



Scriptures and Doctrine :: Israel, the Church and Eschatology

Israel, the Church and Eschatology, on: 2015/11/2 8:52

docs,

Continuing our discussion:

The question I think we are going to grapple with is whether God has two people and two covenants and two plans and some promises are found outside of Christ or does He just have one people and one covenant.

Some good parameters for our discussion and some housekeeping that invariably needs to be done as they are obviously "elephants in the room" is that we need to discuss controversial subjects. I watched another Stephen Sizer, (still looking for elements of anti-semitism) and I have taken from his presentation some things that we will eventually have to talk about.

"We need to talk about whether misguided Christians have perpetuated the conflict in Israel." (I would add that we also need to repudiate racism against the Jewish people which going a little further, Stephen also says).

"And we need to be honest about our "baggage" (presuppositions). We all have baggage which are things that we have been taught by our spiritual leaders, or books or any number of sources. For instance if you think the world is going to end soon in an apocalyptic war, then you won't be too interested in a peace process and that kind of goes against us as Christians being "peacemakers."

"Was the coming of Jesus the fulfillment or the postponement of the promises God made to Abraham. This question alone admittedly does divide us into two groups. Let's seek to understand why. Some see Jesus as the fulfillment of the Hebrew scriptures while others see the coming of Jesus and the birth of the Church as the postponement of those promises. John Nelson Darby said "the Church was a parenthesis to God's continuing purposes on earth."

My comment: Christians and Christian leaders in the past have brought harm to the Jews and Christians and Christian leaders today are bringing harm to non-Jews. Seems that misguided Christians have brought or are presently bringing harm to both sides in the conflict. For this reason alone even if I did not list any others, we need to have this discussion so that we can be instrumental in bringing change within our own church.

"Let us also agree that racism is a sin and anti-semitism must be repudiated unequivocally. We must repudiate and distance ourselves from the extreme elements on both sides that have engaged in these two things if we are going to be able to have a debate in Christian love."

"And we cannot confuse apples with oranges. Anti-Zionism is not the same as anti-semitism. Criticizing a political system as racist is not racist. Judaism is a religious belief, Israel is a sovereign nation, Zionism is a political system. These are not synonymous. I respect Judaism, I repudiate anti-semitism, I encourage inter-faith dialog, I defend Israel's right to exist within borders that the international community recognizes."

docs or anyone else that would like to dialog in peace?

Do you have any problems with these topics/parameters and would you like to add more? Of course this is not to say that the conversation cannot be dynamic and that we cannot add to it as we go along.

I would also add and I think I have the support of those who do want to participate in this discussion that if anyone else cannot abide this topic for whatever reason and your only impulse is to hurl "flaming missiles" so as to censure us, please exercise self-control.

Let's try to believe the best about each other and not group one another in "extreme camps."

Re: The One New Man and Covenants Made with Israel - Part II, on: 2015/11/2 9:12

Let me just reiterate because I may not have made myself clear, that I think everyone wants this to primarily be a Biblical discussion and it is not intended to be political though we may lightly touch other aspects because it is just the nature of this discussion. I think and hope everyone can agree that everyone supports Israel's right to exist so I want to diffuse any potential misunderstanding on that. God obviously allowed the nation of Israel to be created in the land and it will be interesting to hear different ideas why people think God has allowed this. We already know that one viewpoint is that it is the fulfillment of Scripture.

Re: , on: 2015/11/2 9:24

A good place to start (from discussion with docs in another thread).

What does "God isn't done with Israel, yet", mean?

docs, correct me if I am wrong, but are you referring to this Scripture?

Rom 11:1 I say then, Hath God cast away his people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin.

Re: A good place to start - posted by docs (), on: 2015/11/2 9:34

A good place to start (from discussion with docs in another thread).

What does "God isn't done with Israel, yet", mean?

docs, correct me if I am wrong, but are you referring to this Scripture?

Rom 11:1 I say then, Hath God cast away his people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin.

Doc: Work is beckoning this morning bro so I need to be on. But I'll try and get back to you. I am finding these discussions helpful and I have no problem with anyone personally even though this subject tends toward high emotion.

