THE BIBLE, ZIONISM, AND PALESTINE

Bible In Effect

Number 1

BIBLE IN EFFECT, 1

THE BIBLE, ZIONISM, AND PALESTINE

THE BIBLE'S ROLE IN CONFLICT AND LIBERATION IN ISRAEL-PALESTINE

edited by Michael J. Sandford

RELEGERE ACADEMIC PRESS
DUNEDIN, NEW ZEALAND

RELEGERE
RELEGERE ACADEMIC PRESS

It is the objective of Relegere Academic Press to make available excellent open-access scholarship, at zero cost for ebooks and at a low cost for printed books.

Typeset by Deane Galbraith using XeLaTeX

Publication Data
Name: Sandford, Michael J., editor
Title: The Bible, Zion, and Palestine: The Bible's role in conflict and liberation in Israel-Palestine / Michael J. Sandford
Description: Dunedin (New Zealand): Relegere Academic Press, 2016 | Includes bibliographical references and indices
Identifiers: ISBN: 978-0-473-33279-2 (paper) | ISBN: 978-0-473-33280-8 (ebook)
Subjects (LCSH): Bible—Criticism and interpretation. Zionism.

For those who work with wisdom
towards a just peace
in Israel and Palestine

Contents

Acknowledgements

The Bible, Zionism, and Palestine conference and this publication have been made possible only with the cooperation and energy of a good number of people. First of all, Anne Clayton's enthusiasm and cooperation with Sabeel in Jerusalem was instrumental in getting things rolling. I am also grateful for receiving early on encouragement to go ahead with the project from James Crossley. I benefitted from input and conversations with a number of others at (what was) the Department of Biblical Studies at Sheffield, in particular Mark Finney, Philip Davies, Hilary Perry, Hugh Pyper, Iona Hine, and Mike Kok. As ever, Alison Bygrave provided all sorts of practical and logistical help along the way. Angela Broom remains indirectly responsible for igniting my interest in this whole area, and Chloe Skinner supported me in all sorts of ways in the build up to the conference.

A number of people (some of whom travelled many miles to be there) made important contributions to panels or presented papers which are not featured directly in this volume and deserve mention here. These people are Warren Elf, Charles Wallach, Yuval Evri, Nur Masalha, Philip Davies, Susanne Sklar, Stefan Matthias, Laura Quick, Jo Bridger, Chloe Skinner, Chiara Rioli, Jonathan Downing, Kevin McCarthy, Ward Blanton, Karen Wenell, Isabelle Hesse, Nicola Robinson, and Catherine Boyd. Thanks are also due to session chairs Katie Edwards, John Vincent, David Chalcraft, and Iona Hine, and others who helped at the conference itself including Richard Mennear, Jon Ross, Josh Stead, and Towan Greene. I am grateful to Deane Galbraith at *Relegere* for all his work in arranging the publication of this collection.

In many ways this project grew out of my reading the work of Naim Ateek, Keith Whitelam, and Amy-Jill Levine. I am honoured therefore to be able to include responses from Amy-Jill Levine and Keith Whitelam herein, as well as Naim Ateek's keynote address. These voices are joined by a broad selection of scholarly perspectives on the subject, and I am grateful to each one of them for helping to create a collection which will serve as a valuable aid to debate and understanding.

Michael J. Sandford

Contributors

REV DR NAIM S. ATEEK is the founder and head of the Sabeel Ecumenical Liberation Theology Center, and former Canon of St George's Cathedral, Jerusalem. His major writings include *Justice and Only Justice: A Palestinian Theology of Liberation* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1989)—generally recognised as the first book to articulate a Palestinian theology of liberation—and *A Palestin-ian Cry for Reconciliation* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 2008). He continues to lecture widely both at home and abroad.

PROFESSOR JAMES G. CROSSLEY is Professor of Bible, Culture and Politics in the Centre for the Social-Scientific Study of the Bible, St Mary's University, Twickenham, London. His two major research interests are the historical Jesus and contemporary constructions of the Bible in political discourses. His recent publications include *Jesus and the Chaos of History: Redirecting the Life of the Historical Jesus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015) and *Harnessing Chaos: The Bible in English Political Discourse since 1968* (updated edition; London and New York: Bloomsbury/T&T Clark, 2016).

PROFESSOR DAN COHN-SHERBOK is Professor Emeritus of Judaism at the University of Wales and Honorary Professor at Aberystwyth University. He is the author and editor of over 90 books, including many on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and promoting Jewish-Christian dialogue.

DR RON DART has taught in the Department of Political Studies/Philosophy/ Religious Studies at University of the Fraser Valley in Abbotsford, British Columbia, Canada since 1990. His most recent book is *Canadian Christian Zionism: A Tangled Tale* (Dewdnesy: Synaxis Press, 2015), on former Prime Minister Stephen Harper (2006–15), Canadian conservative evangelicals, Zionism and the Palestinians. Ron was featured in the recent film on American Zionism, and the Palestinians, *With God On Our Side* and he has published two articles in *Holy Land Studies*.

DR MARK FINNEY lectures in the Department of Biblical Studies at the University of Sheffield. His teaching and research interests include religion and violence, contemporary aspects of religion and conflict in the Middle East (e.g., the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, Zionism, Christian Zionism, and the influence of the Christian Right in US foreign policy), and concepts of religion and the afterlife. He also has an interest in religion and art.

DR MARK GILFILLAN is currently a Research Assistant at the University of Edinburgh. In 2012 he completed a PhD thesis on the history of Edinburgh Jewry, 1790 to 1950. He is currently working on a project examining the history of the Church of Scotland's attitudes to Jews from the seventeenth century to the present.

PROFESSOR LESTER L. GRABBE is Emeritus Professor of Hebrew Bible and Early Judaism at the University of Hull. His research focuses on early Judaism and Northwest Semitic philology. His recent publications include *Ancient Israel: What Do We Know and How Do We Know It?* (London and New York: T&T Clark, 2007) and his four-volume work *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period*.

DR MARY GREY has held academic posts in the Netherlands (Chair of Feminism and Christianity at the University of Nijmegen), Southampton (Chair of Contemporary Theology), and the University of Wales, Lampeter, (Chair of Pastoral Theology). She has a long association with St Mary's University, Twickenham, where she is Visiting Professor as well as being Honorary Professor at the University of Winchester. She has published extensively in the area of Liberation Theology, Ecology, and Social Justice. Her latest two books have focused on Israel-Palestine, *The Advent of Peace: A Gospel Journey to Christmas* (London: SPCK, 2010), and *The Resurrection of Peace: A Gospel Journey to Easter and Beyond* (London: SPCK 2012). She is a patron of Friends of Sabeel UK, a Trustee of Living Stones of the Holy Land, and Chair of their Theology Group.

DR ALASTAIR G. HUNTER is Honorary Research Fellow in the Department of Theology and Religious Studies in the University of Glasgow. He has taught and researched extensively in the field of Biblical Studies, with particular emphasis on the Psalms, the book of Jonah, and Old Testament wisdom literature. His most recent book is *An Introduction to the Psalms* (London: T&T Clark, 2008). He was President of UCU Scotland for three years to May 2007, and is currently national President of UCU, having served two years as vice-president with responsibility for Higher Education.

DR MICHAEL J. KOK received his PhD in biblical studies at the University of Sheffield under the supervision of Professor James Crossley on the early reception of the Gospel of Mark in the second century. His research interests include Jewish-Christian relations in the early centuries CE and the emergence of the Christian *adversus Ioudaios* ("Against the Jews") literature. His PhD dissertation has recently been published as *The Gospel on the Margins: The Reception of Mark in the Second Century* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015).

PROFESSOR AMY-JILL LEVINE is University Professor of New Testament and Jewish Studies, E. Rhodes and Leona B. Carpenter Professor of New Testament Studies, and

Professor of Jewish Studies at Vanderbilt University Divinity School and College of Arts and Sciences. Levine is also Affiliated Professor at the Woolf Institute: Centre for the Study of Jewish-Christian Relations, and co-edited *The Jewish Annotated New Testament* with Marc Brettler (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

PROFESSOR ILAN PAPPÉ is the Director of the European Centre for Palestine Studies at the University of Exeter and a fellow of the Institute for Arab and Islamic Studies. He was born in 1954 in Israel. He received his D.Phil from the University of Oxford in 1984. He taught in the University of Haifa between 1984 and 2006 when he moved to the University of Exeter. Among his books: *A Modern History of Palestine: One Land, Two Peoples* (2nd ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine* (Oxford: OneWorld, 2006); *The Modern Middle East* (2nd ed.; London and New York: Routledge, 2010); and *The Forgotten Palestinians: A History of the Palestinian Minority in Israel* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2011).

HILARY PERRY is a PhD student in the Department of Biblical Studies at the University of Sheffield, UK.

DR MICHAEL SANDFORD earned his PhD from the University of Sheffield. He has lectured in biblical studies at the University of Leeds, the University of Sheffield, Leeds Trinity University, and the Pacific Theological College, Fiji. His first major monograph is *Poverty, Wealth and Empire: Jesus and Postcolonial Criticism* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2014).

PROFESSOR KEITH W. WHITELAM is Emeritus Professor and former Head of Department at the University of Sheffield. His 1996 book, *The Invention of Ancient Israel: The Silencing of Palestinian History* was a watershed in the study of the construction of Israel within biblical studies. More recently he has published a history of the Palestine region in the longue durée, *Rhythms of Time: Reconnecting Palestine's Past* (Sheffield: BenBlackBooks, 2013).

Abbreviations

AUT	The Association of University Teachers (United Kingdom)
BDS	Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions
COSATU	Congress of South African Trade Unions
CUFI	Christians United for Israel (United States)
EAPPI	The Ecumenical Accompaniment Programme in Palestine and Israel
EUMC	European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia
HLS	*Holy Land Studies* [now, *Journal of Holy Land and Palestine Studies*]
ICAHD	The Israeli Committee Against House Demolitions
JECS	*Journal of Early Christian Studies*
JQR	*Jewish Quarterly Review*
JSHJ	*Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus*
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
NATFHE	The National Association of Teachers in Further and Higher Education (United Kingdom)
NDP	New Democratic Party (Canada)
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
NUS	National Union of Students (United Kingdom)
PCUSA	Presbyterian Church USA
PFUUPE	Palestinian Federation of University Unions of Professors and Employees
SAHRC	South African Human Rights Commission
SJAC	Scottish Jewish Archive Centre
SRB	*Scofield Reference Bible*
SOAS	School of Oriental and African Studies (University of London)
SWP	Socialist Workers Party (United Kingdom)
THES	*Times Higher Education Supplement* [now, *Times Higher Education*]
TUC	Trades Union Congress (United Kingdom)
UCU	The University and College Union (United Kingdom)
UNSCOP	United Nations Special Committee on Palestine

INTRODUCTION

Bible, Zionism, Palestine

Michael J. Sandford

The interest that the Bible, Zionism, and Palestine conference (Sheffield, May 24–26, 2012) generated suggests that there is a continuing need, in the UK, for critical discussion about the relationship between "Holy Land" theology and global politics. As several contributions in this volume highlight, North American religion and politics play a fundamental role in shaping the political structure of the region. But there was a time when the UK meddled significantly in the political organisation of Palestine—and because of this, there is a sense in which the British hold some responsibility for the contemporary situation, whatever their power to influence events there today.[1] Britons, like Americans, remain unshakably inquisitive about goings-on in Israel and Palestine, an interest that certainly derives from the Jewish and Christian bibles, as well as, specifically, restorationist, dispensationalist, and Jewish and Christian Zionist theologies. This interest is, of course, fed daily by certain media outlets which position the Holy Land at the centre of the world stage.

Happily, the Bible, Zionism, and Palestine conference in Sheffield received nothing of the attention that the more overtly political and provocatively titled Christ at the Checkpoint conference in Bethlehem received, earlier in the same month.[2] Yet it is considered political, by some, simply to include the name "Palestine" in the title of a conference or a book (and no doubt to omit the name "Israel"—although "Zionism,"

[1] "The Balfour Project" is especially interesting in this respect. The home page of their website states: "In responding to Jewish aspirations, Britain deliberately ignored the rights and expectations of the Palestinian Arabs who inhabited the land. Without questioning the right of Israel to exist, the Balfour Project believes it is time for British people to express our shame at this unacceptable double standard. There is evidence that healing and reconciliation can flow from acknowledging the wrongs of the past." See http://www.balfourproject.org/.

[2] See http://www.christatthecheckpoint.com/.

of course, implies Israel). The jarring juxtaposition of "Christ" and "the Checkpoint" invoked by Bethlehem Bible College's conference, and their targeting of prominent American Evangelicals may have diverted some attention away from the academic and substantially less politically charged gathering in the green and pleasant lands of South Yorkshire.

I believe that the BZP conference and publication mark a significant period for Sheffield Biblical Studies, during which several at Sheffield have been working on issues relating to Israel and Palestine. Five of the articles in this volume have been contributed by Sheffield staff and students. I have no doubt that some of these contributions, besides at least a couple of others in this volume, have been informed by the work of the former Sheffield Head of Department, Keith Whitelam. Whitelam's *The Invention of Ancient Israel*, which explicitly highlighted the role of biblical studies and the search for "ancient Israel" in shaping attitudes towards the land in recent decades, stands as one of the most important publications on the intersection of the Bible, Zionism, and Palestine to date.[3] It should be noted, however, that the present volume actually contains little on historiography in relation to ancient Israel and Palestine, besides Lester Grabbe's contribution which, as it happens, includes a critique of Whitelam's important book.

The Bible, Zionism, and Palestine includes contributions from three of the four keynote speakers who presented at the conference (Ilan Pappé, Dan Cohn-Sherbok, and Naim Ateek) and nine of the other speakers.[4] To develop and enrich the conversation, we have also solicited three responses: from Amy-Jill Levine to Michael Sandford's essay; from Keith Whitelam to Lester Grabbe's essay; and from James Crossley, who responds to the essays which advocate for a Palestinian Liberation Theology.

These essays could, of course, be organised in numerous ways, but the content suggested three main divisions. Accordingly, Part 1 provides discussion and analysis of some of the varieties of Zionism—both historical and contemporary, both religious and secular, both Jewish and Christian. In Part 2, the volume turns to theologies of liberation, outlining some of the rationales and biblical grounds for a Palestinian Liberation Theology, its potential for forging peace in Palestine-Israel, as well as some of its limitations. The final group of papers, in Part 3, makes some initial forays into a form of biblical studies explicitly performed, as it were, in the shadow of the Nakba.

Part 1 ("Varieties of Zionism") commences with Ilan Pappé's paper, which elucidates the paradoxical value of the Hebrew Bible to secular Zionists in the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century. Mark Finney's paper examines contemporary US Christian Zionism, including its implications for international relations. Next, Hilary Perry's paper focuses on Cyrus I. Scofield's annotated bible and its influence on prominent Amer-

[3] Keith W. Whitelam, *The Invention of Ancient Israel: The Silencing of Palestinian History* (London: Routledge, 1996).

[4] Unfortunately Nur Masalha's keynote paper could not be included, but see Nur Masalha, *The Bible and Zionism: Invented Traditions, Archaeology and Post-Colonialism in Palestine-Israel* (London: Zed Books, 2007).

ican Evangelicals today: John Hagee, Arnold G. Fruchtenbaum, Charles H. Dyer, and Edward E. Hindson. Mark Gilfillan's paper discusses the failure of Scottish Christian Zionism in the late nineteenth century, examining the role of the niche organisation, the Edinburgh *Chovevei Zion*. Finally, Ron Dart's paper traces the origins of Christian Zionism in Canada, and the entry of this ideology into the highest echelons of political power, under Conservative Prime Minister Stephen Harper (2006–15).

In Part 2 ("Palestinian Liberation Theology"), Dan Cohn-Sherbok outlines his vision of a Jewish theology of liberation, one which draws on the notion of the Kingdom of God and Jewish ethics to argue for the equality of all people, and the empowerment of the oppressed. Naim Ateek's contribution argues for an inclusive theology, and a solution to the conflict based on international law. Mary Grey argues that Jesus' nonviolent resistance to the Roman Empire could serve as inspiration today. The response chapter from James Crossley examines negative aspects of the Kingdom of God, arguing that the Gospels are not straightforward resources for liberation.

Michael Sandford's article, which commences Part 3 ("Post-Nakba Biblical Studies"), examines the significance of the Jewishness of Jesus for Jewish-Christian dialogue relating to the land today. This is followed by a brief response from Amy-Jill Levine who picks up issues relating to liberation theology, anti-Judaism, and peace-building. Lester Grabbe's article argues that history has been manipulated not only for "Pro-Zionist" but also for "Pro-Palestinian" purposes.The response from Keith Whitelam replies to Grabbe's charges while reiterating his earlier critiques of ideological blind spots within contemporary biblical studies concerning the construction of Israel and Palestine. Michael Kok's article makes a contribution to the debate over the meaning of *ioudaios* via an analysis of Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*. Kok also critiques certain Christian caricatures of Judaism and the tendency of certain liberation theologies to idealise Christianity, arguing that Christianity must confess to its own "particularity" and "exclusivity" in order to further Jewish-Christian dialogue. Lastly, Alastair Hunter examines the Old Testament notion of the "ban" (*cherem*) and relates it to the University and College Union's dealings with the Israel boycott.

The collection therefore makes useful and often provocative contributions to scholarship in all three areas: bringing to light previously underexplored varieties of Zionism, examining liberation theology's potential either to alleviate or reinscribe oppression, and doing biblical scholarship in ways which consciously foreground the voices of the marginalised in Palestine and Israel.

PART ONE

Varieties of Zionism

ONE

The Bible in the Service of Zionism

"We do not Believe in God, but he Nonetheless Promised us Palestine"

Ilan Pappé

There is a tale, which is 66.5% true, about Ben-Zion Dinburg (later Dinur), the doyen of early Zionist historiography in Palestine and later one of the first Ministers of Education. In 1937, he was approached by David Ben-Gurion, the leader of the Jewish community in Palestine and later the first Prime Minister of Israel, two weeks before the arrival of the Royal Peel Commission that was asked by His Majesty's Government to find a solution for the conflict in Palestine. Ben-Gurion inquired whether the respectable historian could produce some research that would prove Jewish continuity from 70 CE, the time of the Roman exile, to 1882, the time of the arrival of the first Zionists. "Well," replied the historian, "I could but this involves many periods and a variety of expertise and therefore it will probably take a decade or so to complete it successfully." "You do not understand," retorted Ben-Gurion, "The Peel Commission is coming in two weeks' time, therefore you have to reach your conclusion by then. After that, you have a whole decade to prove it!"

Even if this story is not entirely true—it has no identifiable source—it shows the interaction between the ancient Jewish experience in Palestine and the Zionist battle for recognition and legitimacy in the twentieth century. It is not clear whether the presentation of the continuity argument won the day. It was in any case presented as a powerful argument in front of both the Peel Commission and the United Nations Special Committee On Palestine (UNSCOP) in 1947. British and later UN support for Zionism, it seems in hindsight, had little to do with the proof for such continuity. However, both for internal consumption and external support, Zionist exploitation of the Bible as both a scientific truth and moral justification for the colonization of Palestine did matter considerably in the ability to recruit large sections of the Western Christian

world behind the Zionist movement.

The secular early Zionists quoted intensively from the Bible to show that there was a divine imperative to colonize Palestine, or in their discourse, to redeem Eretz Israel.[1] But in fact the Bible is not a very useful text for reinventing a Jewish nation: the father of the nation, Abraham, was not from Palestine, the Hebrews became a nation in Egypt, and the Bible was given to them in Egypt (the Sinai). This text was reinterpreted by the early and secular Zionists: the nation was one of the tribes, living under occupation in Canaan, exiled to Egypt, and come back to redeem the homeland, as did the modern Zionists. The secular Zionists saw themselves as the new occupiers of Canaan—namely the successors of Joshua and the Judges; and they too founded a Jewish kingdom.[2]

On the margins of the secular, and quite often socialist, early Zionist settler bodies grew a small group of religious people who were taken by the idea of Zionism. They added to the secular interpretation the idea that the exile—not only to Egypt, but the various exiles throughout the biblical period associated with the immoral and anti-God behaviour of the people—was a punishment that came to an end with the arrival of Zionism in Palestine. Later, on the ground in Palestine, they would add that in order for the exile not to reoccur, a more religious behaviour would be required by the settlers, an issue that continues to divide Jewish society in Israel.[3]

What secular and religious Zionists agreed on was that the Bible had a central place, not as a religious text, but rather as a historical document that reaffirmed the right for ownership over the land. Moreover, it was read by secular Zionists as a text that deemed exile from that land as an abnormal and unhealthy historical condition.[4]

The Bible was treated as a book that foresaw and predicted the return of the people to their land, the building of the country, and the gathering of exiles—all Hebrew terms appearing the Bible and re-used as a modern national dictionary. So it provided both a spiritual justification and a practical map which pointed to the locations, and sites, where things happened during the biblical period that would become the Zionist map of colonization.[5]

Both these approaches, which regarded the Bible as an independent basis for settlement and rejected exile as non-Jewish and abnormal, in reality were alien concepts to any practicing and religious Jew when Zionism appeared; this fusion still leaves practicing Jews in an uncomfortable position today.

The first problem for them was that they had never studied the Bible as a separate book, if they studied it at all. But the problem was more serious than that. As underlined

---

[1] Bracha Habas, ed., *The Book of the Second Aliya* (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1947) [Hebrew]. This book is the largest published collection of Second Aliya diary entries, letters, and articles.

[2] Oz Almog, *The Sabra: A Profile* (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1981), 81 [Hebrew].

[3] Yohanan H. Levy, *Disputes Regarding Land in Israel in Ancient Times*, in *Studies in Jewish Hellenism* (Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute, 1969), 60–78 [Hebrew].

[4] Micha Yossef Ben-Gurion (Berdichevsky), *Writings and Articles* (Tel Aviv: Dvir, 1960), 99–150 [Hebrew].

[5] See David Ben-Gurion, *Studies in the Bible* (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1976).

by Amnon Raz-Krakotzkin, Zionist experience raised from the very beginning many problems for practising Jews who had found themselves unable to interpret the "return" of the Jews in Israel before the return of the Messiah. Thus, on a metaphysical level, exile is not ended with the creation of the Jewish state. Indeed, exile is a major constituent of Jewish identity and is supposed to have a therapeutic function which Zionism endangers in claiming the return to Eretz Israel, as only God is able to put an end to exile. This particular criticism of course prevailed among the Orthodox Jews such as the *Haredim*, who were not at all comfortable with the use the Zionists made of the Torah and the concept of the Promised Land.[6]

These theological and ideological divergences of opinion about the place of the Bible, the concept of return and other more marginal issues were symptoms of a much more profound gap between the Orthodox and Zionist Jewish perspectives. Mainstream Zionism was not only a movement seeking the colonization of Palestine and the assertion of the Jewish right for self-determination; it was also a very significant movement of secularization. As such it was not unique in the period when other religious groups for similar or other reasons redefined themselves in national terms. But its relationship with the religious interpretation of identity proved to be complex, as in many cases of what Anthony Smith used to call "vertical nationalism"—national identities born in a close association with the religious affiliation despite their modernization and success in creating a nation state.[7]

When the early Orthodox protests were made, Zionism was still a minority opinion among world Jewry and in many ways this objection could have wilted the early buds of secular Jewish nationalism or at least the insistence of implementing the idea of Jewish nationalism necessarily in Palestine. Hence in the early twentieth century, some of the leading figures of the Zionist movement, including the founding father of the movement, Theodor Herzl, opted for colonization elsewhere. The preferred option was Uganda.[8]

Christian Biblical Scholarship and the Zionization of Palestine

Eventually Palestine was chosen. Among the reasons for this shift was strong British support for the idea. The support was mainly on the basis of religious, rather than strategic, interests—although one could very rarely separate the two in the British imperial drive across the globe. The foundations for this British religious interest in settling the Jews in Palestine are to be found in the Western Christian scholarship about the Bible as a text that foresees the future and serves as a political, not just a divine, master plan.[9]

---

[6] Amnon Raz-Krakotzkin, "Jewish Memory Between Exile and History," *JQR* 97, no. 4 (2007): 530–43.

[7] Anthony D. Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nationalism* (New York: Wiley-Blackwell, 1986).

[8] Theodor Herzl, *The Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*, ed. Jacob M. Alkow, trans. Sylvie D'Avigdor (New York: American Zionist Emergency Council, 1946), 69–77.

[9] Michael Prior, ed., *Western Scholarship and the History of Palestine* (London: Melisende, 1998).

Several studies have shown that the gravitation towards Palestine as the epicenter of Zionist visions and aspirations were facilitated, among other factors, by a very keen and intensive Protestant interest in connecting the Jewish colonization of the "Holy Land" with divine and apocalyptic Christian doctrines that saw the return of the Jews as precipitating the second coming of the Messiah.[10]

The orientation of Zionism towards Palestine drew on the European scholarly preoccupation with biblical Israel in the age of colonialism and imperialism. As Keith Whitelam has indicated, this scholarship adopted two attitudes that served secular Zionism particularly well.[11] In its scholarly coverage of the history of the Holy Land—from biblical to contemporary times—this scholarship studied the country as an empty space and by that entirely de-Arabized it. The Arabs and the Muslims were left outside the realm of professional historical writing. Secondly, this scholarly research was motivated by apocalyptic and millenarian notions in which the return of the Messiah would be precipitated by the return of the Jews. This combination of de-Arabization and the religious imperative for the return of the Jews paved the way for the imposition, by word and sword, of the Zionist narrative on the land.

Thus a Eurocentric, as well as a Christian-centric, narrative served well the Zionist one. This is exemplified best in one of the principal Zionist claims: Israel is a nation returning not only to a homeland but also to a space that in the past had been occupied by a Jewish nation-state.

The exclusive nature of the Zionization of the past hinged on the biblical scholarship produced in the nineteenth century in Europe. It began with the theological construction of the "nation of Israel" myth. This term was presented by biblical scholars in the last century as a historical fact—indeed, as the only suitable term for defining the people living in Palestine from the late Bronze Age onward, even though it seems that the scattered villages of that Palestine had very little in common. The reinvention of the Jewish people as an ancient nation of Israel was an important product of that scholarly effort. It played an important role in shaping the founding myth of Zionism: a people without a land returning to a land without a people. Excluding the Palestinians from the land was one thing; claiming that the land had its original nation, wandering about, was another. Yet the two are interconnected: a genuine nation returned home; an undefined group of people had to move, and later move out, to make place for this act of historical justice.[12] As Thomas Thompson showed, the myth of a wandering nation was hardly ever challenged in a scholarly way. He claims that after the great Jewish rebellion against the Romans in 70 CE, most people stayed. Not only that; in due course they were Christianized more or less at the time the empire as a whole was "baptized" and, in turn with the advent of Arab conquerors, were partly Islamicized.[13]

---

[10] Keith W. Whitelam, "Western Scholarship and the Silencing of Palestinian History," in Prior, ed., *Western Scholarship*, 9–22.

[11] Whitelam, "Western Scholarship."

[12] Prior, ed., *Western Scholarship*.

[13] Thomas L. Thompson, "Hidden Histories and the Problem of Ethnicity in Palestine," in Prior, ed.,

This was the indigenous population of Palestine; at times mostly Jewish, later mostly Christian, and finally predominantly Muslim—a population undergoing processes of conversion over a period of 2,000 years which were similar to most people in the area, a historical chapter ending with the redefinition of these communities as national movements.[14]

The late Michael Prior exposed very carefully this enterprise and concluded that the Bible "can be a charter for dispossession, not only for liberation."[15] This is, of course, true about all Holy Scriptures and the elastic interpretation that can be given to them to serve contemporary political aims.

A prime example for this scholarship is the reinvention within Christian scholarship of the Kingdom of David as a Jewish nation-state, a reinvention later adopted gladly by the Zionist movement. The theological scaffolding for Zionism was absurd in Judaism as it was for Christianity. As Thomas Thompson argued, from a biblical point of view (i.e., a theological point of view), any secular (i.e., national) attempt to reclaim the past, or nationalize it, for the present, is false.[16] So he asked, rhetorically, is there a genuine story to be told when such a distant past is considered?

Religion deals with beliefs and not scientific truth and thus even sceptics would be less bothered with the lack of scientific proof for its conviction. But in the case of Palestine a holy, or rather an unholy, alliance was formed between Christian scholarship of that kind and secular Zionism (which also developed a propensity to prove scientifically, later on, these ideological claims over Palestine). The most common thread was the ability to Zionize, or nationalize, anyone who lived in the biblical era up to the Roman time and then de-Palestinize others—namely question other people's, even indigenous ones', affinity or connection to the land of Palestine, up to the arrival of the early Zionists.

This act of nationalizing people in the past was not unique to Zionism of course. As Benedict Anderson noted, it was always easy for national movements to nationalize dead people who could not resist this act of nationalization.[17] The human problem created by this act of Palestine was not whether justifiably or not people were regarded a Jewish nation, but that the Zionist adoption of the biblical narrative was an *a priori* nationalization of the land, as a people-less space between 70 CE and 1882, while the native people were deemed as absent or usurpers who took over a land that was not theirs. In fact the people of Palestine had been excluded from the Zionist narrative of the land already in 1882, long before they were uprooted forcefully from it in 1948. In other words, the imposition of the biblical narrative produced real victims—the Palestinian

Western Scholarship, 23–41.

[14] Shlomo Sand, *The Invention of the Jewish People* (London: Verso Books, 2010).

[15] Michael Prior, "The Moral Problem of the Land Traditions of the Bible," in Prior, ed., *Western Scholarship*, 53.

[16] Thompson, "Hidden Histories."

[17] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso Books, 2003), 41.

people who did not fit the definition of the people of Israel according to the biblical-cum-Zionist narrative.

The Bible as a Secular Charter

By 1905, Zionism was focused on Palestine and any other territorial options were ruled out. The people who took over from the early central European prophets of the day injected socialist and even Marxist ideology, in huge doses, into the growing secular reality of Zionism in Palestine.

But as Zeev Sternhell, and before him Zachary Lockman and Gershon Shafir (among others) have shown, this was always a very conditional and limited version of socialism and Marxism.[18] The universal values and aspirations that characterized the various ideological movements in the Western Left were very early on nationalized or Zionized in Palestine.

Zionization meant in this case evoking the religious dogma and reframing it in such a way that would assert an eternal moral right to the land, which transcends not only any other external claims to the land in those dying days of colonialism and imperialism, but also those of the native population. One of the most socialist, secular colonialist projects demanded exclusivity in the name of a pure transcendental promise.

A secular reliance on the Word of God as a justification for colonization is not the only basis for solidifying a takeover. Material power, diplomacy, and brutality, etc. are of course at times even more essential. But the Zionist leaders wished to cement these discrete impulses into a coherent narrative that would explain not only why they arrived in Palestine but also why they denied the right of the Palestinians to be there.

This however turned out to be a heuristic and dangerous exercise. The Labour movement navigated successfully between Realpolitik and pragmatism when it came to employing the Bible. Colonization and dispossession were a secular strategy but were justified—internally and internationally when needed—on the basis of the Bible. When Labour lost power, the more right-wing factions of Zionism would take the biblical text as justifying disregard for Realpolitik, Israel's international standing or obligations, or indeed of human rights considerations. This reliance on the biblical text as overriding any universalist approach to politics was at first only adopted at the right margins of the Zionist movement but it soon became a mainstream force and in recent years even a domineering force. These political movements within Zionism reconnected, very much as the Labour Zionists did, to a very selective reading of the Bible. In this new, more revered reading of the Bible it became a text that justified not past conquest but also

[18] Zeev Sternhell, *The Founding Myths of Israel: Nationalism, Socialism and the Making of the Jewish State* (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1998); Zachary Lockman, *Comrades and Enemies: Arab and Jewish Workers in Palestine, 1906–1948* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996); Gershon Shafir, *Land, Labor and the Origins of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict, 1882–1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

present-day policies towards the Palestinians, consisting of occupation and dispossession.

Right-wing and marginal religious groups were not the only ones tempted to employ the Bible in such a way. Every now and then the more sober Labour Zionists would do the same, especially in moments of violent clashes with the native Palestinians, over land, water, and other natural resources. Their authors, leaders, and poets described these clashes as a re-enactment of some of the Bible's most famous battles. And thus Israel's foremost national poet, Nathan Alterman, compared various Palestinian attacks on settlers to the defeat of Saul's army in front of the Philistines in the Battle of Gilboa. And he assumed that, unlike in exile, in the homeland defeat will always be succeeded by victory; as it did in the Bible.[19]

But in principle the labour and mainstream Zionist establishment's reliance on the Bible for the major strategy of colonization, as well as for spiritual inspiration in maintaining the colonies, attempted to extricate the Bible from its religious connotations and from the hands of the Rabbis. It was the leader of the Jewish community in Mandatory Palestine and Israel's first Prime Minister, David Ben-Gurion, who led this secular way. "The eternity and greatness of the Bible are not conditioned by another book, interpretation or Talmudic text that came after it," he declared—referring to the Orthodox tendency to stress the importance of other texts. They were wrong and only in Palestine can they realize it:

> Only with the renewal of the homeland and the Hebrew renaissance can we understand fully the real and full light of the Bible.[20]

Thus clear references in the Bible to the Jewish people as spiritual gatekeepers of the text were reinterpreted as the Bible became a pragmatic manual for how to keep the gated Jewish communities in colonized Palestine.[21]

It is not an exaggeration to say that David Ben-Gurion turned the Bible into a foundation of his Zionist thought after 1948. He already made a concerted and conscious effort in the early 1930s, when he was elected as the undisputed leader of the Jewish Community, to extricate the research and study of the Bible from the hands of religious quarters. But more importantly for him was to convey the message that Jewish life in exile revolved around the Bible.

This point was repeated by one of the leading intellectual lights of Zionism, the poet Haim Nahman Bialik. In a lecture he gave to activists and leaders of Mapai, the leading Zionist socialist party, in one of the veteran and highly secular settlements of Nahalal in 1932, he explained how wrong was the Orthodox Jewish assertion that Jews in exile

---

[19] Haim Guri, "On Nathan Alterman: Poets of Our Times," *Zeman Yarok*, July 31, 2008 [Hebrew].

[20] David Ben-Gurion, "Exile and the Bible: A Dialogue with Haim Hazzas," *Dialogues on State and Culture*, October 1962, 12 [Hebrew].

[21] Assaf Sagiv, "The Forefathers of Zionism and Myth of the Nation's Birth," *Techelt* 5:1–4 (Autumn 1989) [Hebrew].

did not learn the Bible or did not know it well. He claimed it was a fundamental part of Jewish education.[22] This rather flimsy and unfounded assertion was connected to another notion in Ben-Gurion's mind that the Jewish nation was not born in exile but only on the land, and the proof for this was in the Bible.[23]

Ben-Gurion insisted on the secular teaching of the Bible as a national text to be inserted in a core place in the educational system, throughout all the stages of learning. He also elevated what one can call the secular and national knowledge of the Bible to a core value and supreme manifestation of what the essence of being an Israeli is all about. For this purpose he initiated the Bible Youth Quiz in 1958, which became an organic part of the Day of Independence celebrations.[24]

Labour Zionist historians see the Bible as indeed one would assume the leaders of the Labour Zionist movement saw it, as linking the East European Jews to the foreign land of Palestine. The land was foreign in its landscape, the people inhabiting it, and the language they spoke. As a recent book by such an historian put it, as absurd as it may sound, the secularization of the modern Jews via Zionism—and not for instance via Marxism or Liberalism—brought the Bible back to the Jewish people who had earlier distanced themselves from it during the attempt to assimilate in Europe. It became the essential link between the second Aliya, the core group that founded the Jewish state, and the land. Hence, the Bible could be found in the room of every socialist worker who laboured in the name of Zionism.[25]

Rediscovering The Land of the Bible: The 1967 Occupation and its Impact

The Israeli reasons for occupying the West Bank and the decision to maintain it as part of Israel are a topic for another article and I have discussed it elsewhere. The government documents before the war and during the first year of the occupation are now accessible to the public. They reveal a mixture of strategic reasoning for the occupation but also a biblical justification.[26] Quite a few secular ministers in the thirteenth government of Israel regarded the West Bank as the heart of ancient Israel and saw the occupation as redemption of the homeland and in this respect the Bible became once more an imperative and important text.

But because there was strategy involved, the biblical map—at least in theory—was not supposed to dictate the plan of colonization and Judaization. The principle, embodied in the famous Yigal Alon plan and accepted by all the politicians, was to settle only where there was no dense Palestinian population. Alas, the biblical map charted a

[22] Anita Shapira, *The Bible and the Jewish Identity* (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 2012) [Hebrew].

[23] Anita Shapira, *New Jews, Old Jews* (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1997), 233 [Hebrew].

[24] Shapira, *The Bible*.

[25] Yitzhak Tabenkin, "The Ideological Sources of the Second Aliya," *Essays*, vol. 2 (Tel Aviv: Ha-Kibbutz Ha-Meuhad Publishing, 1972), 25 [Hebrew].

[26] See Ilan Pappé, "Revisiting 1967: The False Paradigm of Peace, Partition and Parity," *Settler Colonial Studies* 3, nos. 3–4 (2013): 341–51.

different option—the places deemed as the ancient locations from the Bible were at the heart of the Palestinian populated area and this is where the settlers chose to colonize.

And that particular map motivated the settlers' movement, appearing after the 1967 war. It was born in the learning centers of religious nationalism, which played a very minimal role in establishing the state and now, after 1967, felt they could play the leading role in redeeming the heart of the ancient homeland. And indeed the harbinger of this settlement plan was the forceful entrance into the heart of al-Khalil, Hebron in the spring of 1968. The movement, Gush Emunim, would use only the biblical map to determine where it settled next. In most cases their settlement was approved in hindsight by the government—either because the politicians were afraid to challenge this movement, or more likely, because quite a few leading figures identified also with this map of colonization and Judaization.[27]

For the settlers, colonizing large parts of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip was repossession in the name of God and the Bible (and some of these texts such as Joshua's elimination of the Amalekites could have been easily interpreted as even a justification for genocide; but, thank God, no ideological movement in Zionism or later-day Israel has succumbed to such a view, yet). But these settlers did relate to the Jewish haggadah of the Passover Seder where God sends Moses to a land inhabited by others, who are all named, and whose fate is to be dispossessed for the sake of the "return" of the chosen people to the Abrahamite promised land. The first act of colonization in Hebron was done on the eve of the Passover Seder.

So biblical and later-day texts became the cornerstone of the interpretation of the Zionist dispossession of Palestine, combining to view it as an act of God. The biblical texts were needed not only to build new settlements but also expand existing ones—indeed it seems that by now in 2016 the map has been completed, but for maintaining possession in the face of Palestinian resistance and expansion in the face of international condemnation. Not surprisingly, the Christian Zionists in the United States, through their representatives on Capitol Hill, share this biblical license to oppose the American State Department's continued reference to the settlements as illegal.[28]

The biblical texts create an immense energy, excitement, and zeal. And when this was to a certain extent exhausted in the West Bank and when Ariel Sharon, for tactical reasons, ended the Jewish colonization in the Gaza Strip around 2005, it was directed inside Israel into the seams that connect precariously mixed Arab and Jewish towns and locations. In mixed towns such as Acre, Jaffa, Haifa, Lydd, and Ramleh, the Palestinian inhabitants already succumbed to a spatial policy from above that strangulated their habitat and living space—mainly by surrounding them with exclusive gated and apart-

[27] Idith Zertal and Akiva Eldar, *Lords of the Land: Settlers and the State of Israel* (Tel Aviv: Dvir, 1994) [Hebrew].

[28] Jim Rutenberg, Mike McIntire, and Ethan Bronner, "Tax-Exempt Funds Aid Settlements in West Bank," *New York Times*, July 6, 2010. http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/06/world/middleeast/06settle.html.

heid Jewish communities.[29]

But recently this external policy of enclavement from above was accompanied by the appearance of biblical learning centres for Jews, who originally come from the settlements and purchase flats and houses in the heart of the Arab Ghettos of these mixed towns. They declare very openly that they came to redeem these lands. The Bible does not stop, so it seems, to be employed as a tool against the indigenous people of Palestine.

The "*Pulmus*": The Debate

But the inherent paradox of secular Jews wishing to implement God's will in the land in the name of the Bible was not easily solved in twenty-first-century Israel. The settler community in the occupied West Bank, like many parts of the religious national movement, underwent a process of Orthodoxation. What I mean is that secularism, and not only Arabism, is now their enemy. And part of the aversion to secularization is a resentment towards the way the Bible has been expropriated by the secular, hegemonic cultural elites in Israel (including through the establishment of departments for the study of the Bible in Israeli universities).

Thus within the settlement movement and its constituencies inside Israel began a *pulmus* (a halachic debate, in Hebrew). At the heart of this lies a new phenomenon: the "*Hardalim*" (*Mafdal* is the national religious party and *Haredi* are Ultra-Orthodox Jews; a *Hardal*, which also means "mustard" in Hebrew, is a hybrid of *Mafdal* and *Haredi*). These Ultra-Orthodox national Jews, if such a hybrid is possible, resent strongly the secularization of the way the Bible is studied and taught in Israel. One example they offer is how to interpret King David's attitude towards Uriah the husband of the beautiful Bat Sheva, whom the king coveted when watching her bathe on the rooftop. He takes her away from Uriah and sends the latter to die in the battlefield.[30] Secular Jews, so claim the new gatekeepers from the settlements, may understand it as it is written (they admit that only very few scholars through the ages give any particular different explanation for this unpleasant episode). However as Orthodox Jews, the seemingly sinful behaviour remains unexplained, and therefore not judged or criticized, as the mysterious work of the Lord.

The *Hardalization* of the national religious Jews is also the outcome of the political ascendance of the Ultra-Orthodox parties in Israel—allegedly anti-Zionist given their aversion for secular tempering with the divine scheme—but de facto Zionist because of their racist anti-Arabism and their willingness to settle in huge numbers in the Judaization programs of successive governments in the north and south of Israel and inside the West Bank (in particular in the greater Jerusalem area).[31] Those close to them in the

[29] Ilan Pappé, *The Forgotten Palestinians: A History of the Palestinian Minority in Israel* (London and New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011).

[30] Hezel Henkin, "Everyone Who Says for Certain that David Sinned and the Critical Approach," *Hatzofeh*, April 1, 2004 [Hebrew].

[31] Pappé, *Forgotten Palestinians*.

settler communities began the *Pulmus* and demanded that, in the learning centers of the national religious Jewish institutions, secular interpretation of the Bible should be deserted and the Bible's singularity should be reconsidered. Thus a century after Ultra-Orthodox Jews rejected Zionism, partly also for the misuse and abuse of the Bible, they now demand a monopoly on the Bible in order to return the book to its pre-Zionist context.

The two ideological streams in Israel today that reject this reassertion are the national religious settlers who still wish to use the Bible in the same way the early Zionists employed it for colonization and Judaization of Palestine, and the secular liberal Jews, who—without any clear scholarly logic but only on the basis of pragmatism and Realpolitik—demand that the same impulse to colonize Palestine before 1948 would not be reignited for the occupied territories of 1967 so as to enable a chance for peace with the Palestinians. They also claim that the modern usage of the Bible in such a way distanced it from the younger, secular generation. As Anita Shapira claims in a recent book, the settlers spoiled the encounter with the real land of the Bible, namely the West Bank, after the 1967 war.[32] She claims liberal Zionists can differentiate between love of the land of the Bible and the right of the other people living there to have that particular part of the land.

The Battle over the Representation of the Bible

For a long period in the academic world, the official Zionist historiographic version was received in the West and treated as unequivocally "legitimate"—as a scholarly and sound narrative of the conflict—while the Palestinian one was suspected as mere propaganda.

This changed in the late 1970s. The severe criticism directed at orientalist studies in the West, inspired by works of scholars such as Samir Amin, Walid Khalidi, Edward W. Said, and Sami Zubaida, has balanced the study of the Arab-Israeli conflict.[33] This new trend corresponded with the emergence of a revisionist history in Israel. A handful of Israeli scholars began recognizing the validity of at least some of the main chapters in the Palestinian narrative, notably among which is the acceptance of Israel's responsibility for the Palestinian refugee problem.[34]

However, studies that were associated with the Bible were kept out of this intellectual revolution, and in most cases mainstream academia treated the biblical narrative that justified the Zionization of Palestine as empirical fact. Only very few anti-Zionist

[32] Shapira, *The Bible*.

[33] Samir Amin, *Eurocentrism: Modernity, Religion and Democracy. A Critique of Eurocentrism and Culturalism* (2nd ed.; New York: Pambazuka Press, 2010); Walid Khalidi, *Palestine Reborn* (London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 1992); Edward Said, *Orientalism* (London: Vintage, 2000); Sami Zubaida, *Islam: The People and the State, Political Ideas and Movements in the Middle East* (London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 2009).

[34] Ilan Pappé, "The Post-Zionist Discourse in Israel, 1991–2001," HLS 1, no. 1 (2002), 3–20.

scholars, such as Gabi Piterberg have successfully deconstructed this narrative, and there were of course several significant works on the topic outside Israeli academia.[35]

The Bible in Zionist narrative thus serves two narratives within the mainstream secular Zionist movement and later the state of Israel. The meta-narrative is that since this is the land of the Jewish Bible, there were Jews in it until they were brutally expelled; the second part of it, or the second narrative, is that the land then became empty until it was redeemed in the late nineteenth century.

Shlomo Sand, in the footsteps of Arthur Koestler and Paul Thompson, challenged the narrative of Jewish expulsion in the Roman era, and thus of "return" in the late nineteenth century.[36] However his work was a lone voice in an Israeli and pro-Israeli wilderness. Even more profound analysis on the cultural nature of Israel's settler colonialism in this respect can be found in Gabi Piterberg's book, *The Returns of Zionism*. Sand, Piterberg, Whitelam, Prior, and Thompson are still not mainstream, despite the significant revolution in the production of knowledge about modern Palestine and Israel. More typical is the cartographic representation of the Zionist meta-narrative that accompanies still quite a few venues where the narrative is relevant: university modules, popular virtual, electronic, and media presentations, and diplomatic material.

The most common example of this is the still very popular *Atlas of the Arab-Israeli Conflict* by Martin Gilbert, renowned historian and biographer of Winston Churchill. It is now in its tenth edition and still there is not even the slightest echo of the new challenges mentioned above or any reference to the historiographical changes in this atlas.[37] The atlas is a reproduction of mainstream Zionist historiography of the conflict, without any reference to revisionist Israeli historical views, not to mention the possibility of giving at least one map from a Palestinian perspective.

This is all the more remarkable since the pretension as it is stated in the preface is to try to present fairly "the views of those involved in the conflict." A few examples will suffice to show in which direction this book is bent. They will prove once more how supposedly innocent artefacts, such as maps, disclose a strong ideological bias. The first map is a good place to start. It shows the Jews of Palestine before the Arab conquest. Fair enough, we may say, as this demonstrates the romantic Zionist claim to Palestine. But one would have expected at least one map that informs us about Arabs in Abbasid, Mamluk, Seljuk, or Ottoman Palestine. But there is none of that. The subsequent map is about the Jews in Palestine in all these Islamic periods, periods in which they constituted less than one percent of the population. The third map is about the first Jewish immigration of 1882. The myth of the "empty land waiting for the landless people" is recreated in these first three maps.

---

[35] Gabriel Piterberg, *The Returns of Zionism: Myths, Politics and Scholarship in Israel* (London: Verso Books, 2008).

[36] Sand, *Invention*.

[37] Martin Gilbert, *The Routledge Atlas of the Arab-Israeli Conflict* (10th ed.; London and New York: Routledge, 2012), 1–3.

The biblical map is not directly displayed in this atlas, but it is the basis for the story (a Palestinian atlas would begin the story with the arrival of Zionism as the departure point for the conflict). The industry of similar atlases in Israel, including the famous Carta series which covers the time of the Bible to our times, accentuates this connection even better. At the end of the day, however, it may be pointless now, in 2016, to expect that any deconstruction of the manipulation which Zionism and later the state of Israel employed with regards to the Bible would have any significant impact on the reality. The reality will change because of aversion to the abuse of human rights and basic civil rights. Whether this abuse is done in the name of the Bible, or secular texts, from the victim's point of view is irrelevant.

TWO

Christian Zionism, the US, and the Middle East

A Sketch and Brief Analysis

Mark Finney

There is an interesting question as to why the US is so attached to present-day Israel. For this great economic, military, and political superpower appears to gain little from their close relationship and yet stands shoulder-to-shoulder in rejecting numerous UN Security Council resolutions against Israel, in supporting the country economically to the tune of billions of dollars per annum, in sharing sensitive intelligence, in selling their most high-tech, sophisticated military hardware, and in making it clear to all that they will safeguard any security issues that Israel may have. And yet the US gets nothing in return. Indeed, all of the Middle Eastern foreign policy objectives of the US could be, and have been, secured outside of this close relationship. Whether establishment of close ties elsewhere (e.g., Saudi Arabia, other Gulf states, Pakistan, Turkey) or military incursions (e.g., Afghanistan, Iraq), these were all undertaken with little cognizance of their relations with Israel. Indeed, the US economic (and hence, political) importance of Saudi Arabia appears to be of greater value than its relationship with Israel.[1] There is also the question of the Palestinians and a Palestinian state, to which continued Israeli intransigence perpetuates continued unrest amongst the Muslim nations of the Middle East and which leaves the US in the unenviable position of having to both defend Israeli actions whilst attempting rapprochement with the Islamic world. To paraphrase a question posed by John le Carré in his analysis of the US and the Middle East: is America's close relationship with Israel "mad"?[2]

[1] Note the provision made for members of the Saudi royal family to fly out of the US shortly after 9/11 when all other flights were grounded. On this see, Craig Unger, *House of Bush, House of Saud: The Secret Relationship between the World's Two Most Powerful Dynasties* (New York: Scribner, 2004), esp. 247–69.

[2] John le Carré, "America Gone Mad," *Sunday Times*, Jan 15, 2003, available at http://www.snopes.com/rumors/lecarre.asp.

The answer to le Carré's question is, of course, no! But it is not an answer that can be found in any political, economic, or military analysis; it is rather, to be found in ideology—more specifically, an ideology set within a framework of Christian discourse and the central role that Israel and the Jewish people play there. More specifically, it is the influence that Zionism and Christian Zionism have exerted upon the US psyche over the course of the past few centuries. This paper will undertake a brief analysis of Zionism and Christian Zionism in the US over this period in order to explicate the reasons for the close US-Israel ties and how this has manifested itself within US foreign policy and the Middle East (and specifically, the Israeli-Palestinian dispute).

Early Years

The influence of biblical paradigms on the US, which began in the eighteenth century (although they evolved more significantly throughout the nineteenth century), had its origins in the seventeenth-century European Puritan movement and the "Great Migration" to America of over 20,000 Puritans in the years after 1630. This marks the beginning of the influence of various biblical traditions on US society that survive to the present. For the Puritans, the move to a *New World*, a *New England*, was seen as divinely inspired; they were the new Chosen People, a new Israel escaping the sinful secularism of Western Europe for the Promised Land. Their Exodus model prompted similarities between their own experiences and those of the ancient Israelites and they believed that their future success and prosperity would be incumbent upon their commitment and responsibilities to God. Such reflections were observed in attitudes towards the indigenous American Indians who were seen as idolatrous and uncivilized—the equivalent of the biblical "Canaanites." In later US thinking, the Indians were to be colonized and converted, or else, like the ethnic cleansing found in the biblical book of Joshua, annihilated. Some of this early "psychology" of religious chosenness has remained to the present.[3]

The story of the US and Zionism proper (in all its various forms), begins as early as the second US President John Adams (1797–1801), who desired the Jews to be back in their historic homeland and function, once again, within an independent state. From this period on, Gentile Zionists were certain that the return of Jews to Palestine was a central function of biblical prophecy and that this would add significant impetus to what was seen, in apocalyptic perspective, as the impending End Times (that is, the return of Christ, judgment, and the conflagration of the world).[4] In a wider sense however, US advocacy of Zionism was also perceived as part of a more holistic programme of

[3] See Rosemary Radford Ruether, *America, Amerikkka: Elect Nation and Imperial Violence* (London: Equinox, 2007); on the Puritans see esp. 17–32. Also, Robert Jewett and John S. Lawrence, *Captain America and the Crusade against Evil: The Dilemma of Zealous Nationalism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003); Stephen Prothero, *American Jesus: How the Son of God Became a National Icon* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2003); Shawn Kelley, *Racializing Jesus: Race, Ideology and the Formation of Modern Biblical Scholarship* (Biblical Limits; London: Routledge, 2002).

[4] Although Adams's hope was that, "Once restored to an independent government and no longer

global transformation through the spread of Christianity and with it the moral and religious ideals of the US. Such attitudes and apocalyptic fervour became more widespread following the US Civil War (1861–65). Walter Mead notes of this period,

> Books and pamphlets highlighting the predicted restoration of the Jews and speculating on the identity and the return of the "lost tribes" of the ancient Hebrews were perennial bestsellers, and the association between Dwight Moody, the country's leading evangelist, and Cyrus Scofield, the important Bible scholar, put the future history of Israel firmly at the centre of the imagination of conservative American Protestantism.[5]

In 1891, US Zionists were able to motivate hundreds within the nation's business and political elite in an attempt to persuade President Benjamin Harrison (1889–93) to pressure the Ottomans to return Palestine to the Jews. The impetus of such action was made by Christian fundamentalists such as Methodist evangelist William Blackstone. Following the collapse of the Ottoman Empire in 1922, the League of Nations made Palestine a part of the British mandated territories[6] and, from a US perspective, relations with Palestine over the following twenty-four years were largely governed by the Anglo-American Convention established in 1924, in which the US, as a non-member of the League, simply approved the decision to make Palestine a mandated territory and the choice of the British government as the mandatory power. The US adopted a form of the Balfour Declaration,[7] although the US House Committee on Foreign Affairs, in accordance with its isolationist policy, added the qualification that "our moral interest… commits us to no foreign obligations or entanglements." Subsequently, "a see-saw pattern emerged, whereby the official, basically neutral American policy was periodically

---

persecuted they would soon wear away some of the asperities and peculiarities of their character and possibly in time become liberal Unitarian Christians." Cited in Walter R. Mead, "The New Israel and the Old: Why Gentile Americans Back the Jewish State," *Foreign Affairs* 87, no. 4 (2008), 31. A different form of Zionism which appealed to a broad range of religious and secular gentiles through a less literal interpretation of the biblical texts was known as "progressive Zionism." There was also the influence of the Christadelphian movement in the early nineteenth century, which preceded Jewish Zionism as a political movement and which saw the necessity of securing British agreement in any attempt to restore the Jews to Palestine.

[5] Mead, "The New Israel," 32. He also notes that instruction in biblical Hebrew was mandatory for much of early US history at major universities such as Harvard, Princeton, Yale, Columbia, and Dartmouth. James Madison (1751–1836; president, 1809–17; father of the US Constitution and Bill of Rights), for example, completed his studies at Princeton but remained an extra year to study Hebrew.

[6] On the basis of the British statement of policy issued in the Churchill White Paper of July of that year. See Margaret Arakie, *The Broken Sword of Justice: America, Israel and the Palestine Tragedy* (London: Quartet Books, 1973), 12. Winston Churchill was the Minister responsible for the Colonial Office at that time, the Department which issued the document.

[7] Their own resolution reads: "Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, that the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christian and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the Holy Places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected."

interrupted by expressions of sympathy for Zionist goals as a result of vigorous Zionist pressure."[8]

The convention of 1924 in fact came about as a result of pressure by American business firms for equal commercial opportunities in the mandated territories of the Middle East. The US had already secured an approximately 25% share in the Iraq Petroleum Company for a number of American oil companies and was attempting to secure further concessions from France and Britain, the two central mandatory powers in the region, in order that there would be no discrimination against US business interests. "These conventions later enabled American oil interests to consolidate and dramatically expand their foothold in the region."[9]

During the 1930–40s, US Zionists made a concerted effort to enlist the support of clergy and political leaders to their cause. The American Palestine Committee (APC) was established in 1932, advocating the "reunion of the Jewish people with the land of its ancient inheritance."[10] By 1942 it had 67 senators, 143 congressmen, 22 governors, and numerous jurists, educators, clergymen, publishers, editors, writers, and civic leaders on its membership.[11] In the same year (1942), a group of Christian Zionists organized themselves into the Christian Council on Palestine (CCP), their aim being to co-opt US clergymen to their cause.[12] By 1946 it had a membership of some 3,000 Christian leaders and prominent clergymen. A huge fillip for American Zionists came in 1942 when a conference held in Biltmore Hotel, New York ended by unanimously adopting a declaration insisting that "Palestine be established as a Jewish Commonwealth."[13] This became known as the Biltmore Program and in 1943 was adopted at the American Jewish Conference of some sixty-five Jewish organizations. As a result of growing support for the Zionist cause, both the Democratic and Republican platforms in 1944 came out in favour of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine.[14] Harry Truman, who had been supportive of this movement, became President in 1945 (–53).

[8] Arakie, *Broken Sword*, 13.

[9] Arakie, *Broken Sword*, 14. In 1929, violence in Jerusalem led to two commissions of inquiry and the traditionally pro-Zionist Labour government in Britain published the Passfield White Paper which contained a number of declarations: that there was no further land available for agricultural settlement by Jews; that a more stringent immigration policy was necessary; and that a scheme was to be introduced to ensure the rights of Palestinian tenants to subsistence plots. Critically, it also announced that the British government held that the obligations laid down in the mandate with regard to the two sections of the population were of equal weight. Thereupon a political storm erupted. However, when a Zionist delegation appealed for US intervention, the sharp response of Henry Stimson, the Secretary of State, was that his duty was to protect United States citizens, not the Zionist movement.

[10] Paul C. Merkley, *The Politics of Christian Zionism, 1891–1948* (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 1998), 132. The APC was established at the instigation of Emanuel Neumann, an active US Zionist.

[11] So, Irvine H. Anderson, *Biblical Interpretation and Middle East Policy: The Promised Land, America and Israel, 1917–2002* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2005), 77.

[12] Encouraged by Neumann.

[13] See Anderson, *Biblical Interpretation*, 80 (and see the bibliography on p. 154).

[14] The Democratic platform, adopted in July 1944, stated: "We favour the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization, and such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish Commonwealth."

1945–48

Despite the earlier role that the US played in its support of Israel, the general attitude following the end of the Second World War was, once again, one of isolationism. A bill passed in 1947 had taken an anti-immigrant stance, although it did allow for a small number of refugees or settlers. Within the Jewish community the only group that lobbied for making use of the bill was the (anti-Zionist) American Council for Judaism, not the Zionists; the Zionist leadership in Palestine specifically asked them to refrain as they wanted European Jews to go to Palestine. American Jewish Zionists were also reluctant to favour immigration of European Jews who, it was thought, may undermine the reputation of American Jewry. Instead, European Jews were channelled towards Palestine despite the will of the overwhelming majority, who simply wanted to go home or go to the US.[15]

As the influx of Jews into Palestine fomented friction and conflict, Britain announced that it would give up its Mandate on February 18, 1947 and defer the issue to the newly formed United Nations who proposed a separation of the land into two states. In the following year, as Mead relates,

> on May 12, 1948, Clark Clifford, the White House chief counsel, presented the case for US recognition of the state of Israel to the divided cabinet of President Harry Truman. To substantiate the Jewish territorial claim, Clifford quoted Deuteronomy: "Behold, I have set the land before you: go in and possess the land.…"[16]

On May 14, and against the advice of his diplomatic and military advisors, Truman gave de facto recognition to the newly declared state of Israel (just eleven minutes after Israel's declaration of independence). His prompt decision may have been a combination of his Christian background together with the power of the Jewish community in the US.[17] Certainly, for the tightly fought 1948/49 presidential election, having the Jewish vote (and the campaign contributions of Jews or sympathizers), together with the cooperation of the media (support for Israel was popular throughout the US), were

[15] Yosef Grodzinsky, *In the Shadow of the Holocaust: The Struggle Between Jews and Zionists in the Aftermath of World War II* (Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press, 2004), notes that 65% wanted to return home, 20% wanted to go to the US, and 15% wanted to go to Palestine (41). The same goes for later Russian immigration to Israel. The later government of Menachem Begin (1977–83) arranged with Moscow that Jewish emigrants would be given only one choice of destination, that is, Israel (via Vienna or Berlin).

[16] Mead, "The New Israel," 28.

[17] Harry Truman (1884–1972) was a staunch, lifelong student of the Bible. He joined the Baptist Church at 18. From his reading of the Old Testament he felt the Jews derived a legitimate historical right to Palestine (often citing Deut 1.8, "Go and take possession of the land"). This was important when the US took the decision to recognize the state of Israel in 1948. See Anderson, *Biblical Interpretation*, 87. The swift response was probably also made to undermine Soviet (and so Communist) influence upon the new State.

factors of significant importance.[18] After leaving office in 1953, and reflecting on his decision to give prompt recognition to the State of Israel, Truman was quoted as saying, "I am Cyrus. I am Cyrus."[19]

From 1967–

Social upheavals in the US during the 1960s and 70s[20] aroused concern that the nation was descending into moral decay.[21] This not only stimulated religious revivalism into the direction of conservative and fundamentalist Christianity, but also led to such groups becoming more politically involved. This is also true of the media image of successive US Presidents: since Jimmy Carter (1977–81) every presidential candidate has felt it necessary to profess either openly, or at least subtly, some form of religious adherence. Indeed, Ronald Reagan (1981–89), who embraced the ideas preached to him by Christian fundamentalists Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson (a Republican presidential candidate in 1988), saw his primary responsibilities as President to include a military build to equip the US in preparation for the battle of Armageddon. According to Charles Fischbein, a central figure in the Israeli lobby, Reagan and his attorney general Edwin Meese were actively praying for Armageddon to begin during his presidency.[22]

For Bill Clinton it was important to be seen every week singing in his local Baptist church. George W. Bush was an openly committed Christian, and even Barack Obama, not renowned for openly discussing his religious beliefs, has taken the opportunity in an interview with the Washington National Cathedral magazine to declare that at the end of the day, "God is in control."[23] In a directory of religious affiliation of members of Congress in 1999, 87% of Senate members and 91% of members of the House of

[18] But Truman's support for Israel was wildly popular throughout the US. A Gallup poll in June 1948 showed that almost three times as many Americans sympathized with the Jews as with the Muslims.

[19] Anderson, *Biblical Interpretation*, 87. Cyrus was the Persian emperor who authorized the return of the Jews from Babylonian captivity to Palestine in 538 BCE.

[20] E.g., Vietnam (and the ensuing anti-war rallies), Watergate, and the global economic crisis of the 1970s.

[21] The 1970s saw a severe reaction against the social and economic programs enacted under Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal and Lyndon Johnson's Great Society that benefited the majority of the population. Starting with the breakdown of the international economic order, known as the Bretton Woods system, capital became increasingly deregulated and neoliberal programs were instituted that caused much of the population difficult social and economic conditions.

[22] Ronnie Dugger ("Does Reagan Expect a Nuclear Armageddon?" *Washington Post* [April 18, 1984], C1, C4) cites a conversation between Reagan and AIPAC director Tom Dine, during which Reagan was quoted as saying, "You know, I turn back to your ancient prophets in the Old Testament and signs foretelling Armageddon, and I find myself wondering if—if we're the generation that's going to see that come about. I don't know if you've noted any of those prophecies lately, but believe me, they certainly describe the times we're going through."

[23] Quoted in James Nye, "'God is in control': Obama gets really religious in new interview (with the election a little over two months away)," *Daily Mail*, August 22, 2012, http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2191840/Obama-gets-really-religious-new-interview-election-little-months-away.html.

Representatives had some affiliation to Christian denominations.[24]

Since 1967, while liberal support for Israel has gradually waned, conservative support has grown. An important factor leading to increased US support for Israel since this time is the significant increase in prophetic Zionism, with evangelical and fundamentalist US Christians more interested in biblical prophecy and Israel's role in the lead-up to the apocalypse than ever before.[25] The speed and decisive nature of Israeli victory in 1967 looked miraculous to many Americans and Israel's capture of the Old City of Jerusalem meant that after nearly 2,000 years, the Temple site was back in Jewish hands. The sense that the end of time was approaching was a powerful impetus for the American religious revivals that began during this period. Since then, a series of best-selling books, fiction and non-fiction alike, have catered to the interests of millions of Americans in the possibility that the End Times as prophesied in the Bible was now unfolding in the Middle East.[26]

The influence of the Christian Zionists and the pro-Israeli Jewish lobby on Washington has seen successive US administrations be perhaps less-than-impartial in dealings with the Israelis and Palestinians. For instance, for decades the US has turned a blind eye to the growth of settlements in the West Bank.[27] For the Israelis, the principle appears to have been to work by stealth and piecemeal; that is, to take Palestinian land bit-by-bit until they have what they want. According to Noam Chomsky,

> that's been the deeply rooted principle all along. Ben-Gurion is reported to have said, 'It doesn't matter what the goyim [Gentiles] think, it matters what the Jews do.' The US pretends it doesn't know about it, but they do, as they're funding it.[28]

In terms of funding, since 1976 Israel has been the largest single recipient of US foreign assistance and since 1985 has received over $3 billion annually. Between 1949 and 1995, US aid to Israel amounted to $65 billion.

