
American Christians and Israel, 1948 – 1988

Carl Hermann Voss and David A. Rausch

Dr. Henry A. Atkinson, founder in 1942 of the Christian Council on Palestine, was the embodiment of the classic Protestant Social Gospel: optimistic, if not quite utopian, open to sundry suggestions and solutions, possessed of singular fortitude as well as a rugged assurance that good always triumphs over evil and the “Kingdom of God on earth” will prevail. From his earliest days as a Methodist theological student through his younger years as a Congregational minister in Albion, Illinois, and Springfield, Ohio, then in Atlanta, Georgia, such convictions resulted in his pioneering, in 1911, one of the first organizations to implement the principles of the Social Gospel—the Social Services Commission of the Congregational Churches of the U.S.A., later (1934) to become the Christian Social Action Council of what ultimately emerged as the United Church of Christ.¹

In the early decades of the twentieth century, Atkinson worked with such leading citizens as former President William Howard Taft, attorney Amos Pinchot, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, and reformer Raymond Robbins in the League to Enforce Peace² just prior to his trailblazing efforts for ecumenism in key positions with the Carnegie-endowed Church Peace Union and the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches.³ A robust, outspoken Christian statesman, Henry A. Atkinson led fellow Social Gospelers into the fray with buoyant hopes that a new world was “a-bornin’.” True, the Kingdom might now be delayed; but it would assuredly come—eventually . . . So with Zionism.

One aspect of Atkinson’s indomitable faith over the decades was seen in his firm belief that, at long last, Zionism would indeed be victorious. Not only was this certainty rooted in the biblical promises read aloud by his mother from his earliest childhood in the 1880s but

it was confirmed afresh by his own visits to the Holy Land in his travels between the two world wars. He had come to know about the famed Fundamentalist Zionist, William E. Blackstone, whose 1891 petition to President Benjamin Harrison met with Atkinson's wholehearted approval when he chanced upon it some years later.⁴ He also was a friend of the Congregationalist clergyman, Dr. Adolph Berle, Sr., whose *The World Significance of a Jewish State* (1918) he had read at the time of publication, soon after Great Britain's promulgation of the 1917 Balfour Declaration, "view[ing] with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people."⁵ Atkinson enthusiastically endorsed Balfour's famous letter to Lord Lionel Rothschild and often quoted from it. Even though Britain might be slow to implement its League of Nations Mandate for Palestine, granted at San Remo in 1922, Atkinson believed that the British would "muddle through" and effect a satisfactory settlement. He fancifully speculated that some cantonal arrangement on the Swiss model of unity might be achieved, naively proposing a future Palestine in which Jew and Arab, Christian and Moslem would model their government "perhaps after the pattern of Lebanon," he would muse.

The Christian Council on Palestine

At one of the earliest meetings of the Christian Council on Palestine in 1943, Atkinson was taken aback by the sharp disagreements he encountered from such important members of the executive council as archaeologist William Foxwell Albright and theologian Reinhold Niebuhr. They reminded him that realism required a *Jewish* state, not a new bi-national or tri-national satrapy.

Later that fateful fall of 1943, the newly elected co-chairman of the American Zionist Emergency Council, Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver of Cleveland, listened to Atkinson's simplistic expedient of amassing Christian opposition to the 1939 British White Paper and abruptly and sternly rebuked his Christian friend. Rabbi Silver reminded him that only a "Jewish commonwealth" with a self-governing Jewish majority could achieve justice for a harassed and homeless people. Merely relaxing immigration restrictions would not be enough. When Atkinson's rabbinical preceptors—Stephen S. Wise, Philip S. Bern-

stein, and Milton Steinberg—echoed Silver, though in less vehement fashion, the Christian clergyman began slowly to take a new tack. Nevertheless he held back; he still retained his optimistic outlook as he continued in valiant efforts to secure much-needed Christian support for the newly organized Council on Palestine composed, as planned, almost entirely of Christian ministers.

After Henry Atkinson had gathered many influential names, he told the executive secretary of the Council, a young minister from Pittsburgh, that the work with the Council would really last a very short time. He read aloud scores of outstanding names beginning with Reinhold Niebuhr of New York's Union Theological Seminary and continuing with Ralph W. Sockman of New York's Christ Church (Methodist), the doughty Methodist Bishop Francis J. McConnell, the brilliant William Foxwell Albright of Johns Hopkins University, the rugged Daniel A. Poling of the *Christian Herald* and Philadelphia's Baptist Temple, "and many big shots like that," gloated the quintessential Social Gospeler. "You know, [Carl Herman] Voss, it really will be a matter of only a few months. Then you'll see: the British are going to be so impressed by that letterhead of ours with all those top-notch names on it that they will realize we really do have public opinion on our side. They'll grasp the fact that the Christian world will not allow the gates of Palestine to remain closed to the Jewish refugees left in Hitler's Europe. They'll open the gates of Palestine and refugees will pour in. We'll fold up the Committee and congratulate ourselves on a job well done."

When reminded of this naive prediction fifteen years later, shortly before his death, Atkinson reflected grimly: "How wrong I was, lad . . . How wrong I was!"

Like all too many Americans, Atkinson had misjudged the trends and events. He had underestimated the lack of courage in the American government, the insensitivity of the average Christian's conscience, the power of missionary groups to quench all hope of using Palestine as a refuge. He failed to gauge correctly the silence of the Roman Catholics, as well as the hesitation of many Jews. He assessed inadequately the crippling effects of the obduracy of the British Foreign Office and the myopic-minded *Realpolitik* of the Departments of Defense and State to convince the public that any meddling in British policy in the Middle East would spell disaster for the war effort.

The American Christian Palestine Committee

When, at the end of World War II, these same circumstances prevailed with scarcely any change in the hard facts of political life, the attainment of the Partition of Palestine after the vote by the General Assembly of the United Nations on November 29, 1947, and the establishment of the new State of Israel in May 1948 seemed almost a miracle. Again a mood of unreasoning optimism arose among many in the newly formed American Christian Palestine Committee (ACPC), which had from 1946 carried on the work of the combined American Palestine Committee (founded in 1931) and the Christian Council on Palestine (founded in 1942).

At a meeting in the early winter of 1949 the executive council of the American Christian Palestine Committee had to decide whether it was going to continue now that Israel's statehood had been achieved and the new nation was apparently soon to be admitted to the four-year-old United Nations. An Episcopal minister from Westchester, the Reverend Wendell Phillips, argued that the Committee had now done its job. He maintained it should be dissolved and the information services of the embassy and consulates of the new State of Israel allowed to carry on their own programs to counter the hostile forces aligned against Israel.

Professor Paul Tillich, however, thought otherwise. As a member of the ACPC since February 1944, and as a refugee from Nazi Germany since 1933, he recalled the false optimism of his countrymen, especially among his own friends and comrades of the Religious Socialist movement in Germany in the days of the Weimar Republic (1919-1933). He argued that a prudent view of the future would demand a strong Committee, ready and willing to oppose all hostility and antagonism.

Indeed, opposition even then had begun in one organization, the Committee for Peace and Justice in the Holy Land, composed of such well-known pro-Arab supporters as former oil company executive Kermit Roosevelt, Barnard's dean, Virginia Gildersleeve, Yale's archaeologist Millar Burrows, Harvard's philosopher William Ernest Hocking, Harry Emerson Fosdick of Riverside Church, Union Theological Seminary's president Henry Sloane Coffin, and Rabbi Morris Lazaron of Baltimore's Hebrew Temple and the American Council for

Judaism. The rabbi's presence reflected, it was announced, "the non-partisan character" of the organization's constituency.⁶

The American Christian Palestine Committee soon discovered it would have to continue carrying on an educational and informational program among Christians. It did so in effective fashion for a number of years, only to wind down its activities in the late 1950s and early 1960s as financial support began to shrink. By that time, the Israeli government, through the embassy in Washington and consulates throughout the country, was carrying on an ever-growing number and variety of services that interpreted the new Israel to Christians and, of course, to Jews and non-Jews alike.

"Our Hope"

Certainly, Christians reacted quite differently to the formation of a Jewish state. Fundamentalist-Evangelicals welcomed the event, reminding their prophetically minded constituency of Israel's importance in Bible history and future events.⁷ Arno C. Gaebelein, the influential Fundamentalist teacher during the early decades of the twentieth century, had died in 1945, but his son, Frank E. Gaebelein, and his friend, E. Schuyler English, carried on his teaching in the periodical *Our Hope* (founded in 1894). *Our Hope* welcomed the new nation with the ten-paragraph excerpt, "Israel Becomes a Nation Again." It declared: "The State of Israel, one of the world's oldest sovereignties, became the world's newest sovereignty at midnight on May 15 [the correct date was 14], 1948." Alerting its readers to the retreat of High Commissioner Sir Alan Gordon Cunningham, the selection of the new premier David Ben-Gurion, the "recognition" by President Harry S. Truman, and the impending attack by five Arab nations, *Our Hope* exclaimed that "Britain has mystified the world by having disarmed the Jews and armed the Trans-Jordan Arabs."⁸

To the Fundamentalist-Evangelical, as to Henry A. Atkinson's mother, who faithfully read the prophetic passages to her son, the Bible had given the Land to the Jewish people. "There are many Bible references to this restoration," *Our Hope* asserted, quoting one passage in full:

Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and

justice in the earth. In His days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is His Name whereby he shall be called THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS. Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that they shall no more say, the Lord liveth, which brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; but, the Lord liveth, which brought up and which led the seed of the house of Israel out of the north country, and from all countries whither I had driven them; and they shall dwell in their own land (Jeremiah 23:5-8; cf. Matthew 24:30, 31).

“Observe,” E. Schuyler English concluded in this “Current Events in the Light of the Bible” section of *Our Hope*, “that in God’s sight it is *their own land*.” English even alerted his readers to the fact that Moshe Shertok, foreign secretary of Israel, had informed the world that these new citizens would be called “Israelis” (rather than the “Israelites” the Fundamentalist was used to), and Editor English cited experts who differed on how this new term would be pronounced.⁹

Daniel A. Poling

The Evangelical publication, *Christian Herald*, with a circulation approaching 400,000 in 1948, claimed to be *interdenominational* and *undenominational*. Its editor was Dr. Daniel A. Poling, a member of the (Dutch) Reformed Church of America and honorary member of the Ohio Conference of the Evangelical United Brethren Church (his father’s church, in which his own ministry had begun). A self-proclaimed “gentle Fundamentalist,” Poling was senior minister of the Baptist Temple in Philadelphia and national co-chairman of the American Christian Palestine Committee. Answering unequivocally a reader’s question in October 1947, Daniel Poling declared to the *Christian Herald* readership: “I am a Christian Zionist who believes that Palestine should become, as promised, the Jewish state.” Welcoming the new State of Israel, he never wavered from that position.¹⁰

The American Christian Palestine Committee was able to build upon the support that had been gathered through the years by this spectrum of varied minds and theologies to back the idea of a Jewish national home for many different reasons. The joint leadership in earlier decades of such men as the Mormon Senator William King of Utah

and the quintessential Protestant Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts were two extremes of the kinds of interest and support given by Christians to the cause of a Jewish state. In the realm of politics in the 1940s, the guidance came from individuals as diverse as Senator Charles McNary (a Republican who was Wendell Wilkie's running mate in the presidential campaign of 1940) and Senator Robert Wagner of New York, a leading Democrat and New Deal advocate and an outstanding Roman Catholic layman.

