

## **A RESPONSE TO THE *DESPATCH MAGAZINE***

Dr. Arnold G. Fruchtenbaum, Th.M, Ph.D, Director, Ariel Ministries, Tustin, CA

The *Despatch Magazine* is produced by Endtime Ministries Assoc., based in Australia and put together by Wendy B. Howard and Wendy K. Beuster. I was sent a copy of the June 2000 (Vol. 12, No. 2) issue since it contained a rather vicious attack on myself and a number of other Messianic Jewish leaders, particularly Jacob Prasch. It made for rather tedious reading since it is 96 pages long, and not very edifying since it is nothing but one attack after another after another of various members of the Body of Christ. It is obvious that the Wendys are often attacking me and others, not based upon first-hand information, but purely on the fallacy of "guilt by association," and/or on the basis of Jewishness, and/or on the basis of what translation these individuals choose to use.

It is not my purpose in this response to defend all those that are dealt with in this rather bleak periodical since the others, such as Jacob Prasch, are quite capable of defending themselves and certainly need no help from me. I suspect most of the others mentioned in the magazine will not bother to respond, either because they have long discovered that it is somewhat useless to try to reason with those who are blatantly anti-Semitic (it would be like arguing with those of the Flat Earth Society; no matter what pictorial evidence you show from space, it is simply labeled as part of the conspiracy and dismissed) or, more likely, because they do not even know they have been attacked. The Wendys never had the courage to contact me to ask me exactly where I do or do not stand, nor did they have the courage to send me an advance copy of what they were going to publish to check if these things were truly so. I suspect they followed the same policy with the others mentioned in the magazine: a total lack of courage and simple Christian charity to check the facts with those involved before going into print. The only reason I even knew of this attack on my person was because of a concerned Australian believer who went to the trouble of sending me a copy of the entire issue. I will not follow the same cowardly method that the Wendys have followed and produce this response without sending a copy to them. Anyone reading this can rest assured that a copy has been mailed to the Wendys and it is in their hands, whether or not they have chosen to read it.

Because I often minister in Australia, and since I will again be coming shortly for an extensive speaking tour of the country, I am sure this issue is going to be brought up by those who have read it. Therefore, I plan to give a detailed response to those sections where they either attack me or certain organizations and/or ministries I am familiar with where I know the statements are simply untrue. Thus, my plan is to go through the magazine, page by page, and respond to certain specific statements, but these will become somewhat repetitious since they keep repeating their attacks as if saying it enough times would make it true (a principle used in both Nazi and Communist propaganda). However, before going through it page by page, I think it is important to first state certain general principles and make some general observations and then I shall proceed to the more specific issues.

### **General Observations**

First Observation: It became painfully obvious after a few pages that the Wendys never bothered to read anything I have written, neither my books nor manuscripts. They obviously never listened to any of my teaching tapes, nor had they bothered to check Ariel Ministries' web site to see what we do or do not teach and where we do or do not stand. Here, I am being kind to them by giving them the benefit of the doubt and accusing them only of ignorance. If they have read any of my material and know where I truly stand, then their problem is not willful ignorance, but deliberate lying and distortion. To give one example here (there will be others later), they accuse me of supporting the Ecumenical Movement. Yet in print I have clearly come out against the Ecumenical Movement, in print I have encouraged individuals in apostate churches to pull out and join Bible believing churches, and my ministerial credentials are with an association whose whole purpose of existing is to be in opposition to Liberalism and the Ecumenical Movement (more on this later as well). If they had read my material, they would know where I stand and, therefore, I am assuming they did not read it and, therefore, are simply guilty of ignorance, though it is a willful ignorance since my material is readily at hand. However, if they have read it, they are certainly guilty of a much greater sin. It should be noted what they ascribe to me is often the opposite of where my stand is publicly, both verbally and in print.

Second Observation: They tend to use terms such as "Messianic Movement" and then describe it as being somewhat monolithic in its beliefs and purposes and doctrines. Nothing can be farther from the truth. The term "Messianic Movement" is anything but a technical term and it is a very general term basically describing Jews who believe in Jesus as the Messiah. Within the movement there are all kinds of different doctrines and streams, no different than in any Gentile movement. But the Wendys keep imputing only one standard of the Messianic Movement, assuming it stands for all who would claim the title of "Messianic Jew" and then essentially build an elaborate strawman argument and proceed to huff and to puff. Often what they describe as being within the Messianic Movement is only true of a segment, but hardly the entirety. Let's apply this type of logic in a different situation. Throughout the world there are many who call themselves Baptists. Among those who call themselves Baptists there are many who are part of the Ecumenical Movement, such as the American Baptist Convention, and there are others who deny the verbal inspiration of Scripture, as is true within certain parts of the Southern Baptist Convention. If I applied the Wendys' logic to this, I would teach that the whole Baptist Movement is ecumenical and liberal. However, those who are familiar with Baptists know that nothing is farther from the truth. There are other Baptist groups that are very fundamental, such as the General Association of Regular Baptists, and the Bible Baptists, among others. It would be a sin and a lie for me to state that everyone who calls himself a Baptist is ecumenical and liberal. By the same token, because some who call themselves Messianic Jews ascribe to certain issues, it hardly warrants saying that this is what all Messianic Jews teach. The Messianic Movement is no more monolithic than the Baptists or Anglicans or others.

Third Observation: The Wendys keep denying that they are anti-Semitic, but anyone who understands the nature of anti-Semitism will certainly recognize the anti-Semitism found throughout the magazine. Anti-Semitism is not disliking a person who happens to be Jewish. Anti-Semitism is disliking someone or something because it *is* Jewish. The Wendys keep reacting to anything that is Jewish and see this as being negative. As I will point out when I go through the more detailed part of this response, over and over again they are reacting negatively because something is Jewish rather than whether, in essence, it is right or wrong in and of itself. At the same time, they deny over and over again that they are anti-Semitic; but their anti-Semitic addiction is similar to the addiction to alcohol. Persons who work with alcoholics can testify that most alcoholics will deny that they have an alcohol problem. They will often claim that they can "quit any time they want to," and yet never realize that they never seem to be able to really free themselves from their passion for alcohol and their need for drunkenness. Most alcoholics simply refuse to recognize that they have a problem. As people who work with alcoholics can testify, the first step is to get an alcoholic to realize he does have a problem, and only then can one begin to help him out of it. Until that admission is there, it is virtually impossible to help anyone addicted to alcohol. Anti-Semitism tends to be a similar addiction with similar responses. It is amazing how many anti-Semites keep denying they are anti-Semitic, and yet display all of the attributes of anti-Semitism. The Wendys are exactly in that category. What are some of the attributes of anti-Semites? Anti-Semites react negatively to anything that could be Jewish; and even with things that are Jewish, they wish to deny its Jewishness. Although the Bible is obviously a product of Jews, they prefer to keep referring to it as "the Reformation Bible," as if the Reformers were the ones who produced the Bible. Anti-Semites react to any Jewish symbol, ascribing it to some demonic influence, and the Wendys do this, ascribing the Star of David as a part of occultism. Another attribute of anti-Semitism is a phobia of some kind of a "Jewish conspiracy." There is quite a bit of this phobia in this magazine, but it goes a step farther than most anti-Semitic phobias concerning world conspiracies. In this case, they accuse Messianic Jews of conspiring to take over the whole church! To understand much of what they are saying, in spite of their denial, it should be noted that they clearly come from an anti-Semitic frame of reference.

Fourth Observation: When they present evidence, the evidence is often based upon quoting what others have said about such-and-such or so-and-so, without actually going to the sources themselves. Therefore, they quote sources that tend to agree with their perspective without checking the legitimacy of these sources. On page two, however, they have the following disclaimer:

Despatch quotes from many sources, and cites many people. It is impossible to delve into every group, person, doctrine or association which the writers of these quotes may embrace. Therefore, the staff of Despatch may not necessarily agree with everything these writers stand for.

What a pathetic charade! One of the principles of investigative reporting is that if you do not have firsthand information, and must use secondary sources, you must always check the validity of these secondary sources to make sure they are in a position to speak knowledgeably about what they are ascribing. This is simple honesty that every publication that claims to be Christian should be following. While the Wendys prove their

claims by quoting various sources, it is obvious that they do not know where these sources are really coming from, or what these sources really stand for, but because it helps to "prove" their case, they quote it as evidence and, therefore, "it must be true." By their own admission, they do not check the sources for everything they quote. It is that kind of pattern that leads to gross error and misrepresentation. For example, if they wish to know what I believe, where I stand, and what I teach, then the right thing to do is to go to things I have taped or written by way of books, articles, or manuscripts. But this they obviously did not do. Whatever they think they know about me, they got from other sources that they would quote, but they did not feel any obligation to find out if the person or source they quoted was legitimate or qualified to present the truth. I can also tell by what they said about others mentioned in the article, whom I know, that they followed the same format. They did not bother checking with the original sources where these people stand on the issues they were attacking. They simply quote a secondary source which, by their own admission, they do not feel obligated to check. They then proceed to use that as final evidence of where these other Jewish believers stand. Again, I cannot take the time to defend those others whom they attack, making statements of them I know are not true, since this response will be long enough without it. The point to note here is that the Wendys are very dishonest in the way they gather their "factual" information.

*Fifth Observation:* Just as they seem to make the phrase "the Messianic Movement" to stand for one thing, they also seem to confuse the search for Jewish backgrounds to New Testament studies. They use the term "Hebrew Roots Movement" rather loosely and apply it in many situations where it simply does not apply. Therefore, it is important that I distinguish here between what is called "Hebrew Roots Movement" as over against what does not have a technical name, but which I represent, and that is getting into the Jewish historical backgrounds from which much of the Bible, both the Old and New Testaments, came. Now let me clearly distinguish between the two. I will refer to the Hebrew Roots Movement as HRM and the search for Jewish backgrounds as simply JB; but, again, keep in mind that the latter does not have a technical name, nor does it need to have one since it is simply doing what should be natural in all biblical research. The HRM is a movement that claims that parts, or much, or even all (depending on who is advocating it), was originally written in Hebrew, but the Hebrew original is now lost. What we now have is just a poor Greek translation of the original Hebrew and all English versions are translations of the poor Greek translation of the original Hebrew New Testament. Therefore, to really understand the New Testament, we must attempt to find out what the original Hebrew was by translating the Greek back into the Hebrew and only then can we really see what it teaches. Furthermore, the HRM is often heavily dependent upon rabbinic literature and considers it to be virtually authoritative in making certain decisions. Obviously, this creates a great amount of problems for the doctrine of verbal inspiration and, therefore, leaders involved in these movements end up denying the inspiration of the New Testament and that opens the door to allowing rabbinic literature to have priority over the New Testament since, from their perspective, the New Testament we now have is not the original but a somewhat corrupted Greek translation. JB teaches the exact opposite. We firmly believe that the New Testament was written in Greek and that is why it is the Greek New Testament that has survived. Furthermore, we believe the New Testament to be as verbally inspired as the Hebrew and Aramaic Old Testament. Thus, rabbinic writings in no way take priority over the New Testament and the final authority is what the Scriptures (both Old and New Testaments) teach and not any other writings, be they rabbinic or otherwise. However, as all true Bible believers recognize, the Bible was not written from the framework of a twentieth century culture, nor a Protestant culture, it was written in the culture of the period from which specific books of the Bible come out. Therefore, to have a true and full understanding of what is being said, it is necessary to look at the historical frame of reference from which these biblical accounts come. For example, in dealing with Genesis, it is very helpful to understand the cultural frame of reference of Mesopotamia, Aramea, Canaan, Egypt, etc. To understand certain actions of the patriarchs, such as Abraham taking the handmaid Hagar to produce children, or Jacob buying the birthright from Esau, or Rachel stealing the household gods of her father, can be better understood if we understand the laws of the Ancient Middle East. To understand a number of points of the Joseph account in Genesis it is helpful to understand the historical and cultural frame of Egypt when these events occurred. To have a greater understanding of much of what happened throughout biblical history, it is very helpful to look at the backgrounds of Assyria, Babylonia, etc. No Bible believer will ever look at the documents of Babylonia, Assyria, Canaan, Egypt, or other countries, and let them take priority over the Scriptures. However, these documents can enlighten what the Scriptures are saying because the biblical writers, living at the time that they did when this knowledge was available, often assumed the knowledge that was true then but not true now. As we move into New Testament studies, in dealing with books like Corinthians, it is good to know the

