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On September 10, 2014, Republican Senator Ted Cruz of Texas stood to speak before the Washington DC based advocacy group, In Defense of Christians (IDC). The IDC, according to its website, “is a non-profit, non-partisan organization whose mission is to heighten awareness among policymakers and the general public of the existence of ancient and often persecuted minority communities in the Middle East, particularly Christians.”¹ As the keynote speaker for IDC’s September gala, Cruz offered an impassioned speech condemning religious persecution worldwide. Much to Cruz’s surprise, however, he received hostile responses from the crowd when he advocated for Israel; a storm of boos and taunts began to rumble after he simply stated, “Christians have no greater ally than Israel.”² In response to the crowd’s continued animosity, Cruz walked off the stage after he said, “If you will not stand with Israel and the Jews, then I will not stand with you. Thank you and God bless you.” According to Washington Post contributor Sean Sullivan, Cruz stated after the event, “I told the attendees that those who hate Israel also hate America, that those who hate Jews also hate Christians, and that anyone who hates Israel and the Jewish people is not following the teachings of Christ.”³

Senator Cruz’s comments epitomize an ideology known as Zionism, a term coined in 1890 by Nathan Birnbaum meaning, “the national movement for the return of the Jewish people to their homeland and the resumption of Jewish sovereignty in the Land of Israel.” The definition has changed slightly since Israel’s establishment in 1948, as it now “[includes] the movement for

---

the development of the State of Israel and the protection of the Jewish nation in Israel….” Cruz propagates a specific breed of Zionism known as American Christian Zionism, which adds two distinctions to supporting a Jewish homeland: Christian faith and American national identity. Cruz’s exchange with the IDC might raise questions, especially surrounding his theological and political assumptions. Why did Cruz assume a connection between the United States and Israel? Why did he connect political support for Israel with the teachings of Christ? Most importantly, why did he expect other Christians to do the same? All of these questions trace back to American Christian Zionism, a Christian theology rooted in the American national narrative and identity.

Senator Cruz’s interaction with the IDC evidences a shift in American Christian thinking since Israel’s establishment in 1948. Upon its inception, Israel received widespread support from American Christians. Since then, however, several Christian groups, including many mainline Protestant denominations, have decreased their support for or even openly opposed Israel. In contrast, many evangelical Christians have proved unwavering in their support for Israel due to connections with Zionist theology. While many American Christians fall into these two camps, many also fall somewhere in between; all perspective and viewpoints will not find space in this analysis, but the polarizing extremes of Zionism and anti-Zionism and the ambivalence about Israel in between all provide interesting context to a larger divide among American Christians. The growing disparity and diversity among American Christian viewpoints on Israel represents, though does not necessarily define, the growing divide between evangelical and mainline Protestant Christians in the latter half of the twentieth century. Thus through understanding driving factors behind differing views on Israel, we can further understand the broader theological and political divide between evangelical and mainline Protestant Christians.

---

Before proceeding, two terms that will appear regularly in and develop throughout this analysis must have an established baseline definition. Few terms prove harder to define than *evangelical* or *evangelicalism*, for individuals and groups from diverse theological backgrounds attempt to stake their claim in this Christian tradition. Historian David Bebbington, in his famous “Bebbington Quadrilateral,” offers four distinct features of evangelical Christianity:

1. Conversionism: the belief that lives need to be transformed through a “born-again” experience and a life-long process of following Jesus.
2. Activism: the expression and demonstration of the gospel in missionary and social reform efforts.
3. Biblicism: a high regard for and obedience to the Bible as the ultimate authority.
4. Crucicentrism: a stress on the sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the cross as making possible the redemption of humanity.\(^5\)

In contrast, *mainline Protestants*, according to the Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life’s 2007 U.S. Religious Landscape Survey, emphasize, “a less exclusionary view of salvation…a strong emphasis on social reform…[and] long-established religious institutions.”\(^6\) These distinctions will become clearer throughout this study, but a fundamental understanding of these groups’ defining characteristics provides a foundation for further examination.

On one final note before actually beginning this examination, my research scope has limited my ability to include more American Christian traditions, namely Catholic and historically black denominations. Evangelical and mainline Protestant traditions are predominantly white in the United States today, and this discussion does not focus on these two particular denominational families because of their validity or superiority. This trend of division and separation has contributed a unique storyline to the overarching American religious and cultural narrative, and the following analysis simply seems to examine and retell this narrative.

---


American Christian Zionism Before 1948

When one hears the term *Zionism*, several images might come to mind. Perhaps one’s attention immediately shifts to the state of Israel or to conflicts in the Middle East. Perhaps one begins to think about theological doctrine or political ideology. Perhaps, even, one recalls sights and sounds of notable modern Zionist leaders like John Hagee, pastor of Cornerstone Church in San Antonio, Texas, and founder of Christians United for Israel. Hagee, an active Zionist with a large support base and public platform, defends his Zionist theology in his book, *Jerusalem Countdown*. As he articulates his argument from Joel 3, he writes,

> God’s Word is very clear! There will be grave consequences for the nation or nations that attempt to divide up the land of Israel…. God continues expressing His love for Israel, saying, “I will bless those who bless you, and I will curse him who curses you” (Genesis 12:3). This is and has been God’s foreign policy toward the Jewish people from Genesis 12 until this day. Any man or nation that persecutes the Jewish people or the State of Israel will receive the swift judgment of God.7

Hagee’s confident, authoritative language provides an explicit glimpse into one particular type of Zionist thought among evangelical Christians that Israel, as it exists as a nation today, maintains the blessings bestowed by God in the Old Testament and warrants Christians’ unwavering and unquestioning support. While this particular strand of American Christian Zionism maintains a relatively large support base among American evangelicals, it would not exist so widely today without the foundations built by pre-Israel Zionists. Hagee was far from the first to support Israel; thousands of Christians supported Israel before it even existed.

To many American Christian Zionists, a homeland for the Jews served as the only reasonable remedy for centuries of discrimination. As the Christian movement began to separate itself from Judaism in the first and second centuries CE, Christians began to develop resentment toward Jews for deicide (i.e. rejecting and killing Jesus, whom they believed to be God). This

accusation first came from a bishop from Sardis in Asia Minor named Melito in 167, when he declared all Jews guilty of murdering God.\(^8\) Jewish oppression increased after the Christianization of the Roman Empire and engaged in battles for land and power until about 750.\(^9\) At this point, under the newfound influence of Islam, Jews became dragged into the crusading movement as Christians and Muslims fought several holy wars between 700 and 1300 over Jerusalem, Palestine, and the surrounding area. These wars caused Jews to fear augmented persecution as Christians left Europe to fight “God’s enemies.”\(^10\) Their fears actualized as local societies limited Jews’ ability to engage in trade, forcing the landless Jews to engage in moneylending and depending on charging interest, a practice forbidden by all the Abrahamic faiths, for survival. Christians and Muslims scorned Jews further both for charging exorbitant interest rates on loans and for engaging a practice they believed to be sinful.\(^11\) These earlier roots offer a framework through which to view the next thousand years of Jewish discrimination, a time period characterized by further oppression and failed quests for safety and security.

Two key themes of anti-Semitism’s history from the Crusades to today emerge as especially relevant for studying Zionism. First, as the ideas of nations and nationalism developed in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, non-Jews seemed to formalize Jewish “otherness.” Jews had no homeland, and in the eyes of non-Jews their commitment to Judaism trumped any ability they had to commit to a nation. For example, French Jewish leaders met in 1860 because “[they] had come to believe that they must unite in response to a growing nationalism, which tended to treat Jews as permanent outsiders – a people beyond any nation’s universe of


\(^9\) Ibid., 33, 41.

\(^10\) Ibid., 55, 65.

\(^11\) Ibid., 73.
obligation.”

In an age of nationalism, the nationless Jews had no home or place to call their own, setting the stage for Zionists advocate for a Jewish state in Palestine. European anti-Semitism reached its pinnacle (or nadir) during the Holocaust. Under the Nazi regime, nearly six million Jewish children, women, and men lost their lives in a systematic genocide. This overt, culminating expression of anti-Semitism did not end Jewish persecution, but it did create an overwhelming sense of pity, remorse, and sorrow among Christians and many others toward the Jews. These two focuses in modern anti-Semitism’s history create fertile ground for a pro-Jewish Zionist theology to take hold both before and after Israel’s formal establishment in 1948.

American Christian Zionism also owes much of its early development to extra-American roots. English Puritans, whose venture to the new world influenced the American national religious narrative, began to identify with the Jewish plight in the face of religious persecution. The hostility faced due to explicit support for a Jewish homeland in England – where Jews faced significant restrictions – developed into one of several factors that drove the Puritans to venture west across the Atlantic, and the increasingly threatening state of religious affairs in England led Puritans to closely identify with the biblical nation of Israel. Before they departed England, the Puritans felt opposed on nearly every front. Victoria Clark, historian and author of Allies for Armageddon: The Rise of Christian Zionism, observes, “Many Puritans anxiously noted that the ancient Israelites had been similarly surrounded by enemies and betrayed by their rulers.”

While the connection to modern American Christian Zionism remains unclear, one cannot help

12. Ibid., 198.
13. Ibid., 249.
but wonder how Puritan Zionist thought impacted their new religious colony in what would become the United States.

In addition to these possible connections between American Christian Zionism and Puritan theology, any discussion of Zionism must include the Austro-Hungarian father of Zionism, Theodor Herzl. As argued later, some American Christian Zionist work predates Herzl, but that fact does not negate his status in history as the signature leader and founding patriarch of the worldwide Zionist movement. Herzl, himself a Jew, became motivated to act on his Zionist convictions after observing the trial of Alfred Dreyfus. French authorities convicted Dreyfus, a Jewish member of the French military, of spying for Germany in 1895, despite clear and overwhelming evidence supporting his innocence. Dreyfus’ intense public humiliation, apparently due to his Jewish heritage, troubled Herzl. He realized Jewish integration into European culture could not effectively happen amidst rampant anti-Semitism.17 Herzl saw the creation of a Jewish state as a viable solution to ending anti-Semitism. According to Herzl’s biographer, Jacques Kornberg, “Herzl’s goal of reconciliation…and [his view] of Zionism as the fulfillment of emancipation and assimilation determined his remarkably optimistic view about the elimination of [anti-Semitism].”18 However idealistic, Herzl’s work for and writing about the creation of a Jewish state remain foundational to modern Zionist thinking and teaching.

In 1896, Theodor Herzl popularized the Zionist movement through his landmark work, Der Judenstaat (The Jewish State), in which he outlines his progressive vision for a solution benefitting both Jews and Gentiles in Europe. Melvin I. Urofsky, former professor of history at Virginia Commonwealth University, states, “Herzl’s book caught the Jewish imagination less for

---

what it said than for the way he said it.”\textsuperscript{19} While the infrastructural details found in \textit{The Jewish State} did not inspire, Herzl’s optimism did. He concludes his book, “Let me repeat once more my opening words: The Jews who wish will have their state…. The world will be freed by our liberty, enriched by our wealth, magnified by our greatness.”\textsuperscript{20} Herzl, dubbed by international historian Barry Rubin as Zionism’s “main creator,” used his book’s success to institute the First Zionist Congress in August 1897.\textsuperscript{21} This organization met annually until Israel’s official establishment in 1948, but this first meeting signified “the first time in eighteen centuries…a Jewish assembly had gathered to debate the future of the people.”\textsuperscript{22} Herzl’s advocacy coincided with the strongest Zionist voices in the United States, creating a tremendous environment for a pro-Israel mindset to develop among Christians in the late nineteenth century.

With centuries of persecution and discrimination in mind, several American organizations and individual leaders began to advocate for the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine during the nineteenth century. Pre-Israel American Christian Zionism boils down to three primary characteristics. First, American Christian Zionists place a particular emphasis on the United States’ role in the establishment and maintenance of a Jewish homeland. Second, Zionists formed a deep-set bond between theological belief and political action and advocacy. Finally, Zionists often adhere to a significant theological thread known as dispensationalism. Despite American Christian Zionism’s current prevalence, its roots long pre-date the formation of the modern state of Israel. American Christian Zionism, as recognized today, could not exist without the work and teachings of Zionists and dispensationalists before Israel’s establishment in

\textsuperscript{19} Urofsky, \textit{American Zionism}, 22.
\textsuperscript{20} Herzl, \textit{The Jewish State}, 79.
\textsuperscript{22} Urofsky, \textit{American Zionism}, 24.
1948, as their efforts laid the foundation for future Zionist belief and action in the United States.

The prominent place of the United States in American Christian Zionist thinking evidences itself in the writings of the earliest significant American Zionist, George Bush. Bush, professor of Hebrew and Oriental Literatures at New York University and distant relative to the two American presidents who share his name,23 authored the 1844 Zionist work, Valley of Vision, or the Dry Bones of Israel Revived: An Attempted Proof of the Restoration and Conversion of the Jews. In his book, which predates Herzl’s Der Judenstaat by more than half a century, Bush took two measures to cultivate a new breed of specifically American Zionism. First, he “forcefully and presciently argued the case for a literal, man-made rather than miraculous restoration of God’s Chosen People to Palestine.”24 Bush contends this restoration serves as a key step to Jewish conversion to Christianity, which he viewed as the ultimate goal.25 In his exposition of Ezekiel 37:1-14, Bush compares the voice of Ezekiel’s prophecy to the decrees and laws passed by modern “Christian governments.” He argues, “...Those edicts, statutes, and royal ordinances, which will be issued by the different Christian governments in favor of the Jews...promoting, in various ways, their restoration from the...oppression which has so long ground them to the dust, and elevating them to a rank of honorable repute among the nations of the earth.”26 Eventually, Bush argues, just as God brought the bones in the valley back together, he will bring the Jews back to “the predestined soil of Palestine.”27 In Bush’s eyes,


24. Clark, Allies for Armageddon, 82-83.


26. Ibid., 17.
humanity, especially the Church, has a responsibility to work to make this restoration a reality.

Second, Bush also advocated America’s new prominent place in the world, especially as the instruments of God’s active work. In Bush’s eyes, “Americans, not Jews, were the light to enlighten the modern world.”  

Bush clearly saw the work of Jewish restoration in Palestine and Jewish conversion to Christianity as a task yet to be completed and one the Christian Church, particularly the Christian Church in the United States, had a responsibility to take on. He argues,

We [American Christians] can scarcely fail, from this view of the subject, to perceive the direction which all efforts for the conversion of the Jews should mainly take. It must be by the study, the exposition, and the application of their own prophecies, that their minds are to be arrested and their moral captivity brought to a close…. The time has gone by when the Christian world ought to be satisfied with individual conversions, here and there occurring, from among the obscurer members of the community. We are called upon to challenge the collective wisdom of the fathers of Israel to enter with us upon the calm investigation of the holy writings. This must be done rather through the press than through the pulpit. We must spread our tracts before them; we must demand the refutation or the adoption of our views of the sense of the prophets…. Immense obstacles created by pride and prejudice may indeed stand in the way, but if there be truth in the oracles of God, the inveteracy of Jewish unbelief is yet destined to succumb to the force of evidence. Let but our own conviction of the high destiny that awaits them herald theirs, and the work is virtually accomplished.

Bush’s argument here proves clear: the Jews have deep-set beliefs and traditions; but with persistence and faithfulness, Bush believed the Jews’ “moral captivity” was indeed surmountable with their restoration to Palestine serving as a key step to their conversion.  

Through the two emphases of Jewish restoration to Palestine and the role America shall play in Israel’s restoration, Valley of Vision became the first explicit expression of American Zionist thinking. American Christian Zionism’s stress on the United States’ role in Israel’s restoration increased interest in American politics among many Zionists. Some Christian groups began to

27. Ibid., 21.
28. Clark, Allies for Armageddon, 83.
30. Ibid., 21-22.
realize their political possibilities to initiate change and support for Israel while notable leaders also took political steps to advocate for Israel’s creation. One such leader, Louis Brandeis, experienced a sudden and, according to Urofsky, relatively inexplicable conversion to passionate Zionism that only finds ambiguous roots in his Jewish heritage. However, upon this transition, American Zionism knew no better advocate. In 1913, at the age of 56, Brandeis openly advocated for Zionism, and within two years the Provisional Executive Committee for General Zionist Affairs selected him to serve as a member. The Committee, with no members known nationally as Brandeis, greatly benefitted from his presence and leadership. As a nationally renowned lawyer from Boston, Brandeis advocated socially progressive politics, including reforms to and regulations on capitalism in an attempt to preserve the individual’s right to participate freely in the economy. Brandeis successfully merged Zionism and “Americanism,” the “clear and firm commitment to American ideals and democratic principles,” thus creating a political ideology to compliment and parallel American Christian Zionists’ theological beliefs.

Brandeis sealed his Zionist legacy in stone when he accepted a nomination from President Woodrow Wilson to serve as an Associate Justice on the Supreme Court on January 28, 1916. From this position, Brandeis added a Zionist voice to several key foreign policy issues, especially related to Great Britain’s Balfour Declaration of 1917. The Declaration, penned by Arthur James Balfour, simply stated in brief letter form, “His Majesty’s Government

31. Urofsky, American Zionism, 121.
32. Ibid., 120, 125-126.
33. Ibid., 120-121.
34. Ibid., 123-124.
35. Ibid., 126-128.
36. Ibid., 130.
view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people…”37

Brandeis secured President Wilson’s support for this document that served primarily as a formality in the middle of World War I. Some even suggest British Prime Minister Winston Churchill only issued the statement to gain Jewish support throughout the world during wartime.38 Brandeis, in contrast, used this platform to further articulate his Zionist beliefs. According to Clifford Kiracofe, history professor at the Virginia Military Institute, “Brandeis…even told Balfour in Paris in 1919 that all of Palestine would have to be the Jewish homeland.”39 Brandeis’ Zionist belief and his personal relationship with Balfour propelled him to openly advocated for a Jewish homeland, as many continued to question anti-Semitism and empathize with persecuted Jews throughout the world.40

American Christian Zionism had important political implications, especially among those Zionists vying for a Jewish homeland in Palestine. Because of Zionism’s inherently political nature, Brandeis gained popularity as American Zionists began to advocate for politicians that represented their beliefs on national and global scales. Despite Brandeis’ increasing fame among American Christian Zionists, he also disdain from fellow members of the Jewish community. Brandeis received criticism from journalists and other public figures in the Jewish community for a far too “Gentile” brand of Zionism.41 Brandeis’ diminished status among some Jews for his unclean Zionism meant his public advocacy for the creation of a Jewish state propelled him to the forefront of American Christian Zionist-advocated politicians. Brandeis saw Zionism as a

37. Cited in Ibid., 212.
38. Ibid., 218-219.
40. Urofsky, American Zionism, 207.
41. Urofsky, American Zionism, 294.
means of solving the pressing problems of anti-Semitism, which gave him a sense of urgency about creating a Jewish homeland to which many American Christian Zionists gravitated. While Brandeis had no known commitment to Christianity, his prominence among American Christian Zionists evidences a strongly political component to their theology.