Bipartisan in representation but mostly Protestant in its constituency, the ACPC encompassed more than 20,000 Christian leaders under its standard. It carried on a comprehensive educational program into the late 1950s and early 1960s to inform the American public concerning the new Israel. The ACPC endeavored to interpret to American Christians the Jewish people's quest for nationhood as reflected in the Zionist movement, while also drawing attention to the extraordinary achievements of the Jews of the new land of "Israel." At the same time the Committee pointed to the responsibility Christians had, in light of the Hitler terror, to wipe out the evils of anti-Jewish persecution and to remedy the problem of Jewish national homelessness.

To accomplish these ends the Committee had an expansive and varied program: it sponsored seminars on a local basis and conferences on a regional scale, forming city and state chapters. A small but capable staff distributed pamphlets, reprints, and other literature. The ACPC organized a speaker's bureau, Club Program Service, which offered more than three hundred non-Jewish speakers to church groups, university forums, service clubs, and community organizations on the subjects of Zionism, Israel's history, and Jewish-Christian understanding of Israel. Study tours, composed of Christian leaders, were organized to visit Arab lands and Israel. Each year such groups, sponsored by local Jewish communities, attained a rare kind of mutual understanding and friendship, which continued to prevail among Jews and Christians participating in such projects. Films and slides, radio and television programs were promoted, and a provocative, informative, well-edited journal, *Land Reborn*, was published to highlight the major parts of this program, mobilize support among non-Jews, and share informed opinion, usually from prominent Christians, on burning issues in Israeli-Arab affairs.¹¹

Dorothy Thompson

In 1951 a rival organization suddenly sprang up, the American Friends of the Middle East (AFME). The AFME asserted to be “pro all nations of the Middle East” but proved to be especially critical of the new Israel. Claiming that its support came from individuals and corporations interested in the Middle East, the AFME group gathered a sizable number of Middle Eastern authorities, ranging from professors to authors, oil company executives to missionaries, archaeologists to Middle East educators, carrying on an extensive program which called for an annual budget of at least half a million dollars. Not until the early 1960s, however, was it disclosed that the greatest part of the budget—more than \$400,000—came from the CIA, being dispensed in the Middle East by the so-called Dearborn Foundation.¹²

Dr. Garland Evans Hopkins, an associate editor of *Christian Century* magazine, served as executive vice president of AFME; and the president for a considerable length of time was Miss Dorothy Thompson, a famed newspaper correspondent and the daughter of a Methodist minister. Raised in a family devoted to social justice, Thompson had seen her father criticized to the point of almost losing his parish for making friends with a local Italian Catholic priest. During the 1920s, 1930s, and early 1940s Miss Thompson, by then a popular columnist and lecturer, had been an enthusiastic pro-Zionist who spoke at Zionist rallies, and, in later years, at American Christian Palestine Committee affairs on such subjects as, “I Speak as a Christian” and “I Speak Again as a Christian.” In her column in the *New York Herald Tribune* and allied newspapers she sounded a recurring refrain: “The Jews Are a People,” “The Jews Deserve and Need Palestine,” “Jewry is Deserving of Justice and Palestine,” etc.¹³

In the mid-1940s, after a trip to the Middle East, Dorothy Thompson suddenly changed her mind, following two and a half decades of single-minded support of Zionist aspiration. At that time she began to condemn Zionists in general and Israelis in particular, using her column and lecture platform as a means to berate the Jews as a people and Israel as a nation.¹⁴ This was quite a contrast from the 1930s and early 1940s, when the New York Jewish community, for example, found strength and courage in Thompson’s column as it alternated in the

New York Herald Tribune with the writings of Walter Lippmann, a Jew who never mentioned Jews or Zionism or the Nazis' extermination of Jews.¹⁵ Thompson's columns now became anti-Israel, and her new brand of writing appeared even in the pages of *Commentary*, publication of the American Jewish Committee, in a widely publicized article entitled "America Demands a Single Loyalty: The Perils of a 'Favorite' Foreign Nation" (March 1950).

When her lecture engagements shrank in number and her column fell victim to cancellation in a number of newspapers, she made a prudent decision and resigned from the presidency of the American Friends of the Middle East. Thompson retained her membership in the organization, however, speaking out on its behalf and maintaining her loyalty to its principles.¹⁶

An examination of voluminous correspondence in the Dorothy Thompson files at the Syracuse University Libraries has thus far yielded no specific instance of her confiding to friends or associates exactly why she had this sudden change of mind in 1946. She did not reflect it in her conversations or conduct in Palestine in 1945 when she visited Jerusalem on VE-Day and seemed to be as excited and moved by the feats and progress of her Jewish friends in Palestine as on previous visits. In later years some people traced the change to her having married a Sudeten German, Maxim Kopf, who, it was often conjectured, might have altered her thinking in anti-Jewish ways. Such supposition is, however, at best or at worst purely hypothetical. Her generous support of Jewish refugees over many years and her consistent custom of contributing every speaking fee from Zionist sources to the alleviation of the plight of Jewish refugees would lead one to other, more praiseworthy conclusions.

Perhaps some insight may be gained from Dorothy Thompson's own words in a speech, "Israel, Judaism, and the American Jew," delivered to the Philadelphia chapter of the anti-Zionist American Council for Judaism at the Hotel Warwick on November 1, 1949. After arguing in most of her speech that Zionism was anti-American and anti-Enlightenment in its denial of assimilation and its adherence to foreign nationalism, Thompson shared her horror at some of the events that had transpired in the founding of the Jewish state and her astonishment at the opposition she received for voicing her dismay. She stated:

In addition to this fear being engendered among Jews [of a horrible American pogrom] there is another tendency equally dangerous as it affects non-Jews, and that is to equate anti-Zionism with anti-Semitism. This really amounts to making anti-Semites by appointment out of everybody who either does not believe in Zionism, or who criticizes any phase of Zionist and Israel policy and I speak from very unhappy experience—we are in a frame of mind and a condition of affairs in this country, where to make any criticism of any policy or party in Israel is equated, by Zionist leaders and apologists, with anti-Semitism, with, as a result, a highly strained and by no means healthy condition in the press. I thought, for instance, that the assassination of Count Folke Bernadotte and his aide, was a terrible thing; I also thought that the failure of the Israel government to apprehend the culprit was shameful; I also thought that the immense reception, accorded to the Irgunist leader Beigin [Menahem Begin] in New York, was out of place, for I do not feel friendly to terrorists and wild chauvinists whatever their race, nation, or party. I made these criticisms in good faith, but also, as I learned, in most naive innocence, for by making them, I called down upon my head a campaign of vilification such as had seldom been my lot to endure; a huge letter-writing campaign to newspapers, for instance, demanding that my column be dropped, and charging me, of all things, with being an anti-Semite, as though being anti-Irgun or anti-the Stern group was synonymous with being against all Jews everywhere. One of my editors admonished me, “For God’s sake, Dorothy, lay off *the Jews!*” When I protested that I had never been on the Jews but had confined myself entirely to the actions of a specific group and party in a specific instance, as throughout my public life I had thousands of times criticized specific measures and actions taken by states and parties within states, he said, “Well, you may as well learn that Israel and Zionism are sacrosanct; lay off the question, or praise everything; or you will have your throat cut”—whereupon he launched into the most terrific blast of anti-Semitism I have ever heard from a civilized American.

Dorothy Thompson concluded her speech by claiming that she had candidly shared her experience in “the ardent and absolutely sincere hope that Israel will flourish” and in a spirit “uttered by one who far from rejecting the American Jews, and far from rejecting the State of Israel, wants to see American Jews wholly American, free and equal members of the American nation they have dreamed of.”

To many of Dorothy Thompson’s supporters and friends her reversal was sad and disillusioning, leaving a host of them deeply disappointed. She had been such a source of strength and courage for literally millions of people for so many years that her change of mind, in their estimation, was so radical, so pronounced, so bitter at times, so totally unexpected, and so out of character with her former views, that it was as though she had become mentally unbalanced—not, it would appear, such an unkind or unwarranted conjecture.¹⁷

Pierre van Paassen

When her good friend of the Viennese years (the 1920s and 1930s), Vincent Sheean, wrote his saga, *Personal History* (1934), as a roving correspondent, he attained best-seller fame and gathered as well considerable royalties and high fees on the lecture circuit. Sheean devoted a scathing chapter, "Holy Land" (pp. 333-355), to the Zionists in general and the Palestinian Jews in particular, laying the blame on them for the riots at the Wailing Wall in 1929.

These charges were refuted by Pierre van Paassen in his highly acclaimed, widely read *Days of Our Years*, published in 1939.¹⁸ Van Paassen's flamboyant but fascinating journal of a foreign correspondent went through a number of editions; and he, too, became the rage of lecture platforms. In a number of additional books which he turned out on much the same pattern, with tales of Holland, Europe, and far-off lands, and with adventures almost beyond belief, he still pleaded the Zionist cause.

Van Paassen was before anything else a Christian adherent of the Zionist movement, unashamedly, avowedly, and eloquently so. In the 1940s he was probably as well known on behalf of Zionism as any spokesman, Jewish or Christian; but soon his undependability, his drinking habits, his mercurial allegiance to the Revisionists and off-again, on-again positions in their non-Jewish organization ranks, and the repetition of his themes in the swiftly appearing books began to diminish his effectiveness. When people, after Dorothy Thompson's fall from grace and after her death in 1961, looked to van Paassen for guidance and support, they found none. His books no longer attracted readers, and he had nothing new or original to say. His repetitious themes and the lack of scholarship disturbed many, both Christians and Jews, especially now that he had become an ordained Unitarian minister, seeking recognition primarily on that clerical score and his Zionism, coupled with a mystical One World dream where the Soviet Union had only the highest and noblest of intentions.¹⁹

John Haynes Holmes

A minister with considerably more power, credibility, and integrity, whose background was also Unitarian but who proudly called himself

an "Independent," was the great John Haynes Holmes, minister of New York's Community Church, who outlived van Paassen by three years and died at eighty-four in 1964. Yet he did little in his latter years on behalf of Zionism and Israel, except to recall with nostalgia and delight his memorable visit to Palestine in 1929 as a guest of Judah Magnes, Henrietta Szold, and Hans Kohn (then of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem). After his adventurous trip to the Middle East Holmes published a lucid, impassioned book, *Palestine: Today and Tomorrow—A Gentile's View of Zionism* (1929). He had total admiration for Judah L. Magnes and gave his allegiance to the bi-national viewpoint of the Jewish-Arab state as proposed by Magnes, Martin Buber, Ernst Simon, and Hugo Bergman and their Ihud group. Nevertheless, this visionary dream and his own brand of absolute pacifism were rendered irrelevant by Israel's establishment in 1948. Like many liberal Christian ministers, especially those with convictions of absolute pacifism, John Haynes Holmes limited his observations to deploring Israel's having founded a political state; he refused to accept the premise that without such a state the Israelis would be annihilated by their neighbors. He consistently viewed David Ben-Gurion as a "trouble maker" and yearned for the kind of leadership he felt Judah Magnes had given the Hebrew University and the people of Israel. Holmes always questioned his visitors who had been to Israel: "Do they [the Israelis] really appreciate what Magnes meant to them and did for them and ultimately will leave them as legacies of peace and light?" He reluctantly but understandingly forgave Magnes's defection from pacifism at the beginning of World War II and at the outset of hostilities between Arab and Jew in the War for Independence in 1948. John Haynes Holmes had made his greatest contribution in 1929; and his many friends and disciples who were supporters of Israel were willing to let his name abide with honor for that work.