historical frame of reference and the culture of the Greek city of Corinth. To have a better understanding of many parts of the New Testament, it is wise to have an understanding of Greek history and culture, not to mention language, since God chose to produce the New Testament in Greek. To better understand the issues of Roman cohorts, Roman centurions, and the way Pilate conducted his trial of Jesus, it is helpful to know something about Roman jurisprudence. No true student of the Bible denies that it is helpful to get into these Babylonian, Assyrian, Egyptian, Canaanite, Roman and Greek backgrounds to get a better understanding of the New Testament. This is not to say the Bible cannot be understood apart from it. The point is, there will be many gaps of knowledge and often some misunderstandings of the Scriptures if these backgrounds are ignored. All JB says is that the same thing should be true when dealing with the Jewish backgrounds of biblical studies. While much of what Paul wrote had to deal with issues of the Greek and Roman backgrounds, the life of Jesus did not play itself out in the framework of a Greek and Roman culture, but a Jewish culture, and a very specific type of Jewish culture: that of first century Israel. Throughout all four gospels things were said the way they were said, things happened the way they happened, and things were written the way they were written because of a specific Jewish frame of reference. Thus, to have a better understanding of Scripture it is important not to ignore this background any more than we should ignore the other backgrounds. The problem is that usually the Jewish background is the one area that has been ignored. If the Wendys had read some of Ariel Ministries' manuscripts, such as "The Birth of the Messiah," which discusses the meaning of the *Logos*, or the manuscript, "Nicodemus: A Rabbi's Quest," or even listened to our shorter version of the tape series entitled, "The Highlights of the Life of Christ From a Jewish Perspective," they would have seen that that is all we are doing: presenting the Jewish frame of reference behind statements of Scripture. If this background had not been ignored, there would have been a lot less division and splits within even the Protestant Church. But because of their anti-Semitism, the Wendys wished to avoid any concept of Jewishness in the Bible and rather preferred to write a scathing "exposé" of Jewish believers, rather than find out what it is we really stand for. Therefore, they show no desire to even investigate the possibility of Jewish backgrounds because their anti-Semitism will not allow them to do so. Instead, what they choose to do is put everything under the umbrella of HRM and so any talk of a Jewish frame of reference immediately means it must be part of HRM and is, therefore, to be rejected. But these are two separate issues and many of us involved in JB have come out both in print and otherwise against the HRM (Ariel Ministries and Prayer for Israel based out of England being just two of many examples). Finally, despite what the magazine may imply, the vast majority of the leaders and speakers of HRM are Gentiles, not Jews, while those who are part of JB include both Jewish and Gentile believers. You will not find that statement anywhere in the magazine. Instead, everything is put under the HRM umbrella and made part of a worldwide Jewish or Messianic Jewish conspiracy to take over the church.

Sixth Observation: Another issue is the Wendys' reference to the Protestant Reformation. In examples I will point out in the more detailed section of this response, the Wendys consistently present the Protestant Reformation as also being monolithic, always standing on the same point of the same issue. The Protestant Reformation is presented by the Wendys as all standing for the same position and the Reformers all stood together, believing the same things. One only has to read the Reformists to see that nothing is farther from the truth. Within the Reformation, the Reformers and their disciples began to disagree on many issues, including the issues of baptism, communion, church government, predestination and free will; and they continued a great number of the teachings from Roman Catholicism without actually ever evaluating or "reforming" other doctrines, such as sprinkling, infant baptism and Amillennialism, not to mention many other examples I could cite. Again, I will point these out in the more detailed segment of this response. But one should know up front, as an observation, that the Wendys tend to present the Protestant Reformation as being uniform in their theology, which it never was, and that is why very quickly Protestantism developed into a multitude of denominations.

Seventh Observation: Another observation that must be made so that things are clear is the issue of the King James Version. Among those who adhere to the King James Bible, one must distinguish two different groups. The first group is a legitimate group and there is what I would call a legitimate King James Version adherence; but there is also a cultic King James Only element that has no true legitimacy and is rejected by the first King James group. The Wendys represent the latter group and represent the King James Only cult, which must be distinguished from the more legitimate King James Movement. I will define the two different groups so it is understood how I will be using these terms in the remainder of this response. Without going into all of the technical issues, the key issue here does not really involve the Old Testament since all translations are essentially based upon the Masoretic Text, but it is a controversy only over the New

Testament. The issue boils down to: Which is the better and more authentic of two major families of Greek texts? The first family is represented by the *Textus Receptus* and the Majority Text. (Members of the King James cult tend to make the two the same, but they are actually not the same but do belong to the same basic family.) These are later manuscripts. There is another family of manuscripts that are much older and most of the modern translations tend to be based on these other texts. The legitimate King James Movement believes that the *Textus Receptus* and the Majority Text are better witnesses to the original and, therefore, prefer a New Testament translation based upon those texts. Other scholars disagree and feel that although there is less of it, the older the text is the more genuine it is and, therefore, prefer translations based upon the other families of text and translations, such as the American Standard Version of 1901, the New American Standard Bible, and others. The legitimate King James Movement holds to the view that it is the *Textus Receptus* and the Majority Text that are the best Greek texts of the New Testament and, therefore, prefer it. They do not necessarily believe that the King James Version of 1611 is the best translation of these texts and, therefore, scholars who prefer this view have put out the New King James Version based upon the same Greek family of texts from which the Old King James Version was translated, but have provided a more accurate translation than the King James Version. These scholars, I believe, have a legitimate argument and although I am not persuaded, I have a high respect for their view because it is based upon honest scholarship. However, they do not believe in the inspiration of the King James Version in English. They simply believe that the Greek text behind the King James Version is the better one, but they only hold to the inspiration of the original Greek autographs, and they do not hold to the inspiration of any translation, be it the Latin Vulgate or the King James Version. As I said, this is a view I can highly respect and do respect. But the cultic King James Only Movement is not the same. They not only teach that the *Textus Receptus* and the Majority Text (which they often make one and the same) are the only inspired texts, they go on to say that God also inspired the translation of the English King James Version: the only verbally inspired English version is the King James Version and, therefore, any changes in the King James Version would be apostasy. That is why these people reject even the New King James Version, though it is based upon the same Greek textual witness. But it is the belief that the King James Version itself is verbally inspired that makes them cultic and gives them a cultic mindset and I will point out this mindset as I go through the detailed version of this response. As this is read, one should be aware that I am not criticizing the legitimate King James Movement, since they only hold to the inspiration of the original Greek text. My criticism has to do with the King James Only cult which claims it is inspired, although it often sharply disagrees with the Hebrew text, and the significance is that there is no argument about which Hebrew text to use. The King James Only view is represented by Ruckmanism, Gail Riplinger and, of course, the Wendys. As we shall see, the Wendys clearly present a very cultic mindset. One of the common characteristics of cults is a "we against the world" mindset and this comes out several times in the magazine. Also part of a cultic mentality is "we alone have the truth and, therefore, we are the only remnant left and there is no one else in the world adhering to our truth." This too comes out more than once in the magazine. One observation I have been able to make about the King James Only cult is that they spend far more time being concerned about the translation one uses rather than being concerned about the content of Scripture. Thus, they spend more time criticizing and attacking those who do not believe in the verbal inspiration of the King James Version rather than dealing with the content of Scripture. In this entire 96-page diatribe, there is not one page devoted to teaching Scripture nor is there any exposition of any biblical text. It is nothing but one attack after another, often against those who have sacrificed a lot for the sake of Christ, but since they got saved using the wrong translation of the Bible, they must be attacked as viciously as possible.

Eighth Observation: The last observation is to note how they frequently misrepresent Fundamentalism. They give a rather skewed definition of the Fundamentalist Movement and, therefore, those who do not fit their definition of it are not true Fundamentalists. Therefore, it is important that I clearly spell out what the Fundamentalist Movement has always stood for since I have always been part of that same movement. The Fundamentalist Movement was a specific response to Liberalism that began taking over denominations throughout the world. As more and more seminaries were becoming liberal, producing liberal ministers for denominational churches, more and more churches became liberal as well. At first the Bible believers within these denominations tried to fight Liberalism from within and made up a list of what was called, "The Five Fundamentals of the Faith." It was from this that the term "Fundamentalist" was coined. Fundamentalists were those who believed the basics of the faith and the Liberals (in those days they were known as Modernists) did not believe, or rejected, the fundamentals of the faith. After over a decade of struggle, when it became apparent to the Fundamentalists that the Liberals or Modernists were in control of the

denominational schools and denominational higher offices, for the most part gave up the fight within the denominations. While some stayed, many others pulled out of the denominations and started new Bible believing denominations. Out of the American Baptist Convention came the Bible believing General Association of Regular Baptists (GARB), and I am a graduate of Cedarville College (now Cedarville University) which is a GARB school. Other Fundamentalists chose not to form new denominations, but rather Independent Fundamental Churches in the U.S.A. normally referred to as Bible Churches. While these groups do not believe in a denominational hierarchy, they still joined a fellowship of Bible believing churches and this fellowship became known as the Independent Fundamental Churches of America (IFCA). As the fellowship grew beyond the borders of the U.S.A., the name was changed to reflect its international appeal and so it is now known as IFCA International. I am ordained by an IFCA church and I am a member of the IFCA and so I am aligned both with the general Messianic Movement, as I am a Messianic Jew, but I am also aligned with the Fundamentalists and a member of the IFCA in good standing. What this shows is that being a member of the Messianic Movement by itself does not make one a non-Fundamentalist as the Wendys might imply in the *Despatch Magazine*. There are also Baptist Churches in the IFCA, but only those Baptist Churches that are fundamental are allowed to join. By the same token, there are Messianic Jews in the IFCA, but only those Messianic Jews who are fundamental are allowed to join. Being a Fundamentalist does not exclude one from being a Messianic Jew any more than being a Fundamentalist will exclude one from being a Baptist. It boils down to what one believes about the fundamentals of the faith. In connection with what was said in the previous observation, one more thing should be clearly noted about the Fundamentalist Movement. Part of Fundamentalism is the affirmation of the verbal inspiration of Scripture. However, it was always part of Fundamentalism to teach that the verbal inspiration was only with the original autographs in their original languages and that no translation in any language shares verbal inspiration. The great Fundamentalist Movement that held to the faith once delivered up to the saints and gave up so much for their stand for the Word of God never ever claimed the verbal inspiration of any translation, including the King James Version. But they firmly affirmed the verbal inspiration of the original autographs that were written in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek; but no translation, including the King James English translation, was ever considered verbally inspired. This is important because the Wendys keep implying that part of Fundamentalism is the acceptance of the King James Version as the inspired English text. Therefore, if one does not accept the Old King James Version, he is not a Fundamentalist, according to the Wendys. But nothing could be farther from the truth and anyone knowledgeable of the Fundamentalist Movement can see that the Fundamentalists have often used other translations besides the King James Version, and even those who did use the King James Version often would have to say that here and there the verse is not translated correctly according to the Hebrew, Aramaic or Greek texts. I am a Fundamentalist. I believe in the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures. When I read my Hebrew Bible and it contradicts the King James Version, I will give my Hebrew Bible priority over the King James Version.