William Blackstone also served as one of these popular public figures due to his political involvement for his Zionist convictions. Blackstone made a significant impact on American support for Israel by organizing a petition to be sent to then-President Benjamin Harrison. Blackstone, called “one of the most influential and admired religious figures of his generation,” issued this petition, known as the Blackstone Memorial, in 1891 to attempt to secure a location for an international conference on the restoration of Palestine to the Jews.42 Blackstone ended his petition with a plea to several international leaders, asking them “to consider the condition of the Israelites, and their claims to Palestine, as their ancient home; and to promote in all other just and proper ways the alleviation of their suffering condition.”43 The Blackstone Memorial had 413 signatures, including the mayors of Chicago, Boston, New York City, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, the Governor of Massachusetts, numerous journalists, scores of Jewish and Christian clergy, and captains of industry including J. P. Morgan and John D. Rockefeller; such an influential support base revealed Zionism’s pervasive qualities in American culture. Blackstone himself became an unsung American Christian Zionist hero as his political activism complimented his strong contributions to the theological developments taking place among American Christian Zionists during this time.

Blackstone’s Christian thought developed alongside and was influenced by a new


theological movement called dispensationalism, American Christian Zionism’ third distinctive characteristic. Originally advanced in Britain by Scotsman Edward Irving and Irishman John Nelson Darby, dispensational theology emphasizes seven periods of time – known as “biblical dispensations” – and the signs noting transitions between each.44 Dispensationalists believe Christ first came during the fifth dispensation that ended with the destruction of the Jewish temple in 70 CE. The sixth and current Church dispensation will precede the Messianic age (i.e. the 1000-year reign of Christ described in the book of Revelation) after a series of events, including the return of the Jews to Palestine.45 Darby advanced dispensational thought during several missionary journeys to the United States between 1862 and 1877, and his appeals to Zionist leaders created the theology’s firm hold on many evangelical Christians during that time period.46 The marriage of political activism and fundamentalist theology finds deep roots in dispensationalism, which Stephen Sizer says, “[Gives] greater emphasis to political restoration [of the nation of Israel] than evangelism [of the Jews] as it became increasingly preoccupied with interpreting biblical prophecy from a futurist perspective and publicizing what it saw as its contemporary fulfillment.”47 Darby’s dispensationalist converts saw this theology as deeply connected to their Zionist beliefs.

As mentioned above, William Blackstone’s contributions to Zionist thought embodied the political and theological natures of dispensational theology. The entirety of his work surrounding the Blackstone Memorial of 1891 became “the first nationally organized dispensationalist intervention into US foreign policy in support of political Zionism.”

44. Clark, Allies for Armageddon, 61, 91.
45. Ibid., 91.; Revelation 20:1-6; see Appendix A for C. I. Scofield’s outline of the seven dispensations with Scripture references.
46. Kiracofe, Dark Crusade, 63.
Blackstone, a disciple of Darby, espoused dispensational theology four years before organizing his famous petition in a tract titled *Jesus is Coming*, in which he argued that support for Jewish restoration to Palestine evidenced the propinquity of Christ’s return. Blackstone received little support from the American Jewish community, especially in his native Chicago, but proceeded undeterred with his national advocacy for the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine.48

Blackstone fundamentally shaped the American Christian Zionist movement, and many remember him as a religious and political hero despite his nearly complete absence from popular American history. Blackstone later received tremendous affirmation when Louis Brandeis famously wrote in 1916, “you [Blackstone] are the Father of Zionism, as your work antedates Herzl.”49 Brandeis and Blackstone developed a working relationship after Blackstone publicized his petition, and their friendship continued to contribute to Zionist political advances until Blackstone’s death in 1934. Blackstone even formulated another petition, at Brandeis’ urging, to pass across President Wilson’s desk in 1917, but its conflicting messages with the recently released Balfour Declaration meant the United States government never officially recognized it.50 American Christian Zionists remember Blackstone with high praise for his ability to have politics and theology cohabitate the same space and for helping lay the foundation for modern evangelical political action and American Christian Zionism as a whole.

Darby’s dispensational influence also extended to men primarily focused on theological development, including Cyrus I. Scofield, the most significant theological contributor to Zionist efforts before modern Israel’s establishment in 1948. Scofield served as a Confederate Civil War


soldier before he became, as Clark describes, “An unscrupulous Missouri businessman, lawyer, and local politician.” A forgery conviction landed him in a St. Louis prison for six months, where a local pastor, James H. Brookes, reached out to support and teach him. Brookes introduced Scofield to Darby’s works, and this prison encounter turned Scofield into a true believer. Upon his release, Scofield wasted little time advocating for the theology and eventually “ensured that pre-millennial dispensationalism spread so deep and wide that it could never be uprooted.” Scofield entered pastoral ministry in Dallas, Texas, and later in Northfield, Massachusetts, where he continued to shape his own unique brand of dispensationalism.

In 1896, Scofield published a pamphlet titled, “Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth: Being Ten Outline Studies of the More Important Divisions of Scripture.” One of his outlines includes the seven periods, or dispensations, key to dispensational theology. He opens his outline,

The Scriptures divide time, by which is meant the entire period from the creation of Adam to the “new heaven and a new earth” in Rev. 21:1, into seven unequal periods, called, usually, “Dispensations” (Eph. 3:2)....

These periods are marked off in Scripture by some change in God’s method of dealing with mankind, or a portion or mankind, in respect of the two questions of sin and of man’s responsibility. Each of the Dispensations may be regarded as a new test of the natural man, and each ends in judgment – marking his utter failure. Five of these Dispensations, or periods of time, have been fulfilled; we are living in the sixth, probably towards its close, and have before us the seventh, and last – the Millennium.

Scofield became the first significant American articulator of dispensationalism, and his “canonization” of dispensational theology arrived in the Scofield Reference Bible in 1909, of

52. Clark, Allies for Armageddon, 90.
53. Ibid.
54. Ariel, On Behalf of Israel, 48.
which Victoria Clark asserts, “For the first half of the twentieth century, the *Scofield Reference Bible* was…the single most influential fundamentalist text.”

Scofield began developing notes and commentary for his reference Bible off of Darby’s own biblical translation. Some accuse Scofield of plagiarizing Darby and his theology, but Scofield ensured his name became embedded in many Americans’ homes and minds as many new Christians became introduced to the dispensational and Zionist plight through Scofield’s work. Scofield’s commentary fell alongside a King James Version of the biblical text, and while his titles and introductions appear sparse in many biblical books, he makes his presence known in books with prophetic weight, such as Daniel and Revelation. Scofield had a tremendous impact on his readership, as Clark states, “[T]he Scofield Bible’s handy notes on the same page as the text to which they referred meant that the word of Scofield and the Word of God easily merged into one supremely authoritative whole.” Scofield contributed to a theological system to which conservative evangelical Christians could adhere in the face of the theological liberalism found in the Social Gospel and other theological movements of the early twentieth century. This new – or at least borrowed – theology became a key characteristic of American Christian Zionism in its earliest stages of development and allowed Zionism to take a deeper hold in American religious culture.

With dispensationalism in particular, one must remember the limited impact of this theology at this time. While dispensational theology held tremendous influence among fundamentalists, not all Christians were fundamentalists, and not all fundamentalists believed in

60. Kiracofe, *Dark Crusade*, 63; Clark, *Allies for Armageddon*, 92.
dispensationalism.\textsuperscript{61} The rise of dispensationalism, however, created fertile ground for American Christian Zionism before Israel’s establishment, as did increasing theological importance of the United States in Jewish restoration and political involvement and advocacy among Zionists. Through this development, American Christian Zionism became its own distinct theology by the 1940s, but with Israel’s establishment, the theology, and the world, faced significant changes.

**The Birth of Israel**

On November 29, 1947, the newly established United Nations passed only their one hundred eighty-first resolution calling for Palestine’s partition, making that late-autumn day one of the most important in modern world history. Resolution 181 (II) accomplished several tasks, including establishing the United Nations Commission on Palestine, which orchestrated Palestine’s transition from British to independent control, demarcating the boundaries of the new Jewish and Arab states to exist in Palestine, and formulating a plan of action from which to guide their ensuing actions to ensure the safe and secure establishment of their resolution.\textsuperscript{62}

The United Nations ordered Britain’s termination of their mandate over Palestine and removal of all occupying troops by August 1, 1948. According to the resolution, “Independent Arab and Jewish States and the Special International Regime for the City of Jerusalem…shall come into existence in Palestine two months after the evacuation of the armed forces of the mandatory Power [Britain] has been completed….” In addition, the resolution offers foundational principles for the newly established governments, much like the rights promised in the United States Constitution and the proceeding Amendments. The resolution promises freedom of religion, protection of holy religious sites, and open terms for citizenship. On this last


\textsuperscript{62} General Assembly resolution 181(II), *Future government of Palestine*, A/RES/181(II) (29 November 1947), available from undocs.org/A/RES/181(II); see Appendix B for a full-text of the resolution and the roll call vote.
point, the resolution states, “Palestinian citizens residing in Palestine outside the City of
Jerusalem, as well as Arabs and Jews who, not holding Palestinian citizenship, reside in Palestine
outside the City of Jerusalem shall, upon the recognition of independence, become citizens of the
State in which they are resident and enjoy full civil and political rights.”63 As the calendar year
turned to 1948, the United Nations planned to divide Palestine in three: an Arab state, a Jewish
state, and United Nations-governed international zone in Jerusalem.

On May 14, 1948, in Tel Aviv, Israeli leaders signed their Declaration of Independence
and elected David Ben-Gurion to serve as the first Israeli prime minister to lead the new
democratic government system, officially declaring their independence as a nation.64 Nearly one
year later, on May 11, 1949, the United Nations officially admitted Israel to its membership,
twice calling Israel a “peace-loving nation which accepts the obligations contained in the [United
Nations] Charter and is able and willing to carry out those obligations.”65 These events seem to
suggest the United Nations its high hopes for Palestine’s peaceful partition. However, Israel’s
establishment came with the stark opposition of its neighbors. Every Middle Eastern member of
the United Nations at the time voted against Resolution 181, as did other significant members in
the region, such as India, Turkey, and Egypt.66 Israel immediately entered into an environment
surrounded by hostile neighbors upon its 1948 independence and quickly exposed the United
Nations’ naïveté in labeling Israel a “peace-loving nation.” Granted, some adversaries have
imposed violence on Israel, forcing them to respond in kind. Regardless of instigation, wars,
battles, and international conflicts have scarred the entirety of Israel’s existence and have formed
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the dominant portion of Israel’s historical narrative.

With Israel’s restoration, war commenced immediately, beginning offensive military initiatives that have marked its entire modern history. The First Arab-Israeli War began in 1948 as soon as British control ended, as Iraq, Syria, Jordan, Egypt, and Lebanon sent armed forces into Jewish-controlled areas of the former British mandate. In many onlookers’ eyes, Israel had no chance of survival; many believed such a young, small nation surely had no chance of survival against its larger, militarily advanced neighbors. However, in what would become a pattern, Israel’s ability to defend its territory – in this case the United Nations’ assistance – and Arab nations’ ability to unite their forces contributed to Israel’s military success.\footnote{Rubin, Israel, 23.} Sporadic warfare continued until a 1949 armistice, but by this time, Israel “now governed 21 percent more territory than had been offered in the UN Partition Plan.”\footnote{John B. Judis, Genesis: Truman, American Jews, and the Origins of the Arab/Israeli Conflict (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2014), 323-324.} Israel’s existence received no official recognition from its neighbors, perpetuating the hostility evidenced by nearly countless wars.

The next Israeli war of international significance began in 1956, as Israel joined forces with Britain and France to gain control of the Suez Canal (which connects the Red Sea and the Mediterranean Sea on the western side of the Sinai Peninsula) and overthrow Egyptian leader Gamal Abdel Nasser. Israel initiated the attack on the Sinai Peninsula to divert forces from the Suez region, for Britain and France to begin their invasion, but Britain and France never attacked. Young Israel was left on its own at war with Egyptian forces. Israel proved victorious and forced Egypt out of a perpetual, destructive, and exasperating military initiative in Gaza.\footnote{Rubin, Israel, 24.}
Nasser, however, remained in power.\textsuperscript{70} His role as leader in Egypt contributed to a radical shift among Arab nations in the 1960s, and he prepared a massive Arab military barrage on Israel.

Facing this increased hostility, Israel preemptively struck Egyptian forces on June 5, 1967, to prevent their impending destruction. Such an attack provoked other Arab nations to begin their assaults, but Israel secured substantial territory and ended the conflict by June 10, thus the conflict’s name, the Six Day War. In six short days, Israel gained Golan Heights, West Bank, Gaza Strip, and the entirety of the Sinai Peninsula, nearly tripling its land area. Of this conflict, Rubin states, “Within six days, then, Israel had gone from…imminent annihilation to victory – a victory so total and with such low casualties that Israelis saw the results as close to miraculous.”\textsuperscript{71} Israel’s military success became as engrained culturally as did international conflicts, and continued to mark their history through the end of the twentieth century.

Despite more overt attempts at Middle Eastern peace, war continued to ravage Israel and its neighbors throughout the 1970s. Egypt and Syria began a surprise simultaneous attack on October 6, 1973, and, more importantly, what Rubin calls “the holiest day in the Jewish calendar,” Yom Kippur. This celebration of the Day of Atonement essentially shuts Israel down, and the synchronized attacks by Egypt on the Suez Canal and Syria on the Golan Heights briefly pushed back Israeli forces before they recovered and forced a ceasefire on October 25.\textsuperscript{72} This short, destructive war led to the first internationally mediated peace negotiations in Israel’s history, as American then-President Jimmy Carter called both Egyptian President Anwar al-Sadat and Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin to Camp David, Maryland to help facilitate the process of peace the two leaders had already begun. Carter entered the negotiations hopeful,
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but his efforts proved fruitless. The limited tangible outcomes caused even further conflict.

The only achieved compromise at Camp David regarding Palestinians received no support in the West Bank or Gaza. Instead, the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO), founded in 1964 as a radical attempt to represent and vie for Palestinian interests against those of Israelis, “[joined] almost all the Arab states in declaring Egypt to be a traitor to the Arab cause. PLO leader Yasir Arafat threatened to kill any local Palestinian leaders who accepted the offer.” The PLO represents the enemy to many Israelis and Christian Zionists alike, as public opinion treats this organization with suspicion. A 2007 survey revealed that “82% of American Jews agreed that [a systematic, phased destruction of Israel] is the Arabs’ true goal….”

Threats from Arafat, such as the example cited above, became common toward the state of Israel; the PLO has antagonized Israel since the 1960s, and serves as a key player in the modern Israeli-Palestinian conflict that advocates a secularized solution to problems in Palestine, as opposed to Israel’s and other groups’ heavily religious undertones. Israel and Egypt walked away from these meetings with a peace treaty that called for Israel to withdraw from the Sinai Peninsula, and despite lingering tensions between the two nations, Egypt’s relative benevolence toward Israel “greatly [reduced] the chances for a war by Arab states against Israel.”

After these initial peace efforts, Israel continued to make military advances to protect and secure its territory. On June 7, 1981, Israeli forces attempted to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons – which Israel had developed within its borders since the 1950s – in Iraq by destroying a reactor at Osirak. Nearly one year later, on June 6, 1982, Israel began an active military operation on Lebanon, its northern neighbor, due to increased attacks from the PLO in
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the region. Operation Peace for Galilee proved initially successful for Israel, but Syria’s assassination of newly installed Christian Lebanese President Bashir Gemayel devastated their plan. In order to discover other enemy cells in refugee camps throughout Beirut, Lebanon, Israeli forces allowed Lebanese Christian militiamen to enter. According to Rubin, “The militiamen, seeking revenge for the assassination of their leader and for massacres of Christians perpetrated in the bloody civil war, killed over a thousand civilians, mostly Palestinians, living in the camps.” This massacre caused serious international questioning about the war’s motives and necessity.\(^{76}\) In 1987, the first Palestinian Intifada, or uprising, began with the most serious revolt in the West Bank and Gaza Strip under Israeli occupation. This uprising caused further disconnect between Israeli government officials and Palestinian leaders and catalyzed the rise of the radical Islamic group, Hamas.\(^{77}\) Hamas, the Palestinian outworking of the radical Muslim Brotherhood, has developed into the most militant Palestinian opposition to Israeli rule and occupation. According to historian and author of *Genesis: Truman, American Jews, and the Origins of the Arab/Israeli Conflict*, John Judis, “[Hamas] opposed Israel’s existence; it encouraged armed struggle, including suicide bombing; and it espoused a theocratic politics.”\(^{78}\) The Israeli-Palestinian conflict, with complex causes and roots, continues today; while this specific conflict will not appear detailed in the remainder of this paper, Israel’s ongoing war with Palestine further evidences the foundational role warfare plays in Israel’s historical narrative.

International entities responded to these and other Israeli war initiatives with further peace efforts, much like those attempted by President Carter in 1978 at Camp David. The Oslo Agreement, signed in Norway in 1993, expressed mutual effort between the PLO and Israeli
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governments to work toward a two-state solution. The Oslo Agreement, according to Carter, “provided for a phased withdrawal of Israeli military forces from the West Bank, the establishment of a Palestinian governing authority with officials to be elected, and a five-year interim period during which the more difficult and specific issues would be negotiated.” The PLO officially recognized Israel’s right to peace and security and took other massive steps forward, including accepting UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. Israel, on the other hand, saw the opportunity as an attempt to maintain power without maintaining responsibility for the territory’s welfare. The Oslo Agreement achieved mixed results at best, as the 1990s continued to prove tumultuous for Israeli-Palestinian relations. During the closing months of his presidency, Bill Clinton invited Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak and Yasir Arafat back to Camp David for further negotiations between Israel and Palestine, as Barak used his time in office to work, albeit unsuccessfully at times, toward peace in Israel. Operating under the assumption that concessions to warring neighbors would make peace, Barak exposed Israel to an increased level of terrorist and military attacks around the turn of the millennium, making Clinton’s effort at mediating peace ultimately unsuccessful, like all previous attempts.

Although Israel has not gone to war with the United Nations, the relationship between these two entities also contributes to Israel’s conflict-ridden history. As mentioned above, the United Nations had high hopes for Israel upon its establishment and admission to the United Nations between 1947 and 1949. Within a decade, however, UN-Israeli relations became far more tenuous and have persisted with high tensions to this day. Israel repeatedly disregards UN resolutions, despite the fact one of these resolutions established Israel; ironically, the very
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organization to which Israel owes its modern existence now acts as one of its many antagonists.