Rom 11:1 is part of what I base my view on but what glory will God get if Israel is left dispersed and in exile in the nations? The scriptures regarding this exile are taken as literal so why aren't the scriptures portraying a literal return one day (with a heart circumcised in Christ) also taken as literal? Moses prophesied of tribulation and distress to last for Israel even into the last days. God's dealings with Israel are not over.

Re: , on: 2015/11/2 9:53

Work is beckoning to me, also. Till next time.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2015/11/2 22:38

Since I don't have the time right now to work on that piece I had mentioned, I thought I'd share this message by Tim Conway in case anyone is interested. I thought he did a great job at expounding on the crucial Ephesians passage dealing with the Jew/Gentile New Man. No pressure though, I know it's not the same as reading a personal post.

<http://illbehonest.com/one-new-man-in-the-place-of-the-two-part-4>

For those who cannot get YouTube vids, there is also a tab for the mp3 audio on that page.

Re: Oracio, you didn't tell me Tim Conway was funny - posted by docs (), on: 2015/11/3 8:09

I finally found him. You didn't tell me was a hoot!

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bfTyEtVle84&list=RDbfTyEtVle84#t=O>

Re: , on: 2015/11/3 12:36

moving on...

Here is an great example of an excellent debate with Dr. Michael Brown and Dr. Don Preston, regarding Israel and the Church and Eschatology. (I decided to rename the thread as this name seems more appropriate).

Dr. Michael Brown and Dr. Don Preston Debate Israel and Eschatology

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H1fP1xB1gsM>

Very insightful comments below the video, also by the listeners (on both sides of the debate).

Also, good example on how they maintained the debate according to hermeneutical principles, only. I definitely learned something in that area, too. :-)

docs - posted by proudpapa, on: 2015/11/3 12:46

docs wrote :

///I finally found him. You didn't tell me was a hoot!///

I can not download the youtube so I do not know if you were referring to Tim Conway the comedian if so he is different from Tim Conway the preacher,

Tim Conway the preacher is kind of running in the same circle as Paul Washer, John Piper etc.

I am able to get the MP3 thank you Oracio.

Re: Hyperpreterist Don Preston and resurrection denying, on: 2015/11/3 12:50

Another really bad apple to quote from:

Hyperpreterist Don Preston has for a long time attempted to portray his views within the Evangelical Christian umbrella. However, he understands that his Christological view bears nothing in common with doctrine of Christ Jesus as defined by Scripture and espoused by Evangelical Christianity. Thus, Mr. Preston has not been upfront regarding his doctrine of Christ and normally if brought up seeks to change to a different issue often arguing that there is no relevance with his eschatological view. As a result of Mr. Preston's less than forthright representation of his views which seems to be carefully worded in public, he was invited to a forum of Evangelical Christians held at Criswell College discussing the major millennial views representing the modern Christian Church.

Mr. Preston represented the invitation, as, "the preterist movement has caused the scholarly world to pay attention and to realize that Covenant Eschatology has, to cite Andrew Perriman, "a rightful place at the table" in serious discussions on eschatology, and specifically with regard to the preterist view of "The Millennium." However, nothing could have been further from the truth.

When Criswell College learned of Mr. Preston's Christological views and what he had written above, they requested Mr. Preston remove his claim (see above) which falsely represented the situation. Criswell College advised Mr. Preston that he should retract what he had stated and place the following on his website: "Criswell College does not believe preterism is an academically or biblically defensible position or that it deserves a place at the table. We do recognize that preterism has a following and we believe those followers deserve to know the error of the doctrine with which they are being misled."

Mr. Preston did amend his claim, but the manner in which he represented Criswell's position in lieu of his prior claim demonstrates his underhandedness. Mr. Preston's amendment read, "Make no mistake, we are not suggesting that Criswell Bible College, or any of its faculty are in agreement with or sympathizes with the full preterist view of eschatology."

ology.

No kidding Dishonest Don, everyone knows Evangelical Christians disagree with hyperpreterism. The point, however, is that the academic institution didn't believe the view was due a place at the Evangelical table and that was not why Preston was invited in the first place. And had Mr. Preston been forthright about his heretical views regarding the doctrine of Christ Jesus he would have never been invited in the first place. Furthermore, why wasn't Mr. Preston forthright with the College's position and with what they requested to be posted? With that, due to the invitation, Criswell was faced with two choices, cancel Mr. Preston's invite at a very late date or expose him for the heretic he in fact is. Criswell chose the latter path and was successful in securing Mr. Preston's confession as to his heretical position regarding Christ Jesus to the horror of those attending the debate who are Christians.