With these observations made, I am now ready to respond to more specific issues raised by the Wendys in the *Despatch*. As stated earlier, I will do this in the same page order as the issues come up.

#### Specific Responses

Page 5: As stated earlier, typical of anti-Semites is the belief that there is some kind of a world Jewish conspiracy. The conspiracy factor comes out quite early in the article in dealing with Jacob Prasch, accusing him of wanting to change the Bible "to suit his Jewish plans." A denial of the inspiration of the King James Version is part of the Jewish conspiracy and so they write:

. . . other Jewish-style teachers like himself, that the King James Version is not trustworthy, and that the Jews must now reinterpret the Scriptures and return the Church to the interpretation traditions of Judaism – which will make the Jewish scholars the leaders of the Christian Church? Is this the end result they are seeking? And Jacob, along with other Hebrew scholars, wants to use occult-based ancient Hebrew interpretations and traditions to accomplish their agenda.

The issue is not that the King James Version is untrustworthy, but rather it is not necessarily the best translation of both the Hebrew and Greek texts. Nor is the issue reinterpretation of Scripture, but rather a better understanding of the Scriptures based upon Jewish backgrounds. The conspiracy factor comes out in that the Wendys claim that those who want to put the Bible within the Jewish frame of reference from which it came are simply part of a conspiracy so that "the Jewish scholars [become] the leaders of the Christian Church." This is false. I have no desire to become a Bishop or a Pope of the Christian church. But I certainly want all believers to have a better understanding of the Scriptures. It is this kind of conspiracy accusation that

one can also read about in Hitler's, *Mein Kampf*. The Wendys also claim that we want to "undermines and takes away faith in our Protestant Bible, and undermines our true Protestant Movement itself through casting dispersions upon the Reformers." First of all, there is no such thing as "our Protestant Bible," since the Protestants did not produce a Bible. The Bible is a Jewish Bible, written and produced by Jews, and all the Reformists did was recognize the Jewish Scriptures to be inspired. Furthermore, they keep connecting the "Protestant Bible" with the King James Version, but the Protestants did not use the King James Version. The period of the Great Reformation preceded the year 1611 when the King James Bible, as we now have it, was produced. Nor is it "casting dispersions" to criticize the Reformists for what they deserve to be criticized. Martin Luther was a virulent anti-Semite who called for the destruction of all synagogues and for the burning of all Jewish books and for the expulsion of all Jews from Germany, which was the main point of his last sermon three days before he died. His anti-Semitism deserves to be severely criticized as much as the anti-Semitism of the Wendys. Calvin developed a theology that was clearly Replacement Theology and certainly deserves to be severely criticized for not taking the Bible literally concerning prophecy and Israel. Like anyone, the Reformers should be commended for where they did good, such as teaching that justification was by faith alone; but they certainly deserve to be criticized for some of their unbiblical teachings, such as those mentioned above, among others. The Wendys then go on to say:

. . . the Jewish Messianic believers are seen as the only ones to teach, because they are the authorised "priests" and they only. And the more extreme still, that the "Kohen", have a different genetic DNA from the rest of us. They are the only ones who can be priests because of this superior DNA!

This is an incredibly sick piece of a sick paragraph. I do not know of any Messianic Jew who teaches that only Messianic Jews are qualified to teach the Scriptures. On the contrary, if the Wendys had bothered to read even the dedications of my books, they would have noted that I dedicate my books to Gentile teachers from whom I have learned such a great deal. At the most, Messianic Jews are simply trying to point out that there are parts of Scripture that require a Jewish frame of reference to be understood in its fullness in the same way that other parts require a Greek and Roman background of understanding to be understood in its fullness, etc. That is far from claiming that only Messianic Jews can teach those parts as over against only Greeks being able to teach other parts.

Furthermore, they connect Messianic Jews with the recent DNA study of the Cohens and make it all part of the conspiracy. If anything proves their anti-Semitic conspiracy and mindset, this is it. But here is what the facts are: When the Temple was destroyed in the year A.D. 70, the rabbis wished to safeguard the identity of the Tribe of Levi. That was due to the anticipation that someday the Temple would be rebuilt and, by the Mosaic Law, only the Tribe of Levi could function. In relation to the Temple, it was not important to know who the other tribes were, but it was vitally important to know who was of the Tribe of Levi. Therefore, those who were members of the Tribe of Levi would have the name of Levi in their name. Thus, Jews named Levi, Levine, Levinson, Leventhal, or some form of it, are members of the Tribe of Levi to this day. However, not all Levites could be priests, but only those who were direct descendants of Aaron. These were given the name of Cohen, which is the Hebrew word for priest. Thus, the Cohen line has been maintained from generation to generation by virtue of the name. Two thousand years have passed since these laws were put into effect and there may have been some doubt whether the line was truly maintained; so there was a scientific study by means of DNA among Cohens from different parts of the world and from different Jewish communities around the world, and what the DNA evidence showed was that the Cohens do come from one common source. That verifies the Bible, that all Cohens come from Aaron. By the way, this was done by a secular organization with no ax to grind, but was done purely as a scientific study. It has verified what the Bible itself teaches, that there will always be a levitical priesthood available and, in the future, the Temple will be rebuilt and Levites and Cohens will function therein. The only issue here has to do with who qualifies to be a priest and has absolutely nothing to do with who is qualified to teach the Bible and who is not. Since the Bible itself predicts a Third Tribulation Temple and a future Millennial Temple in which the Levites will function in both Temples, this has provided a foundation for the fulfillment of these prophecies. This was a scientific study published in a scientific journal in a secular setting, and it has nothing to do with Messianic Jews, etc. In spite of their reaction about the Cohens having "a different genetic DNA from the rest of us," the fact is that they do have a different genetic DNA. It does not mean that what they have is "superior," it only means that it is different. The fact is, everybody's DNA is different. If the two Wendys went for their own DNA testing, it would be shown that they have a different DNA from each other. It is because everyone has a different DNA that DNA is now being used in courts of law to substantiate certain claims of guilt or innocence; just like everyone has a different fingerprint, so does everyone also have a different DNA. DNA

can also show common origins and establish things like paternity, descendancy, etc. It is the Wendys who claim that the fact that the Cohens have a different DNA, therefore, they can claim superiority. No such claim was ever made either in the DNA study nor by those who are Cohens themselves, and certainly not by Messianic Jews. The issue is not as the Wendys claim: "They are the only ones who can be priests because of this superior DNA." Within Judaism, the only ones who can be priests are the Cohens; not because of a superior DNA, but because God Himself decreed that only the sons of Aaron can function as Jewish priests. However, as far as the Church is concerned, the Bible teaches that priests are all believers so we do not hold to an order or priesthood in the Church anyway. Furthermore, while only the Cohens can function as priests, they are not the only ones who can teach. The fact is that in the Christian church, anyone who has the gift of teaching can teach. And the fact is that in the Jewish Temple, past or future, only the Cohens will be allowed to be priests and in the Millennial Temple there will be Cohens from the line of Zadok who will function as priests. God will also choose certain Gentiles to be priests in the Kingdom. But the Jewish priests will come only from the sons of Zadok who, themselves, are direct descendants of Aaron.

Page 6: On this page the Wendys keep warning the church not to exchange their Christianity for Judaism. In emotional tones they state:

How can anyone who loves the Lord Jesus Christ exchange the fullness of Him for Judaism? . . . How could any Christian think for one moment that Judaism could even compare at all with the glory that is New Testament Christianity, . . . All over the world the strength of the latter day move to Judaism grows in church circles. Not this time does the Church stagger from the wounds inflicted by modernism or liberalism, this time she falls from the exacerbation of Judaization.

However, that is not the issue. The issue is not for the church to become more Judaized; on the contrary, it should act more "Christian." The issue is merely knowing the Scriptures better by getting behind the Jewish frame of reference, and nothing more. A church learning more about the Scriptures from a Jewish frame of reference to understand it better is hardly adopting Judaism. But to the Wendys, anything Jewish is automatically "Judaism." The fact is that the church is still suffering far more from Liberalism and Modernism to this day than it is suffering from any form of Judaization.

Then they make the plea: "Do not believe those who would tell you that authentic, Reformed Christianity itself was always flawed." But the fact is, it *was* always flawed. If it was not always flawed, then Reformed Theology would be uniform with all Reformers and the denominations they started would believe in the same thing. That was not true then any more than it is true today. The very fact that they held different views on so many issues shows that it was somewhat flawed. Otherwise, they would have produced one united systematic theology. But take the case of baptism. The Reformists basically continue the practice of infant baptism, something they inherited not from Scripture but from Roman Catholicism. Nor were they consistent as to why they held to the view of infant baptism. Some believed in baptismal regeneration, that baptism will save the baby, and others believed that it will not. Certainly any teaching about infant salvation only through baptism is flawed. Furthermore, they all did not hold the same view on the purpose and meaning of the Lord's Table. While they all rejected the doctrine of substantiation, Luther, nevertheless, held to consubstantiation, Calvin held to a spiritual presence of the Body in the elements, and Zwingli held to a strictly memorial view. If Reformists were not somewhat flawed, they would not come up with all these different reasons. Furthermore, if the Reformers were not flawed, they would not have continued the Amillennial teaching of Roman Catholicism. Thus Reform Christianity was always flawed in that they did not follow the same principle of literal interpretation in many areas of biblical doctrine, as they did in the issue of Soteriology. Because they held to a literal view, they all concluded correctly that salvation was by grace through faith apart from works. Unfortunately, when they got into other areas of the Bible, they were not so

On the same page the Wendys object to those who "call even the apostle to the Gentiles, Paul, Rabbi Shaul!" In the Hebrew, that was Paul's name. The name "Saul" is the Anglicized form of the Hebrew "Shaul"; that was his name, and certainly the name by which his mother called him. Paul's mother did not speak English.

