Sir Edward Grey, the lamps are going out all over the world, and an awful lot of the map will look an awful lot darker by the time many Americans realize the scale of this struggle.

THE SEMANTICS OF RATIONAL PRETERISM

Or

Looking at the looking Glass vs. Stepping into it,

or

Literalism vs. Semantics.

By Morrison Lee

When I use a word," said Humpty-Dumpty in a rather scornful tone, "It means just what I want it to mean – neither more nor less."

In this brief article I'd like to suggest another idea to those who say "*the bible must be taken literally and only literally.*" I'd like to begin with a parallel with Alice in Wonderland. It began when a seven year old girl peered at the mirror.

At and Into When Alice peered *at* her looking glass she only saw herself, however when Alice stepped *into* the looking glass, she entered another world that ran completely counter to her natural understanding, a world of which she had no experience. It was a world of: bodiless cats, where hookah-smoking blue caterpillars gave advice and feisty eggs sat on walls, where rabbits checked watches, crazy hatters drank tea, people shrank and grew at will and playing cards played croquet - a magical world of logical and semantic nonsense, all of it conjured by a sublime Oxford mathematician.

The rules of the Game The philosophers of language tell us that each language has its own rules, and that you cannot play another person's language-game by imposing the rules from your own language – like you can't play cricket according to the laws of baseball, nor chess by the laws of tennis. Making everything in the bible *literal-to-yourself* is like looking *at yourself* instead of *stepping into the biblical looking glass*. The problem of biblical literalism is that it outfits the prophets in the reader's modern tasseled-loafers, instead of walking in their ancient, stringy, camel-hide sandals.

Counter Intuitive The world of the biblical prophets is non-literal and counter-intuitive, because it does not conform to our modern literal

intuitions of how things should operate. In our ordinary world our intuition informs us of what is 'normal' for words and ideas: we grow up with the rule for understanding patterns of meanings. Sure we can read much of the bible history and make sense of it, but then there are those crazy poetic and prophetic books that just don't seem to fit – they seem to run counter to the way we perceive things to be. Prophet Land is very much like the wonderland of Alice, and understanding them begins by *stepping into* the looking glass. Here is the literalists' worst nightmare. It is a nightmare because the literalist measures ancient, eastern, Hebrew experience by their own modern, western experience, and deny anything beyond their imagination as fiction. Are biblical meanings only literal-to-us? Let's take a quick tour of Prophet Land.

Meanings Not Literal In Prophet Land male ideas rule. Here men can be worms, creatures are not animals, and winds aren't just air, but it is obvious for a priest to be a wall. It is a land with only six kinds of wheels, where above the clouds there is a garden, and clouds are dust, but chariots are also clouds. It is an ancient world which foretells of a super-highway from Egypt to Iran, but strangely no cars travel thereon. The prophets speak of kings as arms, kings as dust, foxes and craniums. Here the dead speak, an army of skeletons arise, and an entire nation is born in a single day. The prophetic world is a world without night, where men have no bodies and suckling babies teach wisdom before they learn language, while people are born in middle-age, and ears are circumcised. In Prophet Land a sea can be; a city of many languages, life, evil, a judgment, the enemy, death, trials, wicked men, or a river, but it is impossible for the sea to be an ocean, while it is possible for men to be islands.

Laws of physics not followed Here the literal laws of physics do not apply, and wheels within each other move in four directions without turning as they move, and in a time before airplanes, people crossed seas without a boat and without getting their feet wet, where unschooled whales act as delivery ferries for personnel, prophets walk over water like stone, and meat exists that is not from an animal, where water flows but not from springs, and cedar trees grow in desert places, and constellations are bound together with chains and cords.

Nature break patterns In the Hebrew prophets the literal rules of instinct are suspended, and instead of babies women give birth to dust, while prey sleep blissfully with their natural predator the lion, and animals break the laws of speech and speak Hebrew freely, and instead of one head and two horns, beasts may have seven heads and ten horns.

Men as Vegetation In Prophet Land men are spoken of as vegetation: men as branches, men as trees, men as fields of wheat, men as grass, men as seeds, and it is acceptable for men to become bread, but they should *never* become leaven.