As the United Nations advanced in its relationship with Israel, it quickly realized the escalating military efforts of the young nation. The UN began to question many Israeli military initiatives beginning as early as the 1950s. Between 1951 and 1955, the UN Security Council issued resolutions condemning Israeli military action with Syria, Jordan, and Egypt. The General Assembly began to add its own condemnations, passing eight resolutions between November 1956 and February 1957 in addition to a Security Council resolution addressing the Suez Canal Crisis. Israel’s disregard for the UN clearly evidenced itself numerous times throughout the first twenty years of Israel’s existence. For example, in 1968, in the aftermath of numerous condemnations of the Six Day War the year before and further conflict between Israel and Jordan, the Security Council passed Resolution 250, in which they stated: “Considering that the holding of a military parade in Jerusalem will aggravate tensions in the area and have an adverse effect on a peaceful settlement of the problems in the area…[the Security Council calls] upon Israel to refrain from holding the military parade in Jerusalem which is contemplated for 2 May 1968.”


trivial nature, the proceeding resolution shows just how little consideration Israel gave the UN.\footnote{Security Council resolution, \textit{Resolution 251 (1968)}, S/RES/251 (1968) (2 May 1968), available from undocs.org/S/RES/251(1968).}

If Israel disregarded the UN early on in its history, UN decisions in the early 1970s eliminated any possibility of a healthier relationship between the two entities. In an effort to include a Palestinian voice in the discussion, the UN invited the PLO to participate in UN activities in 1974 as “the representative of the Palestinian people.”\footnote{General Assembly resolution, \textit{Invitation to the Palestinian Liberation Organization}, A/RES/3210 (XXIX) (14 October 1974), available from undocs.org/A/RES/3210(XXIX).} When the UN granted the PLO observer status in General Assembly activities six weeks later, Israel lost any remaining motivation to follow resolutions passed by an organization they saw as collaborating with their enemies.\footnote{General Assembly resolution, \textit{Observer Status for the Palestinian Liberation Organization}, A/RES/3237 (XXIX) (22 November 1974), available from undocs.org/A/RES/3237(XXIX).} At this point, the United Nations also lost significant moral authority, as the PLO had much international recognition as a terrorist organization. Palestine’s presence in the United Nations remains controversial, especially after a 2012 decision to “upgrade Palestine to a nonmember observer state of the United Nations,” that was viewed as “a sharp rebuke to the United States and Israel.”\footnote{Ethan Bronner and Christine Hauser, “U.N. Assembly, in Blow to U.S., Elevates Status of Palestine,” \textit{New York Times}, November 29, 2012, accessed February 20, 2015, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/30/world/middleeast/Palestinian-Authority-United-Nations-Israel.html?pagewanted=all&r=0.}

In 1974, however, Israel’s disregard for UN resolutions reached a new level. The Security Council passed resolution 338 in 1973 demanding a ceasefire in the midst of the Yom Kippur War.\footnote{Security Council resolution, \textit{Resolution 228 (1973)}, S/RES/338 (1973) (22 October 1973), available from undocs.org/S/RES/338(1973).} While this conflict eventually ended, Israel did so without responding positively to UN suggestions and resolutions, and this particular resolution was referenced in more resolutions
every year until 2012 as Israel participated in practically perpetual violence. Like the original resolution 181 that established two states in Palestine, the Security Council also advocated for a two-state solution to the problems in Palestine through resolutions passed in 2002, 2003, and 2008, causing further tension between the organization and Israel. This pattern of consistent tension continued throughout Israel’s history, and Israel leaves no doubt they have no regard for the United Nations, despite their dependence on the UN for their very existence.

Finally, another contentious aspect of Israel’s history emerges in its relationship with the United States. American-Israeli relations comprise an important part of this analysis of American Christian Zionism, especially based on the established connection between the two in pre-Israel American Zionist thinking mentioned above. The American presidency serves as one example of tension, for American presidents, beginning with Harry Truman, have had their Middle Eastern foreign policy heavily influenced by pro-Israel entities. On this pattern, John Judis argues,

Truman…had moral qualms about Zionism. He was…the last president to express them. But almost every American president since Truman has tried to find a way to improve the lot of Palestinian Arabs, through trying to get Israel to allow refugees to return and later by trying to persuade the Israelis to leave the occupied West Bank and permit the Palestinian Arabs a state of their own. Yet Truman’s successors have…suffered the same fate as he did. They began with a moral and strategic conviction that something had to be done to right the situation of the Palestinians, but under relentless pressure from supporters of Israel (and after 1948 from the Israeli government itself), they gave up.

This presidential pattern speaks to the tremendous influence Israel has maintained in American politics. From Truman to Obama, every American President has notable interactions and tensions with Israel, yet the United States-Israel diplomatic relationship has remained constant; Israel has
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the most fortified diplomatic relationship with the United States of any Middle Eastern nation.

The United States and Israel’s interactions with one another in the United Nations serve as another defining example of the relationship between the two nations. Between 1972 and 2011, the United States has used its veto power as a permanent member of the UN Security Council thirty-nine times to strike down resolutions about Palestine and the Middle East. To put that number in perspective, the United States has only issued 79 vetoes as part of Security Council, meaning nearly half of their vetoes have been issued in support of Israel.\footnote{93. The United Nations, “Security Council Vetoes,” Dag Hammarskjöld Library, accessed April 16, 2015, http://research.un.org/en/docs/sc/quick.} Israel has also proven its willingness to support the United States. In 2004, on General Assembly resolutions relating to Israel, only 3.6% of all votes aligned with the United States; Israel voted identically with the United States on all eighteen such resolutions from 2004.\footnote{94. “Annex – Resolutions Related to Israel Opposed by the United States,” U. S. Department of State, accessed April 16, 2015, http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/44507.pdf.} In 2009, Israel and the United States voted identically on 99.2% of all resolutions.\footnote{95. “Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2009,” U. S. Department of State, accessed April 16, 2015, http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/139479.pdf.} These voting patterns epitomize American-Israeli relations in the United Nations after Israel’s establishment, for as Victoria Clark asserts, “American diplomatic support for Israel has been staunch and invaluable.”\footnote{96. Clark, \textit{Allies}, 146.} The United Nations, the most significant international political arena, offers an example of American-Israeli relations that also stems to intra-national politics.

Several American activist groups have wielded tremendous influence on the United States government on Israel’s behalf. Two of these groups, the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) and Christians United for Israel (CUFI), lobby and petition policymakers from a Zionist perspective. AIPAC, what Clark calls, “the most powerful component of…”
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Jewish lobby,”” has tremendous influence with Congress and an annual budget of $47 million to advocate its political Zionist agenda. The younger evangelical counterpart to AIPAC, CUFI has stormed the American political scene since 2006 as a Christian Zionist outlet to influence American politics. CUFI has benefitted from the work of preceding organizations, such as the International Christian Embassy in Jerusalem (ICEJ). Founded in 1980, the ICEJ serves as a connecting point between Israeli political officials and Zionist supporters in the United States and around the world. ICEJ emerged at a pivotal moment in American-Israeli relations, as the election of Menachem Begin, Israel’s “first right-of-center prime minister,” sparked a relationship with conservative evangelical leaders, creating the association between Israel and conservative Christian theology and politics commonly known today. CUFI, under the leadership of John Hagee, has served as the foremost Christian Zionist activist group in the United States. The influence of these organizations is difficult to quantify in the complexities of the American political system, but in light of the United States’ continued support of Israel since 1948 despite questions from other political activists and politicians themselves, one cannot help but think these groups have bolstered the American-Israeli relationship.

**Modern Zionism: Exemplifying the Divide**

In its relatively brief history as a nation, Israel has engaged in nearly constant warfare, distanced itself from the United Nations, and maintained a love-hate relationship with the United States. Israel is the “most developed nation in the Middle East,” yet comes in as the fourteenth most violent nation in the world according to the Global Peace Index, the fourth most violent
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Middle Eastern nation on this list behind Syria (#1), Afghanistan (#2), and Iraq (#4).\textsuperscript{100}

American Christian Zionism, however, still maintains a strong pro-Israel stance. Israel’s actions have caused further tension among Christians since its establishment, as non-Zionists tend to question Israel’s actions in domestic and international policy far more than Zionists, who tend to view such questions as unwarranted or, at worst, blasphemous.

Israel’s establishment changed everything for American Christian Zionists; what was once a far-off dream became a reality in 1948. As Israel entered its first years as a nation, Zionism experienced a major shift, as the goal of establishing Israel morphed into a goal of ensuring Israel’s survival. In other words, American Christian Zionists continued to support Israel after its establishment with a different focus. However, a parallel shift, also catalyzed by Israel’s creation, proved far more detrimental to the Zionist cause. While many Christian groups survived the transition from supporting to ensuring and protecting Israel’s establishment, many did not, and the division over Israel among different Christian groups represented an increasingly divided American church. Two Christian groups in particular, evangelicals and mainline Protestants, became more alienated over several different theological and political issues. Thus, the growing divide between these two groups centered on their support (or lack thereof) of Israel evidences and epitomizes the growing divide between these two groups overall.

American Christian Zionism’s narrative will emerge by examining several primary sources in an attempt to widely represent the Christian theological spectrum in both periodical publications and denominations. Among periodicals, articles and focuses from three primary resources will supplement American Christian Zionism’s narrative. First, \textit{Christianity Today}, founded in 1956, serves as a representative of evangelical Christianity. In an editorial in its first

issue titled, “Why Christianity Today?” *Christianity Today* presents itself as a counter narrative to both theological liberalism and fundamentalism. The editorial begins, “*Christianity Today* has its origin in a deepfelt desire to express historical Christianity to the present generation. Neglected, slighted, misrepresented – evangelical Christianity needs a clear voice, to speak with conviction and love, and to state its true position and its relevance to the world crisis.” 101

*Christianity Today* also committed to focusing on broader topics rather than niche or denominational issues, allowing it to better represent evangelical Christianity’s broader sentiments, rather than become the media outlet of a very specific theological strand.

*The Christian Century* serves as an example of mainline Christianity that has offered a moderate theological perspective during its 131 years in existence. For example, in 1973, *The Christian Century* labeled itself as “An Ecumenical Weekly.” 102 Today, the magazine maintains its inclusive Christian dialogue: “The magazine remains a voice of generous orthodoxy, both loyal to the church and open to the world.” 103 Both *Christianity Today* and *The Christian Century* have undergone more change in their histories, but their perspective has largely remained the same. *Sojourners* serves as the third and final Christian periodical in this examination. Founded in 1971 by Jim Wallis, *Sojourners* represents a unique strand of Christianity that consistently falls to the theological and political left of the previous two examples. *Sojourners* current expressed focus on “racial and social justice, life and peace, and environmental stewardship” remains an accurate description of its focuses throughout its history. 104 These three periodicals provide voices from several different points on the theological


and political spectra and offer a unique complement to American Christian Zionism’s development in the latter half of the twentieth century.

In addition to these three magazines, two denominations’ publications will also contribute to this examination. Representing evangelical Christianity, the Southern Baptist Convention (SBC) is the largest Christian denomination in the United States, with 6.7% of the American adult population represented among its membership.\textsuperscript{105} The United Methodist Church (UMC), while technically classified as mainline Protestant, is more difficult to classify in these larger denominational families, for the UMC has endured several cases of internal division over issues that normally divide mainline Protestants and evangelicals, such as homosexuality.\textsuperscript{106} The UMC thus serves as a moderate denominational example in this discussion.

While American Christians by no means universally supported Israel’s establishment, Israel’s support came from sources throughout American Christianity. The UMC issued an article in 1948 comparing Israel’s establishment to the growth and flourishing of Beth Ha’arava, a Palestinian Jewish settlement that developed a thriving agricultural system in an arid, unlikely region near the Dead Sea. The UMC qualified its support of Israel’s growth in a statement issued by the editors preceding the article: “This is the first story out of the new country of Israel to reach our desk. It is, we hope, symbolic in that it tells of the creation of life rather than the struggle for nationalism.”\textsuperscript{107} At the same time, evangelical support emerges from the earliest issues of \textit{Christianity Today}, as the first and third issues cite advocacy for Israel in the midst of
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the Suez Canal Crisis. While some liberal Protestants had more hesitation in supporting Israel, they still had some level of support for Israel in the aftermath of the Holocaust and centuries of discrimination and anti-Semitism. This support did not emerge, however, without fear among some mainline Protestants of diminishing Judaism’s inherent value as a religion due to increasing nationalism. As stated in a *Christian Century* article,

> We have a deeper concern, however, with regard to the effect which the victory of the new state will have on Judaism. We regard Judaism as one of the main sources of man's spiritual illumination, its lawgivers and prophets as the lineal forerunners of Jesus the Christ, and its scriptures as the rich soil in which was nurtured that harvest of eternal truth which is garnered in the New Testament…. Will this new Israel serve and spread these spiritual truths, or will it smother them under an arrogant nationalism which despises, when it does not deny, spiritual values?  

Whether or not the advocacy came with attached questions or concerns, Israel received some sense of support from American Christians across theological and political spectra, providing a baseline from which to judge future writings, teachings, and decisions about Israel.

Evangelical advocacy for Israel grew after Israel’s establishment, but *Christianity Today* engaged the subject with openness in order to inform, not indoctrinate, readers. By the end of 1956, *Christianity Today* had already allowed for contrasting articles to run side-by-side. The first, “Israel’s Transgression in Palestine,” overtly but gently questions Israel’s claim to Palestine on biblical grounds. The second, “Israel in Her Promised Land,” takes an opposing view, as Wilbur M. Smith articulates biblical promises he believes support Israel’s claim to the land, citing 141 references in the Hebrew Bible, and Israel’s promised restoration. While these two positions do not encompass all beliefs about Israel or Zionism, but they do imply two truths


about *Christianity Today* and, in turn, evangelicalism in the 1950s. First, as mentioned above, *Christianity Today* had little interest in providing niche Christian groups a public voice. In this case, even Smith attempted to “divorce” himself from dispensationalism.\textsuperscript{112} Despite the crucial role dispensationalism played in American Christian Zionism’s pre-Israel development, dispensationalists began to become less mainline among evangelicals. Other biblical bases for Zionism will emerge later in this study, but clearly the new breed of evangelical Zionism had a different flavor than it did before 1948. In addition, the presence of both of these articles – side by side, no less – indicates an open attitude to discussion surrounding Israel, even though other *Christianity Today* literature still suggests steadfast support.

With these developments in evangelical attitudes toward Israel, mainline Protestants maintained their ambivalent support. Despite early, relatively unified support for Israel’s establishment, many opinions began to change after the Six Day War of 1967. As Zionist historian Paul Charles Merkley states,

> The events of June 1967 constitute the watershed in the story of Christian attitudes toward the state of Israel. From this moment there is rapid movement towards the present polarization between Christian Zionists – generally, but not exclusively, on the right wing, theologically speaking, of the churches – and Christian anti-Zionists – generally, but not exclusively, on the left wing.\textsuperscript{113}

As Merkley implies, the Six Day War initialized the further ideological division between evangelicals and mainline Protestants over Israel. What about the Six Day War initiated this divide? For evangelicals, specifically Zionist evangelicals, the unbelievable, rapid acquisition of vast territory, including the entirety of Israel’s biblical boundaries, proved miraculous and morphed into a clear sign of God’s blessing on the nation of Israel. Among American Christian
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Zionists, particularly those that classify as evangelical Christians, the Six Day War reiterated and amplified the advocacy and wonder surrounding Israel’s initial establishment in 1948. \(^{114}\)

Evangelicals documented the brief but monumental war as a defensive narrative. An editorial in *Christianity Today* from June 23, 1967, less than two weeks after the fighting concluded, framed the narrative in light of Egypt’s desire to seek “revenge” for an embarrassing defeat in 1956. Israel stands out as completely justified, even as a victim, in the 1967 conflict: “Israel, hedged on three sides by Arab foes and outnumbered twenty to one, began fighting to ensure its survival as a nation.” This narrative pits Israel against its Arab foes in a way that anticipates a miraculous victory. \(^{115}\)

As mentioned above, this reading, noticeably free of dispensational language, represents a Christian Zionist view that attempts to eliminate eschatological speculation. This particular brand of Zionism was no less hopeful about Israel, however: “Whether they will retain permanent possession of [Jerusalem] now we do not know since negotiations will determine that in the long run. Even if they do not get the old city now, they will get it some day. We are confident that the Jew will not be driven from Palestine.”\(^{116}\)

While many evangelicals advocated Zionism without dispensationalism, several American Christian leaders saw the Six Day War and Israel’s seizure of Jerusalem, as clear fulfillments of biblical prophecy. The beginning of Jewish rule in Jerusalem marked for many American Christian Zionists the end of the “times of the Gentiles,” meaning Christ’s second coming would soon follow. \(^{117}\)

John F. Walvoord, then-president of Dallas Theological Seminary, called Israel’s conquest of Jerusalem “one of the most remarkable fulfillments of biblical
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prophecy since the destruction of Jerusalem in AD 70.”

One Palestinian Christian, Walid Shoebat, declared this war a prophetic fulfillment of Psalm 83, where Israel validated themselves as a nation and defeated “a confederacy of Ishmaelites (Arabs, said Shoebat), inhabitants of Tyre (Lebanese), Philistines (Gazans/Palestinians, he said), and Assyrians (Syrians, Iraqis, and Turks).” Even among evangelicals, the Six Day War proved incredibly divisive.

As mentioned before, mainline Protestants supported Israel to the nearly the same extent as evangelicals in an American culture that was relatively pro-Israel. Donald Wagner, co-editor of *Zionism and the Quest for Justice in the Holy Land*, states that in the 1950s, 90% of letters and commentary sent to the State Department offered support of Israel in the conflict in Palestine. This percentage might calculate larger than an accurate representation of public opinion at the time, given the limited sample among those passionate enough about the Arab-Israeli conflict to write to the State Department, but the statistic is no less astonishing. With the 1967 war, however, public and mainline Protestant opinion began turning away from Israel. Some Zionist support appeared to remain among many mainline Protestants, including prominent leaders such as Martin Luther King, Jr., and Reinhold Niebuhr, who, along with other Protestant leaders, signed a document which “celebrated Israel’s victory and the ‘unification’ of Jerusalem.”

Niebuhr also published an article in *Christianity and Crisis* comparing Israel’s battle to the biblical narrative of David in his battle against Goliath. Wagner cites this article as further affirmation of Israel’s victory and a confirmation that Cold War politics defined by American
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fear of communism and propagation of democracy throughout the world, demanded the United States’ support of Israel “as a beacon of democracy in the Middle East,” but Niebuhr only mentions the United States once in the article in reference to discussions on the UN Security Council preceding the Six Day War.