Page 23: This page begins with a bold titled statement, "The Protestant Church in the Last Days – Joining the Messianic One World Church." Here we go again with the world Jewish conspiracy. There is no such thing as a "Messianic One World Church." There are certainly Messianic Congregations in many places, some affiliated denominationally and some not. Some are affiliated with regular Protestant denominations, such as the Southern Baptists and the Assemblies of God, among others, and others are part of a Messianic denominational system known as the Union of Messianic Jewish Congregations. Others, such as the

congregation where I am a member, are totally independent, like Independent Bible Churches. Messianic Congregations are as varied in theology and affiliations as the Gentile churches. As a general rule, Messianic Congregations tend not to affiliate with Gentile denominations and, therefore, have no desire to become part of any one world church.

The Wendys' inability to distinguish different strands comes out in the following statement: "The Vatican; the Pentecostal Movement for 'revival'; the Messianic Movement and the Hebrew Roots Movement – and the forming of the One World Church." Again, the Messianic Movement is anything but monolithic and cannot be put into one box any more than the Baptist Movement could be. Furthermore, the Hebrew Roots Movement is totally distinct from the Messianic Movement, as mentioned earlier. Most of these leaders are Gentile, not Jewish. While some members of the Messianic Movement might be supporting the Hebrew Roots Movement, the fact is that many others are not. Because some do, they attribute all Messianic Jews as accepting it, but that would be as fallacious as claiming that all Baptists support the Hebrew Roots Movement just because there are some that do. The fact remains, most do not.

The article states: "We must alert the Remnant Church . . ." Here is where the cultic element comes in: the claim to be the "Remnant Church" and, therefore, it is "us against them and we are all alone!" If I used the Wendys' methodology of guilt by association, I could make certain faulty conclusions. For example, the Seventh Day Adventists refer to themselves as the Remnant Church; so are the Wendys Seventh Day Adventists? They must be since they used the expression "Remnant Church"! There is a Latter Day Rain charismatic group that claim to be the "man-child" of Revelation twelve and particularly "the remnant" of Revelation 12:17. I have heard their speakers claim to be the remnant of that verse. Since the Wendys describe themselves with that same terminology, they must certainly be part of the Latter Day Rain charismatic movement of the Remnant Church. Obviously, these are faulty conclusions based upon either similarity of terminology or guilt by association. I do not know what the Wendys mean by being "the Remnant Church" because, as far as I can see anywhere in the magazine, they do not really define what they mean by that term and who they claim to be. But I do know this: When the Bible uses the term "remnant" in a technical sense, it consistently refers to Jewish believers, both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament (i.e., Romans 11:5). Throughout Scripture, the remnant is viewed as part of Israel, and not distinct from Israel. At any rate, this page merely reflects the cultic mindset of the Wendys.

Page 24: The Messianic Jewish conspiracy to take over world religion comes out on this page with the bold title, "The Messianic One World Religion." The Wendys' pathetic ignorance of what constitutes the Messianic Movement leads to their pathetic inability to distinguish different elements within the movement. Again, because some Baptists are ecumenical does not mean all Baptists are because there are many fine Baptist Fundamentalists. Here they quote a speaker who attended the Messiah '99 Conference, but they make it appear that this is representative of the whole movement. The Messianic Jewish Alliance is only one element within the movement as a whole, just like the Southern Baptists, or American Baptists, or Conservative Baptists, are simply various elements within the Baptist Movement, and one does not speak for all. What the Wendys have done is pick an extreme element within the movement and then simply generalized it to represent the movement as a whole and do not bother quoting all of the Messianic Jewish writers who came out against some of these things. The fact is, the vast majority of Messianic Jews would not agree with Rick Joyner and do not consider him to be a prophet. Speaking as a Messianic Jew, I can clearly state that I consider him a false prophet.

Page 26: Anti-Semites love to blame the Jews for everything and the Wendys have taken it one step beyond anyone else I know of, blaming the Jews for the Ecumenical Movement. They keep referring to the "Messianic One World Religion" to emphasize their anti-Semitic teaching that it is we Messianic Jews who are out to put the whole church under one head and we Messianic Jews will become the rulers! No Messianic Jew I know of accepts the Pope as his leader. Yet the Wendys write:

What we are looking at is ECUMENICAL JEWS, EVANGELICALS, PENTACOSTALS AND CATHOLICS TOGETHER. With the token leadership under the Pope falling to the Jews, naming themselves Hebrew Roots or Messianic Jews.

It is unbelievable how much error can be found in just two sentences, but this little paragraph is full of it. Messianic Jews do not accept the leadership of the Pope. Furthermore, the Wendys equal Hebrew Roots and Messianic Jews as being one and the same. This is false. The term "Messianic Jews" is simply a general term describing Jews who believe in Jesus and nothing more. This is not a monolithic movement in which all hold to the same views any more than all Baptists hold the same views on every biblical issue. Nor can the Hebrew

Roots Movement be equated with Messianic Jews since the Hebrew Roots Movement is a specific movement, largely headed up by Gentiles, not Messianic Jews. The level of the Wendys' ignorance is incredible. It is a real shame that this amount of ignorance can go into print.

And the same page has their anti-Semitic Jewish conspiracy phobia, but this time the blaming of specifically Messianic Jews comes out again in the following paragraph:

We are seeing established before us an endtime Messianic One World Religion of great power! This could not be anything else but the Antichrist religion which is presented in the Bible! Evangelicals and Fundamentals have often been very aware of the role the Roman Catholic Whore will play in this endtime scenario of prophecy, but have we been expecting the Jewish element to arise? In the main I would say we have not!

The Wendys are so anti-Semitic and so anti-Jewish that any hint of Jewishness immediately stirs up their animosity. So now it is the Messianic Jews who are responsible to bring in the Antichrist's one world religion! But according to the Wendys, this is the Messianic Jewish agenda and, therefore, we at Ariel Ministries are working on a program to develop a one world religion under Messianic Jewish control!

Page 27: That we Messianic Jews are going to be the ones to fulfill the prophecies about a one world religion comes out again on this page when the Wendys state:

The Jews in the last days will accept the Antichrist and his religion, for a season. Are we seeing the fulfillment of prophecy in these days just before the Tribulation? In the Messianic Movement and the Hebrew Roots Movement? It appears to be the case.

Again, they confuse the Hebrew Roots Movement with the Messianic Movement, which is anything but the same. Furthermore, they again blame the Messianic Jews for bringing in the one world religion of the Antichrist. And finally, they do not have a clear understanding of the Jewish role with the Antichrist. The fact is that the Bible never says the Jews will accept the religion of the Antichrist, nor will they accept him as the Messiah. One only needs to read the Bible carefully to discover that their relationship with the Antichrist is a covenantal relationship when the Antichrist guarantees Israel's military security, but it is a political military arrangement and not a religious arrangement. The fact is that nowhere in prophecy does it say that the Jews will accept the one world religion of Revelation 17, nor will they accept the Antichrist as the Messiah or their God. In fact, when the Antichrist commits the Abomination of Desolation and begins to claim to be God, that will awaken the Jews as to who he really claims to be and that is when they will flee. The irony is that on the same page they go on to say, "I am writing of the movements, with love and concern." The love of the Wendys is a love of Nazism and anti-Semitism. If what they write about us is out of love, I would request that they love us a lot less.

Pages 28-33: In these pages the Wendys have a lot to say about the Lausanne Consultation on Jewish Evangelism (LCJE), but their primary thrust is to accuse them of promoting ecumenism. Then, as they quote statements from LCJE (sometimes confusing them with the Lausanne Consultation on World Evangelism [LCWE]), the quotations actually say the exact opposite. One of the principles of Ecumenism is to water down the gospel, evangelism, and try to bring all faiths, religions and denominations into a one world religious system. This goes contrary to the principles of evangelism that hold there is only one way of salvation. In other words, those who hold to the principle that faith alone in Christ alone saves and all other ways to salvation are a false gospel is the exact opposite of Ecumenism which essentially teaches that all religions will lead you to Heaven. Speaking of the LCWE, they state that it is an "international movement that was formed for the purpose of uniting Christian churches to evangelize the world before the year A.D. 2000." I am not a member of the LCWE, but my question is: What's wrong with that purpose? Do they object to churches coming together for the purpose of evangelizing the world? Is not that the Church's calling? Furthermore, the word "uniting" is not quite correct in the way they use it. LCWE was not trying to get all churches to become one; what they were trying to do is to get evangelical churches to come together for a cooperative purpose only, and the goal is to evangelize the world. No church denomination was asked to forget their unique distinctives. My question again is: What essentially is wrong with that purpose? Furthermore, this is the exact opposite of Ecumenism that holds to uniting all religions apart from evangelism. That is a big difference. On page 30 they quote a Lausanne Covenant paragraph, pointing out that it calls for believers to "enter into a solid covenant with God and with each other to pray, to plan and to work together for the evangelization of the whole world." Here, again, what is wrong with this statement? There is no statement here that calls for the churches to unite into a one world church. It is simply encouraging churches "to work together," and the purpose of working together is not to unite all churches

into one, but the purpose is "for the evangelization of the whole world." What is wrong with this goal? It seems to me that the Great Commission of Matthew 28:18-20 gave us that goal and all the Lausanne Covenant is doing is reaffirming a commitment to fulfill what Jesus Himself commanded the Church to fulfill. Furthermore, this goes against the grain of Ecumenism that believes that evangelizing with the message that faith in Christ alone saves is a divisive limited message and, therefore, must be dispensed with for the sake of world religious unity. By its very nature, Ecumenism is opposed to evangelism. As long as any organization is practicing active evangelism, it is working against Ecumenism.

On page 31, the Wendys make a transition from LCWE to LCJE and claim: "This ecumenical scheme is now being proposed by the LCJE, ostensibly for the sake of JEWISH evangelism." While I am not a member of the LCWE, I am a member of the LCJE; and while not involved in the founding of the LCJE, for seven years I served as the North American Coordinator of LCJE and, therefore, can speak from knowledgeable, first hand experience, whereas the Wendys are making rash statements out of pure ignorance. Here are the real facts about LCJE. LCJE, as the very name implies, is committed to Jewish evangelism and is comprised of both individuals and organizational members, all of whom are committed to the principle of Jewish evangelism. Every individual and organizational member firmly believes that there is only one way of salvation: by grace alone through faith alone in Christ alone. Therefore, the gospel must be preached to Jews because apart from faith in the Messiahship of Jesus there is simply no salvation for any Jew, whether he is Orthodox or secular. This, too, is the exact opposite of the Ecumenical Movement which calls upon a cessation of Jewish evangelism. What the Ecumenical Movement is teaching is what is called the "Two Covenant Theory." This theory teaches that there are two separate covenants: one for the Jews and one for the Christians. Therefore, Jews can be saved through their own covenant without having to believe in the Messiahship of Jesus; and since salvation is available through the Jewish covenant apart from faith in Christ there is, therefore, no need or necessity to preach the gospel to the Jews. Therefore, the Ecumenical Movement strongly opposes all forms of Jewish evangelism and discourages it everywhere they can. The LCJE stands on the exact opposite end of the spectrum. It holds to the fact that there is no salvation for anybody, Jew or Gentile, apart from faith in Christ and, therefore, it is absolutely necessary to preach the gospel to the Jews. This is not Ecumenism; this is pure Fundamentalism.

