

**reprinted with permission from*
Religion in Life
XLVIII, 4 (Winter 1979)

*Toward a Secular Theology of Israel**

A. ROY ECKARDT

Where, if anywhere, is to be found the authentication of the State of Israel? Much of the long and intense debate over Zionism within Christian and Jewish circles has focused upon this issue. From a rational or morally even-handed point of view, the question today is ludicrous. No such query is posed concerning the sovereignty of Iran or Egypt, Nigeria or Uruguay, Jordan or Lebanon, India or the United States—or even concerning the legitimacy of the regimes in these countries. This fact does not, regrettably, quash the ongoing conflict over Israeli legitimation. The intrusion of a double standard between Israel and other national sovereignties¹ suggests that any discussion of the foundations of Israeli autonomy is a peculiarly negative concession to human intransigence rather than a positive celebration of human attainment. But this state of affairs makes all the more obligatory careful assessments of the debate and a decision on one side or the other.

The question of the Zionist claim may be approached by considering various denials of the integrity of Israel as a political reality, denials that either question Israel's existence in principle or support her on grounds that prove indefensible. For present purposes, two such negations are given attention. It is from opposite directions that these views converge upon our subject. They are alike formidable, for each sustains a certain plausibility and appeal.

I

One position is associated with the Christian theological left. There is the phenomenon called "liberal"-universalism. Quotation marks are used in order to avoid confusion with genuine forms of liberalism. Within authentic liberalism the demands of "liberal"-universalism are not visited upon Jews, since Jewry is there fully enabled to make its own decisions respecting the meaning of Jewishness. But Christian representatives of a "liberal"-universalist viewpoint set the universalist possibilities of faith in severe judgment upon the reputed temptations and evils of Jewish particularity. The modern roots of this outlook lie in the Enlightenment, in that opposition to

Dr. Eckardt is chairman of the Department of Religion Studies, Lehigh University.

nationalism which denominates "humanity" as its center of value. Nationalism is regarded as the single, most powerful foe of universal, "spiritual" norms. National identity is regarded as a barrier to ideal human relationships, a barrier that a truly enlightened people of God will transcend.²

The attraction of this position lies in the honor it gives to the anti-parochial reaches of human moral achievement. As a matter of fact, the modern history of Judaism itself has not been entirely free of the "liberal"-universalist gospel. Thus, in one period the Reform movement was forcibly anti-Zionist, precisely on the ground that the Jewish people are emancipated, or ought to be, from all nationalist enticements. Jewish laic³ and historic particularity was annulled in principle. Jewishness was assimilated to a form of religiousness: Jewish identity was reduced to adherence to the religion called Judaism. It was only through bitter practical experience at the hands of anti-Semites and non-Jewish anti-Zionists that Reform leadership was driven to recognize that there is much more to Jewishness than religiousness, and that universalistic moral and spiritual norms, when not fleshed out in the particularities of existence, comprise a menace to human life itself. "Citizens of the world" are inevitably subversive of legitimate human-collective needs and values. Particularity is the *sine qua non* of universality. The alternative is fascist and totalitarian homogeneity, where the "parts" of a human collectivity are subjugated and even destroyed for the sake of the "whole." The very survival of the religion of Judaism, a faith that boasts many universalist aspects, is threatened whenever provision is lacking for the secular-laic identity of Jews. Fittingly, the Jewish community in its entirety has long since repudiated false universalism. (It is a delightful irony that today every candidate for the American Reform rabbinate is asked to spend a year of her or his studies in Jerusalem.)

