

Kingdom Report

www.kingdomvision.co.za

Week of 21 June 2025

Part 1 : Iran - Israel War : The Dangers of Eschatology and American Foreign Policy

What if President Trump's decision for war is based on a false eschatology? What if Israel loses it's Iran war? It is time for a serious re-consideration of the Church, Israel and the Kingdom of God.

Today's blog...

There are serious considerations for God's people, the Church, Israel, prophecy and international affairs in the developing war between Israel and Iran.

- There is dangerous influence of Dispensational Christian Zionism on America's response to the war between Israel and the rest of the nations in the Middle East.

I want to comment on events this week the illustrate this.

- I want to re-emphasize the proper Scriptural teaching on the Church and Israel.

- I want to analyze...what if Israel is either economically or militarily destroyed in this evolving terrible war.

"A Mission from God": The Peril of Apocalyptic Foreign Policy

When a theological system predicated on an end-times drama moves from the pulpit to the corridors of power, it carries profound implications for international relations. Evangelical dispensationalism, through its political manifestation as Christian Zionism, has become a formidable force in shaping U.S. foreign policy, particularly in the Middle East. I will analyze the tangible dangers of this influence, using this last week's examples of Senator Ted Cruz's interview with Tucker Carlson and US Ambassador to Israel Mike Huckabee's apocalyptic counsel to President Trump illustrate how this theology can distort geopolitical realities, bypass ethical considerations, and sacralize catastrophic violence.

Following the establishment of Israel in 1948—an event hailed as a major prophetic fulfilment—Christian Zionism began to organize into a powerful lobbying force. Figures like televangelists Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson mobilized millions of evangelicals into a reliable pro-Israel voting bloc, wielding significant influence within the Republican Party. This culminated in the formation of organizations like Christians United for Israel (CUFI), founded and led by Pastor John Hagee. With a claimed membership of over 10 million, CUFI is now the largest pro-Israel lobbying group in the United States, outnumbering even the well-known American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC).

This "Armageddon Lobby," as some have termed it, has been actively courted by Republican administrations from Ronald Reagan to Donald Trump. Its influence has been

a key factor in major foreign policy decisions, most notably the controversial relocation of the U.S. embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem, an act seen by Christian Zionists as a direct fulfilment of biblical prophecy and a necessary step in the end-times timeline.

"Those Who Bless Israel" - Senator Ted Cruz and the Politicization of Genesis 12:3

A vivid illustration of how dispensationalist theology translates into political justification occurred during a widely publicized interview between U.S. Senator Ted Cruz and media personality Tucker Carlson this last week. In the midst of a discussion about American participation in the war between Israel and Iran, Cruz articulated the theological foundation for his unwavering support for Israel. "Growing up in Sunday school," Cruz stated, "I was taught from the Bible, those who bless Israel will be blessed and those who curse Israel will be cursed. And from my perspective, I wanna be on the blessing side of things".

This exchange reveals the profound theological leap at the heart of Christian Zionist political reasoning. A covenant promise made by God to a single individual, Abraham, nearly four millennia ago, is lifted from its historical and narrative context and applied directly and unconditionally to the modern, secular nation-state of Israel. This interpretation, a hallmark of dispensationalist proof-texting, bypasses the entirety of the subsequent biblical narrative, which includes themes of covenant conditionality upon obedience, the judgment of exile for disobedience, and, most importantly, the New Testament's radical redefinition of Abraham's "seed" and the fulfilment of the promise in Jesus Christ.

The danger of this approach to foreign policy is its reductionist and absolutist nature. It creates a simple, non-negotiable divine mandate that effectively silences all other prudential, strategic, and ethical considerations. Questions that are central to responsible statecraft—Is a particular Israeli military action just or proportionate? Does a specific policy align with long-term U.S. interests? Does it violate established international law? Does it exacerbate a humanitarian crisis?—become secondary, or even irrelevant. If the overriding biblical command is simply to "bless," which is interpreted as providing unconditional political and military support, then any criticism or questioning of Israeli policy is reframed as an act of "cursing," risking divine retribution not just for the individual but for the United States as a nation. Foreign policy is thus removed from the realm of debatable strategy and elevated to an article of faith.