On the same page, page 31, they printed my picture in that same context and, therefore, it conveys the impression that I support the Ecumenical Movement and the one world church, etc. Here, again, if they had bothered to read anything I wrote, they would have known exactly where I stand on this issue. In my book, *The Footsteps of the Messiah: A Study of the Sequence of Prophetic Events*, I identify the Laodicean Church as the apostate church. I go on to clearly state that the Ecumenical Movement is an unbiblical movement and must be rejected by Bible believers. Furthermore, I clearly state that individual believers in apostate churches are obligated to leave the apostate church and to find a Bible believing and Bible teaching church. This is my position in print. It would not have been hard for the Wendys to find this out. Instead, they chose to print all of these lies and errors, based on what they pretend LCJE is, and then go from there to their standard guilt by association fallacy. If they had the ability to print my picture, they had the ability to read my writings, which are available right there in Australia, with no need to request any writings from the U.S.A. However, they willingly chose not to do that, but chose instead to go ahead and print error. The bottom line, as will come out more than once, is that their real problem with me is my Jewishness. They really do not have a problem with my theology; therefore, they have invented a theology I do not hold, and proceed to blame it on my Jewishness—and that is the bottom line problem. The problem is that I am a Jew who still calls himself a Jew, and that is what is causing them to gnash their teeth.

One of the most common forms of fallacious logical thinking is the principle of guilt by association and the Wendys are consistently guilty of this fallacy. So were the Pharisees, and the Wendys display a Pharisaic mindset. For example, Jesus reached out to the publicans and the prostitutes and the Pharisees objected to it. Their point was that if He really was the Messiah, He would not associate with this class of society. Certainly Jesus reached out to the publicans and prostitutes, but He never participated in their sin; He knew they needed the message of the gospel and so to them He went. He did not stop because of Pharisaic criticism of His actions. Jesus would have been classed as a Fundamentalist and Separatist, not because He separated Himself totally from those who needed the message, but He separated Himself from the sins of the people to whom He was ministering. Let me state boldly that first of all I am a Fundamentalist and I hold to all the fundamentals of the faith; the Wendys will not find anything in any of my writings or tapes that in any way challenge the fundamentals of the faith. If they point to anything, it is my lack of acceptance of the inspiration of the King James Version but, as already stated earlier, that was never part of the fundamentals

of the Fundamentalist Movement. That was a fundamental only of the cultic elements that the Wendys represent. Furthermore, I am a Separatist. As a Separatist, I do not support Ecumenism and I solidly condemn all Liberalism and Modernism in the church. But Separatism does not mean that I will not take the opportunity to preach the Word and to teach the Word in those circles. Ariel Ministries is a Separatist organization and, therefore, Liberals, Modernists, Catholics, and other groups with whom we are not theologically aligned are never permitted to teach in our branches, centers, and never participate as teachers in Ariel's Camp Shoshanah program. Anyone who cannot sign Ariel's Doctrinal Statement cannot be put in a position of prominence in any of our centers or camp ministries. That is what Separatism means. Separatism never meant that we avoid reaching out to these same groups with a message of the gospel. Would I go into a synagogue to preach the gospel if an opportunity was open? The answer is, yes, I would. Would I go to a Catholic Church if the opportunity opened up for me to present the gospel? Yes, I would. Would I go to Pentecostal/charismatic churches to teach the Word? Yes, I would. We are dealing with groups here that either need the gospel and/or need the exposition of Scripture. I will walk through any open door to present the gospel and teach the Word because Separatism does not mean I will not give them the opportunity to hear the truth. Separatism means that I do not open doors for them to come in to teach what they believe. Because I speak to Liberal or Catholic groups (I have had opportunities for the former, but never for the latter) does not mean I am a Liberal or a Catholic. It only means that I was given the opportunity to present the gospel to these groups and I took that opportunity. Let's apply this to the LCJE. The Wendys have presented the LCJE as an ecumenical organization. They noted that I am one of the speakers at LCJE. Therefore, using the fallacy of guilt by association, I am a promoter of Ecumenism. There are two things to note here: first, LCJE is not an ecumenical organization; but secondly, even if it was, that would not preclude my speaking there, it would only preclude my having membership there. If they were an ecumenical organization and I was invited to come and teach, you can be sure I would take the opportunity to get there and teach the Word; but that does not mean I am promoting what they teach. The fallacy of guilt by association is permeating the whole *Despatch Magazine*.

Page 33: It is this page in particular that shows what the Wendys' real problem is: they hate Jewishness and that is what they are reacting to. They quote a statement made by the LCJE International Conference of 1999 and they claim that this statement "defined Messianic believers as 'Jewish' rather than Christian." This is a lie. There is no kinder way to say it. This is simply a lie. The statement does not in any way indicate that Messianic Believers are to be identified as Jewish rather than Christian. The only point the document makes is that Jewish believers who become Christians do not at the same time lose their Jewishness. They even quote the statement, but if you read the statement it says nothing of the kind. The Wendys are lying. Let me reproduce that very quote in this response:

Those of us who are Jewish share in the challenges confronting our people and stand with them in the need to strengthen and preserve our God-given identity. We also recognize that our faith in Yeshua is seen by many as a threat to Jewish identity and survival. Yet we believe that the core of Jewish identity is tied to a purpose and a divine calling that is fulfilled only in Yeshua—to be reconciled to God and to be a light to the nations for his glory. We therefore reject the commonly held view that Jews who believe in Jesus are no longer Jewish . . . Those of us who are Gentiles affirm that Jews who believe in Yeshua do not forfeit their Jewish identity . . . As Jews and Gentiles united by faith in Yeshua, we recognize the right of Jewish believers in Yeshua to maintain a recognizable Jewish identity . . .

First of all, notice the statement is addressed to the Jewish community. Secondly, notice that there is no denial that Messianic Jews are Jews who specifically believe in the Messiahship of Jesus. There is nothing here that denies their faith in Jesus, and there is not one hint of denial of their affiliation with Christ. What they are affirming is that they have not forsaken their Jewishness and still identify themselves as Jews, as well as believers in Jesus. The point is that one does not cancel out the other. Again, the Wendys have lied and lied inexcusably because they have the very quote printed and there is nothing in the quote that states that the Messianic believers are to be defined as Jewish rather than Christian. The point is, they are both.

It is bad enough that they totally misquote the document, but even worse, they totally twist the teachings of the great Apostle Paul. On the same page they go on to state, "Paul's letter to the Galatian Church repudiated the Judaizer's false teaching that converts to Jesus Christ must retain their Jewish identity and traditions." And what is their evidence for such a bold statement about the teachings of Paul in Galatians? They proceed to quote Galatians 3:28 (actually, they begin with verse 27 and go into verse 28), but let me give you the quote as they have it: *For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek . . .* Notice carefully what the Wendys have done with this verse. They claim that this verse teaches that

Paul repudiates the continuity of any Jewish identity. First of all, the context is not dealing with retaining or not retaining Jewish identity, but rather it is teaching that there is no difference in how one is saved and baptized by the Spirit, and all Jews and Gentiles are saved the same way; upon faith they are baptized by the Spirit into the Body of Christ. But secondly, and more dishonest of them, notice the ellipses at the end of the quote. That is an indication that they left something out of the verse. So what else does the verse say? Allow me to complete verse 28, which they failed to quote: . . . *there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus*. Now you have the full quote and it should be obvious to the reader why the Wendys chose not to quote the whole thing because the rest of the verse will discredit what they try to make the verse to mean. Again, they quote the verse partially and then teach that this shows that Paul is teaching against retaining a Jewish identity. But he also mentioned *bond nor free*. Does he mean, then, that all distinctions between bond and free have been removed? If so, then in his writings why does he not tell all Christian slaves to cease being slaves if they are slaves of Christian masters? Why does he not tell Christian masters to release and free their Christian slaves since there are no such distinctions any more? On the contrary, Paul tells Christian slaves that they must submit to their masters even if the masters happen to be Christians. Obviously, not all distinctions have been erased and the bond remained bond and the masters remained masters. However, the point of the verse is that both were saved the same way: by faith in Christ. An even more obvious reason why the Wendys did not quote the whole verse is the mention of *neither male nor female*. If you follow the Wendys' logic about Jewish identity, this verse will have to mean that women cease to be women and men cease to be men. Therefore, Christian women have no female identity and Christian men have no male identity. And yet in his own writings, Paul points out that in many areas the male-female distinctive does remain. For example, he teaches that in the local church authority is only allowed for the male and not the female. He points out that a Christian wife must be in subjection to a Christian husband; but if there were not differences, why is there a need to continue the principle of subjection? Why does Paul tell Christian males to have their heads uncovered in the meeting of the church and Christian females to keep their heads covered in the meeting of the church? Whether one believes this applies today or not does not change the fact that Paul makes a clear sexual distinction between male and female in that passage, even in what they are to wear in the meeting of the church. If there is no longer such a thing as male or female, why are these divine apostolic rules there? The answer is simple: Paul does not teach the elimination of these identities. He is simply saying that as far as one is saved, it makes no difference whether one is a male or a female because both are saved the same way. By the same token, it does not matter whether one is a Jew or a Gentile, both are saved the same way. However, this does not mean all distinctives have been erased. Paul no more teaches against retaining a Jewish identity than he teaches against retaining male and female identities.

The Wendys also go on to quote II Corinthians 5:17 that states: *Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold all things are become new*. Here again, this is an issue dealing with salvation and new birth and becoming a new creation. It says nothing about the erasing of all distinctives, whether they be Jew-Gentile, bond-free, or male-female.

What is extremely interesting are the passages that the Wendys chose not to quote. Did Paul really teach against the practice of Jewish customs by Jewish believers? One only has to look at Acts 21:20-26 to see that Paul publicly took a vow for one specific reason: he did not teach against believers continuing in the practice of Jewish customs and traditions. He certainly taught against Gentile circumcision, but as this passage shows, he did not teach against Jewish circumcision and his own initiative of the circumcision of Timothy, who had Jewish backgrounds, shows how often Paul went out of his way to maintain his own Jewish identity. Did Paul consider himself only a former Jew, but a Jew no longer since he believed? On the contrary, he kept affirming his own present Jewish identity. Notice the use of Paul's present tense in II Corinthians 11:22: *Are they Hebrews? So am I. Are they Israelites? So am I. Are they the seed of Abraham? So am I*. This is only one example where Paul more than once affirms his Jewishness following his salvation. What you find Paul doing consistently is affirming both his Jewishness and his faith in Christ (he never used the term "Christian" of himself). The LCJE statement they quote is simply following Paul's footsteps. They wish to affirm both their faith in the Messiahship of Jesus as well as their Jewish identity. As believers, the Wendys have the absolute right to maintain their Australian identity and culture. They also have the right to remain women. By the same token, Jewish believers have the right to maintain their Jewish identity; but the Wendys wish to deny them that privilege because they have a real problem with Jewishness. The above is followed by another guilt by association statement:

The LCJEs insistence on maintaining 'a recognizable Jewish identity' reminded us of Pope John Paul's insistence that unity with Evangelicals did not imply there would be any relinquishment of his absolute authority over all of Christendom.