In the Christian camp the form of anti-Zionism and anti-Israelism that stems from leftist or "liberal" sources has behind it an influential tradition.⁴ According to that tradition, the great moral heritage of the "Old Testament" prophets is held to be violated whenever and wherever "nationalism" becomes regnant. No form of idolatry is more serious or more destructive than that deriving from nationalistic pretensions. However, it is essential to keep before us that while Christian "liberal"-universalism views itself as emancipated from narrow interests, in truth it bears within itself the antithesis of its own moral norm. For when we turn to the real conflicts of human life, the universalist norm is very often revealed as "mere ideology" (in the Marxist sense): moral ideas and ideals are captured by collective self-interest. In a great many cases it is the custodians of preponderant power

who have been preaching to the powerless the evils of nationalism. Such counsel becomes, in effect, an instrumentality for depriving the afflicted and the weak of equality and justice.

The ideology of "liberal"-universalism remains as a foremost contemporary influence within left-of-center Protestantism (in some contrast to Roman Catholicism) in perpetuating negativistic thought and behavior toward Jewry as a fully laic reality. One Quaker teacher recently wrote that the State of Israel is to be "evaluated" and her future "determined" by her "practice or lack of practice of justice, mercy, and righteousness."⁵ The telling fact in the professor's preachment was not what he sought to demand of Israel but rather what he failed to demand of her foes. The truth that so often only Jewish "nationalism" is singled out for reproof, but not the national interests and politicidal designs of Israel's enemies, indicates that the real motivation cannot be a pure moral judgment against nationalism as such, but rather the taking of an adversary stance vis-à-vis the Jewish people. Thus, the nationalist claims of the Palestinian Arabs are celebrated, or at least readily conceded, rather than being called to reckoning by universalist standards.

If "liberal"-universalism is easily assimilated to the service of less-than-universal causes, its primary import, in the context of this analysis, is its betrayal of the Jews as a historic, particular people. Yet we cannot evade the truth within its warning against nationalist idolatries. In consideration of the challenge of "liberal"-universalism, the question with which we began is changed to read, Is there an authentication of the State of Israel that does not threaten the rights of non-Jews?

II

From within the Christian right we are met by a point of view that appears, at first blush, to have consequences quite different from those of "liberal"-universalism. For now, in place of criticism or even outright rejection of the Jewish national cause, we hear expressions of great sympathy for and solidarity with Israel.

Reference is made to Christian Zionism, a position variously found among conservative Christians, including especially those of an "evangelical"⁶ and fundamentalist bent. Christian Zionists as a group are distinguished by an insistence that the return of the Jewish people to Zion is to be comprehended in positive theological terms. The establishing of the Third Jewish Commonwealth is a special work of God, a sublime act constitutive to the very process of divine salvation (*Heilsgeschichte*).

Christian Zionist ideology takes two alternate forms: a surrogate religious apologetic for Israel and an assimilating of Jewish historical fortunes to the Christian imperium.

In the one version the will of God is insinuated unqualifiedly into the political process, although without any necessary insistence upon Christological sanctions. An example is Evangelicals United for Zion, which through its organ *Perception* and other means seeks "to stimulate real interrelation between the Evangelical Christian and Jewish communities based upon a biblical bond of love for God's land and His people, Israel."⁷ Insofar as "evangelicals" perpetuate the reputed promise of God that Abraham and his children's children are to inherit *Eretz Yisrael*, they naturally incline to sustain the socio-political cause of Israel. (This point of view parallels in some degree right-wing religious Zionism among Jews, as typified in the intractable *Gush Emunim* for a greater Israel.⁸)

The other form of Christian Zionism focuses upon Christology. The return of the Jews to their land is construed instrumentally, in accordance with certain alleged timetables of heaven. The renewal of Israel becomes part of a divinely scheduled preparation for the *Parousia*, the return of Christ in glory. Carl F. H. Henry told a recent Conference on Biblical Prophecy meeting in Jerusalem: "We live already in the last days because of the Resurrection of the Crucified One. The dramatic and unmistakable message of the New Testament is that the very last of those days is soon to break upon us."⁹ The reestablishing of Israel in 1948 is often treated as proof that the *Parousia* is imminent. Sometimes the transpiring of the latter event is held to make possible the Jewish acceptance of Christ. An article in the "evangelical" monthly *Eternity* contends that if God has indeed acted to resettle the sons of Isaac in *Eretz Yisrael*, the sons of Ishmael (the Muslims) can scarcely be expected to dislodge them. The writer goes on to attest that although the Jews have not returned to the Land "in faith," tomorrow they will "look upon Him whom they pierced," and the entire nation of Israel "will be converted in a day."¹⁰