---

[24] See the table in Anderson, *Biblical Interpretation*, 111.

[25] The rise of closer US-Israel ties in the 1960s was also a result of Arab nationalism, which managed to force the US (militarily) out of Saudi Arabia (the dismantling of the US military base in Dhahran was seen as a severe blow). Arab nationalists took over Iraq, Algeria, and later Libya, which increased the importance to Washington of Israel as a regional watchdog and a US force by proxy. During the 1967 war, Israel subdued two US enemies: Nasser and the Syrians.

[26] E.g., the Left Behind series by Tim LaHaye and Jerry B. Jenkins (Tyndale House Publishers, 1995–2007); Hal Lindsey and Carole C. Carlson, *The Late Great Planet Earth* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970).

[27] The peak year was Clinton's last year—Clinton-Barak's last year—2000.

[28] Noam Chomsky and Gilbert Achcar, *Perilous Power: The Middle East and US Foreign Policy, Dialogues on Terror, Democracy, War, and Justice* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 2007), 179. The various proposals since have been just various modifications of the Alon Plan, which is: we take it step by step. Moshe Dayan (in charge of the occupation under the Labor Government from 1967–74) said the same: "We'll take little bits at a time… piece by piece, quietly; we will tell the Palestinians, "We have no solution, you shall continue to live like dogs, and whoever wishes may leave, and we will see where this process leads" (cited in Chomsky and Achcar, *Perilous Power*, 179–80).

Christian Zionism

Dispensationalist theology and Armageddon thinking (which holds to a determinative end-time scenario) has been popularized by influential evangelical ministers such as Robertson, Falwell, and Billy Graham and institutes such as Dallas Theological Seminary, Princeton Theological Seminary, and the Moody Bible Institute. Studies made between 1996 and 2006 demonstrate that approximately one in ten US voters saw themselves as Zionists or dispensationalist Christians. Rammy Haija notes,

> The Christian Zionist lobby has targeted both voting pools to assemble a pro-Israel constituency among American voters through the promotion of biblical and dispensationalist doctrine.... They are an instrumental actor in a pro-US policy towards Israel. This position has been especially solidified among the powerful elites in US policy. Jewish-American leaders saw links with Christian Zionists as an advantageous and a useful influential political bloc.[29]

Christian Zionists justify their support for Israel through a literal reading of the Hebrew Bible, including texts such as Gen 12.3, "I will bless those who bless you, whoever curses you I will curse; and all peoples on earth will be blessed through you." As such, many Christians feel compelled not only to embrace Israel as a premise of faith but also to secure the ongoing blessing and prosperity of the nation. A further tenet of Zionist and Christian Zionist ideology, as noted above, is based on dispensationalist theology which maintains the present time is the last era of the apocalyptic scenario of the end times and that the return of Christ as judge and messiah is contingent upon a certain set of events: critically, that the state of Israel must be in existence. Many Christian Zionists are more ardent than a great number of Israelis and overtly promote the annexation of the lands of the West Bank. Haija notes,

> During the inaugural Christian Zionist Congress conference (Jerusalem 1985) a resolution calling for the total annexation of the West Bank passed unanimously among the Christian voters at the conference. While Jewish groups in the US and Israel vehemently oppose any sort of religious alliance with Christian Zionists they have accepted a political alliance as it creates another strong-arm for Israeli interests within US policy.[30]

So, too, evangelical ministers such as Falwell and Robertson regularly called for a more aggressive stance of Israel towards the Palestinians.

Such attitudes were evident during the presidency of George W. Bush (2001– 2009). Fundamentalist Christian Jerry Falwell met regularly with Bush during his first term in

[29] Rammy M. Haija, "The Armageddon Lobby: Dispensationalist Christian Zionism and the Shaping of US Policy Towards Israel-Palestine," HLS 5, no. 1 (2006), 75–76.

[30] Haija, "Armageddon Lobby," 85.

office to urge for greater US support for Israel. During an interview for the CBS News programme *60 Minutes* in October 2002, Falwell made the claim that "I think now we can count on President Bush to do the right thing for Israel every time."

If true, such statements undermine any US credibility concerning its claim to act as an impartial influence in respect of the various complex issues of the Israeli-Palestinian dispute. Indeed, Christian Zionists have also been publicly vocal that the US should neither support Palestinian goals or aspirations nor promote the Roadmap, which would culminate in some form of a Palestinian state. Conversely, they argue that Israel should have sole sovereignty over the entire land, including Palestinian territories.

During the same interview, Falwell made provocative statements not only about Palestinians, but about Islam as a whole, claiming that Muhammad was a terrorist and that Islam was satanic.[31] Falwell noted, "If there's one thing that brings us together quickly [US evangelical Christians] it's whenever we begin to detect our government becoming a little anti-Israel."[32] According to Falwell, the President's views on Israel were consistent with those of his own.

Impact of Christian Zionism on US Foreign Policy

The White House's responses to various Israeli incursions into the West Bank (April 2002) and Gaza (2008–9; 2014) demonstrate the influence that Christian Zionists have on US foreign policy regarding the Middle East.[33] In 2002, with international outcries and condemnation of the Israelis and pressure focussed upon President Bush and his administration, which the international community viewed as the only influence that could halt this destruction, Bush appealed to Israeli Prime Minister Sharon to cease the Israeli actions. While Sharon responded with the usual claims of justified Israeli self-defence, what was startling was the response of the US Christian Right. Donald Wagner noted,

> The Pro-Israel lobby, in coordination with the Christian Right, mobilized over 100,000 e-mail messages, calls and visits urging the President to avoid restraining Israel. The tactic worked. The President uttered not another word of criticism or caution, and Sharon continued the offensive.[34]

So, too, Bush's initial endorsement of the Roadmap in 2003 led to criticism and heavy pressure from Christian Zionists who organized some 50,000 postcards to be

[31] Jerry Falwell and Bob Simon, interviewer, "Zion's Christian Soldiers," *60 Minutes*, CBS, Oct 3, 2002.

[32] Cf. National Council of Churches' statement, "Resolution Refuting and Condemning the Statements concerning Islam and the Prophet Muhammad Made by Rev. Jerry Falwell on '60 Minutes,"' Oct 7, 2002, http://www.ncccusa.org/news/02news86.html.

[33] According to Donald Wagner, these incursions are considered one of the "decisive moment[s] in the forging of this [contemporary] alliance": "Marching to Zion: The Evangelical-Jewish Alliance," *Christian Century* (June 2003), 20–24.

[34] Wagner, "Marching to Zion," 20–24.

sent to the White House opposing the plan. Significantly, Bush began to subtly withdraw his previous support for the Roadmap.[35] The tragedy of Zionist and Christian Zionist influence on US foreign policy in the Middle East is that it foments and accentuates divisions and violence in Israel/Palestine, undermines international law and justice, undermines any thoughts of US integrity, and even stands opposed to the wishes of the majority of Israeli citizens who are open to disengagement from the West Bank in exchange for peace. As Haija notes,

> While much of the world shamefully watched as Palestinians suffered, through the collective punishment of incursions and devastation, Christian Zionists benightedly supported Israeli military action and used their influence to extend it. It is apparent that through the influence of the Christian Zionist lobby, Israeli objectives can be achieved despite international law and outcry.… Christian Zionists are among the most fanatical advocates for the proliferation of settlements in the West Bank and increased violence against Palestinians. However, Christian Zionism is deaf to the desires of the people which its influence impacts, and does not advocate measures of peace, but rather it seeks the justification of all Israeli action under any pretense and by any means necessary.[36]

At the same time, the Christian Zionists and, more broadly, the Christian Right in the US have fomented the doctrine of various apocalyptic end-time scenarios whereby the return of Christ is incumbent upon Israel having possession of what is regarded as the first-century-CE geographical area of the biblical land. Naturally, such attitudes are not conducive to any form of lasting peace.

The Current State of Play and Possible Future Developments

President Barack Obama is under the same pressure as previous Presidents to conform to a Christian Zionist worldview, particularly in respect to the Middle East and the Israel-Palestinian dispute. Prior to taking office, his election campaign trumpeted a change in attitude towards many aspects of foreign policy. Not only would he normalize relations with Cuba, but Guantanamo Bay would be closed and his administration would move ahead with the Israel-Palestine Roadmap. Yet all have largely come to nothing. Instead, the US finds itself yet again embroiled in further military combat operations in the Middle East as it seeks to degrade and destroy the Islamist group Islamic State in both Iraq and Syria.

Within a broader framework, US hegemony in the Middle East could now be said to be precariously balanced, despite perceptions of its own presence and role in the region

[35] Another example would be the US's condoning of Israel's aerial assassinations of Palestinian leaders.
[36] Haija, "Armageddon Lobby," 93.

as all-powerful and beneficent.[37] Its demise is certainly evident with the invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq in 2001/2003, for these can only be seen as constituting marked failures. Withdrawal from Afghanistan was made without any strategic goals being achieved (even the killing of Osama bin Laden cannot be trumpeted as having taken place on Afghan soil and so, in some senses, justifying the invasion), and, as violence continues in parts of Iraq, the only apparent advantage for the US of the invasion is the securing of key oil reserves (though that, in itself, is not to be understated).[38]

As such, the political cost for the US has been huge—the increased boldness of other regional actors can only be detrimental to perceptions of US power and authority: Iran continues to be provocative despite the apparent rapprochement with the international community over its nuclear ambitions;[39] Israel remains unmoved over the Roadmap and towards Obama's insistence on a settlement freeze; and current Russian military action in Syria in support of President Assad all demonstrate, particularly to other Middle Eastern states, the fragility of regional US hegemony.

Certainly, there is marked nervousness within the White House. Following the US withdrawal from Afghanistan, most critical observers appear assured that the Taliban will return. If so, the war will have achieved no purpose and will have been a public-relations disaster for the US (no matter how much media-spin they are able to create). At the same time the current crisis regarding Syria presents an acute dilemma for the US. Does it continue to insist on political change and the removal of Assad—a position which may open the door to the potential rise of Muslim conservatism in the years ahead and, with it, possibilities of increased political or even militant rhetoric against Israel—or does it remain a muted bystander as events unfold apparently beyond its control? So, too, Iran remains a major concern particularly with the bullish Israeli stance on the pressing need for continued wariness over Iranian nuclear ambitions. All of these place the White House under sustained diplomatic pressure.

Hence, in respect of US foreign policy and the Middle East, Obama's two terms in office have moved from its beginnings of a sense of energized enthusiasm to ending with a hesitant whimper. In terms of Israel, the Christian Zionists are ebullient over the stalling of the Roadmap and inert actions against continued Israeli settlement building on occupied lands; in terms of the wider Middle-East, the tougher US line on militant Islam may well be amongst the defining events in the region over the next decade.

---

[37] Gilbert Achcar, "U.S. Hegemony in the Middle East: From Peak to Adversity," Palestine and the Uprisings: SOAS Palestine Society Annual Conference, London, March 17, 2012.

[38] See Michael Renner, "Post-Saddam Iraq: Linchpin of a New Oil Order," in *The Empire and the Crescent: Global Implications for a New American Century*, ed. Aftab Ahmad Malik (Bristol: Amal Press, 2003), 650-74. On the question of Iraq, as Achar has noted (Chomsky and Achcar, *Perilous Power*, 57), "For the US to withdraw from Iraq and not leave a client state would be an utter catastrophe."

[39] Note the recent BBC article arguing that Iranian hardliners have launched a "rearguard action against President Hassan Rouhani, whom they suspect of trying to steer the country towards the West and in particular the US following the recent nuclear deal": Kasra Naji, "Iran hardliners push back amid fears of change," BBC, Nov 13, 2015, http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-34793719.

Whether Obama's successor will bring any marked changes, or have any greater success, waits to be seen.

THREE

God's Earthly People

C. I. Scofield and the Blessing of Israel

Hilary Perry

Cyrus Ingerson Scofield published the first edition of the *Scofield Reference Bible* (SRB) in 1909.[1] SRB is a standard King James Version with extensive footnotes, cross-references, chapter-headings and sub-headings which put forward a literal interpretation of the Bible and propagate Scofield's premillennial, dispensationalist views. Premillennialists believe that Christ will return to earth before the Millennium. Dispensationalists hold that God has administered and administers the world through varying and progressive dispensations, economies or administrations, each with its own governing principle and particular responsibility placed on humankind, which invariably fails in its task, thus incurring divine judgement and the imposition of a new dispensation. Scofield defines a dispensation as "a period of time during which man is tested in respect of obedience to some *specific* revelation of the will of God."[2] He recognises seven dispensations. The current Dispensation of Grace or of the Church is the penultimate one, to be replaced by the final dispensation, the Millennial Kingdom, at the Second Coming of Christ.[3]

[1] It is extremely difficult to obtain a copy of the 1909 edition but it can be seen online at http://rarebooks.dts.edu/viewbook.aspx?bookid=1385. This paper refers to the second edition, *The Scofield Reference Bible: The Holy Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments*, ed. Cyrus I. Scofield (rev. ed.; London: Oxford University Press, 1917). According to Mark Sweetnam, the 1917 edition has been "the most influential edition of this influential Bible, and, apparently, continues to be so, in spite of the increased competition from other versions and the 1967 revision" (Mark S. Sweetnam, "*The Scofield Reference Bible* and Evangelical Thought: One Hundred Years and Counting," in *The Scofield Bible: Its History and Impact on the Evangelical Church*, R. Todd Mangum and Mark S. Sweetnam [Colorado Springs: Paternoster Publishing, 2009], 202).

[2] SRB note on Gen 1.28, 5 (Scofield's emphasis).

[3] The Dispensations of Innocency (Gen 1.28), Conscience (Gen 3.23), Human Government (Gen 8:20), Promise (Gen 12.1), Law (Exod 19.8), Grace (John 1.17), and the Millennial Kingdom (Eph 1.10).

Mark Sweetnam's recent study concludes that "Scofield and his notes have shaped the doctrinal basis of large swathes of evangelicalism."[4] Todd Mangum likewise finds that it is possible to trace SRB among the original sources of theological ideas in many books about Zionism.[5]

Scofield claimed that the nation of Israel is the chief concern of the Bible from Genesis 11 to Acts 2.[6] Even though he died in 1921 and therefore does not refer to the Jewish state established in 1948, it is interesting to compare dates and places relevant to the planning and production of SRB with the dates of the Zionist Congresses which began in 1897.[7] According to Arno Gaebelein, Scofield first spoke to him of "a plan of producing a Reference Bible… with references and copious footnotes," during the first Sea Cliff Bible Conference of 1901, and spoke of it again at the fourth conference in 1904.[8] In this same year, 1904, Scofield and his second wife Hettie visited London[9] and, according to Scofield's biographer Charles Gallaudet Trumbull also visited Montreux in Switzerland before returning to America.[10] Late in 1906, Scofield visited Oxford and then Switzerland again.[11]

Theodor Herzl (1860–1904) had published *Der Judenstaat*[12] in 1896 and chair-

[4] Sweetnam, "One Hundred Years," 199.

[5] R. Todd Mangum, "The Impact of *The Scofield Reference Bible* on American Evangelicalism, American Premillennialism, and Early Dispensationalism," in Mangum and Sweetnam, *The Scofield Bible*, 173.

[6] Scofield, "A Panoramic View of the Bible," SRB, iv.

[7] David Mendelsson, "From the First Zionist Congress (1897) to the Twelfth (1921)," *Jewish Virtual Library* (2000), http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Zionism/firstcong.html.

[8] Arno C. Gaebelein, *The History of* The Scofield Reference Bible (New York: Our Hope Publications, 1943), http://www.newble.co.uk/writers/Scofield/refbibhist.html. Gaebelein was one of the consulting editors on the 1909 and 1917 editions of SRB.

[9] Gaebelein, "History."

[10] Charles G. Trumbull, *The Life Story of C. I. Scofield* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1920), 88, 90, 94. According to Gaebelein, Scofield's first visit to Montreux was in 1906 ("History," ch. 5), but Gaebelein's biography was first published in *Moody Monthly* magazine, in the early months of 1943, much later than Trumbull's biography of Scofield. Joseph M. Canfield, in *The Incredible Scofield and His Book* (Vallecito, CA: Ross House Books, 1988), 190–91, disputes Gaebelein's dating, though he bases his argument on an apparent misreading of Gaebelein as saying Scofield had stayed two years in Montreux and returned in May 1906.

[11] Trumbull, *Life Story*, 101. Trumbull states that Scofield visited the library at Lausanne, begun by Calvin. Here Canfield corrects Trumbull's account to read "Geneva" (*Incredible Scofield*, 196). This seems more likely.

[12] Theodor Herzl, *The Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*, ed. Jacob M. Alkow, trans. Sylvie D'Avigdor (New York: American Zionist Emergency Council, 1946). Herzl wrote, "Let the sovereignty be granted us over a portion of the globe large enough to satisfy the rightful requirements of a nation; the rest we shall manage for ourselves" (92). "Palestine is our ever-memorable historic home. The very name of Palestine would attract our people with a force of marvelous potency. If His Majesty the Sultan were to give us Palestine, we could in return undertake to regulate the whole finances of Turkey. We should there form a portion of a rampart of Europe against Asia, an outpost of civilization as opposed to barbarism. We should as a neutral State remain in contact with all Europe, which would have to guarantee our existence. The sanctuaries of Christendom would be safeguarded by assigning to them an extra-territorial status such as is well-known to the law of nations. We should form a guard of honor about these sanctuaries, answering for the fulfillment of this duty with our existence. This guard of

ed the First Zionist Congress in Basle, Switzerland in 1897. Two of the Congress's major achievements were the foundation of the World Zionist Organisation and the formulation of the Basle programme, which stated that "Zionism seeks for the Jewish people a publicly recognized legally secured homeland in Palestine."[13] The second and third congresses were held in Basle in 1898 and 1899 and the fourth in London in 1900. The fifth, sixth and seventh congresses took place in Basle in 1901, 1903 and 1905 respectively.[14] The Jewish National Fund was established at the fifth congress. While it cannot be proved that these events had any influence on Scofield, it is interesting that he was in Switzerland, albeit in Montreux and Lausanne, not Basle, in 1904 and 1906, around the time that the sixth and seventh congresses were taking place, and he could have been in London at the time of the fourth congress, or shortly after it. It could also be significant that he was working on the SRB around that time.

Below, I shall outline three of Scofield's important assertions concerning Israel: his distinction between spiritual and earthly seeds of Abraham (i.e., the Church and Jews); his belief in the end-times return of Jews to the Promised Land; and his understanding that the blessing of Gentiles will depend on their treatment of Jews. In respect of each, I will also compare Scofield's commentary with writings by four modern, Christian Zionist authors: John Hagee,[15] Arnold G. Fruchtenbaum,[16] Charles H. Dyer,[17] and Edward E. Hindson,[18] who are also premillennial dispensationalists. Fruchtenbaum, Dyer, and Hindson, along with Larry V. Crutchfield, graciously responded to my email questionnaire about SRB use, sent to eighteen American dispensationalists in April 2010. Dyer and Hindson confirmed they had used SRB early in their Christian lives; Fruchtenbaum, from a Jewish background, stated that he had read it, but not at the time of his conversion. Hagee, whom Stephen Spector dubs "one of the most dedicated and outspoken American Christian Zionists,"[19] did not respond to my email, but he is highly influential, especially through his organisation, Christians United For Israel (CUFI). As will be shown, many of his ideas appear remarkably similar to those of Scofield.

Hagee, pastor of the 18,000-strong Cornerstone Church in San Antonio, Texas,

---

honor would be the great symbol of the solution of the Jewish question after eighteen centuries of Jewish suffering" (96).

[13] David Mendelsson, "First Congress: Basle, 1897," in "From the First."

[14] Ibid.

[15] John Hagee, *From Daniel to Doomsday: The Countdown Has Begun* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1999); *Jerusalem Countdown: A Prelude to War* (rev. and updated ed.; Lake Mary: Frontline, 2007); "Why Christians Should Support Israel: The Apple of His Eye…" *John Hagee Ministries*, http://www.jhm.org/Home/About/WhySupportIsrael.

[16] Arnold G. Fruchtenbaum, *The Footsteps of the Messiah: A Study of the Sequence of Prophetic Events* (Tustin, Ariel Ministries, 1990).

[17] Charles H. Dyer, *What's Next? God, Israel and the Future of Iraq* (Chicago: Moody Publishers, 2004).

[18] Edward E. Hindson, *The Book of Revelation: Unlocking the Future* (Twenty-First Century Biblical Commentary Series; Chattanooga: AMG Publishers, 2002).

[19] Stephen Spector, *Evangelicals and Israel: The Story of American Christian Zionism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 167.

reaches 99 million homes each week through radio broadcasts and televangelism,[20] and millions of people through books, a website, and email newsletters, and through CUFI, which he founded in 2006. CUFI and similar American evangelical Christian organisations, together with the American Israel Public Affairs Committee and neoconservative figures, form the US Israel Lobby, "a loose coalition of individuals and organisations that actively work to shape US foreign policy in a pro-Israel direction."[21] Christian Zionist organisations exert influence by lobbying Congress on behalf of Israel and mobilizing rapid member response whenever needed.[22]

God's Earthly and Heavenly Peoples, Israel and the Church

The claim that God has two eternally separate peoples, Israel and the Church, underpins Scofield's entire eschatology and engenders his belief that, because God's promises to Israel were earthly, so must they be fulfilled on earth in the establishment of an earthly kingdom in the land promised to Abraham and his descendants. The notion of the existence of two separate peoples of God appears in SRB notes from Genesis 5—the genealogy from Adam to Noah—onwards. In Scofield's interpretation, Noah is "a type of the Jewish people" who will be "brought as an earthly people to the new heaven and new earth."[23]

Regarding God's promise that he will make of Abram "a great nation," Scofield creates an innovative distinction between Abraham's earthly and heavenly descendants, putting forward an idiosyncratic interpretation of God's promise to Abram in Gen 13.16[24] and to Jacob in Gen 28.14,[25] where their progeny is described as "as the dust of the earth"; to Abram in Gen 15.5[26] and to Isaac in Gen 26.4,[27] where the number of their progeny is described "as the stars"; and to Abraham in Gen 22.17,[28] where the number of his progeny is likened to both sand and stars. In none of these verses

[20] Stephen Sizer, *Zion's Christian Soldiers? The Bible, Israel and the Church* (Nottingham: InterVarsity Press, 2007), 11.

[21] John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, *The Israel Lobby and US Foreign Policy* (London: Penguin Books, 2007), 112.

[22] Christians United For Israel, "About Us," http://www.cufi.org/site/PageServer?pagename=about_AboutCUFI.

[23] Note on Gen 5.22, SRB, 12.

[24] "And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth: so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered" (Gen 13.16, KJV).

[25] "And thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south: and in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed" (Gen 28.14, KJV).

[26] "And he brought him forth abroad, and said, Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them: and he said unto him, So shall thy seed be" (Gen 15.5, KJV).

[27] "And I will make thy seed to multiply as the stars of heaven, and will give unto thy seed all these countries; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed" (Gen 26.4, KJV).

[28] "That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies" (Gen 22.17, KJV).

is there any intimation of different kinds of descendants or any mention of a spiritual dimension. However, Scofield asserts in his note on Gen 15.18 that Abram's natural posterity is "the dust of the earth," that is, "the Hebrew people," whereas the phrase, "look now toward heaven… so shall thy seed be" (Gen 15.5) indicates "a spiritual posterity… all men of faith, Jew and Gentile."[29] Scofield reinforces the idea of division between the two peoples in two subheads: "The Abrahamic Covenant: the land given; natural posterity promised,"[30] and "The Abrahamic Covenant confirmed: a spiritual seed promised."[31]

This separation between earthly and heavenly comparisons is unjustifiable, however, as proved in other verses not mentioned by Scofield. For example, in Deut 1.10, Moses states, "The LORD your God hath multiplied you, and, behold, ye are this day as the stars of heaven for multitude." Moses here addresses the Israelites on the border of Canaan and cannot possibly be imagined to be addressing "men of faith, Jew and Gentile." The same objection applies to several other texts, none of which bears comment from Scofield.[32] 1 Chronicles 27.23 plainly states that it was Israel whom God had promised to increase like stars.[33] It seems that, to serve his thesis, Scofield imports Paul's arguments in Romans 9 and Galatians 3, where Abraham's physical and spiritual descendants are distinguished—but not in terms of dust, sand, or stars. Tellingly, Scofield refers to Rom 9.6–8 and Gal 3.6–14 in his note on John 8.37 ("I know that ye are Abraham's seed… ").[34]

Hagee likewise differentiates between sand and stars to justify elements of his advocacy of the land entitlement of modern Israel, as will be shown below.[35] The other modern writers do not appear to place so great an emphasis on the concept of God's separate peoples, but Fruchtenbaum's and Hindson's endorsements of rapture eschatology imply they too would accept the notion. According to Fruchtenbaum, seven stages of the Rapture of the Church are described in 1 Thess 4.16–17.[36] Hindson cites four texts

[29] Note on Gen 15.18, SRB, 24. Interestingly, Scofield posits a third way in which the promise is fulfilled: "through Ishmael."

[30] Subhead to Gen 13.14, SRB, 22. Ref. Gen 13.16.

[31] Subhead to Genesis 15, SRB, 23. Ref. Gen 15.5.

[32] "Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, thy servants, to whom thou swarest by thine own self, and saidst unto them, I will multiply your seed as the stars of heaven, and all this land that I have spoken of will I give unto your seed, and they shall inherit it for ever" (Exod 32.12, KJV); "Thy fathers went down into Egypt with threescore and ten persons; and now the LORD thy God hath made thee as the stars of heaven for multitude" (Deut 10.22, KJV); "And ye shall be left few in number, whereas ye were as the stars of heaven for multitude; because thou wouldest not obey the voice of the LORD thy God" (Deut 28.62, KJV); "Their children also multipliedst thou as the stars of heaven, and broughtest them into the land, concerning which thou hadst promised to their fathers, that they should go in to possess it" (Neh 9.23, KJV).

[33] "But David took not the number of them from twenty years old and under: because the LORD had said he would increase Israel like to the stars of the heavens" (1 Chr 27.23, KJV).

[34] Note on John 8.37, SRB, 1127. See below.

[35] See "The Land," below.

[36] Fruchtenbaum, *Footsteps*, 98–99.

as proof of the Rapture of the Church.[37] He states that, in Revelation, "dispensationalists" (who are pretribulational in their view of eschatology) see two distinct groups of people: "Jews on earth and Gentiles in heaven."[38]

In addition to remarks based on the text of Genesis, Scofield develops the concept of God's separate peoples in commentary on other parts of the Bible. Three SRB subheads to Leviticus read, "The relationships and walk of God's earthly people,"[39] and Scofield's Introduction to 1 Chronicles posits the "blessing of God's earthly people in connection with the Davidic monarchy."[40] In his Introduction to the Psalms, Scofield makes a stark distinction between the "earthly" and "heavenly" peoples, averring that "the imprecatory psalms are… a cry appropriate and right in the earthly people of God and based upon a distinct promise in the Abrahamic Covenant… but a cry unsuited to the church, a heavenly people who have their place with a rejected and crucified Christ."[41] Scofield also claims in his note on Hab 3.1 that Moses prayed for an earthly people whose dangers and blessings were earthly whereas Paul prayed for a heavenly people whose dangers and blessings were spiritual.[42] Scofield asserts in his note on John 8:37 that Christ himself contrasts Abraham's "seed,"[43] that is, Abraham's natural posterity, "the Israelitish people and Ishmaelites," with Abraham's "children,"[44] that is, Abraham's spiritual posterity, "all who are 'of the precious faith of Abraham.'"[45]

According to the SRB note on Hos 2.2, Israel is Jehovah's restored and forgiven earthly wife, whereas the Church is "the Lamb's heavenly bride."[46] This assertion is repeated in the note on Rev 19.7, where Scofield states that "The Lamb's wife is the 'bride,' the Church, identified with the 'heavenly Jerusalem,'"[47] to be "distinguished from Israel, the adulterous and repudiated 'wife' of Jehovah, yet to be restored (Isa 54.1–10; Hos 2.1–17), who is identified with the earth (Hos 2.23). A forgiven and restored wife

[37] Hindson, *Revelation*, 12. The texts are John 14.3; 1 Thess 4.16–17; 1 Cor 15.51–53; Rev 19.7–9.

[38] Hindson, *Revelation*, 8. The term "pretribulational" indicates the belief that the true church is to be raptured (caught up to heaven) before the onset of "the Great Tribulation," a seven-year, or three-and-a-half-year, period of intense suffering before the Second Coming of Christ. Unbelievers, including Israel and Gentiles, who are "left behind," are to suffer all the rigors of the Tribulation, which culminates in the attack of Antichrist on Israel, the coming of Christ and the Battle of Armageddon. Interestingly, Scofield holds that the Tribulation will last for three-and-a-half years (SRB notes on Dan 9.24 [914], and Rev 7.14; 13.37). He also asserts in his note on Rev 7.14 that this will be "distinctively 'the time of Jacob's trouble' (Jer 30.7)." He cites Enoch as a type of those to be caught up (SRB note on Gen 6.9 [13]), and those in the Ark rescued from the flood, and Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, as types of the remnant of Israel who will come to faith after the rapture of the true church (SRB notes on Gen 6.14 [13] and Dan 3.17 [903]).

[39] Subheads to Leviticus 18, 19, and 20, SRB, 150–2.

[40] Introduction to 1 Chronicles, SRB, 456.

[41] Introduction to the Psalms, SRB, 599.

[42] Note on Hab 3.1, SRB, 957.

[43] John 8.37 ("I know that ye are Abraham's seed… ").

[44] John 8.39 ("Jesus saith unto them, If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham").

[45] Note on John 8.37, SRB, 1127.

[46] Note on Hos 2.2, SRB, 922; refs John 3.29; Rev 19.6–8; Hos 2.23; Rev 19.7.

[47] Refs Rev 21.9; Heb 12.22, 23.

could not be called a virgin (2 Cor 11.2, 3) or a *bride*."[48] For Mangum, it is in such an assertion that Scofield reveals his hermeneutical approach: "the dichotomy between two peoples of God forms a theological template through which Scripture is read.… This dichotomy takes precedence even when the result is different persons of the Godhead taking on two different 'wives,' one earthly and one heavenly." It "indicates the level at which [his] theological presuppositions are exerting influence."[49]

Scofield also asserts that the four gospels show "a group of Jewish disciples, associated on earth with a Messiah in humiliation," whereas the epistles show "a Church, which is the body of Christ in glory, associated with Him in the heavenlies."[50] This distinction illustrates Scofield's notion that the dispensation of grace does not begin until the crucifixion.[51] Further, Scofield avers that, although "king" is a "divine title," Christ is "King of the Jews, not King of the Church, of which he is LORD and Head."[52] Israel in the wilderness was "a true 'church"' but it is never called a church in the land,[53] and it was in striking contrast with the New Testament *ekklēsia*. The only common feature is that "both were 'called out' by the same God."[54]

Scofield claims that Christ differentiated between Israel and the Church in two parables in Matthew 13. The metaphor of the treasure is made to apply to the lost tribes of Israel and Israel's restoration, and that of the pearl to the true church.[55] Scofield avers that Christ, having given himself for the pearl, is now preparing it for presentation to himself; it is in this sense that the pearl represents the true children of the kingdom, the Church.[56] In fact, the kingdom of heaven is likened to a merchant seeking a perfect pearl rather than to the pearl itself. Similarly and equally unjustifiably, Scofield asserts that "in the great field, the world He [God] sees the redeemed of all ages, but especially His hidden Israel, yet to be restored and blessed."[57]

Scofield also posits a differentiation between "the last days" relating to Israel and "the last days" relating to the Church.[58] Scofield states that "afterward" in Joel 2.28 means "in the last days," and that this "has a partial and continuous fulfilment during the 'last days' which began with the first advent of Christ… but the greater fulfilment awaits the 'last days' as applied to Israel."[59]

Scofield claims that it is not "taught in Scripture" that "the Christian inherits the

---

[48] Note on Rev 19.7 (Scofield's emphasis), SRB, 1348.

[49] R. Todd Mangum, "The Theology of *The Scofield Reference Bible*," in Mangum and Sweetnam, *The Scofield Bible*, 111, 112.

[50] Introduction to the Four Gospels, SRB, 990.

[51] See note on Exod 19.8, SRB, 94.

[52] Note on Matt 2.2, SRB, 995, ref Ps 110.16.

[53] Note on Acts 7.38, SRB, 1158.

[54] Note on Matt 16.18, SRB, 1021.

[55] Notes on Matt 13.44 and Matt 13.45, SRB, 1017.

[56] Note on Matt 13.45, SRB, 1017.

[57] Note on Matt 13.37, SRB, 1017.

[58] Note on Acts 2.17, SRB, 62–63.

[59] Note on Joel 2.28, SRB, 932. Scofield refers to his note on Acts 2.17.

distinctive Jewish promises." As the "heavenly seed of Abraham," the Christian "partakes of the spiritual blessings of the Abrahamic Covenant," but "Israel as a nation always has its own place, and is yet to have its greatest exaltation as the earthly people of God."[60] Stephen Sizer argues that this concept is "in plain contradiction to passages such as John 10.16 and Rom 11.24 (regarding the one flock and one olive tree), neither of which, interestingly, warrant any comment by Scofield."[61]

The concept of two distinct peoples of God is also found in the structure of Scofield's dispensational system. The fifth dispensation, the Dispensation of Law, and the seventh, the Millennial Kingdom, concern God's earthly people, the Jews. However, the sixth, the current Dispensation of Grace or Church Age, represents a "parenthesis" between them.[62] This dispensation concerns God's heavenly people, the Church, to be raptured to heaven before the start of the Great Tribulation, which will precede Christ's return and especially afflict Israel.

Scofield claims that, when Christ first appeared to the Jews, the Davidic kingdom should have been established, but God knew beforehand that both king and kingdom would be rejected and that the Church Age would ensue. He asserts that, because God's unfulfilled, earthly promises to Israel under the Davidic Covenant have never been abrogated, they will be fulfilled at Christ's Second Coming by the establishment of an earthly kingdom in the land promised to Abraham and his descendants, confirming Israel's national regathering, conversion and establishment in peace and power.[63] Thus the final Dispensation, the Millennial Kingdom, is the Davidic kingdom.

Hindson and Fruchtenbaum concur with Scofield on this point. Hindson holds that, following the second coming, Jesus Christ will reign on earth for one thousand years (a millennium) while Satan is bound in the "abyss" and that, during this time God's promises to Israel will be fulfilled. "The Messiah shall reign from Jerusalem over all the earth in peace, blessing, and prosperity (Rev 20.1–6; Isa 2.2–4; 9.6–7)."[64] Fruchtenbaum also sees the seventh dispensation as the Millennial Kingdom, the promised re-establishment of the Davidic throne.[65]

---

[60] Note on Rom 11.1, SRB, 1204.

[61] Stephen Sizer, "The Elevation of National Israel to a Superior Role over the Church," in *Cyrus Ingerson Scofield (1843–1921): The Author of The Scofield Reference Bible*, chapter 5, section 8, *Christ Church Virginia Water*, http://www.christchurch-virginiawater.co.uk/articles/scofield1.html.

[62] Cyrus I. Scofield, *What do the Prophets Say?* (Philadelphia: The Sunday School Times Company, 1918), 79.

[63] Note on Acts 1.11, SRB, 1148.

[64] Hindson, *Revelation*, 13.

[65] Fruchtenbaum, *Footsteps*, 6, 269.

The Land

The land and Jerusalem are constant themes in Scofield's commentary.[66] Scofield asserts that the Abrahamic Covenant, including the land-gift, is unconditional[67] but that the so-called Palestinian Covenant[68] was conditional, its violation resulting in Israel's dispersion.[69] He avers that "the gift of the land is modified by prophecies of three dispossessions and restorations," and that two of these have already occurred. Israel will be restored from her current third dispersion at Christ's return as King under the Davidic Covenant.[70] Significantly, Scofield asserts that "God's directive will for his covenant family is to be in Canaan,"[71] and that, for believers, the heavenlies referred to in Ephesians parallel "Canaan in Israel's experience."[72] "The divine order is… Israel in her own land, the centre of the divine government of the world and the channel of divine blessing; and the Gentiles blessed in association with Israel."[73] The "general theme" of Ezek 47.13–48.35 is "Israel in the land during the kingdom-age."[74]

The perspective of those living after 1948 inevitably differs from Scofield's, though there are suggestions that Scofield had Zionist tendencies and was at least acquainted with wealthy American Zionists, including Samuel Untermeyer. In 1900, according to David Lutzweiler,[75] or 1901, according to Joseph Canfield,[76] Scofield became a member of the Lotos Club of New York, an institution which sought to promote social intercourse between proponents of literature, science, and the fine arts. Canfield argues that Scofield's literary output would hardly have merited his membership at that time and that Untermeyer, a member of the Literary Committee at the time of Scofield's application to join this club, would not have been interested in what Scofield had so far produced. Canfield states that that "a possible clue" to Untermeyer's unlikely support for Scofield may have been "Scofield's 'postponed Kingdom' theory," which "was most helpful in getting Fundamentalist Christians to back the international interest in one of Untermeyer's pet projects—the Zionist Movement."[77] David Lutz holds that Scofield was involved in a conspiracy with Untermeyer and other prominent and wealthy Zion-

[66] References occur in notes on Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 Chronicles, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Joel, Jonah, Habakkuk, Zechariah, Acts, Romans, Ephesians, and Hebrews.

[67] Note on Gen 12.1, SRB, 20.

[68] Subheads to Deut 29, SRB, 248; and Deut 30, SRB, 249; and note on Deut 30.3, SRB, 250.

[69] Introduction to Deuteronomy, SRB, 216.

[70] Note on Gen 15.18, SRB, 25.

[71] Note on Gen 46.3, SRB, 65

[72] Introduction to Ephesians, SRB, 1249.

[73] Note on Isa 13.1, SRB, 724–5; cf. notes on Acts 2.14, SRB, 1150; Acts 3.21, SRB, 1153; Rom 11.26, SRB, 1206.

[74] Section head (capitals) over Ezekiel 40, SRB, 885.

[75] David Lutzweiler, *The Praise of Folly: The Enigmatic Life and Theology of C. I. Scofield* (Draper, VA: Apologetics Group Media, 2009), 138.

[76] Canfield, *Incredible Scofield*, 174.

[77] Canfield, *Incredible Scofield*, 174, 175.

ists "to inject Zionist ideas into American Protestantism." He also claims that Scofield accepted their financial backing.[78] However, Lutzweiler, while acknowledging that "the Lotos Club in Scofield's day had a very strong presence of dedicated Zionists, of whom Samuel Untermeyer was only one,"[79] nevertheless states that "there is, as of this writing, no documentary proof uncovered of any explicit connection between Scofield and the powerful people—especially the world's most prominent Zionists—who were among the hundreds of members listed in the directory of The Lotos Club."[80]

One definition of Christian Zionism is "the doctrine that the return of Jews to the 'Promised Land' fulfils biblical prophecy and will inaugurate the end times."[81] For premillennialists, the Great Tribulation and Antichrist's invasion of Israel must precede Christ's Second Coming, thus the area must be populated in advance by Jews. Organisations like Hagee's CUFI have strong eschatological reasons for urging support for Israel.

Hagee asserts that God's promise to Abraham was literal and unconditional and that "the title deed to the Promised Land" is to "a very literal land." This "title deed" was passed from Abraham to Isaac and then to Jacob. Hagee expands the concept of sand and stars representing God's earthly and heavenly peoples, already posited by Scofield, to refute the suggestion that "God's promise to Abraham was not a promise of literal land, but a promise of heaven." Interpreting Gen 22.17,[82] he states that "stars, as light, rule the darkness, which is the commission of the Church." They are heavenly, not earthly, and "represent the Church, Abraham's *spiritual* seed."[83] Conversely, the sand is earthly and represents "the multitudes of people from Abraham's seed—both Jews and Arabs." Having surprisingly acknowledged Arabs as descendants of Abraham, Hagee immediately states that "God gave to the Jewish people a physical land whose literal boundaries are given in Genesis 15.18–21. It is a specific land with Jerusalem as its capital city forever.… Israel has been given an earthly kingdom with an earthly Jerusalem now located in Israel. The church has been given the New Jerusalem located in heaven."[84]

Hagee's claims concerning the meanings of sand and stars draw the same objections as do those of Scofield and also merit further specific criticism. Being light is not the

---

[78] David W. Lutz, "*Un*just-War Theory: Christian Zionism and the Road to Jerusalem," in *Neo-Conned! Again: Hypocrisy, Lawlessness, and the Rape of Iraq. The Illegality and the Injustice of The Second Gulf War*, ed. D. L. O'Huallachain and J. Forrest Sharpe (Norfolk, VA: Light in the Darkness Publications, 2007), 147.

[79] Lutzweiler, *Praise of Folly*, 138.

[80] Lutzweiler, *Praise of Folly*, 139.

[81] Edward Kessler and Neil Wenborn, eds, *A Dictionary of Jewish-Christian Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 452–53.

[82] "Blessing I will bless you, and multiplying I will multiply your descendants as the stars of the heaven and as the sand which is on the seashore." No citation given by Hagee, but this appears to be from the New King James version.

[83] Hagee, *Daniel to Doomsday*, 137–9, (Hagee's emphasis).

[84] Hagee, *Jerusalem Countdown*, 202.

unique task of the Church. Isaiah 42.6 and 49.6, though often applied by Christians to Christ, may both be interpreted as indicating Israel's role as a light to the nations.[85] In such a strict division between stars and sand, the identity of Arab Christians and Messianic Jews within the Church becomes questionable. Apart from total disregard for modern political implications and lack of concern for non-Jewish inhabitants of Israel, the Occupied Palestinian Territories and the wider Middle East, Hagee's choice of Gen 15.18–21, where the declared extent of the land-gift is at its widest, incurs problems within the biblical text itself. Firstly, Jerusalem is not mentioned in Gen 15.18–21 and certainly not as "a capital city forever." Its inclusion is surely an indication of a political agenda. Secondly, different areas are promised to Abraham and his descendants in different verses even within Genesis,[86] and, as David Holwerda notes, appear in other biblical books too, sometimes in very detailed and complex format.[87] Thirdly, as Sizer remarks, some areas within the general "river of Egypt to Euphrates" region are biblically designated as not available to Israel. God will not give any of Seir, the land given to Esau's descendants, the Edomites, to the Israelites,[88] nor any of the land of the Moabites and

[85] "I am the LORD, I have called you in righteousness, I have taken you by the hand and kept you; I have given you as a covenant to the people, a light to the nations" (Isa 42.6, NRSV); "He says, 'It is too light a thing that you should be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the survivors of Israel; I will give you as a light to the nations, that my salvation may reach to the end of the earth' " (Isa 49.6, NRSV).

[86] For example, an unspecified area, "this land," is given in Gen 12.7; 24.7; 35.12; "all these lands" are given in Gen 26.3; and the area given is limited to what Abram can see in Gen 13.15, and to land on which Jacob is lying in Gen 28.13. In Gen 17.8 and 48.4, the land given is limited to Canaan.

[87] David E. Holwerda, *Jesus and Israel: One Covenant or Two?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 1995), 89, n. 8: "I will set your borders from the Red Sea to the sea of the Philistines, and from the wilderness to the Euphrates" (Exod 23.31a, NRSV); "Command the Israelites, and say to them: When you enter the land of Canaan (this is the land that shall fall to you for an inheritance, the land of Canaan, defined by its boundaries), your south sector shall extend from the wilderness of Zin along the side of Edom. Your southern boundary shall begin from the end of the Dead Sea on the east; your boundary shall turn south of the ascent of Akrabbim, and cross to Zin, and its outer limit shall be south of Kadesh-barnea; then it shall go on to Hazar-addar, and cross to Azmon; the boundary shall turn from Azmon to the Wadi of Egypt, and its termination shall be at the Sea. For the western boundary, you shall have the Great Sea and its coast; this shall be your western boundary. This shall be your northern boundary: from the Great Sea you shall mark out your line to Mount Hor; from Mount Hor you shall mark it out to Lebo-hamath, and the outer limit of the boundary shall be at Zedad; then the boundary shall extend to Ziphron, and its end shall be at Hazar-enan; this shall be your northern boundary. You shall mark out your eastern boundary from Hazar-enan to Shepham; and the boundary shall continue down from Shepham to Riblah on the east side of Ain; and the boundary shall go down, and reach the eastern slope of the sea of Chinnereth; and the boundary shall go down to the Jordan, and its end shall be at the Dead Sea. This shall be your land with its boundaries all around" (Num 34.2–12, NRSV); "Every place on which you set foot shall be yours; your territory shall extend from the wilderness to the Lebanon and from the River, the river Euphrates, to the Western Sea" (Deut 11.24, NRSV); "Every place that the sole of your foot will tread upon I have given to you, as I promised to Moses. From the wilderness and the Lebanon as far as the great river, the river Euphrates, all the land of the Hittites, to the Great Sea in the west shall be your territory" (Josh 1.3–4, NRSV).

[88] Deut 2.5.

Ammonites, given to the sons of Lot.[89] These areas correspond to the modern regions of the Negev and Jordan;[90] thus modern Israel is in breach of this stipulation concerning the former area.

Hagee regards the establishment of the State of Israel as the fulfilment of prophecy. "More than 2,600 years ago the prophet Ezekiel prophesied the resurrection of Israel from the Gentile graves in the lands to which she had been scattered, predicting the rebirth of Israel, which took place on May 14, 1948."[91] Hagee claims, from Gen 13.14 and 15.18,[92] that Christians should support Israel because "all other nations were created by an act of man, but Israel was created by an act of God."[93] "The Royal Land Grant" was given to Abraham and his seed through Isaac and Jacob with an everlasting and unconditional covenant[94] and the Davidic Covenant granted "the Jewish right to own and possess the land of Israel forever." At the Millennium, "the seed of Abraham will be given that land, (Israel), down to its last square inch."[95]

Like Scofield, Hagee ignores the fact that the Abrahamic Covenant has two sides and that obedience was expected from Abraham's physical descendants. Several English translations include the phrases, "as for me" and "as for you" (Gen 17.4 and 9), terms denoting the mutuality of the covenant, rendering the Hebrew emphatic pronouns, אני and אתה; Abraham is to direct his children and household to keep the way of the Lord by "doing righteousness and justice *so that* the Lord would bring about for Abraham what he had promised him."[96] As Gary Burge remarks, "… the land is not a possession that may be enjoyed without reference to God. Possessing this land is contingent on Israel's ongoing faithfulness to God and obedience to his law."[97]

Like Hagee, other modern Christian Zionist writers see the establishment of the state of Israel as fulfilment of prophecy. Hindson states that the great end-times regathering has already begun "since 1948."[98] Modern Israel is viewed as once again a nation in her own land.

---

[89] Deut 2.9, 19.

[90] Sizer, *Zion's Christian Soldiers?* 87–88.

[91] Hagee, *Jerusalem Countdown*, 129; ref. Ezek 37.

[92] "And the LORD said unto Abram, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward: For all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever" (Gen 13.14, KJV); "In the same day the LORD made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates" (Gen 15.18, KJV).

[93] Hagee, "Why Christians."

[94] Hagee, "Why Christians." Refs Gen 12.1–3; 13.14–18; 15.1–21; 17.4–8; 22.15–18; 26.1–5; and Ps 89.28–37.

[95] Hagee, *Daniel to Doomsday*, 268.

[96] Gen 18.19, NRSV, my emphasis. KJV gives a similar rendering: "For I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the LORD, to do justice and judgment; that the LORD may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him."

[97] Gary M. Burge, *Jesus and the Land: The New Testament Challenge to "Holy Land" Theology* (Grand Rapids: SPCK and Baker Academic, 2010), 4–5.

[98] Hindson, *Revelation*, 12. Refs Ezek 20.34; Isa 43.5–6.

Dyer admits that "in one sense the Palestinians have a legitimate claim to at least part of the land" because "some families who were driven off their land in 1948 and 1967 had lived there for centuries."[99] He also acknowledges anachronistically that "the Bible commands Israel to treat with fairness and dignity those non-Israelis [*sic*] who live in their midst." Citing Ezekiel, he says that Israel's blessings cannot come at others' expense and that the land must be divided.[100] However, he concludes that "the ultimate biblical solution is to distinguish between individual rights of ownership and the overarching issue of national sovereignty. God expects the Jewish people to respect the individual ownership rights of all who live in the land, including those who are not Jewish. But God granted national sovereignty of the land to the Jewish people."[101] Dyer also avers that "since Israel is in the land right now, God must have a purpose for them being there even if they are not there in obedience."[102]

Fruchtenbaum echoes Scofield's opinion that the Great Tribulation is centred on Jerusalem and the Holy Land, and involves "the people of God who will have returned to Palestine in unbelief."[103] He sees two regatherings of Israel. The first, prior to the Great Tribulation, has been happening since 1948 and is in unbelief in preparation for judgment. Only the second regathering[104] will be in faith, in preparation for millennial blessings.[105]

Blessing Israel

Scofield writes that Gen 12.3 ("I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee") "has been wonderfully fulfilled in the history of the dispersion. It has invariably fared ill with the people who have persecuted the Jew—well with those who have protected him." He adds that the future will still more remarkably prove this point,[106] a reference to his interpretation of Matt 25.31–46, which contains the assertion that the living nations are judged according to the way in which they have treated "those whom Christ here calls 'my brethren."' Scofield identifies Christ's *brethren* as "the Jewish Remnant… during the tribulation."

The King James translation of Gen 12.3 reflects the Hebrew verbs מברכיך and מקללך, each of which contains a second person masculine singular object.[107] Genesis 12.3 LXX contains a singular object, σε, pertaining to each of the two verbs, εὐλογοῦντάς and καταρωμένους.[108] This implies that these blessings and curses apply to Abraham person-

[99] Dyer, *What's Next?* 69–70.
[100] Ref. Ezek 47.22.
[101] Dyer, *What's Next?* 70.
[102] Dyer, *What's Next?* 85.
[103] Note on Rev 7.14, SRB, 1337.
[104] Ref. Isa 11.11–26.6.
[105] Fruchtenbaum, *Footsteps*, 295.
[106] Note on Gen 15.18, SRB, 25.
[107] ואברכה מברכיך ומקללך אאר: Gen 12.3.
[108] καὶ εὐλογήσω τοὺς εὐλογοῦντάς σε, καὶ τοὺς καταρωμένους σε καταράσομαι: Gen 12.3 (LXX).

ally. Sizer states that "there is no indication in the text that this warning of cursing was ever intended to extend beyond Abraham. The promise, when referring to Abraham's descendants, speaks of God's blessing them, not other nations blessing the Jews."[109] Sizer also notes that Scofield does not comment on Gal 3.16, 28–29, where Paul identifies Christ as the "seed" of Abraham, and states that the promise of blessing to the Gentiles depends upon faith in Christ, not upon their treatment of the Jews.[110]

Hagee's interpretations of Gen 12.3 are very similar to Scofield's but embellish them. Hagee asserts that "God has promised to bless the man or nation that blesses the Chosen People," and that "history has proven beyond reasonable doubt that the nations that have blessed the Jewish people have had the blessing of God; the nations that have cursed the Jewish people have experienced the curse of God."[111]

Hagee describes a visit he made to the Berlin Wall. He emphasises the contrast between West Berlin as "an oasis of boundless abundance created by risk and the reward system of capitalism," and East Berlin as "a barren desert with nothing to offer but empty promises." He recalls his response to a German tour guide who questioned him about God's intentions. It was to be noted that:

> What a nation does to the Jewish people, God will do exactly the same to them.… God allowed the Russians to build barbed-wire fences around the German people to hold you as prisoners with machine guns and German shepherd attack dogs because the German people did exactly the same thing to the Jews at every death camp. You did this at Dachau and Auschwitz, and for every Jew who died, you will have to answer to God.[112]

This seems to imply that Hagee holds the Communist, Marxist, and officially atheist East Germany solely responsible for the atrocities. He does not explain why West Germany enjoyed such opulence but seems implicitly to attribute divine favour to the capitalist system. Perhaps his case might be influenced by the fact that it was the West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer who negotiated the payment of reparations of $822 million with the Israeli government in February 1951.[113]

Hagee states that "Jesus considered the Jewish people His family." He inserts a parenthesis within the text of Matt 25.40, asserting that Jesus's brethren were solely the Jewish people and that "Gentiles were never called his brethren." Hagee ignores verses

---

[109] Sizer, "The Elevation of National Israel."

[110] Ibid.

[111] Hagee, "Why Christians."

[112] Hagee, *Jerusalem Countdown*, 235.

[113] Michael Bar-Zohar, *Ben-Gurion*, trans. Peretz Kidron (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1978), 198; "Jesus considered the Jewish people His family. Jesus said (Mt 25.40) "Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as you have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren (the Jewish people… Gentiles were never called His brethren), ye have done it unto me"' (Matt 25.40 with interpolation by Hagee, "Why Christians").

such as Matt 12.50, which states that "whoever does the will of my Father in heaven is my brother and sister and mother."

Dyer avers that "God unquestionably holds Israel accountable for obedience to His covenant." However, "God holds non-Jews accountable for their treatment of Israel—apart from Israel's spiritual condition." God promises "to punish the nations that had mistreated the Jews when they were under God's judgment."[114] Dyer states that "as the nations have treated Israel, so will they be treated in kind by Him."[115] Because God promised Abraham that he would bless or curse those who blessed or cursed him, "our job… is to make sure we're a blessing to the Jewish people. Biblically speaking,… we do need to support Israel's right to exist as a nation."[116]

Fruchtenbaum asserts that the grounds of the eschatological judgment in Matt 25.31–46 will be "Pro-Semitism" or "Anti-Semitism" during the Great Tribulation, the Jews being "Christ's *brethren*."[117] The charges in the indictment will be scattering the Jews during the Tribulation, parting the land during the Armageddon campaign and selling the Jews into slavery. "Each Gentile… will be judged on the basis of his participation or his refusal to participate in these deeds."[118] Believers, represented by the pro-Semitic sheep of the parable, will resist Antichrist and "populate the Gentile nations in the Messianic kingdom."[119] Answering a feasible charge that this interpretation implies salvation by works, Fruchtenbaum asserts that, since believers alone will oppose Antichrist's antisemitism, it is their belief, not their philosemitism, which will earn them entry to the kingdom and also to eternal life. Unbelievers, the antisemitic goats, having joined Antichrist in his programme of Jewish destruction, will demonstrate their lack of belief through their antisemitic acts and will go to hell.[120]

Conclusion

True to Scofield's statements in his seminal work, *Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth*, that more than half the contents of the Bible relates to the Israelites, who have "a very *distinct* place in the dealings and counsels of God" and "a unique covenant with Jehovah," and that "other nations are mentioned only as they touch the Jew," much commentary in SRB concerns Israel and its prophesied revival and re-establishment under Christ's earthly rule in the Millennial Kingdom.[121]

---

[114] Deut 30.7.
[115] Obad 1.15.
[116] Dyer, *What's Next?* 84–85.
[117] Fruchtenbaum, *Footsteps*, 259–60, Fruchtenbaum's own emphasis.
[118] Ibid., 259.
[119] Ibid., 260.
[120] Ibid. 260–61.
[121] Cyrus Ingersoll [*sic*] Scofield, *Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth: Being 10 Studies of the More Important Divisions of Scripture* (Windber, PA: Classic Reprint Press, 2007; original printing 1885), 11 (Scofield's emphasis).

While a secular Jewish state is not explicitly advocated or even mentioned in SRB, Scofield's text contains seeds which were ripe for later germination in the works of later Christian Zionist writers. The four Christian Zionist authors discussed here share many concepts with Scofield, and Hagee echoes some of his vocabulary—even though tracing precise influence remains difficult. As Sweetnam states, "we cannot simply point to someone who is saying the same thing as Scofield and assume they are saying it because they were influenced by Scofield."[122] Scofield himself states that his commentary comprises the results of fifty years of Bible study[123] and thinkers such as John N. Darby, James Brookes, and Arno Gaebelein, may also have directly influenced the modern writers. The latter [i.e., the modern Christian Zionists] were of course subject to many other influences.

Nevertheless, Scofield's commentary has been very popular. According to Mangum, Scofield aimed to provide readers with a clear application of biblical teaching and this made the notes influential and helpful to the Christian public.[124] Since the commentary was attached to the biblical text itself, it was a relatively cheap and practical tool for personal Bible study, the first of its kind. The "pragmatic usefulness" of SRB "made room for its dispensational distinctives to gain influence."[125]

It does not seem unreasonable to suggest that SRB played some part in the development of the eschatology of Hindson and Dyer, who both used it as young Christians. Of Hagee, one can only infer Scofield's direct influence. Fruchtenbaum's treatment of eschatological issues seems to develop in directions which do not entirely reflect Scofield.

Mangum states that Scofield "provided exegetical rationales for a general belief that ethnic, national Israel would be revived in the last days." He suggests that "it was only a matter of time before someone would come along seeking to correlate his general ideas more specifically with current events—SRB in one hand, newspaper in the other."[126] Mangum's observation is borne out in the writings of the four modern authors. Hagee makes the strongest claims concerning the eternal, physical nature of the "land-grant" to Israel and the status of Jerusalem. He also utilizes powerful historical references to support his argument concerning the consequences for those who either "bless" or "curse" Israel. Hindson and Fruchtenbaum refer directly to the establishment of the state of Israel as part of the end-times regathering, though Fruchtenbaum's opinion of 1948 is more nuanced than Hindson's. Dyer discusses Palestinian rights but concludes that Israel is entitled to ultimate sovereignty over the land and to Christian support. Scofield did not specify when or how Israel was to be restored, but the works of the four modern Christian Zionists, whether directly influenced by Scofield or not, clearly

[122] Mark S. Sweetnam, "The Impact of *The Scofield Reference Bible* on British Premillennialism," in Mangum and Sweetnam, *The Scofield Bible*, 143.

[123] "Introduction," SRB, iii.

[124] Mangum, "Theology," 127.

[125] Ibid., 133.

[126] Mangum, "The Impact of *The Scofield Reference Bible* on American Evangelicalism, American Premillennialism, and Early Dispensationalism," in Mangum and Sweetnam, *The Scofield Bible*, 175–6.

interpret the establishment of the State of Israel as the realisation of the dispensational schema which Scofield had popularized in his influential SRB.

FOUR

"In No Country are the Prophecies of the Bible more Revered than in Scotland"

The Church of Scotland, Christian Zionists, and The Edinburgh Chovevei Zion

Mark Gilfillan

In his recent *Origins of Christian Zionism: Lord Shaftesbury and Evangelical Support for a Jewish Homeland*, Donald Lewis stated that Scottish Presbyterian involvement was "highly significant" in the founding of English societies geared towards the conversion of Jews, and that Calvinists from Scotland and Ireland had been instrumental in the establishment of the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews.[1] Similarly, Nancy Stevenson has pointed out that in almost all nineteenth-century missionary efforts in Britain, Scots featured prominently as pioneer preachers, as planners, and polemicists.[2] However, other than these brief allusions by Lewis and Stevenson to the significant role played by Scots in directing Jewish evangelism, surprisingly little research has been devoted to assessing the context of this involvement, or the evolution of Scottish Calvinist attitudes towards Jews, Palestine, or Zionism. This has mainly been the result of the neglect of Scotland's ecclesiastical history more generally. Emma Macleod has argued that, "for a country whose church was known for being socially influential, Scotland's ecclesiastical history remains a rich, and yet relatively under-researched field."[3] This chapter will attempt to relate the roots of the Scottish enthusiasm for Jews and Judaism, and to explore the complex manner in which this enthusiasm manifested itself, particularly in relation to early Zionism in Scotland. Existing works on Scottish

[1] Donald M. Lewis, *The Origins of Christian Zionism: Lord Shaftesbury and Evangelical Support for a Jewish Homeland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 58.

[2] Quoted in Lewis, *Origins of Christian Zionism*, 59.

[3] Emma V. Macleod, "A Unique and Glorious Mission: Women and Presbyterianism in Scotland, 1830–1930 (review)," *Victorian Studies* 45, no. 4 (2003): 749–51.

Jewry have focused overwhelmingly on the experiences of Jewish immigrants in Scotland. These works often note that Scotland's Calvinist churches were particularly keen to convert Jews, but fail to probe deeper into Scottish motivations or attitudes, or to discover other ways in which this interest in Jews and Judaism manifested itself.[4]

Works on Scottish missions to Jews outside Scotland have similarly tended to avoid discussion of other ways in which the interest of the Scottish Churches in Jews and Judaism was expressed, focusing instead on the methods employed by missionaries, and their presumed role in an imperialist tradition.[5] No research has previously been carried out into the involvement of leading Scottish Presbyterians in Jewish Zionist groups in Scotland, or the keen interest taken by Scottish ministers in the activities of Zionist settlers in Palestine. Nor has any work been carried out into the excursions to the Holy Land undertaken by Scottish ministers purely for the purpose of observing and reporting on the Zionist project. Indeed, the lack of scholarly work on the attitudes of the Christian churches more generally towards Zionism before 1948, and how these attitudes evolved over time, arguably represents a significant lacuna in existing historiography.[6] This neglect is particularly remarkable given the extensive interplay between religion and politics in this area of study. Most importantly for this study, it worth recalling that six of the ten members of the cabinet behind the Balfour Declaration had a Calvinist upbringing on the "Celtic Fringe" of Britain, and that Balfour himself "was raised in a strongly evangelical Scottish Presbyterian home, and was nurtured in a Calvinistic evangelism."[7]

[4] See for example, Abraham Levy, "The Origins of Scottish Jewry," *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England* 20 (1959–61): 129–62; Kenneth E. Collins, *Go and Learn: The International Story of Jews and Medicine in Scotland* (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1988); *Second City Jewry: The Jews of Glasgow in the Age of Expansion, 1790–1919* (Glasgow: Scottish Jewish Archives Committee, 1990); *Be Well! Jewish Immigrant Health and Welfare in Glasgow, 1860–1914* (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2001); ed., *Aspects of Scottish Jewry* (Glasgow: Glasgow Jewish Representative Council, 1987); Charlotte Hutt and Harvey L. Kaplan, eds, *A Scottish Shtetl: Jewish Life in the Gorbals, 1880–1974* (Glasgow: Gorbals Fair Society, 1984); Elizabeth E. Imber, "Saving Jews: The History of Jewish-Christian Relations in Scotland, 1880–1948," Master's Thesis, Brandeis University, 2010; Ben Braber, *Jews in Glasgow, 1879–1939: Immigration and Integration* (London: Vallentine Mitchell, 2007).

[5] See, for example, Michael Marten, *Attempting to Bring the Gospel Home: Scottish Missions to Palestine, 1839–1917* (International Library of Colonial History 3; London: Tauris Academic Studies, 2006); "Imperialism and Evangelisation: Scottish Missionary Methods in Late 19th and Early 20th Century Palestine," HLS 5, no. 2 (2006): 155–86.

[6] For an in-depth look at Christian attitudes since that date see Paul C. Merkley, *Christian Attitudes Towards the State of Israel* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001). Some effort has been made to examine Catholic institutional responses to Zionism before 1948. See for example, Sergio I. Minerbi, *The Vatican and Zionism: Conflict in the Holy Land, 1895–1925*, trans. Arnold Schwarz (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990); Livia Rokach, *The Catholic Church and the Question of Palestine* (London: Saqi Books, 1987).

[7] Lewis, *Origins of Christian Zionism*, 3.

Scottish Calvinist Attitudes Towards Jews and Palestine to 1890

Although the Church of Scotland arrived comparatively late to missionary activity directed towards Jews, the missions of the nineteenth century were rooted in the fact that "a concern for the Jewish people was present in Scotland right from the time of the Reformation."[8] Arthur Williamson argues that as Scottish apocalyptic expectations deepened during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, "interest in the Jews, their culture and their prophesied role in the historical redemption at the end of days, also became articulate and urgent."[9]

Pioneering historian of British Jewry Cecil Roth noted that though in the seventeenth century there were no more than a few Jews residing in Scotland, "there was at times a fairly strong philosemitic atmosphere. At the time of the Messianic agitation associated with the name of Sabbatai Zevi, Aberdeen seems to have been a principal centre for the dissemination of extravagant reports relating to the mystical movement for the restoration to Palestine."[10] The most notable of these reports was a pamphlet titled the "New Letter from Aberdeen," dated October 26, 1665, in which it was claimed a mysterious ship, with white satin sails and white silk ropes was said to have been forced by bad weather to dock at Aberdeen. The pamphlet asserts that with the assistance of a local "Professor of the Tongues and Languages" it was discovered that the inhabitants spoke "broken Hebrew" and that a scarlet inscription on the sails was Hebrew for "These are of the Ten Tribes of Israel." It was further claimed that the occupants of the ship were on a quest to gather "their Brethren," and "joyn with them."[11] Enthusiasm for the return of the Jews to their homeland was keenly felt in Aberdeen's ecclesiastical circles. Patrick Forbes, Episcopalian Bishop of Aberdeen (1618–35), was renowned for his scholarly interest in apocalyptic commentaries, and, according to contemporaries, "visibly ached for the restoration of the Jews to Palestine."[12]

In the late eighteenth and earlier nineteenth centuries, as the result of an evangelical impulse provoked by the Wesleyan and Whitefieldite revivals, several pan-evangelical

---

[8] Allan Harman, ed., *Mission of Discovery: The Beginning of Modern Jewish Evangelism* (Guernsey: Christian Focus, 1996), 5. The official commencement of the Church of Scotland's mission to the Jews began in the late 1830s. By contrast, the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews had been founded, not without the involvement of individual Scottish Presbyterians, in 1809. See R. H. Martin, "United Conversionist Activities among the Jews in Great Britain 1795–1815: Pan-Evangelicalism and the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews," *Church History* 46, no. 4 (1977), 437.