This is an association the Wendys have put together in their own minds. What the Pope said about Evangelicals is totally irrelevant to what the LCJE statement said about Jewish believers maintaining their identity. One does not logically follow the other except in the perverted minds of the Wendys. If there is a good example of them trying to mix apples and oranges, this is it. I might point out that the LCJE does not "insist" on Jewish believers maintaining their Jewish identity. It simply recognizes "the right of Jewish believers" to maintain such identity. There is a big difference between recognizing a right and the insistence of exercising that right. The Wendys give the impression that the LCJE requires Jewish believers to maintain their Jewish identity, but if one reads the statement you see that it makes no such requirement. The fact is, Jewish believers have a great desire to maintain their identity and they have the biblical right to do so, as the Wendys have the right to maintain their Gentile identity (which they seem to do rather well), but they fail to extend that same privilege to others.

The fact is that what the Wendys are saying is closer to what Popes have been saying for centuries. It has always been part of Catholicism that Jews should cease to be Jews and that when Jews were forcibly converted to Catholicism, they were required to change their Jewish sounding names and take on Catholic names. If we are going to start making associations with the Pope and Catholicism, let it be clearly stated that the Wendys are far closer to this than the LCJE. The Wendys share the Catholic goal to eliminate Jewishness. The Wendys apparently share the Catholic anti-Semitic mindset that desires such an elimination of any and all Jewish identities.

Page 34: Here, again, the Wendys talk about "The Messianic One World Religion" and this appears in bold print twice on this page. The word "Jewish" is printed in bold within the article, again showing what their real problem is: they really do not like anything Jewish and that is the bottom line problem they have.

Pages 34-35: Here they make the following statement:

Miles J. Stanford's excellent article on Messianic Judaism is a reasoned response to Arnold Fruchtenbaum's book, *Hebrew Christianity* which identifies as well the errors of the Charismatic and Messianic movements.

First of all, how did they know that this is an "excellent article" and "a reasoned response" to my book since they obviously have not ever read my book? Secondly, that same book argues against the use of the term "Messianic Judaism." What the Wendys do not state is the actual point that Stanford objected to. The only part he disagreed with is my teaching that Jews who believe in Jesus remain Jews and have the privilege of maintaining the Jewish identity. That is the only point he did not like about the book, but that is exactly the issue with the Wendys: they found someone else objecting to Messianic Jews maintaining their Jewishness and since they hate Jewishness so much, they recommend this critique. I also recommend the critique but I think that to be fair one should also read my book, *Hebrew Christianity*, to see whether or not I have a valid argument and then see whether or not Stanford's criticism is valid. More than one person has done both and gotten back to me that they did not find Stanford's criticism valid. The Wendys are in no position to determine whether or not it is valid since they have not bothered to read my book to begin with.

Furthermore, they go on to quote three paragraphs from Stanford's critique, which is not actually directed at what I wrote. Stanford points to a "dispensational vacuum" and that a problem with the Messianic Movement is a "lack of dispensational protection." Here, again, is the fallacy of generalizing something that is only true of a segment. True, many Messianic Jews are not dispensational. That is also true of many Gentile Evangelicals. In fact, it is especially true of the Reformers that the Wendys keep referring to. Not one of them was dispensational. They virtually all held to Replacement Theology, which is exactly anti-dispensational. However, this does not apply to me or to Ariel Ministries. Ariel Ministries has a Doctrinal Statement committing itself to Dispensationalism. No one can join Ariel staff without being a Dispensationalist. Therefore, I am a Classic Dispensationalist and a graduate of Dallas Theological Seminary, about the foremost school of Dispensational Theology. Here again, had the Wendys bothered to read my writings, they would have known that I am a Classical Dispensationalist and that I do not believe they are obligated to keep the Law today. My book, *Israelology: The Missing Link in Systematic Theology*, is a detailed defense of Dispensationalism. In fact, it goes on to show that only Dispensationalism allows for the development of a full-scale Israelology which would include the role of the Remnant of Israel today. Furthermore, I am heavily criticized by many elements of the Messianic Movement because of my dispensational theology. But would anybody know that I am a Dispensationalist from the writings of the

Wendys? Not at all. The whole magazine, when it makes any reference to me, deliberately twists things in such a way as to make me appear to believe the exact opposite of what I do believe. The magazine gives the reader the idea that I am Pentecostal and/or charismatic, when I am not. The magazine gives the indication that I am not a Dispensationalist, when I am. How could any magazine like *Despatch* claim to be "Christian" and bear such a false witness against a brother? You will notice that whatever I say about the Wendys, I quote directly what they do say. Yet whatever they say about me, they cannot come up with one quote to back it because there is no such quote. My teachings are available even in simplified manuscript form, which would let them know what I believe, and though readily available in Australia, they have obviously made no effort to get the material and see what it is that I do teach. Since they do not like the fact of my Jewishness, and the fact that I affirm my Jewishness, they will paint me as black as they can and then basically hope that none of their readers will bother to know what I really say. Unfortunately, that will probably be true with some. Fortunately, others who have contacted me were willing to find out what it is I really do say.

On page 35 they make the statement that ". . . over 90% of Messianic congregations as Charismatic." I am not sure the figure is that high, but definitely a majority of Messianic Jews tend to be charismatic. However, charisma is not purely a Jewish problem. The Charismatic Movement was begun by Gentiles, not Jews. A great percentage (I have no idea what percentage) of Evangelical Gentile Churches are charismatic as well. I do not know what percentage of Australian Evangelical Churches are charismatic, but from my previous trips I know it is pretty high. I do not know if it is the majority, but it is quite high to be sure. However, it is still true that most charismatics in any country are Gentiles, not Jews. Again, charisma is not purely a Jewish problem, but has always been more of a Gentile problem than a Jewish problem. To discount the Messianic Movement because of the percentage of charismatics would be the same as discounting the Baptists or Presbyterians or others because a certain percentage happened to be charismatic. This is just another logical fallacy that the Wendys are so often guilty of.

Page 36: The fact that the Wendys have a problem with Jewishness comes out rather obviously on this page. Here they make a reference to the American Messianic Fellowship (AMF), and again it is a negative reference. As stated earlier, it is not my purpose here to defend all the groups they attack and the AMF is quite able to take care of itself. I bring this up only to show that the real problem is not theology, but Jewishness. The AMF is a Jewish ministry that is more than a century old, and from its inception to the present day it has been both Fundamentalist and Dispensational. The leadership has always been and still is Gentile. So what is it about the AMF that the Wendys do not like? It is because the AMF holds to the view that Jews who believe in Jesus remain Jews. That is really their problem: Jewishness. Make no mistake about it: the Wendys are, simply put, anti-Semitic in spite of their protestations to the opposite. They may as well argue that the Pope is not Catholic.

Page 40: Here they go back to the LCJE (the Wendys seem to keep skipping back and forth on specific points and issues and do not seem to be able to put all their thoughts together in one section) and for the second time identify it as part of the Ecumenical Movement and, once again, list me as one of the speakers (this time without my picture, whereas previously it was with my picture) and, again, apply the fallacy of guilt by association. Since I was an LCJE speaker, and since the LCJE is fostering Ecumenism, therefore, I am part of the Ecumenical Movement. Once again, when they actually quote from the LCJE, it actually says the opposite of what they wish to convey. On this page they list the five purposes of the LCJE. But one needs to look at these purposes without the Wendys' eyeglasses and one will notice there is nothing particularly wrong with any of these five purposes; and certainly nothing in these five purposes implies Ecumenism. The first purpose is: "To gather and catalogue information useful in Jewish evangelism and to furnish such material in an occasional publication." Is there something wrong with this goal? Is there something wrong with different Jewish ministries helping each other by letting each other know what kind of material is helpful in getting the gospel out to Jewish people? The second purpose is: "To provide a platform on which Jewish missions can meet to coordinate strategies." Is there something wrong with Jewish missions coming together in order to plan out strategies to promote Jewish evangelism? Is there something wrong if Ariel Ministries gets together with Chosen People Ministries as a cooperative effort to witness to Jews on the streets of New York City? The Wendys seem to have a phobia of more than one group getting together! The third purpose is: "To monitor and report trends in the Jewish community." Is there something wrong with this purpose? The fourth purpose is: "To stimulate theological and missiological research related to Jewish evangelism." Is there something wrong with this purpose? What is wrong with different Jewish missions coming together to discuss new issues involved in the areas of Jewish evangelism and to respond to arguments against Jewish evangelism coming from the Ecumenical Movement or to respond to anti-missionary arguments coming

from the Jewish community? The fifth purpose is: "To arrange consultations that will be useful to those engaged in Jewish evangelism." Is there something wrong with Jewish ministries getting together to see what they can learn from each other about evangelizing Jewish people? So which of these five purposes promote Ecumenism? None whatsoever! Which of these purposes reflect liberal theology? None whatsoever. In fact, liberal and ecumenical theologians are consistently opposed to all five of these points.

Page 51: Here we go again with the guilt by association. They state: "The Jewish Messianic Movement also has ties and unity with Fuller Theological Seminary." Again, the Jewish Messianic Movement is not any more monolithic than is the Baptist Movement. I might point out that I know of Baptists who have affiliation and ties and unity with Fuller Theological Seminary. One cannot use this to disparage all Baptists. Nor can one use this to disparage all Messianic Jews. Furthermore, Fuller Seminary has never been on Ariel Ministries' "Recommended Seminaries" list.

On the same page they state: "The apostasy which is amalgamating in our day called The Hebrew Roots Movement or The Messianic Movement . . ." Here we go again: the fallacy of associating two groups that do not associate. As noted earlier, the Hebrew Roots Movement and the Messianic Movement are two separate entities. Yet this gives the impression they are one and the same, which they are not.

On the same page comes the old conspiracy element: ". . . any Jewish male who finds himself with Christians in a church setting, should fulfil his duty to teach Gentiles in the Torah, and bring them under the Rabbis of Judaism." I know of no facet of the Messianic Movement that teaches Gentiles should be brought under the teaching of the rabbis of Judaism. There may be those in the HRM that may be saying this (though the Wendys provide no evidence for this), but that is not the position of the Messianic Jewish Movement. It could hardly be the position of Messianic Jews since Messianic Jews, themselves, are rejected by the rabbis and they would hardly wish to put Gentiles under the rabbis who consistently reject Messianic Jews.