Men as birds and Insects In the prophets men are spoken of as birds both flying and non-flying: men as doves and men as ostriches without understanding, men as owls, and men as pelicans as well as carrion-feeding eagles and vultures. In this world ants don the instructional robes of teachers, and men multiply and devour like locusts and grasshoppers.

Terrestrial. Animate & inanimate As animals - men as dogs, men as foxes, men as goats, men as lambs, men as lions, men as brute beasts, men as cattle and as vipers. In this wonderland of the imagination men are spoken of as terrestrial. Here men are high mountains, men as hills, men as valleys, men as stones, men as dust of the earth, and men as pits. Here men are spoken of as walls, men as doors, towers, men and nations as ships, but countries are women and there are *no* sons.

Aquatic. Here angry men are as violent as wild waves of the sea driven by the wind, and others as cunning and destructive as hidden reefs. Unfortunate are those fish caught in an evil net, and a poor spirit indeed is the spring without water.

Celestial. Men are spoken of as beings above the earth: good men as predictable and reliable, stable as fixed stars in the firmament, (we still use in the term ‘movie stars’ as high status) wicked men are as falling stars because they have lost their status, and humbled men are in the dust of the earth. Here unstable men wander as planets detached from the ordained paths of moral cause and effect, and empty men disappoint as clouds without rain.

Conclusion

Literalism - The *doubting Thomas* of literalism says biblical terms cannot be figurative, and yet the literature of Futurism cannot supply us with a uniformly-literal semantic base for biblical terms. For two thousand years a *must-be-literal-and-yet-future* perspective of eschatology has cast a kind of mass hypnosis over humanity blinding us to the semantic relations that lie there. Literalism denies Prophet Land exists. The problem with literalism limits biblical meanings to its own small literal store. This prevents further investigation into an ancient, Eastern civilization that is as far removed from us as carts are from rockets. To use another metaphor, hobbles the investigator prior to investigation by demanding conformity without any authority. Where is the authority for 100% literalism? It is a philosophy of men. Futurism does not just impede semantic research into the bible, it outlaws semantic alternatives by dogma - *O ye of little faith*.

Rational Preterism - Conversely Rational Preterism uses an inductive methodology that *looks to biblical use to determine biblical meaning*: it measures the logical relations between the literal claims of Futurism against the logical relations that exist in the prophets. The above is a small sample is what happens when you *step into* the looking glass of the ancient Eastern prophets – when you take off your tasseled loafers and walk in their stringy, camel-hide sandals. Each of the above terms has a book-chapter-verse correspondence to scripture. (It is fun to see how many you recognize). Prophet Land is either a semanticist’s playground or a dogmatists’ worst nightmare, but all this imaginative diversity is meshed together as one single, giant, integrated and unified production of logical intelligence.

-oo0oo-

Rethinking the Kingdom

Kurt Simmons

Adapted from presentation at the 2nd Annual Carlsbad Eschatology Conference

Importance of the Kingdom

Some believe the kingdom has come, others do not. One whole wing of Christendom – premil-dispensationalism – holds that the kingdom has not come. But what if it could be shown that in fact it has come, and was a present reality? That would invalidate that whole system, would it not? That makes understanding the kingdom very important. And, indeed, quite apart from considerations of what we think or say about it, the kingdom of heaven is an enormously important issue because of what the scriptures think and say about it. It is one of the most prominent themes of scripture, New and Old.

We begin to first hear of it with the appointment of David as king, and it gradually builds from there, until it becomes a central theme among the prophets who place it at the very heart of God’s plan for his people; it is the place where all their hopes *intersect*. 1) The kingdom would be **Messianic**; it would be introduced by the promised Seed, the kinsman Redeemer, the seed of David, whose coming was the earnest expectation of Israel: 2) The kingdom would be **redemptive**; it would bring salvation from sin and the doom of death. 3) The kingdom would be **eschatological**; it would mark the culmination of God’s plan; the mystery hidden from the beginning of the world. 4) The kingdom would be **salvific**; it would bring salvation to God’s little flock from fear of their earthly and temporal enemies.

Moving to the NT, we find the kingdom central to Christ’s and the disciples’ teaching: Jesus’ ministry *begins* by announcing the kingdom’s imminence, *ends* by instructing his disciples concerning it, and is punctuated in between with parables about the kingdom.