[9] Arthur H. Williamson, "'A Pil for Pork-Eaters': Ethnic Identity, Apocalyptic Promises and the Strange Creation of the Judeo-Scots." In *The Expulsion of the Jews: 1492 and After*, ed. Raymond B. Waddington and Arthur H. Williamson (New York: Garland Publishing, 1994), 238.

[10] Cecil Roth, "The First Jews in the Land," *Jewish Chronicle* (May 6, 1938), 32.

[11] R. R. London, *A New Letter from Aberdeen in Scotland Sent to a Person of Quality: Wherein is a more full Account of the Proceedings of the Jewes than hath been hitherto Published* (London: Printed by A. Maxwell, 1665). See also, Michael McKeon, "Sabbatai Sevi in England," *Association for Jewish Studies Review* 3 (1977): 131–69.

[12] Williamson, "Pil for Pork-Eaters," 238.

institutions emerged in Britain.[13] The most prominent of these was the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews, known as the London Society, founded in 1809 by members of several Protestant denominations including Calvinists from Scotland.[14]

Against the backdrop of the French Revolution, an intensification of antisemitic repression in Central Europe, and a resulting increase in Jewish migration to Britain, predictions were made that the "fall of the Papal anti-Christ in Europe" was imminent, and that Jews would soon "be brought within the Christian fold." Subsequently, argues R. H. Martin, "the Jewish place in evangelical missionary thought took on an urgent proportion almost overnight."[15] Mel Scult notes that one of the London Society's key means of conveying its message was the lecture tour, and that during 1813 alone, members of the London Society delivered lectures to seventy-seven Scottish communities.[16] Further, Allan Harman argues that

> desire for the conversion of the Jews was maintained in Scotland by evangelical ministers down into the nineteenth century. However, the concern for Israel seems to have been heightened by the arrival in Scotland of quite a number of Jewish people in the early part of that century.[17]

There was an inherent weakness in the make-up of the London Society. The "interdenominational balance" which had enabled an early pan-Protestant alliance in the cause of converting Jews quickly began to deteriorate in the face of significant "theological and denominational stumbling blocks."[18] Not least among these was the question of, once a Jew had been persuaded to convert, under whose auspices should he be baptized? The ensuing schism led to the gradual departure of the lesser denominations. R. H. Martin states that, by 1815, the London Society had been "taken over by Anglicans."[19]

Between 1815 and 1838 an already extant Scottish interest in Jews and Judaism began to take on a momentum of its own, and in early 1838, as a preliminary to the establishment of a mission to the Jews, the Church of Scotland appointed its own committee "to collect information respecting the Jews, their numbers, condition and character."[20] Simultaneously, the Church of Scotland's leading ministers began to refine

[13] Martin, "United Conversionist Activities," 438. For an in-depth analysis of these revivals and their impact on Scotland, see Ian H. Murray, *The Puritan Hope: A Study in Revival and the Interpretation of Prophecy* (London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1971), 107–28.

[14] Ibid; see also Lewis, *Origins of Christian Zionism*, 58.

[15] Martin, "United Conversionist Activities," 438, 441. See also Mayir Vreté, "The Restoration of the Jews in English Protestant Thought 1790–1840," *Middle Eastern Studies* 8, no. 1 (1972): 3–50.

[16] Mel Scult, *Millennial Expectations and Jewish Liberties: A Study of the Efforts to Convert the Jews in Britain, up to the Mid Nineteenth Century* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978), 99.

[17] Harman, *Mission of Discovery*, 5.

[18] Martin, "United Conversionist Activities," 445–46.

[19] Ibid, 437.

[20] Church of Scotland, *Course of Lectures on the Jews by The Ministers of the Established Church in Glasgow* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication 1840), 6.

their own approach to Judaism, their interpretation of the Jewish past, and their expectations for the Jewish future. In 1838, during the course of a remarkably clear series of lectures, subsequently published and read in "daughter churches" as far afield as the United States, these ministers articulated the new consensus.[21]

The Church of Scotland entered into an endeavour to convert the world's Jews in late 1838, asserting in the publication of its lectures that, in relation to "God's ancient people," this represented the first act "in which any Christian Church *as a church* [original italics] has expressed her deep interest in and her earnest resolution to promote their salvation."[22] Crucially, unlike Anglican evangelism, in which the move to convert Jews was part of a broader mission to global "heathenism," the Church of Scotland would focus its effort solely on Jews, and "saw the conversion of others as an incidental bonus."[23] This exclusive focus on Jews derived from a literal interpretation of Paul's biblical injunction that salvation should come "to the Jew first."[24]

While much of the publication is devoted to justifying a mission to Jews, there is also substantial discussion of Palestine, and the expected "restoration of the Jews." Rev. Robert Buchanan (ca. 1802–75), during his lecture on "History of the Jews viewed in Connection with Prophecy from the Destruction of Jerusalem to the Present Time," remarked that "at this day, the Jews still exist to the number… of three millions of souls—a number amply sufficient to people at once their ancient land."[25]

In the penultimate lecture of the series, devoted exclusively to a discussion of "The Future Prospects of the Jews—Restoration to their own Land," Rev. Patrick Fairbairn (1805–74) argued that restoration to Palestine is "the most interesting and important subject of inquiry connected with the present series of lectures."[26] Fairbairn argued that as Jewish converts to Christianity "are now to be seen in almost every city of Christendom," the time was close at hand when "the Jewish people shall be restored to their ancient territory."[27] Palestine, it was argued, was "a land which may emphatically be called Desolate: being stripped of its ancient and proper people."[28] Fairbairn also showed an

[21] The significant influence of the Church of Scotland on "daughter churches" and other branches of Presbyterianism should not be understated. Just four years after the establishment of the Church of Scotland Mission to the Jews, the General Assembly of the Irish Presbyterian Church established its own mission to the Jews. For more on this see Nicholas M. Railton, "The Dreamy Mazes of Millenarianism: William Graham and the Irish Presbyterian Mission to German Jews," in *Protestant Millenialism, Evangelicalism and Irish Society, 1790–2005*, ed. Crawford Gribben and Andrew R. Holmes (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 174–96.

[22] Ibid, 7.

[23] Michael Marten, "Anglican and Presbyterian Presence and Theology in the Holy Land," *International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church* 5, no. 2 (2005), 183.

[24] Church of Scotland, *Course of Lectures on the Jews*, 13. Stevenson Macgill, Professor of Theology at the University of Glasgow, and author of the introductory lecture states: "To the Jew first. The expression is singular, and demands our attention."

[25] Church of Scotland, *Course of Lectures on the Jews*, 18.

[26] Ibid, 405.

[27] Ibid, 415.

[28] Ibid.

awareness of early Jewish Zionism, noting that while there was some scepticism regarding the restoration among "many Christians and Christian divines," there remained interest in a restoration among "the seed of Israel themselves."[29]

How, then, did the Church of Scotland view its role in relation to the expected restoration? It was first asserted that the restoration "shall be begun by the Jews themselves."[30] Interpretations of biblical prophecy suggested that the Church should expect the restoration to be "opposed by the united councils and collective strength of many nations," that God would subsequently intervene to restore the Jews, but that the restoration would be preceded by a conflict and affliction "such has never been experienced on the earth."[31] Thus, as the return to Palestine was to be begun by Jews themselves, the Church of Scotland was not to intervene until that stage. In addition, as God would "surely punish those who combine to prevent the restoration of his ancient people," it was asserted that it was the duty of the Church of Scotland to work at that time to aid the Jews and "prepare the way for their return."[32]

Christian Zionists and the Edinburgh *Chovevei Zion*

Between 1838 and the last decade of the nineteenth century, a number of Scottish missions were sent to the Jews of various European nations, as well as Palestine, Egypt, and Turkey.[33] However, it was only with the arrival of thousands of destitute Jewish migrants in Scotland, fleeing Russian pogroms or seeking new opportunities, at the end of the century, that Scottish Calvinists were provided with an opportunity to evangelize within their own locality. The resources they employed, and the zeal with which they attempted to convert Jewish migrants resulted in Scotland, and in particular Edinburgh, playing host to some of the most remarkable and controversial missionary endeavours in Britain.[34] In addition, the foreign and domestic efforts of the Church of Scotland and the Free Church of Scotland often intermingled—the Edinburgh Mission, which ran English language classes and a medical dispensary for Jewish immigrants, was operated by a number of Palestinian Jews who had been converted in their homeland by Scottish missionaries.[35]

By 1890, Edinburgh's Jewish population had increased from a handful of families in the middle of the nineteenth century to approximately two thousand individuals, most of whom had started life in the Russian Empire. In August 1890, this immigrant

[29] Ibid, 429.
[30] Ibid, 430.
[31] Ibid, 431.
[32] Ibid.
[33] Harman, *Mission of Discovery*, 5.
[34] See for example the career of Sir Leon Levison, a Jewish-born missionary converted in Palestine by a Church of Scotland minister: Frederick Levison, *Christian and Jew: The Life of Leon Levison 1881–1936* (Edinburgh: Pentland, 1989).
[35] Ibid. See also the papers of the Edinburgh Jewish Medical Mission, National Archives of Scotland, reference no. CH3/979.

community founded Scotland's first Zionist group—the Edinburgh *Chovevei Zion*, or "Lovers of Zion." *Chovevei Zion* had its roots in the East and had in large part been exported to the West along with the flow of Russian refugees. Western Jewry, having benefitted from decades or even centuries of emancipation, had gradually minimized the position of Zion in Jewish identity. In some cases, it was "even being exorcized by reformers and secularists."[36] By contrast, Russian Jewry, labouring under the oppressive laws of the Tsars, remained more attached to the memory of the Holy Land. For many, "the recollection of its loss was a visceral wound."[37] This cultural memory was imbued with more importance following renewed oppression in Russia. Modern Zionism was subsequently born from this renewed persecution, along with the persistence of antisemitism elsewhere in Europe. The resulting need for security, and the trend toward nationalism which swept Europe towards the end of the nineteenth century, also played major roles in the founding of early Zionist organizations.

The first branches of *Chovevei Zion* were scattered among the towns and cities of the Russian Pale, founded upon the belief that "there is no salvation for the People of Israel until they establish a government of their own in the land of Israel."[38] How exactly this was to be achieved was something never clarified by the movement, though it tended towards the raising of funds for small farm colonies, such as Rehevot and Chadera, and support of the Jewish farmers and artisans who inhabited them.[39] In 1884, a conference of Russian branches of the movement had reached a consensus "on the financing of Jewish settlement in Palestine as their first priority," and by the end of the decade the organization had been established in Britain under the direction of leading Sephardic Jews, Colonel Albert Goldsmid and Eli d'Avigdor.[40]

Support for Edinburgh's new Zionist society was soon forthcoming from a number of high-profile Christians, and it became quickly apparent that their motivations were heavily influenced by Christian theology. In December 1891, possibly feeling that the first Jewish moves towards the restoration had begun, Rev. William Paterson (1860–1939), Chair of Divinity at Edinburgh University and future Moderator of the Church of Scotland, wrote to the *Jewish Chronicle* to express his support for Zionism. At that time Paterson was also heavily involved in the aid of Jewish refugees and immigrants, having founded the Russian Refugees Relief Society in July. During the course of his letter to the *Jewish Chronicle*, Paterson argued that after the relief of refugees,

> the next thing which occupies the attention of many in Scotland is to

[36] Howard M. Sachar, *A History of Israel: From the rise of Zionism to Our Time* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982), 5.

[37] Ibid.

[38] Sachar, *History of Israel*, 16.

[39] Yossi Katz states that the *Chovevei Zion* "preached the goals of immigration to Palestine for the sake of agricultural settlement; the reinforcement of national consciousness, and the revival of the Hebrew language." See Yossi Katz, "Agricultural Settlements in Palestine, 1882–1914," *Jewish Social Studies* 50, no. 1/2 (1988–1992), 64.

[40] Ibid.

> help Israel to occupy the land of their fathers.… In no country are the prophecies of the Bible more revered than in Scotland.… The colonisation of Palestine, which may be a problem of the future, must be accomplished wisely and systematically.[41]

Shortly thereafter, Paterson contacted the leaders of the Edinburgh *Chovevei Zion*, assuring them of Christian support and offering to engage the Scottish masses with the Zionist cause. In response, Edinburgh's Zionists seem to have been quite open in accepting support from non-Jewish sources. In fact, Marcus Levy, a picture-frame manufacturer in the city, and at that time Honorary Secretary of the Edinburgh "Tent," wrote to the London-based "Chief Commander" Joseph Prag in July 1891, stating that Rev. Paterson "wishes to establish an honorary *Chovevei Zion* Society in Scotland, entirely submissive under your rules and management he hopes to get hundreds or perhaps thousands of members."[42] Paterson's ambitions were again outlined in a letter he wrote personally to Dr. Solomon Hirsch, Secretary of the London headquarters, in August 1891. Paterson, possibly referring to his influence in the Church of Scotland, professed to have "special means of telling all Scotland about your work, and I desire to do so soon, for the Scottish nation is interested in the Jews." Paterson seems to have thought of himself as the leader of "Gentile Zionism" in Scotland, and also seems to have presumed a great deal about the willingness of Scots to support the cause. These assumptions are apparent at the conclusion of his letter, where he implores Hirsch "if you have any other idea of any way in which the Scottish people can help you, will you please let me know soon, on how we could in any way advance your interests."[43]

Paterson's theological motivations for supporting Zionism do not appear to have caused any friction, at least not in Edinburgh. Paterson was well-received among the city's Jewish leaders, and his efforts to aid Jews on several fronts were appreciated by the community as a whole. Marcus Levy wrote to Hirsch in August 1891, praising Paterson's "high position in life and his warm heart towards our Jewish people." He added that he wished "to have many more such friends as he is."[44]

However, Paterson's motivations, as well as his ambitions, were treated with some scepticism by *Chovevei Zion*'s London headquarters, and this scepticism was communicated to representatives in Edinburgh some months later. On the morning of December 30, 1891, Paterson summoned the leaders of the Edinburgh Tent, where "with tears in his eyes," he conveyed the "letter of discouragement" which he had received from Dr. Hirsch. It is unclear from surviving correspondence if Hirsch expressed disagreement

---

[41] William Paterson, letter to the editor, *Jewish Chronicle* (Dec 18, 1891), 6.

[42] Scottish Jewish Archive Centre (hereafter SJAC), Marcus Levy to Joseph Prag, July 26, 1891, copy of papers of Edinburgh *Chovevei Zion*. Originals held at Central Zionist Archives, Jerusalem, file: A2/44.

[43] SJAC, William Paterson to Solomon Hirsch, Aug 26, 1891, copy of papers of Edinburgh *Chovevei Zion*. Originals held at Central Zionist Archives, Jerusalem, file: A2/44.

[44] SJAC, Marcus Levy to Solomon Hirsch, Aug 20, 1891, copy of papers of Edinburgh *Chovevei Zion*. Originals held at Central Zionist Archives, Jerusalem, file: A2/44.

with the motivations of those behind the drive to recruit an honorary Gentile branch of the organisation, or whether he simply expressed his doubt regarding its chances for success. What is clear is that the letter conveyed the reluctance of Hirsch to send London "promoters" to the first meeting of this Honorary Edinburgh Tent, which was scheduled to take place on January 11, 1892.

Despite a lack of support from national headquarters, plans for the establishment of a Christian branch of *Chovevei Zion* did go ahead, and during a meeting at *Chovevei Zion* headquarters in London in January 1892, it was remarked by the leader of the assembly that a "zealous friend" in Edinburgh had "enlisted the sympathy of the Lord Provost, the Dukes of Abercorn and Argyll, and several other influential gentlemen in Scotland, and a great demonstration will be held in the Scotch capital on 11 January." It was added by the speaker that "it was hoped that some good work will follow, and England will imitate the example of Scotland."[45] Given the influence and public standing required to lobby such figures, it is highly likely that the zealous friend was in fact Paterson.

The aforementioned "great demonstration" was held in Edinburgh's General Assembly Hall of the Free Church of Scotland. Of the several hundred in attendance, the majority were Jews, though most of the speakers were Christian. Attempts were made by the majority of Christian speakers to set aside their missionary zeal, in order to foster closer links with local Jews and better support the Zionist cause. When one of the Christian speakers "appeared desirous to utilize the movement for proselytizing purposes; the attempt was promptly checked."[46] Rev. Dr. James MacGregor, of St. Cuthbert's Church, Edinburgh, and a past Moderator of the Church of Scotland, introduced a motion intended to embrace large numbers of non-Jews in the Zionist cause. It was seconded by Paterson. The wording of the motion is worth stating in full:

> That a Scottish auxiliary be established, embracing Christians of all denominations, entitled "The Scottish Society for the Restoration of Jews in Palestine." That the objects of the society will be to aid the *Chovevei Zion* Association in their work in every way in its power, morally, financially, and politically; and to help deserving Jews to obtain land in Palestine for colonisation by loans of money on easy terms.[47]

During the meeting, Paterson revealed himself to be a pragmatist, and open to a number of methods to induce the Scottish public to lend their support to Zionism. Britain as a whole, at the turn of the century, was undergoing a reaction against the scale of Jewish immigration, and the "foreignness" of the new Jewish population. There were increasing calls to restrict Jewish immigration with legislation and even to deport thousands of Jewish immigrants.[48] In 1892, Paterson, possibly believing xenophobia to be

[45] *Jewish Chronicle*, Jan 8, 1892, 8.

[46] *Jewish Chronicle*, Jan 15, 1892, 16.

[47] Ibid.

[48] For more on this issue see Bernard Gainer, *The Alien Invasion: The Origins of the Aliens Act of 1905* (London: Heinemann Educational Publishers, 1972).

more likely than piety to achieve his desired result, argued that helping Jews relocate to Palestine would ease the immigrant burden, "since many hundreds of the refugees had been denied entrance into New York, and many of them were returning to this country."[49] Thus, while Christian Zionist motivations for the support of Zionism in Edinburgh tended to be theologically rooted, how Zionism was proffered to the non-Jewish public was significantly more nuanced. The meeting concluded with a talk by two deputies from Edinburgh's *Chovevei Zion*, during which the deputies expounded upon the "prospects before Jews who might settle in Palestine under its auspices."[50]

Despite the enthusiasm which accompanied its birth, the Scottish Society for the Restoration of Jews in Palestine was an unmitigated failure. Neither the religious zeal of its leaders nor Paterson's pandering to xenophobia proved sufficient to gather in significant levels of public support for Zionism. A series of letters from Paterson to Hirsch during the course of the following year conveyed Paterson's growing dismay at the failure of the Honorary Tent, and his realization that the vast majority of Scots were not as interested or as sympathetic as he had believed them to be. In April 1892 he wrote that, "I cannot say we have achieved very much in getting subscriptions." By January 1893 he seems to have conceded that his efforts were in vain. He wrote to Hirsch:

> I cannot report much progress here in interesting Scotch Christians in the scheme of colonization. There is first the general apathy to overcome and the difficulty of starting a new project. Over and above there is a very decided hostility to the scheme in some quarters of the "secular" press. Some even of our religious papers have shown great suspicion if not antagonism.… I fondly hoped that our Scotch auxiliary would by this time be able to send you some hundreds of pounds; but I am sorry our revenue has not been much and we have only a very few to remit. Our membership never swelled as I expected it would.[51]

The Honorary Tent was formally dissolved in April 1893, with Paterson remarking on the "surprising" level of apathy shown by Scots towards the scheme of colonization.[52]

The dissolution of the Honorary Tent did not mark the end of Christian involvement in Edinburgh's Zionist movement. A letter from a Benjamin Freeman to the *Jewish Chronicle* in August 1893 reveals that by that date Paterson had become Honorary Secretary to the tent, and that Sir William Muir, Principal of Edinburgh University, had taken a seat on Edinburgh's *Chovevei Zion* council. Furthermore, it is clear that there were leading Zionists in Britain who looked on the involvement of Christians as

[49] *Otago Witness*, Jan 14, 1892, 26.

[50] Ibid.

[51] SJAC, Paterson to Hirsch, April 13,1892, and Paterson to Hirsch, January 14, 1893, copy of papers of Edinburgh *Chovevei Zion*. Originals held at Central Zionist Archives, Jerusalem, file: A2/44.

[52] SJAC, Paterson to Hirsch, April 22, 1893, copy of papers of Edinburgh *Chovevei Zion*. Originals held at Central Zionist Archives, Jerusalem, File: A2/44.

being benign and even as something to be encouraged. In September 1893 the Edinburgh tent was visited by Colonel Albert Goldsmid, who may have been referring to the history of Scottish philosemitism when he informed all present that, "it was also a pleasure to have a tent in Scotland, seeing that there was no nation on the earth nearer akin to the Jewish nation than the Scottish, both in their love of the Bible, and in their sympathy with all that is best in Judaism."[53]

It is clear however, that despite the ostensibly good prospects for a Christian Zionist movement in Scotland, based primarily on decades or even centuries of ecclesiastical interest in Jews and their expected restoration to Palestine, Paterson's Scottish Society for the Restoration of Jews in Palestine failed to achieve even modest success. The reasons for this failure offer insight into not only early Christian attitudes towards Christian Zionism, but also the failings of early Zionism more generally.

Reasons for the Failure of Christian Zionism in Scotland

One of the main reasons for the failure of Christian Zionism in Scotland was its close alliance to *Chovevei Zion*, an organization which was itself fraught with a multitude of problems. The relocation of Jews to Palestine was never achieved on a significant scale by the movement. Howard Sachar has argued that while it was adept at attracting numerous followers, both in Russia and to a lesser extent in the West, "it remained quite ineffective as an agency of immigration," while Walter Laqueur has remarked more severely that "organisationally and politically the Hoveve Zion was a failure."[54] This failure had its roots in the vague and disorganized manner in which the organisation sought its goals, which were arguably just as ambiguous. This ambiguity was most obvious in the western countries, where there was almost no desire on the part of Jews, assimilated or recently arrived, to move on to Palestine. To use a local example, when M. Schapira, "Commandant" of the Edinburgh branch, decided to emigrate from Scotland in 1894, his destination of choice was not Palestine but Canada.[55] It would have been difficult to enthuse prospective Christian Zionists about the impending restoration of the Jews when it was so apparent that, if anything, a great number of Jews were moving further away from Holy Land.

It also became apparent that apathy towards the Zionist project was not limited to Scottish gentiles. Former Honorary Vice-President of the Zionist Federation Rev. J. K. Goldbloom recalled in 1952 that the influence of the British branches of *Chovevei Zion* "on the man in the street was very small."[56] Thus, support for early Zionism was likely to come from a marginal section of British Jewry, just as it came from a marginal

[53] *Jewish Chronicle*, Sept 8, 1893, 16.

[54] Sachar, *History of Israel*, 27; Walter Laqueur, *The History of Zionism* (London: Tauris Parke, 2003), 80.

[55] *Jewish Chronicle*, April 13, 1894, 19.

[56] Jacob K. Goldbloom, "Reminiscences of Zionism in Great Britain," in *The Rebirth of Israel: A Memorial Tribute to Paul Goodman*, ed. Israel Cohen (London: Edward Goldston, 1952), 61.

section of Scottish Christians. Inherently, it would appear, *Chovevei Zion* lacked mass appeal. By 1896, three years following the formal dissolution of its Christian auxiliary, the Edinburgh *Chovevei Zion* began a steady decline. Benjamin Freeman wrote to Dr. Hirsch in July complaining that he couldn't even find a sufficient number of people to hold a meeting, and that this has been the case "for the last couple of years."[57] The ambiguities of the movement and its failure to achieve significant success in Palestine had also become increasingly evident by that point. By December 1897, with Herzl's vision of Zionism in the ascendant following the Basle Conference, Marcus Levy wrote to Dr. Hirsch demanding that the funds donated by supporters in Edinburgh be better used by London headquarters. The disintegration of the relationship between the Edinburgh branch and headquarters was complete by January 1898, when Levy wrote to Hirsch that:

> At our last general meeting the question of our duty to Headquarters was discussed and it has been unanimously agreed to not assist you any more financially until we see you do more practical work in Palestine. It is, I am sorry to say, the general opinion of our members that you have wasted much capital, and much more energy, enthusiasm and hope of those that have entrusted themselves to be led by you.[58]

Of course, one must still account for the fact that while a small group of senior and influential Scottish clergy were heavily involved in the Edinburgh branch, this involvement never encompassed the support of the Church of Scotland *as a Church*, or any of the lesser Presbyterian denominations. Nor did *Chovevei Zion* ever enjoy the support of "all Scotland," as Paterson had hoped.

Arguably, reasons for the lack of ecclesiastical support from the Kirk may lie in the Church of Scotland's understanding of the restoration, as outlined in its influential series of lectures in 1838, and more specifically, the question of whether conversion was an essential prerequisite to the restoration. In the main, Protestant thought in both England and Scotland held that conversion of the Jews would precede the restoration, and this was reflected to a great extent in the conversionist movements mentioned previously. In the seventeenth century, Joseph Mede, a cleric at Cambridge, wrote in his *The Mystery of St. Paul's Conversion* that, in order for Jews to convert, their Diaspora should be ended and they should be restored to a kingdom in "Canaan." But this concept of a "preescathological restoration of the Jews" was notable for being "peculiarly novel," and never achieved widespread support.[59] Nonetheless, the Church of Scotland's approach to the subject was never clearly defined in its 1838 lecture series. In his chapter on

[57] Letter from B. L. Freeman to Dr. Hirsch, July 13, 1896, PECZ.

[58] Letter from Marcus Levy to Dr. Hirsch, Jan 8, 1898, PECZ.

[59] Nabil I. Matar, "George Herbert, Henry Vaughan, and the Conversion of the Jews," *Studies in English Literature, 1550–1900* 30, no. 1 (1990), 81. See also "The Idea of the Restoration of the Jews in English Protestant Thought, 1661–1701," *Harvard Theological Review* 78, nos 1–2 (1985): 115–48.

the future prospects of the Jews, Rev. Patrick Fairbairn stated that the primary means of aiding the restoration of the Jews should be the promotion of "the work of their conversion."[60] Rather ambiguously, however, Fairbairn articulated that there was some "doubt" as to "whether the *entire* [original italics] conversion of the Jewish people shall have taken place before the era of their restoration."[61] This ambiguity helps explain how it was possible for the conversion of the Jews to remain a major aspect of Church policy, and at the same time offers an explanation for the lack of support for Zionism from the Church more generally. This ambiguity also allowed enough of a loophole for individual Christians to devote their energies to aiding the Zionist cause without coming into conflict with a clearly defined Church policy.

Despite Paterson's apparently unsuccessful appeal to the prevailing climate of xenophobia which permeated British politics in the last decade of the nineteenth century, non-Jewish support for a Scottish Christian Zionist organisation would have had to rely first and foremost on religious foundations. In this respect, Paterson's efforts to encourage the support of the laity for his Christian auxiliary would have suffered from a lack of official Church backing, and this difficulty would have been compounded still further by the fact that church-going and religiosity in Scotland had been in steady decline since the 1850s.[62] Perhaps unsurprisingly, Scottish Christian Zionism in the late nineteenth century was a niche within a niche.

Conclusion

The involvement of prominent Christians in the Edinburgh *Chovevei Zion*, and their efforts to create a Scottish Christian Zionist organisation emerged from an historical tradition of Scottish Presbyterian interest in Jews, Judaism, and Palestine. This interest culminated in the establishment, in 1838, of the Church of Scotland's mission to the Jews. This decision, and the articulation of the Kirk's position on Jews and the restoration had a significant influence on its "daughter churches" and other Presbyterian churches as far afield as the United States. While this interest manifested itself most coherently in the Church of Scotland's resolution to convert Jews around the globe, and to focus exclusively on Jews as the target of conversionist activity, the position of the Church in relation to Palestine was less clearly expressed. It was generally agreed that Jews should and would be restored to Palestine, yet it was never clearly defined whether the Church of Scotland should support this move or how and when the Church of Scotland should support the restoration. This ambiguity, coupled with ongoing ecclesiastical interest in Jews and their conversion, resulted in some senior Church of Scotland ministers, as well as influential members of the laity, lending their support to local Zionist groups—in

[60] Church of Scotland. *Course of Lectures*, 431.

[61] Ibid.

[62] Callum G. Brown, *Religion and Society in Scotland Since 1707* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1997), 58.

their view, the most local and immediate sign that "the Jews themselves" had begun their "return."

This co-operation was welcomed by Edinburgh's Jewish Zionist leaders, though the relationship never bore the fruit expected of it. The vague nature of the Church of Scotland's position regarding the restoration, and the resultant absence of official Church support for the activities of Paterson, would have severely hampered Paterson's efforts to gain support for Zionism comparable to the support enjoyed by the mission committees. The weak support that Christians were able to give to the Edinburgh branch was rendered largely ineffectual by the fact that *Chovevei Zion* in Britain suffered from a myriad of problems, not least its inability to clarify its goals or its methods to achieve them, and its corresponding difficulty in attracting and maintaining support from the Jewish "man on the street."

Perhaps one of the key findings of this, quite specific, case study is that there is a need for more research to be carried out into the attitudes of the Christian churches, particularly evangelical churches, towards Zionism, and more specifically, interactions between evangelicals and Zionist organisations before the establishment of the State of Israel. The context of these interactions, how commonplace these interactions were, the factors which influenced their failure or success, and their lasting impact are questions that remain largely unanswered.

FIVE

Canadian Christian Zionism

Hawkish Eccentrics

Ron Dart

Harper has backed Israel with such fervour that veteran scholars and diplomats rank it as the most dramatic shift in the history of postwar Canadian foreign policy.

— Marci McDonald[1]

A third observation based on the The Ipsos Reid exit poll is that the Conservatives did well among Jewish voters in the 2011 election but that they did poorly among Canadian Muslims. Among Jewish voters, 52 per cent voted Conservative, compared to 24 percent who voted Liberal and only 16 per cent who voted NDP. *The Harper government has courted Jewish voters by offering uncritical support for Israel.*

— Dennis Gruending[2]

Those who study the origins, development, and the many contemporary expressions of Christian Zionism often track in two directions. There are those who highlight, within Christian history, the antisemitic tendencies that have dogged Christianity and Christendom. Then, there are those who track and trace the philosemitic and Christian Zionist commitments in England, Germany, and the USA. The fact that Canada is often left out of this discussion does need to be noted. Canada has, to some degree, been shaped and influenced by both its British and American connections, and

[1] Marci McDonald, *The Armageddon Factor: The Rise of Christian Nationalism in Canada* (Toronto: Random House Canada, 2010), 311.

[2] Dennis Gruending, *Pulpit and Politics: Competing Religious Ideologies in Canadian Public Life* (Toronto: Kingsley Publishing, 2011), 2.

the Christian Zionist tendencies from these states have done much to determine the present Christian Zionist position in the ruling political party in Canada today. This chapter will discuss both historic Christian Zionism in Canada and the present reality of Christian Zionism at the highest levels of political power and foreign policy decision-making in Canada today by the majority government of Conservative Prime Minister Stephen Harper (2006–15).

The United Nations General Assembly voted 138–9 on November 29, 2012 to recognize Palestine as a non-Member Observer State. Such a vote opened the door for Palestinian statehood. It is significant to note that of the eight states that opposed the resolution, Canada and the United States were the most prominent. In fact, the Foreign Affairs Minister of Canada, John Baird, suggested that Canada might even take retaliatory measures against the Palestinians for forcing the statehood agenda onto the global stage. Why has the ruling Conservative Party in Canada taken such a pro-Zionist perspective with the USA? Does Canada have a history of taking such a position? And what might be some of the reasons for Canadian Christian Zionism? The present chapter will answer some of these questions in a suggestive way.

Dawn of the Dilemma

The dawn of Christian Zionism in Canada can be tracked to the significant presence of Henry Wentworth Monk (1827–96) in the nineteenth century. Monk had decided philosemitic tendencies and attempted to translate such leanings into the purchase of land for Jews in Palestine. In the 1870s–80s, Monk was aggressively active in the effort to buy land for God's chosen people. Monk was initially introduced to such notions by the seventh Earl of Shaftesbury (Anthony Ashley-Cooper, 1801–85) about 1840, the leading Christian Zionist in England in the latter half of the nineteenth century. Monk called for a "Dominion of Israel," and he even wrote to Balfour in 1896 a letter entitled "Stand Up O Jerusalem." Monk's philosemitic commitments have been amply spelled out in Richard Lambert's biography.[3]

Monk was definitely not alone in his passion for the return of Jews to their historic homeland. The nineteenth century was a bubbling cauldron of interpretations of biblical prophecies and their application to Jews and the Promised Land. A notable example was the Reverend Albert Thompson, who argued strenuously that Christians, in supporting the return of Jews to their ancestral homeland, were facilitating the second return of Christ. Thompson was active in Canada in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in linking prophetic texts from the Bible to current events.

The prophetic tendencies that dominated much of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries had an impact at the highest levels in Canada. Justice Ivan Rand (1884–1969) and future Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson (1897–1972) played significant roles on the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine (UNSCOP). Pearson had decided

[3] Richard S. Lambert, *For the Time is at Hand: An Account of the Prophecies of Henry Wentworth Monk of Ottawa, Friend of the Jews, and Pioneer of World Peace* (London: Andrew Melrose, 1947).

Zionist leanings, and he often made it clear that he had taken in such a position from his Christian upbringing. Rand had been profoundly shaped and influenced by the influential American Zionist and Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis (1856–1941). Pearson has been called the "Lord Balfour of Canada" and "Rabbi Pearson," and he received some of the highest awards from Zionists. Rand's work on UNSCOP and his Zionist leanings are well recounted in William Kaplan's biography.[4]

I have merely pointed to the dawn of Christian Zionism in Canada by mentioning Monk, Thompson, Rand, and Pearson. The fuller tale can be heeded and heard by reading the texts mentioned or sifting and sorting through the studies of David Bercuson[5] and Eliezer Tauber.[6] There can be no doubt, though, that Canadians in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries played significant roles in shaping Canadian foreign policy in a pro-Zionist path and direction.

Canadian Academics and Christian Zionism

I mentioned above that one approach to being pro-Zionist from within the Christian tradition is to list, in historic detail, all the atrocities heaped on the Jewish nation by Christians—such an approach creates, understandably so, an empathy for the plight and victim status of Jews. The publication of William Nicholls's *Christian Antisemitism: A History of Hate*[7] makes it abundantly clear that there is a distinctive Christian tradition from the beginning, through the centuries and into the present, that is antisemitic. Nicholls taught in the Religious Studies Department at the University of British Columbia for many a decade, and was pro-Zionist. Those who take the time to heed Nicholls's detailed arguments cannot but be held by the fact that Christians have been powerful oppressors and Jews, again and again, have been hapless victims. *Christian Antisemitism* has played a significant role in Canada, in both the Christian and Jewish communities, in garnering support for the state of Israel. The natural human reaction to such a reading of Christian-Jewish history is to bend the knee to the needs and demands of the Jewish people. Who, in their right mind, wishes to participate in the continued oppression and victimization of this people?

Don Lewis's *The Origins of Christian Zionism: Lord Shaftesbury and Evangelical Support for a Jewish Homeland*[8] seems to oppose the thesis of Nicholls. Lewis makes it abundantly clear that British evangelicals and German pietists played a significant role before the foundation of the state of Israel in being philosemitic and supporters of a

[4] William Kaplan, *Canadian Maverick: The Life and Times of Ivan C. Rand* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009).

[5] David J. Bercuson, *Canada and the Birth of Israel: A Study in Canadian Foreign Policy* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985).

[6] Eliezer Tauber, *Personal Policy Making: Canada's role in the adoption of the Palestine Partition Resolution* (Contributions to the Study of World History 96; Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2002).

[7] William Nicholls, *Christian Antisemitism: A History of Hate* (Lanham, MD: Jason Aronson, 1993).

[8] Donald M. Lewis, *The Origins of Christian Zionism: Lord Shaftesbury and Evangelical Support for a Jewish Homeland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

Jewish homeland. In short, there is more to the Christian tradition than an antisemitic history of hate. The British evangelical tradition, primarily, were decades (indeed centuries) ahead of Jewish Zionism in arguing and urging at the highest levels in British politics to create the conditions for a Jewish homeland. Both Lewis and Nicholls, but from different perspectives, have therefore articulated arguments used to justify both Christian and Jewish Zionism. I have highlighted elsewhere how both Nicholls and Lewis have pandered to the ideology of Zionism from different academic perspectives.[9]

There is no doubt that Lewis and Nicholls have had a limited readership, whereas Paul Charles Merkley (professor of History at Carleton University in Ottawa) has had a much greater impact. Three of his publications[10] have consolidated and clarified, for the interested and committed, the historic debate within the Christian community in a probing and controversial manner. Merkley has rarely flinched from using his skills for advocacy of Zionism, and his many Canadian backers have more than applauded his interpretation of the Jewish-Christian approach to the state of Israel. The fact that Merkley taught in Ottawa (the seat and centre of political power), and the equally significant fact that he was publishing on these issues as the right-of-centre political agenda was coming to power in Canada, meant that he became, for the up-and-coming political leadership in Canada, their definitive academic authority. Merkley, much more than Lewis and Nicholls, has done much to shape and clarify for the leadership in the ruling Conservative Party in Canada the Zionist position. In fact, Merkley became a key advisor to Stockwell Day on Canadian-Jewish-Zionist relations when Day was head of the Canadian Alliance Party (forerunner of Harper's Conservative Party of Canada). When Harper defeated Day for leadership of the Party in 2002, Day was offered a leadership role in the newly formed Conservative Party on significant foreign policy issues. The Merkley-Day-Harper Zionist agenda knit together the academic and formal party politics that altered significantly the traditional attitude of Canada to Jews and Israel.

Biblical Exegesis and Christian Zionism

The impact of John N. Darby, *The Scofield Reference Bible*, the interpretive ideology of dispensationalism, biblical prophecy, end-times scenarios, and Zionism have been widely discussed and analysed by many. What role has Canada played in this linking together of biblical exegesis and Christian Zionism, though? Darby travelled to North America seven times between 1862 and 1877, and he spent time in Toronto, Montreal, and Ottawa. The annual Niagara Bible Conferences that were held from 1875 to 1897 moved forward Darby's agenda and inspired the young Cyrus I. Scofield. The shift in the United States within the Conservative Evangelical community to *The Scofield Reference Bible* (first published in 1909), dispensationalism, and a more pro-Jewish agenda did not

[9] See Ron Dart, "Christianity, Zionism and Anti-Semitism," HLS 9, no. 2 (2010): 239–43.

[10] See Paul C. Merkley, *The Politics of Christian Zionism: 1891–1948* (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 1998); *Christian Attitudes Towards the State of Israel* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001); *American Presidents, Religion and Israel: The Heirs of Cyrus* (Westport: Praeger Press, 2004).

go unnoticed in Canada. The province of Alberta became a portal into the emerging synthesis of Niagara Conferences, Darby, and Scofield. William Aberhart (1878–1943) was quite taken by the end-time dispensational scenario of Darby-Scofield and tribe, and he started the Calgary Prophetic Bible Institute (modelled somewhat on the Moody Bible Institute in Chicago) in 1927. The merging of prophetic language with a pro-Jewish stance consolidated an emerging vision in Canada by the Conservative Evangelicals. The seeds planted by Aberhart took root and produced a long term-harvest. It did not take long for "Bible Bill's" Calgary Prophetic Bible Institute to morph into the radio program, *Canada's National Back to the Bible Hour*, which defended liberal democracy, American imperialism, anti-communism, and philosemitism. After Aberhart died in 1943, Ernest Manning (1908–96) followed lock-step in Aberhart's footsteps (becoming Premier of Alberta and guiding the *Back to the Bible Hour*). There was a significant roadblock in the way, though, of the final fulfilment of many of the prophetic utterances which were discussed during the radio broadcast: Jews had to return and resettle in the historic land promised them by God via Abraham. The formal founding of the State of Israel in 1948 was viewed as demonstrating that the prophetic clock was moving towards the appointed hour. The Aberhart-Manning twosome had played their role in both Alberta and Canada in raising the flag of prophecy and support of the Jewish people to their historic home. More will be said about the Aberhart-Manning-Zionism connections later in this chapter.

It would be impossible in Canada, when attempting to understand Christian Zionism, to ignore the leadership role of Merv and Merla Watson. The Watson duo and family have done more than most to call conservative evangelicals back to Jewish festivals, music, dress, and a sort of Jewish romanticized ethos. The Watsons and their followers have made many trips to Israel, and the Jewish state has warmly welcomed their uncritical support of Zionism. Merla Watson recounted much of their pro-Jewish leadership and treks to Israel (replete with exuberant photos) in *Merla's Miracle*. The role of Merv and Merla in shaping a pro-Jewish agenda in Canada at a more in-the-trenches populist level has been significant and strategic. Merv emerged from a Plymouth Brethren background, with a commitment to Darby-Scofield, and Merla grew up in a Pentecostal background, with an interpretation of the Jewish prophets that pandered to a pro-Jewish outlook. The Watson family moved to Israel in 1976, and, as Merla comments in *Merla's Miracle*:

> We felt such a burden to comfort the wounded Jewish people with song! We have come to love and respect them with all our hearts! We sang for countless Israelis, rich and poor, young and old, even the Prime Minister and the President. We gave birth to the International Christian Celebration during the Feast of Tabernacles, and the International Christian Embassy in Jerusalem.[11]

[11] Merla Watson, *Merla's Miracle* (Victoria: Catacombs Productions, 1999), 20.

There is, therefore, in Canada, a direct link from Darby-Scofield, through the Niagara Bible Conferences, up to Aberhart-Manning's *National Back to the Bible Hour* and the Watsons' International Christian Embassy in Jerusalem. The ripple effect has been enormous, not the least in Canadian politics in the early twenty-first century.

The Conservative Party and Christian Zionism

Ideas often do, in time, have consequences, and this is certainly true in Canada. John Stackhouse, in his PhD dissertation-turned-book, *Canadian Evangelicalism in the Twentieth Century*, suggested that there were "The Eccentrics" and "The Mainstream" evangelicals in Canada.[12] Stackhouse suggested that figures such as William Aberhart should be included among the eccentrics. I noted above that Aberhart was replaced by Ernest Manning in his dual role as Premier and radio preacher. In 1987, Ernest Manning's son Preston Manning founded the right-of-centre Reform Party of Canada (which later evolved into the Canadian Alliance Party). In 2004, that party merged with the Progressive Conservative Party to form the Conservative Party of Canada. By 2006, the Conservative Party of Canada had formed a minority government in Canada, and held power until 2015, becoming, in the 2011 federal election, the majority government.

Preston Manning was replaced by Stockwell Day (an avid Zionist) in 2000, who in turn was replaced by Stephen Harper in 2002, the latter becoming leader of the Conservative Party of Canada in 2004 and Prime Minister in 2006. Many of Harper's Members of Parliament come from Conservative Evangelical backgrounds, and, as such, the pro-Jewish ethos has been instilled in them by a dispensationalist interpretation of the Jewish prophetic tradition and a Sunday School understanding of Jews as God's chosen people.

According to Marci McDonald, in *The Armageddon Factor*, "Harper has backed Israel with such fervour that veteran scholars and diplomats rank it as the most dramatic shift in the history of postwar Canadian foreign policy."[13] What have been some of the positions taken by the Harper government that are pro-Zionist and why have such positions been taken? When Hamas was legitimately elected in 2006 to represent the Palestinian people, Harper cut aid to the Palestinians. Harper sided with the Jewish state against Lebanon in the 2006 war, and when Israel invaded Gaza in 2009, and the United Nations Human Rights Council opposed such an action, Harper stood uncritically by Israel's side. The decision by Hugo Chávez to oust the Israeli ambassador as a result of Gaza was opposed by Harper. Harper went so far as to suggest he might even represent Israel in Venezuela. Harper opposed Obama at the 2011 G8 summit in France in which Obama suggested a return to the 1967 borders. Former Minister of Citizenship, Immigration and Muliticulturalism, Jason Kenny, attempted to prevent George Galloway (the former British MP, who has sympathies with Hamas) from en-

[12] John G. Stackhouse, *Canadian Evangelicalism in the Twentieth Century: An Introduction to Its Character* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993).

[13] McDonald, *Armageddon Factor*, 311.

tering Canada. There is no doubt that Harper is much further right than the US these days on the Zionist issue (a rather rare and unusual position for most Canadians).[14]

There is much more that could be said about the Conservative Party of Canada and their ideological pro-Zionist stance. The Conservative Party's opposition to the Canadian International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development for funding "terrorist" groups in the Middle East (which, decoded, means anything that questions Zionism) has meant that any questioning of Zionist and settler activities in Israel is now deemed terrorism. Kairos (an ecumenical church group) also had funding cut off because of daring to question Zionist policies, and the research centre Mada al-Carmel (which was studying the treatment of women in Arab-Israel) also had support terminated. Each of the groups mentioned above (International Centre for Human Rights and Democratic Development, Kairos, and Mada al-Carmel) have some sympathies for the plight of the Palestinians, and accordingly were penalized by the Conservative Party of Canada.

The work done decades ago at a more exegetical and Bible-School level by Darby-Scofield, Aberhart, Manning and tribe has now moved into a worrisome political phase. Men and women who took in, as children in Sunday school, a pro-Jewish ideology are now making decisions, as adults, in Canadian foreign policy. The eccentrics have become the mainstream and the Canadian mainstream has been marginalized. The implications are ominous for both Jewish-Palestinian relations and Canadian foreign policy on the Middle East.

Marci McDonald has been one of the few in Canada who has tracked and traced the various connections between Harper and other Zionists. McDonald's chapter, "The Armageddon Factor" in *The Armageddon Factor* probes and highlights all the formal and informal web of relations in Canada that support the present pro-Zionist foreign policy of Harper's majority government.[15]

The deeper the probes into the Conservative Evangelical and fundamentalist ethos in Canada, the more it will become abundantly clear how and why a certain reading of the Bible is significantly impacting who is chosen as an MP in Canada and how such decisions are altering historic Canadian foreign policy in the Middle East.

Populist Evangelicals and Christian Zionism

The National Post carried a full-page advertisement in its August 19, 2006 edition, sponsored by Christians United For Israel (CUFI), calling for a "National Day of Prayer for Israel and the Peace of Jerusalem." A short read of the advertisement makes it quite clear that the political agenda for the day is support of Zionism. Benny Hinn and John Hagee are backers of CUFI and the Canadian version of the organization is equally Zionist. The CUFI website recommends another Conservative Evangelical organization, The

[14] Ron Dart, "The Bible Belt in British Columbia, Canadian Zionism and the Israel Lobby," HLS 11, no. 1 (2012): 87–91.

[15] McDonald, *Armageddon Factor*, 308–36.

Institute for Canadian Values. The CEO of Institute for Canadian Values is Joseph C. Ben-Ami, former Director of Government Relations and Diplomatic Affairs for B'nai B'rith and former policy aid to Stephen Harper and Stockwell Day. CUFI and the Institute for Canadian Values both link to Equipping Christians for the Public Square Centre, founded and formerly headed by Conservative Evangelical activist and pro-Zionist, Tristan Emmanuel, who is closely connected to various members of the Conservative Party.

CUFI has another companion organization in Canada that has drawn the naïve and historically illiterate: Watchman For The Nations was started by Bob Birch on the West Coast. Bob Birch was well connected with Bernice Gerard, and both have played a significant role in linking the Christian charismatic and renewal movements with Zionism. Bob Birch and Bernice Gerard have a decades-long history with David Mainse of 100 Huntley Street in Burlington, Ontario, and Mainse, Birch, and Gerard have clearly advocated for why and how Christianity and Zionism are one. A read of Mainse's *100 Huntley Street*[16] and Beth Carson's *Pastor Bob: A Statesman of Prayer for Canada*[17] connect demonstrates the many connections between Canadian charismatic or renewal movements and Zionism.

The recent booklet publication of Mainse's fifty years of dominating the Canadian Charismatic and Conservative Evangelical ethos, *Crossroads Compass: Special Commemorative Edition: Celebrating 50 years of A Passion for God, A Passion for People (1962–2012)* walks the extra mile to usher the curious into the world of Canadian right-of-centre politics and the media. Bob Birch and Bernice Gerard died a few years ago, but it was Birch and Gerard on the West Coast, Mainse and 100 Huntley Street in Ontario and, earlier, Aberhart-Manning's *Back to the Bible Hour* that did much to massage the Zionist message, at a populist level, for many Canadians. CUFI and the Institute for Canadian Values and Equipping Christians For The Public Square stand on the shoulders of Aberhart-Manning, Birch-Gerard and Mainse-100 Huntley Street.

There has also emerged in Canada in the last decade a youth movement that has decided right-of-centre and Zionist commitments. 4MyCanada has been led by Faytene Krystow (a child of the charismatic movement), and, in many ways, this movement of young adults in their late teens-twenties is the youngest and most energetic child of Birch-Gerard, Mainse, and the organizations mentioned above. 4MyCanada brings together charismatic and Christian renewal types with Harperite Republican conservatism and pro-Israeli policies in the Middle East.

Faith, Hope, No Charity: An Inside Look at the Born Again Movement in Canada and the United States presents an earlier version of the Christian right and Zionism in Canada. Jerry Falwell factors large in the book as does 100 Huntley Street—Falwell and Mainse were the closest of friends—bound together not least by their shared

[16] David Mainse, *100 Huntley Street: The Exciting Success Story from the Host of Canada's Popular Television Programme* (Toronto: G. R. Welch, 1979).

[17] Beth Carson, *Pastor Bob: A Statesman of Prayer for Canada* (Belleville: Guardian Books, 2003).

Zionism.[18] On the death of Falwell, the Zionist torch was passed to John Hagee and CUFI, as I describe in "Canadian Republicanism and Christian Zionism," in *The Eagle and the Ox: Contemplation, the Church and Politics* (2006).[19]

There is a direct Canadian connection between Hagee's CUFI, Charles McVety, and Canada Christian College in Toronto. McVety has been a cheerleader for both Hagee and CUFI. Hagee has been more than welcomed and embraced at Canada Christian College, and many of the Jewish Zionist leaders have spoken at the College. Needless to say, there is a close rapport between Hagee, McVety, and Jewish Zionism—Frank Dimant from B'nai B'rith in Canada has, like Hagee, worked closely with McVety to further the Canadian Christian-Jewish Zionist ideology. Hagee once said when at Canada Christian College, "I am so delighted that Canada's Prime Minister (Stephen Harper) immediately denounced Hamas terrorism when he became the leader of this great nation." Ezra Levant, another friend of McVety, once said, "No world leader has been as clear as Harper has been in his support for Israel's right to defend itself." There is, therefore, within Canada—and this cannot be denied or ignored—a definite collusion between Hagee's CUFI, McVety's Canada Christian College, and the Jewish Zionism of Dimant and Levant. In fact, Dimant and McVety are so ideologically close that Canada Christian College has given Dimant an honorary doctorate.

Dimant had also forced an amiable friendship with Preston Manning and Stockwell Day—populist Zionism is also political Zionism. Marci McDonald clarified much when she stated: "Years earlier B'nai B'rith had honoured Ernest Manning (Preston Manning's father) for excising the antisemitic elements from Alberta's Social Credit Party, and Dimant sought a similar undertaking from his son at Reform"[20]—"anti-Semitic" when decoded, in such a context, often means "anti-Zionist." The fact that the Jewish community in Canada is about three-hundred-and-eighty thousand and the Canadian evangelical community is about three-and-a-half million means that it is more than advisable that Jewish Zionists link warm and affectionate hands and arms with Conservative Evangelical Christian Zionists—Dimant, Levant, and Ben-Ami form a tight Jewish Zionist trinity in Canada that have formed and forged close bonds with the Christian Zionists.

Lastly, we should not ignore the work of John Tweedie and Christians For Israel. Tweedie has made many trips to Israel, and his eight-part series *Why Israel? What Time Is It?* is both an apologia for end-times eschatology and Christian Zionism. Tweedie, like Dimant, has received an honorary doctorate from McVety and Canada Christian College.

---

[18] Judith Haiven, *Faith, Hope, No Charity: An Inside Look at the Born Again Movement in Canada and the United States* (Vancouver: New Star Books, 1984).

[19] Ron Dart, *The Eagle and the Ox: Contemplation, the Church and Politics* (Abbotsford: Freshwind Press, 2006).

[20] McDonald, *Armageddon Factor*, 320.

Conclusion

There is much more that could be said in suggestive depth and detail about the origins, development, and contemporary forms of Canadian Christian Zionism. I have, all too briefly, touched on the dawn of the Canadian Zionist dilemma, Canadian academics and Christian Zionism, biblical exegesis by Canadian Christian Zionists, the Conservative Party's links with Christian Zionism, and populist Evangelicalism's support of Christian Zionism. There is, of course, in Canada, a centrist and left-of-centre evangelical and Christian tradition that is certainly not Zionist. There has been a sloppy tendency amongst many journalists and some academics to equate Evangelical with right-of-centre politics and Zionism, which is inaccurate if not dishonest. There is, though, a form of Conservative Evangelicalism in Canada that has decided Zionist tendencies. I have highlighted, in this brief chapter, some of the people and organizations that embody such a perspective and commitment. Many of the early forms of Christian Zionism antedate Jewish Zionism, but there is a definite convergence in Canada between Jewish and Christian Zionism. It is also important to note that many of the implicit Zionist ideas that were emerging in Canada in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (not fully discussed in this paper) have, in the last couple of decades, moved from backroom Bible Schools, Sunday Schools, and Darby-Scofield interpretations of the Bible to the highest levels of political power and foreign policy decision-making in Canada, in particular within Stephen Harper's Conservative Party. In short, the historically hawkish eccentric fringe in Canada has now become the dominant political position.

The defeat of the Conservative Party of Canada in the autumn 2015 federal election seems, in some ways, to signal the end of the extreme foreign policy position adopted by the Harper government, which involved the most part, backing Israel without too many questions asked and demonizing the Palestinians as the problem. Conversely, the majority victory of Justin Trudeau and the Liberal Party of Canada in the 2015 election appears, in some ways, to point to a better future for Canadian-Israeli-Palestinians. But, does it? Those who stand within the liberal tradition are not likely to use the Bible as a source of authority to support the Chosen People and Israel, but many of the conclusions have much affinity with the Conservative Party. The liberal tradition is much more oriented to the Holocaust, diaspora, Jews surrounded by a sea of militant Muslims, Jewish lobby groups in Canada and Israel being the only liberal democratic state in the Middle East. I think there can be little doubt that Justin Trudeau, in a more nuanced and measured manner, is as likely as Harper, when push comes to shove, to support Israel. The Palestinians will, as always, become the sacrificial lambs that serve the interests of larger political and ideological concerns.

There can be no doubt that the reign of Stephen Harper walked Canada in a right-of-centre direction that most Canadians found rather un-Canadian; Harper's position of Canadian-Israeli relationship was but the spear point of a larger swing to the far right. Justin Trudeau will definitely draw Canada back to the centre and centre-left, but it is

not likely, on the Jewish-Palestinian issue, that he will lean more to the Palestinians plight than did Harper in any significant or substantive way or manner.

I have highlighted, in my book, *Canadian Christian Zionism: A Tangled Tale* (2015)[21] how both liberals and conservatives in Canada have had distinctive Zionism leanings and commitments. Will Trudeau be any different in this regard? Only time will reveal such an answer, but if history points in any consistent direction, Trudeau is just as likely to be a supporter of Israel as was many of his liberal predecessors.

[21] Ron Dart, *Canadian Christian Zionism: A Tangled Tale* (Dewdnesy: Synaxis Press, 2015).

PART TWO

Palestinian Liberation Theology

SIX

A Jewish Theology of Liberation

Dan Cohn-Sherbok

From the origins of the Zionist movement in the nineteenth century, the Hebrew Bible has been used in various ways to justify different approaches to the question of the Jewish return to the Holy Land. Initially secular Zionists simply disregarded biblical teaching about messianic redemption. In their view, it has been a mistake to wait for the Messiah to resurrect the dead and miraculously lead the Jewish people back to Zion. Orthodox critics of Zionism, on the other hand, regarded the creation of a Jewish homeland in the Holy Land as anathema: the actions of secular pioneers, they argued, were undermining God's providential plan of redemption. Early religious Zionists, however, believed that Jews should settle in Eretz Israel in anticipation of messianic deliverance. More recently there has been widespread belief that the creation of the state of Israel is the fulfilment of God's promise to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Such a conviction has fuelled the Jewish determination to expand Jewish settlement building in the West Bank. There is, however, an alternative biblical tradition which calls for a different attitude toward the Middle East crisis.

Early Secular Zionism

With the conversion of Sabbatai Zevi (1626–76), the self-proclaimed Messiah, the Jewish preoccupation with messianic deliverance diminished. Many Jews became disillusioned with centuries of messianic anticipation and disappointment; the longing for the Messiah who would lead the Jewish people to the Holy Land and bring about the end of history seemed a distant hope. Instead eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Jewry hailed the breaking down of the ghetto walls and the elimination of social barriers between Jews and Christians. In this milieu, belief in the Kingdom of God inaugur-

ated by the Messiah-king receded in importance. In its place the clarion call for liberty, equality, and fraternity signified the dawning of a golden age for the Jewish people.

Yet despite the emancipation of Jewry which took place in the nineteenth century, a number of secularists were convinced that Jews would never be secure in the countries in which they lived. In their view anti-Jewish sentiment is unavoidable. The philosopher Moses Hess (1812–75), for example, argued in *Rome and Jerusalem* (1862), that anti-Jewish sentiment is unavoidable. Progressive Jews, he wrote, think they can escape from Judeophobia by recoiling from any Jewish national expression. Yet the hatred of Jews is inescapable. No reform of the religion is radical enough to avoid such sentiments and even conversion to Christianity cannot relieve the Jew of this disability. "Jewish noses," he wrote, "cannot be reformed and the black, wavy hair of the Jews will not be changed into blond by conversion or straightened out by constant combing."[1] For Hess, Jews will always remain strangers among the nations; nothing can alter this state of affairs. The only solution to the problem of Jew-hatred is for the Jewish people to come to terms with their national identity.

Echoing such a view, Leon Pinsker (1821–91), a medical doctor active in The Society for the Promotion of Culture among the Jews of Russia, published *Auto-Emancipation* in 1882. In this work he asserted that the Jewish problem is as unresolved in the modern world as it was in former times. In essence, this dilemma concerns the inassimilable character of Jewish identity in the countries where Jews are in the minority. In such cases there is no basis for mutual respect between Jews and non-Jews. "The Jewish people," he wrote, "has no fatherland of its own, though many motherlands; it has no rallying point, no centre of gravity, no government of its own, no accredited representatives. It is everywhere a guest and nowhere at home."[2] Among the nations of the world, the Jews are like a nation long since dead: the dead walking among the living. What is required, therefore is a secure land for the Jewish nation: "We need nothing but a large piece of land for our poor brothers; a piece of land which shall remain our property, from which no foreign master can expel us."[3]

More than any other figure, Theodor Herzl (1860–1904) has become identified with modern secular Zionism. Herzl's analysis of modern Jewish existence was not original—many of his ideas were preceded in the writings of Hess and Pinsker. Yet what was novel about Herzl's espousal of Zionism was his success in stimulating interest and debate about a Jewish state in the highest diplomatic and political circles. In *The Jewish State*, published in 1896, he wrote:

> We have sincerely tried everywhere to merge with the national communities in which we live, seeking only to preserve the faith of our fathers. It

[1] Moses Hess, "Rome and Jerusalem," in *The Zionist Idea: A Historical Analysis and Reader*, ed. Arthur Hertzberg (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1997), 121.

[2] Leon Pinsker, *Auto-Emancipation* (London: Association of Youth Zionist Societies, 1932), 6.

[3] Leon Pinsker, "Auto-Emancipation: An Appeal to his People by a Russian Jew," in Hertzberg, ed., *The Zionist Idea*, 194.

> is not permitted us. In vain are we loyal patriots, sometimes superloyal; in vain do we make the same sacrifices of life and property as our fellow citizens; in vain do we strive to enhance the fame of our native lands in the arts and sciences, or her wealth by trade and commerce. In our native lands where we have lived for centuries we are still decried as aliens.… The majority decide who the "alien" is; this and all else in the relations between peoples, is a matter of power.[4]

Like Hess and Pinsker, Herzl maintained that there is only one remedy for the malady of antisemitism: the creation of a Jewish commonwealth. In the conclusion to *The Jewish State*, he expressed the longing of the entire nation for the creation of such a refuge from centuries of suffering:

> What glory awaits the selfless fighters for the cause! Therefore I believe that a wondrous breed of Jews will spring up from the earth. The Maccabees will rise again. Let me repeat once more my opening words: The Jews who will it shall achieve their state.[5]

Jewish Anti-Zionism

Although some Orthodox Jewish figures endorsed the Zionist movement, Orthodoxy in Germany, Hungary, and Eastern European countries protested against this new development in Jewish life. To promote this policy an Ultra-Orthodox movement, Agudat Israel, was created in 1912 to unite rabbis and laity against Zionism. Although the Torah maintains that it is the duty of the pious to return to Zion, these Orthodox Jews pointed out that such an ingathering must be preceded by messianic redemption. In the nineteenth century, the spiritual leader of German Jewish Orthodoxy, Samson Raphael Hirsch (1808–88), decreed before the advent of Zionism that it is forbidden to accelerate divine deliverance actively. In the light of such teaching, Zionism was viewed by the Ultra-Orthodox as a satanic conspiracy against God's will and equated with pseudo-messianism.

Yet despite such attitudes, Scripture decrees that it is obligatory for Jews to return to the Holy Land, and this prescription called for an Orthodox response. Accordingly, Ultra-Orthodox figures differentiated between the obligation to return to the Holy Land and the duty of residing there. Orthodox Jews, they argued, were exempt from actually settling in the land for such reasons as physical danger, economic difficulties, and inability to educate the young. In addition these critics maintained that Zionism is not simply a movement to rebuild Palestine; it is a heretical attempt to usurp the privilege of the Messiah to establish a Jewish kingdom. Further, Ultra-Orthodox spokesmen

[4] Theodor Herzl, "The Jewish State," in Hertzberg, ed., *The Zionist Idea*, 209.
[5] Ibid., 225.

declared that Zionism seeks to leave religion out of the national life; as a result a Jewish state would betray the ideals of the Jewish heritage. Throughout its history, the nation has been animated by spiritual principles, and refused to perish because of its adherence to traditional precepts. If Israel endured through thousands of years of persecution, it would be folly to abandon the religious values which kept alive the hope for Jewish survival. Hence, ideologists of the ultra-right such as Isaac Breuer (1883–1946) insisted that Zionism was depriving the Jewish people of its religious commitment in a misguided pursuit of modern notions of nationhood. This, he believed, is the most pernicious form of assimilation.

For these reasons Agudat Israel denounced the policies of modern Zionists and refused to collaborate with religious Zionist parties such as the Mizrahi. In Palestine itself the extreme Orthodox movement joined with Agudat Israel in its struggle against Zionism. Frequently its leaders protested to the British government and the League of Nations about the Zionist quest to make a national home in Palestine. Occasionally it even joined forces with Arab leaders. This conflict eventually resulted in the murder of a member of the executive of the Agudat, Jacob Israël de Haan (1881–1924). A Dutch Jew by origin, he denounced Zionism in cables to British newspapers, attacking the Balfour Commission and British officers for their seemingly pro-Zionist stance. On June 30, 1924, he was assassinated in Jerusalem by the Haganah. For the Ultra-Orthodox Jews of Jerusalem, de Haan became a martyr for the glory of God—this incident illustrated the depths of hatred of Zionism among right-wing Orthodox.

Paralleling the Orthodox critique, liberal Jews attacked Zionism for its utopian character. According to these critics, it is simply impossible to bring about the emigration of millions of Jews to a country which was already populated. In addition, in Western countries, nationalism was being supplanted by a vision of a global community—it was thus reactionary to promote the creation of a Jewish homeland. In Eastern Europe on the other hand there was still a Jewish national consciousness. Yet Zionism is unable to solve the problems facing Jewry. Multitudes of Jews in Eastern Europe were enduring hardship; only a small minority of these individuals would be able to settle in Palestine. Hence these liberal propagandists maintained that assimilation alone could serve as a remedy for the Jewish problem.