"Not Since Truman in 1945" - Ambassador Mike Huckabee and Nuclear Eschatology

If the Cruz interview demonstrates the justification for policy, a text message from then-U.S. Ambassador to Israel Mike Huckabee to President Donald Trump reveals the apocalyptic framing that can shape its formulation. In the message, which Trump himself shared publicly, Huckabee, a Baptist minister and prominent Christian Zionist, offered counsel regarding a potential U.S. strike on Iran. Namely, do to Iran what Pres. Truman did in 1945 to Japan.

Huckabee's message was laden with messianic and eschatological overtones. He began by framing Trump's survival of an assassination attempt as a providential act: "God spared you in Butler, PA to be the most consequential President in a century—maybe ever". He

then drew a direct and chilling parallel between Trump's decision and a pivotal moment of catastrophic violence in world history: "No President in my lifetime has been in a position like yours. Not since Truman in 1945". The allusion to President Harry Truman's decision to use atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki was unmistakable and deeply alarming.⁴⁴ Huckabee concluded by urging Trump to heed a supernatural inner voice from "Him", writing, "I believe you will hear from heaven and that voice is far more important than mine or ANYONE else's," framing the geopolitical crisis as a moment divinely ordained for Trump himself: "You did not seek this moment. This moment sought YOU!".

This communication is far more than standard hawkish foreign policy advice. It is a deliberate act of sacralizing a potential military conflict, casting it in explicitly apocalyptic terms. The subtext, as interpreted by numerous observers, is that the conflict with Iran is not merely a regional power struggle but a biblically foretold clash, a necessary step toward the Battle of Armageddon and the "imminent Rapture". The goal is not just a geopolitical outcome but the acceleration of the end-times script. Nations and peoples who oppose the agenda, such as Iran or the Palestinians, are not merely geopolitical rivals or negotiating partners; they are cast in the role of eschatological enemies. They become agents of the Antichrist, the forces of darkness, or modern-day "Amalekites", according to Netanyahu interpretation, must be utterly annihilated. This framework makes genuine diplomacy, which requires mutual recognition, compromise, and a shared desire for peaceful coexistence, nearly impossible. An apocalyptic worldview does not seek compromise; it demands total victory and the final vanquishing of evil. It has the power to transform complex geopolitical conflicts into simplistic holy wars, a profoundly dangerous and destabilizing paradigm in a nuclear-armed world.

The preeminent danger of this mindset is the normalization and even sanctification of catastrophic violence. The suggestion of using nuclear weapons, or engaging in a war with potentially devastating consequences, is removed from the realm of rational cost-benefit analysis, ethical just war theory, or diplomatic caution. Instead, it is placed within a narrative of divine will and prophetic fulfilment. In this framework, earthly conflict, destruction, and suffering are not tragedies to be avoided but are reframed as necessary, and perhaps even desirable, precursors to the ultimate divine victory and the Second Coming of Christ. This eschatological impatience creates a dangerous incentive for high-risk, escalatory policies, as it views war not as a failure of statecraft but as a fulfilment of prophecy.

The clash between Senator Cruz and Tucker Carlson is a microcosm of a significant fracture developing within the American right. For decades, a broadly interventionist foreign policy was a point of consensus in the Republican party, and Christian Zionism provided a powerful theological engine for that consensus, especially concerning the Middle East. However, the rise of Donald Trump and the "America First" movement injected a potent non-interventionist, nationalist ideology into the party's mainstream. Carlson's critique of Cruz's position does not come from a progressive or liberal standpoint; it emanates from a nationalist worldview that views the Christian Zionist agenda as promoting "forever wars" that entangle the U.S. in conflicts that do not serve its direct national interests but serve Israel's. This internal schism means that the "danger" of a dispensationalist-driven foreign policy is no longer an unopposed force on the right. It is now in direct and open conflict with a competing nationalist-isolationist ideology, creating a volatile and unpredictable political dynamic. The future direction of Republican

foreign policy may well be determined by which of these two powerful, and often contradictory, ideological streams prevails.

The Crisis of a Failed Prophecy: The Psychological and Theological Fallout of Israel's Destruction

What would be the impact on evangelical dispensational believers if the modern state of Israel—the very keystone of their prophetic system—were to be destroyed or defeated in a war? By tying their entire eschatological framework to the fate of a contemporary nation-state, dispensationalists have created a worldview that is not only geopolitically hazardous but also theologically and psychologically fragile. The collapse of this geopolitical keystone would likely trigger a profound crisis of faith, characterized by severe cognitive dissonance and a potential disintegration of the believer's worldview.