Pages 53-59: In these pages the Wendys quote e-mail correspondence between someone whom they identify as a Messianic Jew and their responses to him. Whoever this person is (I am not convinced he really is a Jew since there are so many Gentiles who are posing as Jews nowadays), he is presented by the *Despatch* as being typical of what Messianic Jews believe. Let's assume that this person is a Messianic Jew. If the quote of his position is valid (and we have only the Wendys to believe that is what he said; but knowing what they said about me, I have no reason to believe the Wendys are quoting this person accurately or in context), he is one of those loners, an extremist, who does not speak for anybody but himself. He clearly does not represent the mainline Messianic Movement whatsoever. But you would never know that from the way the Wendys present it. In their introductory statement to the correspondence they state: "The Jews will go as far as saying that Jesus Christ was the *Logos*, or Word, therefore He is the TORAH, which is the Word. Thus, when they speak of Yeshua they can mean, not the Jesus Christ we are talking about, but a written religious LAW! This is IDOLATRY!" A mark of anti-Semitism is to ascribe to all Jews what maybe one Jew has said. They did not introduce the correspondence with the expression: "This one Messianic Jew says . . ." Rather, they say: "The Jews will go as far as . . ." In other words, all Jews will go as far as this. The fact is, most Jews do not. More to the point, virtually no Messianic Jew does that. We certainly believe that "Jesus Christ was the *Logos*" because John tells us that in 1:1-18. But virtually none of us would say that the *Logos* is equal to the Torah and, therefore, the *Logos* is the Torah and the *Logos* is not Jesus Christ. Maybe the Wendys found one Jew who said this (again, their ability to distort things tells me I cannot take what they say at face value), but the fact is, you virtually never find a Messianic Jew anywhere who teaches this. Here again, if they would have simply listened to one of the first tapes of our "Life of Christ" series, or read our manuscript on, "The Birth of the Messiah," which discusses the *Logos*, they would clearly see that what Messianic Jews believe is that the *Logos* was the Incarnate Word, and that is Jesus of Nazareth. One may find a Baptist who believes you can lose your salvation, but most Baptists do not believe you can lose your salvation. Thus, you might find a Messianic Jew that says this, but that is not the position of mainline Messianic Jews whatsoever.

On page 57 they state: "the HRM Jews . . ." Again, by and large the HRM leaders and teachers are not Jews, but Gentiles.

Pages 60-61: In these pages the Wendys again show their anti-Semitism by attacking a Jewish symbol, the *Magen David*, or the Star of David. (In Hebrew, however, it is not called "star," but "shield"; but because it looks like a star to Westerners, it became known as the Star of David, though that was never its Hebrew name.) The point they want to make is that the Star of David originates from occultism and, therefore, any use of the *Magen David*, or the Star of David, is to engage in occultism. Here is another one of their common fallacies. They make the assumption that because a group uses something, it therefore originates it. It is true

that occult groups use the symbol of the six-pointed star. They also use the symbol of the five-pointed star that appears on the American flag. They also use the cross as a symbol. But while they use all these symbols, that is not the same as saying that they originated these symbols. The Wendys quote various sources, but it is obvious they did not bother to look at the legitimacy of the sources, and as is mentioned in the beginning of this response, they write a disclaimer about checking out the validity of these sources. They quote sources that tend to agree with them, but they do not wish to bother validating whether or not these sources can be trusted. The sources that the Wendys are using to discredit the symbol of the shield of David is fallacious. The fact is that the earliest known record of the six-pointed star is in a second century synagogue in Capernaum; but it is one of many symbols there, and is not particularly unique. Second century Judaism did not practice occultism. Furthermore, it became a common Jewish symbol only in the Middle Ages as a sign of Jewish identity and nationalism. While occult movements may use it for their purposes, the Jewish community never used it for that same purpose. Churches should also give up using the cross for similar reasons if you use that same logic. The Wendys rant and rave against Jacob Prasch because he does use the Star of David. So do I, and so does Ariel Ministries, and unashamedly so. We are not going to be intimidated by the Wendys cries of "occultism." Again, their real problem is that it represents Jewishness and that is the point they really hate about it, inventing the whole scenario based upon sources they never even bothered to check out.

Page 62-63: In reading the *Despatch*, one clearly gets the impression that one of the reasons the Wendys do not like Messianic Jews is because Messianic Jews have the nerve to accept the original languages of Hebrew-Aramaic-Greek as having priority over an English translation. And since Messianic Jews virtually en masse reject the teaching that the King James Version is verbally inspired of God, that definitely drives the Wendys crazy. They state: "We have the Word of God in our own hands in the King James Bible in English." That means that unless you have the King James Bible, you do not have the Word of God if you use any other translation. But what do you do if the Hebrew original disagrees with the King James Version? We Messianic Jews will say that the Hebrew has the correct reading and the King James committee simply mistranslated what the verse says. But to them, the only Word of God is the King James Version. Here, again, they make it sound as if Fundamentalism always included loyalty to the King James Version, but that has never been the case in the Fundamentalist Movement in history, and is not now to the present day. That is just a cultic aberration of the Fundamentalist Movement that the Wendys are so guilty of. If something disagrees with "what God has clearly revealed to us already in the KJV—something is amiss." But God did not reveal His Word in the King James Version. He revealed His Word and produced it in Hebrew-Aramaic-Greek. The King James Version is a good translation of the original, but not the best, and has some glaring errors. While we certainly have a "fully reliable English Bible," translations like the American Standard Version of 1901 are far more reliable to the Hebrew text, for example, than is the Old King James Version.

Page 63: Anti-Semites, particularly neo-Nazi groups, love talking about "Jewish conspiracies" and "secret" Jewish organizations who are scheming to take over the world. I was not surprised to see in bold, capital lettered heading the following statement: "This is About 'Secret' Jewish Business!" And so, "This Midrash stuff is 'secret Jewish Business' because it makes the unwary think they need the 'secret key' of understanding that only the Jewish scholars have." The accusations that we are engaged in "secret Jewish Business" seems to come right out of the writings of Hitler's *Mein Kampf* and subsequent neo-Nazi literature. Nazis would not be all that unhappy with what the Wendys are claiming here. It is bad enough that they have no understanding of what *Midrash* really is. It is hardly "secret Jewish Business" since it has been available in English for a very long time. Furthermore, many scholars in *Midrash* are not Jewish, but many Gentile Evangelicals have become scholars in rabbinic literature, including the *Midrashim*. The way neo-Nazis use *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, a Russian Secret Police forgery that claims to be the minutes of secret Jewish meetings mapping out a world takeover, is the same way the Wendys use *Midrash*. However, the *Midrashim* are nothing more than homiletic interpretations of the Scriptures by the rabbis. While they are certainly very helpful in discovering the Jewish backgrounds to the New Testament, particularly the gospels, they are hardly secret or a "secret key" that only Jewish scholars have and, therefore, this is the way they intend to take over the church. Because the timing of the *Midrashim* often parallels the timing of the writing of the gospels, there are many points of similarity and many things in the gospels can be understood by understanding how Jews use these terms; a lot of it is found in the *Midrashim*. This is simply JB and not HRM, nor is it the key to take over the church. What is obvious to anyone who is willing do a simple study, what John says about the *Logos* is what the rabbis refer to as the *memra*. The six things the rabbis taught about the *memra*, John teaches about the *Logos*: (1) The *memra* was sometimes distinct from God but sometimes the same God—John says the *Logos*

was with God (therefore distinct from Him), but the *Logos* was also God (therefore the same as God); (2) the *memra* was the agent of creation—John states that all things were made through Him and without Him nothing was made that had been made; (3) the *memra* was the agent of salvation—John declares that those who believe in Him are the ones who become the children of God; (4) the *memra* was the means by which God became visible by means of the *Shechinah* Glory—John states that the Word became flesh and dwelled among us (and we beheld His glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father), full of grace and truth; (5) the *memra* was the means by which God signed His covenants—John states that the Law came through Moses, based upon the Mosaic Covenant, but grace and truth came through Jesus Christ, based upon the New Covenant, and, therefore, the Messiah is also a covenant signer; and (6) the *memra* was the agent of revelation—John states that while no man has seen God at any time, the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father had declared Him. This is one example of many where using rabbinic literature from that time helps to enlighten the New Testament. The *Midrash* is not a book of secret Jewish conspiracies, outlining how Messianic Jews are to take over the world. It is simply a source, in the same sense that Josephus is a source, the Dead Sea Scrolls are a source, archaeology is a source, to see the historical frame of reference of biblical backgrounds.

I, for one, do not see the New Testament using as much *Midrash* as does my friend, Jacob Prasch. While there are certain examples of the use of *Midrashic* type interpretation as in Galatians four, I see Paul merely using it to counteract the Galatian believers infatuation with rabbinic interpretations. He uses *Midrash* to show that if we resort to homiletic interpretation rather than literal interpretation, then it allows for more than one conclusion, including the opposite of what the Judaizers were teaching the Galatians. Outside of that, and perhaps a few minor examples here and there, I do not see the New Testament writers using *Midrashic* interpretation *per se*. As Matthew two shows, the biblical writers do quote the Old Testament in four different categories, in the same way the rabbis did, both in the *Midrash* and in the *Talmud*. Matthew two quotes Hosea 11:1 and refers it to Christ. However, a look at Hosea itself shows that Hosea is speaking of Israel and calls this son disobedient. That could hardly be true of Christ. So how is it that Matthew can apply this passage to Christ without being accused of taking the verse out of context? A study of how rabbis in the *Midrash* and the *Talmud* quoted the Old Testament would provide the answer. There are many examples like this that will help the Wendys understand the Bible better, but like those in Romans one, they refuse the knowledge available to them because it is Jewish. The point is that the Wendys do not even understand what the *Midrash* is about to begin with and, again, they tend to use it the same way neo-Nazis use *The Protocols*: "secret Jewish Business" to take over something or other.

Page 64: On this page the Wendys declare themselves to be "members of the Remnant Church," but they never define what that means so I have no idea as to who the Remnant Church is and what exactly it constitutes. They claim it is not attached to any denomination, but there is no statement of faith anywhere to know exactly what they do believe and teach. If I was to resort to guilt by association, I could say that the terminology indicates that they are members of the Identity Cults that have become common in the U.S.A. They share a common anti-Semitic, anti-Jewish perspective, and claim to be Fundamentalists, and claim that the King James Version is the only true Bible. I do not know that is what they are; they do not define themselves very well. If nothing else, they certainly share the same views as the Identity Cults. But I will not say they are, since that would be guilt by association.

Page 65: This page is loaded with one anti-Semitic statement after another and they constantly react to Jewishness, claiming that you either have more of Jewishness or more of Christ, but apparently you cannot have both. They again make references to "our Reformation Bibles"; but again, there is no such thing as a "Reformation Bible." The Bible was a product of Jews, not Reformers. The Bible was there well before the Reformation. Furthermore, none of the Reformers used the King James Version. When they raise the question, "Do you believe that the Christian Church has suffered through many hundreds of years because it did NOT have a proper Bible interpretation?" the implication is that the church has suffered because of their adherence to the King James Version. When the Church was persecuted, it had nothing to do with the King James Version and through most of church history those who were persecuted for the faith knew nothing about the King James Version; in fact, most of them could not read English.

Page 66: In dealing here with Jacob Prasch's web site, they state: "Also we are alarmed at the links on his Web site, which includes Arnold Fruchtenbaum links and through him the extremes of the Hebrew Roots Movement. Why aren't you alarmed?" Here is another lie, folks. Why should people be alarmed that his web site has a link to me? Because through me people are exposed to the extremes of the HRM? If only the

Wendys had bothered to read what I actually say, they would know I am opposed to the HRM and so anybody reading our material on the web site would never conclude that the HRM is valid. It is such a shame that the Wendys never bothered to look at our web site and see what we really say. If they have, then what they state makes them out-and-out liars. For now we will give them the benefit of the doubt and simply say they are ignorant, but it is willful ignorance since they did not bother to do any checking.