In response, Zionists protested that assimilation is undesirable and inevitably impossible—such a stance was influenced by racial theories published during the first two decades before the First World War. According to these writings, distinctive qualities were inherited regardless of social, cultural, or economic factors. For the Zionists, the Jewish people constitute an identifiable ethnic group whose identity cannot be manipulated through social integration. Antisemitism, they argued, cannot be eradicated. It is an inevitable response to the Jewish populace no matter what efforts are made to assimilate Jews into foreign cultures. Further, since Jews are predominately involved in trade and the professions—rather than agriculture and industry—they are bound to be the first targets during times of crisis. Pointing to Jewish history, the Zionists emphasized that in the past there were rich and powerful Jews, but without warning they lost their

positions and were reduced to poverty. There is thus no security for Jews in societies where they are in the minority. Zionism is the only solution.

Liberals viewed this interpretation of Jewish history as a distortion of the past. Previously, Jewish emancipation depended on the goodwill of rulers, but in contemporary society, they stated it would result from global socio-economic factors. The Zionists disagreed. The lessons of Jewish history, they believed, must guide current Jewish thought and action. Judeophobia is an inherent aspect of modern society, and those who champion liberal ideologies such as socialism will be disappointed. Everywhere Jews encounter the sign: "No Jews admitted." Despite the fact that modern Jewry has been assimilated into foreign cultures, Jews are not fully accepted. Having dissociated themselves from their coreligionists, they are rejected by their Christian neighbours. Despite fleeing from the ghetto, they are not at home in their adopted countries.

Religious and Spiritual Zionism

Although the majority of Orthodox adherents were highly critical of Zionism along with liberal critics, there emerged a new trend: the advocacy of an active approach to Jewish messianism. Rather than adopt a passive attitude towards the problem of redemption, these Orthodox writers maintained that the Jewish nation must engage in the creation of a homeland in anticipation of the advent of the Messiah. Pre-eminent among such religious Zionists was the Serbian rabbi Yehudah Chai Alkalai (1798–1878), who published the booklet *Shema Israel* in 1834, in which he advocated the establishment of Jewish colonies in Palestine. When the Jews of Damascus were charged with the blood libel four years later, Alkalai became convinced that the Jewish people could be secure only in their own land. Henceforth he published a series of books and pamphlets explaining his plan of self-redemption.

In *Minhat Yehudi* he argued on the basis of Scripture that the Messiah will not miraculously materialize; rather he will be preceded by various preparatory events. In this light the Holy Land needs to be populated by Jewry in preparation for messianic deliverance. "This new redemption will," he wrote,

> be different; our land is waste and desolate, and we shall have to build houses, dig wells, and plant vines and olive trees. We are, therefore, commanded not to attempt to go at once and all together in the Holy Land.… The Lord desires that we be redeemed in dignity; we cannot, therefore, migrate in a mass, for we should then have to live like Bedouins, scattered in tents all over the fields of the Holy Land. Redemption must come slowly. The land must, by degrees, be built up and prepared.[6]

Another early pioneer of religious Zionism was Zvi Hirsch Kalischer (1795–1874), the rabbi of Toruń in Poland (then Prussia). An early defender of Orthodoxy

[6] Yehudah Chai Alkalai, "The Third Redemption," in Hertzberg, ed., *The Zionist Idea*, 105.

against the advances made by Reform Judaism, he championed the commandments prescribing faith in the Messiah and devotion to the Holy Land. In 1836 he expressed his commitment to Jewish settlement in Palestine in a letter to the head of the Berlin branch of the Rothschild family. "The beginning of the redemption," he wrote, "will come through natural causes by human effort and by the will of the governments to gather the scattered of Israel into the Holy Land."[7]

In 1862 he published *Derishat Zion*. In this treatise he advocated the return of Jews to their native soil. The redemption of Israel, he argued, will not take place miraculously: "The Almighty, blessed be his Name, will not suddenly descend from on high and command his people to go forth. Neither will he send the Messiah from heaven in a twinkling of an eye, to sound the great trumpet for the scattered of Israel and gather them into Jerusalem. He will not surround the holy city with a wall of fire or cause the holy Temple to descend from heaven."[8] Instead the redemption of Israel will take place slowly, through awakening support from philanthropists and gaining the consent of other nations to the gathering of the Jewish people into the Holy Land. This view, Kalischer maintained, is inherent in Scripture. Thus the prophet Isaiah declared:

> In the days to come Jacob shall take root, Israel shall blossom and put forth shoots, and fill the whole world with fruit.... In that day from the river Euphrates to the Brook of Egypt the Lord will thresh out the grain, and we will be gathered one by one, O people of Israel. And in that day a great trumpet will be blown, and those who were lost in the land of Assyria and those who were driven out to the land of Egypt will come and worship the Lord on the holy mountain of Jerusalem. (Isa 27.6, 12–13)

Following in the footsteps of Alkalai and Kalischer, Abraham Isaac Kook (1865–1935), the first Ashkenazi chief rabbi of Palestine following the establishment of the British Mandate, formulated a vision of messianic redemption integrating the creation of a Jewish state. Such a conception was influenced by stirrings within the religious wing of the *Chovevei Zion* movement. Leaders like Shmuel Mohilever, Yitzhak Yaakov Reines, and Yechiel Michal Pines paved the way for Kook's religious espousal of Jewish nationalism. In Kook's writings there is the first attempt to combine systematically the centrality of the Holy Land within the religious tradition with the Zionist attempt to resettle the Jewish people in their homeland.

Unlike secularists who advocated practical efforts to secure a Jewish state, Kook embarked on the task of reinterpreting the Jewish religious tradition to transform religious messianic anticipation into the basis for collaboration with the aspirations of modern Zionism. According to Kook, the centrality of Israel is a fundamental dimension of Jewish life and a crucial element of Jewish religious consciousness. Yet the fervent belief

[7] Zvi Hirsch Kalischer, "Seeking Zion," in Hertzberg, ed., *The Zionist Idea*, 110.

[8] In Shlomo Avineri, *The Making of Modern Zionism: Intellectual Origins of the Jewish State* (New York: Basic Books, 1981), 53.

in messianic deliverance has not been accompanied by an active policy of resettlement. This disjunction between religious aspirations for the return from exile and the desire of most Jews to live in the diaspora highlights the confusion in Jewish thinking about the role of Israel in Jewish life. There is thus a contradiction between the messianic belief in a return to Zion and the accommodating attitude to exile of most Jews throughout history.

For Kook, the attachment of the land must serve as the foundation of Jewish life in the modern world. Although the secular pioneers who came to Palestine were motivated by ideological convictions alien to traditional Judaism, their actions are paradoxically part of God's plan of redemption. In the cosmic scheme of the divine will, seemingly atheistic and secular actions are absorbed into the unfolding of God's plan for his chosen people. Therefore these pioneers unintentionally contributed to the advent of the Messiah. Without consciously recognizing the significance of their work, they served God's purposes. Thus Kook maintained:

> Many of the adherents of the present nationalist revival maintain that they are secularists. If a Jewish secular nationalism were really imaginable, then we would indeed be in danger of falling so low as to be beyond redemption. But Jewish nationalism is a form of self-delusion: the spirit of Israel is so closely linked to the spirit of God that a Jewish nationalist, no matter how secularist his intention may be, must, despite himself, affirm the divine. An individual can sever the tie that binds him to life eternal, but the house of Israel as a whole cannot. All of its most cherished national possessions—its land, language, history and customs—are vessels of the spirit of the Lord.[9]

Such observations led Kook to insist that the divine spark is evident in the work of secular Zionists who sacrificed themselves for the land of Israel. Such pioneers were not godless blasphemers, but servants of the Lord. Unaware of their divine mission, they actively engaged in bringing about God's kingdom on earth. Religious Zionism must grasp the underlying meaning of these efforts to redeem the land and attempt to educate secularists about the true nature of their work. In Kook's view the redemption of Israel is part of a universal process involving all humanity. The salvation of the Jewish nation is not simply an event of particular importance—it provides the basis for the restoration of the entire world (*tikkun olam*).

Exodus and Liberation

A central principle of religious Zionism is that Eretz Israel was promised by God to the ancient Israelites and that Jews have the permanent and inalienable right to the land. Central to this vision is the conviction that Jerusalem is a symbol of the Holy Land and their return to it is promised by God in numerous biblical prophecies. Following the

[9] Abraham Isaac Kook, "Lights for Rebirth," in Hertzberg, ed., *The Zionist Idea*, 430.

teaching of Kook, religious Zionists such as Gush Emunim maintained that Zionism is not simply a political movement; rather, it was used by God to initiate the return of the Jews to the land promised to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. It is God's will that Jews return to their home to establish a Jewish sovereign state in which they can live according to the laws of Torah and halakha. In their view, it is a *mitzvah* (commandment) to cultivate the land. Therefore settling Israel is an obligation of religious Jews. Today the Orthodox continue to focus on this one central theme in Scripture: God's promise of the land to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Despite their different orientations, traditional religious Zionists have universally embraced this biblical motif as a justification for their view of the Middle East conflict. In their view, the Holy Land belongs to the Jewish nation. This is a divine mandate and a crucial element in God's providential plan for his chosen people.

There is, however, another fundamental theme within the Hebrew Bible which provides a very different perspective. In Scripture, the Exodus experience is paradigmatic. In ancient Egypt, the Israelites were exploited and oppressed. This experience involved a degradation so severe that it caused the people to turn to God for deliverance. The Egyptians overwhelmed the Hebrew slaves with work: they "made their lives bitter with hard service, in mortar and brick, and in all kinds of work in the field; in all their work they made them serve with rigor" (Exod 1.14). Such affliction caused the people to cry out to God for liberation.

In the biblical account God is on the side of the oppressed. If there is a single passage that encapsulates the liberation themes of scripture, it is the Exodus describing God who takes sides, intervening to free the poor and oppressed. The Book of Exodus declares that God heard the groaning of the people and remembered the covenant with them (Exod 2.23–25). God took sides with his chosen people, stating that they would be liberated from their oppressors. Moses was to lead them out of bondage (Exod 3.7–10).

From this act of deliverance Jews have constantly derived a message of hope. If God was on the side of the poor in ancient times, surely he will continue to take sides with the downtrodden in all ages. Repeatedly, as Jews faced persecution, suffering, and murder, they derived hope from this account of divine deliverance. Yet, the biblical narrative is not confined to the destiny of the Jewish nation. The profundity of the Exodus consists in its significance for all—the past holds a promise for those who understand its relevance. Its message applies to all peoples in economic, political, social, and cultural bondage.

Throughout Jewish history, the experience of the Exodus has been typologically significant. It is a paradigm of divine liberation of the oppressed and persecuted. The Exodus is thus a key element in the self-understanding of the Jewish nation. In the biblical period, details of the Exodus were recorded in cultic sayings (Ps 107.35–38), in Wisdom literature (Wisdom 19), and by the prophets (Isaiah 63). After the exile, the Exodus continued to play a dominant role in the Jewish faith. In particular, the festival of Passover was regarded as crucially important in the religious life of the nation.

The Passover seder envisages the Exodus experience as a symbol of freedom from

oppression, and the whole of the Haggadah is pervaded by the image of God as the Saviour of humankind. For this reason the Passover service begins with an ancient formulaic invitation to those who hunger or are in need to participate in the festival:

> This is the bread of affliction that our fathers ate in the Land of Egypt. All who hunger, let them come and eat: all who are in need, let them come and celebrate the Passover. Now we are here—next year we shall be free men.

Any Jew who sits down to the Passover meal and is oblivious to the call of those who are in want has missed the meaning of the celebration.

The Passover celebration of the Exodus is thus a symbolic exaltation of freedom. Jews are to rejoice in God's liberation of their ancestors, in which each of them takes part. Throughout the history of the Jewish people, this festival has awakened the spirit of the nation to the significance of human liberation. The biblical account of the Exodus, embodied in the liturgy of the Haggadah, has played a central role in the Jewish quest for human dignity and freedom. The Passover ceremony thus unites the Jewish people with their ancestors who endured slavery and oppression in Egyptian bondage. Despite the persecution of centuries, Jews are confident of eventual deliverance and the ultimate redemption of humankind. The message of the Exodus calls the Jewish nation to hold steadfast to their conviction that justice and freedom will prevail throughout the world. Jews therefore possess a biblical heritage and vision of the transformation of society, and the Exodus event unites them in a common hope and aspiration for the triumph of justice. Remembering the divine deliverance of the ancient Israelites, Jews in Israel and the diaspora can work together for the emancipation of those who long to escape from degradation and exile.

The Kingdom of God

Linked to the Exodus event is the Jewish concept of the kingdom of God. In Scripture, the kingdom of God is understood as intimately connected with the establishment of justice on earth. In the Psalms, for example, God is extolled as a king who judges justly: it was he who righted injustice; he is the heavenly king who established and maintains justice on earth:

> But the Lord sits enthroned for ever
> He has established his throne for judgement;
> He judges the world with righteousness;
> He judges the peoples with equity.
> The Lord is a stronghold for the oppressed,
> A stronghold in times of trouble.
> And those who know thy name put their trust in thee,
> For Thou, O Lord, has not forsaken those who seek thee. (Ps 9.7–10)

According to Scripture, God's kingdom is inconsistent with injustice and social misery. The effort to bring about the perfection of the world so that God will reign in majesty is a human responsibility. Jewish ethics as enshrined in the Bible and in rabbinic literature are inextricably related to the coming of God's kingdom. In this context a number of distinctive characteristics of Jewish morality are expressed in the Jewish tradition.

First, there is an intensity of passion about the moral demands made upon human beings. For sins of personal greed, social inequity, and deceit, the prophet in God's name denounced the people and threatened horrific catastrophes. The voice of the prophet was continually charged with agony and agitation. Such shrill denunciations of iniquity were the result of the prophetic conviction that people must be stirred from their spiritual slumber. As Abraham Heschel wrote: "The prophet's word is a scream in the night… while the world is at ease and asleep, the prophet feels the blast from heaven."[10]

Second, Jewish ethics requires that each person be treated equally. Biblical and rabbinic sources show a constant concern to eliminate arbitrary distinctions between individuals so as to establish a proper balance between competing claims. On the basis of the biblical view that everyone is created in the image of God, the Torah declares that false and irrelevant distinctions must not be introduced to disqualify human beings from the right to justice. The fatherhood and motherhood of God implies human solidarity. The Torah rejects the idea of different codes of morality for oneself and others, for the great and the humble, for rulers and ruled, for individuals and nations, for private and public citizens. Given this understanding of the equality of all people, the Torah singles out the underprivileged and the defenceless in society for consideration.

Since all of humanity is created in the image of God, Judaism maintains that there is no fundamental difference between Jew and non-Jew: God's ethical demands apply to all. Indeed, according to the Talmud, the righteous non-Jew is accorded a place in the hereafter: "the pious of all nations have a share in the world to come" (*Sanhedrin* 105a). In this light the rabbis emphasized that Jews must treat their non-Jewish neighbours with loving-kindness. One of the most authoritative rabbis of the nineteenth century, Isaac Spektor (1817–96) declared:

> It is well known that the early as well as the later Geonim wrote that we must abide by the law of the land and refrain from dealing unjustly with a non-Jew.… Therefore my brethren, listen to my voice and live. Study in our Torah to love the Almighty and love people regardless of faith or nationality. Follow justice and do righteousness with Jew and non-Jew alike. The people of my community know that I always caution them in my talks and warn them that there is absolutely no difference whether one does evil to a Jew or a non-Jew. It is a well known fact that when people

[10] Abraham J. Heschel, *The Prophets* (2 vols; New York: Harper & Row, 1969–71), 16.

> come to me to settle a dispute, I do not differentiate between Jew and non-Jew. For that is the law according to our holy Torah.[11]

These specific qualities of Jewish ethics illustrate its humane orientation to all of God's creatures. Throughout biblical and rabbinic literature, Jews were encouraged to strive for the highest conception of life in which the rule of truth, righteousness, and holiness will be established among humankind. Such a desire is the eternal hope of God's people—a longing for God's kingdom as expressed in the daily liturgy of the synagogue. The kingdom is not an internalized, spiritualized, otherworldly concept. Rather, it involves human activity in a historical context. The moral life is at the centre of the unfolding of God's plan for humanity.

Conclusion

As we have seen, at the end of the nineteenth century, traditional Orthodox Judaism—basing itself on biblical prophecy—regarded Zionism with contempt. Secular Zionists such as Leon Pinsker, Moses Hess, and Theodor Herzl were viewed as violators of the Torah. In their determination to create a Jewish commonwealth in the Holy Land, they had usurped God's plan of salvation for his chosen people. Other Orthodox thinkers, including Yehuda Chai Alkalai, Zvi Hirsch Kalischer, and Abraham Isaac Kook, however, interpreted Scripture in a different light. In their view, it is a mistake to think that God will miraculously send the Messiah to resurrect the dead and lead the Jewish people back to their ancient homeland. Rather, Jews must settle and rebuild Eretz Israel in anticipation of messianic deliverance. According to Kook, Jewish pioneers are fulfilling God's plan of redemption even if they are unaware of the religious implications of their actions. Following Kook, religious Zionists adhere to the belief that Israel belongs to the Jewish nation given God's promise to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

There is, however, another biblical framework for viewing Jewish responsibility in the Holy Land. A Jewish theology of liberation based on biblical teaching compels Jews to view the Middle East conflict in moral terms. In the contemporary world where Jews are often comfortable and affluent, the prophetic message of liberation can easily be forgotten. Yet, a theology of liberation—with its focus on the desperate situation of those at the bottom of society—can act as a clarion call, awakening the people of Israel to their divinely appointed task. Jewish tradition points to God's kingdom as the goal and hope of humankind: a world in which all peoples and nations will turn away from injustice. For over 3,000 years the land of Israel has been at the centre of the Jewish faith. Now that the Jewish nation has re-established itself in Eretz Israel after centuries of exile, what is now needed is for Jews worldwide to turn their attention to the Palestinian problem. The Jewish longing for statehood has been fulfilled. As

[11] Isaac E. Spektor, "Nachal Yitzchak," in *Morality, Halakha and the Jewish Tradition*, ed. Shubert Spero (New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1983), 134.

an empowered people, we must empower those who cry out in their distress. God's promise to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob must not be allowed to overshadow the Bible's commitment to the liberation of all of God's people.

SEVEN

The Bible, Zionism, and Palestinian Liberation Theology

Naim S. Ateek

The Bible is the last and lasting bastion of Zionism and we have a responsibility to confront and challenge the way it has been used both by religious Jewish Zionists and by Christian Zionists. When Zionism was established by secular Jews, it was considered by many religious Jews to be an aberration.[1] Likewise, from the perspective of many Christians, the use of the Bible by Christian Zionists to support the oppression of the Palestinians by the government of Israel is a Christian and biblical aberration. I believe that behind both of these aberrations is a misunderstanding and misinterpretation of the Bible that is contrary to the authentic and deeper message of the Bible—the Hebrew Scriptures, our Old Testament, as well as the New Testament. What I intend to do is to consider some of the factors that have led to such an abuse as well as the connection and interplay between Zionism and the Bible and how the ramifications of this have negatively affected and continue to affect the pursuit of a just peace in Israel-Palestine.

I want to make it clear from the start that I do not believe that the solution to the Israel-Palestine conflict should be based on the Bible, but instead on the demands of international law. At the same time, I believe that when the Bible is interpreted in the right spirit, it can inspire us to work for justice and peace for all the people of the land.

[1] See Yakov M. Rabkin, *A Threat From Within: A Century of Jewish Opposition to Zionism*, trans. Fred A. Reed (London: Zed Books, 2006).

Christian Zionism

The story of Zionism is the story of two movements that emerged in the nineteenth century. The first movement, Christian Zionism, began to crystallize during the first part of the nineteenth century; the second, Jewish Zionism, towards the end of the same century. The Christians involved were called "Restorationists" because they believed that Jews needed to be restored to Palestine before the Second Coming of Christ could take place. We know them today as Christian Zionists. They were Bible-loving Christians studying the Scriptures and looking for the signs of the times. As many had done before them, they concluded that they were living close to the end of history and that the Second Coming of Christ was imminent. Whilst the roots of this movement lay in previous centuries, it was in the nineteenth century, for a number of political and religious reasons, that the time became ripe for its religious and political renewal and empowerment.

It is important to remember that Europe was expanding via its colonial and imperial ventures, and with this expansion the spread of the Gospel through Christian missions was taking place in Asia and Africa and in many countries across the world. For many Christians, this wide dissemination of the Gospel was an indication that the Great Commission of Christ to go and preach the Gospel to the ends of the earth was finally being achieved, and that this was a sign of the end times. These Christians, therefore, deduced from their study of the Bible that before Christ's return, Jews must return to Palestine. The Jewish people were placed at the centre of God's plan for history that would culminate in the Second Coming of Christ, the battle of Armageddon, the thousand years of the reign of Christ, and finally the end of the world with a new heaven and a new earth.

Christian Zionism was essentially a Protestant phenomenon. The first half of the nineteenth century was replete with the thinking, interpretation, writings, and teachings of European Christians on Zionism. Some of the prominent figures who played an important role in defining and promoting Christian Zionism warrant some discussion here.

John Nelson Darby (1800–82) was the father of dispensationalism. He charted the history of salvation from the time of the creation to the end of the world and went on eight trips to America promulgating his teachings which were well received by some Christian groups. Two prominent followers of Darby who proved very influential were Cyrus I. Scofield (1843–1921),[2] who authored the Scofield Reference Bible in 1909 with its dispensationalist footnotes and commentary that influenced millions of people, and William Blackstone (1841–1935), an evangelist from Chicago, who was the first to lobby President Benjamin Harrison (1889–93) to promote the immigration of Jews to Palestine.[3]

[2] See David Lutzweiler, *The Praise of Folly: The Enigmatic Life and Theology of C. I. Scofield* (Draper, VA: Apologetics Group Media, 2009).

[3] Ibid., 1, 4–5, 32–33; Naim Stifan Ateek, *A Palestinian Christian Cry for Reconciliation* (Maryknoll:

Lord Shaftesbury (1801–85) "was one of the first English politicians to translate religious or biblical convictions about the return of Jews to Palestine into political action."[4] He believed that the return of Jews to Palestine was important for the strategic interests of the British Empire. In the 1840s he lobbied Henry John Temple, Lord Palmerston (1784–1865), the British Foreign Secretary, to be God's instrument in carrying out the return of Jews to Palestine. On November 4, 1840, he placed an advertisement in the *Times* of London in which he wrote, "A memorandum has been addressed to the Protestant monarchs of Europe on the subject of the restoration of the Jewish people to the land of Palestine… which secures that land to the descendants of Abraham." It was Shaftesbury who was the first to coin the phrase "A country without a nation for a nation without a country," which the Zionists later transposed into "A land of no people for a people with no land."[5]

Shaftesbury was also instrumental in the establishment of the Anglican Bishopric in Jerusalem, which started as a partnership between the British and Prussian Crowns. The history and background of the Jerusalem Bishopric helps us to see how political and religious interests were intertwined. Lord Shaftesbury wrote that the purpose of the bishopric would be both political and religious: "a combination of Protestant thrones—England and Prussia—bound by temporal interests and eternal principles, to plant under the banner of the Cross, God's people on the mountains of Jerusalem."[6] Shaftesbury was given the honor of choosing the first bishop and he chose Michael Solomon Alexander (1799–1845), an immigrant to England from Russian Poland. Alexander was a former Rabbi who had converted to Christianity in 1825. He became the first Anglican Bishop in Jerusalem.[7]

Pragmatically, the person who played one of the most essential roles in the emergence of the Zionist Movement was William Hechler (1845–1931), Anglican chaplain to the British Embassy in Vienna. Herzl called him "the First Christian Zionist." He was the only non-Jew to attend the first Zionist Congress in Basle, Switzerland in 1897. He was a crusader against antisemitism and promoted and supported Zionism. According to Jerry Klinger, "Hechler was the man who made Herzl and Zionism legitimate in the eyes of the world and in the eyes of the Jewry. Were it not for Hechler, Herzl would have remained an eccentric, obscure Austrian writer, long forgotten."[8]

Christian Zionist teachings and doctrines emerged from the Bible and preceded Jewish political Zionism. Christian Zionists were consumed and preoccupied by a particular reading of the Bible. This reading emphasized the Bible as the inerrant word

---

Orbis, 2008), 84.

[4] Ateek, *Palestinian Christian Cry*, 83.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Paul C. Merkley, *The Politics of Christian Zionism: 1891–1948* (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 1998), 14.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Jerry Klinger, "Reverend William H. Hechler—The Christian minister who legitimized Theodor Herzl," *The Jewish Magazine* (July 2010), http://www.jewishmag.com/145mag/herzl_hechler/herzl_hechler.htm.

of God, that the return of Jews to Palestine and the building of their kingdom was an essential precursor to the end, that the Old Testament prophecies must be fulfilled, and that the Second Coming of Christ was imminent.

Jewish Zionism

Jewish Zionism, by contrast, emerged within the pragmatic secular outlook of Theodor Herzl (1860–1904) who was more concerned with the predicament of his fellow Jews in Europe than with biblical prophecy. He was aware of the malevolent nature of antisemitism and was cognizant of the pogroms that were taking place in Eastern Europe. He was also convinced by the Dreyfus Affair that it was not easy to curb the evil of antisemitism. He surmised that if Alfred Dreyfus could be unjustly indicted in France, the most enlightened country in Europe at the time, where the cry for liberty, equality, and fraternity was first heard, then there was no hope for Jews in Europe. He could not imagine a democratic Europe where all people could live with equality under the rule of law. His solution was clear. Jews must have a place of their own like other nations. People without states are looked down upon and are not respected. He believed that Jews, though scattered, nonetheless constituted a nation and needed to live in a country away from antisemitic Christians. Such a project, given the colonial framework within which he was operating, seemed entirely feasible to Herzl. He wrote in his diary that once the Zionists had taken over Palestine, they would drive out its people across the border. He only needed a European sponsor to achieve his project.

The European origins of the Zionist Movement are well known. Herzl was a secular Jew, but from the start he was encouraged and supported by William Hechler and European Christians who believed that Jews must be restored to Palestine. Herzl was anxious to find people to help him, especially those who had political clout and could introduce him to people of power. Without their help, Herzl would be only a dreamer. Hence one of the first requests he made of Hechler was to introduce him to a minister of state or a prince so that he could share with them his vision. "Then the Jews will believe in me," he told Hechler. In spite of his endeavours, Herzl failed to find a sponsor during his lifetime. (1860–1904) Thirteen years after the death of Herzl in 1904, the British Government committed itself to sponsor Zionism in the Balfour Declaration of 1917.[9]

The political tragedy of this Declaration was that although Britain did not own Palestine, it gave it away to somebody else. It fits, however, the spirit of the time—and the nature and arrogance of colonialism.

It is important to point out that one cannot understand the full force of Zionism by looking at it only from the point of view of its beginning and initial success in the establishment of the state of Israel, although that in itself was a huge feat. Nor was the ultimate potential of Zionism realized in the military victory of the 1967 war,

[9] Ibid.

though, again, this was undoubtedly perceived by many to be miraculous. These military victories were undoubtedly impressive and made it possible for Israel to expand its territory tremendously. However, I believe that Zionism reached its full potential and force only when it managed to enlist the Bible as the primary source for justifying its injustice against the Palestinians. The Bible continues to be the core reference point for the legitimization of the occupation. One can even say that religious Zionists have hijacked Zionism from its secular origin and made it more potent. Indeed, as secular Zionism after the 1967 war started waning, religious Zionism waxed and expanded. The main rationale for the creation of the state of Israel was no longer predominantly antisemitism and the holocaust, but the Bible through the manipulation of certain texts. Moreover, for the religious Zionist settlers, their "Aliya" turned into a "right of return" to "Judea and Samaria" based on the Bible. When that happened, the Zionists guaranteed, directly and indirectly, the support of millions of conservative, evangelical, and non-denominational Christians across the globe, not only in the West but also in Africa and Asia. The mere reading of the Bible could potentially make readers naturally inclined to a pro-Israel position especially if such a choice was also between a pro-Jewish and a pro-Muslim stance.

In their own interpretation of the Bible, Christian and Jewish Zionists forced the Bible to legitimize their cause. This legitimization was a sin against the integrity of the Bible as the word of God and its central message about God's love and care for all human beings. It was also a sin against the victims of Zionism and against international law.

As the Kairos Palestine document explains, the word of God in the Bible was turned into a word of death against the Palestinians.[10] Such aberrations were not totally outlandish given the way the Bible has been abused during the last two thousand years by many Christians. The Bible has been used to justify war, colonialism, slavery, the silencing of women, and many other wrongs.

In order to support Israel's claim to Palestine, some Christians and Jews have been using certain biblical texts to condone and justify the displacement and oppression of the Palestinians. Such abuse prompted many of us to ask a barrage of questions. Do such texts used constitute the heart of the biblical message? Do the biblical texts that promote ethnic cleansing and justify the expulsion of Palestinians reflect a message from the word of God for people today? Do these texts manifest the understanding of God that we have come to know in Jesus Christ? Do they reflect the theology of neighbour that Jesus gave us? Such questions and their answers are at the heart of Palestinian Liberation Theology.

These questions can be asked from other angles: Are these texts in line with international law today? Are they in line with the basic moral and ethical values that we cherish as humans? If what we call sacred texts do not rise to the level of the sacred and divine, do they retain their sanctity? Does the God we believe in have a lower standard

[10] Kairos Palestine, "Kairos Document: A Moment of Truth," *Kairos Palestine* (Dec 15, 2009), http://www.kairospalestine.ps/content/kairos-document.

of justice and morality than we humans? If we ordinary human beings have a higher morality and ethical standard than God, then can God be God?

Biblical Texts

It is crucial to recognize that within the Bible one hears different voices. Walter Brueggemann sees the Old Testament as polyphonic and open to various interpretations.[11] There are voices that reflect a tribal understanding of God. Sometimes, they are expressed in a narrow, nationalist language. At other times, they are expressed in a language that we consider today racist, chauvinist, and xenophobic. To describe these texts, I normally use the term "exclusivist." They reflect an exclusivist picture of God and of our fellow human beings. I see them expressing a narrow theological perspective that has, I believe, been transcended not only within the New Testament, but in the Old Testament itself.

There are, however, other voices in the Old Testament. We see a development in theological thinking and understanding of God. God does not change, but human understanding of God changes. These voices reflect an understanding of God that is loving, caring, and merciful, a God of peace and justice, a God who is inclusive, a God who loves all. In the Bible one can discover a development in understanding of God. The movement is from exclusivity to inclusivity, from a narrow theological understanding of God to one that is more open and global, and from a chauvinist to an all-embracing, loving God. This theology is encapsulated in the story of Jonah in the book of Jonah, probably one of the latest books to be written in the Old Testament.[12]

Let me emphasize this point: I believe that in the Old Testament there is a development in theological thinking that moves from the tribal to the universal, from the exclusive to the inclusive, from the particular to the general. This is at the heart of Palestinian Liberation Theology, which entails a critique of narrow theologies of God, the people of God, and the theology of land that we find in those exclusive texts. Furthermore, in my own research and that of other scholars, this movement to inclusive theology is strengthened during and after the Exile, which I will now illustrate with two examples.

First, according to the Torah the solution to the problem of the indigenous people of the land of Canaan is to drive them out or exterminate them.

> [God said to Moses,] "Speak to the Israelites, and say to them: 'When you cross over the Jordan into the land of Canaan, you shall drive out all the inhabitants of the land from *before you*, destroy all their figured stones, destroy all their cast images, and demolish all their high places. You shall

[11] See Walter Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997).

[12] Ateek, *Palestinian Christian Cry*, 67–77.

> take possession of the land and settle in it, for I have given you the land to possess.…"' (Num 33.50–56)
>
> [God said to Moses] "But as for the towns of these people that Yahweh your God is giving you as an inheritance, you must not let anything that breathes remain alive. *You shall annihilate them*—the Hittites and the Amorites, the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, the Hivites and the Jebusites—just as Yahweh your God has commanded, so that they may not teach you to do all the abhorrent things that they do for their gods and you thus sin against Yahweh your God." (Deut 20.16–18)

I believe that such an exclusive theology was critiqued by the prophet Ezekiel. Years later, after the Exile, Ezekiel claims the authority of Yahweh when, in the name of Yahweh, he commands that all the inhabitants of the land must share the land equally.

> "So you shall divide the land among you according to the tribes of Israel. You shall allot it as an inheritance for yourselves and for the aliens who reside among you and have begotten children among you. They shall be to you as citizens of Israel; with you they shall be allotted an inheritance among the tribes of Israel. In whatever tribes aliens reside, there you shall assign them their inheritance," says the Lord God. (Ezek 47.21–23)

This text goes beyond other texts in the Old Testament regarding the inheritance of the land. It is partly a reference to Lev 19.33–34, where we read, "When an alien resides with you in your land, you shall not oppress the alien. The alien who resides with you shall be to you as the citizen among you; you shall love the alien as yourself, for you were aliens in the land of Egypt: I am the Lord your God."

Undoubtedly, in its historical context, this text reflects inclusive ideas about "human rights." It certainly speaks about giving foreigners and aliens what in today's language we would call their "human rights." Nevertheless, it stops short of giving the people of the land their political rights. In other words, it does not mention that the alien has the right to inherit the land. The Ezekiel text, however, goes beyond Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy by insisting that the people of the land he calls "alien" have the right to full inheritance including their share of the land.

Here I would argue that the prophet has gone beyond "human rights" to political rights. The experience of the Exile has stretched his tribal theology of god and land. He now sees God not as exclusive or biased but as demanding the division and allotment of the land equally among all the people of the land. Ezekiel's language was still racist by using the word alien but his theology of land was correct. This is an inclusive theology that can inspire us to work for one democratic state for all the people of the land, a proposal the government of Israel rejects.

The Ezekiel text is an important step in the right direction. It should silence those who use texts of ethnic cleansing and extermination as a solution to the Palestinian

problem. That kind of a theology has been transcended within the Old Testament itself and must be rejected. It is not characteristic of the creator and loving God.

Furthermore, from our Palestinian perspective, it is important to note that we Palestinians are not alien to the land; we are indigenous to the land. We belong to the land.

The second example to look at concerns Jerusalem. Nehemiah 2.19–20 states:

> But when Sanballat the Horonite and Tobiah the Ammonite official, and Geshem [Jasem] the Arab heard of it, they mocked and ridiculed us, saying, "What is this that you are doing? Are you rebelling against the king?" Then I replied to them, "The God of heaven is the one who will give us success, and we his servants are going to start building; but you have no share or claim or historic right in Jerusalem."

This text comes from the end of Exile. The Persian Empire was in control and Nehemiah was the appointed governor of Judea. Nehemiah was intending to build the destroyed walls of Jerusalem but he encountered some resistance from other local officials. The text is part of Nehemiah's response and reflects a very exclusive attitude towards Jerusalem: "You have no share or claim or historic right in Jerusalem."

Nehemiah's words reflect the attitude of the present government of Israel that considers the city of Jerusalem as the exclusive possession of Jews. Such an exclusive claim, in our contemporary context, where Christians and Muslims possess equally valid and historic rights in the city, is absurd. Psalm 87.1–7 states:

> On the holy mount stands the city he founded;
> The Lord loves the gates of Zion more than all the dwellings of Jacob.
> Glorious things are spoken of you, O city of God.
> Among those who know me I mention Rahab [Egypt] and Babylon; Philistia too, and Tyre, with Ethiopia—"This one was born there," they say.
> And of Zion it shall be said "This one and that one were born in it"; for the Most High himself will establish it. The Lord records, as he registers the peoples, "This one was born here."
> Singers and dancers alike say "All my springs are in you."

Biblical scholars identify this psalm as post-exilic and its interpretation is much debated. Some scholars believe that it must refer to Jews living outside Palestine or converts to Judaism but I believe that it is one of those rare texts that comes from the pen of a poet that envisaged God as an inclusive God who embraces all people equally. From this inclusive perspective, Psalm 87 critiques the narrow theology of Ezra-Nehemiah. It sees the city of Jerusalem as an inclusive holy place belonging to all people, even the enemies of ancient Israel and Judah—Egyptians, Babylonians, and the Philistines. Such a psalm inspires our work for a shared Jerusalem, equally holy and equally significant to the three monotheistic faiths, and an open city for all people.

The above two examples are only samples of the growing development of the inclusive understanding of God and God's people that slowly became prevalent after the Exile. Although some people continued in their narrow and exclusive theologies, it is clear that the movement towards inclusive, open and all-embracing understanding was gaining momentum. Palestinian Liberation Theology highlights and emphasizes this inclusive theology and finds it very relevant in addressing the contemporary conflict over Palestine.

Conclusion

What are the political and theological implications and challenges today? I would like to suggest the following points:

1. Palestinian Liberation Theology points us to an inclusive theology of God, an inclusive theology of the people of God, and an inclusive theology of land. It encourages every person to take a stand for truth, to work for justice, and to pursue peace in Israel-Palestine.

2. Even before the New Testament was written, the exclusive tribal theology of God had already been challenged, confronted, critiqued, rejected, and transformed into an inclusive theology by the great Hebrew prophets.

3. We must reject and resist the use of the Bible to justify injustice and oppression against Palestinians.

4. We in the Middle East live in the midst of the Muslim world. They have their own faith and their own holy book. Islam cannot be taken lightly. It is a force to be reckoned with. Political Judaism (Jewish Zionism) and political Christianity (Christian Zionism), due to their misuse of the Bible, are driving moderate Muslims and political Islam towards extremism and further politicization. This is making the conflict a religious one that could drive us backward hundreds of years. The whole region could be enveloped in new wars of religion which we so desperately need to reject and avoid.

5. We continue to work with all people of faith including Christians, Jews, and Muslims and also people of no faith to use all nonviolent means to end the Israeli occupation of Palestinian land. In a special way, I thank God for Jews of conscience who are active in the struggle against the Israeli injustice.

6. In the absence of a strong will by the international community to enforce international law and to stop the injustice which the government of Israel is committing against the Palestinians, we need to keep insisting that justice must be done in accordance with the demands of international law. We continue to work and wait for the time when world public opinion will become strong enough to persuade

Israel to change. I believe that the state of Israel can enjoy peace and security only when it does justice to the Palestinians and when the Palestinians also are allowed to live in peace and security.

7. The justice that the Palestinian people are seeking will not be satisfied by guaranteeing and achieving their human rights alone. Palestinians have the right to self-determination, and we look forward to a time when there will be one state, or two democratic states in Israel-Palestine and a confederation or federation of states in our region.

8. One of the best expressions of the development of the inclusive theology that I am referring to, that looks at all humans as equal and special, entitled to a life of peace, security, and human dignity is found in international law. So far, the United States and its allies have used double standards in this regard, one for Israel and one for the rest of the world. They have protected Israel from accountability for its violations of international law.

9. The Bible, used and interpreted in the right spirit, should inspire us to work for justice and peace. The solution of the conflict, however, must be based on international law, so as to guarantee that there is no oppressor or oppressed and that all can enjoy the fruits of a life of freedom and liberation.

EIGHT

From Galilean Shores to Israeli Checkpoints

Jesus's Way of Non-Violence as Contemporary Challenge

Mary Grey

The theme of non-violent resistance in the New Testament is an integral part of Jesus's preaching of the Kingdom of God that offers an alternative to the violent occupation of the Roman Empire in Judea. From the shores of Galilee to the final confrontation in Jerusalem, Jesus's life-style deliberately embodied a just and peaceful way of coping with the oppression that threatened to remove all hope from the Galilean people. Today, faced with the violence and injustice of the Israeli occupation of Palestine, could drawing on New Testament inspiration offer hope of survival, regaining dignity and finally justice for the land and its people?

Setting the Scene: The Shores of Galilee and The Context of Violence

It was no accident that the young Jesus of Nazareth, at the beginning of his ministry, chose to leave his home town of Nazareth and journey to the shores of Lake Galilee as the setting for his mission. As Ched Myers stated, at the Sabeel Conference 2011 in Bethlehem:

> It was precisely and specifically by the shores of the Sea of Galilee that the radicality of Israel's God confronted the *normalcy* of Rome's civilization under Herod Antipas in the '20s of the first century CE.[1]

On his way from Nazareth, Jesus would have passed through Sepphoris (Zippori), built by Herod the Great, once the capital of Galilee, until Tiberias was founded by

[1] Ched Myers, "Sea-changes Part I: Jesus' Call to Discipleship as Resistance to Colonizing Economics," in *Challenging Empire: God, Faithfulness and Resistance*, ed. Naim Ateek, Cedar Duaybis, and Maurine Tobin (Jerusalem: Sabeel Ecumenical Liberation Centre, 2012), 110.

Herod Antipas in 20 CE, as resort and stronghold. After Herod's death in 4 BCE, a major Judean insurrection broke out, and Josephus tells us that one of the most important skirmishes was the sacking of the royal armoury at Sepphoris, led by Judas, son of Ezekias. In retaliation, Varus, the Roman legate of Syria, razed the city and sold the Jewish rebels to slavery. So it is important to take on board that Jesus, a radical Jew, grew up with the painful memories of violence as well as its daily realities. That is the first link with the contemporary context.

Many scholars think that if we assume that Jesus laboured as a carpenter or construction worker (*tektōn*) in Nazareth, one hour's walk from Sepphoris, then it is highly likely that he worked there rebuilding the city.[2] The trauma of Sepphoris' destruction and reconstruction as an imperial city right at his doorstep would have had a profound impact on his consciousness, infusing in him a keen sense of the suffering of his people under the Roman Empire. Two great cities, Sepphoris and Tiberias: yet they did not form the context for his ministry.

After reaching the high road, the Via Maris, Jesus would have passed Gennesaret and arrived at Heptapegon, (the Seven Springs—later Tabgha, and presumed site of the multiplication of the loaves and fishes). This was the fishing ground for Capernaum's fisher folk. Arriving at Capernaum, it was here where he chose his base for most of his ministry, among humble peasant people. It became his own town—but there is no outward reason as to why he would choose it. Archaeology only reveals its ordinariness—with no palaces or exceptional buildings. Capernaum was a frontier town, with a mixed community of Jews and Gentiles (a population of about 1,500), people who had long suffered the effects of the Roman Empire's domination. Mystery surrounds the character of Capernaum—a hotbed of unrest? Of economic protest? A small garrison was stationed here that protected the frontier and provided back-up for the tax collectors. The custom house of Matthew, the tax collector, stood close to where the Via Maris passed close to the lake.[3] Capernaum had also been on the crossroads of a trade route between Egypt and Syria. Not far away in the hills were the hidden Zealot strongholds—and it is clear from Scripture that at least one of Jesus's apostles was a Zealot.[4] Now long ruined, Capernaum lies peacefully on the edge of the Sea. In the light of recent excavations of what may have been Peter's house, the first century synagogue, and customs buildings, it is increasingly possible to imagine life in New Testament times.

---

[2] This, however, remains in the realm of conjecture, as does the suggestion that the house of Joachim and Anna, parents of Mary, the mother of Jesus, was in Sepphoris. See, for example, Bargil Pixner, *Paths of the Messiah and Sites of the Early Church from Galilee to Jerusalem: Jesus and Jewish Christianity in Light of Archaeological Discoveries* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2010), 53–76. For a recent account of the contemporary history of Sepphoris, Arab Saffuriya, now Israeli Zippori, at the time of the 1948 war and after, see Adina Hoffman, *My Happiness Bears No Relation to Happiness: A Poet's Life in The Palestinian Century* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press 2009).

[3] See Bargil Pixner, *With Jesus through Galilee according to the Fifth Gospel* (Rosh Pina: Corazin Publishing, 1992).

[4] Luke 6.15 speaks of "Simon who is called the Zealot."

The Sea of Galilee, a large freshwater lake about seven miles wide and thirteen long, was dotted with villages connected with the local fishing industry, the most prosperous segment of ancient Galilee's economy. Since 1970 archaeology has made it possible to put on the map some sixteen ancient harbours unknown until recently. When Jesus encountered fishermen, he walked right into an economically threatened landscape. The ancient fishing industry depended on boats constructed of wood and often in need of repair. As a *tektōn* from Nazareth, Jesus may have been drawn away from Nazareth to seek work at the lake repairing boats. As an itinerant labourer, Jesus would have moved up the coast from harbour to harbour, a fact which may explain his appearance in Capernaum, an important centre of the fishing trade.

But what is vital for the argument here are the two characteristics that the Galilean ministry exhibits and what they say about the nature of the non-violent kingdom.[5] These are *itinerancy*—always being on the move—and *commensality*, table fellowship. The focus on itinerancy which became the norm in the first fifty years after Jesus's death, until the firm establishment of Christian communities in diverse geographical areas, should not be understood by contemporary Christians as a fixed recommendation to become nomads, or contemporary Bedouin. Rather, it reflects the refusal of Jesus to have a central base, to found a specific centre for the Kingdom of God and make people come there.[6] Yes, Capernaum was a base, to be returned to now and again, but normal life was to move from one village to the next and accept hospitality. Commensality is not about going around with a begging bowl and accepting charity, but about the just sharing of food as the material basis of life, of life that belongs to God.[7]

These two features addressed the fractured life of poor people under the Roman Empire, because they reflect the unjust land situation—and thus another link with today's situation in Israel and the West Bank for the Arab population. Undoubtedly some larger landowners were enriched; but many poor farmers' lands were amalgamated with larger estates and freehold farmers became tenant farmers or day labourers. So, even if the *later* tradition encouraged the voluntary leaving of land and possession "for Christ's sake," Jesus's own practice was rooted in resisting societal corporate injustice. *Commensality*, or eating practices, were also linked with justice. This is linked not only with the fact that—as is usually stated—Jesus "ate with prostitutes and sinners"—but more associated with the reality that the unjust distribution of land meant massive hunger. Because the unjust situation of Antipas's Kingdom had gone so far, there was no possibility of insisting on just land redistribution:

> All that was possible was to attempt the redistribution of land and healing, of the material and spiritual bases, from the bottom upward. That was the

[5] Here I acknowledge my debt to John Dominic Crossan and Jonathan L. Reed, *Excavating Jesus: Beneath the Stones, Behind the Text* (London: SPCK, 2001), 125–35.

[6] Ibid., 125.

[7] Ibid., 126.

Kingdom of God. On Earth.[8]

Because the *Pax Romana* had fractured the ancient safety nets of peasant kinship, the new discipleship around Jesus attempted to restore this through table fellowship. Even more striking is how this was reflected in the prayer of Jesus. The Jewish Torah had stressed the importance of justice for the land and release from debt. The prayer of Jesus, the Lord's Prayer, changes the priority to *food* and debt. "Give us this day our daily bread" speaks directly to the hunger of poor people. A growing number of biblical scholars now understand the Jesus movement as a movement of resistance to the Roman Empire and the transformation of this regime of violence and oppression into an alternative society of justice, peace, forgiveness, and love.[9] For example, Ched Myers argues that this is *exactly* the reason that Jesus came to Capernaum by the Sea, with its seventeen fishing villages, to begin his ministry.[10] *Go where the pain is felt the most*, he asserts. So, it is no surprise that given Jesus's compassion for the misery of the fisher folk that the call of Matthew to be part of the movement happens so soon. Matthew (Levi) had probably sold fishing rights to the people and charged interest on his services. As a street-level representative of the Roman system, his conversion becomes a reminder that Jesus called both poor and rich. It is not merely as a decorative symbol to choose the fish as Christianity's earliest emblem, since the Gospel call has both economic and social dimensions. The fishing industry was for the poor people of this region the public face of the injustice of the Roman Empire. Yet there is an even more radical level to the agenda for the Kingdom, which will now be discussed.

An Agenda for the Kingdom: the Sermon on the Mount

Wherever is decided as the authentic site for the Sermon on the Mount, it is the Mount of the Beatitudes that points to the heart of the non-violent mission of Jesus and his proclamation of the Kingdom of Peace and Justice. The intention here is not to follow the imagined footsteps of Jesus—but to make his message central in the contemporary struggle for the peace and justice of the Kingdom in Israel/Palestine. To visit Capernaum, Tabgha, and other sites by the lake, is almost like being pulled by an invisible thread to the Mount of the Beatitudes, simply because their message has been recognized through the centuries as being Jesus's legacy to us in the struggle for peace. Today's Melkite Archbishop of Galilee, Elias Chacour, refers in his many works to the pull of this mountain in his life.[11] As a small boy he would take refuge here, as the presence of Christ seemed to him to be tangible. There is a rich legacy of inspiration for today's

[8] Ibid., 135.

[9] For example, Ched Myers, Richard Horsley, John Dominic Crossan, Christopher Ferguson.

[10] Ched Myers, "The Call to Discipleship: Resist Colonizing Economics!" Challenging Empire: God, Faithfulness and Resistance, Eighth International Conference, Sabeel Ecumenical Liberation Theology Center, Bethlehem, Feb 25, 2011 (personal notes).

[11] Elias Chacour, *We Belong to The Land: The Story of a Palestinian Israeli Who Lives for Peace and Reconciliation* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 143–44.

Peace Movement, from the way Leo Tolstoy was influenced by the Beatitudes, and the way this impacted on Gandhi and then Martin Luther King. Gandhi read the Sermon on the Mount every day and it was also prayed by the community in his ashrams. Still today peace activists cherish and live by his message. The inspiration and mission of the Beatitudes are interwoven with Jesus's own passion for justice and peace as he traversed the sea and journeyed through its adjacent villages. It is important not to sentimentalize this message: "Blessed are the poor" probably means "blessed are the impoverished." Thus, the impoverished situation of the peasant communities in the time of Jesus is paralleled by the suffering of the Israeli-Arab political context today.

The Suffering of Galilee Today

In the light of the present realities, how shall we re-read the sacred texts to inspire justice and peace today? Here, almost in the shadow of the Mount of the Beatitudes, with the words "Blessed are the Peacemakers" ringing in our ears, can we avoid the centrality of the message of peace in the Gospels?

Tragically, far too often do we read *out* of the text of the Gospels their call to peace with justice as the central message of the Kingdom. What did Mark do in the first chapter of his Gospel (Mark 1.14) but proclaim the Good News of the Kingdom and call for a change of heart (*metanoia*)? And what is the Good News exactly? It is the proclamation that the Kingdom of God is a kingdom of peace and justice, and is offered by God as alternative to the Roman Empire with its *pax Romana*. Why have we become so deaf to the fact that peace is the major theme of the New Testament? Is it because it would demand too much of us in today's context?

In his wonderful study of this theme, *Covenant of Peace: The Missing Peace in New Testament Theology and Ethics*,[12] William M. Swartley points out that Jesus stands directly in the prophetic tradition of *shalom* of Isaiah and the other prophets. (It is no accident that that Isaiah functions almost as a fifth Gospel for Christians).[13] Yet *shalom* does not mean simply "peace," but the kind of wellbeing and flourishing that is based upon justice and a quality of right relation permeating society. This meaning persisted in Rabbinic Judaism from the second century to the mediaeval period. What is important is that there was an *ethical category to shalom*, which is frequently missed:

> *shalom* primarily signifies a value, an *ethical category*—it denotes the overcoming of strife, quarrel and social tension, the prevention of enmity and war.... The pursuit of peace is the obligation of the individual and the goal of various social regulations and structures.[14]

[12] William M. Swartley, *The Covenant of Peace: The Missing Peace in New Testament Theology and Ethics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 2006).

[13] See for example, John F. A. Sawyer, *The Fifth Gospel: Isaiah in the History of Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

[14] Aviezer Ravitsky, "Peace," in *Contemporary Jewish Religious Thought: Original Essays on Critical Con-*

Have we forgotten this ethical quality of *shalom* and thus pushed the centrality of peace-making to the edges of our consciousness, or to an individualized notion of contentment? The Roman Empire has long fallen, but others have risen to take its place. The waters of Galilee have watched the Ottoman Empire, British, and Jordanian powers come and go: but the might of the Zionist Government backed by the Americans, the lack of moral tone and any element of justice in the so-called Peace Process, means that the current situation is strikingly similar to the days when Jesus offered poor fisher folk and farm labourers an alternative to the regime of the *Pax Romana*.

In the early twentieth century, when Palestine was still under the Ottoman Empire, followed by the British Mandate, Galilee was inhabited by Arab Christians and Muslims, the Druze,[15] and Jews, while minorities from elsewhere in the Ottoman empire—including Circassians and Bosniaks—were also settled here by the Turks. From the nineteenth century Zionist immigrants had slowly begun to inhabit the land. Once the state of Israel was declared as the new homeland for the Jews in 1948, things changed drastically for indigenous inhabitants through what Arabs call *Al Nakba*, the catastrophe.[16] The Palestinian version of events is disputed by the Zionist Government: it is frequently said that "they went away, leaving the houses and buildings empty."[17] Jewish settlers are seldom told the truth of the empty houses to which they are assigned on arrival from many European countries. The very word "*Nakba*" was ordered to be erased from school textbooks, its veracity denied. *Al Nakba* is one of the most tragic and defining events for Arab memory. Each village has its own stories, its own inhabitants with their memories.[18] One witness writes:

---

cepts and Movements and Beliefs, ed. Arthur A. Cohen and Paul Mendes Flohr (New York: Macmillan, 1987), 686.

[15] The Druze—of whom there are about a million in the world—are an esoteric, monotheistic religious community found primarily in Syria, Lebanon, Israel, and Jordan, which emerged during the eleventh century from Ismailism (a large branch of Shia Islam). The Druze people reside primarily in Syria, Lebanon, and Israel. The Israeli Druze are mostly in Galilee (81%), around Haifa (19%), and in the Golan Heights, which is home to about 20,000 Druze. The Institute of Druze Studies estimates that 40%–50% of Druze live in Syria, 30%–40% in Lebanon, 6%–7% in Israel, and 1%–2% in Jordan. See Bejtullah Destani, ed., *Minorities in the Middle East: Druze Communities 1840–1974* (4 vols; Slough: Archive Editions, 2006); Robert B. Betts, *The Druze* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988).

[16] The facts are easy to relate, but they may obscure the profundity of the tragedy that was inflicted on the Palestinians and continues to haunt them till this day. The Arab inhabitants of Palestine were driven out of 531 villages by Israeli soldiers; about 750,000 people were displaced, forced into becoming refugees, in Bethlehem, Lebanon, Syria, and the rest of the world.

[17] See Nur Masalha, *A Land without a People: Israeli Transfer and the Palestinians, 1949–96* (London: Faber and Faber, 1997); *The Politics of Denial: Israel and The Palestinian Refugee Problem* (London: Pluto, 2003); Walid Khalidi, *All That Remains: The Palestinian Villages Occupied and Depopulated by Israel in 1948* (Washington, DC: The Institute for Palestine Studies, 1992).

[18] See Sabeel Centre, *A Time to Remember: Palestinian Towns and Villages* (Jerusalem: Sabeel Centre for Ecumenical Theology, 2008). James Penn tells us that one in every three refugees in the world is Palestinian. There are approximately 7 million Palestinian refugees in the world and they can be categorized as the original "*Nakba* refugees" and their descendants (4.5 million), the 1967 Six Day War refugees and descendants (1 million) and "low intensity population transfer" refugees and other refugees.

> The new rulers have moved into our lands, our homes, claiming them as their own. The great promises of our brother nations and of the world are forgotten. We flee or are driven out of our homes and families. We wander, exiled. Many families seek refuge in neighbouring lands or distant countries, but many of us become refugees in our own land—squatting in tent camps as we watch our land, our home become home to another people.[19]

Despite the sophisticated techniques employed to destroy collective memory and identity, now, sixty-seven years on, *Al Nakba* is still firmly enshrined in Palestinian collective memory (in Israel, Gaza, the West Bank and globally with the Diaspora population), despite some evidence that some of the younger generation have a diminished attachment to their ancestral village. *Nakba Day*—May 15—is still celebrated by the villagers and many international supporters, with pilgrimages to the old sites and nonviolent resistance marches to checkpoints and other places of significance. But remembering *Al Nakba* is one thing; living as second class citizens, as a minority within a Jewish state is another.[20]

Wherever we look, Arab Israelis suffer discrimination—with high unemployment, poor health care, under-representation in Parliament, and a desperate sense of insecurity, heightened by the consciousness that Israel is demanding an acceptance from all citizens that this will be a Jewish State. And I have not even touched upon the situation in the West Bank and Gaza; this is the context for the contemporary search for peace.

---

[19] Walid Khalidi, in Sabeel Centre, *A Time to Remember*, 47.

[20] There are about one-and-a-half-million Palestinians living within the borders of the Israeli state. Arab citizens of Israel form a majority of the population (52%) in Israel's Northern District and about 50% of the Arab population lives in 114 different localities throughout Israel. In total there are 122 primarily, if not entirely, Arab localities in Israel, 89 of them having populations over two thousand. 46% of Israel's Arab population (622,400 people) lives in predominantly Arab communities in the north, Nazareth being the largest Arab city, with a population of 65,000, roughly 40,000 of whom are Muslim. Jerusalem has the largest overall Arab population. In 2000, Jerusalem housed 209,000 Arabs and they made up some 33% of the city's residents. But these facts do little to convey the realities faced by Arab Israelis who face discrimination, racism, and poverty on a daily basis. Almost 140,000 Palestinian families in Israel are below the poverty line, more than 50% of Palestinian children live in these poor families. Poverty now reaches into the third generation. 60% of Palestinian families suffer from housing shortages but 44% cannot afford to rent or purchase a new house or apartment. Permits to build are almost impossible to get—hence the often desperate act of building without a permit, with the frequent consequence of the house being demolished by the Israeli authorities. This is well documented by Jeff Halper, the founder of the Israeli Committee Against House Demolitions (ICAHD). Thousands of demolitions have been carried out over the years, under the aegis of five government bodies. The underlying purpose is to "de-Arabize the land": the purpose is to confine the 3.7 million Palestinians of the Occupied Territories, together with the 1.3 million Palestinian citizens of Israel, to small, disconnected enclaves (referred to by Sharon as "cantons") within about 15% of the entire country. But the overarching plan of ridding the Jewish state of Arabs is given a cloak of legality: demolitions are couched within dry, technical, seemingly neutral master plans. Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu called Arab citizens a "demographic problem." Avigdor Lieberman, Deputy Prime Minister, has called for the execution of the Arab members of the Knesset, and supports the idea of the forcible transfer of the Arab community.

Galilee: the Sea of Challenge for us today

From the shores of Galilee, Jesus set his face to Jerusalem, the Gospels tell us. Now he would have to face the checkpoints—notably Qalandia, scene of routine humiliation of Palestinians. His was the freely chosen path of suffering love, emerging from a being, totally reconciled with the power and source of life and justice. Following this path today means a costly discipleship:

> If anyone is in Christ, he is a new creation. All this is from God, who through Christ reconciled us to himself and gave us the ministry of reconciliation. (2 Cor 5.17)

I want to offer two types of insights here as to flesh out what this costly discipleship involves. The first is from Gandhi's thoughts, the second from Feminist Liberation Theology. People often speak of Gandhi as a failure—not least in India, where his ideas on village republics are considered anachronistic. The complexity and profundity of his thought is often unexplored. How is it relevant for the argument here?

First, Gandhi thought that most of Christianity today is a negation of the Sermon on the Mount. He was speaking directly of what the West thinks of Christianity and how it lives the reality:

> By all means drink deep of the fountains that are given to you in the Sermon on the Mount; but then you will have to take up sackcloth and ashes.… The teaching of the Sermon was meant for each and every one of us. You cannot serve both God and Mammon.[21]

Secondly, non-violence, *ahimsa*, is no passive concept but a highly complex idea based on a lifelong practice of self-purification. It is a quality of the heart, a passion expressed in every act, even the smallest. But it should not be dismissed as a private act: Gandhi saw it as the basis of engagement with political parties, especially those who disagreed with him:

> We have to be patient with them and convince them of their errors and be convinced of our own. Then, proceeding further, we have to deal patiently and gently with political parties that have different policies and different principles. We have to look at their criticism from their own standpoint, always remembering that the greater the distance between ourselves and others, the greater the scope for the play of our non-violence.[22]

---

[21] Mahatma Gandhi, "The Place of Jesus" (Dec 8, 1927), in *The Essential Writings of Mahatma Gandhi*, ed. Raghavan Iyer (Oxford: Oxford India Paperbacks, 1993), 149.

[22] Ibid, 252; "The Fundamental of non-violence."

The power of *ahimsa*, is the power of truth, expressed in *satyagraha*, its public expression: "*Satyagraha* is pure soul-force. Truth is the very substance of the soul. That is why this force is called *satyagraha*."[23] Gandhi's views on truth are at the very heart of the revolution he proposes, the complete opposite of the ethic that "might is right" and "the survival of the fittest." *Satyagraha*

> proposes a deeper sense of shared humanity to give meaning and energy to its sense of justice. The sense of humanity consisted in the recognition of the fundamental fact that humanity was indivisible, that human beings grew and feel together, and that in degrading and brutalizing others, they degraded and brutalized themselves.[24]

The most impressive example of *satyagraha* in action, the Salt March of March 1930, was an important part of the Indian independence movement. It was a direct action campaign of tax resistance and nonviolent protest against the British salt monopoly in colonial India, and triggered the wider Civil Disobedience Movement. Gandhi led the march from his Sabarmati Ashram near Ahmedabad, to the sea coast near the village of Dandi, where the group extracted salt from the sea. As he continued on this twenty-three-day, 390-kilometre march to produce salt without paying the tax, growing numbers of Indians joined him along the way. Women were particularly enthusiastic. When Gandhi broke the salt laws at 6:30am on April 6, 1930, it sparked large scale acts of civil disobedience against the British Raj salt laws by millions of Indians. Salt seemed especially symbolic as it should be a gift of nature, not taxed by a foreign power. What was particularly poignant was that when brutally attacked by soldiers, with some dead and thousands injured, the *satyagrahis* made no attempt to resist and fight back. It is the spiritual and moral power of this action that lives on today.

My second example comes from Feminist Christology and its non-violent understanding of atonement, or the processes of redemption. Yes, Jesus set his face to Jerusalem to confront the powers. But Feminist Liberation Theology stresses the community dimension of Christ's setting his face to confront the power of empire. Christ-and-messianic community together embodied the struggle for truth and justice—even though the redemptive self-giving that led to his crucifixion was unique to Jesus. He—not his followers—is the Saviour of the world. It is a mistake to idealize and glorify crucifixion—as some traditional theologies have done: this can so easily happen if the dimension of justice is removed. Putting justice central means there is a task for us all as we struggle anew against oppression in our different contexts.

The non-violent struggle that appeared to end with crucifixion was a protest against all crucifixions, against the necessity of the violent putting to death of the innocent, poor, and vulnerable. As Beverley Harrison wrote in a widely quoted passage:

[23] Ibid, 309; "Soul-force and *tapasta*."

[24] Bhikhu C. Parekh, "Is Gandhi still Relevant?" in Antony R. H. Copley and George Paxton, eds, *Gandhi and the Contemporary World: Essays to Mark the 125th Anniversary of His Birth* (Chennai: Indo-British Historical Society, 1997), 376.

> Jesus's death on a cross, his sacrifice, was no abstract exercise in moral virtue. His death was the price he paid for refusing to abandon the radical activity of love.… Sacrifice, I submit, is not a central moral goal or virtue in Christian life. Radical acts of love—expressing human solidarity and bringing mutual relationship to life—are the central virtues of Christian moral life.… Like Jesus we are called to a radical activity of love, to a way of being that deepens relation, embodies and extends community, passes on the gift of life.… To be sure, Jesus was faithful unto death. He stayed with his cause and he died for it. He *accepted* sacrifice. But his sacrifice was *for* the cause of radical love, to make relationship and to sustain it, and above all, to righting wrong relationship, which is what we call "doing justice."[25]

In a similar way, Rodolfo Cardenal of El Salvador quoted his Jesuit colleague, Ignacio Ellacuria, murdered by the government soldiers, as saying,

> To liberate means to take the crucified people down from the Cross. But the world of oppression and sin cannot tolerate that the people be taken down from the Cross.[26]

Those women who stood steadfast at the cross of Christ in the presence of the violence and brutality of the soldiers were ready to receive the empowerment of Christ's resurrection. We cannot escape the significance of the fact that these women disciples—like the Samaritan woman—had already experienced forgiveness and reconciliation within the community of those who struggled in suffering love for a new order of living. They had already accepted a ministry of peace-making and reconciliation. Equally, their resistance to the established order was made possible because they were already empowered by Jesus's vision of a world graced with reconciliation.

What is important for this non-violent understanding of atonement is that, yes, as the Kairos Palestine document makes clear, resistance is a right and a duty for the Christian, but *it is resistance with love as its logic*, a creative resistance seeking human ways that engage the humanity of the enemy.[27] It urges "seeing the image of God in the face of the enemy …" (4.2.3) and suggests many practical ways of non-violent resistance. As Gandhi made clear: you have to *be*, *embody* the very change you want to bring about.

If the mission of the Samaritan woman of John's Gospel was to evangelize her own people, our task in today's redemptive journey to peace, as the Kairos document declares,

---

[25] Beverley W. Harrison, "The Power of Anger and the Work of Love," *Making the Connections* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1986), 18–19.

[26] Rodolfo Cardenal, "The Timeliness and the Challenge of the Theology of Liberation," in *Reclaiming the Vision: Education, Liberation and Justice*, ed. Mary Grey (Southampton: LSU College, 1994), 21.