Tangible Results of Misunderstanding

The intersection of the kingdom with so many themes central to salvation and redemption

means that if we misunderstand it, we will likely take a wrong turn and end up out in the boonies regarding important aspects of these others. For example, Premillennialism operates upon an erroneous concept of the *nature* of the kingdom – Premillennialism sees the kingdom in precisely the same terms Jews in Jesus’ day did – they see it essentially earthly, national, political, and imperialistic. In consequence of this, their whole system of belief about the *very gospel and mission* of Christ is horribly distorted and skewed – To listen to them, the cross and church were *not* part of God’s eternal plan for man’s salvation, but are a mere parentheses, based upon the unforeseen contingency of the Jews’ rejection of Christ – In fact, if things had gone as God intended (according to the Premils), the cross would not have occurred at all and we would all still be in our sins. Big stuff!

And we have only touched the *theological* implications – what about its implications for the *world view* that inures from these ideas? What tangible results come from the premil view of the kingdom? Our support of the modern state of Israel is based in part upon the premillennial paradigm dominate among evangelicals that “he who blesses Israel is blessed, and who curses is cursed” etc. No matter how egregious their violation of Palestinian rights, we support Israel! This has earned us nothing but the resentment and hatred of the Arab world. Would 9/11 have happened if premillennial errors about the nature of the kingdom were not prevalent among evangelicals today?

The back ground I come from defines the kingdom as the *church*. This definition is preferable to Premillennialism’s, but as we will see, it is imperfect itself. This view has it that the church is the “called out” – specifically, called out *of the world* and therefore the church is more or less to be *unconcerned* with things of the world. There is a slightly “monkish” withdrawal from the mundane matters of the world. We are discouraged, even told *not to* preach about issues of culture, society, government in many – maybe even most - of our churches.

The public schools can teach that life *comes* from nothing, *returns* to nothing, and therefore *means* nothing, but the pulpit is not supposed to say *anything*; they can teach tolerance of immoral lifestyles and educate pre-pubescent children about sex; have them read books entitled “Heather has two mommies” “Johnnie has two daddies,” they can subtly teach the liberal social agenda and world view, but the pulpit is expected to remain *silent*. Preachers are politely told *only to preach the gospel*. It is easy to see where *that* definition of the kingdom and church will lead and has led. 70-90% loss of our children to the world! Admittedly, we are not to love the world, or the things in the world. But neither are we to be unconcerned for the world either – Souls are in the balance! 10’s, 100’s of millions of school children are being led down the road to hell and destruction; and we cannot even talk about the elephant standing in the room.

Yes, misunderstanding the kingdom has real, tangible consequences in terms of human souls and the sort of world we live in.

A third definition of the kingdom is that prevalent at the nation’s birth. Many of the founding fathers saw the kingdom as Christ’s rule and dominion over the world, and that *all* of our institutions – be it government, marriage, culture, society, husband wife, parent child - ought to bear the imprint of Christ’s rule. I would submit that this view is *much more* in accord with biblical teaching. In fact, it seems to be to be a *synthesis* of the two: The one that would make it purely earthly; the other that would make it purely spiritual and other worldly. Here is my working definition of the kingdom:

The kingdom speaks to the restored spiritual and temporal dominion of the saints through Christ and the gospel.

In the Beginning

To gain a proper sense and view of the kingdom it is helpful to start at the beginning.

God created man in his image. If asked, most of us would probably say that this image was essentially moral and spiritual; God impressed man with his moral and spiritual attributes – the fruits of the spirit – but that when man fell, the

image of God was lost or defaced in Adam’s biological descendants.

When man sinned, he lost the inspiration of God; he became carnal, sold under sin and death. Instead of *having* dominion, he came *under* dominion. In churches where the kingdom is defined as the *church*, redeeming man from bondage of sin and death is a well understood aspect of the kingdom – *perhaps to the exclusion of all else*. That brings us to the next part of Adam’s participation in the divine image. In the beginning, God gave Adam *world-dominion*: In fact, this is the *only aspect* of Adam’s creation that is *expressly connected* with the image of God. We discern, we deduce that the divine image involved man’s moral faculties, but it is in the context of *dominion* that this image is first expressed:

Gen. 1:26 - And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.

So, part of the divine image of Adam’s sonship (Lk. 3:31) was *dominion*. Although this is the only aspect of man’s image that is expressly stated in scripture, the idea of dominion is largely omitted from discussion about the kingdom. We tend to focus on spiritual justification, and overlook *temporal dominion* almost entirely.