The appeal of Christian Zionism derives from its refusal to exclude God's active will from the common life. Here is embodied a vital judgment against those Christians who either remain indifferent to the collective fate of Jews or are positively hostile to Zionism and the State of Israel. Christian Zionism's support of Israel constitutes a practical denial of the error of "liberal"-universalism with its inordinate "spiritual" demands. But the "liberal"-universalist concentration upon the moral perils in nationalist dedication points, functionally speaking, to an equally serious fault within Christian Zionism.

The overall trespass of Christian Zionism in either of its forms is its theologizing of the political order.¹¹ This has several paradoxical effects, all of which are baneful. The foremost of these is an unintended eroding of Israel's collective integrity. Scattered all through the Christian tradition is the claim that the fall of Jerusalem and the "dispersion" of the Jewish people comprise a judgment of God upon an unbelieving Israel. Now along come the Christian Zionists to hold for the opposite side of the identical coin. They proclaim that the contemporary return of the Jews to their land is a special sign of God's mercy and even a disclosure of his own intimate and singular plans. But these fabricators of God's mercy have entangled themselves in the same game played by the historicizers of God's judgment. Both parties misappropriate the events of history. The implication is as ominous as it is obvious: Israel's physical destruction tomorrow would have to be treated as a sign of God's returning wrath. This is the kind of predicament we arrange for ourselves whenever we practice the heresy of fancying that the events of history can contribute to or exemplify the truths of faith—the very opposite of the biblical teaching that it is the Lord of history who assigns his own final meanings to the exigencies of time and place.

Another consequence of Christian Zionism is its exacerbating of human strife. As James M. Wall writes, "The use of religious validation to settle secular conflicts is a misuse of religion and a disservice to politics."¹² One quite logical counter to the claim that Yahweh once gave Palestine to the Jews in perpetuity is the protestation that Allah has since awarded the land to his true people the Muslims, as embodied today through the great majority within the Arab nation. The Muslim rejoinder is not unlike the traditional anti-Jewish affirmation within the Christian church that the "new covenant" fulfills and replaces the "old covenant." A chronologized theology has little choice but to award the medal of victory to the Muslims (over Christians as well as Jews) for having come in last. Last is best. Such theologizing constitutes, of course, a political *reductio ad absurdum*. The expectable reaction to its Muslim version on the part of the Israelis has naturally been to fight. However, the pragmatic-theological and psycho-theological advantage must fall to the Muslims, because the Jews do not possess a counterpart to the *jihād* (religious war) of the *Qur'ān*. As for the Christians of the Near Orient, the future of their communities amongst 150 million Muslims is, like the future of the Jews, most problematic.

An equally serious consequence of Christian Zionism's assimilating of the political world to the assertions of faith is its paradoxical undermining of the integrity and credibility of the religious order. True religion functions as a

pointer to the transcendent and mysterious ways of God. "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, says the Lord" (Isa. 55:8). In Christian Zionism the thoughts and ways of God are massively domesticated—a procedure that is properly reserved for human life with cats and cows. Various parties, Jewish or Christian, may continue to believe that the establishing of the Third Jewish Commonwealth brings special evidence of God's grace and indeed contains the seeds of ultimate redemption. Such testimony may be listened to as an instance of strictly confessional celebration. I do not question the insistence upon God's presence within the common life. But it is one thing to glimpse, in a wholly existential way and as through a glass darkly, the hand of God within the happenings of history, and quite something else to mobilize that witness of faith (hope?) for apologetic or polemic purposes, to the ultimate end of theocratizing a political structure. The *Deutsche Christen* of the Nazi era politicized their theology; the Christian Zionists of today theologize their politics. The result is the same: the integrity of the religious order is undercut.