[27] See Kairos Document, *Kairos: A Moment of Truth* (Bethlehem, 2009)'

"is a call to stand alongside the oppressed and preserve the word of God as good news for all."[28]

Conclusion—On the Open Road to Galilee

But, readers might be saying, many groups are already practising non-violent resistance in the spirit of Gandhi. The tireless work of Sabeel and groups with whom they are in touch, like human rights groups B't Selem, Rabbis for Human Rights, ICAHD, EAPPI programmes, the many voices who are speaking out, the heroic non-violent movement that Mazin Qumsiyeh leads, will never give up, yet so far do not seem to have succeeded. If Gandhi's example and that of other heroic activists teaches us anything, it is that relational power, the power of non-violence appears fragile in the eyes of the world. Recently in Israel, I met a young female soldier—part of a group called Musalaha—who admitted to me that she had charge of the Qalandia checkpoint I mentioned earlier. She said, "You can't imagine how many knives we confiscate from Palestinians!" I said, "But look at the guns you yourselves confront them with!" It illustrated for me the imaginative power needed to persuade people that there can be a different way. Secondly, this is the imagination Gandhi was calling for to form an empathic understanding between hostile peoples. And there are many groups who work in this way. For example, the team at St Ethelburga's Centre for Reconciliation and Peace, London, inspired by the work of peace activist, John Paul Lederach,[29] are skilled in facilitating encounters between groups of people from contemporary conflict situations.

Another approach to revisiting and transforming memory, re-casting identity so that it is not diametrically opposed to the other's, not dissimilar to Martin Buber's, is taken by Rabbi Michael Lerner in *Embracing Israel/Palestine*.[30] Lerner calls for strategies of generosity to listen and embrace "the other." He calls for recognition that Israel suffers from post-traumatic stress disorder.[31] This condition is traced back through centuries of persecution and suffering, the experience of homelessness of the Jews, and antisemitism culminating in the Holocaust (*Shoah*). It remains an unhealed trauma: collectively, many Israelis find it hard to think outside this box. "Survivors of trauma," asserts Lerner, "Create relationships in which they psychically reproduce the circumstances of the original trauma."[32]

The link with the recasting of memory is what is experienced by the disciples in the light of Easter, when they are invited to re-encounter Jesus on the shores of Galilee, where it all began. Here, Peter receives forgiveness and the command to love. Lerner

[28] "Kairos Palestine," 6.1.

[29] See John Paul Lederach, *The Journey Toward Reconciliation* (Scottdale: Herald Press, 1999); *The Moral Imagination: The Art and Soul of Building Peace* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

[30] Michael Lerner, *Embracing Israel/Palestine: A Strategy to Heal and Transform the Middle East* (Berkeley: North Atlantic Books, 2011).

[31] See Michael Lerner, *Healing Israel/Palestine: A Path to Peace and Reconciliation* (Berkeley: Tikkun Books, 2003).

[32] Lerner, *Embracing Israel/Palestine*, 207–8.

recognizes the injustice inflicted on Palestinians and calls upon Israelis to recognize the terrible injustice of what they are doing. At every point in history when a decisive action was taken, *it might have been otherwise*. Jewish settlers could have recognized the rights of indigenous peoples. Palestinians might have had some sympathy for post-holocaust survivors and what now seems like a pathological need for security on the part of the Israelis. The point now is to understand that reconciliation begins with a movement of the heart and the transforming of consciousness, if we are to build a culture/political movement that helps people believe in the possibility of a world of love—that Gandhi also dreamed of. Yes, truth-telling is hard, as Gandhi knew, and Archbishop Desmond Tutu wrote, "It has grave consequences for one's life and reputation. It stretches one's faith, one's capacity to love, and pushes hope to the limit.… No-one takes up this work on a do-gooder's whim. It is not a choice. One feels compelled into it."[33]

Concretely, this means many tasks and they are urgent. First, being in solidarity with the work and commitment of ordinary people—so has it ever been with Liberation Theology. A consequence of this is working for the BDS campaign—Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions—because this is what the Palestinian people have asked us to do. Secondly, engaging in reading the Bible differently means seeking interpretations of difficult texts which are empowering for both peoples of the land. Thirdly, engaging with justice-seeking Jewish people[34] in the search for a solution to the conflict is crucial; difficult issues like the different meanings of "chosen-ness," "election," "superiority" and the image of God behind all these notions need tackling as a joint theological project between Christians and Jews. Fourthly, Christian Zionism's fundamentalist reading of Scripture must be challenged in order to awaken a vision of the just sharing of the land. And finally, the vision of non-violence as the way to peaceful cooperation through a transformed Easter consciousness needs to be wholeheartedly embraced. The coming of the Kingdom is a dream shared. To make this real—peace in the Bible lands—"leaders need to have a vision, to have faith in that vision, and to be able to rally the people to share that faith."[35]

As Gandhi said:

> Europe has disapproved Christ. Through ignorance it has disregarded Christ's pure way of life. Many Christs will have to offer themselves as sacrifices at the terrible altar of Europe, and then only will realization dawn on that continent. But Jesus will always be the first among these. He has

[33] Desmond Tutu, "Realizing God's Dream for the Holy Land," *Boston Globe*, Oct 26, 2007, http://www.boston.com/news/globe/editorial_opinion/oped/articles/2007/10/26/realizing_gods_dream_for_the_holy_land/.

[34] By "justice-seeking Jewish people" I refer to many groups in Israel like Rabbis for Human Rights, Gush Shalom, B'tselem, Machsom Watch, and globally to the many Jewish people who are committed to the state of Israel but also respect the human rights of Palestinians.

[35] Ibid.

> been the sower of the seed and his will therefore be the credit for raising the harvest.[36]

The way of revenge and violence has prolonged the conflict into its sixth decade, even exacerbating it to a more bitter level. Is it stretching the bounds of possibilities that at this juncture the non-violent vision of Gandhi and Jesus could offer a peaceful and hopeful future for the Bible Lands, when so many people are tempted to give up any such possibility?

[36] Mahatma Gandhi, "Satyagraha—Non-violent Resistance," in Iyer, ed., *Essential Writings*, 311.

NINE

Repent, for the Dictatorship of God is at Hand!

James G. Crossley

In a recent webchat on the *Guardian* website, the Marxist-Lacanian celebrity philosopher Slavoj Žižek argued that while he supports a boycott of Israel's state institutions, he "totally" rejects any boycott which would involve "not visiting [Israel], not having contact with people there." He added that there are two reasons for limiting a boycott to state institutions: due to a new wave of European antisemitism and because such a limited boycott would then be "a common project of Palestinians and Jewish progressive critics of Zionism," attaining the unity which is "absolutely crucial." For Žižek, "Palestinian resistance" needs to be nonviolent and also must form part of a "modern universal emancipatory project."[1] While my knowledge of individual views on boycotts is not extensive, the idea of locating Palestinian resistance in a broader emancipatory context clearly echoes the views of a number of participants in the BZP conference and contributors to this volume. Moreover, the importance of nonviolence is also emphasized, at least in the sense that, in some of the exegetical debates concerning a future for Palestinians, Jesus was invoked on the side of a peaceful inauguration of a new homeland. A powerful example is found in this book in the essay by Mary Grey where she presents Jesus's vision of the kingdom in terms of a subversive, nonviolent, anti-imperial colonial resistance against inequalities of wealth and resources and the rule of Antipas and the Roman Empire, all framed in the context of Palestinian resistance. In this respect, it is worth adding that Grey's essay has been influenced by Marxist and Marxist-influenced exegesis of the New Testament associated with Ched Myers, John Dominic Crossan, and Richard Horsley.

While there may be specific points to dispute, the general picture put forward by

[1] Slavoj Žižek, "Slavoj Žižek Webchat," *Guardian* (Oct 8, 2014), http://www.theguardian.com/books/live/2014/oct/06/slavoj-zizek-webchat-absolute-recoil.

Grey may well be accurate, as we will see below. What I want to do instead of a direct response is to look to the potential danger in using the figure of Jesus and his vision for the kingdom: the danger of what might be labelled "Bonapartism" or "Stalinism": of the revolution turning into a dictatorship. This sort of warning levelled at Marxism or Marxist-influenced thinking is hardly new. Mikhail Bakunin, for instance, foresaw what might happen to Marxism when he predicted that the revolutionary state will appropriate all land and property and will thus be a highly centralized and powerful "red bureaucracy." For Bakunin, this "despotic" state would entail slavery and a regimented workforce where "workingmen and women will sleep, wake, work, and live to the beat of a drum; where the shrewd and educated will be granted government privileges."[2] Such criticisms may have become the staple of liberal discourses but, as with Bakunin, they are also central to criticisms from the anti-authoritarian Left. Rudolf Rocker would develop this line of thinking in the socialism of the Jewish East End of London before World War I; Rosa Luxemburg made similar points in her criticism of the Russian Revolution; George Orwell reflected on revolution, totalitarianism and the Stalinist delusions of British intellectuals, most famously in *Animal Farm* (1946) and *1984* (1949); and Noam Chomsky has reviewed the Left of the previous century in such a light while noting contemporary manifestations of such authoritarianism, including in theological reasoning.[3] This is not to say that Grey's thinking is along these lines (on the contrary) but rather that the Gospel and New Testament texts may be more problematic and theocratic—and even contain the seeds of dictatorship.[4] After all, Žižek—himself well aware of issues surrounding totalitarianism—put forward a more dictatorial reading of Christian origins than Grey's analysis when he presented "Paul as a Leninist" and implied Jesus was the betrayed Marx figure. "Paul goes on to his true Leninist business," Žižek claimed:

> that of organizing the new party called the Christian community.… Was not Paul, like Lenin, the great "institutionalizer," and, as such, reviled by the partisans of "original" Marxism-Christianity? Does not the Pauline temporality "already, but not yet" also designate Lenin's situation in between two revolutions, between February and October 1917? Revolution is already behind us, the old regime is out, freedom is here—*but* the

[2] Mikhail Bakunin, *Selected Works* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1972), 283–84.

[3] Rudolf Rocker, *The London Years* (Los Angeles: Robert Anscombe, 1956); Rosa Luxemburg, *The Russian Revolution and Leninism or Marxism?* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1970 [1918]), 24; Noam Chomsky, *Understanding Power: The Indispensable Chomsky*, ed. Peter R. Mitchell and John Schoeffel (New York: New Press, 2002), 222–66.

[4] I am working with broad themes in the Gospel tradition. For those interested in issues relating to the historical Jesus (and Grey's essay goes along these lines), I think that these themes probably reflect the earliest Gospel tradition, even if we cannot be sure about precise passages. See James G. Crossley, *Jesus and the Chaos of History: Redirecting the Life of the Historical Jesus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), ch. 3.

hard work still lies ahead.[5]

The Snowball Effect

A strong case can be made for a revolutionary or subversive Jesus whose message was anti-imperial, generated by vast inequalities of wealth and resources. Running throughout the Gospel tradition is the idea that the imperial authorities, including those authorities perceived to be unjust, will be overthrown. Rome will not be ruling forever, at least not in Israel. This would have been obvious from the book of Daniel as it would have been re-read in light of first-century history and culture (see, e.g., Jos. *Ant.* 10.10.4, 10.11.7):[6] "And in the days of those kings the God of heaven will set up a kingdom that shall never be destroyed, nor shall this kingdom be left to another people. It shall crush all these kingdoms and bring them to an end, and it shall stand for ever" (Dan 2.44). Not only can such Gospel themes be read as "anti-imperial" but there is a distinctive class aspect present, including economic reversal (e.g., Luke 6.20; cf. Matt 5.3). In Mark 10.17–31, a rich person has as much chance of entering the kingdom as a camel has of passing through the eye of a needle, which functions partly as a critique of the idea of earthly wealth being understood as a divine reward.[7] The idea that wealth effectively leads to sin (cf. CD 4.15–19; 1QS 11.1-2; *Ps. Sol.* 5.16), or that reward is to be found in the end times (cf. 1 En. 96.4; 103.5–8; Dan 12; 2 Macc 7), is arguably more explicit still in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Luke 16.19–31). Only one reason is given for the dramatic role reversal of class in that parable: "Child, remember that during your lifetime you received your good things, and Lazarus in like manner evil things; but now he is comforted here, and you are in agony" (Luke 16.25).[8] From this sort of perspective, God and Mammon cannot both be served (Luke 16.13//Matt 6.24). Such issues relating to class are especially common across the Synoptic tradition in a range of different literary contexts (e.g., Luke 6.20–26//Matt 5.3–12; Matt 6.24//Luke 16.13; Luke 14.12–24//Matt 22.1–14; Luke 4.18; 12.13–21) as are concerns about debt (e.g., Luke 12.57–59//Matt 5.25; Luke 6.35; 16.1–8; Matt 5.40–42; 6.12; 18.23–35), food, clothing, drink, and community (Matt 25.31–46; Luke 6.20–21), hostility to wealth and the concerns of the wealthy (e.g., Matt 11.8//Luke 7.25; Matt 6.25–34//Luke 12.22–31; Luke 6.24–25; cf. 1 En. 98.2; 102.9–11), and issues relating to a stark contrast of rich and poor (Luke 6.20–26//Matt 5.3–12; Luke 14.12–24//Matt 22.1–14). Challenging the status quo on issues of class, economic reversal, and injustice is obviously a major

[5] Slavoj Žižek, *The Puppet and the Dwarf: The Perverse Core of Christianity* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003), 9.

[6] See further Craig A. Evans, "Daniel in the New Testament: Visions of God's Kingdom," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, ed. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 490–527.

[7] For a full discussion see James G. Crossley, "The Damned Rich (Mark 10.17–31)," *Expository Times* 116 (2005): 397–401.

[8] See especially Richard J. Bauckham, "Rich Man and Lazarus: The Parable and the Parallels," NTS 37 (1991): 225–46.

concern in the Gospels and those using Jesus in such a manner are hardly building upon sand.

"Welcome to 1984"

But if a "revolutionary" Jesus is easily rediscovered then so are the seeds of a "Stalinist" or "imperialist" future. Rather than escaping imperialist ideology, the Gospel tradition embraces it and reinscribes it. This is clearest in the theocratic language of the kingdom of God. As has long been established, the language of a "kingdom" (βασιλεία/מלכות) concerns both God's rule or kingship while incorporating spatial dimensions in terms of what is deemed God's territory. God's kingdom in heaven was presented with the imperial imagery of a throne or chariot and warrior-like angels. Of some difficulty for Palestinian reclamations of Jesus is the earthly kingdom-of-God language which might, of course, involve a Davidic king.

Occupation of Israel and ownership of all lands are standard assumptions concerning the kingdom and kingship of God (e.g., Obad 1.19–21; Zech 14.9; Ps 47.2–3; Dan 7.27). On Daniel, Maurice Casey pointed out, "If this was reapplied to the time of Jesus… it was bound to mean that the Romans would be driven out of Israel and made subject to the Jewish people" (cf. Jos. *Ant.* 10.10.4, 10.11.7).[9] To make this more complicated still for a Palestinian reclamation of Jesus, Dale Allison has shown that the idea of "inheriting the kingdom" in the Gospel tradition "is like taking possession of the land" (with reference to LXX Exod 12.25; Lev 19.23; Num 15.2; 20.24; Deut 1.8; 4.1, 21; 6.18; 16.20; 27.3; Judg 18.9; Ezek 13.9; 20.38; *T. Mos.* 2.1; *T. Levi* 12.5).[10] Related imperialistic and even "Zionist" concerns are found across the Gospel tradition, including the idea of Jesus and his followers sitting on twelve thrones "judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Matt 19.28; Luke 22.29–30). Further examples of the interaction of power, authority, and hierarchy are common, including in relation to the kingdom of God (e.g., Mark 11.10; Matt 21.5, 9; Luke 19.38).

One of the warning signs for those wanting to appropriate Jesus for the cause of liberation is that the kingdom of God has been appropriated for ecclesiastical, national, and pan-national authority throughout the history of Christianity.[11] What such appropriations partly do is to replicate, re-inscribe, and buy into imperialism, domination, and authority. Indeed, even the theme of radical economic reversal still assumes related power structures, even when reward is reversed in the end times (see e.g., 1 En. 92–105; cf. Job 42.10–17). In the case of the rich man in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, the same hierarchical structure of privilege remains and is thus not ultimately

[9] Maurice Casey, *Jesus of Nazareth: An Independent Historian's Account of His Life and Teaching* (London: T&T Clark, 2010), 215.

[10] Dale C. Allison, *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History* (London: SPCK, 2010), 180–81. On Jesus and territory see now Karen J. Wenell, *Jesus and Land: Sacred and Social Space in Second Temple Judaism* (London: T&T Clark, 2007).

[11] Allison, *Constructing Jesus*, 184–86.

dismantled. But such issues cannot be dismissed as abstract "structural" similarities or restricted to something that will happen in the future. In the case of Mark 10.17–31 and those who have more chance of passing through the eye of the needle than the rich man, rewards (including "houses," family, and "fields") are even expected in "this age" and not just "the age to come." The imagined alternative to the power of the present world clearly has its limits in the Gospel tradition—and the coming kingdom of God might even be seen as little more than a changing of the guard.

This sort of thinking may also be implicit in the Gospel sayings about the present and growing kingdom (e.g., Mark 4.26–32; Luke 13.20–21; Matt 13.33; Matt 13.44; Luke 17.20–21). The idea of the "good" kingdom mimicking the "bad" kingdom, including more "presentist" concerns, is found in the dispute about casting out demons (Mark 3.22–30) where it is further claimed that "if a kingdom is divided against itself, that kingdom cannot stand" (see also Matt 12.28; Luke 11.20; cf. Mark 10.14–15; 12.34). The popular Book of Daniel, which looks to the future kingdom, tells us who is really ruling in the present and tellingly does so by having a monarch do the explaining: "I, Nebuchadnezzar, lifted my eyes to heaven, and my reason returned to me. I blessed the Most High, and praised and honoured the one who lives for ever. For his sovereignty is an everlasting sovereignty, and his kingdom endures from generation to generation" (Dan 4.34).

The Great Leader and the Vanguard

The mimicking of kingdoms also involves the mimicking of leadership and authority. In Matt 16.19, for instance, Jesus says to Peter: "I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven." Luke 22.29–30 provides a telling addition to the saying concerning the judging of the twelve tribes, implying some form of human ownership or stewardship: "I confer on you, just as my Father has conferred on me, a kingdom, so that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and you will sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Given that Jesus was remembered as Messiah, king of the Jews, the Son of Man who will return, equal with God, judge of the twelve tribes, and millenarian prophet, the world to come in this tradition must involve a violent seizure of power (even if God was expected to lead the way). Eternal rule is thus intertwined with the conventional imperialist and dictatorial propagandist promises of peace.[12] Relevant ideas in a number of texts explicitly point in this direction (Ps. Sol. 17; 4Q246 II 1–9; 1QM VI 4–6; 4Q252 V 1–4; 4Q521 frag. 2 II 1–13; 11Q13 2.13; 2 Bar. 72.2–73.2).

[12] Compare the postcolonial readings of Mark and Revelation in this respect. See e.g. Tat-siong Benny Liew, "Tyranny, Power and Might: Colonial Mimicry in Mark's Gospel," JSNT 73 (1999): 7–31; *Politics of Parousia: Reading Mark Inter(con)textually* (Leiden: Brill, 1999); Simon Samuel, *A Postcolonial Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus* (London: T&T Clark, 2007); Stephen D. Moore, *Empire and Apocalypse: Postcolonialism and the New Testament* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2006).

Perhaps the Gospel tradition simply could not conceive an alternative which did not involve domination, subjugation, imperialism, and theocracy. Paul certainly could not. He may not have used precisely the same language but the imperialist ideas are likewise present: the one who humbled himself would become so exalted "that at the name of Jesus every knee should bend, in heaven and on earth and under the earth and every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord" (Phil 2.10–11). Seemingly more benignly, Paul could impose dominance in the removal of particular identities in Christ (Gal 3.28). Paul is likewise explicit about eschatological change in power relations: "When any of you has a grievance against another, do you dare to take it to court before the unrighteous, instead of taking it before the saints? Do you not know that the saints will judge the world? And if the world is to be judged by you, are you incompetent to try trivial cases? Do you not know that we are to judge angels—to say nothing of ordinary matters?" (1 Cor. 6.2).

But what the discussion so far reveals is that we should not simply blame Paul (or indeed the Gospel writers) for somehow "betraying" the millenarian and egalitarian peasant Jesus. Millenarianism is quite able to promote exalted claims on the part of the great millenarian leader alongside claims of egalitarianism. An ability to hold together seemingly contradictory ideas of subversion, egalitarianism, and authoritarianism should not be a surprise—neither today nor 2,000 years ago. One of the most pertinent examples would be the phenomenon of banditry. Like Jesus, bandits could be remembered as a product of social upheaval (e.g., Jos. *Ant.* 17.10.4–7; 18.8.3–4; *War* 2.4.2–3; 2.21.1; *Life* 35, 66) and celebrated as attacking power, wealth, and Rome (Jos. *War* 2.17.6–9; *Ant.* 18.8.3–4; *War* 2.31; *Ant.* 20.5.4; *Life* 126–27), while still mimicking the world of kings and kingship (*War* 2.5; *Ant.* 17.10.6–7; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.9).

Whatever the earliest realities, the Gospels present Jesus as Lord, Messiah, king of the Jews, eschatological Son of Man, and, in the case of John's Gospel, Son of God in the sense that he identified closely and strongly with God. In John 5.1–18 there is a close connection between Jesus and his "father." This meant, according to John, that "the Jews" wanted to kill Jesus because "he was also calling God his own Father, thereby making himself equal to God" (John 5.18). There are similar sentiments in John 10.30–33 where the Johaninne Jesus claims that "the Father and I are one" and "the Jews" are presented as wanting to stone Jesus for blasphemy "because you, though only a human being, are making yourself God." Given what we know about the range of elevated figures in early Jewish thought, John must be elevating Jesus especially highly to present this as a deadly dispute. Of course, it might reasonably be argued that this is a Johannine innovation, but the earliest Christian tradition presents a Jesus with such a potential. One of the most significant moments in the development of Christology must have been the visions of Jesus shortly after his death and which clearly goes back to a relatively widespread pre-Pauline tradition (1 Cor 15.3–9; to 500 followers). This earliest development of Christology was interpreted to involve a blazing "light from heaven" (Acts 9.3). This heavenly Christ presumably had the imperial trappings of heaven which we know from texts such as 1 Enoch—hence the relatively standard heavenly vision in

2 Cor 12.2–4. The Qumran scroll 4Q405 frag. 23 II 8–12 gives us further indication of what this might have involved, particularly in tying together ideas of heaven with kingdom and kingship:

> In their wonderful stations there are spirits (with) multi-coloured (clothes), like woven material engraved with splendid effigies. In the midst of the glorious appearance of scarlet, the colours of the light of the spirit of the holy of holies, they remain fixed in their holy station before [the k]ing (מ[לך]), spirits of [pure] colours in the midst of the appearance of the whiteness. And the substance of the spirit of glory is like work from Ophir, which diffuses [lig]ht. All their decorations are mixed purely, artful like woven material. These are the chiefs of those wonderfully clothed for service, the chiefs of the kingdom (ממלכות) <of the kingdom> of the holy ones of the holy king (למלך) in all the heights of the sanctuaries of the kingdom (מלכות) of his glory.

From a very early date, the peasant Jesus was deemed to have quickly risen up the theocratic hierarchy.

The Gospel tradition reflects such imperial grandeur and the exaltation of Jesus probably also involved some sort of enthronement. Moreover, there are strong hints of a restoration of the power of *Israel*. As we have seen, there is the Israel-focused enthronement, or at least elevated role of judge, in Matt 19.28 and Luke 22.28–30. We have similar ideas implied in Mark 10.35–45 and the question raised by the sons of Zebedee about sitting at the right and left of Jesus "in your glory" (Mark 10.37). We might add that there may again be a hint of an Israel-centred focus in Mark 10.35–45, which echoes the Maccabean martyr theology of dying for Israel (e.g., 2 Macc 7; 4 Macc 17:20–22), and which can likewise be associated with glorification after death (e.g., Dan 12.2–3). Dying for "the many" could imply Israel if it were being used in the more limited sense of "the many" we find in the Dead Sea Scrolls (1QS 6.1, 7–25; CD 13.7; 14.7). Needless to say, this is problematic evidence for any Palestinian reclamation of Jesus.

The Dictatorship of God in the Making

Nevertheless, the Gospel writers, like most of the other New Testament authors, still saw this in light of a more universal and even emancipatory project. But these traditions of enthronement, judging, and sitting with people at right and left also obviously envision—even in the earliest tradition—something far more hierarchical and less egalitarian than, for instance, John Dominic Crossan's famous "brokerless kingdom" in which all had equal access to God.[13] Even scholars whose Jesuses have more "apocalyptic" or "eschatological" traits than Crossan's Jesus can make similar arguments. For

[13] John Dominic Crossan, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991): 225–416.

example, Bart Ehrman claimed Jesus's eschatological teachings on the kingdom advocated and predicted "no more war," nonviolence, fair treatment of "all people," and a world free from demonic powers, disease, and poverty.[14] Ehrman is no doubt broadly right in making such claims; but perhaps we might also raise suspicions, as Ehrman himself appears to do, and think more about the ways in which power is involved in such theocratic thinking. The idea that the Gospel contrast of Christ with Caesar involved a non-imperial, non-monarchical, non-dictatorial alternative is prevalent in New Testament scholarship. For instance, Tom Thatcher argues that:

> Time and again—so often that it seems to be the rule rather than the exception—rebel leaders with high ideals become oppressive dictators once their movement has dispossessed the old regime. This observable fact of history is a surface manifestation of the many hidden hierarchies of power that operate within the communities of the oppressed before the revolution begins—the rebel leader was already a king of sorts and simply begins to act like one once he officially takes charge.... Viewed in this light, the genius of the footwashing lies in the fact that Jesus anticipates and precludes the emergence of anything like a new imperial order within his eschatological community. No one steps in to take the throne once the ruler of this world is cast out. In fact, there are no thrones, only footstools, and masters find themselves in the place of slaves, washing the filthy feet of the people over whom they have authority.[15]

Thatcher's argument is one of the rare occasions where a New Testament scholar attempts to come to terms with such language—and he takes seriously the postcolonial reading of John's Gospel by Stephen Moore.[16] However, it is also noticeable that Thatcher cannot escape the language of "authority" in respect of Jesus. Even if Thatcher is right about the absence of someone to take the throne once the ruler of this world is cast out, this does not alleviate the issue of power, at least not in the potential receptions of John. Thatcher is aware of the problems of the uncontrollable nature of reception: "there can be little doubt that the Gospel of John has been read in support of imperial politics—Roman, European, and, more recently, American." But perhaps there are already issues of dominance and power present in the text of John as it stands. This seems clearer still in the case of John 5.1–18 where the Johannine Jesus is in dispute with "the Jews" who, we should recall, want to persecute and kill him because of his view of the Sabbath and because he was "calling God his own Father, thereby making himself equal to God" (John 5.18; cf. John 10.30–33). This may be the language of a

[14] Bart D. Ehrman, *Jesus: Apocalyptic Prophet of the New Millennium* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 181.

[15] Tom Thatcher, *Greater Than Caesar: Christology and Empire in the Fourth Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009), 138.

[16] Moore, *Empire and Apocalypse*.

relatively powerless group who, for all we know, may also have experienced some degree of persecution for their high Christological beliefs (cf. John 16.2). In line with Thatcher, it may even be the case that John looked to a peaceful future.

But what happens once the conflict between Jesus and "the Jews" in John 5.1–18 gets placed in a context of Christian power? We need only think of how re-reading this story in light of the history of European Jews might show how narrative power relations can be heightened in light of a change in material power relations.

A particularly apt example of reading John 5.1–18 in changing relations of imperial and material power has been discussed by Mary Huie-Jolly.[17] Huie-Jolly illustrates how in light of the Anglo-Maori wars of the 1860s and early 1870s some indigenous Maori in New Zealand's Bay of Plenty region began identifying with "the Jews" of John 5 because they were the hostile enemy of Jesus, and thus Christianity. A further reason for such identification with "the Jews" involved the idea of the Israelites as the chosen people who were presumed to be entitled to the land, rather than the Canaanite settlers, that is, the European settlers. This is, of course, a classic case of a resistance to colonialism and the undermining of traditional ways of life and land rights. But Huie-Jolly sees such issues as implicit in John's argument as the Gospel: "[John] constructs a dominating Christology which has affinities with the universalizing claims of later colonialist Christianity." In this respect, we might note the shift in John 5 from Jesus as one whom "the Jews" sought to kill (5.18) to the all-powerful judge (5.19–23). The decision to identify with "the Jews" of John 5 was, then, part of "a decision to 'leave the way of the Son' and to resist colonial domination."[18]

Conclusion

Paul, or indeed Constantine, were not straightforwardly "betraying" the teaching of Jesus, even if most of the New Testament writers no doubt would have been unimpressed by their version of theocracy being co-opted by Rome. Imperialism, theocracy, empire, and, in modern terms, dictatorship, were as much a part of the Gospel tradition as was hope for the poor or the overthrow of the rich and the fall of Rome. The mimicking of one kingdom with another, one ruler with another, and one reward system with another only shows how the Gospel tradition is constrained by its imperial context. This is, as Roland Boer has pointed out (albeit himself someone who would embrace any potential "Stalinism" in the Gospels), "the tension between reaction and revolution that one so often finds with Christianity."[19] This is important for the topic that has been implicit throughout this chapter: the relationship to Palestinian resistance and universal emancipatory projects. Of course there are the major well-known issues of what comes

[17] Mary Huie-Jolly, "Maori 'Jews' and a Resistant Reading of John 5.10–47," in *John and Postcolonialism: Travel, Space and Power*, ed. Musa W. Dube and Jeffrey L. Staley (London: T & T Clark, 2002), 94–110.

[18] Huie-Jolly, "Maori 'Jews,"' 95–96.

[19] Roland Boer, "Apocalyptic and Apocalypticism in the Poetry of E. P. Thompson," *Spaces of Utopia* 7 (2009), 45, 50.

next—typically concerning the debates over a one- or two-state solution—which dwarfs the issues raised in this essay. But whether in exegesis, theology, or politics, the desire for dominance, power, and control remains strong. Exegetes should heed the warnings of Bakunin, Rocker, Luxemburg, Orwell, and Chomsky—for it is not clear that the Gospels are compatible with this strand of emancipatory thinking.

PART THREE

Post-Nakba Biblical Studies

TEN

The Jewish Jesus and the Israel-Palestine Conflict

Palestinian Liberation Theology, Anti-Judaism, and Jewish-Christian Relations

Michael J. Sandford

> *The most important achievement of Jesus scholarship in the last century is the acknowledgement of the foundational significance of Jesus being a Jew, appreciated and supported not only by those interested in the historical Jesus but also by followers of the biblical Jesus who is venerated by Christians around the globe.*
>
> — Roland Deines[1]

As the opening statement of Roland Deines's recent article suggests, Jesus's Jewishness is not just an area of importance for New Testament scholars, but is increasingly of interest to a much broader religious community. Popular Christian theologians such as N. T. Wright have often tried to emphasize the Jewishness of Jesus not only in scholarly work, but also in books for a lay audience,[2] and recent works such as *The Jewish Annotated New Testament*[3] are expressly concerned with informing a broader lay audience (both Jewish and Christian) about the relationship between the New Testament and Judaism. In a 2008 article in *Time* magazine, David Van Biema listed "Re-Judaizing Jesus" as a "future revolution."[4] Van Biema may have been a little late, for both popular

[1] Roland Deines, "Jesus and the Jewish Traditions of His Time," *Early Christianity* 3, no. 1 (2010), 344.

[2] For instance in N. T. Wright's popular New Testament For Everyone series (London: SPCK; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001–2011).

[3] Amy-Jill Levine and Marc Z. Brettler, eds, *The Jewish Annotated New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

[4] David Van Biema, "What's Next 2008: Future Revolutions: Re-Judaizing Jesus," *Time*, Mar 13, 2008, http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/article/0,28804,1720049_1720050_1721663,00.html.

and scholarly writings on Jesus's relationship to Judaism have been steadily produced for the last four decades. However, it is clear that the question of Jesus's relationship to Judaism is still a hot topic, as evident from popular works such as Shmuley Boteach's *Kosher Jesus*[5] and scholarly works like Daniel Boyarin's *The Jewish Gospels*[6] being just a couple of recent examples.

The contemporary social context in which the Jewish Jesus has risen to popularity is certainly not simple. On the one hand, research into the social world of first-century Palestine, aided and spurred on by archaeological research and the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in particular, has contributed vitally to our understanding of Jesus's Jewish context. On the other hand, the political culture in recent years in which the Jewish Jesus has grown from strength to strength must be noted. It was arguably after the so-called Six-Day War and a significant increase in American support of the state of Israel that interest in the Jewish Jesus really grew.[7] Although there was certainly some discussion of Jesus's Jewishness before this time, it is clear that Jesus scholarship since the 1970s has involved a huge increase in discussions about the Jewishness of Jesus.[8] In this respect, it could be said that support for the idea of Jesus being Jewish coincided with American support for the state of Israel to some extent—although I hasten to add that this need not *necessarily* detract from historical-critical scholarship that has highlighted the importance of Jesus's relationship to Judaism.

In *The Symbolic Jesus*, William Arnal made the suggestion that the Jewish Jesus "can become… a symbolic justification for the state of Israel."[9] For Arnal, this was seemingly more of a "hunch," based on "symbols, attitudes, and general ideological suggestions," than a developed argument. In this paper I suggest, in effect, that there is evidence to support Arnal's hunch. The following represents the beginnings of an examination of the relationship that claims about the Jewishness of Jesus can have with claims about the Israel-Palestine conflict. A vast amount of writing on the Jewishness of Jesus, no doubt, demonstrates no interest in the contemporary state of Israel and its politics and is far removed from such debates. I argue, however, that in Amy-Jill Levine's *The Misunderstood Jew*, concerns about the Jewishness of Jesus have become problematically intertwined with interests relating to the Israel-Palestine conflict.[10]

---

[5] Shmuley Boteach, *Kosher Jesus* (Jerusalem: Gefen Publishing House, 2012). See also Adam Gregerman's response, "It's 'Kosher' To Accept Real Jesus? Boteach Book Seeks To Strip Away Distortions of Christ," *Forward*, Feb 9, 2012, http://forward.com/articles/151028/its-kosher-to-accept-real-jesus/.

[6] Daniel Boyarin, *The Jewish Gospels: The Story of the Jewish Christ* (New York: New Press, 2012).

[7] James G. Crossley, *Jesus in an Age of Terror: Scholarly Projects for a New American Century* (London: Equinox, 2008), 145–72.

[8] See James G. Crossley, "Jesus the Jew Since 1967," in *Jesus beyond Nationalism: Constructing the Historical Jesus in a Period of Cultural Complexity*, ed. Halvor Moxnes, Ward Blanton, and James G. Crossley (London: Equinox, 2009), 119–37.

[9] William Arnal, *The Symbolic Jesus: Historical Scholarship, Judaism and the Construction of Contemporary Identity* (London: Equinox, 2005), 55.

[10] Amy-Jill Levine, *The Misunderstood Jew: The Church and the Scandal of the Jewish Jesus* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007).

Jews, Palestinians, and Questions of Continuity

Notions of continuity between "ancient Israel" and the contemporary state of Israel are fundamental to Jewish claims on the land of Palestine. As Keith Whitelam has highlighted,[11] the notion of continuity between "ancient Israel" and the contemporary nation state has, in fact, fundamentally shaped biblical studies as a discipline, as well as broadly shaping Western understandings of the history of the region in general. It is hardly surprising that related questions have arisen in the field of New Testament studies; in particular, I refer to what is now known as the *ioudaios* debate. In the past two decades there has been some debate over whether *ioudaios*—the term most frequently translated in the New Testament as "Jew"—would be better translated as "Judean" (or even, as John Elliot has argued, "Israelite").[12] While"Judean" has been favoured by a minority as an historically accurate term,[13] it is clear that such a term does not adequately convey the cultural and religious meanings associated with the terms "Jew" and "Jewish," and hence the framing of the recent *Marginalia* debate with the question, "have scholars erased the Jews from antiquity?"[14] In *The Misunderstood Jew*, Amy-Jill Levine linked the Jew-Judean debate to questions of continuity between ancient and modern Jews in an interesting way:

> The translation "Jew"… signals a number of aspects of Jesus's behaviour and that of other "Jews," whether Judean, Galilean, or from the Diaspora: circumcision, wearing *tzitzit*, keeping kosher, calling God "father," attending synagogue gatherings, reading Torah and Prophets, knowing that they are neither Gentiles nor Samaritans, honoring the Sabbath, and celebrating the Passover. All these, and much more, are markers also of traditional Jews today. Continuity outweighs the discontinuity.[15]

This is all very well, and I believe that Levine is correct on the *ioudaios* issue. However, she problematically goes on to use this idea of "continuity" to strengthen Jewish claims to land today. Levine states:

---

[11] Initially in Keith W. Whitelam, *The Invention of Ancient Israel: The Silencing of Palestinian History* (London: Routledge, 1996) and most recently in *Rhythms of Time: Reconnecting Palestine's Past* (Sheffield: BenBlackBooks, 2013).

[12] John H. Elliott, "Jesus the Israelite Was Neither a "Jew" Nor a "Christian": On Correcting Misleading Nomenclature," JSHJ 5, no. 2 (2007): 119–54. For a review of the debate, as it stood until recently, see Michael Kok's article in the present volume. The debate has since continued in *Marginalia*. See "Jew and Judean: A Forum on Politics and Historiography in the Translation of Ancient Texts," *Marginalia Review of Books*, Aug 26, 2014, http://marginalia.lareviewofbooks.org/jew-judean-forum/.

[13] E.g., Steve Mason, "Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 38 (2007): 460–80.

[14] Adele Reinhartz, et al, "Jew and Judean: Have scholars erased the Jews from Antiquity?" *Marginalia* (Aug 26, 2014), http://marginalia.lareviewofbooks.org/jew-judean-forum/.

[15] Levine, *Misunderstood Jew*, 162.

> The argument that Jesus is not a Jew but a Galilean and then the severing of *Jews today* [my italics] from any connection to the people of Israel in the late Second Temple period lead to the inevitable conclusion *that Jews have no connection—historically, ethnically, spiritually—to the land of Israel* [my italics]. Jesus the Jew becomes Jesus the Galilean, and Jesus the Galilean becomes Jesus the Palestinian.[16]

When Levine writes here of Jesus's Jewishness, it is apparent that she has one eye on present-day claims to the land. It is not problematic in itself that Levine discusses the question of Jesus's Jewishness in relation to contemporary claims to the land; she is, arguably, only making explicit those implicit questions that may lie beneath the surface of the aforementioned *ioudaios* debate.[17] But Levine's statement here seems rash, and unhelpfully suggestive in the connections that it draws between Jesus as a Galilean, the "severing of Jews today" from "the land of Israel," and the notion of Jesus as a Palestinian.

Another statement that Levine makes about Jesus's relationship to contemporary Palestinians is also worded in a problematic way. Levine states:

> Any writing that separates Jesus and his first followers from Jewish identity, associates these proto-Christians with the Palestinian population, and reserves the label "Jew" for those who crucified Jesus and persecuted the church is not only historically untenable but theologically abhorrent.[18]

Levine is certainly right that reserving the label "Jew" for those who crucified Jesus is misleading and completely indefensible. But Levine's statement could easily be interpreted as conflating "any writing that associates these proto-Christians with the Palestinian population" with the worst kind of theological anti-Judaism. Moreover, Levine could also be interpreted as saying that the association of Jesus and his first followers with "the Palestinian population" is theologically abhorrent. Levine is unclear here. In a certain sense, it seems relatively natural to make some connections between the Palestinian population and the people who once occupied the very same space as them. There is potentially a question of continuity and discontinuity here, as well. If it is acceptable to highlight Jesus's connection to Jews today because of certain shared beliefs and practices, is it not reasonable to allow some association between Jesus and Palestinians today because of their connection to the land, or their culture?[19]

---

[16] Ibid., 165.

[17] Elliott, I presume, was also gesturing towards the contemporary situation with his ominous closing comment that "so much is at stake." Elliott, "Jesus the Israelite," 154.

[18] Levine, *Misunderstood Jew*, 183.

[19] I pursue such questions at length in my article "Is Jesus Palestinian? Palestinian Christian Perspectives on Judaism, Ethnicity, and the New Testament," HLS 13, no. 2 (2014): 123–38.

Stereotyping of "Palestinian" in *The Misunderstood Jew*

I find further issues with Levine's treatment of the Israel-Palestine conflict in the section of *The Misunderstood Jew* which deals with Palestinian Christian theologians. To be sure, Levine makes some very reasonable statements on the subject. She states, for instance, that for effective inter-faith dialogue, a person should "not dismiss the suffering that they face," and that, ultimately, the "goal of Palestinian statehood is good."[20] Yet while Levine warns that her readers should not be dismissive of Palestinian suffering, I find her treatment of Palestinian Christian concerns dismissive; her section on "The Palestinian Jesus" is dedicated to critiquing Naim Ateek's theology as anti-Jewish. I would suggest that Levine's critique might be fairer if Ateek were a North American or British New Testament scholar making the same statements. But Ateek writes from a context in which violence against Palestinians is all too often justified in the name of Judaism. The peculiarity of his perspective ought to be acknowledged. Levine makes no concession for the negative effects that certain aggressive forms of religious Zionism may have had upon Ateek and his theology, or upon any other Palestinian's view of the Bible and of Judaism. I do not mean to disregard Levine's critique of Ateek's work entirely—and I will highlight the importance of her concerns later—but her portrayal of Ateek's work here as wholly negative is unhelpful. Considering the breadth of her readership and the popularity of this book, her treatment of such a delicate issue is insufficiently nuanced, where a proper and thorough engagement is warranted. It could be noted that Levine's comments on Ateek fall within a chapter that is concerned with a variety of cases of Christian anti-Judaism within liberation theology more broadly, and that a discussion of the positives of Ateek's work would not have fitted in that particular chapter. Nonetheless, Levine's portrayal of Ateek furthers the negative portrayal of Palestinians in general in *The Misunderstood Jew*.

Aside from Levine's presentation of Ateek, the overall picture of Palestinians that she paints draws heavily on negative stereotypes. Levine makes warnings in her "guidelines for successful inter-faith dialogue" that the reader should "not state that all Palestinians left their homes in 1948 'voluntarily,' …not equate all Palestinians with the violent few," and "not dismiss the suffering that they face."[21] Yet, unfortunately, Levine herself goes on to uncritically reinforce negative stereotypes of Palestinians. "On the positive side," she advises, readers should

> seek suggestions on how Israeli citizens might be secure from terrorism.… The Gaza pull-out has occurred, and bombers are still trying to blow up Israelis. Participate in this conversation, but also obtain information about Palestinian teaching and textbooks where not just anti-Israeli but anti-Semitic comments abound.[22]

[20] Levine, *Misunderstood Jew*, 185, 225.
[21] Ibid., 225.
[22] Ibid.

In this statement Levine suggests to her readership that it is not only Ateek who is anti-Jewish, but that the whole of Palestinian literature is in fact rife with not only anti-Israeli sentiments but antisemitism. Levine could state: "obtain information about Palestinian teaching and textbooks," or indeed, she could advise: "*read* Palestinian textbooks" (although this would of course entail some practical difficulties). Instead Levine highlights that Palestinian literature contains "anti-Semitic comments," a statement which is undeniably true of some Palestinian authors, but a statement which, in the context of Levine's other comments, continues to serve to present all Palestinian literature as antisemitic. This is not to deny that antisemitism exists in Palestine, for it certainly does. But a problematic image of Palestinians begins to emerge in Levine's book, in which Palestinians are very consistently equated with Christian anti-Judaism, antisemitism, or terrorism.

Presentation of Israeli State Violence in *The Misunderstood Jew*

I find further issues arising from Levine's discussion of the World Council of Churches' stance on the Israel-Palestine conflict. Levine notes that "the WCC praised the Presbyterian Church USA for its decision to put economic pressure on Israel and hailed its 'process of phased, selective divestment from multinational corporations involved in the occupation,' "[23] which one might call a partial implementation of the Palestinian call for international boycott, divestment, and sanctions for Israel. Levine's comments on the WCC's call for divestments are remarkable. She states:

> The targeted companies make equipment the Israeli army used to demolish homes belonging to the families of homicide bombers and by the Israeli government both to build what the churches consider illegal settlements and to construct the "security fence" designed to block off terrorist access to Israel.[24]

Levine's statement amounts to a defence of housing demolitions, for her statement suggests that the only homes that are demolished belong to "the families of homicide bombers," making her comments severely misleading.[25] Furthermore, her use of the past tense "used" suggests that housing demolitions are a thing of the past, when in fact they were happening when she was writing and have been happening up to this day. Despite the fact that Israeli settlements are illegal according to international law, Levine speaks of "*what the churches* consider illegal settlements" (my italics). And finally, she states that the function of what she euphemistically terms the "security fence" is "to block off terrorist access to Israel," a questionable claim considering that thousands of Palestinians live on either side of the wall.

[23] Levine, *Misunderstood Jew*, 171.

[24] Ibid.

[25] See the research and work of the Israeli Committee Against House Demolitions at http://www.icahd.org/.

Despite the issues that I have highlighted with Levine's *The Misunderstood Jew*, Levine continues to participate in dialogue on these issues, and expressed support for, and willingness to be involved with the Bible, Zionism, and Palestine conference. Although unable to come, Levine helped greatly, suggesting numerous different scholars whom she felt could fulfil a similar role to her at the conference, namely, to discuss the issue of Christian anti-Judaism. As it happened, none of these scholars, the vast majority of whom are based in North America, could attend either; although Adam Gregerman, who has also written critically about Palestinian liberation theology and Christian anti-Judaism,[26] would have attended if the conference did not clash with the Shabbat and the Shavuot holiday. Both Levine and Gregerman have challenged Palestinian liberation theology in their written work, but both demonstrate a warm willingness to participate in dialogue. It is only unfortunate that Levine's work, which is so popular, influential and excellent in so many ways, has been marred by an uncritical and ultimately ostracizing portrayal of Palestinian theologians and their work, which warrants further engagement, rather than hasty dismissal.

Christian Anti-Judaism

Levine's and Gregerman's critiques, on the other hand, should also not be dismissed. The Jewishness of Jesus, whilst increasingly acknowledged and discussed in Christian communities around the world, continues to be an issue of some concern and of some sensitivity, as demonstrated throughout Levine's book. Levine is not alone, however, for there remains a sense of caution amongst numerous New Testament scholars—both Jewish and gentile—about the possibility of minimizing Jesus's Jewishness; a fear no doubt rooted in the efforts of certain Nazi theologians in fairly recent decades. Furthermore, Christian anti-Judaic discourses, which have influenced Christian theology for centuries, continue to influence many strands of Christian theology.[27]

Some of the biblical language and metaphors that Ateek and others have used have clearly proven offensive to Levine and others. Levine gives three examples of such texts from Ateek. First, "Israel has placed a large boulder, a big stone that has metaphorically shut off the Palestinians in a tomb. It is similar to the stone placed on the entrance of Jesus's tomb." Second, "In this season of Lent, it seems to many of us that Jesus is on the cross again with thousands of crucified Palestinians around Him.… The Israeli government crucifixion system is operating daily." And third,

> Palestinians have been condemned as a nation by Israel, and sentenced to destruction. The accusations of people in power are strikingly similar throughout history to the charges levelled against Jesus in this city—terrorist,

[26] See Adam Gregerman, "Old Wine in New Bottles: Liberation Theology and the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 41, no. 3/4 (2004), 313–40.

[27] See, for example, Amy-Jill Levine, et al, "Roundtable Discussion: Anti-Judaism and Postcolonial Biblical Interpretation," *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 20, no. 1 (2004): 91–132.

> evildoer, or rebel and a subversive person. Palestinians are being crucified today for refusing to succumb to Israel's demand for greater concession on land.[28]

Western theologians today must demonstrate awareness of and sensitivity towards Christian anti-Judaism, and we can expect that their work will rightly be criticised, should they fail to do so.[29] I would suggest that a slightly more sympathetic approach, however, could arguably be afforded to the Palestinian Christian community. As Levine has commented herself, Christian anti-Judaism is a "colonial product,"[30] transported around the world by Western missionaries and academies; anti-Judaism can be found all around the world, and a Palestinian whose discourse becomes infected with it is no worse than anyone else. I am not saying that Palestinian Christians, as an oppressed minority, ought to be allowed to say whatever they like without repercussions. I am saying, however, that considering the ubiquity of anti-Judaic discourse, it is not a surprise that it surfaces in Palestinian literature. This is then exacerbated by the fact that Judaism, unfortunately, has been used to justify violent actions of the Israeli state.

If we bracket, for a moment, the concerns expressed about Palestinian Christian anti-Judaism by Levine and Gregerman, postcolonial biblical critic R. S. Sugirtharajah's concept of "heritagist" reading offers a different perspective on the way in which Ateek's hermeneutical methods may operate. Sugirtharajah describes heritagist reading as

> an attempt by the colonized to find *conceptual analogies in their high culture and textual traditions* and philosophies, and also in their oral and visual art forms. It is an attempt to retrieve cultural memory from the amnesia caused by colonialism. This retrieval takes place sometimes in the form of *reinterpretation of stories, myths, and legends* as a remembered history of a region, class, caste, gender, or race, sometimes as *intertextual interpolation of quotations, allusions, and references* [my italics].[31]

It is not surprising that Christians in the Occupied Territories turn to their sacred texts for images and metaphors with which to describe and understand their situations. This is not to say that comparing the Israeli government's actions to those of Herod the Great, or describing Palestinians as "crucified today" are particularly sensitive metaphors to use,

---

[28] Ibid., 183. Levine states that some of these examples come from Michael C. Kotzin's essay, "The Continuing Challenge of Anti-Semitism," presented at the meeting of the International Council of Christians and Jews, Chicago, IL (July 26, 2005), http://d11840.u26.azkihosting.com/article.asp?article=1512.

[29] Indeed I have argued that a growing awareness and understanding of Christian anti-Judaism is among the most important developments in New Testament studies. See Michael J. Sandford, "On the Past and Future of New Testament Studies: A Response to Larry Hurtado," *Relegere: Studies in Religion and Reception* 4, no. 2 (2014), 236.

[30] Levine, *Misunderstood Jew*, 169.

[31] R. S. Sugirtharajah, *Postcolonial Criticism and Biblical Interpretation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 55.

when seen in a centuries-long history of Christian anti-Judaism; this is to say, however, that a keen awareness of the context from which the interpretation arises is necessary. I do not believe that the statements of Ateek and certain others which have proven offensive to Levine (and others) result from a wilful desire to offend, but, more likely than not, from a heritagist mode of reading. The concern of Ateek and other such theologians, I believe, has often been simply to use biblical texts—that is, "conceptual analogies in their high culture and textual traditions"—to come to terms with their present situation, and to draw upon these texts in the hope of changing this situation.

Conclusion

My analysis of Levine's *The Misunderstood Jew* seems to go some way to supporting Arnal's suggestion that the Jewish Jesus can function as a "symbolic justification" for the state of Israel. I have demonstrated that this "misunderstood Jew" has been drawn into debates about the Israel-Palestine conflict not only by Palestinian theologians, and politicians like Shmuley Boteach, but also by biblical scholars such as Levine.[32] Questions surrounding the identity of Jesus—his Jewishness, his Palestinianness—are clearly pertinent to Jewish-Christian dialogue; as is, of course, the Israel-Palestine conflict in general. I hope that this piece therefore opens up some latent questions about the connection between the Jewishness of Jesus and the Israel-Palestine conflict.

[32] I am grateful to Amy-Jill Levine for responding to this article in the present collection. I have made some minor revisions to the manuscript since Levine's comments, but the essence of my critique and argument remains the same.

ELEVEN

Response to Michael Sandford

Palestinian Liberation Theology, Anti-Judaism, and Jewish-Christian Relations

Amy-Jill Levine

It is, as I told Michael Sandford when he sent the draft of his chapter to me, always salutary to hear how one sounds in the ears of another. I begin this short response with my thanks to him, my acceptance of culpability in some cases and gentle demurrals in others, and a few suggestions on where the conversation might go.

Corrections

Regarding my use of the past tense in describing house demolitions, Sandford is correct: this practice continues. Similarly, on textbooks, I could have been more precise (although "reading" either Palestinian or Israeli literature will falter less because of political pressure than the lack of skills most English speakers have with either Hebrew or Arabic).[1]

Sandford also surmises that I could be "interpreted as saying that the association of Jesus and his first followers with 'the Palestinian population' is theologically abhorrent." I thought I was clear in listing three claims that *together* create the problem: the other two factors are separating Jesus from his Jewish identity and restricting "Jews" to Christ-killers and Christian-persecutors. The association of Jesus with any group—Jesus the Mexican, Jesus the Aleut, Jesus the Palestinian—can be a theologically profound move. But to claim a multicultural reading while stripping Jesus of his own culture and then making his own culture into a negative foil can be theologically toxic.

[1] See now Council of Religious Institutions of the Holy Land, "'Victims of Our Own Narratives?' Portrayal of the 'Other' in Israeli and Palestinian School Books," *Study Report* (Feb 4, 2013), http://d7hj1xx5r7f3h.cloudfront.net/Israeli-Palestinian_School_Book_Study_Report-English.pdf.

Third, Sandford finds me dismissive of "Palestinian perspectives" and suggests that my critiques "might be fairer if Ateek were a North American or British New Testament scholar.… " In the few pages in which I address Ateek's statements, I also speak of Palestinian victimization, the legitimate concerns of the Palestinian people, and the "ugly rhetoric on the part of those who would oppose the Palestinian state." I explicitly noted abuses Palestinians face because I have too often heard their concerns dismissed; it is from my interest in a lasting peace in the Middle East that I do consulting work for both Americans for Peace Now and Churches for Middle East Peace. It is humbling, and instructive, to find myself accused of exactly what I was seeking to correct.

Those abuses do not, however, excuse the anti-Jewish tropes deployed by Ateek. To grant "concessions" strikes me as a pernicious form of Western imperialism that sets up a "separate but equal" system: those speaking from a position of colonialism or occupation are judged either ignorant or traumatized (pathologizing is a frequent and nasty move) and therefore given a pass in the promotion of hateful speech. The theologians I cited publish in Western presses, have degrees from Western Universities, and receive speaking invitations from Western universities and churches. Those who choose to appear on the international stage should be open to the same critique as anyone else.

Conversations

Sandford refers to "the social world of first-century Palestine"; more politically loaded is the claim that "notions of continuity between 'ancient Israel' and the contemporary state of Israel are fundamental to the Zionist narrative and to Jewish claims on the land of Palestine."[2] The Bible does not call the land Palestine, and the term is rare in Josephus and Philo. Romans used the term to erase Jewish presence, and scholars, by using "Palestine" rather than "Israel," or "Judea/Samaria/Galilee" do the same. Sandford could have used "Syro-Palestina," but that name compromises the immediate association between Palestine then and Palestine now. From Sandford's rhetoric, one could get the impression that ancient "Palestine" is the equivalent of modern "Palestine," and that no such place as Israel—those quotation marks Sandford places around "ancient Israel" renders even that name suspect—ever existed. I'd call this language "rash," but I do not want to be snarky.

Second, Sandford, following James Crossley, proposes that the Six-Day War and its attendant increase in American support of the state of Israel prompted interest in the Jewish Jesus. Temporal proximity is not the same thing as cause. More than the 1967 war, I think the Jewish interest in Jesus was sparked by *Nostra Aetate* (1965),[3] Hugh J.

[2] This statement was from an earlier version of the chapter. Sandford has now removed the reference to "the Zionist narrative," simplifying the statement to: "Notions of continuity between 'ancient Israel' and the contemporary state of Israel are fundamental to Jewish claims on the land of Palestine."

[3] Pope Paul VI [Giovanni Battista Montini], "Declaration on The Relation of The Church to Non-Christian Religions—*Nostra aetate*," *Holy See*. Oct 28, 1965.

Schonfield's *The Passover Plot* (1965)[4] and Samuel Sandmel's *We Jews and Jesus* (1965).[5] It was also about this time that departments of Religion, detached from Theology, appeared in American universities, and only then could Jews study the New Testament without having to bracket their own Judaism.

Third, Sandford suggests that NT scholars concerned about the minimizing of Jesus's Jewishness have "a fear no doubt rooted in the efforts of certain Nazi theologians.…" My concern is based in more optimistic settings. I would like more Jews to recognize Jesus as a Jew. As mentioned in *The Misunderstood Jew*, if we Jews can celebrate our connections to Freud, Einstein, and Marx (Karl and Groucho), surely we can do the same for Jesus. I would like more Christians to recognize Jesus's Judaism: its practices, theologies, ethics, scriptural interpretation, willingness to argue over the Law (and most everything else)—that recognition creates richer biblical appreciation, and it plants seeds for Jewish-Christian dialogue.

Finally, Sandford asks, "is it not reasonable to allow some association between Jesus and Palestinians today because of their connection to the land, or their culture?" This reasonable association should, I think, require acknowledgment of the Jewish roots of Jesus and his earliest followers, and so a connection between today's Palestinian Christians (and Muslims) and today's Israeli Jews. I like the idea of Jesus serving as a bridge between Jews and Christians, Israelis and Palestinians.

This bridge-building comports with my major concern in documenting negative depictions of Jews in Christian teaching. These depictions prevent me from being able to work with Rev. Ateek or with the signers of the Presbyterian 2010 report,[6] the British Methodist 2010 report,[7] and so on. Worse, they make it more difficult for me to convince Jews and Christians to my political right that there are potential partners for peace.

Sandford does "not believe that the statements… which have proven offensive to Levine (and others) result from a wilful desire to offend, but, more likely than not, from a heritagist mode of reading." While the prompts are not mutually exclusive, I would like to think that he is correct. If we can learn to hear through each other's ears and acknowledge our trespasses, we have a better chance of working together for peace.

---

[4] Hugh J. Schonfield, *The Passover Plot: A New Interpretation of The Life and Death of Jesus* (London: Hutchinson, 1965).

[5] Samuel Sandmel, *We Jews and Jesus* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965).

[6] Ted A. Smith and Amy-Jill Levine, "Habits of Anti-Judaism: Critiquing a PCUSA report on Israel/Palestine," *Christian Century* 127, no. 13 (June 29, 2010): 26–29; Response to letters, *Christian Century* 127, no. 18 (Sept 7, 2010): 6.

[7] Amy-Jill Levine, "Old Habits Die Hard: A Critique of Recent Christian Statements on Israel," International Council of Christians and Jews, Scholarly Contributions 507 (Feb 5, 2012), http://www.jcrelations.net/Old_Habits_Die_Hard__A_Critique_of_Recent_Christian_Statements_on_Israel.3797.0.html.

TWELVE

The Manipulation of History for Ideology

Pro-Palestinian and Pro-Zionist Examples

Lester L. Grabbe

In the past three decades and more, there has been an intense discussion about "Zionist foundation myths." There are a number of reasons for this, but the work of the Israeli "New Historians" was important as a catalyst or at least as a focus in academic circles.[1] Several of their books in the late 1980s showed that some of the foundation myths of the Israeli state were either wrong or in need of qualification. Other recent studies have examined the "Masada syndrome" and other historical elements important in the developing Zionist national tradition. To the best of my knowledge, the same debate has not yet taken place in pro-Palestinian circles. It is true that Edward Said's *Orientalism* did arouse a debate, though it went much beyond the issue of a Palestinian state. But in any case the Palestinian side also has its "foundation myths."

My aim in this paper is to discuss how both sides in the debate have attempted to manipulate history to support their own ends. The focus will be on examples mainly from ancient history to illustrate the point. The pro-Zionist examples include Masada and Bar-Kokhva; the pro-Palestinian examples will include Keith Whitelam's *The*

[1] Benny Morris, the one who coined the term "New Historian" for himself and several others, has pointed out that the debate had a number of causes, partly because of a developing openness in Israeli society but especially because of the opening of archives relating to 1948 under the thirty-year embargo rule, not only in Israel but in the US, Britain, and the UN. Several of the writings of the "New Historians" were widely read in academic and even popular circles, especially Morris's 1988 work on the refugee problem, *The Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem, 1947–1949* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988). As Morris has argued, the New Historians did not initiate the debate and made only a small portion of the change of attitudes ("long-term historical processes and a traumatic historical reality [in the First Intifada] were infinitely more important"), but the New Historiography represented a concern already becoming widespread. See Benny Morris, ed., *Making Israel* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2007), 6–7.

Invention of Ancient Israel and Shlomo Sand's *The Invention of the Jewish People*.[2]

Pro-Zionist Examples

I want to consider two examples from antiquity that have been important in modern Israeli nationalistic consciousness and education: Masada and Bar-Kokhva. Interest in both of them goes back at least to the nineteenth century and the beginnings of the modern Zionist movement.

Masada

Nachman Ben-Yehuda has written extensively on the part played by Masada in the modern history of Zionism and Israeli nationalism,[3] but the term "Masada complex" ("Masada syndrome," "Masada myth") long predates his work.[4] It has been defined as follows:

> the conviction … that it is preferable to fight to the end rather than to surrender and acquiesce to the loss of independent statehood.[5]

The following two quotations illustrate the place of the Masada in recent thinking:

> Nearly one thousand Jewish men, women and children who had survived the fall of Jerusalem refused to surrender to Rome. They took over King Herod's fortress on the steep rock-mountain of Masada by the Dead Sea. For three years they managed to hold their own against repeated Roman attempts to dislodge them. When the Romans finally broke through, they

[2] Keith W. Whitelam, *The Invention of Ancient Israel: The Silencing of Palestinian History* (London: Routledge, 1996); Shlomo Sand, *The Invention of the Jewish People* (London: Verso Books, 2010).

[3] For the history of Masada I draw on primary sources, as discussed in Lester L. Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian: Vol. I: Persian and Greek Periods*; *Vol. II: Roman Period* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992); *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period 4: The Jews under the Roman Shadow (63 BCE to 70 CE, with an Excursus to 138 CE)* (Library of Second Temple Studies; London and New York: T&T Clark International, forthcoming). But for discussion and examples relating to the modern situation, I have depended primarily on Nachman Ben-Yehuda, *The Masada Myth: Collective Memory and Mythmaking in Israel* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1995); Nachman Ben-Yehuda, *Sacrificing Truth: Archaeology and the Myth of Masada* (Amherst, NY: Humanity Books, 2002); Yael Zerubavel, *Recovered Roots: Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National Tradition* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995). Also consulted were Nachman Ben-Yehuda, "The Masada Myth," *Bible and Interpretation* (2000), http://http://www.bibleinterp.com/articles/2000/masada.shtml; Robert Alter, "The Masada Complex," *Commentary* 56, no. 1 (July 1973): 19–24.

[4] It has been traced back as early as 1963. See Zerubavel, *Recovered Roots*, 209.

[5] Susan H. Rolef, ed., *Political Dictionary of the State of Israel* (New York: Macmillan Publishing, 1988), 214.

> found that the Jews had committed suicide so as not to surrender to the enemy.[6]
>
> Today, we can point only to the fact that Masada has become a symbol of heroism and of liberty for the Jewish people to whom it says: "Fight to death rather than surrender; Prefer death to bondage and loss of freedom."[7]

Ben-Yehuda did a thorough survey of the cultural elements of the nation to check for the place and use of Masada in those contexts.[8] He concluded that examining all these areas gave a powerful cultural analysis with regard to the amount of correspondence between the presentation of Masada in Israeli culture and our primary source, Josephus.

The Masada mythical narrative apparently began to be created about the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.[9] It was used in a debate between two famous Zionist ideological leaders, Ahad Ha'am and Micha Yossef Ben-Gurion (Berdichevsky). Several developments gave it a considerable boost in the 1920s: a Hebrew translation of Josephus in 1923; the publication of Yitzhak Lamdan's most popular "Masada" poem in 1927; and the promotion of Masada as a heroic tale by Shmarya Guttman and the academic Joseph Klausner in the late 1920s and early 1930s. Guttman (1909–96) took a tour of the Dead Sea with friends in 1933 and climbed Masada, for which he had Josephus's account. He was the main one fostering a pilgrimage to Masada as a regular part of youth movements and Haganah training. He believed that knowing the land and fighting for it were essential elements of the Zionist consciousness.

The archaeological finds in the 1960s gave a new impetus to national interest in Masada. Few, if any, had more influence than Yigael Yadin (1917–84) who had been chief of staff of the Israel Defence Forces, before studying for a career as an archaeologist and Dead Sea Scrolls scholar. It was he who excavated Masada in 1963–65. The English version of his book in 1966 was *Masada: Herod's Fortress and the Zealots' Last Stand*, but the earlier Hebrew title translates literally as *Masada: In Those Days, At This Time* (הזה מצדה: בימים ההם בזמן), a phrase taken from the Hanukkah liturgy.

What we find in the Zionist collective memory are some definite changes of emphasis—if not to the actual story—from the account in Josephus. Some of these are the following:[10]

---

[6] From the 1985 booklet, *Facts about Israel*, published by the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Information Division, 22.