Mr. Preston has finally gone on record! Mr. Preston claims Christ Jesus no longer possesses the body of His birth and resurrection. Mr. Preston attempts to downplay the implication of his heresy by qualifying his position as a "physical" body, but this is simply more intellectual dishonesty on his part. Webster's 1830 definition of the term "body" is, "The frame of an animal; the material substance of an animal, in distinction from the living principle of beasts and soul of man", "Matter, as opposed to spirit", "any extended solid substance". The fact is human bodies are "physical". Inherent within the concept of a human body is the concept of "physical". Thus when Dr. Kenneth Gentry points out Paul in, Col 2:8, 9, explains Christ Jesus has His body, Paul is referring to the fact Christ Jesus possesses the human body of His birth and resurrection. If Christ Jesus no longer has the body of His birth and resurrection, He is no longer human.

The implication of Mr. Preston's view, whether he wants to admit it or not is that the historical Christ Jesus no longer exists. In other words, according to Mr. Preston, Christ Jesus temporally made use of a human body, the incarnation was only temporary! This, of course is essentially the same position held by the second century docetics, "Doceticism refers to the doctrine that the manhood of Christ was apparent not real, that as in some Greek myths, a divine being was dressed up as a man in order to communicate revelations, but was not really involved in the human state". 1 According to Dr. Roger E. Olson, "sophisticated docetics held a dualistic Christology that strongly distinguished between Christ, a heavenly, spiritual redeemer and Jesus, the human taken over by the Christ and used as his instrument for a time on earth." 2 Indeed, this is the Christ of Mr. Preston, a Christ who no longer possesses the body of His birth and resurrection. The fact of the matter is Mr. Preston is advocating a "sophisticated" heretical view which dates back to the second century. The logical implication is that Christ is no longer the God-man. That is damnable heresy and Criswell knew it and called Preston on it.

Orthodox Evangelical Christianity owes Criswell College a hearty thank you. Criswell College was able to do something no one else within the community has been able to do. That is, they were able to get Mr. Don Preston to go on record regarding his heretical docetic doctrine of Christ, which lies at the core of his heretical "Gnostic like" teachings. Mr. Preston is certainly entitled to his opinion, but he is not entitled to mislead people by skirting the issue hiding the fact he denies a core tenet of Evangelical Christianity as proclaimed by Scripture. Mr. Preston is not entitled to a position at the Evangelical table as he denies a core tenet of Christianity as defined by Scripture. Preston, the word is out about your theology. You are not within the Evangelical and orthodox camp, you are outside of the Church of Jesus Christ. ..."

Re: , on: 2015/11/3 12:52

docs,

They both made some strong points and although I don't agree with everything either of them stand for, I would be interested in hearing what you thought their strong points (and weak points, too) were.

And, I am currently listening to another one which is also very good, so far.

Dr. Brown Debates Dr. Gary DeMar on Israel and the Church
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uKJwH7_5QqU

Be blessed.

Re: , on: 2015/11/3 12:54

Especially this gross heretical Christ denying error:

"Mr. Preston has finally gone on record! Mr. Preston claims Christ Jesus no longer possesses the body of His birth and resurrection. Mr. Preston attempts to downplay the implication of his heresy by qualifying his position as a "physical" body, but this is simply more intellectual dishonesty on his part. Webster's 1830 definition of the term "body" is, "The frame of an animal; the material substance of an animal, in distinction from the living principle of beasts and soul of man", "Matter, as opposed to spirit", "any extended solid substance". The fact is human bodies are "physical". Inherent within the concept of a human body is the concept of "physical". Thus when Dr. Kenneth Gentry points out Paul in, Col 2:8, 9, explains Christ Jesus has His body, Paul is referring to the fact Christ Jesus possesses the human body of His birth and resurrection. If Christ Jesus no longer has the body of His birth and resurrection, He is no longer human."