The identical effect occurs through the very insistence upon a religiously absolutist rendering of Israel's right-to-be. Once God is made into a weapon of geopolitical claims, the opposition is furnished with an excuse to cry "Idolatry!"—and this reaction is not unjustified.

We are advised that right-wing Protestantism is at last coming to honor the moral obligations first made vital to some of us by the Christian "social gospel." If the "evangelical" position on the politics of the Middle East is any harbinger, "evangelicalism" would be better advised to go home to its "pure gospel." Christian Zionism is a perfect case of the way in which the combining of social action with the dictates of religious absolutism engenders a flawed political theology.

Despite all their seeming disparity, "liberal"-universalism and Christian Zionism are conjoined by a failure to provide responsible political counsel. For significantly, it is not only the Christian right but also the "liberal" left that theologizes the political order—the one by imperializing the particularities of human affairs, the other by nullifying them. The "evangelicals" coerce Israel into becoming a *political church*, a theocratic tool. The "liberals" force Jewish integrity onto the Procrustean bed of an *apolitical church*, a strictly "spiritual" entity. In both instances the Jews are forbidden to be what they are, a laic reality with all the limited rights of any collectivity of this world. Thus is the authentication of Israel menaced from two different directions.

III

Our question now becomes: How are the elements of truth in the "liberal"-universalist and Christian Zionist positions to be honored as at the same time we avoid their temptations? The answer to this question is grounded, generically speaking, within a secular form of theology, i.e., a theology oriented to this world, the human order. To force convictions of faith upon the political domain is only to cut the ground from under Israel's real legitimation and to assault, unwittingly, Jewish collective life.

Several points are offered, as a means of bringing out the position behind the foregoing critiques.

1. The particularity of Israel is to be comprehended within the "orders of creation" (*Schöpfungsordnungen*), or at the least as "emergency orders" (*Notordnungen*): Emil Brunner identifies the orders as ways in which the will of God meets us, even if only in fragmentary and indirect fashion.¹³ These orders extend to the family, economic life and labor, the community of culture, the law, and the nation-state. Helmut Thielicke utilizes the phrase "emergency orders," and thus speaks more cautiously than Brunner. The orders provide "physical spheres of existence" that help protect men in a fallen world. They are orders of "preservation."¹⁴

An application of Brunner's reasoning is that "liberal"-universalism has ranged itself against the very nature of the divine creation. In ruling out Jewish sovereignty, the "liberals" reject one incarnation of the ways of God with men. An application of Thielicke's reasoning is that discrete peoples must have political sovereignty if they are to have needed protection against the will-to-power of others. This need applies especially to small peoples. "Liberal"-universalism thus represents a threat to human beings within our far-from-perfect world. But Christian Zionism incorrectly concentrates upon Israel, to the tacit exclusion of a concerned policy respecting other peoples and nations. The linking of the nation-state to the protective authorization of God is not an argument for Israel *qua* Israel; yet, unless we fall into a double standard, the right of Jewish sovereignty is seen as one instance of a universal right.

2. Within the real world, i.e., the world of political relations, the legitimation of the State of Israel is a matter of the historic rights of the Jewish people within the larger area known as Palestine. (The original British Mandate of Palestine extended through present-day Jordan; Israel today possesses only 25 percent of that area. Of equal significance, the majority of the population of Jordan today are Palestinians.) Objectively

speaking, the historic rights of Jews match, and in many comparisons surpass, the claims of any sovereignty in the world. Emphasis here falls upon the unbroken residency of the Jews in the land for more than three thousand years, a residency that was finally acknowledged, in a power-political sense, by the international community of nations in 1947.