[7] Moshe Dayan, ed., *Masada* (Paris: Armand and Georges Israël, 1983), 21.

[8] These included the following (according to Ben-Yehuda, "The Masada Myth"): 1. Youth movements (the major seven youth movements in Israel, both secular and religious); 2. The Jewish underground movements in the Mandate period; 3. The Israeli army; 4. School textbooks in both elementary and high schools, and reference and encyclopedic works; 5. The daily printed media (secular and religious) during the 1963–65 excavations of Masada; 6. Presentations to tourists who visit the site of Masada; the printed manual tour guides; the numbers of visitors; the development of the site for tourists; 7. The presentation in art forms: children's literature; adult fiction; poetry; theater; movies; pictures; sculpturing; science fiction.

[9] Ben-Yehuda,"The Masada Myth"; Zerubavel, *Recovered Roots*, 62–65.

[10] Ben-Yehuda (*Sacrificing Truth*) has catalogued most of these. Although I am working from Josephus's own account, I find that Ben-Yehuda has done his research on Josephus carefully. For information on the

- *Some of the "Zealots" who were defending Jerusalem took refuge in Masada after the fall of the city in 70* CE.
  Josephus tells us that Masada was taken over in 66 CE by members of the *Sicarii*. They were a group who mainly attacked other Jews (supposedly collaborators with the Romans), even the high priest, using a hidden *sica* (type of dagger), beginning already in the 40s or 50s (*War* 2.13.3). Their name can thus be roughly translated as "Assassins." They obtained money by kidnapping (e.g., members of the high priestly family) and even by murder for hire. Their leader was assassinated by other Jewish groups, and they were driven out of the city and took refuge in Masada already in 66 CE (*War* 2.17.8–9; 4.7.2). They had no part in the defence of Jerusalem, but lived by raiding the local villages and robbing and killing fellow Jews (*War* 4.7.2; 7.8.1), using the excuse that these Jews had submitted to Rome. They are alleged to have massacred 700 fellow countrymen, including women and children, at En-gedi (*War* 4.7.2; 7.8.1).

- *It is common to refer to the defenders of Masada as "Zealots" (as Yadin does).*
  As noted in the previous point, the defenders were members of the *Sicarii*. The "Zealots" were one of the groups defending Jerusalem, and most of their members seem to have died there.[11]

- *A long siege (e.g., "three years") is implied in most discussions.*
  The siege was actually brief (*War* 7.8.2–9.2). The Romans established the siege, first building a wall around the site to prevent escape. They then constructed the ramp to get to the top. Once it had reached the top and they were able to deploy the battering ram, the climax came quite quickly. The siege lasted a few months at most.

- *Eleazar son of Jairus, the leader of the Sicarii, made a striking speech on the nature of freedom on the eve of the final Roman attack* (*War* 7.8.6–7).
  It was common for Greek and Roman historians to invent speeches and put them into the mouths of historical characters. The speech supposedly given by Eleazar was an invention of Josephus, though, interestingly, it is very religious: God as the only king, God's having abandoned the Jews, the immortality of the soul. It makes great copy for modern readers of the story, but we have no idea whether Eleazar made a speech or, if he did, what its contents were.

- *Most or all the defenders died fighting the Romans.*
  Josephus says nothing about attacks on the Romans (*War* 7.8.5). As the Romans were besieging the site and constructing a ramp to get to the top, they fired arrows and other missiles at the defenders. In Josephus's account, all the defenders did

modern situation, I depend on him and others as outlined in n. 3.

[11] On the Zealots, see Lester L. Grabbe, *Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period: Belief and Practice From the Exile to Yavneh* (London: Routledge, 2000), 287–88.

> was to try to defend against the siege measures, such as building a second defence wall when the first was breached. No doubt some defenders would have been killed by the Roman siege engines, but the vast majority died by suicide, before the Romans broke through.

As Ben-Yehuda pointed out, "The Masada mythical narrative played a crucial role in the crystallization of a new individual and collective identity for generations of Israeli Jews between the early 1940s and the late 1960s."[12]

At this point, however, we have a curious development. During the early days of statehood, many Israelis found the Holocaust embarrassing, a symbol of the Jewish victimhood that the new state aimed to eliminate. It was only from the early 1960s, with the Eichmann trial, that the Holocaust came to be an important part of collective memory. A commemorative day for the Holocaust was established by law in 1959, but this date served both for the Holocaust and Masada: Holocaust and Heroism Remembrance Day. Initially, the focus was on the heroic aspects of the Holocaust, such as the Warsaw Ghetto uprising, but attitudes to both events began to change in the late 1960s. Even more significant were the Yom Kippur war in 1973 and the events that followed.

These helped to create a new commemorative narrative that saw the similarities between the two events: the "tragic narrative" (as opposed to the earlier "activist narrative"). The tragic version "redefines Masada as the very end of Antiquity and the beginning of Exile.... The tragic commemorative narrative thus establishes a continuity between Masada, the Holocaust, and the State of Israel."[13] The two narratives exist side by side in modern Israel and tend to be called upon in different situations. As with the Bar Kokhva revolt, there have been scholarly debates about the facts of the siege of Masada and objections to its use as a symbol. Nevertheless, Zerubavel summarizes the current situation:

> In spite of these multiple voices of criticism, Masada has not lost its symbolic significance. Clearly, both the site and the myth have been transformed. In a more diversified and more politically polarized Israeli society, there is much less agreement on the interpretation of the past as well as it implications for the present. But Masada is still part of Israeli collective memory and still evokes strong responses. In this respect the criticism of Masada provides further evidence of its continuing, if transformed, symbolic significance for Israeli and Jewish political discourse.[14]

[12] Ben-Yehuda, *Masada Myth*, 14.
[13] Zerubavel, *Recovered Roots*, 194–95.
[14] Ibid., 213.

Bar-Kokhva

Unlike the 66–70 CE war, for which we have the detailed account in Josephus, we are poorly informed about the second Jewish revolt against Rome in 132–35 CE.[15] We have a couple of brief accounts in Roman sources, a short entry in Eusebius's *Chronicle*, and on the Jewish side a few rabbinic legends. Now, archaeology has added valuable data in the form of letters and documents left by refugees from the Roman advance, including even a few letters from Bar Kokhva himself. Yet even this primary evidence still leaves us with many unanswered questions.

Although the course of the revolt is basically unknown, we have archaeological evidence that Jewish fighters caused enormous damage to the Roman army.[16] Many concealed hideouts have been found from which Jewish raiders could make surprise attacks on the Roman forces.[17] Yet with Roman military resources the outcome was inevitable, and after three years the revolt was put down with huge Jewish losses.[18] Yet these numbers seem grossly exaggerated because the whole Jewish population was nothing like the amount to allow this. We have no indication on what information this number was based. It was probably just a guess, but it does probably reflect many Jewish deaths. Eusebius similarly writes, "Rufus, the governor of Judaea, when military aid had been sent him by the Emperor, moved out against them, treating their madness without mercy. He destroyed in heaps thousands of men, women, and children, and under the law of war, enslaved their land" (*Church History* 4.6.1). Bar Kokhva himself was killed, though because of legendary accretions to the story the exact manner of his death is unknown.[19]

The image of Bar Kokhva in the Zionist narrative had a much different emphasis from that in the rabbinic literary accounts. The Jewish sources were primarily negative, showing him as a false messiah whose leadership had led to a disastrous outcome for the Jews. There were elements of heroism in some of the stories, but he was a flawed hero who undermined his own success by his character faults. Zionism of the nineteenth

[15] The available information on the Bar Kokhva revolt is summarized, with a survey of primary and the main secondary studies, in Grabbe, *Judaism*; *Judaic Religion*. For a survey of views among Zionists from the nineteenth century to the present, I have mainly made use of Zerubavel's *Recovered Roots*.

[16] According to Cassius Dio, "Many Romans, moreoever, perished in this war. Therefore Hadrian in writing to the senate did not employ the opening phrase commonly affected by the emperors, 'If you and your children are in health, it is well; I and the legions are in health' " (69.14.3).

[17] See Amos Kloner, "The Subterranean Hideaways of the Judean Foothills and the Bar-Kokhba Revolt," *The Jerusalem Cathedra* 3 (1983), 83–96; "Underground Hiding Complexes from the Bar Kokhba War in the Judean Shephelah," *Biblical Archaeologist* 46 (1983): 210–21.

[18] Cassius Dio states, "Five hundred and eighty thousand men were slain in the various raids and battles, and the number of those that perished by famine, disease and fire was past finding out" (69.14.1).

[19] The rabbinic accounts are too legendary from which to extract useful information. Eusebius states rather cryptically, "The war reached its height in the eighteenth year of the reign of Hadrian in Beththera [Beter], which was a strong citadel not very far from Jerusalem; the siege lasted a long time before rebels were driven to final destruction by famine and thirst and the instigator of their madness paid the penalty he deserved" (*Church History* 4.6.3).

century rediscovered him and emphasized a positive nationalist hero, as opposed to the religious dimension that the rabbis associated with him. The Bar Kokhva fighters became the model of the Zionist pioneers who were fighting for freedom and a Jewish state. Bar Kokhva was a popular subject for children's stories, with a variety of legendary accretions.

As with Masada, archaeology gave a significant impetus to the appropriation of the Bar Kokhva revolt as a national symbol. And once again the chief instigator was Yigael Yadin, who led the exploration of caves in the Judean Desert where literary, artifactual, and skeletal remains from the time of Bar Kokhva were found. Yadin's sense of drama and showmanship was illustrated by the event of May 1960 when he presented a newly discovered document with the name "Simon bar Koseba, president of Israel" to the then president of Israel, Yitzhak Ben-Zvi: "In this act he thus symbolically erases the rupture of eighteen-hundred years of life in Exile."[20]

One interesting development was the change of date for the celebration of Bar Kokhva's fight against Rome. Traditionally, the fall of Beter was associated with the Fast on the 9th of Av, but this became changed to the Lag ba-Omer, originally a minor festival during the weeks between Passover and Shevuot. This allowed the heroic battle of Bar Kokhva to be emphasized, in contrast to the rabbinic attempt to suppress knowledge of the revolt.

This was not the end of the matter, however. The former general Yehoshafat Harkabi, a professor of international relations and a specialist in Israeli-Arab relations, wrote a short treatise in 1980 arguing that far from being an event to be celebrated, Bar Kokhva's revolt was a disaster that ought to be so commemorated. Harkabi was not a specialist in ancient history and admitted that his concern was with the implications for modern Israeli attitudes. He developed his thesis into a book that eventually appeared in English as *The Bar Kokhba Syndrome* (1983).[21] His arguments caused an enormous controversy, and his views were attacked even by some academics. By the time of the English edition, however, the Yom Kippur war had intervened, and Harkabi was able to add an epilogue that showed how this conflict had confirmed some of his earlier analysis.[22]

A rather different reaction concerned questions of archaeology and the views of the chief rabbi. The chief rabbi wanted the bones identified as those of the Bar Kokhva fighters (though some scholars argued against this identification) to be buried with Jewish religious ceremony. He argued this should be in the caves where they and various manuscripts were found. This caused a conflict with archaeologists, including Yadin who was by this time a political leader and part of the government coalition of the time. If the chief rabbi had got his way, it would have put the caves off limits to further exploration. The bones were eventually buried nearby in a state-sponsored ceremony, but Yadin and other archaeologists boycotted the proceedings. This is particularly ironic in

[20] Zerubavel, *Recovered Roots*, 57.

[21] Yehoshafat Harkabi, *The Bar Kokhba Syndrome: Risk and Realism in International Relations* (New York: Rossel Books, 1983).

[22] See the discussion in Zerubavel, *Recovered Roots*, 179–85.

that Yadin had promoted the state burial of the supposed defenders of Masada in 1969. Yet the events since then, especially the Yom Kippur war, had changed public attitudes in certain ways, and many (intellectuals, at least) agreed with the archaeologists.[23]

Pro-Palestinian Examples

Keith Whitelam

Keith Whitelam's *The Invention of Ancient Israel* aroused a lot of controversy when it appeared in 1996. An archaeologist friend from America proclaimed it "antisemitic" in a conversation with me, though he was somewhat mollified when I assured him that nothing in my experience indicated that Whitelam was in any way antisemitic, and I had known him for quite a few years. But this was the reaction of some, not least among the more conservative Israeli biblical scholars. Yet the Israeli archaeologist Israel Finkelstein reviewed the book rather more positively in the *Times Higher Educational Supplement*. My knowledge of Palestinian reactions are only indirect, but I understood that it was welcomed by some, though the extent to which it was read by knowledgeable professionals in the field is unclear.

While appreciating Whitelam's desire to right the balance in supporting the Palestinian cause, I argue that this and other attempts to manipulate scholarship to support political causes are misconceived. I have a number of criticisms of Whitelam's study from a purely historical point of view.[24]

First, he several times cites Edward Said's *Orientalism* in support of his conclusions.[25] Said's arguments are not laid out or critiqued; instead his opinion is given in a proof-texting manner, as if the matter were inarguable.[26] But although Said's arguments have been widely accepted in whole or in part, there have been considerable criticisms of his use of data. Three of the main book-length critiques have been published since Whitelam wrote, but there were already some sharp critiques from the beginning.[27] In

[23] Zerubavel, *Recovered Roots*, 185–91.

[24] I should point out that I agree in principle with his statements that the reconstructed history of ancient Israel found in many accounts is unjustifiable. See Lester L. Grabbe, *Ancient Israel: What Do We Know and How Do We Know It?* (London and New York: T&T Clark International, 2007).

[25] E.g., Whitelam, *Invention of Ancient Israel*, 1, 45, 67, 224–26, 234–36.

[26] See ibid.

[27] Some of the original critiques were Malcom H. Kerr, "Edward W. Said, *Orientalism*," *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 12 (1980): 544–47, www.campus-watch.org/article/id/2998; Bernard Lewis, "The Question of Orientalism," *New York Review of Books*, June 24, 1982; Fred Halliday, "'Orientalism' and its Critics," *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 20, no. 2 (1993), 145–63. Bernard Lewis was one of the main early critics and, though some of his comments are a conservative reaction, his arguments nevertheless merit consideration as a leading scholar in the general area. The main book-length critiques are Robert Irwin, *For Lust of Knowing: The Orientalists and their Enemies* (London: Allen Lane, 2006); Daniel Martin Varisco, *Reading Orientalism: Said and the Unsaid* (Publications on the Near East; Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2007); Ibn Warraq, *Defending the West: A Critique of Edward Said's* Orientalism (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2007). See also Christopher de Bellaigue, "Where Edward Said was Wrong," review of Robert Irwin, *Dangerous Knowledge*, *Times Literary Supplement* (May

such a controversial field, no one can defend his or her position by simply citing a disputed argument. A number of those who have written critically of Said's work actually agree with his overall aims and position but have found some serious weaknesses in some of his arguments.[28]

Secondly, a constant refrain in Whitelam's book is that scholars referring to the ancient peoples of Palestine do not refer to them as "Palestinians":

> Although he [John Bright] discusses the history of the region prior to the emergence of Israel, he never refers to its inhabitants as Palestinians. The land might be called Palestine, yet its inhabitants are Amorites, Canaanites, or Israelites.[29]
>
> The recognition [by Miller and Hayes] that this region was not the sole reserve of Israelites and Judaeans but was populated by various "inhabitants of ancient Palestine" (1986: 33) does not extend to their identification as "Palestinians."… It is possible to refer to the "Palestinian coastline," "Palestinian agriculture," or the "Palestinian economy" (1986: 51), but the inhabitants are never described as Palestinians.[30]
>
> The fact that they [a number of representative works] refer to the geographical region as Palestine but never refer to its inhabitants as Palestinians is a denial and silencing of Palestinian history.… All refuse studiously to use the term Palestinians to describe the inhabitants, even though the adjective "Palestinian" is acceptable to describe inanimate objects such as the physical setting or economy.[31]

These are strange statements and look even stranger as they are repeated time and again. "Palestinian" is a modern term, but scholars writing about antiquity want to be precise and also true to their sources. The sources use various ethnic terms, such as "Philistine" or "Phoenician." Any scholar who was so careless (or dogmatic) as to

17, 2006), www.campus-watch.org/article/id/2974; Irfan Habib, "Critical Notes on Edward Said," *International Socialism* 108 (Oct 17, 2005), http://isj.org.uk/critical-notes-on-edward-said/; Stephen Howe, "Dangerous Mind?" *New Humanist* 123, no. 6 (Nov-Dec 2008); Gary Kamiya, "How Edward Said Took Intellectuals for a Ride," *Salon* (Dec 6, 2006), www.salon.com/2006/12/06/orientalism/; Neil Templeton, "Orientalism: A Critique," *The Imperial Archive* (2007), www.qub.ac.uk/schools/SchoolofEnglish/imperial/transnational/Orientalism-critique.html; David Zarnett, "Edward Said and the Iranian Revolution," *Democratiya* 9 (Summer 2007): 43–53, http://dissentmagazine.org/democratiya/article_pdfs/d9Zarnett.pdf; David Zarnett, "Edward Said and Kosovo," *Democratiya* 11 (Winter 2007): 109–43, http://dissentmagazine.org/democratiya/docs/d11Whole.pdf; David Zarnett and Rayyan al-Shawaf, "The Legacy of Edward Said: An Exchange between Rayyan Al-Shawaf and David Zarnett," *Democratiya* 13 (Summer 2008): 171–204, http://dissentmagazine.org/democratiya/article_pdfs/d13ShawafZarnett.pdf.

[28] Both Irwin and Varisco articulate their agreement with Said's basic position.

[29] Whitelam, *Invention of Ancient Israel*, 45.

[30] Ibid., 45.

[31] Ibid., 46.

refer casually to such different peoples as simply "Palestinians" would be censured by colleagues for imprecision or even ignorance. Of course, there is also the consideration that the modern term "Palestinian/s" is a designation for the modern people and would create confusion if used of ancient peoples. For same reason, we never use the term "Israeli" for ancient Israelites, even though the term in the biblical Hebrew text is the same.

A further point (that Whitelam seems to have overlooked) is that if "Palestinian" is used as a generic designation of all the inhabitants of ancient Palestine, that would include Israelites and Jews. "Israel" and "Judah" were constituent kingdoms of ancient Palestine. Thus, if one chose to use "Palestinian" as a reference to inhabitants of the Palestinian region in antiquity, the Israelites and Judahites would be just as legitimately called "Palestinian" as any of the other peoples. Yet to do so would seem to negate Whitelam's whole concerns. Interestingly, Shlomo Sand wants to argue that the ancient Jewish inhabitants of Palestine are the ancestors of the modern Palestinians (see below)!

A third point made by Whitelam is that scholars such as Alt, Noth, and Albright were influenced in their views of the history of ancient Israel by the Zionist-Palestinian dichotomy existing in Palestine in the 1920s. For the most part, he gives no evidence for this claim, only attempting at best to infer it from their reconstruction of the history of Israel and often doing nothing but assert it. I find this very unconvincing. I see nothing in the writings of Alt, Noth, or Albright that reflected anything to do with the current Zionist-Palestinian controversy in the post–World War I Mandate. Albrecht Alt and Martin Noth might have been influenced by the situation with Prussia seeking to effect a union of German states.[32] But what I mostly see are scholars steeped in the Bible trying to make sense of the biblical text and the other data from the ancient Near East. With Albright it seems that a desire to support the biblical text where possible was the main influence on his views of history.

Albright might later have taken the side of the Israelis over against the Palestinians, as Whitelam points out.[33] But this is long after the 1920s and comes at a time when Nazi antisemitism, the Holocaust, and finally the creation of the state of Israel had been added to the equation. It is interesting to me since my teacher William Brownlee was very anti-Zionist. Although he occasionally made a barbed comment about Israeli treatment of Palestinians, he said little else about it because he (rightly!) thought it

[32] This is noted by Jack Sasson, though he comments that Noth based his thesis on a "richly detailed and very carefully presented analysis of the traditions regarding the rise of the monarchy": "On Choosing Models for Recreating Israelite Pre-Monarchic History," JSOT 21 (1981), 9. Whitelam himself cited Sasson's arguments (*Invention of Ancient Israel*, 79) but made no attempt to show that they were wrong and his right.

[33] Whitelam, *Invention of Ancient Israel*, 249, n. 8. He cites Leona G. Running and David N. Freedman, *William Foxwell Albright: A Twentieth-Century Genius* (New York: The Two Continents Publishing Group, 1975), 377–80, but his quote from that source (apparently an oral comment from Yadin) leaves out a telling phrase: "Of course he saw the problems which the creation of the State [of Israel] made for the Arabs; he admired the Arabs, he loved them. But *on balance*, as he always used to say, he thought that if there were two justs here, the justification for Israel to have a state was the greater one; that's why he supported Israel," 380 (italics original).

inappropriate to discuss such matters in class. But when asked by some students, he did distribute a reading list and some other pro-Palestinian material (which I still have). Yet Brownlee's views about the history of Israel were similar to Albright's, and I never heard him suggest any criticisms of other biblical scholars for taking a "pro-Zionist" interpretation of ancient Israel. This is because, in my view, most biblical scholars had no such model in mind; it is simply a figment of Whitelam's imagination. To make such claims without evidence is as absurd as the claim of my friend (cited above) that Whitelam was antisemitic, in spite of having no evidence of this claim.

One can debate the issue of trying to establish an ancient history for the Palestinians before Islam, though I question how interested Palestinians are in the matter. Indeed, I think most Palestinians would recoil in horror at being equated with the ancient polytheistic Canaanites! It is true that some Zionists have used the history of ancient Israel—illegitimately in my opinion—to support their cause. More frequent, however, is to use biblical material, such as the promise to Abraham. But I do not see what ancient Israel has to do with modern Zionism, nor what ancient Phoenicia or ancient Philistia have to do with modern Palestine.[34] I sympathize with the desire to write a history of ancient Palestine, but why does Whitelam not write it?[35] I agree with Whitelam's statement, "It is the historian who must set the agenda and not the theologian"; but I would go further and state, it is the historian who must set the agenda and not the politician!

Shlomo Sand

Sand is one of the few radicals to have an Israeli university post, but this is probably because his specialty is modern French history, and he has written little on Israeli or Zionist history. His recent *Invention of the Jewish People* has sold very well in Israel as well as the English-speaking world but has also attracted a huge amount of criticism. The reason is that the thesis of his book is that the idea of the Jewish nation and even Jewish identity is a modern invention. He claims that a large number of Jews in the Roman empire arose through conversion; likewise, the bulk of European Jews originated as converts of the Khazar kingdom (ironically, precisely an argument used in some antisemitic quarters). He further concludes that the descendents of the ancient Jews of Palestine are the modern Palestinians.

Sand is dealing with areas outside his area of competence, and those of us who specialize in the history of the ancient Jews find seriously weak arguments in his book. (That does not prevent his stating his own opinion firmly even in those areas where he should show more caution and humility.) The question of the Khazars is outside my own area of knowledge, though it has been critiqued as problematic.[36] Some specialists have argued that there may have been large numbers of converts in the Roman Empire, but

[34] Whitelam, *Invention of Ancient Israel*, 68.

[35] Ibid., 69.

[36] See Anita Shapira, "The Jewish-People Deniers," review of Shlomo Sand, Hebrew edition of *The Invention of the Jewish People*, *Journal of Israeli History* 28 (2009): 63–72.

that is controversial and not the view of most specialists in Second Temple Judaism.[37] It is generally agreed that there was no special Jewish mission for converts, as we later find among Christians. There were also many obstacles to conversion. First, circumcision would have been a major obstacle to male converts, which is why there seem to have been more female converts. Secondly, there was great hostility toward the Jews in the eastern Mediterranean after the Hasmonean state and help provided by the Judeans to the Romans in their conquest of Egypt, manifest in the widespread attacks on the Jewish communities in Greek cities of the East after the 66–70 revolt began.[38] Thirdly, after 70 CE Jews were tagged as "rebels" against Rome and were required everywhere in the Roman Empire to pay a "Jewish tax" (Josephus, *War* 7.6.6; Cassius Dio 66.7). Finally, circumcision was forbidden to non-Jews by Roman law, a law reaffirmed by Antoninus Pius after the Bar-Kokhva revolt.[39]

Thus, there were many obstacles to conversion. There is also the problem of estimating the number of Jews at the time, which is difficult. Yet we do know that there were some conversions, such as the Adiabene royal house, and under Hasmonean rule there was mass conversion forced on the Idumeans and the Itureans. Whether the Itureans remained Jews is not known, but it seems that many Idumeans did, even coming to the aid of the rebels in Jerusalem during the 66–70 CE revolt.[40] Furthermore, I have argued against relying on scholarly consensuses (such as that against the widespread conversion under the Romans) as evidence for maintaining a particular view.[41]

Yet, even were we to accept Sand's stance about widespread conversion for the sake of argument, there are major problems with his position about Jewish identity. The question of Jewish identity was hardly an innovation of Sand: it has been debated for a long time, but this has not generally been to discount that the Jews had an identity as a people (or an *ethnos* in the Greco-Roman world). In fact, I have published two discussions on Jewish identity, and I can say that Sand has largely missed the point.[42] The fact is that the Jews had an ethnic identity for centuries in the ancient Near East and Greco-Roman world after they ceased to be a nation. Without going over the long debate about ethnic identity, a widely accepted definition is the following:

---

[37] Louis H. Feldman has argued for a great deal of conversion: *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993); "Conversion to Judaism in Classical Antiquity," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 74 (2003): 115–56. A discussion of the question of Jewish conversion is found in Grabbe, *Judaism*, 534–37; *Judaic Religion*, 292–97.

[38] For a discussion and further bibliography on these, see Grabbe, *Judaism*, 449.

[39] See Grabbe, *Judaism*, 570–71 and the references there.

[40] Grabbe, *Judaism*, 329–31, 457–59.

[41] See Lester L. Grabbe, "The Case of the Corrupting Consensus," in *Between Evidence and Ideology: Essays on the History of Ancient Israel read at the Joint Meeting of the Society for Old Testament Study and the Oud Testamentisch Werkgezelschap Lincoln, July 2009*, ed. Bob Becking and Lester L. Grabbe (OTS 59; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 83–92.

[42] See Grabbe, *Judaism*, ch. 3; *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period 2: The Coming of the Greeks: The Early Hellenistic Period (335–175 BCE)* (Library of Second Temple Studies 68; London and New York: T&T Clark International, 2008), ch. 6.

> a group of people who share most—but not necessarily all—of the following: (1) a collective proper name; (2) a myth of common ancestry; (3) historical memories; (4) one or more differentiating elements of common culture; (5) an association with a specific homeland (which may be symbolic, without physical control of the homeland); and (6) a sense of solidarity among at least parts of the group.[43]

This refutes one of Sand's main points, that being a Jew was based on religious identity. Again, Sand is unaware of the debate. To summarize a longer discussion I have given elsewhere, religion is a part of ethnic identity but only one part. Already in the Persian and early Hellenistic periods the term *Ioudaios* had associations with the territory and people of Judah. The Hebrew designation *Yehudi* (יהודי "Judahite") arose as a reference to those from the area of *Yehuda* (יהודה "Judah"). However, it is not just a "geographical" designation since it always seems to have had an ethnic connotation; that is, even those living outside Judah were still called "Judahites." Those deported from Judah by Nebuchadnezzar continued to be referred to as "Jews/Judahites" (Jer. 40:11; 44:1; Esther 2:5; 3:6, etc.). The colony at Elephantine continued to call its members *Yehudi*/*Yehudaya* (יהודי/יהודיה) generations after the original settlers had left Judah to live in Egypt.

In the papyri, identifying someone by *Ioudaios* is comparable to identifying someone as Macedonian, Thracian, Athenian, and Persian. Some of these terms are debated and may not be ethnic designations in all contexts, but they are ethnic terms in at least some contexts. The overwhelming impression is that you were a *Ioudaios* in the Greco-Roman world if you were born one. Ethnic identity naturally included religious peculiarities, and both insiders and outsiders regarded certain religious practices as characteristic of being a Jew. Yet Jewish identity was hardly an exclusively religious matter. The question can in part be clarified by considering those Jews who are reported to have abandoned their Judaism in antiquity. The examples suggest that abandoning the Jewish religion did not make them cease to be Jews. While religion was part of ethnic identity, it was not the sole criterion even among Jews.

The Jews are referred to repeatedly in Greco-Roman sources as a "people" (*ethnos*, *laos*). They were identified in the Greco-Roman period as another people or ethnic group alongside many such at the time. They were not seen as only a religion, in the same way as Isis worshipers or similar religious conversion groups were. As Martin Goodman (a historian of Rome and Jews under the Romans) notes, Roman sources

---

[43] Raz Kletter, "Can a Proto-Israelite Please Stand Up? Notes on the Ethnicity of Iron Age Israel and Judah," in *"I Will Speak the Riddles of Ancient Times": Archaeological and Historical Studies in Honor of Amihai Mazar on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. Aren M. Maeir and Pierre de Miroschedji (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 574. A similar definition is given in Sergey Sokolovskii and Valery Tishkov, "Ethnicity," in *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*, ed. Alan Barnard and Jonathan Spencer (London and New York: Routledge, 1996): 190–93.

refer to the Jews as a *natio*, a "people, race, nation."[44]

Here we come to the crux of the matter: one of the most curious of Sand's claims concerns what he calls "ethnobiology," by which he seems to mean the idea that ethnic identity depends on biology—on DNA. In a number of references he indicates his disapproval of this concept, and rightly so. But this immediately exposes the major flaw in Sand's argument: he has made Jewish identity a matter of DNA—of ethnobiology! He is essentially saying that the Jews could not be a people because they have diverse origins. Leaving aside the controversy over whether they really have such diverse origins as he claims, this does not prevent their being a people, an *ethnos*. As noted above, ethnic identity usually has some form of presumed kinship between members of the group, but this is frequently manufactured and is usually only a myth. But all those with a Jewish identity claim most of the six characteristics for an ethnic group as found in the definition of Kletter and others. They are an *ethnos* or people, regardless of common DNA. Sand has contradicted his own argument.

Conclusions

I have examined several examples of where history has been manipulated for political purposes in the Israeli-Palestinian controversy. In my opinion, such manipulation is unjustified and contrary to good history work. As well as writing extensively on ancient Jewish and Israelite history, I have set out my principles for writing history at length. A major principle is that if you allow ideological concerns—however noble they might seem at the time—to structure your research and your historical reconstruction, you undermine and call into question the validity of all your historical work.

The two Zionist examples examined aspects of collective memory that have a long history. There are of course many other examples of collective memory used for nationalistic purposes in Zionist thinking, some of which have been critiqued by the Israeli New Historians since the late 1980s. But in spite of all the negatives and faults, at least there has been a public debate, and the attitudes of many ordinary Israelis not in the academic establishment have been altered in some sense as a result. What is very much needed is a similar public self-examination on the part of Palestinians and their supporters.

One may have sympathy with the plight of the Palestinians, but the historical criticisms of the Zionist enterprise are equally valid, mutatis mutandis, for the Palestinian endeavour. As Gershom Gorenberg asks,

> If a collective, politicized narrative obstructs Israelis' view of their past, why is building such a narrative positive for Palestinians? If fragmentary testimony helps us understand how Palestinians experience 1948 and how

[44] Martin Goodman, "Secta and Natio," review of Shlomo Sand, *The Invention of the Jewish People*, *The Times Literary Supplement* (Feb 26, 2010).

> memory changes over time, might not Israeli testimony have the same value?[45]

One cannot reject Zionist myths and then turn around and support Palestinian ones. You cannot reject Zionist use of the Bible or the history of ancient Israel and then create some sort of artificial ancient history for modern Palestinians. Both invent history for ideological causes, and both are equally invalid.

[45] Gershom Gorenberg, "Memory Serves: Two Books Look at Oral Testimony and Israel in 1948," *Bookforum*, Sept-Nov 2007, http://www.bookforum.com.

THIRTEEN

On the Manipulation of History for Ideology

A Response to Lester Grabbe

Keith W. Whitelam

Lester grabbe set himself the task of examining how history has been manipulated for ideological purposes by comparing what he labels "pro-Zionist" and "pro-Palestinian" examples. His choice of case studies is puzzling. The first section on the use of Masada and the Bar Kochba revolt is a rehash of standard treatments of these episodes in collective memory and their use in contemporary Zionist narratives. His two so-called "pro-Palestinian" examples—my *The Invention of Ancient Israel: The Silencing of Palestinian History* and Shlomo Sand's *The Invention of the Jewish People*[1]—can hardly claim to be "foundation narratives" or "foundation myths" in the same sense. Grabbe's attempt to demonstrate "balance" in his work fails because the examples he has chosen are not comparable. A more meaningful comparison might have been between *The Invention of Ancient Israel* and *The Invention of the Jewish People* and two recent volumes on the history of ancient Israel, for instance.

However, rather than respond to the article as a whole, I will concentrate on his specific criticisms of *The Invention of Ancient Israel* (hereafter *Invention*) since he levels some serious charges against my work. This will also raise more general issues about the nature of history writing and ideology.

Answering the Charge of Antisemitism

I find Grabbe's opening remarks about my book, however well intended, both puzzling and troubling. He cites an anonymous friend, an American archaeologist, as claiming that *Invention* was "antisemitic." Why the scare quotes here? What are they meant to

[1] Keith W. Whitelam, *The Invention of Ancient Israel: The Silencing of Palestinian History* (London: Routledge, 1996); Shlomo Sand, *The Invention of the Jewish People* (London: Verso Books, 2010).

signify? Either the friend claimed it was antisemitic or he/she did not. Grabbe's response, though welcome, is hardly a thorough rebuttal of such a charge: "nothing in my experience indicated that Whitelam was in any way antisemitic, and I had known him for quite a few years." The response to the anonymous archaeologist and the anonymous "more conservative Israeli biblical scholars" whom he claims think the book is antisemitic is simple. Prove it! Analyze the text and show where and how it is antisemitic. If not, withdraw the charge.

Until the publication of *Invention*, many of the issues explored in the book had not been raised in print or in academic debate at major conferences. There was never a serious attempt to engage with the book and show how or where it is antisemitic. The charge of antisemitism—usually issued in private conversations, like the one Grabbe reports—only serves to show the bankruptcy of ideas of those who were unable to address the issues. It was part of a whispering campaign to try to vilify, to isolate, to intimidate, and to silence arguments that threaten a consensus narrative. Unfortunately, Grabbe, by prefacing his remarks in this way only adds to that kind of whispering campaign.

The whispering campaign against the book and against me personally is not a serious attempt to combat antisemitism. It is, in my view, an offensive and immoral use of the suffering of Jews to try to silence the debate on how the history of ancient Israel has been constructed and, more importantly, how it has been utilized to support the Israeli government's treatment of the Palestinians and the continued occupation of Palestinian land in contravention of international law and numerous UN resolutions. Its effect has been to warn off others, particularly younger scholars, who might have the audacity to challenge the consensus narrative or question the objectivity of mainstream biblical studies. It is the last resort when the normal means of manufacturing and maintaining consent within the discipline fail.

The Reception of *Invention*

One of the most surprising aspects of Grabbe's paper are the number of errors it contains, especially from someone who is normally so careful. In mentioning briefly the immediate reception of the book, he claims that Israel Finkelstein was more positive in a review in the *Times Higher Education Supplement* (THES) than some conservative Israeli biblical scholars, whom he prefers not to identify. Grabbe does not give any bibliographical details for this review. I am unaware of any such review in the THES.

There was an article in the THES (January 19, 1996) by Simon Taggart shortly after the publication of the book, entitled "The Bible Bashers," which was based on an interview with me, his reading of the book and reactions from various scholars. In a side panel under the title of "Reality of Ancient Israel," Israel Finkelstein disagreed with two of the main theses of the book.[2] He claimed that ancient Israel could not have been invented because it "is a real and important historical, political, social and ideological

[2] Simon Taggart, "The Bible Bashers," THES, Jan 19, 1996.

phenomenon" for which there is ample evidence. I assume that this was a misunderstanding of my point that Western scholarship has "invented" ancient Israel in the image of the European nation state: I was not claiming that some entity called "Israel" did not exist in the ancient past. Finkelstein also disagreed with the view that Palestinian history has been silenced claiming that "the torrent of recent work on the history of medieval Palestine and the Palestinian peasantry (including works by Israeli deconstructionists) disprove Whitelam." Although again I think that Finkelstein misses the point, this is not the issue in the current context. Finkelstein did not offer a positive review of the book as Grabbe claims. Unless there is a more positive review of *Invention* in a later issue of THES of which I am unaware—and I am happy to be corrected on this—then it brings into question the accuracy of Grabbe's representation of scholarly views. In an article in which he claims that I have manipulated scholarship, this is not an auspicious opening.

In a further brief comment on the reception of the book, Grabbe claims that his knowledge of Palestinian reactions are only indirect, though he understands it was welcomed by some. What exactly is this meant to prove? Is this supposed to show that the book is a new Palestinian foundation myth? Although it might have received a favourable reaction from some Palestinians, Grabbe questions how far it might have been read by "knowledgeable professionals in the field." What conclusion is the reader to draw from this? That those Palestinians who might have welcomed the book were not part of the high priesthood of biblical studies and so unable to have an informed opinion of their own?

Such comments at the opening of this section hardly give the reader confidence that they are about to be presented with a critically informed and insightful analysis of the book.

The Manipulation of Scholarship

Grabbe's most serious charge is that I have manipulated scholarship to support a political cause. This is different from his declared intention at the opening of the article where he claims to be examining the manipulation of history. The charge has now become the manipulation of scholarship. He focuses his criticisms on three areas, supposedly "from a purely historical point of view."[3]

[3] This phrase—"from a purely historical point of view"—is meaningless in the context. A number of the examples he chooses are about my use and representation of various scholarly views (Said, Alt, Noth, and Albright) not about the way I reconstruct (or manipulate) history. The only one to which such a phrase might apply is his discussion of the use of the term "Palestinians." It is not clear to me what the phrase is meant to signify, unless he is trying to claim that he is not making any "political" judgements and again trying to demonstrate "balance" in his comments.

Edward Said

Grabbe complains that I cite the work of Edward Said as a proof-text rather than laying out his arguments and critiquing them. Grabbe's own contribution to scholarship in recent years has tended to focus on summarizing a wide range of scholarly views before adding a few comments of his own. However, *Invention* is a very different type of work. As a research monograph, it was arguing a particular case by analysing how biblical studies as a discipline had developed its model of historical scholarship. I had assumed an intelligent reader—whether Palestinian or non-Palestinian, biblical specialist or non-biblical specialist—who is capable of assessing Said's views for themselves.

He claims that "in such a controversial field, no one can defend his or her position by simply citing a disputed argument." I used the work of Said, amongst others, to set out some of the theory and underlying principles behind my analysis of biblical studies throughout the rest of the book. Said's classic work on Orientalism had been published in 1978, nearly 20 years before, was well known, even though it had not been used extensively in biblical studies. The idea that I should not have used Said because his work is controversial and some people disagree with him is astonishing. Does Grabbe believe that I was unaware of the academic industry generated by Said's work or had not read this material? I also cite the work of Fernand Braudel, Franz Fanon, Robert Young, Aimé Césaire, and even Philip Davies, among many others. Are they to be excluded as well because their views are controversial and not universally accepted? I make no apologies for using the work of someone I consider to be one of the most important intellectuals of the late twentieth century.

Grabbe's lengthy footnote n. 27, which lists various criticisms of Said, properly deserves the description "proof-texting." In the first place, Grabbe's list ignores many of the more substantive and engaged criticisms of Said, while cataloguing a number of populist reviews and responses in newspapers, magazines, and online sources. But perhaps the majority of academic engagements with Said have, rather than rejecting his thesis outright, added their own refinements or other developments to it. For example, subsequent studies have demonstrated that Orientalism was a significant ideology outside of the great colonial powers France and Britain, to which Said largely confined his analysis in *Orientalism* (e.g., Russia,[4] the Netherlands,[5] and Germany[6]). Such developments in scholarship, while critiquing the particular form of Said's thesis, also serve to demonstrate its generative power—which is a measure of *Orientalism*'s fundamental legitimacy.

---

[4] Daniel R. Brower and Edward J. Lazzerini, eds, *Russia's Orient: Imperial Borderlands and Peoples, 1700–1917* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1997).

[5] Michael Laffan, *The Makings of Indonesian Islam: Orientalism and the Narration of a Sufi Past* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011).

[6] Todd C. Kontje, *German Orientalisms* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004); Suzanne L. Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire: Religion, Race, and Scholarship* (Washington, DC: German Historical Institute; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

More disturbing is that Grabbe has found at least two of his online sources, according to his citations, from *Campus Watch*, which is a notorious McCarthyite organization responsible for campaigns against academics who are openly critical of Israeli policies. Among other activities, *Campus Watch* has arranged for the sending of hundreds or thousands of emails to academics with whom it disagrees (i.e., "e-mail bombing"), and runs campaigns aimed at stultifying their freedom of speech via government officials, university administrators, and corporate funders. Furthermore, in Grabbe's attempt to give the impression that the quantity of critiques of Said is overwhelming, he has evidently scoured the internet less than discreetly, even including a paper by Neil Templeton from a source called the *Imperial Archive*. Presumably Grabbe missed the fact that Templeton's short paper was a class assignment for an MA course at the School of English at the Queen's University of Belfast.[7] With all due respect to the student, inclusion of such a source in Grabbe's list demonstrates either a considerable lack of critical acumen or simple negligence, and makes transparent an attempt to create the appearance of a long list of critiques of Said, all the while neglecting to mention the ongoing value of Said's influential thesis within genuine scholarship.

In any case, the major point that I was trying to make—the most important aspect of *Invention* as far as I am concerned—is that just as in Said's analysis of orientalist discourse, we need to be aware of and critically analyze the discourse of biblical studies: "a powerful, interlocking network of ideas and assertions believed by its practitioners to be the reasonable results of objective scholarship while masking the realities of an exercise of power."[8] My contention was that the analysis and exposure of this network of ideas, assumptions, and power was preliminary to any attempt to write a history of Palestine.

This is not a manipulation of scholarship. It would have been manipulation if I had misrepresented the work of Said and then used that to try to support my arguments. Said certainly did not think that I had manipulated or misrepresented his views as he chose *Invention* as one of his two books of the year in the *The Times Literary Supplement*. He described it as:

> a remarkable work of scholarship, certainly audacious enough, despite its painstaking manner, to undermine many unthinking presuppositions about ancient biblical history.… The book possesses that keen independence of

[7] Neil Templeton, "Orientalism: A Critique," *The Imperial Archive* (2007), https://web.archive.org/web/20081014041348/http://www.qub.ac.uk/schools/SchoolofEnglish/imperial/transnational/Orientalism-critique.html.

[8] Whitelam, *Invention of Ancient Israel*, 4. Said acknowledged in a later essay that "Whitelam is quite right to criticize my own work on the modern struggle for Palestine for not paying any attention to the discourse of biblical studies. This discourse he says was really a part of Orientalism, by which Europeans imagined and represented the Orient as they wished to see it, not as it was, or as its natives believed" ("Invention, Memory, Place," *Critical Inquiry* 26 (2000), 187).

spirit and vision that is so rare and so invigorating when one encounters it.[9]

The Use of the Term "Palestinians"

Grabbe objects to my use of "Palestinians" on the grounds that it is a modern term and that scholars writing about antiquity should be precise and true to their sources. The section from which Grabbe quotes and conflates is part of a discussion of the denial of Palestinian time and space. It is an examination of the ways in which the discourse of biblical studies through its search for ancient Israel has ignored the wider aspects of the history of Palestine. I was using the term to signal the need for a broader regional history of Palestine as opposed to the narrow search for ancient Israel that has skewed the history of this region.

The early unequivocal identification of the inhabitants of the proliferation of small Iron Age villages as "Israelite" is one illustration of the power of the discourse of biblical studies to determine the shape and outcome of research. In many cases, we do not know how the inhabitants of a town, village, or pastoral group identified themselves. However, despite the fact that scholarship frequently used the terms "Palestine," "Palestinian coastline," "Palestinian economy," even where there is no evidence to suggest a specific identity for the inhabitants of a village or town, the generic term "Palestinian" is never used. It is only ever used of inanimate objects.[10]

The growing awareness that the material culture of these villages was indigenous undermined the attempt to impose an ethnic label on their inhabitants. Finkelstein, in recognizing the problems that the new information about the hill country villages raised for the assumption that the inhabitants were "Israelites," proposed the term "hill country settlers." The response of Hershel Shanks was that the settlement of the hill country in Palestine in the early Iron Age is of "special interest" only if the inhabitants were Israelite: "if the people were not Israelites, they have as much interest to us as Early Bronze Age IV people. That does not mean that we are uninterested, but it does mean considerably less interest than if they were Israelites."[11] The search for ancient Israel, a key feature of the discourse of biblical studies, has produced a hierarchy of interest, often forcing other aspects of the history of the region to the margins.

The initial response by biblical historians and archaeologists to this growing threat to the consensus narrative was to try to reclaim the villages by describing their inhabitants as "proto-Israelites." The ensuing debate revealed the ethno-centric view of Israel that

[9] Edward W. Said, "International Books of the Year," *The Times Literary Supplement* (Nov 29, 1996).

[10] Strangely, he seems to miss the point that "Palestinian" is being used here to signal the need for a regional history, but is willing to consider "Canaanite" as a geographical term: "the term 'Canaanite' probably applies to territory rather than ethnicity; that is, a 'Canaanite' seems to be the inhabitant of a region or land rather than the member of an ethnic group": Lester L. Grabbe, *Ancient Israel: What Do We Know and How Do We Know It?* (London: T&T Clark International), 20, 50–52.

[11] Hershel Shanks, "When 5613 Scholars Get Together in One Place: The Annual Meeting," *Biblical Archaeology Review* 17 (1991), 66. See Whitelam, *Invention of Ancient Israel*, 199 for a critique of this view.

permeated the discourse of biblical studies. In what source do we find this ethnic label? What degree of precision is being utilized when scholars regularly refer to the inhabitants of Iron Age highland villagers as "proto-Israelites"? Grabbe claims that "any scholar who was so careless (or dogmatic) as to refer casually to such different peoples as simply 'Palestinians' would be censured by colleagues for imprecision or even ignorance." I have searched Grabbe's discussion of ethnicity in *Ancient Israel: What Do We Know and How Do We Know It?* in vain for any censure of carelessness or dogmatism for those who use the term "proto-Israelite."

Grabbe is mistaken in his claim that I have overlooked that if "Palestinian" is used as a generic designation of all the inhabitants of ancient Palestine, this would include Israelites and Jews, as well as the kingdoms of Israel and Judah.[12] I was arguing for the need for an integrated history of Palestine that stretched from the ancient past to the present. In writing the history of one land, Palestine, that has been inhabited by many different peoples and groups over the centuries, it is the long-term trends—population movements, economic fluctuations, the shifting fortunes of the towns and villages, etc.—that tie such a narrative together. My use of the term "Palestinian" presupposed an inclusivist reading of history. It is opposed to the exclusivist and nationalist historiographies that emphasize difference and separation by insisting on precise ethnic labels being imposed on the past. Unfortunately, all too often, our histories of ancient Israel are presented as though they are histories of Palestine: the history of ancient Israel subsumes the history of the region as a whole. Thus the Iron Age becomes the exclusive property of the history of Israel and thereby detached from Palestinian history. The kingdoms of Israel and Judah, whatever form they took, as well as the modern state of Israel, are threads within that wider history of Palestine.

Similarly, to talk of Palestine's history as only a modern phenomenon is to curtail chronology artificially, as if the present is not the result of deep-flowing currents from the past. It is this idea which has led to the situation where the past, particularly the Iron Age, seems to be divided from the present and so seemingly does not belong to Palestinian history. It is a curtailing of history that is all too often carried out in the service of modern, ethno-centric nationalism; a history that emphasizes that which is different or separate. When I am out walking in the Peak District outside Sheffield and come across dry stone walls and various field patterns, are they not the result of long-term patterns of land use which stretch back centuries before? Similarly, are the agricultural terraces found throughout the West Bank not the result of ancient currents that flow into the present? Attempts to understand the history of ancient Palestine as part of an integrated narrative that continues into the present have been hindered by the way in which the history of ancient Israel has come to dominate and subsume the past.

In his frustration, Grabbe asks why I do not write a history of ancient Palestine. Again, this is puzzling since he claims to be critiquing *Invention*: I stated in the intro-

[12] He claims that this would negate my "concerns," though what these concerns are is not defined.

duction that this was not a history of ancient Palestine but an attempt to expose the cultural and political obstacles that stood in the way of such a task.[13]

My recent work, *Rhythms of Time: Reconnecting Palestine's Past*,[14] offers my understanding of Palestine in the Iron Age as part of a coherent narrative that runs from past to present. It is an inclusive narrative, not one driven by ethnic identity or narrow nationalism. It focuses on how its inhabitants, regardless of ethnic label, responded to changing natural and economic rhythms of the region. Grabbe may not approve of it, of course, but at least I have answered his question.

Representing Alt, Noth, and Albright

Grabbe says that I offer no support for the view that Alt, Noth, and Albright were influenced in their views of the history of ancient Israel by the "Zionist-Palestinian dichotomy" existing in Palestine in the 1920s and that he is unconvinced by my argument.

Once again, the analysis of the work of Alt, Noth, Albright and others was part of the analysis of the power of the discourse of biblical studies. The so-called immigration and conquest models had begun to lose their persuasive power as a result of fresh archaeological information and changes in the intellectual climate. What I was trying to illustrate was why these models had been so powerful and continued to exert influence despite changing perspectives or the growing weight of evidence against them. Although Grabbe only sees "scholars steeped in the Bible trying to make sense of the biblical text and the other data from the ancient Near East," no scholar can interpret such evidence outside of the dominant concepts of their own thought worlds.[15] I was trying to show how the reconstructions of ancient Israel by western scholars mirrored the social and political circumstances in which they found themselves. I prefaced this analysis with the following:

> This is not a standard review of the relative strengths and weaknesses of German and American scholarship from the 1920s onwards, a function already provided by the many convenient reviews. It is an attempt to illustrate the theological and political assumptions which have contributed to the dominant definitions of Israel's past. It is designed as a commentary, using their own words, to illustrate just how far their constructions of

[13] Whitelam, *Invention of Ancient Israel*, 1–2.

[14] Keith W. Whitelam, *Rhythms of Time: Reconnecting Palestine's Past* (Sheffield: BenBlackBooks, 2013).

[15] In footnote 32, Grabbe cites Jack Sasson's comment that Noth based his thesis on a "richly detailed and very carefully presented analysis of the traditions regarding the rise of the monarchy" (Jack Sasson, "On Choosing Models for Recreating Israelite Pre-Monarchic History," JSOT 21 (1981), 9). He then says that although I also cite Sasson's arguments, I make no attempt to show that they were wrong. The reason for that is that I believe Sasson to be correct. I consider Sasson's article on Israelite historiography to be one of the seminal articles in the field. He illustrated how American and German scholarship was influenced by the political context in which it was conceived. That is not to deny that Noth had carried out a detailed analysis of the text, but to try to explain how his interpretation was informed by a particular model of the past.

> the past have mirrored and are implicated in contemporary struggles for Palestine. What it reveals is a series of imaginative pasts which have been responsible for the silencing of Palestinian history in the name of objective scholarship.[16].

I was not suggesting that this was a wilful distortion of the past but trying to show how our reconstructions are located firmly in their own contemporary worlds. Of course, Grabbe may not be convinced by the analysis that follows. But this was not a manipulation of scholarship, as he charges. It is a relatively detailed examination of the classic works of biblical scholarship using their own words. Readers can easily check whether or not I represented the views of these scholars accurately, even if they remain unconvinced by my analysis.

Unfortunately at the time of writing *Invention*, I was unaware of Norman Cantor's brilliant analysis of medieval studies, *Inventing the Middle Ages: The Lives, Works, and Ideas of the Great Medievalists of the Twentieth Century*.[17] His description of medieval studies as a cyclical process in which once powerful ideas lose their explanatory power and are replaced is equally applicable to biblical studies:

> What was wrong was not the application of powerful modern ideas to interpreting the Middle Ages but the lack of the self-critical temperament to recognize their limitations and to reexamine assumptions periodically. What was wrong was not too much intellectualization in medieval studies but too little. It is well-nigh inevitable that once a group of scholars has gained success working with a set of intellectual assumptions and, following from the work using these ideas, has advanced to positions of comfort and power within the academic establishment, self-criticism wanes, and the ideas and assumptions that once were novel inspirations, held tentatively, harden into orthodox academic dogma, which the next generation is supposed to parrot.[18]

The work of great biblical scholars of the past (and the present), just like the medievalists described by Cantor, was fashioned amidst the tremendous social and political upheavals of their own times. In particular, I was exploring the role of the nation state and the different perspectives of competing national scholarly traditions in shaping how and why the history of ancient Israel was constructed differently by German and American scholarship. The world in which scholars pursue their research is imprinted on their work but usually this only becomes apparent in retrospect as perspectives and intellectual currents change.

---

[16] Whitelam, *Invention of Ancient Israel*, 73–74.

[17] Norman F. Cantor, *Inventing the Middle Ages: The Lives, Works, and Ideas of the Great Medievalists of the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Lutterworth Press, 1991).

[18] Ibid., 38.

Many biblical scholars continue to long for "the golden age" of Alt, Noth, and Albright and deplore the move away from their seemingly dispassionate world. Yet like all "golden ages," it is a myth: an analysis of their work reveals a world of committed scholarship. Biblical studies has always been a conceptual site of struggle for power and authority. It reflects the geopolitical world of which it is a part and a contributor.

Grabbe also claims that I misrepresent Albright's views, particularly by selective quotation. However, as with Alt and Noth, there is a detailed analysis of his classic works against the background of his religious convictions and the social and political events taking place at the time of their inception. I also discuss Albright's oscillating views on contemporary events, as evidenced in his article "Why the Near East Needs the Jews," published in *New Palestine* in 1942.[19] My conclusion was that Albright's Israel of the Iron Age was a mirror image of the Israel of his present. His construction of this imagined past bears the imprint of the world in which he lived and operated.

Any reader is free to disagree with my analysis, of course, but can easily check if I have manipulated and misrepresented Albright's views. Grabbe claims that when I cite Yadin's comment that Albright had been "so free and open in supporting Israel politically, even in public press conferences, that I had to caution him a bit that he should perhaps be more careful on that," I leave out "a telling phrase" from Running and Freedman's work on Albright: "Of course he saw the problems which the creation of the State [of Israel] made for the Arabs; he admired the Arabs, he loved them. But on balance, as he always used to say, he thought that if there were two justs here, the justification for Israel to have a state was the greater one; that's why he supported Israel."[20]

I am baffled by Grabbe's charge of selective quotation because a careful reading of the footnote to which he refers, where I quote Yadin's view, has the following sentence:

> He describes Albright as a champion of Israel but one who recognized the problem that the creation of the modern state caused for the Arabs. "*But on balance*, as he always used to say, be that if there were two just causes here, the justification for Israel to have a state was the greater one."[21]

Leaving aside any discussion of the belief that the dispossession and persecution of one group of people to solve the persecution of another can be described as a higher justice, Grabbe seems to have overlooked the fact that I do acknowledge Albright's view of two just causes and his recognition of the problem that the creation of the modern state caused for Arabs. Where we disagree is on the interpretation of this view.

---

[19] William F. Albright, "Why the Near East Needs the Jews," *New Palestine* 32, no. 9 (1942): 12–13.

[20] Leona G. Running and David N. Freedman, *William Foxwell Albright: A Twentieth-Century Genius* (New York: The Two Continents Publishing Group, 1975), 378.

[21] Whitelam, *Invention of Ancient Israel*, 249, n. 8, quoting Running and Freedman, *Albright*, 380.

History and Ideology

Grabbe's final comments on the writing of a history of Palestine further illustrate where we disagree on the nature of history writing. He questions how interested Palestinians are in the history of ancient Palestine, claiming that they would recoil in horror at being equated with ancient polytheistic Canaanites.

The writing of history is not dependent upon popular demand or acclaim; Palestinian or otherwise. Where in *Invention* are Palestinians equated with Canaanites? It is Grabbe who introduces the terms "pro-Zionist" or "pro-Palestinian" into the debate. These terms and his other comments reveal an assumption that history writing must be a nationalist enterprise. His immediate impulse appears to be to assume that history is essentially about difference.

When we examine Grabbe's principles for history writing—as set out in *Ancient Israel: What Do We Know and How Do We Know It?* for example—what we find are a set of proposals that are standard procedures that most, if not all, historians would claim to follow. Grabbe also included the instructions for the use of his hermeneutical machine for the production of neutral history: "The only valid arguments are historical ones. Ideology, utility, theology, morality, politics, authority—none of these has a place in judging how to reconstruct an event." It would seem that unlike the great biblical scholars or medievalists of the past, Grabbe believes that anyone who purchases his machine is able to escape the social and political upheavals that shape the lives of their contemporaries. What his machine produces is a colourless, disjointed narrative of "events," devoid of creativity or passion.

Although historians claim to follow very similar procedures, what we find in the case of British, American, Indian, Sri Lankan history, for instance, are differing and competing constructions of the past. Grabbe admits that historians are human and that subjectivity is inevitable. But what is subjectivity if not the product of the social, political, and religious background of the historian? The claim to produce ideology-free history is an ideological claim. It is part of the facade of objectivity that has characterized much of the history writing in biblical studies, particularly during the period of dominance of the Albright school.

Invention was born out of a question that had exercised me for some time. When we look at the debates that have swirled around the history of Israel and the supposed crisis of history that it was said to reflect, what does all the re-evaluation amount to when the same themes remain the focus of those who work in the field? Why the proliferation of works when the issues are constantly recycled and particularly when the shape of the history remains the same, unlike other fields of history? Is it solely due to inertia within the discipline? Or does it reveal the means by which consensus is manufactured and maintained within biblical studies?

Despite the high profile debates on history in biblical studies in recent years, there remains an existing consensus, involving a network of buried assumptions that need careful and patient analysis. It represents a powerful system of interests which has the

ability to manufacture consent by incorporating, frustrating, or, on odd occasions, silencing any challenges to its dominant position. It is, you might say, a mainstream orthodoxy against which it is very difficult to argue or provide alternative visions of the past.

It is reflected in the ways the so-called minimalist challenge has been dealt with in recent years. Many aspects of that debate have been incorporated into the orthodox position through the selection of what is considered to be the appropriate subject of history, while those aspects of the debate that cannot be managed in this way have been marginalized, or on occasions, demonized (particularly as a warning to younger scholars). It is a self-regulating system in which the preconceptions and assumptions that form this complex network are internalized through training and debate, so that scholars and students operating with complete integrity are able to convince themselves that their choices are unrestrained and objective.

Constraints are built into the system and operate in many different ways: the construction and choice of courses and course materials, which form part of the training of the next generation of scholars; the selection of topics that are deemed worthy of research; the constraints of the job market; the selection of research papers at conferences; the funding of research projects, including the evaluation of research for government funding; the publication of research; and so on. The kinds of choices that are made by biblical scholars, the particular emphases or the omissions, become understandable in the context of the discourse of biblical studies, that vast complex of assumptions and ideas that has build up over a century or more and operates below the surface but determines the nature, shape, and outcome of the debate. It helps to explain why our histories retain their essential shape and why we do not have alternative visions of Palestine's past; in short, how history is forged within our discipline.

Understanding the system in this way raises the critical question about how we choose to operate as biblical scholars, particularly if one of our particular concerns is the shaping and moulding of history. It is important, in my opinion, to use our privileged position to try to expose the ways in which our worldly affiliations influence scholarship, to challenge vested interests and unseen power and the unargued assumptions that mask their influence, and to offer a counter view which confronts the orthodox vision of the past.

Thus, we are faced with some very difficult personal questions about how we should act, particularly when faced with charges of antisemitism. It is a situation that requires constant vigilance, asking why have I made this choice, and whom does it serve? In asking myself these questions, I constantly return to Edward Said's discussion of the role of the intellectual and the recognition of the critical line between individual responsibility and the authority of consensus:

> Nothing in my view is more reprehensible than those habits of mind in the intellectual that induce avoidance, that characteristic turning away from a difficult and principled position which you know to be the right one, but

> which you decide not to take. You do not want to appear too political; you are afraid of seeming controversial; you do not pursue an issue or present and argument because you fear of being accused falsely of antisemitism; you need the approval of a boss or an authority figure; you want to keep a reputation for being balanced, objective, moderate; your hope is to be asked back, to consult, to be on a board or prestigious committee, and so to remain within the responsible mainstream; someday you hope to get an honorary degree, a big prize, perhaps even an ambassadorship.[22]

[22] Edward W. Said, *Representations of the Intellectual: The 1993 Reith Lectures* (London: Vintage, 1994), 74.

FOURTEEN

Christian Claims on the Inheritance of Israel

Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho the Jew

Michael J. Kok

Underlying some reconstructions of Christian origins is a dichotomy of Christian universalism and Jewish particularity. For instance, three of the four pillars of Second Temple Judaism(s) listed by James Dunn are election, covenant, and land.[1] Despite dating the "parting of the ways" of Christians from Jews to between 70 and 135 CE,[2] he considers Jesus and Paul to be precursors to the Christian negation of these pillars. According to Dunn, Jesus's practice of open table-fellowship challenged the internally drawn boundaries and his responses to the Syrophoenician woman and the centurion suggest that he "[r]egarded faith expressed by whomsoever as more important than the ethnically understood and ritually expressed boundaries surrounding and protecting the elect people."[3] Paul also opposed a covenantal nomism which set Israel apart in its "ethnic distinctiveness."[4] To be fair, Dunn notices descriptions of Christians as the "true Israel" (e.g., Justin, *Dial.* 11.5) or a "third kind" of humanity (e.g., Clement, *Strom.* 6.5) but judges such language to reflect a fall from an original universalistic ideal:

> Here was a great irony: Christianity began by rejecting the *ethnocentricity*

[1] James D. G. Dunn, *The Partings of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity* (2nd ed.; London: SCM, 2006), 26–47.

[2] Dunn, *Partings*, 312–18. His new preface stresses that the plural in "partings" signals a process rather than a single clear-cut split between two monolithic traditions, "Judaism" and "Christianity," but he concedes that the process was longer and more complicated than he had supposed (xix–xxiv).

[3] Dunn, *Partings*, 152, cf. 141–53. See Mark 7.24–30 (Matt 15.21–28); Matt 8.5–13/Luke 7.1–10.

[4] Dunn, *Partings*, 178, 181, cf. 194. Dunn indicates that he does not wish to revive the dichotomy between universalism and ethnocentrism (xxvii, n. 65), but this is contradicted by his reading of certain texts. He reads Rom 2.28–29 as a critique of a Jewish identity constructed in "too formal, outward, physical and ethnic terms" (181, 194) or Rom 9.6–13 as shifting the definition of "Israel" from an ethnic designation to one that revolves around the divine calling, a calling extended to the Gentiles (xxvii).

> of *Judaism* and of *Jewish* Christianity; but in coming to think of itself as a separate "race," it opened the door to a different kind of racialism, where Christians defined themselves by excluding the Jews, making the very mistake against which Paul in particular protested so vehemently.[5]

Appeals to Christian egalitarianism and inclusivism have served the cause of liberation theology, but it is frequently at the expense of setting up "Judaism" as a negative foil.[6] Daniel Boyarin fairly protests that racism is not just on the side of the particular but can also be on the side of an imperialistic universalism that refuses the right of others to retain their difference.[7] There is an additional problem of historical anachronism, as "religion" was bound up with ethnic identity in antiquity, so criticism of the ethnic "boundary markers" would have been perceived as an attack on Jewish identity.[8] The strongest objection to the contrast of Christian universalism against Jewish ethnocentrism is the number of recent studies that underscore the importance of "ethnic reasoning" in early Christian identity formation.[9]

The self-representation of Christians as a distinct people (ἔθνος, γένος, λαός) is often dismissed as fictive as if other ethnic identities had a fixed and primordial essence.[10] Although Stanley Stowers has a largely positive assessment of Denise Buell's foundational work in this area, he objects that, "[a] writer's claim that a recently formed group is an ancient ethnicity is not the same as a population that has lived for hundreds of years on land passed down with practices that form the belief that these people inherently belong to the land."[11] However, I want to build on Buell's case that Justin Martyr understood the Christian community as an ancient *ethnos* akin to the nation of Israel, regardless of how incredible the claim may have sounded to onlookers, and demonstrate that the hallmarks usually associated with ethnic identity such as a shared name, ancestry, kin-

[5] Dunn, *Partings*, 314–15 (emphasis added).

[6] See Denise K. Buell, *Why This New Race: Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 11–12; Caroline Johnson Hodge, *If Sons then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 44, 46, 128.

[7] Daniel Boyarin, *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 233–35.

[8] Paula Fredriksen, "Mandatory Retirement: Ideas in the Study of Christian Origins whose Time Has Come to Go," *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 35, no. 2 (2006), 238; "What Parting of the Ways? Jews, Gentiles and the Ancient Mediterranean City," in *The Ways that Never Parted*, ed. Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 39–40.