Reinhold Niebuhr

During Holmes's absence in Palestine in 1929, he invited a newcomer to New York City, Reinhold Niebuhr, to serve as guest preacher at Community Church for six successive Sundays. Niebuhr had just arrived at Union Theological Seminary to join the faculty as the William E. Dodge Professor of Applied Christianity. He was already commit-

ted to a Zionist approach to Palestine's ultimate settlement and had spoken to that effect in his former Detroit parish. He had also written sympathetically about the Jews in his regular Saturday night column in the *Detroit News*. His strictures against assimilation appeared often in *World Tomorrow*, the *Christian Century*, the *New Leader*, and the *Messenger* (Evangelical Synod), and he had a special aversion to the admonitions and pieties of those who advocated "brotherhood" in all-too-easy language, as in the newly founded National Conference of Jews and Christians (as it was then called).

By the early 1930s, Reinhold Niebuhr was fully aware of the problems German Jewry faced and, with such articles as "Germany Must Be Told!" in a May 1933 issue of the *Christian Century*, pointed to Palestine as a refuge for Jews fleeing Hitler's sadism. In an historic and stirring address in 1938, before a national convention of Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization, he deplored the moral bankruptcy of the Munich settlement of 1938 and its "Evil Pact"; and then he turned to Palestine and spoke of the time, energy, and treasure invested in the national homeland and the necessity of not letting it fail.²⁰

Professor Niebuhr warned repeatedly in the 1940s about the inequities of the 1939 British White Paper limiting immigration to Palestine and cutting it off entirely in March 1944. His membership in the American Palestine Committee from the early 1930s and his leadership in founding the Christian Council on Palestine in 1942 reflected his keen interest in that country's Zionist beginnings. In New York City he had a steady stream of visitors coming to his study to discuss a Jewish national home. He had many friends in Jerusalem and in London, including such well-known people as Kurt Blumenfeld from Berlin, later Jerusalem, and Isaiah Berlin (later "Sir Isaiah") of Oxford and London. Niebuhr kept in touch with American Zionists for whom he spoke frequently. He was especially well known for two articles, "Jews After the War," in the *Nation* in February 1942, when, to the consternation of his many "liberal" and socialist friends, he wrote on behalf of Zionism in a carefully reasoned plea. In those two essays Niebuhr insisted on the right of Jews to live anywhere in the world they chose but at the same time to have the right to express their unique heritage with a national homeland. He particularly wanted to have the Jewish people recognized for their genius in their culture, their religion, and their contribution to the history of mankind. The

Nation articles created a great furor in the early 1940s and were widely distributed for many years thereafter.²¹

While Niebuhr's pro-Zionism is probably best known from these articles, he wrote on the subject throughout his entire career. The magazine he founded in 1941, *Christianity and Crisis*, also carried important articles on anti-Semitism, the Holocaust, and Arab-Jewish tensions in the 1940s. Henry A. Atkinson's pro-Zionist article, "The 'Jewish Problem' Is a Christian Problem," appeared in the June 28, 1943 issue and stirred up such a lively debate in the pages of the journal that it was clear great divisions prevailed within Christendom concerning a Jewish national homeland. The debate never ceased. The editorial board of *Christianity and Crisis* was composed of some foremost Protestant leaders and was hopelessly divided on this issue for the next four decades. It became increasingly pro-Arab in spite of Niebuhr, its pro-Zionist founder.

Bayard Dodge

When Bayard Dodge, president of Beirut University, contributed the pro-Arab article "Peace or War in Palestine" in the March 15, 1948 issue of *Christianity and Crisis*, he unequivocally opposed the U.N. Partition Plan. He warned that "not only well meaning Christian leaders, but even the highest executives in Washington . . . did not take seriously the warnings of missionaries, as well as of the experts of the Department of State and the Army Intelligence" that the Arabs would not accept Partition. Among other concerns, Dodge feared, "If American Christians insist upon sending large numbers of Jewish immigrants to Palestine, it will wreck much of the work which missionaries have carried on for a century, among the Oriental Christians and Moslems of the Southern Near East." Insisting that "Arab progress depends much more upon American industry and philanthropy, than it does on Jewish example," he denigrated the Jewish benefits to Arabs, asserting that "our Protestant and Catholic missions and our non-sectarian colleges are developing leaders with the spiritual strength to demand integrity, toleration, and public service."²²

Bayard Dodge was satisfied he had "been assured by competent Arab leaders that they are willing to accept some sort of a federal state

[of Arabs and Jews in Palestine], provided it can be conducted according to the regularly established principles of democratic government, with respect for human rights." "Although they [the Arabs] will insist upon limiting immigration," he added, "they will respect the rights of the Jewish cantons, so that they can form the sort of spiritual cultural 'National Home' which the non-Zionist Jews have asked for." The Christian missionary and university president concluded piously: "The Seers of old prophesied a return to Mount Zion. But let us leave it to the Divine Providence to carry out his purposes, without human interference and bloodshed. For one greater than the Prophets has said: 'Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the Sons of God.' "

In a three-paragraph "Editor's Note" which followed President Dodge's article, Reinhold Niebuhr emphasized that Bayard Dodge had been asked by the editorial board of *Christianity and Crisis* "to give his impressions and convictions on the Palestine situation." Niebuhr underscored the fact that Dodge's position "accurately reflects the prevailing opinion in the missionary movement of the Middle East." Acknowledging the fact that "so many men of good will take completely contradictory views of the situation," Professor Niebuhr reminded Dodge (and the readers of *Christianity and Crisis*) that "the bi-national state was found unacceptable by the United Nations, primarily because the Arabs were unwilling to grant the Jews any freedom of immigration in such a bi-national state." Niebuhr concluded:

It must also be observed that the proposal to resubmit the question to the United Nations [as Dodge had urged in his article] is fraught with the gravest perils. Responsible observers, close to the situation, express the fear that such a policy may completely destroy the United Nations because there is little prospect that an agreement could be reached on any alternative proposal, thus making confusion worse confounded.

In one fell swoop, Reinhold Niebuhr had rendered Bayard Dodge's entire article of little effect. Other articles critical of Israel continued to appear in the pages of *Christianity and Crisis* during the 1950s and 1960s, but Niebuhr remained committed to the Jewish state.

Of those who commanded the respect and possessed the credentials of a Reinhold Niebuhr, one of the most redoubtable opponents of Zionism was William Ernest Hocking, Alford Professor of Philosophy at Harvard University. A prominent Christian layman and missionary statesman, foremost philosophical idealist in the Josiah Royce tradition, Hocking began the second decade of the century as a convinced Zionist,²³ and an admirer of Arthur James Balfour²⁴ and the Balfour Declaration.

Traveling widely as chairman of the Laymen's Inquiry on Foreign Missions, Hocking became progressively anti-Zionist during the late 1920s. By the 1930s he was on the attack against the claims and hopes of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine, proposing a "three-faiths land" which would be sacred to Jew, Moslem, and Christian, as World War II brought America into its areas of concerns and theatres of action. Professor Hocking became increasingly disturbed with Jewish aspirations, especially as Nazi persecution of the Jews highlighted the need for at least one place where Jews might be welcome while the world closed its doors everywhere to Jewish refugees. Articles and public addresses, including views presented in radio debates, so hardened Hocking's opposition that by the late 1940s he was one of the foremost anti-Zionists in the academic world of the United States.

Yoking himself in implacable support of the aims of Kermit Roosevelt, Virginia Gildersleeve, Garland Evans Hopkins, Bayard Dodge, the oil companies, and the missionary movement in general, William Ernest Hocking was among those instrumental in encouraging and forming the American Friends of the Middle East (1951). Entirely sympathetic to anti-Zionist Rabbi Elmer Berger and his American Council for Judaism, Hocking tried persistently but unsuccessfully to win over Reinhold Niebuhr and Harvard's political scientist, Carl J. Friedrich, to Christian opposition to the Jewish state. While friends and intellectual giants did not succumb to Hocking's entreaties, other Ivy League men and women were quite impressed.

On June 12, 1951, William Ernest Hocking wrote to the *New York Times* (published June 18) criticizing grants-in-aid to Israel as urged by distinguished signatories to an appeal by the *Nation* Associates. He emphasized that those who viewed Israel as "a natural ally" in the

Middle East might “inflame the already explosive situation against every American interest” and were “inviting 150 million people [the Arab world] to seek their political friendships elsewhere.” Slapping at the Jewish community, he asserted that the Arabs “had no apprenticeship in Europe and no fabulously wealthy American community to draw upon,” an imbalance that was “the American duty . . . to rectify.” He concluded:

As an American taxpayer I feel a profound resentment at the thought of being called on to support not democracy in the East, but the self-interest aims of a state willing to create for itself an environment seething with potential hostilities, whose consequences we shall have to share just to the extent that we abet Israel. We can safely lend our support to Israel only when we can make it clear to all, including the Arabs, that we are not supporting Israel against the Arabs.

Three months later his article “Is Israel a Natural Ally?” appeared in the influential *Christian Century* (September 19, 1951). In this short essay Hocking reiterated his opposition to government aid to Israel, noting that “the Zionists have developed a propaganda of contempt for Arab culture, character, and prospects” that had biased American Christians as well as the government of the United States. “In brief,” he concluded, “anti-Arab policies are un-American policies. . . . It would be read in Arab lands as a reward of [Israeli] aggression—as in fact it would be.”²⁵

The depth of William Ernest Hocking’s animosity toward the State of Israel is perhaps most telling in a 1958 article that he wrote for the (then) right-wing *American Mercury*. The anti-Jewish extremist magazine (Russell Maguire, its wealthy board chairman and publisher, in 1952 had purchased copies of John Beatt’s anti-Semitic book, *The Iron Curtain Over America*, for his friends) billed Dr. Hocking as a scholar who exposed the machinations of the “Zionist tacticians—with London and Washington cooperation” and who “foresaw today’s events in 1932.”

Criticizing American support for Israel, Hocking asserted that “at a stroke we made ourselves seem sponsors and protectors of a regime in Palestine which had in effect renounced its birth-duty to the Palestinian Arabs; we became underwriters of the abstract logic of the Zionist hope, fundamentalist and totalitarian in character.” He referred to the “self-declared State of Israel” and insisted that when

“Egypt, sensing danger, attacked Israel, and went down in defeat,” Israel took the opportunity to clean house, “ridding the new state of embarrassing Arab citizens.”

“Who cares?” Hocking contended emotionally. “Not Israel! Israel has arrived; it is, Israel thinks, *fait accompli*.”

“But only the blind can suppose that under these conditions we have reached the end of the story,” Hocking declared, insisting, “nor can the crazy armistice line be accepted as a permanent barrier to the unity of a land which was once called holy.” The emeritus professor of Harvard concluded:

The first step toward sanity would seem to be a confession by Israel that the ideal of a national home, expressing the soul of the Jewish people, is not realizable under human conditions; that the use of force and corrupt pressures whether in the Middle East or in Washington to achieve the impossible must be discontinued; and that the flag of a religious fundamentalism alien to the present spirit of Israel will no longer be used to cover a crude political realism. With this easing of the logical absolute, the way for human goodwill would be open, and the existing impossibles could begin to melt. I am not expecting this confession to be forthcoming; but its definition may work, in the silent places of men’s thought where, after all, the forces of history were made.²⁶

That these statements were written a decade before Israel obtained the West Bank, Gaza Strip, and East Jerusalem in the Arab-initiated Six-Day War of 1967, underscores the unacceptability of a sovereign Jewish state in the mind of liberal Christians of the Hocking mold.