If, however, some mainline Protestants began to support Israel for global political reasons during the Cold War rather than a biblical mandate to do so, they clearly have distinguished their Zionist motivations from those of evangelicals. This shift not only includes shifting motivations, but also significant theological questioning of Israel. Many mainline Protestants held Israel in high regard until 1967, and the Six Day War did not necessarily change their minds completely. Instead, Israel’s preemptive strike and military initiatives against Egypt and other Arab neighbors caused more questions and ambiguity surrounding Israel’s status. The Christian Century opened their July 12, 1967 issue with an article titled, “Israel and the Christian Dilemma,” and explained earlier statements that appeared to overtly support military action in Israel. This article offers a statement that captures both the ambiguity of the mainline stance on Israel post-1967 and the tendency away from Zionist beliefs:

The recent events in the Middle East have produced a new situation in which fresh approaches to peace and justice may be possible, but anyone who thinks that Israel's military victory has solved the local conflicts and reduced the global dangers of Arab-Israeli bitterness and belligerence has a naive understanding of human nature and of the nature of proud and hostile states. Unless peace with justice develops in the Middle East, the Arab states will lick their wounds until once again they believe themselves strong enough to fulfill their threat to drive Israel into the sea.

A tension emerged for many mainline Protestant between theological understandings about Israel and other theological convictions. What trumps: a biblical conviction about Israel or a

commitment to “peace and justice,” that is, orders of life consistent with God’s ideal orders? Many Christians, not necessarily only mainline Protestants, found themselves forced into this ambiguity – not quite Zionist, but not anti-Zionist either – and wavered back and forth throughout the rest of the twentieth century. These Ziognostics grew no more certain about their beliefs as further events in Israel polarized other Christian groups, but the role of Ziognosticism becomes important in developing the narrative of the larger Christian divide exemplified by differing views about Israel and Zionism.¹²⁶

Before venturing into further Ziognostic study, examining evangelical theology reveals more wrestling with but little change to their Zionist theology after 1967. Despite a lack of a monolithic evangelical constituency behind Israel, evangelicals maintained constant support for Israel through the end of the twentieth century. President Carter’s peace initiatives received praise from evangelicals, but not at the expense of supporting Israel’s theological existence. A 1977 Christianity Today editorial claimed, “...it would be unwise to deny that there is no eschatological significance in the events of the Middle East.”¹²⁷ Many Zionists seriously questioned and criticized a 1978 Israeli law banning proselytization, for conversion remained a significant component of American Christian Zionism. However, in the midst of significant opposition among evangelical Zionists, Israel still found tremendous support:

As we understand Scripture, God has an interest in all peoples, yet he has a distinguishable interest in the people of Israel. Moreover, the tragic history of the suffering of the children of Israel, most of it in recent centuries and inflicted by those who claim to be followers of the Jewish Messiah, Jesus Christ, warrants our support of a homeland for the Israelis. There is no better place for such a state than on Palestinian soil…. Even if the Arab nations cannot acknowledge biblical grounds for doing so, we think they should recognize Israel as a sovereign state…. Nevertheless, we contend that a recognition of the sovereignty of Israel and its borders ought not to depend on Israel’s

¹²⁶ I use the term, Ziognostic (a combination of Zionist and agnostic), for the remainder of this study to describe Christians in-between Zionism and anti-Zionism. The concept will develop as part of the analysis.

acceptance of a PLO-run neighboring state.\textsuperscript{128}

The support evidenced in this particular article does not directly coincide with a dispensational evangelical view. The primary reasons for supporting Israel include biblical justification, restitution for past wrong done by the Christian church, and an oppressive political climate in the Middle East. Nowhere does prophecy emerge in these statements as it does among dispensationalists, evidencing a continued Zionist spirit separate from specific eschatological beliefs among many evangelicals.

As tension increased between Israelis and Palestinians in the 1980s and 90s, many evangelical Christians maintained their support for Israel but began to wrestle further with seemingly conflicting characteristics between the nation of Israel and Christian faith. In March 1992, \textit{Christianity Today} featured Christian Zionism on its cover. The cover story by Ken Sidey analyzes mainline Protestants changing their views on Zionism and a small sect of evangelicals who counter the continuing emphasis on Zionism propagated by the Religious Right beginning in the 1980s. Sidey also cites a \textit{Christianity Today} poll, which reveals numerous trends among evangelical Zionist thought. 39\% of respondents said they had become “more critical” of Israel in the previous decade (since 1982). 88\% of respondents believed in holding Israel to the same standards of conduct as any other nation. Only 24\% affirmed a biblical mandate to support Israel politically, and 20\% believed “Israel had no legitimate claim to territories occupied [since] the 1967 war (Gaza Strip, Golan Heights, West Bank).”\textsuperscript{129} Granted, these statistics do not reveal any sort of anti-Zionist sentiments brooding among a majority of evangelicals, but the presence of such beliefs among evangelicals does suggest more variance on traditionally held beliefs.

Despite some questioning of Zionism among evangelicals, many remained consistent


\textsuperscript{129} Ken Sidey, “For the Love of Zion,” \textit{Christianity Today}, March 9, 1992, 47-49.
with their beliefs in the 1980s and 90s. The Baptist Press documents an argument between Southern Baptist leaders and a Jewish Rabbi at a 1983 Jewish-Baptist colloquium in Little Switzerland, North Carolina, surrounding proselytization of Jews in Israel. Rabbi Howard Singer implored Baptist leaders to send missionaries to Africa or anywhere else in favor of giving Jews Judaism rather than Christianity. Several leaders present acted defensively, largely due to Singer’s remarks’ brash nature, but also because Jewish conversion remained a key tenant of Zionism for many evangelicals. In 1995, shortly after the assassination of Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, Jim Sibley, a Southern Baptist Convention missionary to Messianic Jews in Tel Aviv, Israel, stated conversion served as the only viable peacemaking method in the Middle East: “Evangelicals should not take lightly the biblical inference that peace in Israel, as in the rest of the world, will be out of reach as long as Jews remain separated from the knowledge of Jesus the Messiah.” Clearly, Zionism still had strong roots among evangelical Christians, leading Timothy P. Weber to label evangelicals as “Israel’s best friend” in 1998. Several of these theological connections received additional support and engraining from evangelical political tendencies as well, for many evangelicals equated Christians needing to support Israel with the United States needing to do the same.

This idealized connection between the United States and Christendom emerged as a popular evangelical belief throughout the twentieth century. For example, in a letter to missionary Francis A. Schaeffer, American religious historian George Marsden criticizes this view through this unique synopsis:

> It seems to me that the most exact parallel to Ancient Israel today is the church and not the culture at large. You [Schaeffer] emphasize more that the application [of particular


passages in Jeremiah] is to both. But Jeremiah is addressing the kingdom, God’s chosen
group of people who have betrayed him, in the passages you cite; and it seems to me that the only
parallel to the Kingdom today is the church, and not the culture at large. Since my
professional work is primarily in American intellectual and religious history, I am very
sensitive to parallels drawn between ancient Israel and modern culture. That parallel has
been employed extensively throughout American religious history…. Applied positively
(e.g. God will bless our nation if we keep his covenant [i.e. the law] just as he has blessed
Israel) it has led to an unwarranted confusion of church and nation — which in turn has
led to a disastrous identification of Christianity with American mores and even with
American patriotism…. Protestantism and American cultural values had become so
closely identified in the 19th century that when the cultural values began to shift radically
in the early 20th century most of the church shifted right along with it and hence lost the
Gospel. Many Fundamentalists, on the other hand, confused their witness by trying to
preserve both the Gospel and the 19th century American mores that had been identified
with it.133

In the absence of dispensationalism’s widespread influence, American Christian Zionism
has depended on its formidable American identity to maintain clout among American
evangelicals. Christianity Today records a sermon offered in National Presbyterian Church by
Dr. Edward L. R. Elson in 1957, preached to the ears of several federal government leaders,
including President Eisenhower and Vice President Nixon, titled, “One Nation Under God.”
Elson preached, “Religion and national identity are forever intertwined,” and contended that
being “under God” implied acknowledging God’s lordship over all creation and submitting to
divine providence and guidance. In a fascinating sermon epitomizing the metaphorical marriage
between Christian and American values, Elson said, “…enriched by prayer, strengthened by
worship, and maintained by a variety of spiritual disciplines, our great nation can successfully
confront all forces which would corrupt its life or destroy its freedom.”134 For many evangelicals,
biblical Israel and the United States have a similar standing in God’s eyes, thus support for
modern-day Israel among evangelicals flows naturally out of a sense of responsibility or duty. As

133. George Marsden to Francis A. Schaeffer, May 19, 1969, Francis A. Schaeffer Collection, Box 57, File 23, Item
05723028, Library at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary; accessed with permission from the Francis A. Schaeffer
Collection at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary; reproduced with permission by George Marsden.

fellow chosen people, Americans, or at least American Christians, have the obligation to support Israel today. This particular ideology proves extremely difficult to reconcile with many more liberal Christian groups, and provides a larger context for the growing divide between evangelical and mainline Protestants over issues in addition to Zionism.

While Zionism among evangelicals at least remained steady through the end of the twentieth century, this time period also evoked strong criticism from Israel’s opponents. Often labeled “anti-Zionists,” these critics view Israel outside of the framework of any biblical mandates or prophecy and judge it (often harshly) as another nation among many. By the 1980s, more liberal Christian publications began publishing articles far more critical of Israel and American-Israeli relations. In 1982, David Graybeal published an opinion piece in *The Christian Century* labeling American actions as attempts to become God and deliver Israel much like the Exodus narrative. Graybeal uses harsh satire to subtly criticize this viewpoint before openly expressing his discontent with the unique relationship between the United States and Israel:

> The tragic consequence for the United States is that our identification with an Israel which has had occupying armies in Egypt, Jordan and Syria for 14 years increasingly reveals the cynicism in our commitments to human rights, to international law, and to the United Nations. It prevents us from having straightforward interactions with other nations of the Middle East, many of which are convinced that our Middle East policies are formulated in Tel Aviv. Our covenant with Israel is so powerful that we may find ourselves fighting in a war we did not choose.\(^{135}\)

James Wall also criticizes the tendency to only emphasize Israel’s Jewish nature:

> Israel is a Jewish state—the only democracy in the Middle East. It is a democracy under constant threat from hostile neighbors, and a nation friendly to the United States, which some of its neighbors certainly are not. But the land of Israel also has a Christian and a Muslim history, and it certainly has both a Christian and a Muslim presence today.\(^{136}\)

Robert McAfee Brown, in an attempt to achieve mutual understanding and reconciliation among


Jews and Christians, affirms Israel’s right to exist in security, but mourns the fact that Christians cannot criticize Israeli policies or military action without an immediate anti-Semitic label. He also decries dispensational theology, which makes Israel and Jews nothing more than “pawns” in a particular Christian theology.\(^{137}\) If Donald Wagner correctly perceived a general pro-Israel sentiment among American mainline Protestants after the Six Day War, that sentiment all but faded away by the 1990s, as mainline Protestants had no qualms questioning or even denouncing Israeli political and military action.

In 1990, the Middle East Council of Churches (MECC), one of the most significant Christian organizations on the ground in the Middle East with which many mainline Protestants – especially anti-Zionists – connect and from which they receive information, issued a prayer for peace in Palestine that many Jews and Zionist Christians perceived as a threat to Israel’s security. Many American Christians, however, reconsidered the plight of Christians, Palestinian Christians in particular, as they formed their opinions about Israel.\(^{138}\) The MECC has served as a strong, constant voice in opposition to Israel, and while this opposition has caught many Christians’ attention, the MECC also receives a lot of criticism from American Christian Zionists in particular. Many mainline Protestants, in spite of at times severe anti-Zionism, sought peace and reconciliation over favoring one particular nation or people group. This pursuit led to further criticism toward Israel as it undermined the peace process, such as James Wall’s condemnation of Israel’s tunneling near Jewish and Muslim holy sites under the cover of darkness as a provocation for violence.\(^{139}\) Instead of continued focus on believing particular things about Israel for Israel’s sake, many mainline Protestant Christians began to refine their theological beliefs.


around a new concept: social justice.

If connection with American ideals serves as a defining characteristic of evangelicalism, the pursuit of social justice comprises a core tenet of the last fifty years of mainline Protestantism. Social justice, however, requires a set definition moving forward. This phrase and concept most clearly emerge from *Sojourners* magazine, and according to a 2007 article by *Sojourners* contributor Rose Marie Berger, “Justice is the moral code that guides a fair and equitable society.” Berger continues, “The principle of social justice, according to Catholic social teaching, requires the individual Christian to act in an organized manner with others to hold social institutions accountable—whether government or private—to the common good.” In short, Berger describes social justice as a public outworking of Christian faith.\(^{140}\) On the surface, this concept might appear similar to the evangelical notion of biblical mandates to support Israel politically, as Christian faith makes manifest that particular political belief; these two concepts could not be more different. Social justice initiatives look to reform the structures that impact people’s daily lives – often through progressive social reform – and such political initiative often receives scorn from evangelical communities who view such policies as too liberal. The social justice theme, however, becomes a key focus for anti-Zionists in the late twentieth century.

*Sojourners* wasted no time upon its 1977 founding to criticize pro-Israel tendencies in the United States. They first criticized President Carter’s early pro-Israel tendencies on the basis of pursuing peace. According to Wes Michaelson, “If, with millions of other evangelicals, [Carter] becomes convinced about whose side God is on in the Middle Eastern conflict, there will hardly be a sound basis for constructing a foreign policy aimed at reconciliation.”\(^{141}\) On at least three


occasions by the end of 1979, *Sojourners* published significant articles contending for justice on behalf of Palestinians.¹⁴² This decision did not come without repercussions, as a letter to the editor claimed, with regards to *Sojourners*’ stance on Israel, “You have compromised to the world’s standards. Satan will use a righteous tool to beat a Christian to death…”¹⁴³ However, *Sojourners* continued its unabashed advocacy for radical peace and justice in the Middle East regardless of the implications for Israel or its own reputation.

*Sojourners* continued Israeli criticism on social justice grounds well into the 1980s and 90s. Further provocative articles advanced knowledge of the Palestinian plight, including an transcribed interview with Palestinian Christian priest Friar Elias Chacour.¹⁴⁴ Other criticisms openly opposed the marriage between theology and American politics, such as Danny Collum’s denunciation of distorting eschatology for the sake of a political agenda, or Yehezkel Landau’s disapproval of Ronald Reagan’s apocalyptic language in his second presidential campaign in light of nuclear weapon developments.¹⁴⁵ By 1989, *Sojourners* articles openly advocated for the nonviolent creation of a Palestinian state in according with UN Resolution 181(II) with a continued emphasis on Palestinian suffering at the hands of Israel.¹⁴⁶ A January 1990 article examined Christian Zionism’s global influence, citing the MECC’s condemnation of the theology as “a heretical interpretation of scripture that exalts one particular people over another


in God’s creation….” Jeremy Milgrom captures the perceived duplicitousness among Israeli leaders in a 1998 article when he says, “On the declarative level, Israelis want peace; on the operative, conscious level, what they mean is they want their own security.”

The social justice movement has driven Sojourners to repeatedly and openly criticize Israel. In contrast, American Christian Zionists among evangelicals hesitate to question and criticize Israel at all. These differences between mainline Protestant and evangelical responses include two vital implications for understanding this conflict in American political and religious culture today. First, mainline Protestant and evangelical differences and the growing divide on their ideologies on Israel represent a larger religious cultural rift between the two groups. Second, this tension, characterized by polarizing opposites, leaves many people caught in between beliefs about Israel and convictions about exercising Christianity on earth. These Ziognostics have developed into a larger minority of people who seek a solution that advances peace and other Christian values for all involved in the Middle East, but these voices come through muffled by polarizing noise from the Zionist and anti-Zionist ends of the spectrum.

While the Zionist debate has clear intrinsic implications and meaning, it also represents a larger divide between evangelicals and mainline Protestants in terms of theological values and emphases. Evangelical and mainline Protestant Christians have distinct views on Israel; a 2003 Pew Research Forum survey shows 55% of white evangelicals “sympathize more with Israel,” while only 34% of white mainline Protestants feel the same way. In 2004, a similar survey revealed 64% of traditionalist evangelicals – the demographic group most associated with conservative evangelical Christianity – support Israel over Palestine, as opposed to 33% of

---


However, the 1950s began a slow but steady division process between these two Christian groups – a division highlighted by the slight split over the Six Day War in 1967 – that extends far beyond Zionism and Israel.

Since the 1970s, evangelical Christianity has dominated the American political landscape from a religious standpoint. The rise of the Religious Right placed faith back in the political marketplace under the assumption that all Christians valued conservative religious and political principles. However, the parallel rise of the Evangelical Left offers a more complete picture of religion-driven politics in the late twentieth century. David Swartz, professor of history at Asbury University, labels this demographic the “Moral Minority,” and despite the fact this group did not win significant elections or make significant progress after the 1970s does not mean they did not exist or had no impact. Swartz argues the social justice emphasis in modern evangelicalism has emerged out of the Moral Minority, including emphases on racial and economic justice, peace, and reconciliation. This group now seems to have revitalized among young evangelicals in recent years, evidenced by George W. Bush’s plummeting approval rating from 87% to 45% between 2002 and 2009 among this demographic. Swartz uses the diverse influence of the Evangelical Left to argue against evangelicalism’s inherently conservative political leanings: “Attention to historical and global realities suggests…that evangelicalism is not inherently conservative, nor universally fixed to individual solutions to social problems.”

Christians left and right, evangelical and mainline, realize the need to get involved politically to

---
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pursue “holistic, not just personal, transformation.”¹⁵⁴ Division between these two groups still pervades, forcing Christians to learn to disagree well rather than how to work together.

To portray the Zionism discussion as simply Zionists versus anti-Zionists is dishonest and misleading. Many Christians cannot place themselves in one camp in particular and instead attempt to navigate the tumultuous waters of Zionism and other beliefs about Israel on their own. Ironically, many women and men of faith are not alone in their question-ridden pursuits. However, after years of ambiguity and uncertainty, the Ziognostics have found a landing point of theology that allows them to both maintain (or develop) a respect for the people of Israel while addressing their convictions to pursue justice in the Middle East.

This developing type of theology among Ziognostics emerges very clearly in the March 2015 issue of Sojourners. Granted, this article comes fifteen years into the twenty-first century and from a periodical historically far more critical of Israel, but over a background of the city of Jerusalem on the magazine cover emerge the words, “Pro-Israeli, Pro-Palestinian, Pro-Jesus.” The article by the same title articulates a growing position among Christians in the United States to support the peace and security of people in the Middle East (note the title did not read “Pro-Israel, Pro-Palestine…”). Ryan Rodrick Beiler lists seven reasons that many evangelical perspectives are changing on Israel and many people caught in the middle of this spectrum tend to lean toward pursuing justice in this new framework:

1. Evangelicals are listening to Palestinian Christian voices.
2. Leaders are getting educated [about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict] and helping to educate others.
3. Young evangelicals are more passionate and less prejudiced.
4. Evangelicals of color know injustice when they see it.
5. Jewish voices are broadening the boundaries of debate.
6. When governments [i.e. that of the United States] fail, grassroots movements grow.