[9] This terminology was coined by Buell, *New Race*, 2. See also Judith M. Lieu, *Christian Identity in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 239–68; Hodge, *If Sons*; Love L. Sechrest, *A Former Jew: Paul and the Dialectics of Race* (London: T&T Clark, 2009); Michael Kok, "The True Covenant People: Ethnic Reasoning in the Epistle of Barnabas," *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 40, no. 1 (2011): 81–97; David G. Horrell, "'Race,' 'Nation,' 'People': Ethnic Identity-Construction in 1 Peter 2.9," NTS 58 (2012): 123–43.

[10] Thus, Hodge (*If Sons*, 17) resists the language of "fictive" kinship because it may give the impression that there is a pure, natural kinship that is not a social product and that the Christian claims are less real.

[11] Stanley Stowers, "Review of *Why This New Race? Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity*, by Denise K. Buell," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 75 (2007): 730.

ship, territory, customs, and cult are present in his *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*. To legitimize his Christ association as an ethnic community after severing its ties with the Jewish people, Justin completely appropriates the heritage and land of Israel.

Ancient Ethnic Reasoning with Special Reference to the Ἰουδαῖοι

There has been a shift in the academic understanding of ethnicity from a natural and biologically self-perpetuating to a socially constructed category.[12] Fredrik Barth influentially argued that the chief feature of ethnic identity is that it is ascribed and a social boundary is set up between insiders and outsiders, though that boundary encloses ever-changing cultural content and remains permeable for individuals to cross.[13] Not only is primordialism unable to account for this mutability within ethnic identities, but it also neglects the emergence of new ethnic groups under colonial conditions which claim primordial status and reinterpret older cultural resources.[14] This is not to adopt an instrumentalist view that ethnic symbols are consciously exploited to attain certain political ends, a position which condescendingly disregards the self-understanding of members of minority collectivities or the durability of such groups over time.[15] Human constructions wield real power over social life and it is impossible to re-negotiate identity or stir up collective sentiments if such negotiations fail to convince the actors involved.[16]

While recognizing that ethnicity is socially constructed, Jonathan Hall insists that its defining criteria are a myth of collective descent and kinship, an association with a specific territory, and a shared history. Biological features, language, religion, or culture are relegated to "secondary *indicia*" or "surface pointers."[17] For instance, Jews look back to their ancestor Abraham who was promised a homeland and a lineage.[18] Caroline Hodge explains the logic of patrilineal descent: sons inherit the property of the fathers and incorporate wives into the family line.[19] The rite of circumcision (Gen 17.9–14) on the male generative organ was a sign of belonging to Abraham's lineage

[12] I take up the debate about whether Ἰουδαῖοι should be translated as "Jew" or "Judaean" below.

[13] Fredrik Barth, "Introduction," in *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference*, ed. Fredrik Barth (London: Allen and Unwin, 1969), 13–16. John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith note that Barth is open to critique for assuming the fixity of bounded ethnic identities: "Introduction," in *Ethnicity*, ed. John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 9.

[14] Jack Eller and Reed Coughlan, "The Poverty of Primordialism," in Hutchinson and Smith, ed., *Ethnicity*, 46.

[15] Jonathan Hall, *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 18–19; Hutchinson and Smith, "Introduction," 9. Not even Eller and Coughlan deny that there are some long-lasting social realities ("Primordialism," 47).

[16] Hodge, *If Sons*, 22, 162 n. 96; Sechrest, *Former Jew*, 47–48.

[17] Jonathan Hall, *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2002), 9; *Ethnic Identity*, 25.

[18] See Gen 12.1–3; 13.14–17; 15.4–5, 7, 18–19; 17.2–8, 19–21; 22.16–18.

[19] Hodge, *If Sons*, 22.

and a fertility rite to perpetuate his line of descendants (cf. Philo, *Spec. Laws* 1.7).[20] When the province of Yehud was re-established under Persian rule, the religious elites tried to strengthen the communal boundaries by enforcing endogamous marriage (Ezra 10.9–44, Neh 10.23–31).[21] Adrian Hastings observes that intermarrying societies often define themselves by common ancestors and a shared myth of origins or land, genealogical claims that he discourages scholars from cavalierly dismissing.[22] But descent can be reconfigured through adoption or the re-writing of genealogies.[23] One example is when it happened to be discovered that the Jews shared a kinship with the Spartans through mutual descent from Abraham (1 Macc 12.1–23). Another is Paul's central concern with how members of the nations might be adopted into Abraham's family (Gal 3.6–9, 29; Rom 4.11–19).[24]

Buell disagrees that "religion" or "culture" are mere markers rather than among the constitutive elements of ethnicity and counters that descent and kinship can be discursively or ritually redrawn.[25] She proposes that ethnic reasoning incorporates aspects of both fixity and fluidity in that ethnicity is believed to be inherited yet is also acquired by adopting cultural practices.[26] Hastings broadly defines ethnicity as the common culture by which a group of people share the basics of life such as clothing, styles of houses, occupational roles, laws, rituals, customs, history, myths, religious beliefs, or language.[27] However, to distinguish a group as ethnic instead of some other form of social arrangement, John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith enumerate six features that generally characterize an ethnic group: a shared proper name, myth of ancestry, historical memory, elements of a common culture, link to a homeland, and social solidarity.[28] Their list is not a far cry from Josephus's defence, against detractors, of the ancient pedigree (*C. Ap.* 1.71), national territory (1.1; 1.224; 1.132; 2.147; 2.289), common language (1.167; 1.319; 2.27), sacred texts (1.128; 1.154; 2.45), temple system (1.315),

[20] Hodge, *If Sons*, 28, 60–61; cf. Boyarin, *Radical Jew*, 231.

[21] Shaye Cohen argues that the exclusion of the foreign wives may be because Ezra had no jurisdiction over foreign men marrying Judaean women and that the matrilineal principle (*m. Qidd.* 3.12; *m. Yev.* 7.5) was a rabbinic innovation to determine the ethnicity of a child of a mixed marriage: *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 263–82.

[22] Hastings, *Construction of Nationhood*, 169.

[23] Hall, *Greek Identity*, 43; *Hellenicity*, 25–29; Hodge, *If Sons*, 28–41.

[24] Hodge renders ἐκ πίστεως in Gal 3.6–9 and Rom 4.16 as "descended out of the faithfulness" of Abraham, signifying that the reward for Abraham's faithfulness is not only to be the father of the circumcised but also of many nations who are blessed "in" (ἐν) him (Gen 12.3; 15.5; 17.5; 18.18): *If Sons*, 84–89, 97–100. Conversely, Sechrest reads Rom 4.9–12, 16 as differentiating Jewish descendants out of the law (ἐκ τοῦ νόμου) (4.16) from Christ-believing Jews (the circumcised who follow in the faith of Abraham in 4.12) and Gentiles who form a new ethnic community, anticipating the construction of Christians as a third γένος: *Former Jew*, 121–26.

[25] Buell, *New Race*, 9.

[26] Ibid., 6–10.

[27] Adrian Hastings, *The Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion and Nationalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 167. I adopted this definition in Kok, "True Covenant People," 84.

[28] Hutchinson and Smith, "Introduction," 7.

and Mosaic constitution (2.145; 2.185–89) of his people.[29] It is also similar to Herodotus's articulation of Greek unity as based on blood (ὅμαιμον), language (ὁμόγλωσσον), shrines (θεῶν ἱδρυματα), and customs (ἤθεά τε ὁμότροπα) (*Hist.* 8.144.2).

As can be seen from both writers, "religion" was an integral component of ancient ethnic identity. The communal memory of the exodus and the Torah as the group's covenant charter was central to many ancient Jews. For groups holding a myth of election, Smith lists four patterns of ethnic survival: the *imperial dynastic* model where election is attached to the ruling dynasty; the *communal-demotic* model where election is applied directly to the people living in their sacred land; the *emigrant-colonist* model where the people settle in new homelands with little regard for the indigenous inhabitants; and the *diaspora-restoration* model where a return to the land is a precondition of collective redemption.[30] Smith traces a belief in the divine election of the monarchy to ancient Sumer and Egypt, but contends that the Hebrew Bible enshrines the earliest articulated theology of communal election.[31] The biblical conquest narratives fit the emigrant-colonist model while the banishment from the land after the Bar Kochba revolt in 132–35 CE fits the diaspora-restoration model. The Maccabean revolt hardened the construction of religious difference from outsiders in its defence for Judaizing ways (Ἰουδαϊσμός) in opposition to Hellenizing (Ἑλληνισμός).[32] Probably categorized as an ἔθνος by the Seleucids, 2 Maccabees appropriated the term to contest Seleucid control.[33] Other texts draw sharp social boundaries around religious lines, characterizing the other ἔθνη (nations) as idolatrous and immoral (Wisdom 13–14; Rom 1.18–32, Gal 2.11–15), which reflects what Hall describes as an oppositional strategy for identity formation.[34]

Some may still object to imposing modern conceptions of ethnicity onto the Ἰουδαῖοι or any other ancient people group. The term ἔθνος might simply denote a group sharing a common identification such as a flock of birds (Homer, *Il.* 2.459), swarm of bees (2.87) or group of warriors (2.91).[35] There is no equivalent Greek term for gender, class, or culture, but scholars do not shy away from using these categories as heuristic

[29] John M. G. Barclay, "Constructing Judean Identity after 70 CE: A Study of Josephus's *Against Apion*," in *Identity and Interaction in the Ancient Mediterranean: Jews, Christians and Others. Essays in Honour of Stephen G. Wilson*, ed. Zeba A. Crook and Philip A. Harland (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2007), 101–11.

[30] Anthony D. Smith, "Chosen Peoples," in Hutchinson and Smith, eds, *Ethnicity*, 194–96.

[31] Smith, "Chosen Peoples," 196.

[32] Steve Mason, "Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History," JSJ 38 (2007): 460–80. See 2 Macc 2.21; 8.1; 14.38; 4 Macc 4.25; cf. Gal 1.13–14; Ign. *Phld* 6.1; *Magn.* 8.1. Mason argues that nouns ending in *-ismos* represent in nominal form the ongoing action of the cognate verb in *-izō*. Thus, he is adamant that Ἰουδαϊσμός should be translated as "Judaizing" rather than as a fixed and ossified religious system (Judaism), an innovation he attributes to Christian usage from Tertullian onwards.

[33] Lieu, *Christian Identity*, 245. See 2 Macc 1.1; 2.16; 10.8.

[34] Hall, *Hellenicity*, 179. Hall sees the Persian invasion (480–479 BCE) as crucial to the shift in Greek identity from an aggregative identity based on kinship networks to an oppositional contrast with the "barbarians."

[35] Hall, *Greek Identity*, 35; Horrell, "Ethnic Identity Construction," 125.

devices.[36] Love Sechrest has exhaustively surveyed the literary contexts where ἔθνος and γένος appear in Greek-speaking Jewish, Christian, or Greco-Roman sources between 100 BCE and 100 CE, with an exception made for the Septuagint, under the following categories: 1) people-groups or classes, 2) group description, 3) war or conflict, 4) land and territory, 5) government, 6) customs or laws, 7) religion, 8) language, 9) group name, 10) kinship, 11) humanity (i.e. the human γένος) and 12) group founder.[37] What she uncovers is that ἔθνος is most often found in reference to territory or war while γένος is most often related to kinship followed by people-group and territory in Greco-Roman texts.[38] On the other hand, "religion" is the most prominent criterion of an ἔθνος and, excluding the emphasis on kinship and territory in Josephus, the second most prominent criterion of a γένος after defining a people-group in Jewish texts. A potential weakness in her results may be in how she defines the slippery term "religion" as the cultural expression of human piety with reference to a deity or cultic activity and personnel, thus double counting some Jewish references to kinship, land, customs, and so on under the rubric "religion" as well,[39] but her main point on the distinctiveness of Israel's sense of divine election and covenant relationship with a deity seems secure.

With this background in mind, what are the implications for the translation of Ἰουδαῖος? The names of ethnic groups were often associated with their place of origin.[40] Out of roughly 220 references to Ἰουδαῖος in the LXX, John Elliott estimates that 61 translate Hebrew terms with the יהד-root and 154 scattered in the apocryphal writings refer mainly to the regional sense of residents of Ἰουδαία (Judaea).[41] Aristotle's pupil Clearchus derives Ἰουδαῖος from Ἰουδαία according to Josephus (*C. Ap.* 1.179), though Josephus maintains that the purity of the priestly stock is preserved wherever the exiles are dispersed (1.32–33).[42] To render Ἰουδαῖος consistently as "Judaean" underscores that they were a recognisable ethnic entity like any other within ancient ethnic discourse. Alternatively, Shaye Cohen contends that the influence of the Greek idea of πολιτεία (citizenship), resulting in the incorporation of the Idumeans into the Hasmonean state through circumcision, and the acceptance of Gentile proselytism (Jud 14.10; Philo, *Virt.* 20.102–3) indicates that the term Ἰουδαῖος broadened from an ethnic-geographic

[36] Hall, *Hellenicity*, 17; Sechrest, *Former Jew*, 54.

[37] Sechrest, *Former Jew*, 61–105. She examines the LXX, the Jewish Apocrypha, Diodorus Siculus, Dionysius Halicarnassus, Philo, Josephus, the NT, Strabo, and Plutarch. Horrell ("Ethnic Identity Construction,"126–27) adds that λαός is found 2,000 times in the LXX generally for the "people" of Israel whereas the plural of ἔθνος tends to be reserved for the other nations, but he notes some exceptions where ἔθνος is applied to Israel.

[38] Sechrest, *Former Jew*, 94–96. Horrell ("Ethnic Identity Construction," 126) comes to the similar conclusion that γένος may be used either synonymously with ἔθνος or have a more specialized focus on kinship.

[39] Sechrest, *Former Jew*, 75–76, 102.

[40] John H. Elliott, "Jesus the Israelite was neither a 'Jew' nor a 'Christian': On Correcting Misleading Nomenclature" JSHJ 5 (2007), 132. Elliott provides some examples such as Ἕλλην (Greek) with Ἑλλάς (Greece), Ῥωμαῖος (Roman) with Ῥώμη (Rome) or Φιλιππήσιος (Philippian) with Φίλιπποι (Philippi).

[41] Elliott, "Jesus the Israelite,"132.

[42] Barclay, "Constructing Judean Identity," 104–5; Elliott, "Jesus the Israelite," 130.

designator (Judaean) to a religious one (Jew).[43] Just as "Hellenicity" became equated with civilization and was attainable through a Hellenic education (παιδεία),[44] so too "Jewishness" became a "portable culture."[45] Daniel Schwarz cites epigraphic evidence to show that Ἰουδαϊσμός was applied to non-residents of Judaea and even proselytes. He calls attention to royal figures willing to Judaize (2 Macc 9.17; Jos., *Ant.* 20.17–96) without abdicating their position as foreign rulers and "pagan" residents of Judaea are identified as Ἕλληνες.[46]

While Cohen and Schwarz demonstrate a historical shift in how "Jewishness" was defined and how the boundaries became more porous in the Hellenistic period, their arguments seem to rely on a bifurcation of religion and ethnicity in antiquity. Individuals in the ancient Mediterranean were free to assume whatever cultural practices they wished, though Cohen's study of a set of Greek verbs in the *-izein* family used to denote persons who offered political support or adopted foreign languages or customs shows that it generally carried negative connotations.[47] Texts that speak about initiates who Judaized all the way by leaving their blood relations, country, customs and icons behind (Philo, *Virt.* 20.102–3) or how a group of Chaldaens were transformed into Israelites when they abandoned their native divinities (Jud 14.10) are better read as the crossing of the boundary from one *ethnos* to another rather than the anachronistic "religious conversion."[48] Given the fear that living among barbarians could lead to the adoption of their language, customs and gods (*Rom. Ant.* 1.89.4),[49] Judaizing represented the threat of the Other within the empire itself, leading to a total abandonment of native traditions for a foreign superstition (cf. Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.3–5).[50] Thus, I had supported the translation "Judaean" to get across that "religion" was embedded in ethnicity in

[43] Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 109–39. See also Amy-Jill Levine, *The Misunderstood Jew: The Church and the Scandal of the Jewish Jesus* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007), 161–62. Cohen argues that non-Israelites could bless Israel's deity or actively participate in Israelite society, but they did not become Israelites. They were still resident aliens, such as Uriah the Hittite (2 Sam 11) or Ruth the Moabitess (Ruth 1.22; 4.10).

[44] Hall, *Hellenicity*, 172–226. For example, he highlights that during the Roman period Dionysius omitted shared blood altogether when he defines Greeks in relation to language, customs, laws, and cult (*Rom. Ant.* 1.89.4). Yet if Hall adopted Buell's model of fixity and fluidity instead of narrowly defining ethnicity as necessitating shared descent (i.e., blood), a shift from an ethnic to a cultural identity is not so transparent.

[45] Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 134.

[46] Daniel R. Schwartz, " 'Judean' or 'Jew'? How Should We Translate *ioudaios* in Josephus?" in *Jewish Identity in the Greco-Roman World*, ed. Jörg Frey, Daniel R. Schwartz, and Stephanie Gripentrog (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 12, 14–16.

[47] Cohen, *Beginnings of Jewishness*, 175–79. For some of his examples: to phoenicize is to adopt unnatural vice, to cilicize is to be cruel and a cheat, to egyptize is to be sly and crafty, to cretize is to lie, and so forth.

[48] Mason, "Problems of Categorization," 491; Buell, *New Race*, 31. Fredriksen ("Mandatory Retirement," 232–37) urges that the terminology of "conversion" be dropped from the study of religious life in the ancient Mediterranean.

[49] Buell, *New Race*, 466.

[50] Lieu, *Christian Identity*, 276; Fredrickson, "What Parting," 41–42.

antiquity.[51]

However, like Caroline Hodge, I have had a change in heart on the necessity of a change in nomenclature.[52] A major drawback is that it overestimates the importance of land at the expense of other criteria, especially the dominant role of religious praxis. Schwarz points out that the Diaspora had a long history without a national homeland and that Greco-Roman authors did not always call the land "Judaea" but also "Idumea" or "Palestine," nor did they always associate the Jews with the land but with cultural practices and motifs like their Sabbath (Frontinus), sacrificial system (Damocritus), superstition (Quintilian), the legislator Moses (Nicarchus), or diet (Epictetus).[53] Turning land into the quintessential criterion of ancient Jewish identity may carry negative ramifications for the contemporary Israeli-Palestinian situation. To address this concern, Mason writes, "just as 'Roman,' 'Egyptian,' and 'Greek' (etc.) had a wide range of associations beyond the geographical, and they do not require us to substitute other terms when we refer to 'Roman citizens' or call Lucian a 'Greek,' so too 'Judaean' should be allowed to shoulder its burden as a term full of complex possibilities." A further liability to the translation "Judaean" is that it may downplay significant continuities between first-century Ἰουδαῖοι and modern Jews. It assumes the tradition changed so drastically after rabbinic literature to warrant a change in terminology, but Amy-Jill Levine highlights significant examples of continuity such as circumcision, wearing *tzitzit*, keeping kosher, honouring the Sabbath, attending synagogue gatherings, reading the Torah and Prophets or celebrating Passover. Notwithstanding the intentions of careful advocates of "Judaean" to introduce linguistic precision, there is the risk that modern hate groups may exploit the denial that "Jews" existed in antiquity.

Space does not permit a full evaluation of Elliott's proposal that scholars adopt "Israelite" as the preferred emic terminology instead of the outsider term Ἰουδαῖος. A preference for "Israel" or "Hebrew" may be due to its greater scriptural warrant and archaizing resonances with their epic narratives, but I am not persuaded that the use of Ἰουδαῖος in the LXX, Josephus, Philo, the New Testament, and inscriptional or epigraphic evidence does not signal that it was also an insider term.[54] For example, Elliott reads the Samaritan woman's address to Jesus as a Ἰουδαῖος as mistaken because he journeyed from Judaea (John 4.9). But Jesus positively identifies with the term when he stresses that "we" worship what we know for salvation is from the Ἰουδαίων" (4.22b). Levine points out that the woman does not find Jesus on the move but sitting at Jacob's well (4.6–7).[55] Elliott dismisses Paul's reference to himself and *Cephas* as Ἰουδαῖοι (Gal 2.14) as due to the fact that he was writing for a mixed audience and downplays the identification of Paul as a Ἰουδαῖος before a Jerusalem crowd in Acts 22.3 as a singular

[51] Kok, "The True Covenant People," 95 n. 1.

[52] See Hodge, *If Sons*, 11.

[53] Schwartz, " 'Judean' or 'Jew,' " 19–20. Mason ("Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism," 496) does counter that the name Judaea was preserved even after 135 CE for centuries.

[54] Contra Elliott, "Jesus the Israelite," 126–38, 143–44.

[55] Levine, *Misunderstood Jew*, 163.

example. James Crossley also warns that some scholars, who are by no means anti-semitic, have non-reflexively borrowed the statistics and argument that Ἰουδαῖος was an outsider term from the notorious antisemite Karl Georg Kuhn.[56] To conclude, I affirm the valid points about not retrojecting the privatization of "religion" as a disembedded category back to the ancients, but this point does not require changing the standard nomenclature.

Justin Martyr's Ethnic Claims and the Heritage of Israel

The self-understanding of the people of Israel, which Smith aptly describes as that of a "sacred communion of the people" and "holy congregation,"[57] served as a model for Justin's ethnic reasoning. Justin probably composed his *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew* after the *Apology* (*Dial.* 120.6) and before his martyrdom under the prefect Junius Rusticus (ca. 162–68 CE), though it covers an earlier encounter with a Hebrew refugee named Trypho shortly after the Bar Cochba revolt (1.3) which Eusebius credibly places in Ephesus (*Church History* 4.18.6).[58] It resembles classic Socratic-style debates, albeit Justin rigidly controls the time allotted to each speaker and the outcome of the dispute.[59] It is unclear whether he intended the work for outsiders or for internal consumption or had multiple audiences in mind, though it may be unlikely that many besides Christians would be interested in this lengthy work and his objective seems primarily to supply an apologetic for a distinctly Christian identity and worldview against Jewish objections.[60]

Justin must have had some contact with Jews or with Jewish sources. He is able to describe a phylactery (46.5), recounts post-biblical details about Yom Kippur (40.4; *m. Yoma* 6.1), and evinces a similar eschatological outlook to Jewish apocalyptic texts involving the defeat of Amalek (49.8; 131.5) and the fourth beast (i.e., Rome) (31.5; 32.3) and a chiliastic hope (80–81; 85.7; 138.3; 139.4–5). He took the legendary origins of the Septuagint seriously and was aware that it was read in synagogue services (72.3), even though he accuses Jews of tampering with the divinely inspired text (71.1–3; 72.1–4;

[56] Crossley, *Neoliberalism*, 186–87 n. 37.

[57] Anthony D. Smith, *Chosen Peoples: Sacred Sources of National Identity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 32.

[58] Judith M. Lieu, *Image and Reality: The Jews in the World of the Christians in the Second Century* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 103; William Horbury, *Jews and Christians: In Contact and Controversy* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 131; Michele Murray, *Playing a Jewish Game: Gentile Christian Judaizing in the First and Second Centuries* CE (Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 2004), 91–92. Lieu (*Image and Reality*, 103) adds that Eusebius's report of Trypho as a leading Hebrew of his day is contradicted by Trypho's ignorance of Hebrew and dependence on his teachers. The identification of Trypho with Rabbi Tarphon is spurious.

[59] Stephen G. Wilson, *Related Strangers: Jews and Christians 70–170* CE (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 259.

[60] See Nina E. Livesey, "Theological Identity Making: Justin's Use of Circumcision to Create Jews and Christians," JECS 18, no. 1 (2010): 51–79; Wilson, *Related Strangers*, 261–65; Lieu, *Image and Reality*, 105–8.

73.1–2; 84.1–4).[61] For some scholars, Trypho actually comes across better when his friendly demeanour is compared to Justin's lengthy tirades and may have been a real individual or representative of realistic objections against Christian antinomianism or Christology.[62] Conversely, Paula Fredriksen deems the hermeneutical idea of the "Jew" as fleshly, half-hearted, philosophically dim, and violently anti-Christian to be a product of Christian intellectuals striving to make sense of the premier literary medium of revelation, the Septuagint, and positioning the Jews as the anti-type for the "correct" type of Christian.[63] Justin had the double task of explaining why a majority of Jews were unimpressed by Christian readings of their scripture and refuting other Christians (e.g., Marcion) who were equally unconvinced (35.5–6). Therefore, the *Dialogue* may genuinely reflect the kind of debates Justin engaged in, but he has massively shaped it for the needs of Christian identity formation.

What may have prompted Justin to write the *Dialogue* is precisely the need to work out the place of Christians in the world, for Justin had become a stranger to his native customs yet resisted joining the Jewish people despite their established roots in antiquity. Trypho was perplexed at why Christians do not segregate themselves from the nations and spurn the commandments which mark out Jewish election (8.3–4; 10.2–4), so Justin endeavoured to carve out a collective identity for the Christians that distinguished them from the Jews but was also a recognisable category in the Greco-Roman context. Ethnic reasoning helped Justin accomplish these aims. As Buell demonstrates, the *Dialogue* is littered with references to the Christians as the γένος of Judah, Jacob, Isaac, and Abraham (11.5), the high priestly γένος of god (116.3), another γένος (138.2–3), another people (λαός ἕτερος) (119.3), a holy people (λαὸς ἅγιος) or another Israel (123.5–6; 130.3).[64] Justin's original contribution is the explicit assertion that Christians constitute the true spiritual Israel (11.5). In a creative stroke of exegesis, he re-interprets the oracles of Isaiah and the other prophets as referring to two entities called Israel; all the curses apply to non-Christian Israelites and the promised restoration foreshadowed the Christians (123.5–9; 135.3–6). By these means, in spite of their recent appearance, Justin roots the Christians in the antiquity of the Israelite epic. He also brings into sharp relief the difference between an association model where non-Jews are grafted onto Israel through Christ (cf. Rom 11.16–32) and a substitution model where the Gentile Christians replace Israel.[65]

Although Justin juxtaposes Trypho's image of Israel as Abraham's descendants κατὰ σάρκα (according to the flesh) (44.1; 125.5; 140.2) with his fluid definition of Israel

[61] Murray, *Playing a Jewish Game*, 92; Horbury, *Jews and Christians*, 151–54.

[62] Lieu, *Image and Reality*, 104; Wilson, *Related Strangers*, 260; Murray, *Playing a Jewish Game*, 92.

[63] Fredriksen, "What Parting," 37.

[64] Buell, *Why This New Race*, 99–106.

[65] Oskar Skarsaune, *The Proof From Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile* (Leiden: Brill, 1987), 326–27, 352–53. Note, however, that Sechrest embraces the admittedly minority reading of Romans 9–11 as re-defining Israel around Jewish and Gentile Christ-followers against the presently severed branches symbolizing Israel κατὰ σάρκα and of Gal 6.16 as applying the name "Israel of God" to the Christ congregation (*Former Jew*, 141–45; 181–86).

κατὰ πνεῦμα (according to the spirit) as comprised of all who share Abraham's faith (11.4–5; 44.2, 4), the fluidity of Trypho's understanding is revealed in his connection between practice and salvation (45.1–2) and exhortations to adopt his way of life (8.4) while Justin's appeal to Abrahamic descent reveals an element of fixity.[66] Abraham plays a critical function in Justin's ethnic reasoning, appearing 103 times in the *Dialogue*.[67] Christians are defined as Abraham's γένος (11.5; 43.1; 66.4), τέκνα (children) (25.1; 80.4; 110.5; 120.2), or σπέρμα (seed) (44.1; 44.7) and Abrahamic descent is used to concede that the Jews are Abraham's physical descendants, to designate Christians as his spiritual descendants, and to discount the sole Jewish claim on Abraham.[68]

It may be to undermine such claims on Abrahamic descent that the Rabbis in *Sifre Deuteronomy* (on Deut 32.9) deny that election has its basis in descent from Abraham or Isaac because some of their descendants were unworthy (Ishmael, Esau); the Lord takes the portion of his inheritance from Jacob's offspring. If this tradition existed in Justin's time, his counter is that Christians are also descendants of Jacob because the Isaianic Servant, whom Justin identifies with Christ, was surnamed Jacob and Israel (cf. Isa 42.1–4) and so by extension the followers of Christ are the true Israelite γένος (123.8–9).[69]

Justin rejects traditional Jewish praxis on fasting, dietary laws, Sabbaths, circumcision, sacrifices or festivals as identity markers of the true Israel because he perceives their typological intent (cf. 12–24; 40–43). Although Trypho concedes that that the laws relating to the temple cult can no longer be performed, he is unwavering on circumcision, Sabbath, festivals, and ceremonial washing as key marks of difference in the Diaspora (46.2).[70] For his part, Justin allows that the Law promulgated at Horeb was valid for a limited duration before being rendered obsolete by a new covenant (11.2–4; cf. Jer 31.31–32), but submits that the remarks in Ezekiel 20.25 on the addition of statutes which were not good (21.4) and the Golden Calf incident indicate that the ceremonial laws were added as an accommodation to Israel's idolatrous disposition and hard hearts (18.2; 19.5; 20.4; 22.1; 27.2; 43.1; 44.2; 45.3, etc.).[71] His repeated invocation of Jewish hard-heartedness equates the rites themselves with impiety, echoing Pharaoh's hardened heart (Exod 14.4, 17) and anticipating Trypho's resistance to Christianizing to the end (142.3).[72]

Justin aims his full arsenal at circumcision, asserting that humans are by nature uncircumcised (29.3), several biblical heroes were uncircumcised (19.3–4; 92.2), Abraham was reckoned as righteous before he was circumcised (92.3), females cannot be circum-

[66] Buell, *Why This New Race*, 95–96, 106–7.

[67] Abraham Siker, *Disinheriting the Jews: Abraham in Early Christian Controversy* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991), 163.

[68] Siker, *Disinheriting the Jews*, 171; cf. Buell, *Why this New Race*, 103–8.

[69] Skarsaune, *Proof From Prophecy*, 346–50.

[70] Lieu, *Image and Reality*, 115.

[71] Skarsaune (*Proof from Prophecy*, 313–20) discerns an earlier Jewish-Christian critique of the sacrificial cult (e.g. Pseudo-Clementine *Recognitions*) that Justin extended to cover all aspects of the ceremonial law.

[72] Livesey, "Theological Identity Making," 60–61.

cised (23.5; 46.3), other peoples are circumcised (28.4), Gentiles have divine approval without being circumcised (29.1), and the only thing that counts is for the heart to be circumcised (15.7; 16.1; 19.3a). His case deconstructs when he puts forward the view that circumcision makes the Jews visible for punishment (16.2–5; 19.2) while dismissing it as a custom shared by others (28.4).[73] His aversion towards the rite is not due to fear about the procedure or the political costs of the act (18.3), for Christians endured torture and death to avoid idolatry (34.8; 35.7–8),[74] but reflects the breakaway sect's dramatic reversal of "formative symbols" of the dominant group as a means of differentiation and self-justification.[75] Indeed, Christians underwent a "second circumcision" like the wilderness generation under Joshua (Ἰησοῦς) (Josh 5.2), but Justin reinterprets this allegorically as Jesus circumcising a new righteous nation (24.2).[76]

Justin's polemic should not be misread as transcending ethnic particularism in favour of Christian universalism. He too describes particular customs that mark out the Christian community including baptism (14.1), the Eucharist (41.1–3; 117.1), and a select holy day (41.4). They even have a dietary restriction to abstain from idol meat (εἰδωλόθυτα) (35.1–3; cf. 1 Cor 8.1–13; 10.25–31; Acts 15.20; Rev 2.14, 20). Boyarin emphasizes that a mutual process of identity formation revolved around the classification of binitarianism as the "Christian" position and monarchianism as "Jewish" and the Christian heresy par excellence,[77] but Justin was also concerned to differentiate "Christianness" from "Jewishness" at the level of social praxis.

One thing that Buell's otherwise excellent discussion on Justin overlooks is the crucial role of the Abrahamic promise of land (25.6–26.1; 80.1–81.4; 85.7; 119.5–6; 138.3; 139.4–5). In a key passage, Justin writes that the Christians are not a despised people (δῆμος) or barbarian tribe (φῦλον), nor are they like the nations (ἔθνη) of the Carians or the Phrygians or the faithless people of Israel. Instead, they are a holy people (λαὸς ἅγιος), the nation (ἔθνος) promised to Abraham, who will inherit the land with the patriarch (119.3–6). Siker points out that Justin enlists Abraham as an honorary Christian in heeding Christ's call to leave the land in which he dwelled, just as Christians left their former way of life (119.5),[78] but Justin emphasizes that Abraham and those who have become Abraham's children through sharing his faith and believing upon the same divine voice will inherit the holy land (119.5–6). Justin interprets the prophecies that Jerusalem would be rebuilt quite literally, aligning it with his chiliastic interpretation of the Apocalypse (81.4; cf. Rev 20.1–6).

Hence, both Trypho and Justin fit Smith's *diaspora-restoration* model, the for-mer as an exile after the failed Bar Kochba revolt and the latter with his expectation that

[73] Lieu, *Image and Reality*, 119.

[74] Lieu, *Image and Reality*, 116. She adds that the accusation of idolatry may have had a major role in the propaganda war, which explains Justin's polemical appeal to Israel's worship of the Golden Calf.

[75] Lieu, *Image and Reality*, 119.

[76] Livesey, "Theological Identity Making," 58.

[77] Daniel Boyarin, "Justin Martyr Invents Judaism," *Church History* 70 (2001): 438, 449–56.

[78] Siker, *Disinheriting the Jews*, 164; cf. Buell, *New Race*, 103–5.

Christians will be gathered with the saints of old in a rebuilt Jerusalem in a millennial kingdom. The more sinister aspect of Justin's account is that the Jewish history of rebellion and persecution of divine messengers, climaxing in the murder of the Just One (ὁ δικάιος), resulted in the desolation of their cities and expulsion from Jerusalem (16; 108; 133; 136). Skarsaune detects an underlying Deuteronomic theology where Israel's covenantal unfaithfulness results in the state of foreign domination and was designed to move the nation to penitence,[79] which Justin turned into a replacement narrative. In light of the Hadrianic decree, circumcision was indeed a "sign" (σημεῖον) (cf. Gen 17.11) to set the Jews apart for suffering under the Romans and prohibit their re-entry into the land now possessed by others (16.2–5).[80] Not only does Justin extrapolate circumcision as a key marker of Jewishness, it is precisely their Jewishness that cuts them off from the inheritance! Yet when Trypho forthrightly asks Justin if means to suggest that none of Jews will inherit the holy mountain in the future, he wavers a bit and does not explicitly deny them a share in it, though he is adamant that Jews who persecute Christians will not partake in the inheritance promised to those who believe in Christ (25.6–26.1).

Thus, Justin equates the Jewish way of life with a hard-heartedness that resulted in the curse of exile, while the true Israel that is entitled to the scriptural promises is characterized by a Christian way of life. He promoted this essentializing Christian identity in contradistinction to the Jews, but he is not entirely successful in concealing that the socially-constructed boundaries are porous. He grudgingly tolerates the presence of Jewish (and Gentile Judaizing!), Torah-observant Christ followers (47.1–4), regardless of his demand on all peoples to relinquish their former way of life (121.3).[81] Livesey sees in this compromise an indication that the complex social reality between Jews and Christians was considerably different to Justin's theological construction.[82] In spite of his best efforts to police the border and check the spread of Christian Judaizing by censuring Jews who induce Gentile Christians to adopt their customs (47.1b, 3), he ultimately cannot control the flow of goods and personnel across the border.[83]

Ethnic Election in Judaism and Christianity

All of the criteria outlined by Hutchinson and Smith feature in Justin's *Dialogue*: a collective name (Israel), myth of descent, scriptural memory, way of life, attachment to a homeland, and sense of group solidarity. Nor is the *Dialogue* an aberration in Christian thought. Hastings and Smith have challenged the modernist theory of the

[79] Skarsaune, *The Proof from Prophecy*, 278–79. For the accusation of killing the prophets, see Neh 9.26; Ezra 9.11; Josephus, *Ant.* 9.13.2; 10.3.1; *Jub.* 1.12; 1 Thess 2.15.

[80] Livesey, "Theological Identity Making," 62–63; Skarsaune (*Proof from Prophecy*, 293–95) argues that Justin's other points against circumcision could have been drawn from traditional sources, but this particular polemic was Justin's own innovation based on the Hadrianic ban on circumcision.

[81] Buell, *New Race*, 112–13.

[82] Livesey, "Theological Identity Making," 75.

[83] I owe this analogy to Boyarin, "Justin Martyr," 456.

origins of nationalism and focus on how the biblical model of Israel and specific forms of Christianity have been instrumental in creating and sustaining various nationalisms throughout history.[84] Ethnic reasoning was a mode of discourse available to early Christians to articulate their sense of peoplehood. Regrettably, it was accompanied by the denigration of the Jews in order to justify the existence of the Christians as a separate entity, their *raison d'être*. Yet since the "Other" is no more primordial or given then the Self, Lieu writes, "acknowledging this acts as a reminder that there can be other relationships with difference and alterity than the oppositional, although it is the latter that has tended to dominate studies of identity and otherness in antiquity as well as in the present."[85]

While several contributions to this volume fairly critique uncritical uses of the Bible in contemporary Zionism, I think it important to issue a reminder that historically Christians have held to an equally flawed replacement theology. Further, while I am sympathetic to the aims of liberation theologians to address the Israeli-Palestine situation, I would discourage comparing a caricatured Judaism to an idealised version of Christianity. Specifically, it is time to bid adieu to the binary opposition of Christian universalism and Jewish ethnocentrism as Christians have historically defined themselves as a chosen people and made totalizing claims on the heritage of Israel. A more fruitful line of inquiry may be to ask about the implications of the doctrine of election in *both* traditions. Smith denies that a myth of ethnic election equates with plain ethnocentrism as the former entails a moral responsibility to live up to certain obligations and values.[86] Belonging to such a group can be accepted as a call to incarnate divine justice and compassion in the world. However, it becomes a dangerous force when it leads to the suppression of difference or the de-humanization of the Other, whether manifested in antisemitism or in the mistreatment of the Palestinians.

[84] Smith, *Chosen Peoples*; Hastings, *Construction of Nationhood*.
[85] Lieu, *Christian Identity*, 269.
[86] Smith, "Chosen Peoples," 190.

FIFTEEN

Banning the Nations

An Old Testament Approach to the Rights and Wrongs of Boycotts

Alastair G. Hunter

There is nothing as benign as an economic, academic or cultural boycott in the recorded traditions of Ancient Israel. Although modern Hebrew uses the classical Hebrew noun *cherem* to express the idea of the boycott, anyone subject to its effects three millennia ago would have experienced something much worse than the loss of income from produce, the drying up of invitations to scholarly conferences, or the absence of Vanessa Redgrave and Emma Thompson from their theatres. I shall return to this theme later; in the meantime I want to begin by establishing some context for this particular paper.

The boycott as a human weapon is not new, even if the term itself only emerges from the sorry history of Ireland in the nineteenth century.[1] It begins in early childhood, when toddlers recognize the power they have over significant adults of refusal of cooperation. Once you know that someone with power needs something from you, its refusal gives even technically weak individuals surprisingly effective means of control. This explains its attractions, and the difficulty opponents have in seeking alternative forms of action. Whenever boycotts are proposed to confront an obvious (or apparently obvious) evil, the presumption is that most right-minded people will be in favour. No analysis of the moral nature of boycotts is ever presented, no consideration of the effectiveness of such approaches is entered into. The boycott belongs to that part of human ethical behaviour which is, in effect, taken for granted.

In the course of this paper I want to illustrate and amplify these points by (a) considering their equivalent in Ancient Israel, (b) reviewing the recent history of an SWP

[1] Captain Charles Boycott, the land agent of Lord Erne, attempted to evict tenants in a time of famine in Ireland in 1880. The response from the Irish Land League was to impose ostracism on him. The success of this initiative led quickly to his name becoming a synonym for such actions.

(Socialist Workers Party)–inspired movement to bind UCU (the University and College Union, United Kingdom) into boycotting Israel, and (c) giving some pointers of principle. In so doing, I want to make it clear that the specific case of Israel and Palestine (or Israelis and Palestinians) is not one from which we can stand back in some philosophical vacuum and take a purely dispassionate position. Consequently, I do not wish to claim objectivity on my own part, or to conceal my own sympathies—which are with Israel's right to continue to exist without regular threats to the well-being of its citizens, and with a corresponding right for Palestinians to have control of their own viable state and the return to them of what has been taken by force majeure—as distinct from the legitimate decisions of the UN.

Boycott and Ostracism in Ancient Israel

The "ban" (*cherem*) in Tanakh

The frequent instruction, ostensibly on God's command, to annihilate people and things, is a disturbing aspect of the Old Testament.[2] At various points the Israelites are told to destroy (wipe out) Canaanites, Sihon, Og of Bashan, Amorites, Jericho, Ai, Makkadah, Eglon, Hebron, Debir, Hazor, the Anakim, Zephath, all the adults in Jabesh-Gilead, and the Amalekites.[3] The purpose of the ban in these cases would seem to be what we would now describe as genocide or ethnic cleansing—the creation of an "empty" land so that the Israelites could have unchallenged possession. The myth of the empty land is a persistent one. It recurs in exilic texts which suppose that after 587 BCE no-one remained, and the land was given over to thorns, thistles and wild animals. The ideological purpose of this rhetoric was to justify the ethnic and theological claims of the group which returned from Babylon at various points after the rise of Persia and enforced their religious and political systems in Jerusalem. Its modern incarnation is to be found in some of the language of ultra-Zionists and their evangelical Christian fellow-travellers; thus the slogan "a land without a people for a people without a land" and the canard that Palestine was more or less a wasteland until modern Israelis caused "the desert to bloom."[4]

[2] It is possible that in some sense the meaning of *cherem* is "devoted to the Lord" (hence Lev 27.21, 28, 29; Mic 4.13); the surest way for something to reach God, of course, is to annihilate it (or him or her). Num 18.14, however, seems to suggest that "devoted things" are the property of Aaron, and Ezra 10.8 seems to refer simply to the confiscation of property. Other passages indicate a trend towards the more general meaning of "to destroy utterly" (Jer 50.21, 26; 51.3), and can refer to the destruction brought about by Assyrians and others (2 Kings 19.11; 2 Chron 20.23; 32.14; Isa 37.11; Jer 25.9; Isa 37.11; Dan 11.44); it is also used of God's generalized rage against the nations (Isa 11.15; 34.2, 6) and Israel herself (Isa 43.28; see also the withdrawal of the threat against Israel in Zech 14.11 and Mal 4.6).

[3] The references are, respectively, Num 21.2, 3; Deut 2.34; 3.3–6; Josh 2.10; 6.17–21; 8.26; 10.1, 28, 35, 37, 39; 11.11, 12, 21; Judg 1.17; 21.11; 1 Sam 15 passim. Cf also Deut 20.17; Josh 10.40; 11.20.

[4] See for example Meron Benvenisti, *Sacred Landscape: The Buried History of the Holy Land Since 1948*, trans. Maxine Kaufman-Lacusta (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002) for a thorough discussion of these and related issues concerning the mythology which undergirds much settler and right-wing Israeli

There is no conceivable moral defence of the ban in this sense. It is unequivocally monstrous, a remnant from a past which has no place in modernity, though the use of genocide to create space for groups that perceive themselves to be superior has by no means been absent from twentieth and twenty-first-century history.[5] The only saving factor (and this is relevant to my overall argument) is that all of these efforts have failed in their ultimate objective. Canaanites and Philistines—and indeed Amalekites[6]—and Jews, Armenians, and others have survived despite the ban.

Other uses of cherem imply reasons for its imposition other than the naked land-grab referred to above. Two passages in Deuteronomy (7.1–6 and 13.12–18) spell out what are perceived as the real dangers to Israel of allowing free intercourse with "the enemy." The core issues are clear: no covenants with outsiders, no intermarriage, and no worship of gods other than Yahweh (with the rider that this almost certainly entails idolatry—hence Deut 7.5). The "dangers" cited can be loosely correlated with more general fears associated with the threat of the other:

1. Intermarriage, with implications for ethnic identity. This is dealt with separately, in (3).

2. Cultural relationships. The "covenant" had a secular aspect in the ancient world, since it covered all sorts of agreements between peoples, sometimes voluntary, sometimes imposed by a stronger party. There is ample evidence from the archaeological record of cultural assimilation, and the indigenous development of Israel from existing peoples in the region, despite Biblical traditions about invasions from outside—all of whom spoke dialects of the same language. Hence defining "difference" matters.[7]

3. Religious syncretism. Leaving to one side the objective fact that all religions known to history have been and are accretions of various earlier traditions combined with faith-specific beliefs and practices, it remains the case that many religions abhor syncretism.[8] This is particularly true of the Old Testament's position on what is commonly referred to as Yahwism, the supposed faith of Israel.

---

rhetoric.

[5] Armenians, Jews, Cambodians, Rwandans, black South Africans, the villagers of Darfur … the list is depressing.

[6] I have written elsewhere on the way that Amalek functions as a trope for genocide: see "(De)nominating Amalek: Racist Stereotyping in the Bible and the Justification of Discrimination," in *Sanctified Aggression: Legacies of Biblical and Post-Biblical Vocabularies of Violence*, ed Jonneke Bekkenkamp and Yvonne Sherwood (London: T&T Clark, 2003), 92–108.

[7] See, for example, Lev 18.3: "You shall not do as they do in the land of Egypt, where you lived, and you shall not do as they do in the land of Canaan, to which I am bringing you. You shall not follow their statutes." This is followed by an extensive list of banned sexual practices; the implication is that these were found in Canaan.

[8] The instruction in principle to put to the ban anyone who sacrifices to any other god than Yahweh is found in Exod 22.20.

4. The fourth perceived threat is what we would today describe as political assimilation. If other peoples remain a viable force, we (Israel) may one day find ourselves absorbed into an alien polity. It is perhaps ironic that the survival of the Jews and of Judaism was precisely at the cost of surrendering their national identity. It was the diaspora which defined, defended, and successfully delivered to the future everything we now understand by Judaism.

There are notable examples of failure to comply with the command to destroy. The two most striking are in Joshua 7 and 1 Samuel 15, dealing with the disobedience respectively of Achan regarding Ai and Saul regarding Agag. In each case the punishment is condign and ineluctable: the guilty parties are themselves, in effect, put to the ban, and no mercy is shown. Nevertheless, whether the reasons were cupidity (as the text insists) or moral scruples (as we might guess reading between the lines), these cases show that even in antiquity it was possible to question the boycott.[9]

The Separation of Groups (*badal*)

This is the same root that is used in the first creation narrative in Genesis 1 to describe the separation of the heavens and the earth; it also covers the division between clean and unclean, pure and impure. It is the latter which is implied in the passages of interest to us, where human groups are to be regarded as separate in the sense of "in-groups" and "out-groups." This is particularly clear in Lev 20.24, 26 where God is understood to have separated Israel out from all other nations (1 Kings 8.53 enshrines the same principle): the two references sandwich the use of the same verb in verse 25 to mark the distinction between clean and unclean animals. Deut 29.21 ("The LORD will single them out from all the tribes of Israel for calamity, in accordance with all the curses of the covenant written in this book of the law") describes God's isolation of those who revert to the idolatrous ways of Egypt; they are, in effect, singled out for calamity—a process similar to that described in Deut 7 and 13 (see above).

The post-exilic experience strengthens this concept of separation, but now it is self-imposed rather than a divine choice. Thus Ezra 6.21 (and by contrast 9.1, and see also Neh 9.2; 10.28) refers to the returned exiles and (significantly) those of the land who "separated themselves from the pollutions of the nations of the land to worship the LORD, the God of Israel." The verb is also used in speaking of the separation of Israelites from their foreign wives, in a process of harsh ostracism (thus Ezra 10.11: "Now make confession to the LORD the God of your ancestors, and do his will; separate yourselves from the peoples of the land and from the foreign wives"). Finally, direct ostracism is imposed in Ezra 10.8 (on those who don't conform) and Neh 13.3 (on foreigners: "When the people heard the law, they separated from Israel all those of foreign descent").

[9] See also the note in 1 Kings 9.21 referring to the descendants of the various nations "who were still left in the land, whom the Israelites were unable to destroy completely"; Solomon enslaves them!

The ban on intermarriage

There is a pronounced strand in the Old Testament which is concerned to emphasize the importance of Israelites not marrying outside the group. This is found both in narrative passages and as direct injunctions; the following list covers the most significant.

Wives for the sons of patriarchs.

In Gen 24.3 Abraham makes his servant swear "not [to] get a wife for [his] son from the daughters of the Canaanites, among whom I live"; the servant reiterates this injunction later (24.37). This attitude is reinforced wittily in a rather catty aside about Esau's choice of bride (Gen 26.34–35):

> When Esau was forty years old, he married Judith daughter of Beeri the Hittite, and Basemath daughter of Elon the Hittite; and they made life bitter for Isaac and Rebekah.

This in turn leads to the convoluted adventures of Jacob who is sent off to his maternal uncle's farmstead to find himself a wife from within the family rather than one of the local Canaanite girls.

The righteous anger of Phineas (Num 25.1–18).

This is a complex story, which I will not attempt to unpack fully here. For our purposes, what is of interest is (a) the link made between an outbreak of plague and Israelites whose sexual relations with Moabites led them to worship Baal of Peor; (b) the bad timing which led an Israelite with a Midianite wife to come home; (c) Phineas's action in spearing the couple to death, followed by the cessation of the plague; and (d) his being blessed by God for his action. There are of course all sorts of comments one might wish to make about this sequence regarding, for example, history, ethics, cause and effect, morality and the nature of God. My reference to it is simply because it demonstrates starkly the effects on society of a harsh definition of endogamous marriage as a ruling principle.

Solomon and his foreign wives (1 Kings 11.1–13). Perhaps naively, the author of Kings ascribes to Solomon wives and concubines from a wide range of suspect nations: Egyptian, Moabite, Ammonite, Edomite, Sidonian and Hittite. He is also said to have endorsed the worship of Astarte, Milcom, Chemosh and Moloch—errors which are then said to have caused the break-up of his kingdom.

Rules against intermarriage.

These are forthright and daunting, and almost always linked to the supposed danger of idolatry. Thus Exod 34.15–16 warns against making covenants with local peoples

lest they then persuade you into intermarriage, while Deuteronomy simply bans both practices without linking them causally. Both, however, hold up the threat of apostasy as the key issue. Neh 10.30 records the ban on intermarriage without further comment, following it with an injunction to observe the Sabbath, as though the matter is more one of ethnic distinctiveness than religious danger. Neh 13.23–29 also contains a condemnation of mixed marriages which, unlike Ezra, focuses on foreign-ness (speaking other languages!) and only alludes indirectly to the biblical reasons for the ban.

Perhaps the most disturbing episode is the extended process described in Ezra 9–10 by which Israelites married to "foreign" women were forced to divorce them and send them and their children packing. Three things are noteworthy: the citation of Torah as the authority for this action; the extensive list of those involved; and the poignancy of the last verse of the book: "All these had married foreign women, and they sent them away with their children."

Did boycott and ostracism work?

There is clear evidence (see above) that biblical demands for the eradication of other peoples were at least sometimes defied, and were certainly not successful in their aim of complete ethnic cleansing. Of course, we know this to be true from the extensive archaeological record: the Philistine cities, for example, flourished until the Babylonian period. The list in Ezra 9.2 (Canaanites, Hittites, Perizzites, Jebusites, Ammonites, Moabites, Egyptians and Amorites), while paying tribute to the remarkable inclusiveness of the Judaeans of the time, bears comparison with the list of nations in Exodus 23.23 whom Yahweh undertook to blot out, or in Deut 7.1–2 of those whom the Israelites were to "utterly destroy." None of this is to be accorded any moral credit: it is simply part of the pragmatic analysis of the effectiveness of such processes.

Of the four specific purposes of the ban listed above, I have already commented briefly on the failure of the cultural and political aspects. The two remaining—syncretistic religion and the ban on intermarriage—merit further analysis.

It is abundantly clear from the extensive rhetoric found in the prophets and elsewhere that fear of indigenous Canaanite religion was widespread in elite groups in Israel. The "bad kings" of the northern kingdom are frequently denounced for having followed Jeroboam in worshipping other gods. The principal danger from intermarriage was thought to be idolatry and apostasy, and the major theme of much prophetic writing is the accusation against Israel that she has abandoned her first loyalty to Yahweh. It comes as something of a surprise, therefore, to find that the archaeological record shows extensive use of female figurines in worship contexts throughout much of Israel's history,[10] and that there is evidence as late as the Jewish colony in Elephantine

[10] There is no doubt than many female figurines have been found dating through the period of the Israelite and Judean monarchies, and most scholars now accept a significant place for some kind of female deities in the everyday religion of the period. See, for example, Judith M. Hadley, *The Cult of Asherah in Ancient Israel and Judah: Evidence for a Hebrew Goddess* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000);

of a female associate of Yahweh, perhaps his consort.[11] The variety of designations for God, many drawn from surrounding cultures, are prima facie evidence for a far more syncretistic and open religion at the popular level in Israel than is often admitted. The ban and the boycott turn out to be the weapons of an exclusive elite bent on changing the rules, rather than a realistic reflection of societal norms.

The point of greatest tension in the ancient sources belongs to the field of human sexual relationships. We have sampled already the extensive and sometimes brutal range of words and actions designed to protect the purity of the Israelite inheritance by means of ethnic exclusivism. What is equally fascinating is the counter-evidence suggesting that at the very highest levels, and at the heart of the religious tradition itself, exogamy was far from unusual: Abraham and Hagar the Egyptian; Moses's and Zipporah, the daughter of the priest of Midian; Joseph's Egyptian wife Asenath; Naomi's sons married Moabites—Ruth and Orpah—and Ruth in turn married Boaz and was the great-grandmother of David; David himself married Bathsheba, the wife of Uriah the Hittite; Solomon was their son.

Negatively, the excessively long list of priests, Levites and lay Israelites who had married foreign women found in Ezra 10.18–44 implies that there was nothing scandalous or even abnormal about the practice in many Israelite circles. It may further be inferred that one reason why intermarriage was not controversial was that—contrary to certain biblical rhetoric—there was in fact little cultural or religious difference between the various city states and small kingdoms that flourished in the Levant during the second and the first half of the first millennium BCE. Just as Yahweh was the named God of Judah, so was Chemosh of Moab, Baal of Ugarit, Milcom/Moloch of Ammon, Astarte of Sidon, Marduk of Babylon, and Dagon of Gaza and Ashdod.

Summary

The evidence I have surveyed in Part One of this paper may be summarized briefly as follows:

1. Two verbs—"to ban" (emphcherem) and "to separate" (*badal*)—are used in Hebrew Bible contexts which are broadly similar to aspects of modern approaches to the use of boycott and ostracism, though of course without the ancient context of the elimination of those under the ban.

2. These similarities are, it should be emphasized, far from exact; nevertheless they give expression to the motivations behind modern tactics in that (a) they intend the utter isolation of the target group, (b) they condemn those of the in-group

Othmar Keel and Christoph Uehlinger, *Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God in Ancient Israel*, trans. Thomas H. Trapp (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002).

[11] John Day, *Yahweh and the Gods and Goddesses of Canaan* (London: Continuum, 2002), 144; ibid. 59–60 for the likelihood that Asherah was thought to be Yahweh's consort.

who do not participate in the process, and (c) they presuppose the moral superiority of those imposing the ban.

3. The demand for the ban and separation is reiterated by an elitist, probably minority group intent upon establishing its control over the wider body politic and religious in Jerusalem. To the extent that this is the case, the negative claims made about the target groups (other nations, foreign wives, supposedly alien deities) must be regarded with some suspicion.

4. The morality of the ban is deeply suspect, involving as it does (a) demands for ethnic cleansing and genocide and (b) the forcible dissolution of marriages with no recompense for alienated wives and children.

5. Perhaps thankfully, it effectiveness is also dubious, in that the nations targeted largely survived—indeed, action against them may have been much exaggerated by some of the biblical tradents—and marriage across ethnic boundaries was in fact an integral and positive part of the experience of Israel.

Boycott and Osracism in UCU

Perhaps the most sustained campaign for boycotting in recent years has been directed against the state of Israel. In the light of the first section it is not a little ironic that a largely religious process which arguably failed within the history of ancient Israel should be so strongly advocated against its modern secular incarnation in the form of legitimate boycotts. The irony lies in the quasi-religious fervour which informs the campaign; for unlike other boycotts of recent times, the focus of this one centres firmly on the competing claims of two communities perceived to have both religious and ethnic features: Palestinian Muslims and Israeli Jews. The fact that numbers of Palestinians are not Muslim, and Israelis not Jews, is largely glossed—as indeed is the dubious character of the assumptions made regarding ethnicity—with the result that the language of the boycott campaign can all too easily segue into antisemitism through a careless identification of Israel as a state with Jews as a people. In part the problem lies in the hardly surprising fact that, while modern Israel is a secular state, albeit one that operates with an underlying structure of Jewish customs, festivals and beliefs, there is undoubtedly a vociferous and influential element within Israel which sees the modern state as being in direct continuity with, and fulfilment of, the promises supposed to have been made by Yahweh to ancient Israelites. Most perniciously, these promises are used to justify the seizure of Palestinian land and property in the name of this religious belief—and it has to be admitted that elements in government in Israel have either actively or tacitly endorsed these actions, though usually by claiming the fig-leaf of security. I should make it clear here that Israel has a perfectly legitimate security need, faced as it undoubtedly is by neighbours whose acceptance of its very existence is at best lukewarm, and by some who regularly deploy violence against non-combatant citizens to make their point.

It is not my purpose in this paper to discuss or comment on the various positions taken regarding the stand-off in the Middle East between Israel and Palestine, or to pass any value judgments on the actions of the various powers involved. I have a much more limited objective, which is to look at the recent history of the "boycott Israel" movement within UCU and its predecessors, the Association of University Teachers (AUT) and National Association of Teachers in Further and Higher Education (NATFHE), and to draw some parallels and perhaps some lessons from the analysis in Part One of boycotts and ostracism in ancient Israel. It is also not my intention to suggest that the Union was in some sense the progenitor of or prime mover in the campaign, which undoubtedly originated in Palestinian circles.

In 2005, AU Council unexpectedly voted in favour of a package of motions designed to isolate certain specific HE institutions in Israel, and more generally to commit the Union to "advocate a comprehensive boycott of Israeli institutions at the national and international levels." Though this series of victories came as something of a surprise to a union which had little track record of activity vis-à-vis Israel (though it had in the past endorsed the boycott campaign against South Africa), its timing—towards the end of the second or Al Aqsa intifada—represented a significant shift in public opinion more generally regarding Israel's treatment of Palestinians, and international disapproval of the expanding settler movement. Within a couple of months a special Council had been called; that meeting overwhelmingly reversed the boycott call, and mandated Executive to prepare a properly thought-through policy on international affairs, the implication clearly being that we should have guidelines for the possible application of international boycotts. The guidelines which were eventually drafted by a representative committee of AUT were passed in due course, and subsequently became policy in UCU.

The issue faded while the merger between AUT and NATFHE was effected; but came back with a vengeance at the first full congress of the new union in 2008, and then in each of the next three congresses. The final straw, for many people, was the decision of Congress in 2011 to disbar the Union from employing the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) working definition of antisemitism,[12] on the grounds that it confused criticism of Israel with antisemitism and was "used to silence debate about Israel and Palestine on campus."

These campaigns have proved to be extremely controversial, and have prompted a number of legal moves, clarifications by UCU, and latterly an individual tribunal complaint. Threats of resignation, and actual resignations from the Union have occurred, and it is abundantly clear that this is an issue which profoundly divides UCU at all levels: The executive, officers, regions, branches and individual members. This is not, of course, the only international issue on which UCU has taken a position. In recent years, for ex-

[12] "Antisemitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of antisemitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities." The full text of the English version can be found at http://www.european-forum-on-antisemitism.org/working-definition-of-antisemitism/english/.

ample, the Union has expressed its solidarity with academics under threat in a number of countries, with the most successful arguably being the case of the Colombian lecturer Dr Miguel Angel Beltrán, who was cleared of false charges of terrorism in June 2011. Yet none of these other instances has engendered the kind of internal tension which attends the expression of concern regarding Israel and Palestine. The most obvious reason for the difference is that it is only the latter case which raises the spectre of race and ethnicity, running the danger of confusing political criticism of a government with generalized assumptions about the ethnic composition of those held to be under its influence, or complicit in is decisions. Moreover, it is only in this instance that many who identify themselves as of the same religion/culture/ethnicity as those in the "offending" state are also British academics and citizens of the United Kingdom.[13] They naturally question whether they ought to be held personally responsible (as some rhetoric implies) for the actions of a state to which they do not belong and over which they have little influence.[14]

While this admittedly brief survey cannot do justice to the many complexities of the issues raised by the stand-off between Israel and Palestine, I hope that it will serve as a context for my narrower focus on the question of boycott and the phenomenon of a small pressure group's ability to win support against the odds for its specific objectives. Even a cursory glance at the various motions in the appendix is revealing. Of the eighteen successful motions, four involved the Birmingham branch, three came from branches in Brighton, and seven from the National Executive. A further three relate to the May 2005 special council of AUT and represent in essence the opposition position. It is not accidental that a leading exponent of the campaign against Israel came from Birmingham, that the leadership in Brighton is dominated by the Socialist Workers Party faction for whom this has been until very recently a cause célèbre, and that the National Executive of UCU in its first five years contained a clear majority of elected members who were either in the SWP or belong to its support group, UCU Left. In short, the move to target Israel and to urge the membership of UCU to undertake both economic and academic/intellectual boycotts of the country is a classic example of the effectiveness of a dedicated grouping within an otherwise open organization.

It would be wrong to suggest that this is the only reason for the success of the motions we are considering. Without broad support from delegates to the annual meetings of AUT, NATFHE and UCU, it would not have been possible to promote such policies. Moreover, the wider context of perfectly legitimate criticism of many of Israel's policies in recent years provided fertile ground for the superficial success of the boycott cam-

[13] Muslim Britons experience some of the same prejudice when they are lumped together as symbols of Islamist terrorism. At present, however, there is to my knowledge no active campaign against (say) Saudi Arabia which blames Muslims in general for its appalling civil rights record; nor, indeed, has there been any call amongst British trade unions for a boycott of that supremely undemocratic state.

[14] I pass over another irony—that few individual British citizens are held similarly to be personally responsible for the actions of their government in similarly dubious neo-colonialist adventures like Iraq, Afghanistan and Libya!

paign. My choice of the word "superficial" is a considered one: there has been no review of the extent to which the various calls for members to carry out a process of boycott has been successful, and certain voting patterns within the Union demonstrate that individuals known to oppose academic boycotts have been successful in winning the support of members.

As a result serious divisions emerged in UCU, and individuals have found themselves under pressure either from, on the one hand, those who hold as a very strong moral principle that the only answer to crisis in the Middle East is to isolate Israel, or, on the other, Jewish leaders and members of UCU who believe that they have been singled out unfairly and subject to tactics which are virtually antisemitic. The passing of Motion 70 at UCU Congress in 2011 (dissociating the Union from the EUMC definition of antisemitism) did nothing to ease their fears and suspicions.

To sum up, it is likely that the whole process has had a far greater effect on UCU than on either Israel or Palestine. On the credit side, the issues have certainly been widely aired; and UCU's commitment to the observation each year of Holocaust Memorial Day is positive. No-one who has been an active member of UCU over the last five years can fail to have been prompted to look very seriously at our attitudes, whatever they are, to the peace process (or lack of it) in the Middle East. On the debit side it is legitimate to wonder whether the price in terms of public obloquy has been worth it. Have any attitudes actually changed? Have we lost collegiality in the interest of a principle which we do not all agree on? I shall attempt to draw some conclusions in Part Three by making some comparisons between the ancient and the modern exemplars.

Lessons to be Learnt?

I shall refer here to the five summary points at the end of section one. We can, to a remarkable degree, identify modern comparators for many of these points, and I will consider them in turn.

1. The least contentious (and perhaps least relevant!) is the shared technical language—"to boycott" and "to ostracise"—which (in modern Hebrew) uses the very terms found in the Biblical examples. There is not much to say about this, beyond noting the irony that terms used in the Hebrew Bible with reference to somewhat unsavoury practices in the ancient world have now been turned against modern-day Israelis, whatever their relation to the ancient Israelites.

2. The second group of indicators—intended isolation of Israel, condemnation of those who refuse to participate in the boycott, and an assumption that the boycotters occupy the moral high ground—can each be identified as part of the process in UCU. Frequent descriptions of Israel as "an apartheid state," coupled in extreme instances by accusations of ethnic cleansing, if not attempted genocide, show how Israel is defined as a pariah state. Even polite objections to the campaign for academic boycott are met with overt hostility, regardless of the moral position of

those who object. Finally, a clear sense of moral superiority is evident in several of the motions, and is an underlying assumption of the whole campaign.[15] The one-sided nature of this morality is perhaps illustrated by the refusal of Congress to pass motion 33/2010 which asked the Union to dissociate itself from antisemitic remarks made by Bongani Masuku (then the International Relations Secretary of the Congress of South African Trade Unions [COSATU]), an invited speaker at a UCU event. This refusal was seen by many to have undermined the many protestations that there is nothing antisemitic about the campaign to isolate Israel and win support for sanctions against it.