The absolute centrality of the modern state of Israel to the dispensationalist system cannot be overstated. Its creation in 1948 and its continued existence are held up as the single most compelling piece of evidence that the Bible's prophecies are being literally fulfilled in our time. The preservation of Israel is seen as a non-negotiable precondition for the sequence of end-times events: the Rapture, the seven-year Tribulation, the Battle of Armageddon, and the Second Coming of Christ. Within this tightly-wound system, the destruction of Israel before this sequence plays out is a theological impossibility. It is an event that the system's own logic dictates cannot happen.

The core, foundational belief—"God has made an unconditional, literal promise to preserve ethnic Israel in their land to fulfil end-times prophecy"—would clash violently and irreconcilably with an undeniable geopolitical fact: "Israel has been destroyed." This is not a minor theological discrepancy that can be easily adjusted; it represents the collapse of the entire system's prophetic keystone.¹⁰ The very event that their theology deems impossible would have occurred, creating a crisis that strikes at the heart of their understanding of God, the Bible, and history itself.

Beyond the theological recalibration, the psychological impact on the individual believer could be devastating. A primary appeal of dispensationalism is the certainty it provides. It offers a comprehensive, ordered worldview—a "master plot"—in which the chaos of history has a clear script, a divine purpose, and a guaranteed victorious outcome. It answers the profound existential question of "Where is history going?" with absolute, scriptural confidence.

The destruction of Israel would shatter this script, plunging the believer into a state of what could be termed "theological anomie"—a crisis of meaning and a sense of profound doubt. The God they believed they knew—a God who keeps His literal promises to the letter—would have seemingly failed. The future, once a predictable timeline leading to glory, would become a terrifying and uncertain void. This is more than simple grief or disappointment; it is the disintegration of the cognitive and spiritual map that the believer uses to navigate reality.

This crisis of meaning would likely manifest in severe psychological distress, including prolonged depression, acute anxiety, and deep identity crises. For many Christian Zionists, their identity is deeply intertwined with being part of the "end-times generation," possessing a special, prophetic insight into world events. The failure of that prophecy would be a deeply personal invalidation. The phenomenon of "Jerusalem

syndrome," a rare but intense psychosis triggered by a visit to Jerusalem, hints at the powerful psychological and emotional connection that some individuals forge with the physical land of Israel. While different, it illustrates the potential for profound psychological distress if that geopolitical and spiritual anchor were to be violently removed. The experience could be analogous to the trauma and disillusionment faced by members of doomsday cults whose predictions of the world's end fail to materialize.

The inherent fragility of a belief system built on literal, falsifiable predictions about the material world is its greatest vulnerability. By elevating the political fate of the modern state of Israel to the level of a core theological doctrine, dispensationalism has made itself uniquely susceptible to geopolitical events. The very certainty that makes it so appealing to its followers is also its greatest weakness. This reveals that the danger of dispensationalism is not merely its capacity to influence risky foreign policy in the present, but also its potential to set up millions of its adherents for a catastrophic crisis of faith in the future. The system's architects, in their pursuit of a rationalized and predictable "literal" certainty, have constructed a theological house of cards upon a volatile geopolitical foundation.

Should such a theological collapse occur, the aftermath would create a massive spiritual vacuum. Millions of evangelicals, particularly in the United States, would find themselves theologically and psychologically adrift, their trusted interpretive framework shattered. This would represent a moment of profound crisis, but it could also become a moment of potential transformation. Other theological traditions—including historic Covenant Theology, or perhaps more progressive or socially engaged forms of Christianity—would have an unprecedented opportunity to offer alternative, more resilient, and more historically orthodox ways of understanding faith, Scripture, and God's work in the world. The collapse of dispensationalism, therefore, could paradoxically trigger a major and long-overdue realignment within evangelicalism, potentially shifting it away from the politics of apocalypse and toward a faith that is less preoccupied with predicting the end of the world and more engaged with discipling the nations and the biblical call to seek justice and mercy within it.

Let's consider such alternatives.....

A Theological Re-evaluation: Israel, the Church, and the Kingdom

The political influence of dispensationalism is built upon a specific set of theological claims about the Bible's narrative, particularly concerning the identity of Israel and the fulfillment of God's promises. A critical examination of these claims reveals that they represent a significant departure from historic Christian orthodoxy. That the New Testament itself presents a radical, Christ-centered definition of God's people, a definition that directly challenges the dispensational equation of modern Israel with the Israel of biblical prophecy.