¹⁵⁴. Ibid., 266.
7. Evangelicals are trading pop-theology for prophetic theology\textsuperscript{155} Former Ziognostics find themselves drawn to this new framework as a means of making sense of conflicting theologies and practically working out core convictions of the Christian faith. This more recent development has been highlighted by prominent Christian leaders – all more progressive theologically but self-identifying as evangelical – such as Lynne Hybels, Shane Claiborne, and Jim Wallis.\textsuperscript{156}

Perhaps it is possible the extreme outliers on both ends of this discussion on Zionism do not have the influence they once had. Sure, they still have their voices (as evidenced in the conclusion), but often the loudest voices in American culture are not always worth listening to. As Christians continue to decipher their way through beliefs about the Middle East, many desire to form a cohesive theology driven by key biblical themes or commands, like love, justice, or peace, rather than believing particular specifics, such as Zionism or anti-Zionism, regardless of their cohesiveness with these larger theological themes. The Ziognostics do not have a defined history; their source material is limited if even existent, they do not have leaders, they do not have powerful or popular organizations. What they do have, however, is a desire for theological consistency, which drove to question the unquestionable dogma of Zionism and reject the teeming hatred at times evident within anti-Zionism.

**Conclusion: Identity in Zionism Today**

Zionism is still undoubtedly prevalent among many evangelical Christians. Speakers and authors like John Hagee and Jimmy DeYoung still advocate dispensational theology and Christian Zionism in many of the same ways it was articulated in modern Israel’s earliest days. Hagee argues in his Zionist manifesto, *In Defense of Israel*,

\textsuperscript{155} Ryan Rodrick Beiler, “Pro-Israeli, Pro-Palestinian, Pro-Jesus,” *Sojourners*, March 2015, 16-18.
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The Bible states quite clearly, “I will bless those who bless you, and I will curse him who curses you” (Genesis 12:3). Entire books could be written on how that blessing and cursing have dramatically impacted human history. It is an undeniable fact that the man or the nation that has blessed Israel has been blessed of God, and to the man or the nation that cursed Israel the judgment of God came in spades.\textsuperscript{157}

In addition to these “Zionist veterans,” new evangelical leaders are paving the way to keep Zionism in the forefront of American Christian life and thought. Chelsen Vicari, Evangelical Program Director at the Institute on Religion and Democracy, clearly advocates for Zionism in her book \textit{Distortion}, where she describes, “…the clarion call to stand side by side with the only nation-state established by God.…”\textsuperscript{158} Even if new theologies about Israel have developed and gained popularity, Zionism maintains a strong constituency.

With new advocates for American Christian Zionism come new critics as well. One such example of a harsh critic of Zionism is Stephen Sizer. Sizer’s text, \textit{Christian Zionism: Road-map to Armageddon?}, due to cover art and sentences such as, “It is intended that this book will expose the historical origins, the theological basis and political consequences of [Christian Zionism],” appears a bit sensationalist at times.\textsuperscript{159} However, he also appears to have goals beyond simple critique: “It is hoped that this book will contribute not only to greater dialogue between advocates and critics [of Christian Zionism], but also to the wider search for peace between the children of Abraham, physical and spiritual [that is, Jews and Christians].”\textsuperscript{160}

Sizer bases his critique on American Christian Zionists’ failure to adhere to and advocate a theology centered on Jesus Christ. Instead, Sizer contends, Christian Zionism is “based primarily on the shadows of the old covenant,” and focuses more on a geographic territory than
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the person of Christ. Sizer continues,

Christian Zionism is an exclusive theology that focuses on the Jews in the land rather than an inclusive theology that [centers] on Jesus Christ, the [Savior] of the world. It consequently provides a theological endorsement for racial segregation, apartheid and war. This is diametrically opposed to the inclusive theology of justice, peace and reconciliation which lie at the heart of the new covenant.

As an alternative to Zionism, Sizer describes a theology of “covenantalism,” which advocates the universality and inclusivity of the biblical idea of Israel; all people have the opportunity to enter the kingdom of God. Covenantal theology looks at people, not people groups, and acknowledges their value and worth and works for the “peace and security” of all people. Sizer does not deny Israel’s right to peaceably exist – in fact, he supports this proposition – while also recognizing the right of all people to peaceably exist. Sizer concludes his book, “With the repudiation of the destructive elements of Christian Zionism, Jews and Arabs, like Isaac’s children, Jacob and Esau, can be assisted by Christians to stop fighting over their birthright and start sharing the blessings.” Sizer, like many evangelical critics of Christian Zionism, ultimately desires peace and the protection of all people naturally intertwines with the peace pursuit.

Based on Sizer’s language throughout his book, he clearly does not support Christian Zionism as traditionally understood. However, his conclusions highlight several “constructive” consequences of Zionism (see Table 1 below). To Sizer, these constructive consequences have little association with Zionist theology’s direct implications, but rather serve as acknowledgements of positive, if not accidental, outcomes that result from Zionist efforts. 

Alongside these constructive consequences lay more “destructive” consequences, and the
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comparison between some of these implications proves quite interesting. For example, Sizer cites “Stand against anti-Semitism,” as a constructive consequence, and rightly so; American Christian Zionists despise anti-Semitism as an expression of hatred toward the Jewish people. On the other hand, he also cites “Justification of apartheid within an exclusive Jewish state,” as a destructive consequence, revealing a blatant inconsistency in Zionist thinking. According to Sizer, a theology, driven partially by ethnic and religious inclusivity, ultimately excludes and justifies institutional racism. Overall, Sizer’s drawn implications also reveal his qualms about Christian Zionism: this inconsistent theology typically causes more harm than good.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructive Consequences</th>
<th>Destructive Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement of dialogue between Jews and Christians</td>
<td>Justification of apartheid within an exclusive Jewish state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A general commitment to share the gospel with Jewish people</td>
<td>Undermining Christian witness in the Middle East by partisan support for Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand against anti-Semitism</td>
<td>Encouragement of religious intolerance and Islamophobia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of the Gentile church in the Jewish origins of the Christian faith</td>
<td>Tacit acceptance of the ethnic-cleansing of Palestinians by their support for the Jewish settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion for and humanitarian work among Jewish refugees</td>
<td>Denigration of moderate Jews willing to negotiate a land-for-peace deal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incitement of religious fanaticism by supporting the rebuilding of the Jewish temple on Haram Al-Sharif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apocalyptic eschatology in danger of becoming a self-fulfilling prophecy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Constructive and destructive consequences of Christian Zionism

To reiterate, the divide between evangelicals and mainline Protestants has grown since – though not necessarily as a result of – Israel’s establishment in 1948, and this divide remains to this day; the specific divisions over Zionism fit into their own narrative but also the larger narrative of division between American evangelicals and mainline Protestants. Zionism still
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wields tremendous theological and political influence, but many studies show signs of further demographic change. Less formally, Trevin Wax of The Gospel Coalition argues that young Southern Baptists are less likely to hold dispensationalist eschatological beliefs (and thus, less likely to be Zionists).\footnote{167} This trend incorporates various factors, but ultimately the biggest differences stem from different theological values and emphases. The question remains: how has American Christian Zionism maintained a support base in light of such fervent criticism?

Before American Christian Zionism is a belief or theology, it serves as a fundamental identity; a mere observation of the phrase itself reveals three specific identities rolled into one. But in this phrase that ties in nationality, religion, and theology and the belief system which it represents, we see exemplified a very human characteristic. Humanity cannot survive without identity. In a complex world, the sheer amount of information presented before our minds every second should overwhelm us to the point of complete shut down. In addition to the miracle of the human mind, one particular practice proves crucial to humanity’s survival: the ability to identify.

David Berreby, the author of \textit{Us & Them: The Science of Identity}, approaches the human ability to identify through the lenses of history, sociology, and neuroscience to help make sense of how humans make sense of their environments. He argues humans have to make connections, link events together, and, most significantly, group people or objects together in order to have any chance to make sense of the world.\footnote{168} Humans divide people by race, nationality, class, occupation, societal status, height, weight, and any sort of dividing factor in order to make a classification; honestly, remembering characteristics – however stereotypical they might be – about a group proves far easier than remembering individual characteristics about each member.
of a group. This phenomenon explains why many people feel uncomfortable in cultural settings where they are the minority, for the perceived difference between *us* and *them* puts defenses up and heightens anxiety, even without any logical reason to do so. On the flipside, according to Berreby, “The human ability to imagine that a stranger is not an enemy, that a stranger can feel like Us, is an essential part of our humanity.”\(^{169}\) Whether building barriers or constructing connections, humans’ perceived identities, specifically identities within particular groups, grow into something far more than a social construct humans create to make sense of the world.

Berreby argues these human “kinds,” quite literally the groups or types in which humans can be classified, become humanity’s means of making sense of the world.\(^{170}\) When these kinds become a part of our cognitive behavior, however, we make observations and decisions based on these various identities, groups, or categories. These observations and decisions reinforce these categorizations, leading to more observations and decisions in a cycle that builds these identity markers to the point of becoming solid fortresses in the human mind only surmounted with great difficulty.\(^{171}\) Think about your reactions to these identities: college graduate, homeless, New York Yankees fan, mechanic, business executive, prisoner, teacher, pop star, pastor. While responses to these different human “kinds” might produce different results, the process for all humans who have an understanding of these different identities remains identical. Humans identify a group with which a fellow human belongs, identify characteristics typically associated with people of a particular group, associate those characteristics to a particular person, then, if truly engaged, adjust their understanding of a particular group based on their interactions with that particular individual. Many people fall short of this last step, however, and simply let the
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groupings and identities speak for themselves.

In the past, “kinds” and identities centered primarily on appearance or ethnicity. Those still exist as pervasively as ever, but Berreby contends, “In modern times, ideologies have rivaled older human kinds in their numbers of adherents and in their fatal consequences.”\(^{172}\) These groupings in particular have three significant consequences. First, similarity breeds together; a lack of diversity leads to a lack of interest in and compassion for others. Second, because ideologies change, as do definitions of race, class, ethnicity, or any other particular grouping, these categories change as well, meaning, for example, the definition of “white” in the United States means something far different in 2015 than it did in 1815. Third, and most significantly, ideological differences contribute to the often deadly Us and Them mentality. As Berreby argues, “There is apparently no people known to history or anthropology that lacks a distinction between ‘us’ and ‘others.’ Famously, the name many societies use for their own people is also their word for ‘human being.’”\(^{173}\) In attempts to persuade, humans often appeal to common humanity; relatability speaks volumes in today’s culture. But why the need to connect before attempting to persuade? Humans will not act outside their “kind,” even if the group with which they identify is a mere social construct. It is this particular mentality that led to tragedies of the past twenty-five years such as the Rwandan genocide of 1994 and the Iraq and Afghanistan Wars. Humanity has the capacity to kill for identity and has proven time and time again its willingness to do so. Berreby states, “This feeling – what is not ‘us’ is not moral – should strike people as deeply weird, but it doesn’t. We are so used to it in out own lives that it doesn’t seem odd…. Many of our feelings about right and wrong are actually feelings about Us and Them.”\(^{174}\)
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American Christian Zionism and American Christian anti-Zionism alike have standing traditions of beliefs and theologies that resound in both communities as complete and legitimate. There are legitimate, blatant differences between these two theologies and the beliefs of Ziognostics in between these two ends of the spectrum of beliefs about Israel. But perhaps the reason for the division, the identification with Israel, the tension with American politics and foreign policy, the hatred, the violence, the war, and the slander goes beyond theology. Perhaps anti-Zionists see Zionists and think, without thinking: “What a bigoted, racist murderer. I am so glad I am better than them.” Perhaps Zionists see anti-Zionists and think, without thinking: “What an unfaithful, amoral anti-Semite. I am so glad I am better than them.” The division is real, and men and women on both sides have acted upon the identities created by the theological differences. Perhaps these theological differences are not as insurmountable as we have come to believe and construct them to be. Quite honestly, the biggest gap is not between Zionists and anti-Zionists or Ziognostics, or between evangelicals and mainline Protestants. The biggest gap of all will always exist between us and them.
Appendix A: The Seven Dispensations

The Scriptures divide time, by which is meant the entire period from the creation of Adam to the “new heaven and a new earth” in Rev. 21:1, into seven unequal periods, called, usually, “Dispensations” (Eph. 3:2), although these periods are also called “ages” (Eph. 2:7) and “days” – as, “day of the Lord,” etc.

These periods are marked off in Scripture by some change in God’s method of dealing with mankind, or a portion or mankind, in respect of the two questions of sin and of man’s responsibility. Each of the Dispensations may be regarded as a new test of the natural man, and each ends in judgment – marking his utter failure.

Five of these Dispensations, or periods of time, have been fulfilled; we are living in the sixth, probably towards its close, and have before us the seventh, and last – the Millennium.

1. Man Innocent. – This dispensation extends from the creation of Adam, Gen. 2:7, to the expulsion. Adam, created innocent and ignorant of good and evil, was placed in the garden of Eden with his wife, Eve, and put under responsibility to abstain from the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. The Dispensation of Innocence resulted in the first and, in its far-reaching effects, the most disastrous of the failures of the natural man, and was closed by judgment – “So He drove out the man.”
   a. Genesis 1:26: And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.
   b. Genesis 2:16-17: And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.
   c. Genesis 3:6: And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat.
   d. Genesis 3:22-24: And the Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever: Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden Cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.

2. Man under Conscience. – By the Fall Adam and Eve acquired, and transmitted to the race, the knowledge of good and evil. This gave conscience a basis for right moral judgment, and hence the race came under this measure of responsibility – to do good and eschew evil. The result of the Dispensation of Conscience was that “all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth;” that “the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of (15) the thoughts of his heart was only evil.

---
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continually;” and God closed the second testing of the natural man with judgment – the Flood.

a. Genesis 3:7, 22: And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons…. And the Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever.

b. Genesis 6:5, 11-12: And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually…. The earth also was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence. And God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth.

c. Genesis 7:11-12, 23: In the six hundredth year of Noah’s life, in the second month, the seventeenth day of the month, the same day were all the fountains of the great deep broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened. And the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights…. And every living substance was destroyed which was upon the face of the ground, both man, and cattle, and the creeping things, and the fowl of the heaven; and they were destroyed from the earth: and Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the ark.

3. Man in Authority over the Earth. – Out of the fearful judgment of the Flood, God saved eight persons to whom, after the waters were assuaged, He gave the purified earth with ample power to govern it. This, Noah and his descendants were responsible to do. The Dispensation of Human Government resulted, upon the plain of Shinar, in the impious attempt to become independent of God and closed in judgment – the Confusion of Tongues.

a. Genesis 9:1-2: And God blessed Noah and his sons, and said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth. And the fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon every beast of the earth, and upon every fowl of the air, upon all that moveth upon the earth, and upon all the fishes of the sea; into your hand are they delivered.

b. Genesis 11:1-4: And the whole earth was of one language, and of one speech. And it came to pass, as they journeyed from the east, that they found a plain in the land of Shinar; and they dwelt there. And they said one to another, Go to, let us make brick, and burn them thoroughly. And they had brick for stone, and slime had they for morter. And they said, Go to, let us build us a city and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth.

c. Genesis 11:5-8: And the Lord came down to see the city and the tower, which the children of men builded. And the Lord said, Behold, the people is one, and they have all one language; and this they begin to do: and now nothing will be restrained from them, which they have imagined to do. Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another’s speech. So the Lord scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth: and they left off to build the city.

4. Man under Promise. – Out of the dispersed descendants of the builders of Babel, God
now calls one man Abram, with whom he enters into covenant. Some of the promises to Abram and his descendants were purely gracious and unconditional. These either have been, or will yet be, literally fulfilled. Other promises were conditional upon the faithfulness and obedience of the Israelites. Every one of these conditions was violated, and the Dispensation of Promise resulted in the utter failure of Israel, and closed in the judgment of the Egyptian Bondage. The book of Genesis, which opens with the sublime words, “In the beginning God created,” closes with, “in a coffin in Egypt.”

a. Genesis 12:1-3: Now the Lord had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee: And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.

b. Genesis 13:14-17: 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. 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. Arise, walk through the land in the length of it and in the breadth of it; for I will give it unto thee.

c. Genesis 15:5: 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.

d. Genesis 26:3: Sojourn in this land, and I will be with thee, and will bless thee; for unto thee, and unto thy seed, I will give all these countries, and I will perform the oath which I sware unto Abraham thy father;

e. Genesis 28:12-13: And he dreamed, and behold a ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven: and behold the angels of God ascending and descending on it. And, behold, the Lord stood above it, and said, I am the Lord God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac: the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed;

f. Exodus 1:13-14: And the Egyptians made the children of Israel to serve with rigour: And they made their lives bitter with hard bondage, in morter, and in brick, and in all manner of service in the field: all their service, wherein they made them serve, was with rigour.