Fundamentalist-Evangelicals

The biblically and prophetically minded Fundamentalist-Evangelicals were quite a contrast to the liberal Hocking or the anti-Semitic right-wing extremists. While acknowledging imperfection in the State of Israel and the plight of the Middle East milieu, the bottom line for Fundamentalist-Evangelicals was the Jewish right to the Land. Hocking had stated in the *American Mercury*: “Nor can any will of God be appealed to to sanction the present situation.” Much to the contrary, Fundamentalist-Evangelicals concurred with the early sentences of Blackstone’s Petition of 1891, i.e., “According to God’s distribution of nations [Palestine] is their [the Jewish people’s] home, an inalienable possession, from which they were expelled by force. . . . Let us

now restore them to the land of which they were so cruelly despoiled by our Roman ancestors.”

Whereas Dorothy Thompson was devastated by attacks against the British and by the assassination of Count Bernadotte, conservative evangelical news analyst Gabriel Courier wrote in his column in the *Christian Herald* (November 1948):

So they shot Count Bernadotte. They shot *at* him before they got him. And when they murdered this man from the U.N., the Stern gang extremists did as much harm to their cause in Israel as they would have done by dropping an atomic bomb on New York. . . .

Let's remember that "the Jews" did *not* do this thing; an irresponsible, lawless, barbarously ignorant Stern gang did it. And when they did it, they may have cut off from their cause the sympathy and resources of millions of friends around the world.

Completely innocent, the leaders of Israel and their cause have suffered a tragic blow . . .

Earlier in June 1948, Courier had ridiculed the United States for not backing the U.N. Plan, concluding: "What then? Do we just hand Palestine over to the Arabs?" Later, in 1949, he gloried in Israel's victory, asserting that "Israel has made the Arab—and the U.N. look foolish. Egypt seems to have lost all stomach for the fight." Of England, Courier questioned: "How can she deal with the Jew when she supported the Arabs?"²⁷

A 1958 survey conducted by Opinion Research Corporation showed that most Protestant clergymen in the United States considered themselves to be either "conservative" (39%), "fundamentalist" (35%), or "neo-orthodox" (12%). Their influence on their parishoners during the 1950s should not be underestimated. Fundamentalist-Evangelical Billy Graham had risen to prominence throughout the world, and Fundamentalist-Evangelical periodicals kept their readers informed on events taking place in the Middle East. For example, up to its merger with *Eternity* magazine in January 1958, *Our Hope* continued to run news about Israel and the Middle East in its "Current Events in the Light of the Bible" section. Through these news reports, conservative Christians were made aware that the Israeli-Arab situation was even more complex and increasingly volatile, as the weeks and months sped by.²⁸

Likewise, Gabriel Courier had been interpreting the news for the *Christian Herald* throughout the 1940s and 1950s. In his "Gabriel

Courier Interprets the News” section he emphasized that the Arab world was in flux and was by no means unified. Violence threatened the Jewish state and world peace at every juncture. In April 1958, in “Furtive Crescent,” Courier wrote of Egypt and Syria’s merger to form the United Arab Republic “with Nasser, of course, as President.” He believed that Nasser could not be satisfied with “one bite,” expecting him to try to link by land Egypt and Syria. “No one felt the calculating gaze of the new Republic more than Jordan (unless it was Israel; Egypt already had ordered the name ‘Israel’ erased from all school maps and replaced by the name ‘Arab Palestine’),” Gabriel Courier reported, noting that King Hussein of Jordan and his second cousin King Faisal II of Iraq had agreed to merge economically, militarily, and diplomatically into an Arab Federation to protect themselves from Egypt and Syria. In coming months, Courier included reports on Lebanon’s request to the United Nations to protect it from Nasser’s United Arab Republic and also on the Israeli-Jordanian frictions.²⁹

Wilbur M. Smith

Prophetically minded Fundamentalist-Evangelicals fully expected the Jewish people to occupy all of Jerusalem. As early as 1950, the Moody Bible Institute, the “West Point” of Fundamentalist-Evangelicalism, offered a correspondence course entitled “World Crises and the Prophetic Scriptures.” The series of twelve lessons was written by a famed professor in their circles, Wilbur M. Smith, who had taught at MBI from 1937 to 1947, at Fuller Theological Seminary from 1947 to 1963, and at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School from 1963 to 1968. Lesson 7 was “The Reestablishment of Israel in Her Own Land,” while Lesson 8 was entitled “At the Center of the Earth—Jerusalem.” To Wilbur Smith, God had not only promised the Jewish people Palestine and worked the miracle of their restored state, but would restore Jerusalem to Jewish control. He wrote:

I am not an alarmist, and I trust through the years I have never attached to any world event a prophetic significance that was not justified; but it seems to me that almost any day or night this prophecy of our Lord could be fulfilled. Already there are more Jews living in Jerusalem than there were Jews living in the whole of Palestine at the dawn of this century. Furthermore, there is a government of a newborn nation in the modern city of Jerusalem—Israel. One hun-

dred feet of no-man's land, some barbed wire fences, and a few machine guns manned by a mere handful of Arabs—these are all that keep the Jews from fully occupying this city and setting up their government there.

“Why the Jews do not go in and take that city, I do not know,” Smith interjected. “They certainly could do it.”

In a series of articles a decade later, “Jerusalem in Prophecy,” Wilbur M. Smith declared that the Balfour Declaration could have meant a great deal to the Jewish people, but Britain never carried out her promises. He viewed the 1948 war quite differently than did William Ernest Hocking and the American Friends of the Middle East. Smith explained that this “war for freedom” by the Jews in Palestine “in an almost miraculous way put to flight the Arabs, for whom the most part were occupying the land, and established the State of Israel—one of the most amazing events of modern history.” Writing in *Moody Monthly* (October 1960), Dr. Smith then made a statement *he* would live to see:

If some morning we should open our newspapers and read that Israel has taken the old city of Jerusalem, *and is able to hold it*, we shall know that the words of our Lord have been fulfilled—and when this takes place, we are at the end of the age of the Gentiles.³⁰

While many other Christians were calling for “internationalization” of the city of Jerusalem, Fundamentalist-Evangelicals believed that the Bible gave it to the Jewish people. These supporters of Israel also believed that the right of Jewish statehood was fair and just, totally in accord with sound protocol.

The Six-Day War

Little wonder then that 1967 found Evangelical periodicals ablaze with eschatological fervor. The Six-Day War and Israel's victory had thrilled these Christians. The October 1967 issue of *Moody Monthly* had a picture of the Wailing Wall on its front cover. This special issue on the Bible and prophecy was captioned: “The Amazing Rise of Israel!” Dr. John F. Walvoord, president of the dispensationalist Dallas Theological Seminary, began his article of the same title with these words:

The recent dramatic victory of Israel over the Arab states electrified the entire world. The stunning impact of this war of only sixty hours on the political scene was not only a great setback for Russian designs in the Middle East, but crushed Arab hopes of destroying Israel. For students of the Bible the most significant aspect of the war lies in the fact that Israel, after 1900 years of exclusion from the capital city, Jerusalem, now possesses this holy place so rich in both history and prophecy.

Emphasizing that Israel had been attacked by Arab nations at its inception, Walvoord related to his readers the great gains Israel had made in reclamation of the Land and progress in agriculture. Other articles on Israel as the depository of divine revelation and Israel in prophecy followed.³¹

Eternity magazine (which had absorbed *Our Hope*) had the caption "Israel Is Here to Stay" on its July 1967 cover, featuring an article by Raymond Cox, "Eyewitness: Israel." The article had been written a few months before the "current violence," but the editors explained that they found it "more timely than ever." With the Arabs stockpiling armaments for an attack on Israel, Cox noted that "many wonder whether Israel can survive a united assault." He himself, however, believed that "this is more a prophetic question than a military question. . . . Israel will survive."³²

William Sanford LaSor

The following issue of *Eternity* was dedicated totally to Evangelical-Jewish relations as well as the Arab-Israeli war and Bible prophecy. The theme was "loving one's neighbor as oneself." The editors had planned to have this special issue more than a year before in cooperation with the American Jewish Committee. And yet, the events of the Six-Day War had to be analyzed. The major article in this issue that concerned itself with the Six-Day War was written by William Sanford LaSor, professor of Old Testament at Fuller Theological Seminary. He clarified that he was "not willing to concede that the State of Israel is to be identified as the Israel described in Holy Scripture," but he was "willing to admit that it seems quite likely that the regathering of the Jews to Palestine, the establishment of the State of Israel, and the almost incredible military successes of Israeli armies against what appeared to be overwhelming odds, are somehow to be related to God's promises."

Admitting that “it is probably true that most Evangelical Christians are more sympathetic to the Israeli than to the Arabic side of the continuing conflict,” LaSor implored Evangelicals not to forget “that a large number of Arabs are Christians” and “a vast number of Arabs are now wanderers on the face of the earth, and they, too, deserve a place to call home.” Interacting and living in the Arab world as well as widely traveling the Middle East, LaSor explained to his Evangelical community that “only one who has lived in the Arab world and has talked intimately with Arabs knows how deep are the wounds caused by the formation of the State of Israel.” He related the extreme difficulty of using the Old Testament with its passages on “Zion” in a Christian service in the Arab world. “If you ask an Arab Christian what solution he has to offer to the present problem,” LaSor noted with all candor, “you will get the same answer you get from a non-Christian Arab: Israel must be effaced, every Jew must be driven into the sea.”³³

Believing that Christians must devote themselves in larger numbers to missionary work among the Arabs, LaSor asserted:

It is my deep conviction that the Christian must be positively impartial in the present situation. By “positively impartial” I do not mean “neutral” or passive. We must have a positive approach and an impartial one. It is possible that the best peace-keeping force in the Middle East would be the State of Israel. The Arabs were unwilling and United Nations unable to keep the peace. If the nations involved would accept such a solution, and if Israel would rise to the occasion, this would result in tremendous benefit and blessing to Lebanon, to Jordan, even to Syria, and perhaps to Egypt. But such a decision is not ours to make.

He concluded by asking Christians to urge Arabs and Jews to “apply the principles of justice and mercy” and to urge “our own governments to act with the same principles, to remember that the safeguarding of human rights for both Arab and Jew is more important than Jewish votes and Arab oil.”³⁴

G. Douglas Young

Fundamentalist-Evangelical G. Douglas Young, director of the American Institute of Holy Land Studies and a former professor at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, took a more solid pro-Israel stance.

Young's article, "Lessons We Can Learn from Judaism," appears in the same issue as LaSor's, declaring: "The very existence of modern Israel loudly proclaims that Judaism has survived two millennia in diaspora and thus it can neither be decadent nor of no interest to God." He insisted that the existence of the new State of Israel "should force every Christian back to St. Paul's mystery, back behind the sins of the early Church so long and so sadly perpetuated, back to the Bible itself where it is clear that God has a continuing interest in Jews."