The historical and moral attainments of men are not contradictory of attestations to the will of God—provided that God is understood in humanizing, creative, and providential terms. This principle applies everywhere. Thus, one tenable rejoinder to a possible allegation that “our” country really belongs to the Indians and ought to be “given back” to them is that such a demand does not take into account the “white man’s” stewardship of the land over a considerable period of time. This is not in any way to ignore our terrible treatment of the native Americans or the need for continuing acts of justice in behalf of these people. The state of affairs within Palestine is a comparable one. Israel’s stewardship of the land easily meets that of the United States. This stewardship extends to the developing of a democratic social order that contravenes various forms of tyranny, including religio-political forms.

3. Every argument for Israel’s historic and moral rights is an argument for the independence of the Palestinian Arabs. The United Nations’ acknowledgment in 1947 of the Jewish claim was restricted, of course, to part of a division of that section of Palestine lying west of the Jordan River, with a Palestinian Arab polity being equally recognized. Significantly, the admission of Israel to the United Nations in 1949 was consummated quite independently of the Arabs’ reaction to the UN decision. Israeli sovereignty was acknowledged in a way not at all conditional upon the Arab response to the Plan of Partition. Thus, the Jewish historical and moral claim was capped by a fresh juridical factor at the international level.

The lingering tragedy of the Middle East is that the Arab side refused the United Nations’ partition. For as the Peel Commission of a decade earlier had reported, here was a clear case of “a conflict of right with right.” It is sometimes contended that by their rejection of the 1947 partition, the Palestinian Arabs forfeited their claim to the land. Since the refusal was not grounded in a democratic plebiscite, this argument is not easy to sustain. However, the moral validity and practical workability of a given act of geographical partition depends wholly upon the readiness of each primary party to acknowledge the other’s legitimacy. The question of such mutuality continues as the single foundational issue in the Middle East conflict.

4. The desacralizing of political claims is an essential of peace among

nations, because this helps to temper the imperious pretensions and uncompromising character of theological asserveration. This is especially a problem in the Middle East, where religion remains a massive, ever increasing obstacle to a final settlement. The line goes: We are simply obeying the divine will and decree. How dare you charge us with selfish interests! In contrast to this unyielding posture, the essence of politico-secular procedures is the art of compromise.

5. The character of the Christian-Jewish relationship, normatively considered, is such that the Christian position on Zionism and the State of Israel is enabled to pattern itself upon the prevailing Jewish position. Support for a Jewish state would hardly be distinctively Christian were it limited to humanitarian grounds or purely politico-moral justifications.

Were it so that the Christian church has now supplanted the Jewish nation as the elect people of God, the concept "Israel" would thereby refer to a "spiritual community" rather than a laic reality. The very idea of political sovereignty for God's people would be not only proscribed but emptied of all meaning. But a wholly different persuasion is open to us: The covenant of God with the Jewish people, original Israel, is not broken, and cannot be broken because God does not renege on his promises (Gen. 17:13, 19; Lev. 24:8; II Sam. 23:5; I Chron. 16:17; Ezek. 37:26; etc.). Indeed, Christians, those erstwhile pagans, have been made "fellow-citizens" with God's people (Eph. 2:19). The Christian church consists of those who have been "grafted in" to the tree of salvation which is Israel (Rom. 11:17). The Christian community is composed of those human beings who have been permitted to become, in Krister Stendahl's phrase, a "peculiar kind of Jew."¹⁵ We have been joined to that Israel which is the potential humanizer of all her children. Accordingly, any attempt within the church to cancel out the special divine relation with Israel may be seen as "theologically self-annihilative for the Christian community itself."¹⁶ (Part of the contribution of Christian Zionism is its insistence upon the peculiar and ineluctable relationship that Christians have with Jews.)