5. Man under Law. – Again the grace of God came to the help of helpless man and redeemed the chosen people out of the hand of the oppressor. In the Wilderness of Sinai He proposed to them the Covenant of Law. Instead of humbly pleading for a continued relation of grace, they presumptuously answered, “All that the Lord hath spoken we will do.” The history of Israel in the Wilderness and in the Land is one long record of flagrant, persistent violation of the Law, and at last, after multiplied warnings, God closed (16) the testing of man by law in judgment, and first Israel, and then Judah, were driven out of the Land into a dispersion which still continues. A feeble remnant returned under Ezra and Nehemiah, of which, in due time, Christ came: “Born of a woman – made under the law.” Him both Jews and Gentiles
conspired to crucify.

a. Exodus 19:1-8: In the third month, when the children of Israel were gone forth out of the land of Egypt, the same day came they into the wilderness of Sinai. For they were departed from Rephidim, and were come to the desert of Sinai, and had pitched in the wilderness; and there Israel camped before the mount. And Moses went up unto God, and the Lord called unto him out of the mountain, saying, Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel; Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself. Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine: And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel. And Moses came and called for the elders of the people, and laid before their faces all these words which the Lord commanded him. And all the people answered together, and said, All that the Lord hath spoken we will do. And Moses returned the words of the people unto the Lord.

b. Romans 10:5: For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law, That the man which doeth those things shall live by them.

c. Galatians 3:10: For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.

d. Romans 3:19-20: Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God. Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin.

e. 2 Kings 17:1-18: In the twelfth year of Ahaz king of Judah began Hoshea the son of Elah to reign in Samaria over Israel nine years. And he did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord, but not as the kings of Israel that were before him. Against him came up Shalmaneser king of Assyria; and Hoshea became his servant, and gave him presents. And the king of Assyria found conspiracy in Hoshea: for he had sent messengers to So king of Egypt, and brought no present to the king of Assyria, as he had done year by year: therefore the king of Assyria shut him up, and bound him in prison. Then the king of Assyria came up throughout all the land, and went up to Samaria, and besieged it three years. In the ninth year of Hoshea the king of Assyria took Samaria, and carried Israel away into Assyria, and placed them in Halah and in Habor by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes. For so it was, that the children of Israel had sinned against the Lord their God, which had brought them up out of the land of Egypt, from under the hand of Pharaoh king of Egypt, and had feared other gods, and walked in the statutes of the heathen, whom the Lord cast out from before the children of Israel, and of the kings of Israel, which they had made. And the children of Israel did secretly those things that were not right against the Lord their God, and they built them high places in all their cities, from the tower of the watchmen to the fenced city. And they set them up images and groves in every high hill, and under every
green tree: And there they burnt incense in all the high places, as did the heathen whom the Lord carried away before them; and wrought wicked things to provoke the Lord to anger: For they served idols, whereof the Lord had said unto them, Ye shall not do this thing. Yet the Lord testified against Israel, and against Judah, by all the prophets, and by all the seers, saying, Turn ye from your evil ways, and keep my commandments and my statutes, according to all the law which I commanded your fathers, and which I sent to you by my servants the prophets. Notwithstanding they would not hear, but hardened their necks, like to the neck of their fathers, that did not believe in the Lord their God. And they rejected his statutes, and his covenant that he made with their fathers, and his testimonies which he testified against them; and they followed vanity, and became vain, and went after the heathen that were round about them, concerning whom the Lord had charged them, that they should not do like them. And they left all the commandments of the Lord their God, and made them molten images, even two calves, and made a grove, and worshipped all the host of heaven, and served Baal. And they caused their sons and their daughters to pass through the fire, and used divination and enchantments, and sold themselves to do evil in the sight of the Lord, to provoke him to anger. Therefore the Lord was very angry with Israel, and removed them out of his sight: there was none left but the tribe of Judah only.

f. 2 Kings 25:1-11: And it came to pass in the ninth year of his reign, in the tenth month, in the tenth day of the month, that Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon came, he, and all his host, against Jerusalem, and pitched against it; and they built forts against it round about. And the city was besieged unto the eleventh year of king Zedekiah. And on the ninth day of the fourth month the famine prevailed in the city, and there was no bread for the people of the land. And the city was broken up, and all the men of war fled by night by the way of the gate between two walls, which is by the king's garden: (now the Chaldees were against the city round about:) and the king went the way toward the plain. And the army of the Chaldees pursued after the king, and overtook him in the plains of Jericho: and all his army were scattered from him. So they took the king, and brought him up to the king of Babylon to Riblah; and they gave judgment upon him. And they slew the sons of Zedekiah before his eyes, and put out the eyes of Zedekiah, and bound him with fetters of brass, and carried him to Babylon. And in the fifth month, on the seventh day of the month, which is the nineteenth year of king Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, came Nebuzaradan, captain of the guard, a servant of the king of Babylon, unto Jerusalem: And he burnt the house of the Lord, and the king's house, and all the houses of Jerusalem, and every great man's house burnt he with fire. And all the army of the Chaldees, that were with the captain of the guard, brake down the walls of Jerusalem round about. Now the rest of the people that were left in the city, and the fugitives that fell away to the king of Babylon, with the remnant of the multitude, did Nebuzaradan the captain of the guard carry away.

g. Acts 2:22-23: Ye men of Israel, hear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, a man
approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know: Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain.

h. Acts 7:51-52: Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye. Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? and they have slain them which shewed before of the coming of the Just One; of whom ye have been now the betrayers and murderers.

6. Man under Grace. – The sacrificial death of the Lord Jesus Christ introduced the dispensation of pure grace – which means undeserved favor, or God giving righteousness, instead of God requiring righteousness, as under law. Salvation, perfect and eternal, is now freely offered to Jew and Gentile upon the one condition of faith

a. John 6:29: Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom He hath sent.


c. John 5:24 (Revised Version): Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth My word, and Believeth on Him that sent Me, Hath eternal life, and cometh not into judgment, but hath passed out of death into life.

d. John 10:27-28: My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish.

e. Eph. 2:8-9 (Revised Version): For by grace ye have been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; not of works, that no man should glory.

The predicted result of this testing of man under grace is judgment upon an unbelieving world and an apostate Church.

a. Revelation 3:15-16: I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth.

b. Luke 17:26-30: And as it was in the days of Noe, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man. They did eat, they drank, they married wives, they were given in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and the flood came, and destroyed them all. Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; But the same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all. Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed.

c. Luke 18:8: I tell you that he will avenge them speedily. Nevertheless when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?

d. 2 Thessalonians 2:7-12: For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying
wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.

The first event in the closing of this dispensation will be the descent of the Lord from Heaven, when sleeping saints (17) will be raised and, together with believers then living, caught up “to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord.” 1 Thess. 4:16-17. Then follows the brief period called “the great tribulation.”

a. Matthew 24:21-22: For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be. And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved: but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened.

b. Daniel 12:1: And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book.

c. Zephaniah 1:15-18: That day is a day of wrath, a day of trouble and distress, a day of wasteness and desolation, a day of darkness and gloominess, a day of clouds and thick darkness, a day of the trumpet and alarm against the fenced cities, and against the high towers. And I will bring distress upon men, that they shall walk like blind men, because they have sinned against the Lord: and their blood shall be poured out as dust, and their flesh as the dung. Neither their silver nor their gold shall be able to deliver them in the day of the Lord's wrath; but the whole land shall be devoured by the fire of his jealousy: for he shall make even a speedy riddance of all them that dwell in the land.

d. Jeremiah 30:5-7: For thus saith the Lord; We have heard a voice of trembling, of fear, and not of peace. Ask ye now, and see whether a man doth travail with child? wherefore do I see every man with his hands on his loins, as a woman in travail, and all faces are turned into paleness? Alas! for that day is great, so that none is like it: it is even the time of Jacob's trouble, but he shall be saved out of it.

After this occurs the personal return of the Lord to the earth in power and great glory, and the judgments which introduce the seventh and last dispensation.

a. Matthew 24:29-30: Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken: And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.

b. Matthew 25:31-46: When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on
his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: For I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: Naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me. Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungred, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee? And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me. Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels: For I was an hungred, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not. Then shall they also answer him, saying, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me. Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal.

7. Man under the Personal Reign of Christ. – After the purifying judgments which attend the personal return of Christ to the earth, He will reign over restored Israel and over the earth for one thousand years. This is the period commonly called the Millennium. The seat of His power will be Jerusalem, and the saints, including the saved of the Dispensation of Grace, viz., the Church, will be associated with Him in His glory.

a. Acts 15:14-17: Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things.

b. Revelation 19:11-21: And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; and he had a name written, that no man knew, but he himself. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called The Word of God. And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King Of Kings, And Lord Of Lords. And I saw an angel standing in the sun; and he cried with a loud voice, saying to all the fowls that fly in the midst of heaven, Come and gather yourselves together unto the
supper of the great God; That ye may eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains, and the flesh of mighty men, and the flesh of horses, and of them that sit on them, and the flesh of all men, both free and bond, both small and great. And I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war against him that sat on the horse, and against his army. And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshipped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone. And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth: and all the fowls were filled with their flesh.

c. Isaiah 2:1-4: The word that Isaiah the son of Amoz saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem. And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.

d. Revelation 20:1-6: And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, and cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled: and after that he must be loosed a little season. And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years.

e. Isaiah 11: And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots: and the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord; and shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord: and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears: but with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and he shall smite the earth: with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. And righteousness shall be the
girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins. The wolf also shall
dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf
and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them.
And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together:
and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. And the sucking child shall play on
the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice' den.
They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be
full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea. And in that day
there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to
it shall the Gentiles seek: and his rest shall be glorious. And it shall come to
pass in that day, that the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to
recover the remnant of his people, which shall be left, from Assyria, and from
Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar,
and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea. And he shall set up an
ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather
together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth. The envy
also of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off:
Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim. But they
shall fly upon the shoulders of the Philistines toward the west; they shall spoil
them of the east together: they shall lay their hand upon Edom and Moab; and
the children of Ammon shall obey them. And the Lord shall utterly destroy the
tongue of the Egyptian sea; and with his mighty wind shall he shake his hand
over the river, and shall smite it in the seven streams, and make men go over
dryshod. And there shall be an highway for the remnant of his people, which
shall be left, from Assyria; like as it was to Israel in the day that he came up
out of the land of Egypt.

But when Satan is “loosed a little season” he finds the natural heart as prone to evil as
ever, and easily gathers the nations to battle against the Lord and His saints, and this
last dispensation closes, like all the others, in judgment. The “great white throne” is
set, the wicked dead are raised and finally judged, and then come the “new heaven
and a new earth” – eternity begun.

a. Revelation 20:3, 7-15: And cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up,
and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the
thousand years should be fulfilled: and after that he must be loosed a little
season.…. And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out
of his prison, And shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four
quarters of the earth, Gog, and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the
number of whom is as the sand of the sea. And they went up on the breadth of
the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city:
and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them. And the
devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where
the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for
ever and ever. And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from
whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place
for them. And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the
books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life:
and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire.

b. Revelation 21: And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea. And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away. And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new. And he said unto me, Write: for these words are true and faithful. And he said unto me, It is done. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end. I will give unto him that is athirst of the fountain of the water of life freely. He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son. But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death. And there came unto me one of the seven angels which had the seven vials full of the seven last plagues, and talked with me, saying, Come hither, I will shew thee the bride, the Lamb's wife. And he carried me away in the spirit to a great and high mountain, and shewed me that great city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God, Having the glory of God: and her light was like unto a stone most precious, even like a jasper stone, clear as crystal; And had a wall great and high, and had twelve gates, and at the gates twelve angels, and names written thereon, which are the names of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel: On the east three gates; on the north three gates; on the south three gates; and on the west three gates. And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb. And he that talked with me had a golden reed to measure the city, and the gates thereof, and the wall thereof. And the city lieth foursquare, and the length is as large as the breadth: and he measured the city with the reed, twelve thousand furlongs. The length and the breadth and the height of it are equal. And he measured the wall thereof, an hundred and forty and four cubits, according to the measure of a man, that is, of the angel. And the building of the wall of it was of jasper: and the city was pure gold, like unto clear glass. And the foundations of the wall of the city were garnished with all manner of precious stones. The first foundation was jasper; the second, sapphire; the third, a chalcedony; the fourth, an emerald; The fifth, sardonyx; the sixth, sardius; the seventh, chrysolyte; the eighth, beryl; the ninth, a topaz; the tenth, a chrysoprasus; the eleventh, a jacinth; the twelfth, an amethyst.
And the twelve gates were twelve pearls: every several gate was of one pearl: and the street of the city was pure gold, as it were transparent glass. And I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it. And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof. And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it. And the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day: for there shall be no night there. And they shall bring the glory and honour of the nations into it. And there shall in no wise enter into it any thing that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie: but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life.

c. Revelation 22: And he shewed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb. In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life, which bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month: and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations. And there shall be no more curse: but the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it; and his servants shall serve him: and they shall see his face; and his name shall be in their foreheads. And there shall be no night there; and they need no candle, neither light of the sun; for the Lord God giveth them light: and they shall reign for ever and ever. And he said unto me, These sayings are faithful and true: and the Lord God of the holy prophets sent his angel to shew unto his servants the things which must shortly be done. Behold, I come quickly: blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of the prophecy of this book. And I John saw these things, and heard them. And when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel which shewed me these things. Then saith he unto me, See thou do it not: for I am thy fellowservant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God. And he saith unto me, Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book: for the time is at hand. He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still. And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last. Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city. For without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie. I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star. And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely. For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things
which are written in this book. He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.
Appendix B: United Nations General Assembly Resolution 181 (II) and Voting Record

Resolution 181 (II). Future government of Palestine

A

The General Assembly,

Having met in special session at the request of the mandatory Power to constitute and instruct a special committee to prepare for the consideration of the question of the future government of Palestine at the second regular session;

Having constituted a Special Committee and instructed it to investigate all questions and issues relevant to the problem of Palestine, and to prepare proposals for the solution of the problem, and

Having received and examined the report of the Special Committee including a number of unanimous recommendations and a plan of partition with economic union approved by the majority of the Special Committee,

Considers that the present situation in Palestine is one which is likely to impair the general welfare and friendly relations among nations;

Takes note of the declaration by the mandatory Power that it plans to complete its evacuation of Palestine by 1 August 1948;

Recommends to the United Kingdom, as the mandatory Power for Palestine, and to all other Members of the United Nations the adoption and implementation, with regard to the future government of Palestine, of the Plan of Partition with Economic Union set out below;

Requests that

(a) The Security Council take the necessary measures as provided for in the plan for its implementation;

(b) The Security Council consider, if circumstances during the transitional period require such consideration, whether the situation in Palestine constitutes a threat to the peace. If it decides that such a threat exists, and in order to maintain international peace and security, the Security Council should supplement the authorization of the General Assembly by taking measures, under Articles 39 and 41 of the Charter, to empower the United Nations Commission, as provided in this resolution, to exercise in Palestine the functions which are assigned to it by this resolution;

(c) The Security Council determine as a threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of

aggression, in accordance with Article 39 of the Charter, any attempt to alter by force the settlement envisaged by this resolution;

(d) The Trusteeship Council be informed of the responsibilities envisaged for it in this plan;

Calls upon the inhabitants of Palestine to take such steps as may be necessary on their part to put this plan into effect;

Appeals to all Governments and all peoples to refrain from taking action which might hamper or delay the carrying out of these recommendations, and

Authorizes the Secretary-General to reimburse travel and subsistence expenses of the members of the Commission referred to in Part I, Section B, paragraph 1 below, on such basis and in such form as he may determine most appropriate in the circumstances, and to provide the Commission with the necessary staff to assist in carrying out the functions assigned to the Commission by the General Assembly.

B 2/

The General Assembly

Authorizes the Secretary-General to draw from the Working Capital Fund a sum not to exceed $2,000,000 for the purposes set forth in the last paragraph of the resolution on the future government of Palestine.

Hundred and twenty-eighth plenary meeting 29 November 1947

[At its hundred and twenty-eighth plenary meeting on 29 November 1947 the General Assembly, in accordance with the terms of the above resolution [181 A], elected the following members of the United Nations Commission on Palestine: Bolivia, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Panama and Philippines.]

PLAN OF PARTITION WITH ECONOMIC UNION

PART I

Future constitution and government of Palestine

A. TERMINATION OF MANDATE, PARTITION AND INDEPENDENCE

1. The Mandate for Palestine shall terminate as soon as possible but in any case not later than 1 August 1948.
2. The armed forces of the mandatory Power shall be progressively withdrawn from Palestine, the withdrawal to be completed as soon as possible but in any case not later than 1 August 1948.

The mandatory Power shall advise the Commission, as far in advance as possible, of its intention to terminate the Mandate and to evacuate each area.

The mandatory Power shall use its best endeavours to ensure that an area situated in the territory of the Jewish State, including a seaport and hinterland adequate to provide facilities for a substantial immigration, shall be evacuated at the earliest possible date and in any event not later than 1 February 1948.

3. Independent Arab and Jewish States and the Special International Regime for the City of Jerusalem, set forth in part III of this plan, shall come into existence in Palestine two months after the evacuation of the armed forces of the mandatory Power has been completed but in any case not later than 1 October 1948. The boundaries of the Arab State, the Jewish State, and the City of Jerusalem shall be as described in parts II and III below.

4. The period between the adoption by the General Assembly of its recommendation on the question of Palestine and the establishment of the independence of the Arab and Jewish States shall be a transitional period.

B. STEPS PREPARATORY TO INDEPENDENCE

1. A Commission shall be set up consisting of one representative of each of five Member States. The Members represented on the Commission shall be elected by the General Assembly on as broad a basis, geographically and otherwise, as possible.

2. The administration of Palestine shall, as the mandatory Power withdraws its armed forces, be progressively turned over to the Commission; which shall act in conformity with the recommendations of the General Assembly, under the guidance of the Security Council. The mandatory Power shall to the fullest possible extent co-ordinate its plans for withdrawal with the plans of the Commission to take over and administer areas which have been evacuated.

In the discharge of this administrative responsibility the Commission shall have authority to issue necessary regulations and take other measures as required.

The mandatory Power shall not take any action to prevent, obstruct or delay the implementation by the Commission of the measures recommended by the General Assembly.

3. On its arrival in Palestine the Commission shall proceed to carry out measures for the establishment of the frontiers of the Arab and Jewish States and the City of Jerusalem in accordance with the general lines of the recommendations of the General Assembly on the partition of Palestine. Nevertheless, the boundaries as described in part II of this plan are to be modified in such a way that village areas as a rule will not be divided by state boundaries unless pressing reasons make that necessary.
4. The Commission, after consultation with the democratic parties and other public organizations of The Arab and Jewish States, shall select and establish in each State as rapidly as possible a Provisional Council of Government. The activities of both the Arab and Jewish Provisional Councils of Government shall be carried out under the general direction of the Commission.

If by 1 April 1948 a Provisional Council of Government cannot be selected for either of the States, or, if selected, cannot carry out its functions, the Commission shall communicate that fact to the Security Council for such action with respect to that State as the Security Council may deem proper, and to the Secretary-General for communication to the Members of the United Nations.

5. Subject to the provisions of these recommendations, during the transitional period the Provisional Councils of Government, acting under the Commission, shall have full authority in the areas under their control, including authority over matters of immigration and land regulation.

6. The Provisional Council of Government of each State acting under the Commission, shall progressively receive from the Commission full responsibility for the administration of that State in the period between the termination of the Mandate and the establishment of the State's independence.

7. The Commission shall instruct the Provisional Councils of Government of both the Arab and Jewish States, after their formation, to proceed to the establishment of administrative organs of government, central and local.

8. The Provisional Council of Government of each State shall, within the shortest time possible, recruit an armed militia from the residents of that State, sufficient in number to maintain internal order and to prevent frontier clashes.

This armed militia in each State shall, for operational purposes, be under the command of Jewish or Arab officers resident in that State, but general political and military control, including the choice of the militia's High Command, shall be exercised by the Commission.

9. The Provisional Council of Government of each State shall, not later than two months after the withdrawal of the armed forces of the mandatory Power, hold elections to the Constituent Assembly which shall be conducted on democratic lines.

The election regulations in each State shall be drawn up by the Provisional Council of Government and approved by the Commission. Qualified voters for each State for this election shall be persons over eighteen years of age who are: (a) Palestinian citizens residing in that State and (b) Arabs and Jews residing in the State, although not Palestinian citizens, who, before voting, have signed a notice of intention to become citizens of such State.

Arabs and Jews residing in the City of Jerusalem who have signed a notice of intention to become citizens, the Arabs of the Arab State and the Jews of the Jewish State, shall be entitled to
vote in the Arab and Jewish States respectively.

Women may vote and be elected to the Constituent Assemblies.

During the transitional period no Jew shall be permitted to establish residence in the area of the proposed Arab State, and no Arab shall be permitted to establish residence in the area of the proposed Jewish State, except by special leave of the Commission.