The implication of Mr. Preston's view, whether he wants to admit it or not is that the historical Christ Jesus no longer exists. In other words, according to Mr. Preston, Christ Jesus temporally made use of a human body, the incarnation was only temporary! This, of course is essentially the same position held by the second century docetics, "Doceticism refers to the doctrine that the manhood of Christ was apparent not real, that as in some Greek myths, a divine being was dressed up as a man in order to communicate revelations, but was not really involved in the human state". 1 According to Dr. Roger E. Olson, "sophisticated docetics held a dualistic Christology that strongly distinguished between "Christ", a heavenly, spiritual redeemer and "Jesus," the human taken over by the Christ and used as his instrument for a time on earth." 2 Indeed, this is the Christ of Mr. Preston, a Christ who no longer possesses the body of His birth and resurrection. The fact of the matter is Mr. Preston is advocating a "sophisticated" heretical view which dates back to the second century. The logical implication is that Christ is no longer the God-man. That is damnable heresy and Criswell knew it and called Preston on it.

Re: , on: 2015/11/3 12:56

And, I am currently listening to another one which is also very good, so far. Again, I don't necessarily endorse everything each person believes, but to the central issue that we are discussing, they bring out some interesting points, hermeneutically, speaking. These speakers never disparage one another which I find refreshing and kind hearted.

Dr. Brown Debates Dr. Gary DeMar on Israel and the Church
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uKJwH7_5QqU

Re: , on: 2015/11/3 12:58

Why do you keep using heretics and apostates to support your views?

They do not even believe that Jesus Christ, is the eternal Son of God and Son of man. And he is. Shame on you.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2015/11/3 13:47

Yes, unfortunately I will have to agree that Mr. Preston holds to full Preterism (denying the Second Coming of Christ and bodily resurrection of believers), making him a a heretic who should be shunned by believers.

Re: , on: 2015/11/3 13:51

Oracio,

I earlier distanced myself from Full Preterism, and that was not what this debate was about.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2015/11/3 13:55

Julius, did you know that Preston was a Full Preterist before listening to this debate?

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2015/11/3 13:58

proud papa wrote:

Quote:
-----I can not download the youtube so I do not know if you were referring to Tim Conway the comedian if so he is different from Tim Conway the preacher,

Tim Conway the preacher is kind of running in the same circle as Paul Washer, John Piper etc.

I am able to get the MP3 thank you Oracio

Yes, I was referring to the preacher not the comedian lol. I am sorry to hear that you cannot download the mp3, I wish they did transcripts.

Re: , on: 2015/11/3 14:09

Quote:
-----by Oracio on 2015/11/3 13:55:14

Julius, did you know that Preston was a Full Preterist before listening to this debate?

No, absolutely not! I never heard of him before.

So, do you think we can conduct our own conversation, at least in the same kind-hearted spirit that Brown and Preston did?

I think we can, at least with you, ProudPapa, docs, roadsign, TMK and JFW. Crusader also has been civil and makrothumia actually posted one time and I think everyone missed his post, which was actually a good post.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2015/11/3 14:24

Thanks Julius. I guess my concern is for heretical perspectives to be promoted here, views which would be on the same level of heresy as JW's, Mormons and others. At some point I think the mods have to draw a line and not allow certain heresies to have a platform here. That's just what I've observed here over the years anyway. I appreciate that you had no clue that he was a Full Preterist.

But I agree with your point about having civil discussions despite strong disagreements, even when it comes to orthodox vs unorthodox views.

Re: , on: 2015/11/3 14:26

Brown didn't even call Preston a heretic or disparage him in any way (and he probably doesn't agree with his eschatology) as he focused on the hermeneutics of Israel and the Church. I wouldn't even want to talk about what a Mormon believes, so I respect your view and thanks for telling me about it in a brotherly way.

If you and the others I mentioned think it is impossible in this current atmosphere to talk about the hermeneutics regarding Israel and the Church, I am ok with that. I don't care about what the bullies say, but I do care about what the "bullied" say. So, if you and the others think we should "hang it up", then let's do it.

Re: , on: 2015/11/3 14:32

Paul as led by the Holy Sprit said

Galatians 5:12

I wish those who unsettle you would emasculate themselves!

(Talking about those who promote false religion)

Re: , on: 2015/11/3 14:35

Let me just say that I apologize to everyone on SI if I said anything that offended any of you.

Furthermore, please feel free to take a vote whether you would like me to be banned or not and publish the results for G reg. I will accept the wisdom of the Church.