It follows from the above that the question of Zionism and Israel ought to be raised and answered by Christians as younger brothers and sisters in the same manner as it is raised and answered by Jews as elder brothers and sisters. And it is exactly here that we encounter a remarkable thing, of supreme moment for the entire challenge of a secular theology. When Christians turn for guidance to their elders in the faith, they quickly learn that the dominant Jewish persuasion is such that it avoids the very kinds of theologizing we have ourselves criticized. For the great majority of Jews do

not take refuge in "religious arguments" for the Third Jewish Commonwealth but instead seek to live out their lives for the sake of the responsibilities of this world. And an even more remarkable thing is that most Israelis seek neither solace nor direction in theologization—they who are passing their days within the gates of Zion itself! It is a wondrous paradox that the new Israel of the Middle East should itself be an increasingly secular reality. How infelicitous it is then—no, how wrongheaded—when Christian spokesmen keep on trying to religionize Israel. It is most noteworthy that the main trunk of the tree of Israel, as it lives and grows today, bends neither to the theological left nor to the theological right.

The most remarkable element of all is the Jewish and Israeli transcendence of the theological absolute⁵ that divides human beings from one another. The dominating Israeli-Jewish rationale for the existence of Israel is a secular-political one. This becomes quite evident to any who have resided, as I have, in Israel. Fortunately for the Israelis, as for the well-being of their Arab neighbors, the theologization of Israel from within the country itself remains a minority exercise, and it is effectively kept under public control. The last thing most Israelis would tolerate is a theocracy. Out of much bitter history these people know that the nation-state is anything but a law unto itself. Political sovereignties are subject to the universal norms of justice. Were this not insisted upon, we should find ourselves subject to the error of the Christian Zionists. A genuinely secular theology will never sanction more than relative and partial claims to political autonomy.

To express the matter in categories of theological challenge, How could we ever sanction a split between the being of God and the creation of God? The most perennial and influential of all Christian temptations is to return to the old paganism, that fateful polytheism which keeps company with the Marcionites. What is the political meaning of the *shema*? Herein lies the ultimate question of Zionism. The remedy to all dichotomous theologies is found in that majestic confession of Judaism: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is One." The only true universalism is one that moves dialectically between the unity of the one God and the integral particularities of his creation. Because God is one, the concept of secular theology is not only meaningful but obligatory, a requirement laid upon us all. In Zionism and the State of Israel the world of God and the world of human politics are endeavoring to converge—a paradigm for humanity as a family.

6. Having suggested several pathways toward a secular theology of Israel, I have to offer a qualifying point, lest the above proposals assume the countenance of perfectionism.

The relation of the religious and political orders will continue to manifest varying degrees of tension. This fact may be viewed both positively and negatively—positively in that each of the sides is possessed of integrity; negatively in that each side is conditioned by the demands of the other. From a theological viewpoint, judgment must be rendered against any political order that absolutizes itself or its claims, idolatrously equating itself with God. From a political standpoint, judgment must be levied against the spiritualizing of the people of God, whereby the wardrobe of their “whole armor” is limited to truth, righteousness, and faith (Eph. 6:11-17) and does not include tanks, guns, and bombs. Eugene B. Borowitz counteracts all such spiritualization: The equating of justice and love, particularly *agape* (as in the thinking of Joseph Fletcher), means that the laying down of my life permits you to “continue in your sinfulness. The appeal of such a doctrine of love to all exploiters and oppressors of the weak is a commonplace of social and historical analysis.” This is why “justice looms so large” in the biblical prophets¹⁷—justice as the *weapon* of love, never to be confused with love itself.

There is within this world no ultimate peace, no final resolution of human conflict, no end to the struggle between moral claims and human will-to-power, and hence no wholly consummated marriage (*basar*, one flesh) of the sacred and the profane. The persistence of the duality of religion and politics is itself a reminder of this. The very fact that the reestablished Jewish Commonwealth of today has not dispelled an untidy dualism of religiousness and the state helps to underscore the point. This dualism is found in every human collectivity—Christian, Muslim, *et al.*

The seer John finds no Temple in the heavenly Jerusalem because there and then God will be all-in-all (Rev. 21:22). Only in that transcendent time and place will the separating categories of life be obliterated, for that is the Day of the Messiah. A secularizing theology is a needed corrective to such enticements as we have here reviewed and criticized. But it does not put an end to enticement as such, for to hope in that fashion would itself be to ignore the tension of the two orders. The men of Caesar and the King of the universe do not march to the one drummer.