10. The Constituent Assembly of each State shall draft a democratic constitution for its State and choose a provisional government to succeed the Provisional Council of Government appointed by the Commission. The constitutions of the States shall embody chapters 1 and 2 of the Declaration provided for in section C below and include inter alia provisions for:

(a) Establishing in each State a legislative body elected by universal suffrage and by secret ballot on the basis of proportional representation, and an executive body responsible to the legislature;

(b) Settling all international disputes in which the State may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered;

(c) Accepting the obligation of the State to refrain in its international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity of political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations;

(d) Guaranteeing to all persons equal and non-discriminatory rights in civil, political, economic and religious matters and the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including freedom of religion, language, speech and publication, education, assembly and association;

(e) Preserving freedom of transit and visit for all residents and citizens of the other State in Palestine and the City of Jerusalem, subject to considerations of national security, provided that each State shall control residence within its borders.

11. The Commission shall appoint a preparatory economic commission of three members to make whatever arrangements are possible for economic co-operation, with a view to establishing, as soon as practicable, the Economic Union and the Joint Economic Board, as provided in section D below.

12. During the period between the adoption of the recommendations on the question of Palestine by the General Assembly and the termination of the Mandate, the mandatory Power in Palestine shall maintain full responsibility for administration in areas from which it has not withdrawn its armed forces. The Commission shall assist the mandatory Power in the carrying out of these functions. Similarly the mandatory Power shall co-operate with the Commission in the execution of its functions.

13. With a view to ensuring that there shall be continuity in the functioning of administrative services and that, on the withdrawal of the armed forces of the mandatory Power, the whole administration shall be in the charge of the Provisional Councils and the Joint Economic Board,
respectively, acting under the Commission, there shall be a progressive transfer, from the mandatory Power to the Commission, of responsibility for all the functions of government, including that of maintaining law and order in the areas from which the forces of the mandatory Power have been withdrawn.

14. The Commission shall be guided in its activities by the recommendations of the General Assembly and by such instructions as the Security Council may consider necessary to issue.

The measures taken by the Commission, within the recommendations of the General Assembly, shall become immediately effective unless the Commission has previously received contrary instructions from the Security Council.

The Commission shall render periodic monthly progress reports, or more frequently if desirable, to the Security Council.

15. The Commission shall make its final report to the next regular session of the General Assembly and to the Security Council simultaneously.

C. DECLARATION

A declaration shall be made to the United Nations by the provisional government of each proposed State before independence. It shall contain inter alia the following clauses:

**General Provision**

The stipulations contained in the declaration are recognized as fundamental laws of the State and no law, regulation or official action shall conflict or interfere with these stipulations, nor shall any law, regulation or official action prevail over them.

**Chapter 1**

*Holy Places, religious buildings and sites*

1. Existing rights in respect of Holy Places and religious buildings or sites shall not be denied or impaired.

2. In so far as Holy Places are concerned, the liberty of access, visit and transit shall be guaranteed, in conformity with existing rights, to all residents and citizens of the other State and of the City of Jerusalem, as well as to aliens, without distinction as to nationality, subject to requirements of national security, public order and decorum.

Similarly, freedom of worship shall be guaranteed in conformity with existing rights, subject to the maintenance of public order and decorum.

3. Holy Places and religious buildings or sites shall be preserved. No act shall be permitted which may in any way impair their sacred character. If at any time it appears to the Government that any particular Holy Place, religious building or site is in need of urgent repair, the Government may call upon the community or communities concerned to carry out such repair.
The Government may carry it out itself at the expense of the community or communities concerned if no action is taken within a reasonable time.

4. No taxation shall be levied in respect of any Holy Place, religious building or site which was exempt from taxation on the date of the creation of the State.

No change in the incidence of such taxation shall be made which would either discriminate between the owners or occupiers of Holy Places, religious buildings or sites, or would place such owners or occupiers in a position less favourable in relation to the general incidence of taxation than existed at the time of the adoption of the Assembly's recommendations.

5. The Governor of the City of Jerusalem shall have the right to determine whether the provisions of the Constitution of the State in relation to Holy Places, religious buildings and sites within the borders of the State and the religious rights appertaining thereto, are being properly applied and respected, and to make decisions on the basis of existing rights in cases of disputes which may arise between the different religious communities or the rites of a religious community with respect to such places, buildings and sites. He shall receive full co-operation and such privileges and immunities as are necessary for the exercise of his functions in the State.

Chapter 2

Religious and Minority Rights

1. Freedom of conscience and the free exercise of all forms of worship, subject only to the maintenance of public order and morals, shall be ensured to all.

2. No discrimination of any kind shall be made between the inhabitants on the ground of race, religion, language or sex.

3. All persons within the jurisdiction of the State shall be entitled to equal protection of the laws.

4. The family law and personal status of the various minorities and their religious interests, including endowments, shall be respected.

5. Except as may be required for the maintenance of public order and good government, no measure shall be taken to obstruct or interfere with the enterprise of religious or charitable bodies of all faiths or to discriminate against any representative or member of these bodies on the ground of his religion or nationality.

6. The State shall ensure adequate primary and secondary education for the Arab and Jewish minority, respectively, in its own language and its cultural traditions.

The right of each community to maintain its own schools for the education of its own members in its own language, while conforming to such educational requirements of a general nature as the State may impose, shall not be denied or impaired. Foreign educational establishments shall
continue their activity on the basis of their existing rights.

7. No restriction shall be imposed on the free use by any citizen of the State of any language in private intercourse, in commerce, in religion, in the Press or in publications of any kind, or at public meetings.\(^3\)

8. No expropriation of land owned by an Arab in the Jewish State (by a Jew in the Arab State)\(^4\) shall be allowed except for public purposes. In all cases of expropriation full compensation as fixed by the Supreme Court shall be paid previous to dispossession.

Chapter 3

Citizenship, international conventions and financial obligations

1. Citizenship. Palestinian citizens residing in Palestine outside the City of Jerusalem, as well as Arabs and Jews who, not holding Palestinian citizenship, reside in Palestine outside the City of Jerusalem shall, upon the recognition of independence, become citizens of the State in which they are resident and enjoy full civil and political rights. Persons over the age of eighteen years may opt, within one year from the date of recognition of independence of the State in which they reside, for citizenship of the other State, providing that no Arab residing in the area of the proposed Arab State shall have the right to opt for citizenship in the proposed Jewish State and no Jew residing in the proposed Jewish State shall have the right to opt for citizenship in the proposed Arab State. The exercise of this right of option will be taken to include the wives and children under eighteen years of age of persons so opting.

Arabs residing in the area of the proposed Jewish State and Jews residing in the area of the proposed Arab State who have signed a notice of intention to opt for citizenship of the other State shall be eligible to vote in the elections to the Constituent Assembly of that State, but not in the elections to the Constituent Assembly of the State in which they reside.

2. International conventions. (a) The State shall be bound by all the international agreements and conventions, both general and special, to which Palestine has become a party. Subject to any right of denunciation provided for therein, such agreements and conventions shall be respected by the State throughout the period for which they were concluded.

(b) Any dispute about the applicability and continued validity of international conventions or treaties signed or adhered to by the mandatory Power on behalf of Palestine shall be referred to the International Court of Justice in accordance with the provisions of the Statute of the Court.

3. Financial obligations. (a) The State shall respect and fulfil all financial obligations of whatever nature assumed on behalf of Palestine by the mandatory Power during the exercise of the Mandate and recognized by the State. This provision includes the right of public servants to pensions, compensation or gratuities.

(b) These obligations shall be fulfilled through participation in the Joint economic Board in
respect of those obligations applicable to Palestine as a whole, and individually in respect of those applicable to, and fairly apportionable between, the States.

(c) A Court of Claims, affiliated with the Joint Economic Board, and composed of one member appointed by the United Nations, one representative of the United Kingdom and one representative of the State concerned, should be established. Any dispute between the United Kingdom and the State respecting claims not recognized by the latter should be referred to that Court.

(d) Commercial concessions granted in respect of any part of Palestine prior to the adoption of the resolution by the General Assembly shall continue to be valid according to their terms, unless modified by agreement between the concession-holder and the State.

Chapter 4

Miscellaneous provisions

1. The provisions of chapters 1 and 2 of the declaration shall be under the guarantee of the United Nations, and no modifications shall be made in them without the assent of the General Assembly of the United Nations. Any Member of the United Nations shall have the right to bring to the attention of the General Assembly any infraction or danger of infraction of any of these stipulations, and the General Assembly may thereupon make such recommendations as it may deem proper in the circumstances.

2. Any dispute relating to the application or the interpretation of this declaration shall be referred, at the request of either party, to the International Court of Justice, unless the parties agree to another mode of settlement.

D. ECONOMIC UNION AND TRANSIT

1. The Provisional Council of Government of each State shall enter into an undertaking with respect to economic union and transit. This undertaking shall be drafted by the commission provided for in section B, paragraph 1, utilizing to the greatest possible extent the advice and cooperation of representative organizations and bodies from each of the proposed States. It shall contain provisions to establish the Economic Union of Palestine and provide for other matters of common interest. If by 1 April 1948 the Provisional Councils of Government have not entered into the undertaking, the undertaking shall be put into force by the Commission.

The Economic Union of Palestine

2. The objectives of the Economic Union of Palestine shall be:

(a) A customs union;
(b) A joint currency system providing for a single foreign exchange rate;

(c) Operation in the common interest on a non-discriminatory basis of railways; inter-State highways; postal, telephone and telegraphic services, and port and airports involved in international trade and commerce;

(d) Joint economic development, especially in respect of irrigation, land reclamation and soil conservation;

(e) Access for both States and for the City of Jerusalem on a non-discriminatory basis to water and power facilities.

3. There shall be established a Joint Economic Board, which shall consist of three representatives of each of the two States and three foreign members appointed by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. The foreign members shall be appointed in the first instance for a term of three years; they shall serve as individuals and not as representatives of States.

4. The functions of the Joint Economic Board shall be to implement either directly or by delegation the measures necessary to realize the objectives of the Economic Union. It shall have all powers of organization and administration necessary to fulfil its functions.

5. The States shall bind themselves to put into effect the decisions of the Joint Economic Board. The Board's decisions shall be taken by a majority vote.

6. In the event of failure of a State to take the necessary action the Board may, by a vote of six members, decide to withhold an appropriate portion of that part of the customs revenue to which the State in question is entitled under the Economic Union. Should the State persist in its failure to co-operate, the Board may decide by a simple majority vote upon such further sanctions, including disposition of funds which it has withheld, as it may deem appropriate.

7. In relation to economic development, the functions of the Board shall be the planning, investigation and encouragement of joint development projects, but it shall not undertake such projects except with the assent of both States and the City of Jerusalem, in the event that Jerusalem is directly involved in the development project.

8. In regard to the joint currency system the currencies circulating in the two States and the City of Jerusalem shall be issued under the authority of the Joint Economic Board, which shall be the sole issuing authority and which shall determine the reserves to be held against such currencies.

9. So far as is consistent with paragraph 2 (b) above, each State may operate its own central bank, control its own fiscal and credit policy, its foreign exchange receipts and expenditures, the grant of import licenses, and may conduct international financial operations on its own faith and credit. During the first two years after the termination of the Mandate, the Joint Economic Board shall have the authority to take such measures as may be necessary to ensure that—to the extent that the total foreign exchange revenues of the two States from the export of goods and services permit, and provided that each State takes appropriate measures to conserve its own foreign exchange resources—each State shall have available, in any twelve months' period, foreign
exchange sufficient to assure the supply of quantities of imported goods and services for consumption in its territory equivalent to the quantities of such goods and services consumed in that territory in the twelve months' period ending 31 December 1947.

10. All economic authority not specifically vested in the Joint Economic Board is reserved to each State.

11. There shall be a common customs tariff with complete freedom of trade between the States, and between the States and the City of Jerusalem.

12. The tariff schedules shall be drawn up by a Tariff Commission, consisting of representatives of each of the States in equal numbers, and shall be submitted to the Joint Economic Board for approval by a majority vote. In case of disagreement in the Tariff Commission, the Joint Economic Board shall arbitrate the points of difference. In the event that the Tariff Commission fails to draw up any schedule by a date to be fixed, the Joint Economic Board shall determine the tariff schedule.

13. The following items shall be a first charge on the customs and other common revenue of the Joint Economic Board:

(a) The expenses of the customs service and of the operation of the joint services;

(b) The administrative expenses of the Joint Economic Board;

(c) The financial obligations of the Administration of Palestine consisting of:

(i) The service of the outstanding public debt;

(ii) The cost of superannuation benefits, now being paid or falling due in the future, in accordance with the rules and to the extent established by paragraph 3 of chapter 3 above.

14. After these obligations have been met in full, the surplus revenue from the customs and other common services shall be divided in the following manner: not less than 5 per cent and not more than 10 per cent to the City of Jerusalem; the residue shall be allocated to each State by the Joint Economic Board equitably, with the objective of maintaining a sufficient and suitable level of government and social services in each State, except that the share of either State shall not exceed the amount of that State's contribution to the revenues of the Economic Union by more than approximately four million pounds in any year. The amount granted may be adjusted by the Board according to the price level in relation to the prices prevailing at the time of the establishment of the Union. After five years, the principles of the distribution of the joint revenues may be revised by the Joint Economic Board on a basis of equity.

15. All international conventions and treaties affecting customs tariff rates, and those communications services under the jurisdiction of the Joint Economic Board, shall be entered into by both States. In these matters, the two States shall be bound to act in accordance with the majority vote of the Joint Economic Board.
16. The Joint Economic Board shall endeavour to secure for Palestine's export fair and equal access to world markets.

17. All enterprises operated by the Joint Economic Board shall pay fair wages on a uniform basis.

*Freedom of transit and visit*

18. The undertaking shall contain provisions preserving freedom of transit and visit for all residents or citizens of both States and of the City of Jerusalem, subject to security considerations; provided that each state and the City shall control residence within its borders.

*Termination, modification and interpretation of the undertaking*

19. The undertaking and any treaty issuing therefrom shall remain in force for a period of ten years. It shall continue in force until notice of termination, to take effect two years thereafter, is given by either of the parties.

20. During the initial ten-year period, the undertaking and any treaty issuing therefrom may not be modified except by consent of both parties and with the approval of the General Assembly.

21. Any dispute relating to the application or the interpretation of the undertaking and any treaty issuing therefrom shall be referred, at the request of either party, to the international Court of Justice, unless the parties agree to another mode of settlement.

**E. ASSETS**

1. The movable assets of the Administration of Palestine shall be allocated to the Arab and Jewish States and the City of Jerusalem on an equitable basis. Allocations should be made by the United Nations Commission referred to in section B, paragraph 1, above. Immovable assets shall become the property of the government of the territory in which they are situated.

2. During the period between the appointment of the United Nations Commission and the termination of the Mandate, the mandatory Power shall, except in respect of ordinary operations, consult with the Commission on any measure which it may contemplate involving the liquidation, disposal or encumbering of the assets of the Palestine Government, such as the accumulated treasury surplus, the proceeds of Government bond issues, State lands or any other asset.

**F. ADMISSION TO MEMBERSHIP IN THE UNITED NATIONS**

When the independence of either the Arab or the Jewish State as envisaged in this plan has
become effective and the declaration and undertaking, as envisaged in this plan, have been signed by either of them, sympathetic consideration should be given to its application for admission to membership in the United Nations in accordance with Article 4 of the Charter of the United Nations.

PART II

Boundaries

A. THE ARAB STATE

The area of the Arab State in Western Galilee is bounded on the west by the Mediterranean and on the north by the frontier of the Lebanon from Ras en Naqura to a point north of Saliha. From there the boundary proceeds southwards, leaving the built-up area of Saliha in the Arab State, to join the southernmost point of this village. Thence it follows the western boundary line of the villages of `Alma, Rihaniya and Teitaba, thence following the northern boundary line of Meirun village to join the Acre-Safad sub-district boundary line. It follows this line to a point west of Es Sammu`i village and joins it again at the northernmost point of Farradiya. Thence it follows the sub-district boundary line to the Acre-Safad main road. From here it follows the western boundary of Kafr I'nan village until it reaches the Tiberias-Acre sub-district boundary line, passing to the west of the junction of the Acre-Safad and Lubiya-Kafr I'nan roads. From southwest corner of Kafr I'nan village the boundary line follows the western boundary of the Tiberias sub-district to a point close to the boundary line between the villages of Maghar and Eilabun, thence bulging out to the west to include as much of the eastern part of the plain of Battuf as is necessary for the reservoir proposed by the Jewish Agency for the irrigation of lands to the south and east.

The boundary rejoins the Tiberias sub-district boundary at a point on the Nazareth-Tiberias road south-east of the built-up area of Tur'an; thence it runs southwards, at first following the sub-district boundary and then passing between the Kadoorie Agricultural School and Mount Tabor, to a point due south at the base of Mount Tabor. From here it runs due west, parallel to the horizontal grid line 230, to the north-east corner of the village lands of Tel Adashim. It then runs to the north-west corner of these lands, whence it turns south and west so as to include in the Arab State the sources of the Nazareth water supply in Yafa village. On reaching Ginneiger it follows the eastern, northern and western boundaries of the lands of this village to their southwest corner, whence it proceeds in a straight line to a point on the Haifa-Afula railway on the boundary between the villages of Sarid and El Mujeidil. This is the point of intersection.

The south-western boundary of the area of the Arab State in Galilee takes a line from this point, passing northwards along the eastern boundaries of Sarid and Gevat to the north-eastern corner of Nahalal, proceeding thence across the land of Kefar ha Horesh to a central point on the southern boundary of the village of `Ilut, thence westwards along that village boundary to the eastern boundary of Beit Lahm, thence northwards and north-eastwards along its western
boundary to the north-eastern corner of Waldheim and thence north-westwards across the village lands of Shafa 'Amr to the south-eastern corner of Ramat Yohanan'. From here it runs due north-east to a point on the Shafa 'Amr-Haifa road, west of its junction with the road to I'Billin. From there it proceeds north-east to a point on the southern boundary of I'Billin situated to the west of the I'Billin-Birwa road. Thence along that boundary to its westernmost point, whence it turns to the north, follows across the village land of Tamra to the north-westernmost corner and along the western boundary of Julis until it reaches the Acre-Safad road. It then runs westwards along the southern side of the Safad-Acre road to the Galilee-Haifa District boundary, from which point it follows that boundary to the sea.