Re: From Grace to You Canada, on: 2015/11/3 14:46

An attack of the gospel

First Timothy 1:4 says these false teachers "minister questions rather than godly edifying which is in faith." They provide speculations instead of truth. They continually stir up useless questions, and that creates confusion. The Greek word translated "edifying" (oikonomia), means "stewardship," "administration," or "dispensation." It refers to a modus operandi--a means of operation. Since it is connected with theos, the Greek word translated "God," it refers to the plan of God. Through their questions these false teachers strike a blow at the gospel of saving faith. Therefore, it is likely they were propagating a system of works righteousness or legalism.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2015/11/3 14:52

Brother Julius, this thought also came to mind. Let's say someone here were to post a teaching by let's say for example Joel Osteen and say they agree with that particular teaching in some respects. It would be hard for many of us to take seriously anything coming from Osteen. We wouldn't even want to give him the time of day. Hope you understand that's how I feel regarding anyone who holds to Full Preterism, as I see it to be that serious of an error.

Re: , on: 2015/11/3 14:56

I do fully understand, Oracio. I agree it is definitely a serious error, too. Being corrected and even alerted to error does not offend me. I am actually thankful for it.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2015/11/3 15:00

Thanks for understanding brother.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2015/11/3 15:03

Now Gary DeMar on the other hand I think is ok :-)

Re: , on: 2015/11/3 15:07

I am just finishing up that debate. Very respectful, also.

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2015/11/3 15:09

Quote:

-----â€ godly edifying which is in faith

When I see the news re Israel, I see people (both Jew and Palestinian) who are beset with fear, offense, revenge, suspicion, humiliation, retaliation and much more â€ all which point to a need for reconciliation of these two people groups. People are dying, getting killed!! Each side seems far more acutely aware of how they have been wronged by the other t

han how they may have wronged and provoked the other. That's characteristic of unforgiveness.

I see a critical need for each side to confess their own wrongs, to forgive the other, and be reconciled to each other and ultimately to God. Is this not the only solution? Is this not Biblical?

What doctrines re Israel would best promote that direction?

Perhaps some scriptures and doctrines would be far more applicable to Israel right now than the usual handful of doctrines about Israel and eschatology.

Just wondering,

...

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2015/11/3 15:20

I am enjoying the discussion, but perhaps the motive of the discussion has been lost due to all the different threads. Obviously there have been accusations (false I might add) of ulterior motives.

I for one am fine with discussion for the sake of discussion- particularly topics that interest me.

But perhaps it might be helpful to explain 1) why the proper view of Israel is important; 2) what are the consequences of being wrong; 3) are the consequences of being wrong dire.

Personally I put very little importance on eschatology. It is interesting but I used to be much more interested when I was dispensational because I liked to make current events fit. Since I moved from that camp, I really place little importance on it. My motto is just Be Ready.

So I am curious why you think a particular view of Israel matters in the long run.

Re: , on: 2015/11/3 15:23

I absolutely agree that we should be promoting love on both sides, FOR BOTH SIDES. There is much pain and loss that everyone has encountered and people are hurting.

<http://www.theparentscircle.org/Content.aspx?ID=60>

Here is a very touching film about Arab and Jewish parents who have lost family members, coming together to understand and reconcile with each other. Jesus is not even in the mix and they are coming together in love. How much more should the Church of Jesus Christ be sowing seeds of love over there instead of taking sides?

<http://www.theparentscircle.org/Article.aspx?ID=1259>

I would like to see the Church of Jesus Christ stop taking sides in this conflict and take the side of Jesus.

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2015/11/3 16:10

Quote:

----- I would like to see the Church of Jesus Christ stop taking sides in this conflict and take the side of Jesus.

I suspect every contributor is sincerely trying to take the side of Jesus. Actually, I don't wish to hijack this thread title. I just hope to see theological perspectives of Israel become submitted to the priority teachings of scripture. Surely, if we set Israel (as well as ourselves) within that framework, we will move towards eschatological realizations.

So often the teachings on forgiveness get eclipsed by other ideologies re Israel. The terrible problems persist- and no one thinks about it - or cares. Doesn't seem godly to me.

"Thy Kingdom Come!"