In sum, while the movement *toward* a secular theology of Israel may manage to become an obligation within our human journey, pointing to the ultimate norms and hopes of faith, a fully realized secular theology of Israel is not possible. Abraham and his children's children must abide in their search for the secular city “whose builder and maker is God” (cf. Heb. 11:10).

NOTES

1. Within Christian circles this double standard appears as a psycho-theological carry-over of the persuasion that the Jews, having been rejected by God for their unfaith, are condemned to endless wandering without a country of their own.
2. A. Roy Eckardt, "Theological Implications of the State of Israel: The Protestant View," *1974 Yearbook of the Encyclopaedia Judaica* (Jerusalem), pp. 161-62.
3. The concept "laic" is a proposed replacement for "ethnic" in characterizing the overall reality of the Jewish people. "Ethnic" is rather too narrow. "Laic" is the adjectival form of *laos* (peopleness). Strictly, "laic" means "lay" or "secular." But this very usage is applicable to Judaism as a whole, which is a lay religion, without priests or clergy. Even more significantly, the Jewish *laos* is totally secular in an all-decisive respect: a people wholly of this world (*saeculum*) is involved. Cf. James Parkes's conceptualization of the Jewish people as a "natural community," in, among many references, *Prelude to Dialogue* (London: Vallentine, Mitchell, 1969), p. 193.
4. There are fully documented reminders of this judgment in Hertzels Fishman's *American Protestantism and a Jewish State* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1973).
5. Calvin Keene, "Prophecy and Modern Israel," *The Link*, X,3 (1977), 1-3.
6. The quote marks reflect a double consideration: it is the group under discussion that calls itself "evangelical"; yet many Christians oppose this group's version of the gospel (evangel) and hence its preempting of the term "evangelical."
7. *Perception*, October 1978, p. 4.
8. Right-wing Jewish Orthodoxy is not necessarily Zionist. The *Neturei Karta* are an ultrareligious yet militantly anti-Zionist sect—and they live, strikingly enough, within the State of Israel (the Mea Shearim section of Jerusalem).
9. As quoted in *Newsweek*, June 28, 1971, p. 62.
10. *Eternity*, July, 1967, as cited in Solomon S. Bernards, "The Arab-Israel Crisis and the American Christian Response," *The Lutheran Quarterly*, August, 1968, p. 272.
11. Not all Christian Zionists do this. Thus, Dr. G. Douglas Young, director of Bridges for Peace and former president of the American Institute of Holy Land Studies in Jerusalem, is an exceptional evangelical Christian whose dedication to Israel is through-and-through political. Young has grasped the meaning of a Christian secular theology of Israel. This is made clear in his serial *Dispatch from Jerusalem*.
12. Wall, "Israel and the Evangelicals" (Editorial Comment), *The Christian Century*, November 23, 1977, p. 1083. This editorial marshalls devastating criticisms of the Christian Zionist handling of the Middle East conflict.
13. Brunner, *The Divine Imperative* (New York: Macmillan, 1942), p. 291.
14. Thielicke, *Theological Ethics*, I (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), 276, 439-40.
15. Stendahl, "Judaism and Christianity II—After a Colloquium and a War," *Harvard Divinity Bulletin* (New Series), I, (1967), 5.
16. Eckardt, "Theological Implications," p. 160. The interpretation of the Christian-Jewish relationship here sketched is treated intensively in two volumes by the present author: *Elder and Younger Brothers* (New York: Schocken, 1973) and *Your People, My People* (New York: Quadrangle/New York Times, 1974).
17. Borowitz, "On the New Morality," *Judaism*, XV (1966), 333.