The boundary of the hill country of Samaria and Judea starts on the Jordan River at the Wadi Malih south-east of Beisan and runs due west to meet the Beisan-Jericho road and then follows the western side of that road in a north-westerly direction to the junction of the boundaries of the sub-districts of Beisan, Nablus, and Jenin. From that point it follows the Nablus-Jenin sub-district boundary westwards for a distance of about three kilometres and then turns north-westwards, passing to the east of the built-up areas of the villages of Jalbun and Faqqu'a, to the boundary of the sub-districts of Jenin and Beisan at a point north-east of Nuris. Thence it proceeds first north-westwards to a point due north of the built-up area of Zir'in and then westwards to the Afula-Jenin railway, thence north-westwards along the district boundary line to the point of intersection on the Hejaz railway. From here the boundary runs south-westwards, including the built-up area and some of the land of the village of Kh.Lid in the Arab State to cross the Haifa-Jenin road at a point on the district boundary between Haifa and Samaria west of El Mansi. It follows this boundary to the southernmost point of the village of El Buteimat. From here it follows the northern and eastern boundaries of the village of Ar'ara, rejoining the Haifa-Samaria district boundary at Wadi'Ara, and thence proceeding south-south-westwards in an approximately straight line joining up with the western boundary of Qaqun to a point east of the railway line on the eastern boundary of Qaqun village. From here it runs along the railway line some distance to the east of it to a point just east of the Tulkarm railway station. Thence the boundary follows a line half-way between the railway and the Tulkarm-Qalqiliya-Jaljuliya and Ras el Ein road to a point just east of Ras el Ein station, whence it proceeds along the railway some distance to the east of it to the point on the railway line south of the junction of the Haifa-Lydda and Beit Nabala lines, whence it proceeds along the southern border of Lydda airport to its south-west corner, thence in a south-westerly direction to a point just west of the built-up area of Sarafand el'Amar, whence it turns south, passing just to the west of the built-up area of Abu el Fadil to the north-east corner of the lands of Beer Ya'aqov. (The boundary line should be so demarcated as to allow direct access from the Arab State to the airport.) Thence the boundary line follows the western and southern boundaries of Ramle village, to the north-east corner of El Na'an village, thence in a straight line to the southernmost point of El Barriya, along the eastern boundary of that village and the southern boundary of 'Innaba village. Thence it turns north to follow the southern side of the Jaffa-Jerusalem road until El Qubab, whence it follows the road to the boundary of Abu Shusha. It runs along the eastern boundaries of Abu Shusha, Seidun, Hulda to the southernmost point of Hulda, thence westwards in a straight line to the north-eastern corner of Umm Kalkha, thence following the northern boundaries of Umm Kalkha, Qazaza and the northern and western boundaries of Mukhezin to the Gaza District boundary and thence runs across the village lands of El Mismiya, El Kabira, and Yasur to the southern point of intersection, which is midway between the built-up areas of Yasur and Batani Sharqi.
From the southern point of intersection the boundary lines run north-westwards between the villages of Gan Yavne and Barqa to the sea at a point half way between Nabi Yunis and Minat el Qila, and south-eastwards to a point west of Qastina, whence it turns in a south-westerly direction, passing to the east of the built-up areas of Es Sawafir, Es Sharqiya and Ibdis. From the south-east corner of Ibdis village it runs to a point south-west of the built-up area of Beit 'Affa, crossing the Hebron-El Majdal road just to the west of the built-up area of Iraq Suweidan. Thence it proceeds southwards along the western village boundary of El Faluja to the Beersheba sub-district boundary. It then runs across the tribal lands of 'Arab el Jubarat to a point on the boundary between the sub-districts of Beersheba and Hebron north of Kh. Khuweilifa, whence it proceeds in a south-westerly direction to a point on the Beersheba-Gaza main road two kilometres to the north-west of the town. It then turns south-eastwards to reach Wadi Sab' at a point situated one kilometre to the west of it. From here it turns north-eastwards and proceeds along Wadi Sab' and along the Beersheba-Hebron road for a distance of one kilometre, whence it turns eastwards and runs in a straight line to Kh. Kuseifa to join the Beersheba-Hebron sub-district boundary. It then follows the Beersheba-Hebron boundary eastwards to a point north of Ras Ez Zuweira, only departing from it so as to cut across the base of the indentation between vertical grid lines 150 and 160.

About five kilometres north-east of Ras ez Zuweira it turns north, excluding from the Arab State a strip along the coast of the Dead Sea not more than seven kilometres in depth, as far as Ein Geddi, whence it turns due east to join the Transjordan frontier in the Dead Sea.

The northern boundary of the Arab section of the coastal plain runs from a point between Minat el Qila and Nabi Yunis, passing between the built-up areas of Gan Yavne and Barqa to the point of intersection. From here it turns south-westwards, running across the lands of Batani Sharqi, along the eastern boundary of the lands of Beit Daras and across the lands of Julis, leaving the built-up areas of Batani Sharqi and Julis to the westwards, as far as the north-west corner of the lands of Beit Tima. Thence it runs east of El Jiya across the village lands of El Barbara along the eastern boundaries of the villages of Beit Jirja, Deir Suneid and Dimra. From the south-east corner of Dimra the boundary passes across the lands of Beit Hanun, leaving the Jewish lands of Nir-Am to the eastwards. From the south-east corner of Dimra the boundary passes across the lands of Beit Hanun, leaving the Jewish lands of Nir-Am to the eastwards. From the south-east corner of Beit Hanun the line runs south-west to a point south of the parallel grid line 100, then turns north-west for two kilometres, turning again in a south-westerly direction and continuing in an almost straight line to the north-west corner of the village lands of Kirbet Iksha'a. From there it follows the boundary line of this village to its southernmost point. It then runs in a southerly direction along the vertical grid line 90 to its junction with the horizontal grid line 70. It then turns south-eastwards to Kh. el Ruheiba and then proceeds in a southerly direction to a point known as El Baha, beyond which it crosses the Beersheba-El 'Auja main road to the west of Kh. el Mushrif, from there it joins Wadi El Zaiyatin just to the west of El Subeita. From there it turns to the north-east and then to the south-east following this Wadi and passes to the east of 'Abda to join Wadi Nafkh. It then bulges to the south-west along Wadi Nafkh. It then bulges to the south-west along Wadi Nafkh, Wadi Ajrim and Wadi Lassan to the point where Wadi Lassan crosses the Egyptian frontier.
The area of the Arab enclave of Jaffa consists of that part of the town-planning area of Jaffa which lies to the west of the Jewish quarters lying south of Tel-Aviv, to the west of the continuation of Herzl street up to its junction with the Jaffa-Jerusalem road, to the south-west of the section of the Jaffa-Jerusalem road lying south-east of that junction, to the west of Miqve Israel lands, to the north-west of Holon local council area, to the north of the line linking up the north-west corner of Holon with the north-east corner of Bat Yam local council area and to the north of Bat Yam local council area. The question of Karton quarter will be decided by the Boundary Commission, bearing in mind among other considerations the desirability of including the smallest possible number of its Arab inhabitants and the largest possible number of its Jewish inhabitants in the Jewish State.

B. THE JEWISH STATE

The north-eastern sector of the Jewish State (Eastern) Galilee) is bounded on the north and west by the Lebanese frontier and on the east by the frontiers of Syria and Transjordan. It includes the whole of the Hula Basin, Lake Tiberias, the whole of the Beisan sub-district, the boundary line being extended to the crest of the Gilboa mountains and the Wadi Malih. From there the Jewish State extends north-west, following the boundary described in respect of the Arab State.

The Jewish Section of the coastal plain extends from a point between Minat et Qila and Nabi Yunis in the Gaza sub-district and includes the towns of Haifa and Tel-Aviv, leaving Jaffa as an enclave of the Arab State. The eastern frontier of the Jewish State follows the boundary described in respect of the Arab State.

The Beersheba area comprises the whole of the Beersheba sub-district, including the Negeb and the eastern part of the Gaza sub-district, but excluding the town of Beersheba and those areas described in respect of the Arab State. It includes also a strip of land along the Dead Sea stretching from the Beersheba-Hebron sub-district boundary line to Ein Geddi, as described in respect of the Arab State.

C. THE CITY OF JERUSALEM

The boundaries of the City of Jerusalem are as defined in the recommendations on the City of Jerusalem. (See Part III, Section B, below).

PART III

City of Jerusalem

A. SPECIAL REGIME

The City of Jerusalem shall be established as a corpus separatum under a special international regime and shall be administered by the United Nations. The Trusteeship Council shall be
designated to discharge the responsibilities of the Administering Authority on behalf of the United Nations.

B. BOUNDARIES OF THE CITY

The City of Jerusalem shall include the present municipality of Jerusalem plus the surrounding villages and towns, the most eastern of which shall be Abu Dis; the most southern, Bethlehem; the most western, Ein Karim (including also the built-up area of Motsa); and the most northern Shu'fat, as indicated on the attached sketch-map (annex B).

C. STATUTE OF THE CITY

The Trusteeship Council shall, within five months of the approval of the present plan, elaborate and approve a detailed Statute of the City which shall contain inter alia the substance of the following provisions:

1. Government machinery; special objectives. The Administering Authority in discharging its administrative obligations shall pursue the following special objectives:

   (a) To protect and to preserve the unique spiritual and religious interests located in the city of the three great monotheistic faiths throughout the world, Christian, Jewish and Moslem; to this end to ensure that order and peace, and especially religious peace, reign in Jerusalem;

   (b) To foster co-operation among all the inhabitants of the city in their own interests as well as in order to encourage and support the peaceful development of the mutual relations between the two Palestinian peoples throughout the Holy Land; to promote the security, well-being and any constructive measures of development of the residents, having regard to the special circumstances and customs of the various peoples and communities.

2. Governor and administrative staff. A Governor of the City of Jerusalem shall be appointed by the Trusteeship Council and shall be responsible to it. He shall be selected on the basis of special qualifications and without regard to nationality. He shall not, however, be a citizen of either State in Palestine.

   The Governor shall represent the United Nations in the City and shall exercise on their behalf all powers of administration, including the conduct of external affairs. He shall be assisted by an administrative staff classed as international officers in the meaning of Article 100 of the Charter and chosen whenever practicable from the residents of the city and of the rest of Palestine on a non-discriminatory basis. A detailed plan for the organization of the administration of the city shall be submitted by the Governor to the Trusteeship Council and duly approved by it.

3. Local autonomy. (a) The existing local autonomous units in the territory of the city (villages, townships and municipalities) shall enjoy wide powers of local government and administration.

   (b) The Governor shall study and submit for the consideration and decision of the Trusteeship
Council a plan for the establishment of a special town units consisting respectively, of the Jewish and Arab sections of new Jerusalem. The new town units shall continue to form part of the present municipality of Jerusalem.

4. **Security measures.** (a) The City of Jerusalem shall be demilitarized; its neutrality shall be declared and preserved, and no para-military formations, exercises or activities shall be permitted within its borders.

(b) Should the administration of the City of Jerusalem be seriously obstructed or prevented by the non-co-operation or interference of one or more sections of the population, the Governor shall have authority to take such measures as may be necessary to restore the effective functioning of the administration.

(c) To assist in the maintenance of internal law and order and especially for the protection of the Holy Places and religious buildings and sites in the city, the Governor shall organize a special police force of adequate strength, the members of which shall be recruited outside of Palestine. The Governor shall be empowered to direct such budgetary provision as may be necessary for the maintenance of this force.

5. **Legislative organization.** A Legislative Council, elected by adult residents of the city irrespective of nationality on the basis of universal and secret suffrage and proportional representation, shall have powers of legislation and taxation. No legislative measures shall, however, conflict or interfere with the provisions which will be set forth in the Statute of the City, nor shall any law, regulation, or official action prevail over them. The Statute shall grant to the Governor a right of vetoing bills inconsistent with the provisions referred to in the preceding sentence. It shall also empower him to promulgate temporary ordinances in case the council fails to adopt in time a bill deemed essential to the normal functioning of the administration.

6. **Administration of justice.** The Statute shall provide for the establishment of an independent judiciary system, including a court of appeal. All the inhabitants of the City shall be subject to it.

7. **Economic union and economic regime.** The City of Jerusalem shall be included in the Economic Union of Palestine and be bound by all stipulations of the undertaking and of any treaties issued therefrom, as well as by the decision of the Joint Economic Board. The headquarters of the Economic Board shall be established in the territory of the City.

The Statute shall provide for the regulation of economic matters not falling within the regime of the Economic Union, on the basis of equal treatment and non-discrimination for all members of the United Nations and their nationals.

8. **Freedom of transit and visit; control of residents.** Subject to considerations of security, and of economic welfare as determined by the Governor under the directions of the Trusteeship Council, freedom of entry into, and residence within, the borders of the City shall be guaranteed for the residents or citizens of the Arab and Jewish States. Immigration into, and residence within, the borders of the city for nationals of other States shall be controlled by the Governor under the directions of the Trusteeship Council.
9. Relations with the Arab and Jewish States. Representatives of the Arab and Jewish States shall be accredited to the Governor of the City and charged with the protection of the interests of their States and nationals in connexion with the international administration of the City.

10. Official languages. Arabic and Hebrew shall be the official languages of the city. This will not preclude the adoption of one or more additional working languages, as may be required.

11. Citizenship. All the residents shall become ipso facto citizens of the City of Jerusalem unless they opt for citizenship of the State of which they have been citizens or, if Arabs or Jews, have filed notice of intention to become citizens of the Arab or Jewish State respectively, according to part I, section B, paragraph 9, of this plan.

The Trusteeship Council shall make arrangements for consular protection of the citizens of the City outside its territory.

12. Freedoms of Citizens. (a) Subject only to the requirements of public order and morals, the inhabitants of the City shall be ensured the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including freedom of conscience, religion and worship, language, education, speech and press, assembly and association, and petition.

(b) No discrimination of any kind shall be made between the inhabitants on the grounds of race, religion, language or sex.

(c) All persons within the City shall be entitled to equal protection of the laws.

(d) The family law and personal status of the various persons and communities and their religious interests, including endowments, shall be respected.

(e) Except as may be required for the maintenance of public order and good government, no measure shall be taken to obstruct or interfere with the enterprise of religious or charitable bodies of all faiths or to discriminate against any representative or member of these bodies on the ground of his religion or nationality.

(f) The City shall ensure adequate primary and secondary education for the Arab and Jewish communities respectively, in their own languages and in accordance with their cultural traditions.

The right of each community to maintain its own schools for the education of its own members in its own language, while conforming to such educational requirements of a general nature as the City may impose, shall not be denied or impaired. Foreign educational establishments shall continue their activity on the basis of their existing rights.

(g) No restriction shall be imposed on the free use by any inhabitant of the City of any language in private intercourse, in commerce, in religion, in the Press or in publications of any kind, or at public meetings.
13. **Holy Places.** (a) Existing rights in respect of Holy Places and religious buildings or sites shall not be denied or impaired.

(b) Free access to the Holy Places and religious buildings or sites and the free exercise of worship shall be secured in conformity with existing rights and subject to the requirements of public order and decorum.

(c) Holy Places and religious buildings or sites shall be preserved. No act shall be permitted which may in any way impair their sacred character. If at any time it appears to the Governor that any particular Holy Place, religious building or site is in need of urgent repair, the Governor may call upon the community or communities concerned to carry out such repair. The Governor may carry it out himself at the expense of the community or communities concerned if no action is taken within a reasonable time.

(d) No taxation shall be levied in respect of any Holy Place, religious building or site which was exempt from taxation on the date of the creation of the City. No change in the incidence of such taxation shall be made which would either discriminate between the owners or occupiers of Holy Places, religious buildings or sites, or would place such owners or occupiers in a position less favourable in relation to the general incidence of taxation than existed at the time of the adoption of the Assembly's recommendations.

14. **Special powers of the Governor in respect of the Holy Places, religious buildings and sites in the City and in any part of Palestine.** (a) The protection of the Holy Places, religious buildings and sites located in the City of Jerusalem shall be a special concern of the Governor.

(b) With relation to such places, buildings and sites in Palestine outside the city, the Governor shall determine, on the ground of powers granted to him by the Constitutions of both States, whether the provisions of the Constitutions of the Arab and Jewish States in Palestine dealing therewith and the religious rights appertaining thereto are being properly applied and respected.

(c) The Governor shall also be empowered to make decisions on the basis of existing rights in cases of disputes which may arise between the different religious communities or the rites of a religious community in respect of the Holy Places, religious buildings and sites in any part of Palestine.

In this task he may be assisted by a consultative council of representatives of different denominations acting in an advisory capacity.

**D. DURATION OF THE SPECIAL REGIME**

The Statute elaborated by the Trusteeship Council on the aforementioned principles shall come into force not later than 1 October 1948. It shall remain in force in the first instance for a period of ten years, unless the Trusteeship Council finds it necessary to undertake a re-examination of these provisions at an earlier date. After the expiration of this period the whole scheme shall be subject to re-examination by the Trusteeship Council in the light of the experience acquired with
its functioning. The residents of the City shall be then free to express by means of a referendum their wishes as to possible modifications of the regime of the City.

PART IV
CAPITULATIONS

States whose nationals have in the past enjoyed in Palestine the privileges and immunities of foreigners, including the benefits of consular jurisdiction and protection, as formerly enjoyed by capitulation or usage in the Ottoman Empire, are invited to renounce any right pertaining to them to the re-establishment of such privileges and immunities in the proposed Arab and Jewish States and the City of Jerusalem.

* * *

Notes

1/ See Official Records of the second session of the General Assembly, Supplement No. 11, Volumes I-IV.

2/ This resolution was adopted without reference to a Committee.

3/ The following stipulation shall be added to the declaration concerning the Jewish State: "In the Jewish State adequate facilities shall be given to Arab-speaking citizens for the use of their language, either orally or in writing, in the legislature, before the Courts and in the administration."

4/ In the declaration concerning the Arab State, the words "by an Arab in the Jewish State" should be replaced by the words "by a Jew in the Arab State".

5/ The boundary lines described in part II are indicated in Annex A. The base map used in marking and describing this boundary is "Palestine 1:250000" published by the Survey of Palestine, 1946.
Annex A: Plan of Partition with Economic Union

PALESTINE

PLAN OF PARTITION
WITH ECONOMIC UNION
proposed by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Palestinian Question
Annex B: City of Jerusalem Boundaries Proposed by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Palestinian Question

CITY OF JERUSALEM

BOUNDARIES PROPOSED
### Roll Call Vote: United Nations General Assembly Resolution 181(II)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>Abstained</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byelorussian S.S.R.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>Abstained</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian S.S.R.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of South Africa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.S.R.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For – 33  
Against – 13  
Abstained – 10  
Absent – 1
Recommended Reading

**Christian Zionism Surveys** – these texts have served me well in my research and would serve you well in further study of Christian Zionism. These four texts vary in perspective but compare well in terms of scholarship. Clark and Spector seem to have the more moderate takes on the subject, while Merkley is himself a Zionist and Sizer is far more critical of Zionism:


**Further Historical Context** – these texts might not be as specifically related to American Christian Zionism, but are all worth reading to supplement knowledge about the time period of American Christian Zionism:


**Primary Source Readings** – these texts provide opposite perspectives on Israel; reading them in succession could prove rather interesting:


**Compilations** – Wagner and Davis’ text compiles numerous essays on Zionism about and written by a variety of religious backgrounds. Tremendous modern resource:
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