The primary historical and theological alternative to dispensationalism is known as Covenant Theology. While dispensationalism sees biblical history as a series of disconnected dispensations ending in failure, Covenant Theology views it as the unified, progressive unfolding of a single, overarching plan of salvation: the Covenant of Grace. This covenant, first promised in Genesis 3:15 after the Fall, is the singular way God saves sinners throughout all of history—by grace through faith in the work of a promised

Redeemer. That was the whole point of Paul's detailed presentation of the gospel to the gentile believers in Rome.

The various covenants of the Old Testament (e.g., with Noah, Abraham, Moses, David) are not seen as separate, failed tests, but as different administrations of this one Covenant of Grace, each revealing more about the person and work of the coming Messiah, Jesus Christ. This framework emphasizes the fundamental unity and continuity of God's plan and His people across the Old and New Testaments.

This leads to the most crucial point of divergence: the relationship between Israel and the Church. Whereas dispensationalism posits a sharp discontinuity, Covenant Theology insists on a fundamental continuity. In this view, there is only one people of God throughout history. This people was called "Israel" under the Old Covenant administration and is called "the Church" under the New Covenant administration. The Church is not a "parenthesis" or a separate entity; it is the fulfilment, continuation, and international expansion of the covenant community that existed in the Old Testament. The Church is, in essence, the "New Israel" or the "Israel of God" (Galatians 6:16), composed of both Jews and Gentiles who are united by faith in the Jewish Messiah.

Consequently, in Covenant Theology, the promises made to Old Testament Israel find their ultimate and true fulfilment not in a future political nation-state, but in the person and work of Jesus Christ and, by extension, in His body, the Church. The promise of a king is fulfilled in King Jesus; the promise of a priesthood is fulfilled in the priesthood of all believers; the promise of a temple is fulfilled in Christ's body and the Church as the dwelling place of the Holy Spirit; and the promise of the land is fulfilled in the new heavens and new earth that believers inherit. This Christological approach, which reads the Old Testament through the clarifying lens of the New, stands in stark opposition to the literalistic approach of dispensationalism.

"Not the Children of Abraham": An Exegesis of John 8:39-44

Senator Ted Cruz relied on the false idea that the Jews of today are the seed of Abraham and heir to his promises. In the eighth chapter of John's Gospel, Jesus engages in a tense and revealing dialogue with a group of Jewish leaders and challenges their most cherished claim to spiritual security: their physical lineage from Abraham. This passage provides one of the New Testament's most direct and radical redefinitions of covenant identity.

The Jewish leaders repeatedly assert their identity with the claim, "Abraham is our father". For them, this was not merely a statement of genealogy; it was a declaration of their privileged status as God's chosen people, heirs of the covenant, and thus spiritually secure. They believed their bloodline guaranteed their relationship with God.

Jesus systematically dismantles this assumption by shifting the very definition of sonship from genetics to ethics, from physical descent to spiritual resemblance. He retorts, "If you were Abraham's children, you would be doing the works Abraham did" (John 8:39). The defining "work" of Abraham, throughout the biblical narrative, was not his ethnicity but his faith—his willingness to believe and obey God's word, even when it seemed illogical or impossible.

But their actions their desire to kill Jesus prove they cannot be Abraham's true children.

This leads to the dialogue's shocking climax. If their actions do not resemble Abraham's, whose do they resemble? Jesus provides the answer: "You are of your father the devil, and your will is to do your father's desires. He was a murderer from the beginning, and does not stand in the truth, because there is no truth in him" (John 8:44). Jesus argues that their desire to murder him (the author of life) and their rejection of his words (the truth) reveal their true spiritual parentage. They are acting as children of Satan, the original murderer and the father of lies.

The theological implication of this passage is revolutionary. It establishes that true membership in Abraham's family is spiritual, not ethnic. It is defined by faith in God's word—which Jesus embodies—and demonstrated by obedience. This teaching directly undermines the core dispensationalist premise that ethnic Israel remains the primary, unconditional heir of the Abrahamic covenant promises. Jesus himself declares that physical descent from Abraham is insufficient for one to be considered a true child of Abraham or a child of God.

"The Kingdom Shall Be Taken From You": An Exegesis of Matthew 21:43

In Matthew 21, following his triumphal entry into Jerusalem, Jesus confronts the religious leadership in the Temple. He tells the parable of the wicked tenants, a clear and pointed allegory. A landowner (God) plants a vineyard (Israel) and leases it to tenants (Israel's religious leaders). When he sends his servants (the prophets) to collect his fruit, the tenants beat, stone, and kill them. Finally, the landowner sends his own son (Jesus), whom they also kill, casting him out of the vineyard.