Diane

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2015/11/3 16:19

Quote:

----- Arab and Jewish parents who have lost family members, coming together to understand and reconcile ...

Isn't this what the people crave so badly! They do not know the way of peace.

Diane

For Julius - posted by docs (), on: 2015/11/3 18:45

I think we can, at least with you, ProudPapa, docs, roadsign, TMK and JFW. Crusader also has been civil and makrothumia actually posted one time and I think everyone missed his post, which was actually a good post.

Doc: I think Heydave should also be included in any future conversations or discussions.

Re: , on: 2015/11/3 18:49

It's what we all want, Diane.

I think we can all agree that a theology that favors one group of people to the detriment of another group is not a theology anyone here wants to embrace.

<http://littleguyintheeye.com/biblical-studies/end-times/zionism/>

Re: , on: 2015/11/3 18:54

Yes we all want to keep bashing God's chosen people Israel in a civil and polite manner don't we?
A soft kill , so silky smooth and so approachable. Yes you got it Juli

Re: For Julius - posted by Oracio (), on: 2015/11/3 18:55

docs wrote: For Julius

Quote:

-----I think we can, at least with you, ProudPapa, docs, roadsign, TMK and JFW. Crusader also has been civil and makrothumia actually posted one time and I think everyone missed his post, which was actually a good post.

Doc: I think Heydave should also be included in any future conversations or discussions.

Well, I never. Fine then, I see how it is. Jk :-). I know I still need to work on my "calm civility" when it comes to these types of topics. I think I was doing fairly well until we started being labeled unsaved, satanic, Jew-hating anti-Christians. It's all good though, Lord bless.

Re: For Julius, on: 2015/11/3 18:58

Quote:

-----by docs on 2015/11/3 18:45:10

I think we can, at least with you, ProudPapa, docs, roadsign, TMK and JFW. Crusader also has been civil and makrothumia actually posted one time and I think everyone missed his post, which was actually a good post.

Doc: I think Heydave should also be included in any future conversations or discussions.

Yep! It wasn't my intention to exclude Dave.

But, you know, is there really any point anymore?

As Christians, we are peacemakers, preaching a Gospel of reconciliation, asked by our Lord to love our enemies, walking as He walked. We are to forgive from our hearts. I know, in my heart I do not embrace a theology that could anyway, whatsoever bring harm to other men. Maybe, it's best we all start there and check our respective beliefs. Then, and only then might it be edifying to talk about the Scriptures.

Re: , on: 2015/11/3 19:11

Jesus Christ is LORD

Re: , on: 2015/11/3 19:22

Relax Rev, the Lord is in control/ He knows what they are trying to do. They cannot subvert the way of the Lord and as always they will fail.

Re: For Oracio - posted by docs (), on: 2015/11/3 19:31

docs wrote: For Julius

Quote:
-----I think we can, at least with you, ProudPapa, docs, roadsign, TMK and JFW. Crusader also has been civil and makrothumia actually posted one time and I think everyone missed his post, which was actually a good post.

Doc: I think Heydave should also be included in any future conversations or discussions.

Well, I never. Fine then, I see how it is. Jk :-). I know I still need to work on my "calm civility" when it comes to these types of topics. I think I was doing fairly well until we started being labeled unsaved, satanic, Jew-hating anti-Christ. It's all good though, Lord bless.

Doc: I'm playing a little catch up ball here. I've seen a lot of stuff hurled I guess but I'm not aware of Heydave doing so. I'm a bit quizzical by, "I see how it is."

Thanks.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2015/11/3 20:08

docs, I was jokingly (with dry humor) referring to not being included in your list of "welcomed contributors".

Re: - posted by docs (), on: 2015/11/3 20:39

docs, I was jokingly (with dry humor) referring to not being included in your list of "welcomed contributors".

Doc: Yo I get it. Ha! I just assumed you were in automatically.

Re: , on: 2015/11/3 21:31

Ah, well you know you slipped my mind, too. Probably a good thing though, someone else won't take it personal and think I was leaving them out on purpose.

Whenever you bring up something like this you run the risk of being branded, "anti-semitic".

<https://pjmiller.wordpress.com/2007/08/04/the-strong-delusion-of-%E2%80%9Cchristian%E2%80%9D-zionism/>

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2015/11/4 0:17

No worries at all, carry on mates.