Young's interest in prophecy was a powerful force in leading him to see Israel for himself, and he traveled there just after the Sinai Campaign of 1956. Totally enamored with what the Israelis had accomplished in spite of a worldwide campaign to annihilate the Jewish state, Dr. G. Douglas Young became a credible witness with the Evangelical community in the United States and Canada to stem anti-Israel rhetoric. In Jerusalem in 1958, he founded the Institute of Holy Land Studies, where Evangelical students and faculty could learn more about Israel. In 1963, he and his wife, Georgina, moved to Israel, spending the next seventeen years actively involved in the everyday life of the Jerusalem community. During the Six-Day War in 1967, Dr. Young drove an ambulance through the bombed areas of Jerusalem, and his wife provided for as many neighbors and visiting soldiers as she could feed and shelter at the Institute. The people of Israel reciprocated his love by appointing him to civic and municipal commissions, awarding him the Israel Pilgrim Medal and, later, Jerusalem's highest honor, the title "Worthy of Jerusalem." Young's *A Dispatch from Jerusalem* brought news from Israel to the American Christian community; and his organization, Bridges for Peace, still exists today. When he died of a heart attack in May 1980, he was buried on the crest of Mount Zion after a stirring memorial service in the St. Andrew's Scottish church.

Young's love for Israel and for the Jewish people was indicative of the broad segment of Evangelical Christians to whom Professor LaSor had alluded. In the article "The Feel for Jerusalem," published in the *Jerusalem Post* (December 24, 1969), Dr. Young had written:

As a Christian I testify to the joys, privileges and freedom in Israel for me, my institution, my students and faculty, the other Christian people, churches and institutions in this dynamically exciting part of the world, where at long last

once again, Jewish energy, creativity and “follow-through” are making the wastes a garden, the desert to blossom, the crooked places straight.

I thrill to see so many of my own faith coming on pilgrimage to see and experience for themselves all that is taking place here. I could only wish that the pilgrim could find the way to stay a little longer to let the real Israel seep into his consciousness and expel the hate, the myths, the false reporting that seems to be getting through the mass media in other parts of the world, both in the secular and in the church press.³⁵

During the 1970s, G. Douglas Young had become increasingly alarmed by the anti-Israel rhetoric infiltrating the Evangelical community. Pro-Arab missionaries, archaeologists, and university professors combined with Arab Christians themselves in an attempt to capture Evangelical Protestantism in the same way that a strong segment of Liberal Protestantism had been captured.

For example, Bert De Vries, an Evangelical professor of history at Calvin College and participant on archaeological excavations in the Middle East, castigated Billy Graham’s film, *His Land*, in the *Reformed Journal* (November 1971). De Vries insisted that Israel had been founded on “Arab land” and declared that the Jews had forfeited their right to the Promised Land long ago through their “unfaithfulness.” By 1975, De Vries announced:

Why then the vehement Israeli reaction to Arafat and the PLO? The PLO call for an end to the state of Israel does not mean the destruction of its Jews, but the destruction of its Jewishness. Arafat proposed to replace Israel with a state in which Muslim, Jew, and Christian will live together in a “democratic, humanistic, and progressive society.”³⁶

When G. Douglas Young’s article “Israel: The Unbroken Line” appeared in *Christianity Today* (October 1978), the Evangelical periodical felt obligated to follow with Elisabeth Elliot’s pro-Arab “Furnace of the Lord” (without telling Young that they were going to provide space for a rejoinder).

“*Christianity Today*”

The scholar who researches the attitudes of American Christians toward Israel is impressed by one striking reality: the same anti-Israel arguments are used decade after decade. Apart from new events and actions taken by Israel, the Arabs, the United Nations, etc., reported in

the media, the basic arguments in 1988 remain the arguments from 1968 (or even 1948!). For instance, *Christianity Today* magazine, founded with the support of Billy Graham and Sun Oil magnate J. Howard Pew to be an Evangelical counterpart to the *Christian Century*, was undergoing intense upheaval during 1967. Editor Carl F. H. Henry had embarked on gaining nationwide Christian respect for the magazine, which included more “balance” on the Middle East than Billy Graham had. During 1967, *Christianity Today* received most of its information on the Arab-Israeli situation from its correspondent, Dwight L. Baker, chairman of the Baptist Convention in Israel. Again, the importance of the missionary movement and its anti-Israel rhetoric must not be underestimated, even in affecting the opinions and stance of Evangelicals. Pastor Baker was concerned that the position of missionaries in Arab nations was becoming “more dangerous” because of the Israeli victory in the Six-Day War. The views of Harry W. Genet, assistant executive secretary of the Arabic Literature Mission in Beirut, were also included in the July 7, 1967 issue, as Genet related that the “slender missionary force in the Arab world” was experiencing “the hardening Arab attitude toward foreigners.”³⁷

The next issue of *Christianity Today* (July 21, 1967) contained a diatribe against Israel by James L. Kelso, a former moderator of the United Presbyterian Church, that was so incendiary the editors labeled his remarks an “interpretative appraisal of the Arab-Jewish conflict.” Next to missionaries, Christian archaeologists (with notable exceptions, such as William Foxwell Albright) had been progenitors of the anti-Israel rhetoric, in both liberal and conservative circles. Kelso also worked with Arabs for forty-one years and had participated in a number of archaeological expeditions in Palestine. He began:

How did Israel respect church property in the fighting a few weeks ago? They shot up the Episcopal cathedral just as they had done in 1948. They smashed down the Episcopal school for boys so their tanks could get through to Arab Jerusalem. The Israelis wrecked and looted the YMCA upon which the Arab refugees had bestowed so much loving handcraft. They wrecked the big Lutheran hospital, even though this hospital was used by the United Nations. The hospital had just added a new children’s center and a new research department. The Lutheran center for cripples also suffered. At Ramallah, a Christian city near Jerusalem, the Episcopal girl’s school was shot up, and some of the girls were killed.

So significant was this third Jewish war against the Arabs that one of the finest missionaries of the Near East called it “perhaps the most serious setback that Christendom has had since the fall of Constantinople in 1453.”³⁸

Dr. Kelso then went on to blame the Balfour Declaration as “the major cause of the three wars whereby the Jews have stolen so much of Palestine from the Arabs who have owned it for centuries.” He expounded upon the Arab refugee problem, the mothers and babies that he saw suffering in the camps “in the bitterly cold winter of 1949–50,” interjecting that “Mary and Christ received better treatment at Bethlehem than the Arab refugees did that winter.”

Missionary and archaeologist came together in a duet of anti-Israel rhetoric in his following statements. The United Presbyterian pastor exclaimed:

A missionary who has worked constantly with Arab refugees through the long years since Israel became a state in 1948 speaks of them as “human sacrifices to political ruthlessness.” It is the most accurate statement I know. Sometimes it was actual human sacrifice, as when 250 Arab men, women, and children were massacred at Deir Yassin, I know that massacre well, for one boy who was fortunate enough to escape that massacre later worked for me on my excavations. There is deep horror about all this history in the fact that great numbers of Christians in the United States applaud Israel’s crimes against Arab Christians and Arab Muslims. How can a Christian applaud the murder of a brother Christian by Zionist Jews? The Arab church is as truly the body of Christ as the American church.

This last question, unfortunately, came to dominate both liberal and conservative Christian propaganda against Israel. Either in blatant denouncement or a secretive whisper, the anti-Israel argument took the form of anti-Jewish thought, i.e., how can you support the non-Christian Jew against your Arab brother?

Some *Christianity Today* readers were appalled at Reverend James L. Kelso’s interpretation, and their edited letters in following issues showed shock and dismay. Elias Newman of Minneapolis wrote of his “chagrin and disillusionment,” while Reverend Harold P. Warren of First Baptist Church in Oak Park, Michigan, emphasized that many of Kelso’s statements “are contrary to the facts as I know them.” Warren’s church was attempting to build a good rapport with the Jewish community in their area, and he believed that “it is time for Christians

to speak out on behalf of Israel and be identified as friends of Israel." In the September 29, 1967 issue, Benad Avital, first secretary of the embassy of Israel in Washington, D.C., responded to Kelso's "emotional charges." The following year, William Culbertson, president of the Moody Bible Institute of Chicago, supported the Jewish restoration to the Land of Israel in an article citing relevant biblical passages. It was followed by James Kelso's fifteen-point response. Again, Kelso began by reminding *Christianity Today's* readers that "10 per cent of the Arab population is Christian."³⁹

Liberal Christians

Christianity Today had been striving since its inception to capture not only the entire spectrum of Evangelicals, but also to affect Christians from all walks and of all theologies. Even the letters to the editor concerning Israel underscore the great diversity in the conservative Christian community regarding Israel. Among liberal Christians, Dr. Henry P. Van Dusen, past president of Union Theological Seminary, deplored the Israeli victory in 1967 as "the most violent, ruthless (and successful) aggression since Hitler's blitzkrieg across Western Europe." He argued that "every square mile of Arab homeland appropriated by Israel, every additional Arab subjugated or driven into exile, will merely exacerbate the smoldering resolve for revenge." The *Christian Century* called for joint administration by Israeli and Jordanian forces, while the National Council of Churches favored an "international presence" to guarantee the holy sites and security.⁴⁰

Reinhold Niebuhr, however, graced the pages of *Christianity and Crisis* (June 26, 1967) with his famous article "David and Goliath." "No simile better fits the war between Israel and the Arabs in lands of biblical memory," the respected theologian began, "than the legend of David and Goliath. David, of course, is little Israel, numbering less than 2.5 million souls. . . . Goliath, of course, is the Arab world under Egyptian President Abdel Nasser's leadership, numbering a population of 20 to 40 million. This Goliath never accepted Israel's existence as a nation or granted it the right of survival." This time, the chairman of the editorial board, John C. Bennett, followed with his "Further Thoughts on the Middle East."

Niebuhr approved of Jerusalem's administrative reunification, asserting that "Judaism presupposes inextricable ties with the land of Israel and the city of David, without which Judaism cannot be truly herself." After his death, the magazine he founded was often unjustly critical of Israel, so much so that his widow, Ursula Niebuhr, has requested *Christianity and Crisis* to withdraw her husband's name from the journal as a "Founding Editor." Nevertheless, disciples of the great theologian, such as Franklin Hamlin Littell and A. Roy Eckardt (with his wife, Alice), have carried the message to the liberal Christian community. Franklin Littell was active first in the American Christian Palestine Committee as a young graduate student fresh out of Yale with his bright new Ph.D. He then became extremely important in successor organizations to the ACPC, including the Christians Concerned for Israel (CCI) and the National Christian Leadership Conference for Israel (NCLCI). The latter included both Fundamentalist-Evangelical and Pentecostal Christians as well as members of the liberal Christian tradition.

On the fortieth anniversary of the liberation of Europe and the rescue of the survivors of the concentration camps, the NCLCI, in a press conference at the Church Center for the United Nations, urged the UN to reconsider "the falsehood promulgated in its 1975 resolution declaring Zionism to be a form of racism" and called on the Christian community to appreciate the centrality and importance of the State of Israel for the Jewish people. The statement, "Forty Years Later: Christians Speak Out on Israel and Zionism," was delivered at the UN in May 1985, and later appeared in newspapers. "We see it as urgent that Christians speak out against the vicious anti-Semitism that hides under the cloak of anti-Zionism," the ad continued. Similar newspaper advertisements have been paid for by Christians for Israel as well as those who oppose Israeli actions.