After telling the parable, Jesus asks the leaders what the landowner will do to those tenants. They correctly reply that he will bring those wretches to a wretched end and lease the vineyard to others who will give him his share of the crop. Jesus then applies the parable directly to them, quoting Psalm 118:22 about the rejected stone becoming the cornerstone, and delivering a stunning verdict: "Therefore I tell you that the kingdom of God will be taken away from you and given to a nation bringing forth its fruit" (Matthew 21:43).

The kingdom is then "given to a nation bringing forth its fruit." The Greek word for "nation" is *ethnos*. Jesus is not saying that covenantal privilege will be transferred to another single political state. Rather, he is referring to a new, multi-ethnic "nation"—the Church—which will be composed of people from every tribe, tongue, and nation who believe in him (Revelation 5:9). This new spiritual nation will be defined not by ethnicity or political boundaries, but by its ability to produce the "fruit" of the kingdom: repentance, faith, righteousness, and justice.

This passage, like John 8, signifies a monumental shift in redemptive history. It declares a transfer of covenantal status and privilege from an unfaithful ethnic-political entity to a new, fruitful spiritual community. It does not mean God has abandoned Jewish people—indeed, the new community begins with Jewish apostles and believers—but it does mean that the primary locus of God's kingdom work on earth is no longer defined by the political or ethnic boundaries of national Israel.

Why the Modern State of Israel is Not the Fulfilment of Biblical Prophecy

Synthesizing the theological arguments from Covenant Theology and the exegesis of these key New Testament passages leads to an unavoidable conclusion: the dispensationalist equation of the modern state of Israel with the fulfilment of biblical prophecy is built on a flawed reading of Scripture. The New Testament's consistent testimony is that the story of Israel finds its climax and fulfilment in the person of Jesus Christ.

The Apostle Paul argues explicitly that Jesus is the one true "seed" of Abraham to whom the promises were ultimately made (Galatians 3:16). Jesus is the ultimate "Israelite" who perfectly loved and obeyed God, succeeding where national Israel had failed. Therefore, all who are united to Christ by faith—whether they are ethnically Jewish or Gentile—become the true "offspring of Abraham, heirs according to promise" (Galatians 3:29). The Church is not an afterthought or a parenthesis; it is the "one new humanity" (Ephesians 2:15) created by the cross, the community that inherits the fulfilled promises of the covenant.

This theological reality is compounded by the profound anachronism of equating the modern state of Israel with ancient, biblical Israel. As numerous analysts have pointed out, the two are entirely different entities. Ancient Israel was a theocratic monarchy (or tribal confederacy) whose laws were based on the Torah and whose identity was defined by its covenant with God. Modern Israel is a secular, liberal democracy with a diverse population that includes a large number of secular Jews, as well as Muslim and Christian Arab citizens. While it draws on Jewish ideals, it makes no official claim to be the theocratic entity of the Old Testament and does not base its civil law on the Torah. To apply prophecies made to the former directly to the latter is to ignore two thousand years of history and the New Testament's own theological revolution.

Therefore, from a non-dispensational, covenantal perspective, while one might support the modern state of Israel for various prudential, geopolitical, or humanitarian reasons, such support cannot be justified as a biblical command flowing from the belief that it is the direct fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy. The New Testament's own witness points decisively to Jesus Christ and his multi-ethnic Church as the true fulfilment of God's ancient promises to Israel.

It is also important to frame the covenantal position correctly. It is often caricatured as "Replacement Theology," the idea that God arbitrarily cast aside the Jews and replaced them with the Gentiles. While some crude versions of this exist, a more nuanced and accurate understanding, as seen in the exegesis of John 8 and Matthew 21, is one of *fulfillment* and *redefinition*. Jesus does not simply swap one ethnic group for another. He fundamentally redefines the *criteria* for being God's people: the basis shifts from ethnicity to faith in Him. The Church does not so much "replace" Israel as it is the true, eschatological Israel that the Old Testament was always pointing toward. This reframing preserves God's faithfulness to His promises to Israel while simultaneously explaining the radical newness of the Church as a multi-ethnic body united in the Messiah. God fulfilled His promises to Israel, but in a way that was unexpected—through a suffering servant, a cross, a resurrection, and a global family of faith.