The dominion given to Adam *as a son* was lost through sin. Spiritual dominion was lost to sin; temporal dominion was lost to the sons of disobedience. The world *quickly* came under the power and dominion of the wicked. They were like weeds that spread and took over. By the time we get to Genesis six, existence of a righteous seed is at the threshold of perishing. Through mixed marriages with the daughters of unbelievers, a righteous seed was imperiled in the earth, and the world is filled with violence. To prevent the complete extinction of a righteous seed, God brought in a flood upon the *kosmos* of the ungodly.

The flood wipes out the whole population of man, save Noah and his sons. 101 years after the flood, man is living in a single socio-political community where the wicked – Nimrod and his successors – are in power. The common

language of mankind, contributes to their having a single culture and political community, and the righteous seed is *again* threatened in the earth.

God must divinely intervene a *second* time lest the wicked choke out the righteous seed. He confounds man's language so that they disband and spread across the face of the earth, and form themselves into smaller socio-political groups and nations.

That is a brief survey of Genesis 1-11. In Gen. 12 we are introduced to Abraham, whom God calls to leave his county and kin that God might make of him a *separate nation*. Among God's promises to Abraham was that he would be *heir of the world*.

Rom. 4:13 - For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, [was] not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith.

World dominion would be returned to the saints in and through Abraham's seed.

In forming the seed of Abraham into the nation of Israel, God's purpose is to keep them pure from the nations around them; he wanted to preserve a righteous seed in the earth in order to work out his great plan. Meanwhile, however, dominion of the world was clearly in the hands of unregenerate and uncircumcised men: Babel, Egypt, Philistia - all the great powers of the world were of the **lost**.

Kingdom of Solomon – A Type

We now skip ahead to the Davidic throne and the kingdom of Solomon:

*II Sam. 7:12-14 - And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy **seed** after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his **kingdom**. He shall build an house for my name, and I will stablish the **throne** of his kingdom for ever. I will be his father, and he shall be my **son**.*

The immediate referent here is to Solomon, but it is plain that its ultimate object is Christ. Solomon and Solomon's *reign* were typical of Christ and Christ's reign. Like the world dominion promised to Abraham and his seed, Solomon was given world dominion in *typological prophecy* of Christ

Ps. 72:8-11 – [A psalm entitled a “psalm for Solomon”] He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth....Yea, all kings shall fall down before him: all nations shall serve him.

Solomon's kingdom was the world power of its day; Egypt was in the decline, and Assyrio-Babylonian power had not yet risen. All the kingdoms of the Mediterranean world brought tribute to Solomon and were subject to him.

It is important to understand the typological nature of Solomon's kingdom because of the light it sheds upon the Kingdom of Christ. The Messiah would bring back the glory days of Solomon. The Messiah was to lead *spiritual Israel* to world dominion, just as Solomon had led national Israel to world dominion.

However, meanwhile, apart from the brief moment when Solomon's kingdom was the power of its day, the world power lay with the wicked. Egypt, Midian, Moab, Ammon, Edom, Assyria, Babylon, Persia, Greece, Rome – all trod upon the people and nation.

Isa. 25:13 – O Lord our God, other lords beside thee have had dominion over us:

Matt. 11:12 – And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence and the violent take it by force.

But this was all going to change: the restoration of the captivity from Babylon and the revival of the political kingdom were foreshadows of the world dominion that would belong to the saints in Christ.

Kingdom and Dominion Restored

We see the restored kingdom and glory in Daniel: Daniel is in captivity in Babylon: God gave him a vision of the glory to come:

*Dan. 7:13, 14 - I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the **Son of man** came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was **given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away,***

and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.

I don't know of *any one* in my church background that doesn't acknowledge this as Christ's *coronation at his ascension*. The whole imagery of his coming to heaven upon clouds, *to the Ancient of days*, etc brings scenes of Christ's ascension to our minds.