Roman Catholics

While the signers of the above declaration include "Reverend Franklin H. Littell, President Emeritus," the leading signature is that of Father Edward H. Flannery, president of the NCLCI in 1985. Sister Rose Thering is listed as one of the three vice-presidents of the organization. This underscores the fact that there are a number of eminent American

Catholics who have been supporters of the State of Israel and its right to exist. This is phenomenal when one considers that the Vatican was not only opposed to the establishment of the State of Israel, but has carefully refrained from recognizing the Jewish state. After the Six-Day War in 1967, Pope Paul VI proposed the internationalization of all holy places in Jerusalem. Pope John Paul II stated in 1980 that in the establishment of the State of Israel “a sad condition was created for the Palestinian people who were excluded from their homeland. These are facts that anyone can see.”

On the American scene, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops in 1975 declared that because “Jews see this tie to the land as essential to their Jewishness,” Christians “should strive to understand this link between land and people which Jews have expressed in their writings and worship throughout two millennia as a longing for the homeland, holy Zion.” Nevertheless, this official statement on Catholic-Jewish relations added the caution that this affirmation was not “meant to deny the legitimate rights of other parties in the region, or to adopt any political stance in the controversies over the Middle East, which lie beyond the purview of this statement.” A Roman Catholic theologian, Rosemary Ruether, who has been very active in Christian-Jewish relations, wrote in the *National Catholic Reporter* (September 14, 1984) that Zionism was a “form of nationalism that most Americans regard as unacceptable and, ironically, a Fascist state if settlements continue to be established in the West Bank or annexation takes place.” She concluded that if Israel is to remain a democratic state it must cease to be a Zionist state. Similar diatribes by Ruether appear in the *Christian Century*.⁴¹

Father Edward Flannery deplors such attitudes among Christians—including Catholic Christians. In the essay “Israel, Jerusalem, and the Middle East,” he wrote:

The Middle East (Arab-Israeli) conflict has proven a grave distraction for the Jewish-Christian dialogue and for Jewish-Christian understanding generally. Numerous Christians, unaware of any bias on their part, see the establishment of the State of Israel very simply as a serious injustice inflicted upon the Palestinian Arab population by the Israelis. Through this prism they fail to perceive much significance, historical or theological, in the new state, and direct their attention exclusively to problems of Arab refugees, a Palestinian state, and other socio-political aspects of the problem. The peril in which Israel continuously exists and the problem of its security and survival become in this way

secondary considerations, if they are considered at all. The simplicity and one-sidedness of this approach, for one thing, stems in most cases from inadequate information and uncritical acceptance of Arab or anti-Zionist propaganda. The United Nations can serve as a large-scale sample of this way of approaching the Middle East problem. It is imperative, in any case, for the health and survival of the Jewish-Christian embrace that the misinformation and mythologizing that have engulfed the conflict be dispelled.⁴²

Recognizing that one must not be insensitive to the Palestinian Arab, Father Flannery identified the root problem in the Arab-Israeli conflict as “the refusal of many of Israel’s enemies to accept or respect Israel’s right to live in peace and security.” Answering the question, Is anti-Zionism in its various degrees and forms anti-Semitic?, he answered: “Not necessarily, but almost always.”

Black Christians

The pro-Israel, Fundamentalist-Evangelical biblical and prophetic interpretations made great inroads into the black church in the twentieth century. To these black Christians, the newly formed Jewish state of Israel was part of God’s plan and purpose. Support from the remainder of the black community, however, was slow in developing all through the years from 1948 onward. A number of blacks, prominent in their local communities, often accompanied study tours sponsored by the American Christian Palestine Committee to the Middle East, returning with positive and favorable reports of what they had seen. Many times this occurred because these black leaders encountered immigrants of a darker hue, such as the people from India, the B’nai Zion, and the Falashas from Ethiopia, and heard them report that they had been well received and were being accommodated into the stream of economic and political life in Israel.

Walter White, well-known executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, visited Israel in 1949; and Vernon Jordan, executive vice-president of the National Urban League, visited the land in the 1960s. Both returned with favorable reactions, but neither with startling reports nor with enthusiastic championing of the Zionist achievements. They had other responsibilities on their own civil rights agendas, and these came first.

In May of 1967, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., joined seven other prominent Christian clergymen, including Franklin Littell, Reinhold

Niebuhr, and John Sheerin (editor of the *Catholic World*), in issuing a statement urging all Americans to “support the independence, integrity and freedom of Israel in the current crisis.” The clergymen declared that “men of conscience must not remain silent at this time” and warned that the Egyptian blockade of the Straits of Tiran “may lead to a major conflagration.” Shortly before he was assassinated in 1968, Dr. King made his definitive statement on Israel at a meeting before the Conservative rabbis’ Rabbinical Assembly at Kiamesha Lake, New York. There, the great black leader spoke of Israel as a democratic force in the Middle East, as a creative factor in the life of Jewry, and as a potent force for good Jewish-Christian relations. These assertions he firmly believed and resoundingly affirmed.

The left wing among the civil rights groups, both black and white, was tinctured with anti-Semitism. This directly fostered anti-Zionism, as Israel was often viewed as an imperialist force in the Middle East. Black militants supported the Arab nations in their struggle with Israel, at times condemning Israel as part of a world conspiracy against blacks. Animosity between blacks and Jews resulted in a *Time* magazine cover story (January 31, 1969) entitled “Black vs. Jew: A Tragic Confrontation.” Moderate black leader Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League, criticized *Time*’s “unfortunate, almost irresponsible reporting of the current tensions between the black and Jewish populations.” In a letter published February 14, 1969, Young pointed to the significant positive relationships between the two groups, and “the masses of black people who are obviously not anti-Semitic.”

Indeed, even in regard to Israel, well-known black leaders such as A. Philip Randolph of the AFL-CIO, Bayard Rustin, civil rights activist and publicist, and Whitney Young had given their unqualified support. Their names were among sixty-four black leaders who signed a page-length *New York Times* advertisement, “An Appeal by Black Americans for United States Support to Israel” (June 28, 1970). Christian clergymen, such as Martin Luther King, Sr., Gardner Taylor (past president of the Progressive National Baptist Convention), and William J. Walls (bishop of the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church), joined black publishers, editors, congressmen and women, political and judicial leaders, union representatives, businessmen, and organizational representatives in calling upon the United States to up-

hold the ideals of democracy and social justice in the Middle East by “unequivocally guaranteeing Israel’s security.”

It is an important fact that the opposing *New York Times* advertisement (November 1, 1970), “An Appeal by Black Americans Against United States Support of the Zionist Government of Israel,” was filled with left-wing signatories, but notably lacked black Christian leaders. In fact, Reverend Albert B. Cleage of Detroit’s Shrine of the Black Madonna was the only black Christian clergyman listed—a less than overwhelming sign of Christian support. Loaded with extremist rhetoric, this proclamation began: “We, the Black American signatories of this advertisement are in complete solidarity with our Palestinian brothers and sisters, who, like us, are struggling for self-determination and an end to racist oppression.”

Early in 1975, Manhattan Borough President Percy Sutton took a trip to Africa and Israel, returning with an enthusiastic response. Writing in the nation’s largest black newspaper, the *New York Amsterdam News*, Sutton praised “the genius of a dedicated group of agronomists, technicians and scientists who have turned Israel’s roadsides, mountains and deserts into fertile and productive land.” Later that month, an editorial acknowledged the role of the Jewish people in the civil rights movement, declaring that blacks could not adopt a position of “benign neutrality” when Jews needed support. In April 1975, the Black Americans Supporting Israel Committee (BASIC) was formed.

As there is much debate about the state of black-Jewish relations today, so also there are many questions surrounding black Christian attitudes toward Israel. While Reverend Charles Mims, Jr., Evangelical black pastor of the 1,500-member Tabernacle of Faith Baptist Church in the heart of Los Angeles’ Watts District, is indicative of millions of blacks who are supportive of the Jewish people and of Israel, Reverend Jesse Jackson’s sharp criticism of Israel and uncritical attitudes toward the Palestine Liberation Organization are indicative of a segment of the black community with little compassion toward the Jewish state.

An Overview

Perhaps the complex state of affairs in the black community today only reflects the historic ambivalence that has dominated Christen-

dom as a whole. The World Council of Churches has often uttered expressions of “effective international guarantees” for the territorial integrity and political independence of Israel and the Arab nations, while repeatedly criticizing Israeli policies and calling for “an international presence” over Jerusalem. With so many Christian denominations fearful of losing their missionary agencies and institutions in Arab lands, their animosity toward the Jewish state has steadily increased.⁴³

And forty years of Arab and Christian propaganda have certainly taken their toll. In 1980, the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. endorsed a pro-Arab commission report which stipulated that the Palestine Liberation Organization, with Yasser Arafat as its leader, was the accredited agency of those opposed by Israel. The Middle East agenda of the seventeen-member commission was so biased at its inception that major Jewish organizations, including the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, and the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith, refused to present testimony—the PRO PLO findings were a foregone conclusion. The recent defeat of positive statements on Israel in both the 199th General Assembly of the 3.1 million member Presbyterian Church (USA) and the 1.7 million member United Church of Christ in June 1987 underscores the political ploys, stereotypes and caricatures, and fears of divisiveness over Israel that plague even the best of intentions in Jewish-Christian relations.

Significant in this study is the fact that American Christians were not silent concerning the State of Israel from 1948 to 1988. There are American Christian movements for and against the Jewish state that in fact predate that state. Those who oppose the Jewish state today, however, continue to use the same arguments and comparisons that were formulated forty years—and more—ago. Arguments concerning refugees, internationalization, bi-national and tri-national states, United States “bias” against Arabs and the harm threatening American interests, have changed little. Comparisons of the Israelis to Adolf Hitler and the Nazis, to sophisticated warmongers in a well-armed bastion, to internationally funded parasites, to Arab haters and denigrators, have been used by anti-Israel Christians for four decades. Yet, throughout these years there has been a segment of the American Christian community that has loved and supported Israel. This essay has underscored the conclusion that Israel may well count on a strong

core of Christian supporters in America, but at the same time the Jewish state must never expect justice from American Christendom as a whole.

Carl Hermann Voss and David A. Rausch are co-authors of the recently published *Protestantism: Its Modern Meaning* (Philadelphia, 1987).

Voss is the author of nine books and editor of twelve others. In the early 1940s he was one of the founders of the American Christian Palestine Committee, its first executive director, then chairman of the executive council, and co-editor of *Land Reborn*. A biographer of Stephen S. Wise and John Haynes Holmes, he is also an authority on comparative religion.

Rausch is professor of church history and Judaic studies at Ashland College, Ashland, Ohio. He is the author of nine books, including *Zionism Within Early American Fundamentalism: 1878–1918—A Convergence of Two Traditions* (1980) and *A Legacy of Hatred: Why Christians Must Not Forget the Holocaust* (1984).

Voss and Rausch are now completing a book entitled *They Were Not Silent—American Christians For and Against Israel: 1917 to the Present*. Material from the research for that volume provided the basis for this essay.

Notes

1. Carl Hermann Voss, "The Rise of Social Consciousness in the Congregational Churches: 1865–1942" (doctoral diss., University of Pittsburgh, 1942), pp. 134–136.