3. There is no doubt that, within UCU, the SWP poses as an elite, politically speaking. It has a clearly-stated agenda which is quite separate from, and at several points in conflict with, the aims of UCU, and it is without doubt a minority faction in the Union. In many of the motions it sponsors (by no means only in the case of Israel and Palestine) matters of opinion are stated as fact and council delegates asked to endorse these with very little background information.

4. The morality of calls to boycott Israel is questionable though not, of course, in terms of the right of any individual to take non-aggressive action in the interests of a firmly-held conviction. But that is not an absolute right, as recent cases where medics who wished to boycott abortions, or registrars who wanted to boycott same-sex civil ceremonies have found to their cost. When it comes to a matter of institutional action, wider concerns must be considered, and it is not safe for individuals to take action on the assumption that the institutional boycott call will cover them. Refusal of what are seen to be the human rights of Israeli citizens could well become a legal issue, and in terms of common justice, at the very least must give right-minded people pause for thought. Is the choking off of cultural and intellectual communication appropriate? Similar issues, of course, arose in the case of the boycott of Apartheid South Africa, and I shall return to these shortly when I consider the efficacy of sanctions. The furore caused by Paul Simon's decision to work in South Africa with black musicians to make the classic album *Graceland* is perhaps indicative of the tensions involved[16]—tensions which have still not been resolved.

5. Do boycotts work? And perhaps more important, in what circumstances might they work? South Africa and the world-wide campaign against apartheid is often (indeed, almost exclusively) cited as the paradigm case, but even that exemplar is far from clear cut. Lee Jones, of Queen Mary University in London, is currently engaged on an extensive research programme intended to identify not just how

[15] See for example 56/2005; 25/2008; and 70/2011.

[16] There is a useful summary of the issues in a Guardian article marking the twenty-fifth anniversary of *Graceland*: Robin Denselow, "Paul Simon's *Graceland*: the acclaim and the outrage," *The Guardian*, April 19, 2012, http://www.guardian.co.uk/music/2012/apr/19/paul-simon-graceland-acclaim-outrage.

effective sanctions might be, but how such effectiveness might be measured, and what preconditions should govern decisions about the application of sanctions, and what kind of sanctions might be deployed.[17] His preliminary findings suggest that even at governmental level, "policymakers impose sanctions essentially on a wish and prayer, merely hoping that economic deprivation will have the desired outcome, without any sense of how it may (or may not) do so." There is not room in the context of this paper to discuss his work in detail, but some observations are particularly pertinent. It is likely, for example that most of those currently advocating sanctions against Israel base their advocacy on classic liberal assumptions which Jones identifies as having three aspects:

> First, target-state policymakers' decisions are based on cost-bene-fit analyses which are highly sensitive to economic calculations, such that imposing costs will lead to a policy change. Secondly, and underpinning the first assumption, the function of states is to maximize the general welfare, leading them to prioritize economic costs of resisting over the political costs of conceding. Thirdly, those affected by sanctions enjoy the capacity to effect political change. If the targeted government does not automatically respond on the basis of a revised cost-benefit analysis, the classical liberal view expects the target population to compel it to do so, on the basis of their own rational, cost-benefit analysis.

He notes, dryly, that "[a]ll of these classical liberal assumptions are questionable"! Even in the case of South Africa, the long-term effectiveness of sanctions (in the short- and medium term they were largely counter-productive) was due in considerable part to the development of internal change—including, ironically, greater access to resources and information on the part of the oppressed groups targeted by apartheid. In a fascinating parallel to the Paul Simon case cited above, Jones observes that even "fake" disinvestment was positive in its effects, since it

> enhanced the leverage of anti-apartheid forces, particularly black trade unions, which was used to further fragment the dominant coalition.... [thus] the very fakery of disinvestment created significant "pullout leverage" for unions which "dramatically increase[d] our bargaining power." Foreign firms were reluctant to actually withdraw from South Africa but to stay they had to strike deals with workers to appease hostile activists back home. Many firms reduced layoffs, increased pay, agreed to press the government to negotiate with the opposition, and

[17] This is a preliminary report, to which I have referred with the permission of the author. See now, Lee Jones and Clara Portela, "Evaluating the 'success' of international economic sanctions: Multiple goals, Interpretive methods and critique," *Research Collection School of Social Sciences*, paper 1671 (April 2014).

> recognized black unions, helping COSATU to enhance its "organizational base" and survive the government crackdown.

In short, Jones's answer to the question, "Do sanctions work" is a resounding "It depends"; moreover it is clear that it is unsafe to draw upon analogy in relation to sanctions. His conclusions are particularly apt:

> What an analysis of the important South African case does highlight, however, is the danger of reasoning by analogy in relation to sanctions. As noted earlier, calls for sanctions to be applied in other cases, from Myanmar to Israel, are justified by claims that since they worked in South Africa, they will work elsewhere. The analysis of sanctions against apartheid suggests that, to the extent that they worked, they did so in interaction with historically and societally specific dynamics. To the extent that other target states lack these pressures and offer very different contexts, we cannot logically expect even identically-designed sanctions to have the same effect elsewhere.

Lee Jones does not discuss academic and cultural boycotts directly, though they were a vociferous part of the sanctions campaign in general, and one to which UCU's predecessor unions (AUT and NAFTE) subscribed without much controversy. In 2006, however, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) hosted in its online journal *Academe* three contributions reflecting on the experience.[18] Two of the contributors (Salim Vally and Shireen Hassim) accepted without much question the effectiveness of academic sanctions against South Africa; the third (Jonathan Hyslop) provides a nuanced historical account based in part on his own experiences, and concludes that "it had no important political effect in undermining apartheid and … may have had a minor negative impact on postapartheid society." He identifies many problems which quickly arose in practice, and notes the emergence of internal support for a "selective boycott," but that too proved problematic not least because of the impossibility of identifying appropriate criteria for selective exemptions. In the end the ineffectiveness of the academic boycott was beneficial in that openness to external influences enable real changes of mind and attitude in the white population. However, Hyslop notes a countervailing unfortunate consequence of the "effect of boycott on the boycotters," namely that

> the politics of the boycott engendered a situation where academics approached the South African question primarily as moralists. In doing

[18] Jonathan Hyslop, Salim Vally, Shireen Hassim, "The South African Boycott Experience," *Academe* (Sept-Oct 2006), http://cosmos.ucc.ie/cs1064/jabowen/IPSC/archive/seanArchives/journal989/article0046403.html.

> so, they largely abandoned the contribution they could have made as intellectuals to the creation of South African democracy. To this day, it damages their ability to engage with the country.

He concludes by citing Kant's idea of "universal hospitality," and reflecting that

> Kant's words must provoke us to think about whether the abandonment of that cosmopolitan right of hospitality in one place on the globe can be a useful contribution to overcoming the transgression of rights in another. If we do believe that scholarship is more than a job, that ideas do make a difference in human affairs, that the clash of ideas is essential to change, then it is difficult for me to understand how stemming the flow of people and ideas assists us toward a better world. The great achievement of South Africa's present is surely that it is an attempt at sharing the earth, to which nobody has a greater right than another. My experience of the South African boycott makes me doubt whether a refusal of academic hospitality is a means to bring about the conditions for that kind of sharing.

Conclusions

Undoubtedly there are many attractions in using the boycott as a political weapon. It is something that can be done with little consequence to those doing it (which might, incidentally, be morally problematic); it is highly visible; it seems to "fit the crime" in that those against whom it is deployed deserve to be isolated from their fellow human beings; it scores highly on the ideological scale because of its "right and wrong" certainty: we know who the enemy are and feel justified in acting against them; and it can be very simply presented, requiring little in the way of nuanced argument.

Do boycotts work? There is evidence that they can; indeed, the original boycott was highly successful, being small-scale, local, and highly focused. Above all it was short-term, aimed at a particular abuse within a limited period of time. The Montgomery Bus Boycott of 1955, which brought fame to Rosa Parks and Martin Luther King, and set in train a sequence of events which permanently changed the United States, affords a similar instance. An interesting recent variant on the boycott is the use of social media to address very specific abuses (or perceived abuses), usually in the retail sector. Large companies seem to be particularly susceptible to this technique, and will sometimes make very public changes to policy and/or practice to protect their markets; this was certainly the case when a widespread campaign was launched against the Cameron Government's "workfare" scheme which was interpreted as a scam to force the unemployed to work for nothing, and as a consequence to render other workers redundant. On the other hand, many of the businesses thus targeted do not show signs of being much affected: while Starbucks made a token payment to the Treasury to ward off bad publicity, Amazon

and Vodafone seem to have continued blithely in their tax- minimising ways. Perhaps the truth of the matter is that successful boycotts are either short, sharp campaigns addressing a sharply defined and specific issue, or those mounted at an international level by a consortium of national governments. Even then, success is not guaranteed: it is by no means clear that the Western boycott of Iran is close to achieving its aims, and the analyses referred to above of South Africa reveal a much more complex situation than most of those who appeal to its example will allow.

On the negative side, in situations where there is sharply divided opinion and no clear moral certainty, it is likely to prove a damp squib. There are also the problems associated with over-use: hardly a week goes by without a call coming out to consumers to boycott some business or another, whether for alleged tax avoidance, bad employment practices, the use of child labour, complicity in the arms trade, or whatever. Many of the seeming advantages of the sanctions/boycott weapon can, of course, also be presented as drawbacks. In what circumstances are we justified in imposing suffering on others in the name of our own principles? Are we sure that the isolation and ostracism of the many innocents amongst boycotted communities is a price worth paying? Have the innocent had the chance to make their voice heard in the debate? Ideological purity is a dangerous condition, being perhaps the other side of the coin called bigotry: have we explored the counter-arguments, and made allowance for mitigating circumstances with regard to the supposed crimes of those we are targeting? Is their violence, for example, a defensible response to attacks on their well-being? Are the high profile accusations often made in such circumstances factually correct? The use of terms like Apartheid and genocide or ethnic cleansing in criticisms of Israel is frequent, offensive; and it is doubtful that their use is accurate, to say the least.

This paper has drawn on the implicit evidence in the Old Testament for programmes of sanctions, boycotts and social exclusion (up to and including ethnic cleansing and genocide). What that seems to show is that, rooted as they are in the narrow beliefs and agendas of elite minorities, their ultimate effectiveness is nugatory and their impact negative. The irony that these same programmes were frequently used against the Jews in Christendom up to the Holocaust under the Nazis reinforces their suspect nature.

Parallels with modern calls for sanctions and boycotts are of course limited, but they certainly highlight the risks of self-righteous supposed moral superiority on the part of those making such calls, of ill-thought out presuppositions regarding the application and effectiveness of sanctions, and of a consequent failure to explore other and perhaps better approaches to resolving the undoubted injustices and inequalities which abound in the Middle East—as, indeed, in too many other places in our as yet unreformed world. There is no single magic bullet that will resolve these problems; perhaps at least a recognition of their complexity might help to forestall simplistic "answers" which run the risk of, in the end, making things worse rather than better.

Appendix: UCU Motions 2005–11

Note: only those motions directly referred to have been given in full. Others may be found in the records of the national meetings of AUT and UCU. The numbers correspond with the numbers used in the proceedings of these meetings.

AUT Council—April 2005

56 (Moved by Open University and seconded by Birmingham)
Council notes:

1. That nearly sixty of the most prominent academic, cultural and professional associations and trade unions in the Occupied West Bank and Gaza, including the Federation of Unions of Palestinian Universities' Professors and Employees and the umbrella organization of Palestinian Non-Governmental Associations (NGOs) in the occupied West Bank (PNGO), and thus highly representative of the views of major sectors in Palestinian civil society, have now called for an academic and cultural boycott of Israeli institutions.

2. That AUT is affiliated to Friends of Bir Zeit University and Trade Union Friends of Palestine.

3. That the full text of the Palestinian Call can be found on the following websites: right2edu.birzeit.edu/news/article178;www.bricup.org.uk

4. That the wording of this call is as follows:

   In the spirit of international solidarity, moral consistency and resistance to injustice and oppression, we, Palestinian academics and intellectuals, call upon our colleagues in the international community to comprehensively and consistently boycott all Israeli academic and cultural institutions as a contribution to the struggle to end Israel's occupation, colonization and system of apartheid, by applying the following:

   a) Refrain from participation in any form of academic and cultural cooperation, collaboration or joint projects with Israeli institutions;

   b) Advocate a comprehensive boycott of Israeli institutions at the national and international levels, including suspension of all forms of funding and subsidies to these institutions;

   c) Promote divestment and disinvestment from Israel by international academic institutions;

   d) Exclude from the above actions against Israeli institutions any conscientious Israeli academics and intellectuals opposed to their state's colonial and racist policies;

e) Work toward the condemnation of Israeli policies by pressing for resolutions to be adopted by academic, professional and cultural associations and organizations;

f) Support Palestinian academic and cultural institutions directly without requiring them to partner with Israeli counterparts as an explicit or implicit condition for such support.'

Council resolves to circulate the full text of the Palestinian call to all LAs for information and discussion.

AUT Special Council—May 2005

1 (Proposed by Southampton)

Council notes that at the last council, AUT international policy on Israel and Palestine was resolved in the absence of defining principle and without debate or acceptable standards of democratic procedure.

Council therefore resolves:

1. that international policy must be based on consistent principle, openly debated and democratically confirmed

2. that the European and international affairs sub-committee of the national executive update such a policy for debate at the next meeting of council

3. that in light of this, existing policy relating to boycotts of Israeli universities should be set aside

4. to reiterate its long-term position in regard to the occupation

5. to mandate the executive to work with NATFHE and the TUC to establish an investigative commission charged with examining how best to implement this policy and to provide practical solidarity to Palestinian and Israeli trade unionists struggling to maintain academic freedom, undertake research and teach students whilst arguing for Israel's compliance with UN resolution, with a view to reporting back to the next council.

UCU Congress 2008

25 (Proposed by University of Brighton—Eastbourne, University of Brighton—Grand Parade, University of East London Docklands, National Executive Committee)

Congress notes the

1. continuation of illegal settlement, killing of civilians and the impossibility of civil life, including education

2. humanitarian catastrophe imposed on Gaza by Israel and the EU
3. apparent complicity of most of the Israeli academy
4. legal attempts to prevent UCU debating boycott of Israeli academic institutions; and legal advice that such debates are lawful

   Congress affirms that

5. criticism of Israel or Israeli policy are not, as such, anti-semitic;
6. pursuit and dissemination of knowledge are not uniquely immune from their moral and political consequences; Congress resolves that
7. colleagues be asked to consider the moral and political implications of educational links with Israeli institutions, and to discuss the occupation with individuals and institutions concerned, including Israeli colleagues with whom they are collaborating;
8. UCU widely disseminate the personal testimonies of UCU and PFUUPE delegations to Palestine and the UK, respectively;
9. the testimonies will be used to promote a wide discussion by colleagues of the appropriateness of continued educational links with Israeli academic institutions;
10. UCU facilitate and encourage twinning arrangements and other direct solidarity with Palestinian institutions;
11. Ariel College, an explicitly colonising institution in the West Bank, be investigated under the formal Greylisting Procedure.

December 2008—Statement on motion 25

(Agreed by the National Executive and Trustees)

Over the past months, the UCU has been under the threat of legal action from 12 anonymous members of the union. These members sought, by bringing the threat of legal action, to persuade the National Executive Committee to repudiate motion 25 on education in Palestine and on the role of Israeli universities and colleges in the Occupation. They sought this outcome on the basis that, in their view, solidarity boycotts of institutions are unlawful, and that targeting Israeli institutions specifically would be discriminatory.

Contrary to the widespread misreporting, the UCU has neither abandoned nor repudiated motion 25 as a result of legal threats and challenges. Together with all other policy positions adopted at the 2008 Congress, national, professional and international, motion 25 will be pursued vigorously and rigorously. This motion was carried overwhelmingly at Congress, and, amongst other things, called for an investigation and

report into the conditions of education in the Occupied Territories, and specifically for an investigation of the role of one college preparatory to any request of "greylisting" being received. At its recent meeting, the National Executive confirmed, again by an overwhelming vote, that this investigation would be pursued as part of our wider concern with the condition of academic freedom in a number of areas across the world. The outcome will be reported to our next Congress.

It is to be deeply regretted that an attempt should have been made to subvert the democratic procedures of the union by resort to a tendentious interpretation of the law. Even many of those who had opposed motion 25 were determined that this should not succeed. If members of the union wish to change policy, there are established democratic mechanisms for that to be done, without recourse to the courts.

The union has met the counsel for the litigants in the motion 25 threat, and has politely explained this position to them. It has explained that motion 25 will be pursued in a manner determined by its executive bodies, and within the law, and that the union will not be deterred by legal threats or by intimidation. No discussion of amendments to this position was possible outside the formal democratic processes of the union, and no "concessions" or "compromises" on this position would be negotiated formally or informally.

Congress 2010

33 (Proposed by University of Oxford) [The motion was defeated]

Congress notes that:

- UCU invited Bongani Masuku to a meeting in December 2009 to discuss Boycott, Disinvestment and Sanctions against Israel;
- the South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC) has found that at a rally at the University of the Witwatersrand in March 2009 Masuku "uttered numerous anti-semitic remarks which were seen to have incited violence and hatred amongst the students who were present.";
- the SAHRC has determined that these statements, and others made publicly by Masuku, amount to hate speech prohibited by the South African constitution;
- the SAHRC finding makes it clear that Masuku does not deny making the remarks attributed to him;
- these remarks were publicly available on the internet well before UCU's invitation to Masuku was issued.

Congress dissociates itself from Masuku's repugnant views.

Congress 2011

70 (Proposed by National Executive Committee)

Congress notes with concern that the so-called 'EUMC working definition of antisemitism', while not adopted by the EU or the UK government and having no official status, is being used by bodies such as the NUS and local student unions in relation to activities on campus.

Congress believes that the EUMC definition confuses criticism of Israeli government policy and actions with genuine antisemitism, and is being used to silence debate about Israel and Palestine on campus.

Congress resolves:

1. that UCU will make no use of the EUMC definition (e.g. in educating members or dealing with internal complaints)

2. that UCU will dissociate itself from the EUMC definition in any public discussion on the matter in which UCU is involved

3. that UCU will campaign for open debate on campus concerning Israel's past history and current policy, while continuing to combat all forms of racial or religious discrimination.

Bibliography

Achcar, Gilbert. "U.S. Hegemony in the Middle East: From Peak to Adversity." Palestine and the Uprisings: SOAS Palestine Society Annual Conference. London. March 17, 2012.

Albright, William F. "Why the Near East Needs the Jews." *New Palestine* 32, no. 9 (1942): 12–13.

Alkalai, Yehudah Chai. "The Third Redemption," in Hertzberg, ed., *The Zionist Idea*, 105–7.

Allison, Dale C. *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History*. London: SPCK, 2010.

Almog, Oz. *The Sabra*. Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1981. [Hebrew]

Alter, Robert. "The Masada Complex." *Commentary* 56, no. 1 (July 1973): 19–24.

Amin, Samir. *Eurocentrism: Modernity, Religion and Democracy. A Critique of Eurocentrism and Culturalism*. 2nd ed.; New York: Pambazuka Press, 2010.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso Books, 2003.

Anderson, Irvine H. *Biblical Interpretation and Middle East Policy: The Promised Land, America and Israel, 1917–2002*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2005.

Arakie, Margaret. *The Broken Sword of Justice: America, Israel and the Palestine Tragedy*. London: Quartet Books, 1973.

Arnal, William. *The Symbolic Jesus: Historical Scholarship, Judaism and the Construction of Contemporary Identity*. London: Equinox, 2005.

Ateek, Naim S. *Justice and Only Justice: A Palestinian Theology of Liberation*. Maryknoll: Orbis, 1989.

Ateek, Naim S. *A Palestinian Christian Cry for Reconciliation*. Maryknoll: Orbis, 2008.

Avineri, Shlomo. *The Making of Modern Zionism: Intellectual Origins of the Jewish State*. New York: Basic Books, 1981.

Bakunin, Mikhail. *Selected Works*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1972.

Bar-Zohar, Michael. *Ben-Gurion*. Translated by Peretz Kidron. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1978.

Barclay, John M. G. "Constructing Judean Identity after 70 CE: A Study of Josephus's *Against Apion*." In *Identity and Interaction in the Ancient Mediterranean: Jews, Christians and Others. Essays in Honour of Stephen G. Wilson*, ed. Zeba A. Crook and Philip A. Harland, 99–112. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2007.

Barth, Fredrik. "Introduction." In *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference*, ed. Fredrik Barth, 9–38. London: Allen and Unwin, 1969.

Bauckham, Richard J. "Rich Man and Lazarus: The Parable and the Parallels." NTS 37, no. 2 (1991): 225–46.

de Bellaigue, Christopher. "Where Edward Said Was Wrong." Review of Robert Irwin. *Dangerous Knowledge*. *Times Literary Supplement*. May 17, 2006. www.campus-watch.org/article/id/2974.

Ben-Gurion, David. "Exile and the Bible: A dialogue with Haim Hazzas." *Dialogues on State and Culture*. October 1962, 12. [Hebrew]

Ben-Gurion, David. *Studies in the Bible*. Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1976.

Ben-Gurion (Berdichevsky), Micha Yossef. *The Writings of Micha Yosef Berdichevsky*. Tel Aviv: Dvir, 1960. [Hebrew]

Ben-Yehuda, Nachman. *The Masada Myth: Collective Memory and Mythmaking in Israel*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1995.

Benvenisti, Meron. *Sacred Landscape: The Buried History of the Holy Land Since 1948*. Translated by Maxine Kaufman-Lacusta. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

Ben-Yehuda, Nachman. "The Masada Myth." *Bible and Interpretation*. 2000. http://http://www.bibleinterp.com/articles/2000/masada.shtml.

Ben-Yehuda, Nachman. *Sacrificing Truth: Archaeology and the Myth of Masada*. Amherst, NY: Humanity Books, 2002.

Bercuson, David J. *Canada and the Birth of Israel: A Study in Canadian Foreign Policy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985.

Betts, Robert B. *The Druze*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.

Boer, Roland. "Apocalyptic and Apocalypticism in the Poetry of E. P. Thompson." *Spaces of Utopia* 7 (2009): 34–53.

Boteach, Shmuley. *Kosher Jesus*. Jerusalem: Gefen Publishing House, 2012.

Boyarin, Daniel. *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

Braber, Ben. *Jews in Glasgow, 1879–1939: Immigration and Integration*. London: Vallentine Mitchell, 2007.

Brower, Daniel R. and Edward J. Lazzerini, eds. *Russia's Orient: Imperial Borderlands and Peoples, 1700–1917*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1997.

Brown, Callum G. *Religion and Society in Scotland Since 1707*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1997.

Brueggemann, Walter. *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997.

Buell, Denise K. *Why This New Race: Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.

Burge, Gary M. *Jesus and the Land: The New Testament Challenge to "Holy Land" Theology*. Grand Rapids: SPCK, Baker Academic, 2010.

Canfield, Joseph M. In *The Incredible Scofield and His Book*. Vallecito, CA: Ross House Books, 1988.

Cantor, Norman F. *Inventing the Middle Ages: The Lives, Works, and Ideas of the Great Medievalists of the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Lutterworth Press, 1991.

Cardenal, Rodolfo. "The Timeliness and the Challenge of the Theology of Liberation." In *Reclaiming the Vision: Education, Liberation and Justice*, ed. Mary Grey, 21. Southampton: LSU College, 1994.

Carson, Beth. *Pastor Bob: A Statesman of Prayer for Canada*. Belleville: Guardian Books, 2003.

Casey, Maurice. *Jesus of Nazareth: An Independent Historian's Account of His Life and Teaching*. London: T&T Clark, 2010.

Chacour, Elias. *We Belong to The Land: The Story of a Palestinian Israeli Who Lives for Peace and Reconciliation*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.

Chomsky, Noam. *Understanding Power: The Indispensable Chomsky*. Edited by Peter R. Mitchell and John Schoeffel. New York: New Press, 2002.

Chomsky, Noam and Gilbert Achcar. *Perilous Power: The Middle East and U.S. Foreign Policy. Dialogues on Terror, Democracy, War, and Justice*. London: Hamish Hamilton, 2007.

Christians United for Israel. "About Us." http://www.cufi.org/site/PageServer?pagename=about_AboutCUFI.

Church of Scotland. *Course of Lectures on the Jews by The Ministers of the Established Church in Glasgow*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication 1840. Cohen, Shaye. *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

Cohen, Shaye. *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

Collins, Kenneth E. *Go and Learn: The International Story of Jews and Medicine in Scotland*. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1988.

Collins, Kenneth E. *Second City Jewry: The Jews of Glasgow in the Age of Expansion, 1790– 1919*. Glasgow: Scottish Jewish Archives Committee, 1990.

Collins, Kenneth E. *Be Well! Jewish Immigrant Health and Welfare in Glasgow, 1860–1914*. East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2001.

Collins, Kenneth E., ed. *Aspects of Scottish Jewry*. Glasgow: Glasgow Jewish Representative Council, 1987.

Council of Religious Institutions of the Holy Land. "'Victims of Our Own Narratives?' Portrayal of the 'Other' in Israeli and Palestinian School Books." *Study Report* (Feb 4, 2013). http://d7hj1xx5r7f3h.cloudfront.net/Israeli-Palestinian_School_Book_Study_Report-English.pdf.

Crossan, John Dominic. *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991.

Crossan, John Dominic and Jonathan L. Reed. *Excavating Jesus: Beneath the Stones, Behind the Text*. London: SPCK, 2001.

Crossley, James G. "The Damned Rich (Mark 10.17–31)." *Expository Times* 116 (2005): 397–401.

Crossley, James G. *Jesus in an Age of Terror: Scholarly Projects for a New American Century*. London: Equinox, 2008.

Crossley, James G. "Jesus the Jew Since 1967." In *Jesus beyond Nationalism: Constructing the Historical Jesus in a Period of Cultural Complexity*, ed. Halvor Moxnes, Ward Blanton, and James G. Crossley, 119–37. London: Equinox, 2009.

Crossley, James G. *Jesus and the Chaos of History: Redirecting the Life of the Historical Jesus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Crossley, James G. *Harnessing Chaos: The Bible in English Political Discourse since 1968*. Updated edition; London and New York: Bloomsbury/T&T Clark, 2016.

Dart, Ron. *The Eagle and the Ox: Contemplation, the Church and Politics*. Abbotsford: Freshwind Press, 2006.

Dart, Ron. "Christianity, Zionism and Anti-Semitism." HLS 9, no. 2 (2010): 239–43.

Dart, Ron. "The Bible Belt in British Columbia, Canadian Zionism and the Israel Lobby." HLS 11, no. 1 (2012): 87–91.

Dart, Ron. *Canadian Christian Zionism: A Tangled Tale*. Dewdnesy: Synaxis Press, 2015.

Day, John. *Yahweh and the Gods and Goddesses of Canaan*. London: Continuum, 2002.

Dayan, Moshe, ed. *Masada*. Paris: Armand and Georges Israël, 1983.

Deines, Roland. "Jesus and the Jewish Traditions of His Time." *Early Christianity* 3, no. 1 (2010):

Denselow, Robin. "Paul Simon's *Graceland*: the acclaim and the outrage." *The Guardian*. April 19, 2012. http://www.guardian.co.uk/music/2012/apr/19/paul-simon-graceland-acclaim-outrage.

Destani, Bejtullah, ed. *Minorities in the Middle East: Druze Communities 1840–1974*. 4 vols. Slough: Archive Editions, 2006.

Dugger, Ronnie."Does Reagan Expect a Nuclear Armageddon?" *Washington Post*. April 18, 1984, C1, C4.

Dunn, James D. G. *The Partings of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity*. 2nd ed.; London: SCM, 2006.

Dyer, Charles H. *What's Next? God, Israel and the Future of Iraq*. Chicago: Moody Publishers, 2004.

Ehrman, Bart D. *Jesus: Apocalyptic Prophet of the New Millennium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Eller, Jack and Reed Coughlan. "The Poverty of Primordialism." In Hutchinson and Smith, ed., *Ethnicity*, 45–51.

Elliott, John H. "Jesus the Israelite Was Neither a 'Jew' Nor a 'Christian': On Correcting Misleading Nomenclature." JSHJ 5, no. 2 (2007): 119–54.

Evans, Craig A. "Daniel in the New Testament: Visions of God's Kingdom." In *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, ed. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint, 490–527. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Fairbairn, Patrick. "The Future Prospects of the Jews—Restoration to their own Land." In *Course of Lectures on the Jews*, Church of Scotland.

Falwell, Jerry and Bob Simon, interviewer, "Zion's Christian Soldiers," *60 Minutes*, CBS, October 3, 2002.

Feldman, Louis H. *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Feldman, Louis H. "Conversion to Judaism in Classical Antiquity," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 74 (2003): 115–56.

Fredriksen, Paula. "Mandatory Retirement: Ideas in the Study of Christian Origins whose Time Has Come to Go." *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 35, no. 2 (2006): 231–46.

Fredriksen, Paula. "What Parting of the Ways? Jews, Gentiles and the Ancient Mediterranean City." In *The Ways that Never Parted*, ed. Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed, 35–63. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.

Fruchtenbaum, Arnold G. *The Footsteps of the Messiah: A Study of the Sequence of Prophetic Events*. Tustin, Ariel Ministries, 1990.

Gaebelein, Arno C. *The History of the Scofield Reference Bible*. New York: Our Hope Publications, 1943.

Gainer, Bernard. *The Alien Invasion: The Origins of the Aliens Act of 1905*. London: Heinemann Educational Publishers, 1972.

Gandhi, Mahatma. *The Essential Writings of Mahatma Gandhi*. Edited by Raghavan Iyer. Oxford: Oxford India Paperbacks, 1993.

Gilbert, Martin. *The Routledge Atlas of the Arab-Israeli Conflict*. 10th ed.; London and New York: Routledge, 2012.

Goldbloom, Jacob K. "Reminiscences of Zionism in Great Britain." In *The Rebirth of Israe: A Memorial Tribute to Paul Goodman*, ed. Israel Cohen. Connecticut: Hyperion, 1952. "Reminiscences of Zionism in Great Britain," in *The Rebirth of Israel: A Memorial Tribute to Paul Goodman*, ed. Israel Cohen, 61–76. London: Edward Goldston, 1952."

Goodman, Martin. "Secta and Natio." Review of Shlomo Sand, *The Invention of the Jewish People*. *The Times Literary Supplement* (Feb 26, 2010).

Gorenberg, Gershom. "Memory Serves: Two Books Look at Oral Testimony and Israel in 1948." *Bookforum*, Sept-Nov 2007. http://www.bookforum.com.

Grabbe, Lester L. *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian: Vol. I: Persian and Greek Periods*; *Vol. II: Roman Period*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

Grabbe, Lester L. *Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period: Belief and Practice From the Exile to Yavneh*. London: Routledge, 2000.

Grabbe, Lester L. *Ancient Israel: What Do We Know and How Do We Know It?* London and New York: T&T Clark International, 2007.

Grabbe, Lester L. *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period 2: The Coming of the Greeks: The Early Hellenistic Period (335–175* BCE*)*. Library of Second Temple Studies 68; London and New York: T&T Clark International, 2008.

Grabbe, Lester L. "The Case of the Corrupting Consensus." In *Between Evidence and Ideology: Essays on the History of Ancient Israel read at the Joint Meeting of the Society for Old Testament Study and the Oud Testamentisch Werkgezelschap Lincoln, July 2009*, ed. Bob Becking and Lester L. Grabbe, 83–92. OTS 59; Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Grabbe, Lester L. *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period 4: The Jews under the Roman Shadow (63* BCE *to 70* CE*, with an Excursus to 138* CE*)*. Library of Second Temple Studies; London and New York: T&T Clark International, forthcoming.

Gregerman, Adam. "Old Wine in New Bottles: Liberation Theology and the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict." *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 41, no. 3/4 (2004), 313–40.

Gregerman, Adam. "It's 'Kosher' To Accept Real Jesus? Boteach Book Seeks To Strip Away Distortions of Christ." *Forward*. Feb 9, 2012. http://forward.com/articles/151028/its-kosher-to-accept-real-jesus/.

Grey, Mary. *The Advent of Peace: A Gospel Journey to Christmas*. London: SPCK, 2010.

Grey, Mary. *The Resurrection of Peace: A Gospel Journey to Easter and Beyond*. London: SPCK, 2012.

Grodzinsky, Yosef. *In the Shadow of the Holocaust: The Struggle Between Jews and Zionists in the Aftermath of World War II*. Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press, 2004.

Gruending, Dennis. *Pulpit and Politics: Competing Religious Ideologies in Canadian Public Life*. Toronto: Kingsley Publishing, 2011.

Guri, Haim. "On Nathan Alterman: Poets of Our Times." *Zeman Yarok*. July 31, 2008. [Hebrew]

Habas, Bracha, ed. *The Book of the Second Aliya*. Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1947. [Hebrew]

Habib, Irfan. "Critical Notes on Edward Said." *International Socialism* 108 (Oct 17, 2005). http://isj.org.uk/critical-notes-on-edward-said/.

Hadley, Judith M. *The Cult of Asherah in Ancient Israel and Judah: Evidence for a Hebrew Goddess*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Hagee, John. *From Daniel to Doomsday: The Countdown Has Begun*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1999.

Hagee, John. *Jerusalem Countdown: A Prelude to War*. Revised and updated ed.; Lake Mary: Frontline, 2007.

Hagee, John. "Why Christians Should Support Israel: The Apple of His Eye…" http://www.jhm.org/Home/About/WhySupportIsrael. *John Hagee Ministries*.

Haija, Rammy M. "The Armageddon Lobby: Dispensationalist Christian Zionism and the Shaping of US Policy Towards Israel-Palestine." HLS 5, no. 1 (2006): 75–95.

Haiven, Judith. *Faith, Hope, No Charity: An Inside Look at the Born Again Movement in Canada and the United States*. Vancouver: New Star Books, 1984.

Hall, Jonathan. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Hall, Jonathan. *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2002.

Halliday, Fred. "'Orientalism' and its Critics." *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 20, no. 2 (1993): 145–63.

Harkabi, Yehoshafat. *The Bar Kokhba Syndrome: Risk and Realism in International Relations* New York: Rossel Books, 1983.

Harman, Allan, ed. *Mission of Discovery: The Beginning of Modern Jewish Evangelism*. Guernsey: Christian Focus, 1996.

Harrison, Beverley W. "The Power of Anger and the Work of Love." *Making the Connections*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1986.

Hastings, Adrian. *The Construction of Nationhood: Ethnicity, Religion and Nationalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Henkin, Hezel. "Everyone Who Says for Certain that David Sinned and the Critical Approach." *Hatzofeh*. April 1, 2004. [Hebrew]

Hertzberg, Arthur, ed. *The Zionist Idea: A Historical Analysis and Reader*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1997.

Herzl, Theodor. *The Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*. Edited by Jacob M. Alkow. Translated by Sylvie D'Avigdor. New York: American Zionist Emergency Council, 1946.

Herzl, Theodor. "The Jewish State." In Hertzberg, ed., *The Zionist Idea*, 204–26.

Heschel, Abraham J. *The Prophets*. 2 vols; New York: Harper & Row, 1969–1971.

Hess, Moses. "Rome and Jerusalem." In Hertzberg, ed., *The Zionist Idea*, 119–39.

Hindson, Edward E. *The Book of Revelation: Unlocking the Future*. Twenty-First Century Biblical Commentary Series; Chattanooga: AMG Publishers, 2002.

Hodge, Caroline Johnson. *If Sons then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Hoffman, Adina. *My Happiness Bears No Relation to Happiness: A Poet's Life in The Palestinian Century*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press 2009.

Holwerda, David E. *Jesus and Israel: One Covenant or Two?* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 1995.

Horbury, William. *Jews and Christians: In Contact and Controversy*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.

Horrell, David G. " 'Race,' 'Nation,' 'People': Ethnic Identity-Construction in 1 Peter 2.9." NTS 58 (2012): 123–43.

Howe, Stephen. "Dangerous Mind?" *New Humanist* 123, no. 6 (Nov-Dec 2008).

Huie-Jolly, Mary. "Maori 'Jews' and a Resistant Reading of John 5.10–47." In *John and Postcolonialism: Travel, Space and Power*, ed. Musa W. Dube and Jeffrey L. Staley, 94–110. London: T&T Clark, 2002.

Hunter, Alastair G. "(De)nominating Amalek: Racist Stereotyping in the Bible and the Justification of Discrimination." In *Sanctified Aggression: Legacies of Biblical and Post-Biblical Vocabularies of Violence*, ed Jonneke Bekkenkamp and Yvonne Sherwood, 92–108. London: T&T Clark, 2003.

Hunter, Alastair G. *An Introduction to the Psalms*. London: T&T Clark, 2008.

Hutchinson, John and Anthony D. Smith. "Introduction." In *Ethnicity*, ed. Hutchinson and Smith, 3–16.

Hutchinson, John and Anthony D. Smith, eds. *Ethnicity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Hutt, Charlotte and Harvey L. Kaplan, eds. *A Scottish Shtetl: Jewish Life in the Gorbals, 1880–1974*. Glasgow: Gorbals Fair Society, 1984.

Hyslop, Jonathan, Salim Vally, Shireen Hassim, "The South African Boycott Experience," *Academe* (Sept-Oct 2006), http://cosmos.ucc.ie/cs1064/jabowen/IPSC/archive/seanArchives/journal989/article0046403.html.

Imber, Elizabeth E. "Saving Jews: The History of Jewish-Christian Relations in Scotland, 1880–1948." Master's Thesis. Brandeis University, 2010.

Irwin, Robert. *For Lust of Knowing: The Orientalists and their Enemies*. London: Allen Lane, 2006.

Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Information Division. *Facts about Israel*. 1985.

Jewett, Robert and John S. Lawrence. *Captain America and the Crusade against Evil: The Dilemma of Zealous Nationalism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

Jones, Lee and Clara Portela. "Evaluating the 'success' of international economic sanctions: Multiple goals, Interpretive methods and critique." *Research Collection School of Social Sciences*; Paper 1671 (April 2014).

Kairos Palestine. "Kairos Document: A Moment of Truth." *Kairos Palestine*. Dec 15, 2009. http://www.kairospalestine.ps/content/kairos-document.

Kalischer, Zvi H. "Seeking Zion," in Hertzberg, ed., *The Zionist Idea*, 109–10.

Kamiya, Gary. "How Edward Said Took Intellectuals for a Ride." *Salon* (Dec 6, 2006). www.salon.com/2006/12/06/orientalism/.

Kaplan, William. *Canadian Maverick: The Life and Times of Ivan C. Rand*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009.

Katz, Yossi. "Agricultural Settlements in Palestine, 1882–1914." *Jewish Social Studies* 50, no. 1/2 (1988–1992): 63–82.

Keel, Othmar and Christoph Uehlinger. *Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God in Ancient Israel*. Translated by Thomas H. Trapp. London: T&T Clark, 2001.

Kelley, Shawn. *Racializing Jesus: Race, Ideology and the Formation of Modern Biblical Scholarship*. Biblical Limits; London: Routledge, 2002.

Kerr, Malcom H. "Edward W. Said, *Orientalism*." *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 12 (1980) 544–7. www.campus-watch.org/article/id/2998.

Kessler, Edward and Neil Wenborn, eds. *A Dictionary of Jewish-Christian Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Khalidi, Walid. *All That Remains: The Palestinian Villages Occupied and Depopulated by Israel in 1948*. Washington, DC: The Institute for Palestine Studies, 1992.

Khalidi, Walid. *Palestine Reborn*. London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 1992.

Kletter, Raz. "Can a Proto-Israelite Please Stand Up? Notes on the Ethnicity of Iron Age Israel and Judah." In *"I Will Speak the Riddles of Ancient Times": Archaeological and Historical Studies in Honor of Amihai Mazar on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. Aren M. Maeir and Pierre de Miroschedji (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 573–86.

Klinger, Jerry. "Reverend William H. Hechler—The Christian minister who legitimized Theodor Herzl." *The Jewish Magazine*. July 2010. http://www.jewishmag.com/145mag/herzl_hechler/herzl_hechler.htm.

Kloner, Amos. "The Subterranean Hideaways of the Judean Foothills and the Bar-Kokhba Revolt." *The Jerusalem Cathedra* 3 (1983): 114–35.

Kloner, Amos. "Underground Hiding Complexes from the Bar Kokhba War in the Judean Shephelah." *Biblical Archaeologist* 46 (1983): 210–21.

Kok, Michael. "The True Covenant People: Ethnic Reasoning in the Epistle of Barnabas." *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 40, no. 1 (2011): 81–97.

Kok, Michael. *The Gospel on the Margins: The Reception of Mark in the Second Century* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015)

Kontje, Todd C. *German Orientalisms*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004.

Kook, Abraham Isaac. "Lights for Rebirth." In Hertzberg, ed., *The Zionist Idea*, 427–31.

Kotzin Michael C. "The Continuing Challenge of Anti-Semitism." International Council of Christians and Jews. Chicago, IL. July 26, 2005. http://d11840.u26.azkihosting.com/article.asp?article=1512.

Laffan, Michael. *The Makings of Indonesian Islam: Orientalism and the Narration of a Sufi Past*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011.

LaHaye, Tim and Jerry B. Jenkins. Left Behind: A Novel of the Earth's Last Days. 16 vols; Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, 1995–2007.

Lambert, Richard S. *For the Time is at Hand: An Account of the Prophecies of Henry Wentworth Monk of Ottawa, Friend of the Jews, and Pioneer of World Peace*. London: Andrew Melrose, 1947.

Laqueur, Walter. *The History of Zionism*. London: Tauris Parke, 2003.

Le Carré, John. "America Gone Mad," *Sunday Times*, Jan 15, 2003.

Lederach, John Paul. *The Journey Toward Reconciliation*. Scottdale: Herald Press, 1999.

Lederach, John Paul. *The Moral Imagination: The Art and Soul of Building Peace*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Lerner, Michael. *Embracing Israel/Palestine: A Strategy to Heal and Transform the Middle East*. Berkeley: North Atlantic Books, 2011.

Levine, Amy-Jill. *The Misunderstood Jew: The Church and the Scandal of the Jewish Jesus*. New York: HarperCollins, 2007.

Levine, Amy-Jill, et al. "Roundtable Discussion: Anti-Judaism and Postcolonial Biblical Interpretation." *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 20, no. 1 (2004): 91–132.

Levine, Amy-Jill and Marc Z. Brettler, eds. *The Jewish Annotated New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Levine, Amy-Jill. "Old Habits Die Hard: A Critique of Recent Christian Statements on Israel." International Council of Christians and Jews, Scholarly Contributions 507. Feb 5, 2012. http://www.jcrelations.net/Old_Habits_Die_Hard__A_Critique_of_Recent_Christian_Statements_on_Israel.3797.0.html.

Levison, Frederick. *Christian and Jew: The Life of Leon Levison 1881–1936*. Edinburgh: Pentland, 1989.

Levy, Abraham. "The Origins of Scottish Jewry," *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England* 20 (1959–61): 129–62

Levy, Yohanan H. "Disputes Regarding Land in Israel in Ancient Times." In *Studies in Jewish Hellenism*, 60–78. Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute, 1969. [Hebrew]

Lewis, Bernard. "The Question of Orientalism." *New York Review of Books*. June 24, 1982.

Lewis, Donald M. *The Origins of Christian Zionism: Lord Shaftesbury and Evangelical Support for a Jewish Homeland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Lieu, Judith M. *Image and Reality: The Jews in the World of the Christians in the Second Century*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.

Lieu, Judith M. *Christian Identity in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Liew, Tat-siong Benny. "Tyranny, Power and Might: Colonial Mimicry in Mark's Gospel." JSNT 73 (1999): 7–31.

Liew, Tat-siong Benny. *Politics of Parousia: Reading Mark Inter(con)textually*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Lindsey, Hal and Carole C. Carlson. *The Late Great Planet Earth*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970.

Livesey, Nina E. "Theological Identity Making: Justin's Use of Circumcision to Create Jews and Christians." JECS 18, no. 1 (2010): 51–79.

Lockman, Zachary. *Comrades and Enemies: Arab and Jewish Workers in Palestine, 1906–1948*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.

London, R. R. *A New Letter from Aberdeen in Scotland Sent to a Person of Quality: Wherein is a more full Account of the Proceedings of the Jewes than hath been hitherto Published*. London: Printed by A. Maxwell, 1665.

Lutz, David W. "*Un*just-War Theory: Christian Zionism and the Road to Jerusalem," In *Neo-Conned! Again: Hypocrisy, Lawlessness, and the Rape of Iraq. The Illegality and the Injustice of The Second Gulf War*, ed. D. L. O'Huallachain and J. Forrest Sharpe, 127–170. Norfolk, VA: Light in the Darkness Publications, 2007.

Lutzweiler, David. *The Praise of Folly: The Enigmatic Life and Theology of C. I. Scofield*. Draper, VA: Apologetics Group Media, 2009.

Luxemburg, Rosa. *The Russian Revolution and Leninism or Marxism?* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1970.

Macleod, Emma V. "A Unique and Glorious Mission: Women and Presbyterianism in Scotland, 1830–1930 (review)." *Victorian Studies* 45, no. 4 (2003): 749–51.

Mainse, David. *100 Huntley Street: The Exciting Success Story from the Host of Canada's Popular Television Programme*. Toronto: G. R. Welch, 1979.

Mangum, R. Todd. "The Impact of *The Scofield Reference Bible* on American Evangelicalism, American Premillennialism, and Early Dispensationalism." In Mangum and Sweetnam, *The Scofield Bible*, 169–98.

Mangum, R. Todd. "The Theology of *The Scofield Reference Bible*." In Mangum and Sweetnam, *The Scofield Bible*, 93–134.

Mangum, R. Todd and Mark S. Sweetnam, *The Scofield Bible: Its History and Impact on the Evangelical Church*. Colorado Springs: Paternoster Publishing, 2009.

Marchand, Suzanne L. *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire: Religion, Race, and Scholarship*. Washington, DC: German Historical Institute; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Marten, Michael. "Anglican and Presbyterian Presence and Theology in the Holy Land." *International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church* 5, no. 2 (2005): 182–99.

Marten, Michael. *Attempting to Bring the Gospel Home: Scottish Missions to Palestine, 1839–1917*. International Library of Colonial History 3; London: Tauris Academic Studies, 2006.

Marten, Michael. "Imperialism and Evangelisation: Scottish Missionary Methods in Late 19th and Early 20th Century Palestine." HLS 5, no. 2 (2006): 155–86.

Martin, R. H. "United Conversionist Activities among the Jews in Great Britain 1795–1815: Pan-Evangelicalism and the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews," *Church History* 46, no. 4 (1977): 437–52

Masalha, Nur. *A Land without a People: Israel, Transfer and the Palestinians, 1949–96*. London: Faber and Faber, 1997.

Masalha, Nur. *The Politics of Denial: Israel and The Palestinian Refugee Problem*. London: Pluto, 2003.

Masalha, Nur. *The Bible and Zionism: Invented Traditions, Archaeology and Post-Colonialism in Palestine-Israel.* London: Zed Books, 2007.

Mason, Steve. "Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History." JSJ 38 (2007): 457–512.

Matar, Nabil I. "George Herbert, Henry Vaughan, and the Conversion of the Jews." *Studies in English Literature, 1550–1900* 30, no. 1 (1990): 79–92.

Matar, Nabil I. "The Idea of the Restoration of the Jews in English Protestant Thought, 1661–1701," *Harvard Theological Review* 78, nos 1–2 (1985): 115–4

McDonald, Marci. *The Armageddon Factor: The Rise of Christian Nationalism in Canada*. Toronto: Random House Canada, 2010.

McKeon, Michael. "Sabbatai Sevi in England." *Association for Jewish Studies Review* 3 (1977): 131–69.

Mead, Walter R. "The New Israel and the Old: Why Gentile Americans Back the Jewish State." *Foreign Affairs* 87, no. 4 (2008): 28–46.

Mearsheimer, John J. and Stephen M. Walt. *The Israel Lobby and US Foreign Policy*. London: Penguin Books, 2007.

Mendelsson, David. "From the First Zionist Congress (1897) to the Twelfth (1921)." *Jewish Virtual Library* (2000). http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Zionism/firstcong.html.

Merkley, Paul C. *The Politics of Christian Zionism, 1891–1948*. London: Frank Cass Publishers, 1998.

Merkley, Paul C. *Christian Attitudes Towards the State of Israel*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001.

Merkley, Paul C. *American Presidents, Religion and Israel: The Heirs of Cyrus*. Westport: Praeger Press, 2004.

Minerbi, Sergio I. *The Vatican and Zionism: Conflict in the Holy Land, 1895–1925*. Translated by Arnold Schwarz. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Moore, Stephen D. *Empire and Apocalypse: Postcolonialism and the New Testament*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2006.

Morris, Benny, *The Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem, 1947–1949*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Morris, Benny, ed. *Making Israel*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2007.

Murray, Ian H. *The Puritan Hope: A Study in Revival and the Interpretation of Prophecy*. London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1971.

Murray, Michele. *Playing a Jewish Game: Gentile Christian Judaizing in the First and Second Centuries* CE. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 2004.

Myers, Ched. "The Call to Discipleship: Resist Colonizing Economics!" Challenging Empire: God, Faithfulness and Resistance. Eighth International Conference. Sabeel Ecumenical Liberation Theology Center. Bethlehem. Feb 25, 2011.

Myers, Ched. "Sea-changes Part I: Jesus' Call to Discipleship as Resistance to Colonizing economics." In *Challenging Empire: God, Faithfulness and Resistance*, ed. Naim Ateek, Cedar Duaybis, and Maurine Tobin, 107–125. Jerusalem: Sabeel Ecumenical Liberation Centre, 2012.

Naji, Kasra. "Iran hardliners push back amid fears of change," BBC, Nov 13, 2015, http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-34793719.

National Council of Churches. "Resolution Refuting and Condemning the Statements concerning Islam and the Prophet Muhammad Made by Rev. Jerry Falwell on '60 Minutes.'" Oct 7, 2002. http://www.ncccusa.org/news/02news86.html.

Nicholls, William. *Christian Antisemitism: A History of Hate*. Lanham, MD: Jason Aronson, 1993.

Nye, James. "'God is in control': Obama gets really religious in new interview (with the election a little over two months away)." *Daily Mail*. August 22, 2012.

Pappé, Ilan. "The Post-Zionist Discourse in Israel, 1991–2001." HLS 1, no. 1 (2002), 3–20.

Pappé, Ilan. *A Modern History of Palestine: One Land, Two Peoples*. 2nd ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Pappé, Ilan. *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*. Oxford: OneWorld, 2006.

Pappé, Ilan. *The Modern Middle East*. 2nd ed.; London and New York: Routledge, 2010.

Pappé, Ilan. *The Forgotten Palestinians: A History of the Palestinian Minority in Israel*. London and New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011.

Pappé, Ilan. "Revisiting 1967: The False Paradigm of Peace, Partition and Parity." *Settler Colonial Studies* 3, nos. 3–4 (2013): 341–51.

Paterson, William. Letter to the editor. *Jewish Chronicle*. Dec 18, 1891, 6.

Parekh, Bhikhu C. "Is Gandhi still Relevant?" In Antony R. H. Copley and George Paxton, eds, *Gandhi and the Contemporary World: Essays to Mark the 125th Anniversary of His Birth*, 372-82. Chennai: Indo-British Historical Society, 1997.

Pinsker, Leon. *Auto-Emancipation*. London: Association of Youth Zionist Societies, 1932.

Pinsker, Leon. "Auto-Emancipation: An Appeal to his People by a Russian Jew." In Hertzberg, ed., *The Zionist Idea*, 181–97.

Piterberg, Gabriel. *The Returns of Zionism: Myths, Politics and Scholarship in Israel*. London: Verso Books, 2008.

Pixner, Bargil. *With Jesus through Galilee according to the Fifth Gospel*. Rosh Pina: Corazin Publishing, 1992.

Pixner, Bargil. *Paths of the Messiah and Sites of the Early Church from Galilee to Jerusalem: Jesus and Jewish Christianity in Light of Archaeological Discoveries*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2010.

Pope Paul VI [Giovanni Battista Montini]. "Declaration on The Relation of The Church to Non-Christian Religions—*Nostra aetate*." *Holy See*. Oct 28, 1965.

Prior, Michael. "The Moral Problem of the Land Traditions in the Bible." In Prior, ed., *Western Scholarship*, 41–81.

Prior, Michael, ed. *Western Scholarship and the History of Palestine*. London: Melisende, 1998.

Prothero, Stephen. *American Jesus: How the Son of God Became a National Icon*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2003.

Rabkin, Yakov M. *A Threat From Within: A Century of Jewish Opposition to Zionism*. Translated by Fred A. Reed. London: Zed Books, 2006.

Railton, Nicholas M. "The Dreamy Mazes of Millenarianism: William Graham and the Irish Presbyterian Mission to German Jews." In *Protestant Millenialism, Evangelicalism and Irish Society, 1790–2005*, ed. Crawford Gribben and Andrew R. Holmes, 174–96. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Ravitsky, Aviezer. "Peace." In *Contemporary Jewish Religious Thought: Original Essays on Critical Concepts and Movements and Beliefs*, ed. Arthur A. Cohen and Paul Mendes Flohr, 685–9. New York: Macmillan 1987.

Raz-Krakotzkin, Amnon. "Jewish Memory Between Exile and History." JQR 97, no. 4 (2007): 530–43.

Reinhartz, Adele, et al. "Jew and Judean: Have scholars erased the Jews from Antiquity?" *Marginalia* (Aug 26, 2014). http://marginalia.lareviewofbooks.org/jew-judean-forum/.

Renner, Michael. "Post-Saddam Iraq: Linchpin of a New Oil Order." In *The Empire and the Crescent: Global Implications for a New American Century*, edited by Aftab Ahmad Malik, 65–74. Bristol: Amal Press, 2003.

Rocker, Rudolf. *The London Years*. Los Angeles: Robert Anscombe, 1956.

Rokach, Livia. *The Catholic Church and the Question of Palestine*. London: Saqi Books, 1987.

Rolef, Susan H. ed. *Political Dictionary of the State of Israel*. New York: Macmillan Publishing, 1988.

Roth, Cecil. "The First Jews in the Land." *Jewish Chronicle*. May 6, 1938, 32.

Ruether, Rosemary Radford. *America, Amerikkka: Elect Nation and Imperial Violence*. London: Equinox, 2007.

Running, Leona G. and David N. Freedman. *William Foxwell Albright: A Twen-tieth-Century Genius*. New York: The Two Continents Publishing Group, 1975.

Rutenberg, Jim, Mike McIntire, and Ethan Bronner. "Tax-Exempt Funds Aid Settlements in West Bank." *New York Times*. July 6, 2010. http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/06/world/middleeast/06settle.html.

Sabeel Centre. *A Time to Remember: Palestinian Towns and Villages*. Jerusalem: Sabeel Centre for Ecumenical Theology, 2008.

Sachar, Howard M. *A History of Israel: From the Rise of Zionism to Our Time*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1982.

Sagiv, Assaf. "The Forefathers of Zionism and Myth of the Nation's Birth." *Techelt* 5: 1–4. Autumn 1989. [Hebrew]

Said, Edward W. *Representations of the Intellectual: The 1993 Reith Lectures*. London: Vintage, 1994.

Said, Edward W. "International Books of the Year." *The Times Literary Supplement*. Nov 29, 1996.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. London: Vintage, 2000.

Said, Edward W. "Invention, Memory, Place." *Critical Inquiry* 26 (2000): 175–92.

Samuel, Simon. *A Postcolonial Reading of Mark's Story of Jesus*. London: T&T Clark, 2007.

Sand, Shlomo. *The Invention of the Jewish People*. London: Verso Books, 2010.

Sandford, Michael J. "Is Jesus Palestinian? Palestinian Christian Perspectives on Judaism, Ethnicity, and the New Testament." HLS 13, no. 2 (2014): 123–38.

Sandford, Michael J. "On the Past and Future of New Testament Studies: A Response to Larry Hurtado." *Relegere: Studies in Religion and Reception* 4, no. 2 (2014): 229–40.

Sandmel, Samuel. *We Jews and Jesus*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Sasson, Jack. "On Choosing Models for Recreating Israelite Pre-Monarchic History." JSOT 21 (1981): 3–24.

Sawyer, John F. A. *The Fifth Gospel: Isaiah in the History of Christianity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1996.

Schonfield, Hugh J. *The Passover Plot: A New Interpretation of The Life and Death of Jesus*. London: Hutchinson, 1965.

Schwartz, Daniel R. " 'Judean' or 'Jew'? How Should We Translate *ioudaios* in Josephus?" In *Jewish Identity in the Greco-Roman World*, ed. Jörg Frey, Daniel R. Schwartz and Stephanie Gripentrog, 3–27. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Scofield, Cyrus I., ed. *The Scofield Reference Bible: The Holy Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments*. Rev. ed.; London: Oxford University Press, 1917.

Scofield, Cyrus I. *What do the Prophets Say?* Philadelphia: The Sunday School Times Company, 1918.

Scofield, Cyrus I. *Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth: Being 10 Studies of the More Important Divisions of Scripture*. Windber, PA: Classic Reprint Press, 2007.

Scult, Mel. *Millennial Expectations and Jewish Liberties: A Study of the Efforts to Convert the Jews in Britain, up to the Mid Nineteenth Century*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978.

Sechrest, Love L. *A Former Jew: Paul and the Dialectics of Race*. London: T&T Clark, 2009.

Shafir, Gershon. *Land, Labor and the Origins of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict, 1882–1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Shanks, Hershel. "When 5613 Scholars Get Together in One Place: The Annual Meeting." *Biblical Archaeology Review* 17 (1991), 62–68.

Shapira, Anita. *New Jews, Old Jews*. Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1997. [Hebrew]

Shapira, Anita. "The Jewish-People Deniers." Review of Shlomo Sand, Hebrew edition of *The Invention of the Jewish People*. *Journal of Israeli History* 28 (2009): 63–72.

Shapira, Anita. *The Bible and the Jewish Identity*. Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 2012. [Hebrew]

Siker, Abraham. *Disinheriting the Jews: Abraham in Early Christian Controversy*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991.

Sizer, Stephen. *Zion's Christian Soldiers? The Bible, Israel and the Church*. Nottingham: InterVarsity Press, 2007.

Skarsaune, Oskar. *The Proof From Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile*. Leiden: Brill, 1987.

Smith, Anthony D. *The Ethnic Origins of Nationalism*. New York: Wiley-Black-well, 1986.

Smith, Anthony D. *Chosen Peoples: Sacred Sources of National Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Smith, Anthony D. "Chosen Peoples." In Hutchinson and Smith, eds, *Ethnicity*, 194–6.

Smith, Ted A. and Amy-Jill Levine. "Habits of Anti-Judaism: A Critique of Recent Christian Statements on Israel." *Christian Century* 127, no. 13 (June 29, 2010): 26–29.

Smith, Ted A. and Amy-Jill Levine. Response to letters. *Christian Century* 127, no. 18 (Sept 7, 2010): 6.

Sokolovskii, Sergey and Valery Tishkov. "Ethnicity." In *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*, ed. Alan Barnard and Jonathan Spencer, 190–3. London and New York: Routledge, 1996.

Spector, Stephen. *Evangelicals and Israel: The Story of American Christian Zionism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Spektor, Isaac E. "Nachal Yitzchak," in *Morality, Halakha and the Jewish Tradition*, edited by Shubert Spero. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1983.

Stackhouse, John G. *Canadian Evangelicalism in the Twentieth Century: An Introduction to Its Character*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.

Sternhell, Zeev. *The Founding Myths of Israel: Nationalism, Socialism and the Making of the Jewish State*. Princeton: Princeton University Press 1998.

Stowers, Stanley. "Review of Why This New Race? Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity, by Denise Kimber Buell." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 75 (2007): 730.

Sugirtharajah, R. S. *Postcolonial Criticism and Biblical Interpretation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Swartley, William M. *The Covenant of Peace: The Missing Peace in New Testament Theology and Ethics*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing, 2006.

Sweetnam, Mark S. "The Impact of *The Scofield Reference Bible* on British Premillennialism." In Mangum and Mark S. Sweetnam, *The Scofield Bible*, 135–68.

Sweetnam, Mark S. "*The Scofield Reference Bible* and Evangelical Thought: One Hundred Years and Counting." In Mangum and Mark S. Sweetnam, *The Scofield Bible*, 199–222.

Tabenkin, Yitzhak. "The Ideological Sources of the Second Aliya." In *Essays*, vol. 2. Tel Aviv: Ha-Kibbutz Ha-Meuhad Publishing, 1972. [Hebrew]

Taggart, Simon. "The Bible Bashers." THES, Jan 19, 1996.

Tauber, Eliezer. *Personal Policy Making: Canada's role in the adoption of the Palestine Partition Resolution*. Contributions to the Study of World History 96; Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2002.

Templeton, Neil. "Orientalism: A Critique." *The Imperial Archive* (2007). https://web.archive.org/web/20081014041348/http://www.qub.ac.uk/schools/SchoolofEnglish/imperial/transnational/Orientalism-critique.html.

Thatcher, Tom. *Greater Than Caesar: Christology and Empire in the Fourth Gospel*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009.

Thompson, Thomas L. "Hidden Histories and the Problem of Ethnicity in Palestine." In Prior, ed., *Western Scholarship*, 23–41.

Trumbull, Charles G. *The Life Story of C. I. Scofield*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1920.

Tutu, Desmond. "Realizing God's Dream for the Holy Land." *Boston Globe*. Oct 26, 2007.

Unger, Craig. *House of Bush, House of Saud: The Secret Relationship between the World's Two Most Powerful Dynasties*. New York: Scribner, 2004.

Van Biema, David. "What's Next 2008: Future Revolutions: Re-Judaizing Jesus." *Time*. Mar 13, 2008.

Varisco, Daniel Martin. *Reading Orientalism: Said and the Unsaid*. Publications on the Near East; Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2007.

Vreté, Mayir. "The Restoration of the Jews in English Protestant Thought 1790–1840." *Middle Eastern Studies* 8, no. 1 (1972): 3–50.

Wagner, Donald. "Marching to Zion: The Evangelical-Jewish Alliance." *Christian Century*. June 2003: 20–24.

Warraq, Ibn. *Defending the West: A Critique of Edward Said's* Orientalism. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2007.

Watson, Merla. *Merla's Miracle*. Victoria: Catacombs Productions, 1999.

Wenell, Karen J. *Jesus and Land: Sacred and Social Space in Second Temple Judaism*. London: T&T Clark, 2007.

Whitelam, Keith W. *The Invention of Ancient Israel: The Silencing of Palestinian History*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Whitelam, Keith W. "Western Scholarship and the Silencing of Palestinian History." In Prior, ed., *Western Scholarship*, 9–22.

Whitelam, Keith W. *Rhythms of Time: Reconnecting Palestine's Past*. Sheffield: Ben-BlackBooks, 2013.

Williamson, Arthur H. "'A Pil for Pork-Eaters': Ethnic Identity, Apocalyptic Promises and the Strange Creation of the Judeo-Scots." In *The Expulsion of the Jews: 1492 and After*, ed. Raymond B. Waddington and Arthur H. Williamson, 237–58. New York: Garland Publishing, 1994.

Wilson, Stephen G. *Related Strangers: Jews and Christians 70–170* CE. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.

Wright, N. T. New Testament For Everyone series. London: SPCK; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001–2011.

Yadin, Yigael. *Masada: Herod's Fortress and the Zealots' Last Stand.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1966.

Zarnett, David. "Edward Said and the Iranian Revolution." *Democratiya* 9 (Summer 2007): 43–53. http://dissentmagazine.org/democratiya/article_pdfs/d9Zarnett.pdf.

Zarnett, David. "Edward Said and Kosovo." *Democratiya* 11 (Winter 2007): 109–43. http://dissentmagazine.org/democratiya/docs/d11Whole.pdf.

Zarnett, David and Rayyan al-Shawaf. "The Legacy of Edward Said: An Exchange between Rayyan Al-Shawaf and David Zarnett." *Democratiya* 13 (Summer 2008): 171–204.

Zertal, Idith and Akiva Eldar. *Lords of the Land: Settlers and the State of Israel*. Tel Aviv: Dvir, 1994. [Hebrew]

Zerubavel, Yael. *Recovered Roots: Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National Tradition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Žižek, Slavoj. *The Puppet and the Dwarf: The Perverse Core of Christianity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003.

Žižek, Slavoj. "Slavoj Žižek Webchat." *Guardian*. http://www.theguardian.com/books/live/2014/oct/06/slavoj-zizek-webchat-absolute-recoil. Oct 8, 2014.

Zubaida, Sami. *Islam: The People and the State. Political Ideas and Movements in the Middle East*. London and New York: I. B. Tauris, 2009.

Primary Source Index

Author Index

Subject Index