Page 68: Here the Wendys state: "These insults against Protestant Theology deny the fact that the Protestant Reformers were utterly dependable and stood firm in literal-grammatical interpretation of the Holy Scriptures." The assumption is that "Protestant Theology" was always uniform, again a statement that simply is not true. If it was, there would not have been the different denominations within the Protestant Movement. Furthermore, while the Protestants generally held to a grammatical-historical interpretation, it would be incorrect to say they held to a literal-grammatical interpretation. If they took the Bible literally, they all would have been premillennial and, more specifically, they would have been Dispensational. But virtually all of the Reformers took an Amillennial stance and they spiritualized and allegorized prophecy, Ecclesiology, and Israelology. Replacement Theology by its very nature denies the literal interpretation. They were certainly literal in some parts, such as statements about salvation, but they were not literal in many other parts of their biblical interpretation, as anybody reading Luther or Calvin can easily see.

On the same page they seem to contrast literal-grammatical interpretation from grammatical-historical, but that is a faulty dichotomy. The correct hermeneutic principle is literal-grammatical-historical interpretation. The term "historical" simply means that when we take the words of the Bible literally, we must understand how these words were used at the time they were written and not how they may be used today. Because a certain word has a certain meaning in the twentieth century, this does not mean it had the same meaning in the first century. If we take the grammatical interpretation, at the same time we must understand the grammatical issues as used at the time the Bible books were written. Furthermore, we take them literally. The Reformers generally followed the grammatical-historical interpretation, as their commentaries show; however, to claim that they took the Bible literally is simply not true to fact. If they had taken it literally, there would have been a lot less theological divisions in the Protestant Church. Furthermore, if they had not ignored the Jewish backgrounds, they would never have come up with such fantasies as Amillennialism, infant baptism, baptismal regeneration, and other false teachings that were found among the Reformers. It is proper to praise the Reformers for what they did accomplish. But it is wrong to ignore the errors that they also produced, such as Amillennialism, infant baptism, church hierarchies, etc. When the Wendys say they are not part of any denomination or hierarchy, they are doing something against Reformers who did set up hierarchical churches themselves.

Page 70: Here the Wendys claim that what we are saying is: "You have to have a Jewish rabbi who can explain Midrash before you can have the 'secret key' that will open the door to understanding." They have never read anything that I have written that says this. And as far as I know, neither has Jacob Prasch ever said this. But Jacob Prasch can ably defend himself. Furthermore, Prasch has never claimed to be a rabbi and neither have I.

Page 71-72: Here the Wendys fault Jacob Prasch because: "He does not say he accepts the KJV as the completed, authoritative, infallible Word Of God in English." Nor should he, and neither do I. Neither do most of the Fundamentalists in the Fundamentalist Movement. The only thing we accept is the authoritative and infallible Word of God as the original autographs that were written in Hebrew-Aramaic-Greek. No English translation, or any other translation, shares the principle of verbal inspiration.

They then go on to attack me under the bold title, "Jacob's co-worker?" Before putting this in print, a simple phone call would have answered that question. On one hand we are co-workers because we are in Jewish ministries. But if by "co-worker" they mean that we work for the same organization, the answer is no. We have separate and different ministries so that he can fulfill God's calling in his life, and I can fulfill God's calling in mine. The real problem is their accusation of me fostering the Ecumenical Movement. The premise is already faulty in that they begin with the presupposition that the LCJE is an Ecumenical Movement, fostering a one world church concept; but there is nothing anywhere in any LCJE writings that even comes close to such a concept. Based on that, they go on to say: "The emerging One World Church, with its World Christian Movement, lists Arnold Fruchtenbaum and his 'Ariel Ministries!'" Even if what they say about the LCJE was true, my speaking there does not mean I am promoting a one world church since, as I have already made clear, I will preach the gospel anywhere the door is opened. The fact is, that is not the position of the LCJE to begin with. If they had simply read a few pages of my writings, particularly pages 50-60 of

*Footsteps of the Messiah*, which would not have taken them all that much time, they would have read clearly what my position is. I stand in opposition to the Ecumenical Movement. I also stand in opposition to Liberalism. I tell believers inside liberal churches or apostate churches to get out. Would you know that is my position from what the Wendys write? Obviously not. Once again, they are guilty of out-and-out lying and the reason for these lies is for no other reason than I am a Jew and they hate that.

Page 76: Here the Wendys mix their King James cultism with their anti-Semitism when they write in bold print: "We will not denounce our reformers or the reformation Bible! We will not do so in order to drift off into Judaism! Nor will we accept the 'superior' hermeneutics of the Jewish rabbis!" First, once again, there is no such thing as the Reformation Bible because the Bible was produced by Jews, not by the Reformers; second, the Reformers used a Bible that was clearly not the King James Version; third, the issue is not "drift off into Judaism," but willing to look at the Jewish frame of reference out of which the Bible was written to see if we can gain a better understanding of it; fourth, no one is promoting rabbinic hermeneutics, least of all myself or Ariel Ministries. They go on to say that "the Bible must be understood only in its plain and literal sense . . ." This is true and it is a shame the Reformers did not do so, but allegorized and spiritualized great parts of Scripture, especially in the area of Bible prophecy.

Page 79: On this page the Wendys deny that they are guilty of "Ruckmanism," but that really is what they are guilty of since the essence of Ruckmanism is the belief that God inspired only one English translation and that is the King James Version. They give lip service to the original languages, but what do you do when the original languages disagree with the King James Version? Take the case of Isaiah 14:12. The King James Version reads "Lucifer," a Latin title borrowed from the Latin Vulgate. However, the Hebrew word simply says, "day star." That is what the American Standard Version of 1901 reads and that is the correct translation. Here, the King James Version is clearly wrong, and while the Wendys would like for me to correct the Hebrew Bible based upon King James, that is not the way God chose to reveal His Word. In Ezekiel 39:1-5, the King James Version states that God will leave one-sixth of the invading army alive to survive. The Hebrew makes no such statement and the point is that the entire invading army is destroyed. Thus, the ASV of 1901 has made the correct translation and does not state, "I will leave but a sixth part of you." It is not in the Hebrew text and the King James Version simply got it wrong here. So do we correct by an English version the original Hebrew that God gave us? Under no circumstances. I could give many other examples along this line, but here is a foundational reason why the Wendys hate Messianic Jews so much. They refuse to change what God wrote in His Hebrew Bible to make it correspond with a faulty English rendering of the King James Version. The Wendys state:

Not one doctrine or truth has been changed or flawed in the KJV, it is a soundly reliable and a glorious translation in English. Trust it, you need no other. And use Greek and Hebrew concordance et al to look up meanings of words.

I can agree with the first part of that sentence, but that is also true of many other English translations, that they are soundly reliable and do not change a single doctrine and no doctrine is flawed in my ASV of 1901. I can also say that if you have the ASV of 1901 you need no other since that is a very superb English translation of the original languages. But when they suggest you use the Greek and Hebrew concordances to look up meanings of words, what do you do when that same Hebrew and Greek concordance gives you a different translation than what the King James Version provides? What do you do then? The answer is, you fix the English to conform to the Hebrew and Greek. You do not change the Hebrew and Greek to make it conform to the English. If the Wendys would simply follow their own advice, they would soon see that there are translation errors, like those I have just mentioned, in the King James Version. Pages 88-90: In these pages the Wendys respond to certain questions and make some interesting statements, but they also continue to reveal their anti-Semitic mindset with statements such as "perverted Jewish symbols" (they never mention anything like "perverted Gentile symbols"). In this section a writer asks about what she has heard about God's name being YHWH and wonders if this is part of "the emerging One World Religion which is really the religion of Freemasonry . . ." And the question is asked, "How is this name YHWH going to figure in this." Anyone who knows basic Hebrew 101, realizes that these are the four letters that make up God's personal name and, therefore, could hardly be accused of being occultic. At least the Wendys know this much and they initially respond by saying, "Firstly, the Name YHWH is, of course, the Name Yahweh in the Hebrew. It is the same as Jehovah." That is not quite correct, but I will let that pass as I have had to let many, many small points of error pass since it is impossible to comment on every single error this magazine makes. But the interesting point is that they obviously cannot claim that YHWH is just another "perverted Jewish symbol" and obviously cannot blame the occult movement for producing this. But they also have to admit

that the occult movement does use it. They state, "Satan is not an instigator, he copies, he is a copier." While YHWH is used by occult groups, this does not mean they originated YHWH, they are simply copying it and using it for their own purpose. For once they have made a correct observation. What they fail to see is that the same thing has happened with the Magen David, or the "Star of David." The occult groups are merely using this Jewish symbol (which the Wendys consider "perverted," but which I wear proudly), but they are not the originators of this symbol. Just as the occult groups misuse YHWH, they also misuse the six-pointed star. Their anti-Semitism simply does not allow them to see it for what it truly is. Also, just in passing, it would be biblically incorrect to claim that Satan "is not an instigator," but only a copier. He has the capacity to instigate many things. One of the things he instigates is the very anti-Semitism that the Wendys so consistently display while denying it at the same time.

On page 90 the Wendys claim that the term *Yeshua* is "a perversion of the name Jesus." It is very difficult to tolerate this level of ignorance. You would think that the Messiah's mother called him "Jesus" and that later the name was perverted to *Yeshua*. The simple fact is that the name "Jesus" is the Anglicized form of the Greek *Iesous* which, in turn, is the Greek form for the Hebrew *Yeshua*. The only possible way they could come up with such a theory, that *Yeshua* is a perversion of the name "Jesus," is their assumption that the King James Version is the only inspired Bible and, therefore, the way the King James committee chose to spell out biblical names was what they were actually called in biblical times, the fact that English was not known back then notwithstanding.

Page 93: This whole page is dedicated to an exposé that the Millennium Dome built in England is a product of witchcraft (though they make a point of reading the Disclaimer on this page, so apparently they are not really sure since they are quoting somebody else, and are very good at not checking their sources). My only observation here is that at least on this page they do not blame the Jews for it. Perhaps in a future issue we will find some Jewish connection and conspiracy concerning the Millennium Dome!

This has been a very long and tedious response and has taken many, many hours of my time, which I would rather devote to serious Bible study. I can often ignore the many attacks I get from unsaved Jewish groups, the liberal Protestants who oppose our work in Jewish evangelism, attacks coming from Ecumenical leaders, and I can even largely ignore the many attacks I get from Messianic circles because of my position concerning freedom from the Law and the rejection of rabbinic writings as being authoritative, to be used only for background studies. But when an organization that claims to be a Fundamentalist Christian organization attacks me in the name of Christ, while never reading anything I have written or listening to any tape I have made, and presents me as believing and fostering things where the exact opposite is true, and then sends this out to Christians without even the courage to send me a copy themselves, that cannot go unanswered. Because of the cultic nature that the Wendys represent, those who are their followers will not bother to read this response, since they have already chosen to believe what they wish to believe, the facts notwithstanding. And those who are familiar with my writings and my teachings will know that the whole magazine is nothing but a lie, and I know of at least one detailed response to that effect already. This response has been written for people who may not be in the loop and might assume that what the Wendys are saying is based upon well-researched facts; therefore, the purpose of this response is to disperse any such misconceptions. Again, the purpose of this response is to present the simple truth.

I am happy to answer any further questions about any of these details that anybody reading this would like to ask.