Christ is expressly stated to then receive *dominion over all peoples and nations*. The prophetic type of Solomon is here seen to be fulfilled in Christ. But, *and here is the point*, look what it says about the saints:

*Dan. 7:21, 22 – I beheld, and the same horn made war against the saints, and prevailed against them; until the **Ancient of days came**, and **judgment** was given to the saints of the most High; and the time came that the **saints possessed the kingdom**.*

“Kingdom” here does not mean the church; it is not saying the time came when the saints possessed the church. They possessed the church from Pentecost, but this *follows* the persecution of the little horn. Possessing the kingdom signifies *world dominion*.

Same with the word “judgment” – it does not mean the act of adjudicating so much as it signifies the act and power of ruling. When God asked Solomon what he wanted, Solomon asked for wisdom to judge his people – this did not mean wisdom merely when sitting as judge, adjudicating a case; he meant wisdom *to rule*.

The point of Daniel's vision is that the kingdom and dominion that had been the beasts' would become the saints with Christ.

*Dan. 7:27 - **And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High, whose kingdom [is] an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him.***

If we can think of the kingdom in terms of Israel under Solomon, in which there are those that are sons of the kingdom and there are strangers who are under subjection and pay tribute, we would have a proper concept of the kingdom.

This is why the Jews thought the kingdom of heaven meant they were to receive the dominion

of the world; it is why Premillennialists believe it today. It is because that is what the *scripture said* of the Messiah. Like Solomon, his rule *would be* world wide; and the saints *would* rule with him.

Isa. 2:2 – And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow into it.

Hills & mountains are symbols for nations and peoples: The kingdom would be exalted and have dominion over all others.

Ps. 2:8, 9 - Ask of me, and I shall give [thee] the heathen [for] thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth [for] thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel.

The fact that the nations are under the kingdom's dominion pretty well shows that his kingdom is *much, much* bigger than the church.

Just as Rome was a city, but its empire was world wide, so the church is the new Jerusalem, and our kingdom and dominion is *world wide!*

This is the true significance of the term *ecclesia*; the term does not mean that the saints are not called *out of the world*; rather the term signified a *body politic*; an assembly gotten together to conduct the *business of the realm*. *Ecclesia: an assembly of the people convened at the public place of the council for the purpose of deliberating*. That is the point of calling the church the *ecclesia* – we are members of the ruling body politic with Christ. We reign with him as princes over the nations of the world.

*Rev. 5:10 - And hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign **on the earth**.*

This is the true significance of the New Heavens and Earth. They represent the world in which the tables are finally turned. No more forever crushed, bruised or oppressed; we are sons and daughters of God almighty and he is guiding all of history in favor of his people, ruling the nations with a rod of iron. The implications of this for the world are immense. Rather than abandon the world to its own devices, we are challenged to conform the world to Christ.

Conclusion

The kingdom is the restored spiritual and temporal dominion of the sons of God through the reigning Christ.

-oo0oo-

More Women are having fewer children, if at all

She shall be saved in child-bearing. II Tim. 2:15

Editor's Note: As our family prepares to welcome its sixth child into a Christian home, Americans overall are having fewer children. Meanwhile, Muslim fertility rates continue to grow. The ethic of curtailing fertility rates is Biblically insupportable. We could double, triple, quadruple the size of the church if Christian parents would simply follow the Biblical ethic of large Christ-centered families. Of course, we might have to drive old cars, and do without a few things, like our grandparents did, but then aren't we called to sacrifice for the faith?

Washington – (Associated Press) More women in their early 40s are childless, and those who are having children are having fewer than ever before, the Census Bureau said Monday [Aug. 18th]. In the past 30 years, the number of women age 40 to 44 with no children has doubled, from 10 percent to 20 percent. And those who are mothers have an average of 1.9 children each, more than one child fewer than women of the same age in 1976. The report, *Fertility of American Women: 2006*, is the first from the Census Bureau to use data from an annual survey of 76 million women, ages 15-50, allowing a state-by-state comparison of fertility patterns. About 4.2 million women participating in the survey, which was conducted from January through December 2006, had had a child in the previous years. The statistics could be used by state agencies to provide maternal care services, the report said.

About 36 percent of women who gave birth in the previous 12 months were separated, divorced, widowed, or unmarried. Unemployed

women had about twice as many babies as working women, although women in the labor force accounted for the majority – 57 percent – of recent births. [Note: this means that over 1/3rd of children are now born into single parent homes.]

-oo0oo-



Futurist Voodoo
Eschatology got you
down?

Read
The Sword & The Plow