2. The high expectations men and women held for the World Organization expected to emerge from the "Great War" of 1914–1918 are apparent in the chronicles of Robert Goldsmith, with a special introduction by President A. Lawrence Lowell, *League to Enforce Peace* (New York, Macmillan, 1917), and Ruhl Jacob Barlett, *The League to Enforce Peace* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1944).

3. The optimism and hopefulness of the pre- and post- World War I years are reflected in the reminiscing pages of Charles Stedman MacFarland's *Pioneers for Peace Through Religion*, based on the records of the Church Peace Union (founded by Andrew Carnegie), 1914–1945 (New York and London: Fleming H. Revell, 1946).

4. Henry A. Atkinson, "William E. Blackstone," *Land Reborn* 6, no. 1 (February–March 1955): 6–7.

5. In the June 23, 1922 issue of the *New Palestine*, Adolph Berle, Sr., wrote a brief article, "The Jew: Barometer of Civilization," describing the Palestine he had recently visited: "I who had set out as a pilgrim and had been captured by the way by interests that appeared to be anything but pilgrim interests, discovered that I had not gone astray when I found myself on the highways and

in the camps with men and women who had come to Palestine with love in their hearts and as day laborers were the purest idealists" (p. 405). Berle, professor of Christian ethics at the Crane School of Religion at Tufts University, looked upon the Jew as "a permanent intellectual and moral asset of mankind, [a great fact which] has made him the natural ally of culture and the development of the intellectual life."

Berle explained further why he looked upon the Jew as "the barometer of civilization": "His mentality, his moral outlook and his cultural tendencies are the concern of the whole world. Wherever he has wended his way, whether in freedom or under persecution, he has proven himself an indestructible force. The great question for the world is whether this great force shall be dissipated and lost, be driven into a war on existing social systems and other cultures, or given the opportunity and furnished the place and occasion to develop the highest and finest capabilities of which it is possible."

Berle clinched his argument by pointing to "this which makes the Homeland quest of the Jews of such importance to the rest of the world" (p. 406).

6. The founding of the Committee for Peace and Justice in the Holy Land is described in the autobiography of Barnard's dean, later president, Virginia Gildersleeve, *Many a Good Crusade* (New York, 1954). Of special interest are the accounts of her support of the Christian educational institutions of the Near East College Association and her activities in the spring of 1945 at the San Francisco Charter Conference for UNO (United Nations Organization), where, as a member of the United States delegation, she cast a baleful influence on any individuals or organizations favoring the Zionist cause. She singled out among the delegates the graduates of the American Universities of Beirut, Aleppo, Cairo, Assuit, Istanbul (Robert College), etc., for briefing sessions and special conferences, never reluctant to manifest her anti-Zionist views. See especially pp. 177 ff. and 400 ff.

7. For a detailed analysis of the premillennial eschatology of the prophetically minded Fundamentalist-Evangelical, cf. David A. Rausch, *Zionist Within Early American Fundamentalism 1878-1918: A Convergence of Two Traditions* (1980). To place this movement in perspective within the larger context of Protestant thought, cf. David A. Rausch and Carl Hermann Voss, *Protestantism: Its Modern Meaning* (1987), where chapters 7 and 8 deal with "Protestant Liberalism" and "Fundamentalism" respectively.

8. "Israel Becomes a Nation Again," *Our Hope* 55 (July 1948): 26-27. On Arno C. Gaebelein, his son Frank E. Gaebelein, and his friend E. Schuyler English, cf. David A. Rausch, *Arno C. Gaebelein, 1861-1945* (1983). The excerpt also states: "Ten days later (as we write), it is evident that this small state has been launched in stormy waters. Regular military units of the Arab states are attacking on many sides, crying out: 'We are ready to die for Allah!' while well-equipped Jewish forces, called 'Haganah,' are defending their strongholds with steadfast zeal and this word on their lips: 'We are ready on every front!' " Of Russia, it continues: "The U.S.S.R. has recognized Israel as a sovereign state, thus performing another of her many enigmatic operations—for on the one hand, Communist-controlled Czechoslovakia, through the firm of Skoda, has accepted orders from Syria for arms, totalling \$24,000,000, while on the other, Russia is financing the Stern Gang in Palestine. In backing both sides the Kremlin, no doubt, expects to create chaos upon chaos."

9. "Pronunciation," *Our Hope* 55 (July 1948): 27. This editorial explained: "There is some confusion about the pronunciation of Israelis. Dr. Wilford Funk says that all the vowels should be short, the pronunciation appearing to be 'Iz-ri-uhl-iz,' with the accent on the last syllable. But Rabbi Isidor Hoffman, counselor to students at Columbia University, submits that in Hebrew the pronunciation would be 'Is-ray-el-ees,' the last syllable being accented. Both experts suggest that since the word is a new one, coined by the State of Israel, it is up to its Government to announce

an official pronunciation. So, in the meantime, take your choice. You are as much an authority as the next person."

10. "Dr. Poling Answers Your Questions," *Christian Herald* 70 (October 1947): 4. Cf. Poling's columns in the July 1947 issue (p. 4) and the June 1948 issue (p. 5). In this latter issue, Poling expounds: "CHRISTIAN HERALD is inter-denominational and undenominational. Its managing editor is a Methodist, its publisher a Presbyterian. Practically every Protestant Evangelical denomination is represented on its roster, and all races and colors as well." Dr. Daniel A. Poling was also treasurer for the Children's Memorial Forest in Palestine; cf. Joyce Van Patten and Richard Tyler, "Children's Memorial Forest in Palestine," *Christian Herald* 70 (August 1947): 32.

11. See Carl Hermann Voss, "The American Christian Palestine Committee," in *Essays in American Zionism 1917-1948*, edited by Melvin I. Urofsky, *Herzl Year Book*, vol. 8 (1978), pp. 242-262.

It was difficult to structure a definite, consistent program, except to stir public opinion and carry on as broad and specific an educational project as possible, especially through pamphlets and booklets, radio debates and public forums. We had to rely on letters to the editor and petitions to Congress, protests to the State Department and pressure on the American Delegation to the United Nations, especially in the final months from the August 1947 Report of the Special Committee on Palestine through the adoption of partition by the General Assembly in late November, 1947, on to the incredible reconstitution of the Third Jewish Commonwealth on May 14, 1948. Christians did play a part but not as significantly or as definitively as they should have. . . . Despite the uncertainty and timidity of many Christians, however, there was indeed a Christian voice; and it was expressed, though imperfectly and often ineffectually, by the American Christian Palestine Committee. (pp. 261-262).

12. In a book unfortunately marred by inaccuracies and omissions, *American Protestantism and a Jewish State* (1973), Hertzell Fishman deals in a scholarly way with the origin and purposes of the American Friends of the Middle East. He documents definitely and precisely the matter of the CIA sponsorship and financing of AFME.

13. Dorothy Thompson's articles of the 1930s included "Refugees: A World Problem" (*Foreign Affairs*, April 1938); "Nazi Rule of Terror Described" (*Pro-Palestine Herald*, 1933); and "The White Paper on Palestine" (*New York Herald-Tribune*, May 19, 1939); and in the early 1940s, she was writing for her *Herald Tribune* and syndicated audiences on such topics as "American Opinion Denounces Land Regulations in Palestine: Blood and Soil Under the Union Jack" (March 1, 1940); "The Future of the Jews" (National Conference on Palestine, Philadelphia, Pa., 1943); "The Jews Are a People" (*Our Voice*, May 1, 1943); "I Speak As a Christian" (Balfour Day, November 2, 1943, New York City); "To Whom Does the Earth Belong?" (Madison Square Garden, New York City, March 21, 1944 and *Jewish Frontier*); "There Is Only One Answer" (*Palestine*, American Zionist Emergency Council, November 1942); "The Jews in the Family of Nations" (Jewish Agency Publications, 1943-44); "Let the Promise Be Fulfilled: A Christian View of Palestine" (*New Palestine*, December 1944); "I Speak Again As a Christian" (January 1945, American Christian Palestine Committee, St. Louis, Mo., ACPD Reprint); and "Why the Zionists Are Right" (February 1945, *Palestine*, American Zionist Emergency Council).

14. By the summer of 1946 Dorothy Thompson had begun to change her viewpoint, and her pro-Zionism abated, giving way to anti-Zionism with increasing intensity until by 1948-49 she was quite anti-Israel.

15. Ronald Steel, *Walter Lippmann and the American Century* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1980), esp. pp. 186–195, 330–336, 372–390.

16. A sympathetic, accurate, but somewhat limited biography, *Dorothy Thompson: A Legend in Her Time* by Marion K. Sanders (1973), gives no clue to the mystery of her sudden, inexplicable change of mind in 1946. Her July 9, 1946 column in the *New York Post*, “The Palestine Tragedy,” was the first indication of her altered views; in subsequent weeks and months she focused her attacks on “Jewish acts of terrorism” and “Zionist zealotry.” By 1952 her distinguished journalistic career began to wane; her influence declined; she died in 1961.

17. Dr. Abram Leon Sachar, founder and first president, later chancellor, of Brandeis University, wrote to Carl Hermann Voss on January 6, 1988 about his friendship with Dorothy Thompson: “I knew [her] very well when I was at the University of Illinois. In her earlier years as a journalist she was an ardent Zionist; later on she turned bitter against the whole Israeli concept and in your writing about her you will have to handle her as a schizophrenic because the early Dorothy will really be arguing with the later one.”

18. Pierre van Paassen, *Days of Our Years: A Personal Memoir* (1939).

19. In the *Saturday Review* of May 23, 1964, Commentary’s ace correspondent, Hal Lehrman, reviewed van Paassen’s *To Number Our Days: An Autobiography of Pierre van Paassen* (1964), and complained of “journalistic fuzziness,” “rearranged chronologies,” “frequent repetitions of tales of a quarter century earlier,” “doctored anecdotes and interviews,” and “inventions which take over as fact.”

20. Reinhold Niebuhr, “My Sense of Shame,” *Hadassah Newsletter* 19, no. 3 (December 1938): 59–60.

21. “Jews After the War,” *Nation*, vol. 154, Feb. 21, 1942, pp. 214–216; Feb. 28, 1942, pp. 253–255.

22. Bayard Dodge, “Peace or War in Palestine,” *Christianity and Crisis* 8 (March 15, 1948): 17–19. Of the displaced persons, Dodge writes: “The attempt to aid the displaced persons in Europe, by sending them to Palestine, will place the Jews in the outlying districts of Palestine itself as well as the quarter million Jews in the states of the Arab League, in great peril. By trying to help the Jews in Europe, we are likely to subject the Jews in the Near East to persecution and massacre” (p. 27). Dodge notes of Jewish opponents: “At the same time that Christians are trying to overcome prejudice in America by upholding Partition, the American Council for Judaism, the president of the Hebrew University at Jerusalem, and numerous rabbis, are opposing the Zionist policy in Palestine. Many fear that it may produce the same sort of anti-Semitism in America, which it has already caused in England.” He refers to these opponents of Zionism as “Jewish moderates” (p. 28).

Reinhold Niebuhr, “Editor’s Note,” *Christianity and Crisis* 8 (March 15, 1948): 30. Niebuhr notes that “President Dodge rightly points out that the Arab and Jewish states, which would emerge from partition, could not become economically viable if the highest measure of economic cooperation were not achieved, an end which will not be easily attained within the present framework of animosity.”

23. William Ernest Hocking, “The Need of Zionism,” *Maccabean* 15 (1915): 272.

. . . In the future we must recognize and make place in the world for that vital intense creative nationality, the Jewish nationality. We want only that internationalism which preserves nationality. Nationality is fundamental, because it means continuance of experiments in living together.

The life of every nationality as embodied in art, religion, science, and the conduct of life has its root in the soil of its land and, therefore, the whole of humanity is impoverished, when any nation is uprooted and the whole of humanity will be impoverished unless every

strong national stock has a chance to show what is in it and to develop itself in experimental life on its own homeland. The first point then is that Jewish nationality must have a fair chance for national self expression.

That nationality wherever it exists must be an all-round partnership in the things that go to make up a state. Whatever happens to the Jewish people in the future I hope that the expression of their national life will be an all-round expression: . . . In the aspirations in the establishment of a Jewish state that we plead to see to it that the Jewish state is self-protective, that is, that it does its distinctive and adequate part in the maintenance of its own distinctive life. It will mean a great deal to the self-respect of Jewry the world over if the Jewish state established in Palestine is self-protective.

My third point is that the sentiment of Jewish nationality as the sentiment of nationality in all people is profoundly religious. Every nationality has religious roots and should experience its attitude in its own lives, laws, and institutions.

24. William Ernest Hocking, *Congregationalist* August 16, 1917, pp. 202–203: “One of the most versatile minds of his generation [for whom] religion has been the great concern. . . . Much of Mr. Balfour’s power as a religious thinker comes from the fact that he gives masterful expression to the still prevalent quality of common sense, which has not parted company with reverence.”

25. William Ernest Hocking, “Is Israel a ‘Natural Ally’?” *Christian Century* 68 (September 19, 1951): 1072–1074.

26. William Ernest Hocking, “The Time Bomb of the Palestine Fait Accompli,” *American Mercury* 86 (January 1958): 58–59. The entire article runs from page 47–59. The editor’s introduction of Hocking is on page 46. The subtitle is “How and why our State Department lost the respect and alliance of the Arab World for the U.S.”

Ibid., p. 59. The article includes sidebars with quotations from Rabbi Stephen S. Wise on Colonel House’s help in the Wilson administration (p. 50), from a letter of Lord Sydenham to Winston Churchill (p. 51), and Dr. Chaim Weizmann (p. 56). Other sidebars include Sir Mark Sykes stating to Lloyd George on September 2, 1918, “We have . . . Zionist agents scattered all over the world” (p. 52), and a lengthy excerpt from Winston Churchill’s answer to Lord Passfield’s White Paper on Palestine (p. 53). The article is followed by an *American Mercury* news release entitled, “Aid to Israel to be Increased by \$3,525,000 for Educational Cultural, and Scientific Activities under Educational-Exchange Program” (pp. 59–61). Listing forty “Israel Projects” the editors conclude: “The wide variety of projects in Israel being supported with American tax dollars makes one wonder if we have not really set Uncle Sam up as the principal donor to a national community chest in Israel.

27. “Gabriel Courier Interprets the News,” *Christian Herald* 71 (November 1948): 13. Cf. Robert Lindsey’s “Christianity’s Chance in Palestine,” *Christian Herald* 72 (February 1949): 26–28. Lindsey talks of psychological and spiritual “emancipation,” and says that the claims of both the Arabs and the Jews are valid. He believes that partition is the only way.

28. Note for example “Which Group Composes Zionism?” (pp. 220–222) and “The Middle East” (pp. 223 ff.) in “Current Events in the Light of the Bible,” *Our Hope* 64 (October 1957). It is interesting that the last item in the December 1957 issue before the merger deals with religion in Israeli schools. Cf. “Religion in Schools” in the “Current Events in the Light of the Bible” section, *Our Hope* 64 (December 1957): 360–361.

29. “Furtive Crescent” in “Gabriel Courier Interprets the News,” *Christian Herald* 81 (April 1958): 11. Compare “Lebanon” in his July 1958 column (p. 14), and the excerpt “Scopus” explains the “tension point” between Israel and Jordan over the Mount Scopus “enclave” and the intervention of the Israel-Jordan Armistice Commission of the United Nations.

30. Wilbur M. Smith, *World Crises and the Prophetic Scriptures* (1950), p. 171. Smith's statement at the end of his study, i.e., "How strange and yet how remarkable a confirmation of the Holy Scriptures that Israel is re-established and a government is set up in Jerusalem just at this time" (p. 276), is indicative of the Fundamentalist-Evangelical movement throughout the 1950s. It is of interest that Dr. Wilbur Smith recognizes the historic heritage of this prophetic interpretation when he writes on the dedication page: "GRATEFULLY DEDICATED to that noble group of interpreters of the oracles of God, C. I. SCOFIELD, R. A. TORREY, JAMES M. GRAY, A. C. GAEBELEIN who, not slow to believe all that the prophets have said, so clearly foresaw the day in which we are now living, and faithfully proclaimed the Blessed Hope."

Wilbur M. Smith, "Jerusalem in Prophecy," *Moody Monthly* 61 (October 1960): 39-40. Cf. Smith's autobiography, *Before I Forget* (1971).

31. John F. Walvoord, "The Amazing Rise of Israel!," *Moody Monthly* 68 (October 1967): 22-25. A sidebar on pp. 24-25 by Richard Wolff is entitled, "Why Did God Choose Israel?" It underscores the fact that the Bible stresses that God's choice is the Jews and that their covenant with God has not been nullified. Hal Lindsey, the director of Campus Crusade for Christ at UCLA, who would become a millionaire through his book, *The Late Great Planet Earth*, in the 1970s, also has an article entitled "The Pieces Fall Together" (pp. 26-28) in this issue. "For centuries Christians have pondered over the prophetic puzzle," the caption to his article asserts. "Now in this mid-twentieth century they are seeing the pieces fall together."

32. Raymond Cox, "Eyewitness: Israel," *Eternity* 18 (July 1967): 6-8.

33. William Sanford LaSor, "Have the 'Times of the Gentiles' Been Fulfilled?" *Eternity* 18 (August 1967): 32. Cf. the editorial, "Prophetic Overtones in the Middle East," pp. 6 and 7 in the same issue.

34. *Ibid.*, p. 34, "... and above all," LaSor ended, "to equip the nations of the Middle East with instruments of peace instead of weapons of war."

35. G. Douglas Young, "Lessons We Can Learn from Judaism," *Eternity* 18 (August 1967): 22. Dr. Young insisted that the world should awaken to "see the values that God enabled Jews to perpetuate, the values He intends to keep on using." While most conservative Protestants may not yet be clear on this part of Judaism, Dr. Young declared that "it is inescapable to those who live in Israel. . . . In Israel we are being faced with the realization that God has been and remains in Jewry, and that everything points (as Biblical prophecy should lead us to expect) to the time when once again 'the law shall go forth from Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.'" He then listed nine specific values among Jewish people.

Cf. David A. Rausch, "Evangelical Protestant Americans," in *With Eyes Toward Zion—II*, edited by Moshe Davis (1986), pp. 327-329.

This article appeared in a special supplement to the *Jerusalem Post* (December 24, 1969). Some of Dr. Young's letters to the editor of the *Jerusalem Post* include the following: "Al Aksa—A Christian Accuses the Churches" (August 27, 1969); "Fulbright and Middle East Realities" (December 11, 1973, Overseas Edition); "Murdering of Jews" (May 17, 1974); "Misconceptions About Refugee Problem" (September 22, 1970); "The Church and Terror" (January 21, 1973); "Arab Riots" (June 9, 1976). In his letter published October 31, 1975, and titled "Christian Zionists," G. Douglas Young began: "I have been accused of being a Zionist—a Christian Zionist—by some of my coreligionists in Israel and in the administered areas. I would like to take this means of thanking them for this compliment."

36. Bert De Vries, "The Palestinian Issue," *Reformed Journal* 21 (April 1971): 10-11; and "His Land' and History," *Reformed Journal* 21 (November 1971): 13.

37. Note "Mideast: Weighing the Effects," *Christianity Today* 11 (July 7, 1967): 31. Cf. "Middle East Crisis: A Biblical Backdrop," *Christianity Today* 11 (June 9, 1967): 38-40; and

"Jews in Old Jerusalem!—A Historic Re-Entry," *Christianity Today* 11 (June 23, 1967): 37–38. On the magazine's history and turmoil, see Carl F. H. Henry, *Confessions of a Theologian: An Autobiography* (1986).

38. Rev. James L. Kelso's "interpretive appraisal of the Arab-Jewish conflict" follows the special news report of Dr. Dwight L. Baker, "Jerusalem: A Third Temple?" *Christianity Today* 11 (July 21, 1967): 34. The quotation from Kelso is on p. 35.

Ibid., pp. 35–36.

39. "Perspectives on Arab-Israeli Tensions," *Christianity Today* 12 (June 7, 1968): 7. Dr. William Culbertson's views are found on pp. 6 and 8. Before becoming president of Moody Bible Institute, he was bishop of the New York and Philadelphia synod of the Reformed Episcopal Church. A graduate of Temple University and of the Reformed Episcopal Seminary, Culbertson mentioned the Arab refugee problem at the end of his article, his "heart" going out to them. But, in face of the fact that "Israel has incorporated hundreds of thousands of refugees" into its economic and social life, he asks: "Why have not Arab countries (especially those rich in oil) done more to help their own?" (p. 8). Cf. "Letters to the Editor" August 18, 1967 (p. 24) and Benad Avital's letter, September 29, 1967 (pp. 18–19).

40. *Christianity Today* even reports these views in its editorial, "Casting Lots for Jerusalem," 11 (August 18, 1967): 29–30.

41. Father John T. Pawlikowski, professor of social ethics at the Catholic Theological Union in Chicago, singled out Dr. Ruether in his September 1986 address to the delegates of the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA) in Baltimore as one of his colleagues who, while sensitive to the pain suffered by Jews for centuries from anti-Semitism, apparently "considers Zionism roughly equivalent to Fascism." "This reaction by a scholar who has spoken out so strongly against anti-Semitism in all its other forms," Father Pawlikowski underscored, "shows how urgent is the need for a serious, *sustained* and comprehensive conversation between Zionists and Christians." See *Christianity and Zionism: A Necessary Dialogue*, a booklet of speeches sponsored by the Jacob Goodman Institute of ZOA. (1986), pp. 10–14.

42. Father Edward H. Flannery, "Israel, Jerusalem, and the Middle East," in *Twenty Years of Jewish-Catholic Relations*, edited by Eugene J. Fisher, A. James Rudin, and Marc H. Tanenbaum (1986), p. 79. The following quote is on page 82.

43. "A good example of increasing animosity is found in the American Friends Service Committee founded by the Quakers in 1917 to enable conscientious objectors to engage in relief work. By the 1970s, the A.F.S.C.'s hostility toward the State of Israel was amply evidenced resulting in a national conference, 'The New Imperative for Israeli-Palestinian Peace: A Learning and Organizational Conference,' held in Chevy Chase, Maryland in February 1977. Speakers at this conference compared the Israelis to the Nazis, and vowed to organize a nationwide pressure group to oppose Zionist policy. So volatile has been the anti-Zionist rhetoric of the A.F.S.C., that it sometimes appears to be anti-Semitic."