

DEFINING CHRISTIAN PALESTINIANISM: WORDS MATTER

Hans Morten Haugen

Dr. Haugen is a professor in the Faculty of Theology, Diakonia and Leadership at VID Specialized University in Oslo.

Western churches have over the last 10-15 years made repeated calls for a just peace in the Israel-Palestine conflict. This includes adoption of measures referred to as BDS (boycott, divestment, sanctions) and calls to their respective governments to put stronger pressure on Israel to bring an end to the 1967 occupation. Calls to boycott settlement products or divest from companies operating in a settlement, or providing crucial equipment to the Israeli separation barrier — most of it built inside the 1967 borders — have been strongly resented by other Christian actors,¹ who believe these churches are deceiving Israel and revitalizing the anti-Judaism that has been a shameful part of the history of Western churches.

Many of these actors self-identify with Christian Zionism, which some term Biblical Zionism. The latter term has a broader appeal than “Christian” when engaging Jews. For simplicity, the acronym CZ is used in this article to encompass different forms of Christian Zionism, defined by the leading scholar Robert O. Smith as follows:

A politically mobilized strand of Christian fundamentalism committed to preserving Jewish control over all of historic Palestine to ensure the realization of the movement’s own end-time hopes.²

While this definition is useful, not all adherents of Christian Zionism are necessarily fundamentalists. Moreover, a distinction must be made between those basing their support of the modern state of Israel on Biblical end-time prophecies (primarily Ezeckiel, Joel, Daniel and Zechariah) and those basing their support on Biblical texts about land promises for Israelites³ from the first books of the Bible.⁴ Many of those emphasizing the end-time prophecies belong to premillennial dispensationalism,⁵ which has its greatest representation in the United States. Those emphasizing covenantal land promises have their stronghold in Europe, the so-called International Christian Embassy Jerusalem (ICEJ) being the most important actor.⁶ Its media director says that dispensationalism “is based on erroneous interpretations of ... the Bible,”⁷ but he does not acknowledge any associated harmful effects.

There are many reasons to be concerned about the noncompromising position of both the ordinary CZ — who claim that those “dividing the land” will come under God’s judgment⁸ — and the premillennial dispensationalists. Irrespective of how much influence the CZ actors have over U.S. foreign policy, they are at least recognized as important by Benjamin Netanyahu, quoted as saying: “Israel has no better friends in the world than Christian Zionists.”⁹

Hence, there is a wide split within Christianity over the state of Israel. While “official” Israel has chosen to align with CZ actors, it seeks to delegitimize all those, including churches, who are accused of delegitimizing Israel. Even calls for divestment from companies of *any* nationality that are either operating in the illegal settlements or building infrastructure upholding the occupation are considered anti-Semitic. CZ actors have engaged in a two-tiered strategy: first, to criticize the churches making decisions labeled “anti-Israeli” or even “anti-Jewish” or “anti-Semitic”; and second, to stigmatize those Christians and Christian organizations that are said to influence these very churches, purported to represent Christian Palestinianism (CP).

This article attempts to analyze the rhetoric at play between two opposite positions: CZ, a term in general use, including by CZ actors themselves, and CP, a term currently used only by their opponents.¹⁰ The reasons it is of interest to study verbal exchanges between CZ and CP actors through the lens of the term CP are three-fold. First, the term is new and has not been previously researched. Second, it provides an intriguing introduction to the worldviews and strategies of CZ actors. Third, it has fewer inherent prejudices attached to it, as compared to terms like anti-

Semitism, anti-Zionism, anti-Israelism or “replacement” theology,¹¹ the latter closely linked to Christian anti-Judaism. These terms are all applied imprecisely, as will be illustrated.

A brief reflection on ethical considerations in undertaking this analysis is necessary. I have chaired Friends of Sabeel Norway since 2007. *Sabeel*, Arabic for “water source” and “way,” has offices in Jerusalem and Nazareth and “friends” associations in a dozen countries. This has given Sabeel a platform to reach a wide audience in several countries, making it a target for many CZ actors. Sabeel is said to “spearhead the [CP] movement,” with its founder, Naim Ateek, being the “chief architect.”¹² I am critical of many CZ authors’ inaccuracies. For instance, Paul Wilkinson, who labeled CP (see more below),¹³ made strong allegations against the document titled *Kairos Palestine*. Published by 13 influential Palestinian Christian men and women in 2009, it called for an end to the Israeli occupation, labeled a “sin” (kairos is Greek for the “appointed time”). Wilkinson alleges that *Kairos Palestine* includes the following message: “Israel is an apartheid state, guilty of genocide, ethnic cleansing and war crimes, and the state of Israel is a sin against God...” and that “WorldVision is totally against Israel.”¹⁴ While all of these are wrong,¹⁵ it might be that other observations made by Wilkinson or other authors are both accurate and a fruitful basis for further investigations. I seek to relate to the writing of CZ actors critically and without prejudice, even if I myself might be one of those targeted.

THE ORIGIN OF TERMS

The term “Palestinianism” was first used in a publication in chapter 14 (“Palestinianism: The New Eurabian Cult”) of Bat

Yeor's 2005 book *Eurabia: The Euro-Arab Axis*. The authors cited in explaining the emergence of this term are Kenneth Cragg (1913-2012; Anglican bishop of Egypt 1970-74 and Oxford Professor of Theology)¹⁶ and Naim Ateek (b. 1937; Anglican, founder and current chairperson of the Board of Sabeel; originator of the term "morally responsible investments," which inspired BDS).¹⁷ Neither of them uses "Palestinianism." The term is introduced by Yeor to capture the overall message of this "cult," characterized by conferring "a theological value upon Palestinian suffering, ...drummed into the European political conscience through the church institutions, the media and Eurabian networks."¹⁸ Hence, even if theology were relevant and church institutions were identified as central to the emergence of the term "Palestinianism," Yeor did not apply the term *Christian* Palestinianism.

When specifying the means through which Palestinianism had been promoted, Yeor identifies "the traditional Christian demonization of the Jews."¹⁹ She also claims that Palestinianism "provides the moral justification for the elimination of the state of Israel."²⁰ While Yeor refers to several sources, starting with Saint Augustine, her linking of the tragic history of Christian anti-Judaism and the current "justification for the elimination of the state of Israel" fails to convince.

Yeor then introduces Palestinian Liberation Theology (PLT), rightly identifying Naim Ateek as its conceptualizer. Her subsequent description of PLT is less precise, however: "These Christians believe that they would thereby obey God's will by helping to destroy Israel by whatever means."²¹ This is a very inaccurate description of PLT. To quote Sabeel, established by Ateek in 1994,

Our faith teaches that following in the footsteps of Christ means standing for the oppressed, working for justice, and seeking peace-building opportunities, and it challenges us to empower local Christians... [and] to pursue ways of finding answers to ongoing theological questions about the sanctity of life, justice, and peace.²²

This formulation seems to capture the essence of PLT. The emphasis is on following in the footsteps of Jesus and the prophets in calling for repentance and justice. It is true that Sabeel's "vision for the future" is for one state,²³ but this has to come as the result of a long process of building mutual trust and a drastically improved security situation.

PLT is concerned with the universalization of the Christian Gospel and seeks to build on Christ's example. The term "contextual theology" is applied by other Palestinians, but Ateek and Sabeel promote PLT. Their inspiration comes from Biblical stories of liberation and the teachings of Jesus.²⁴ Old Testament stories of land conquest and attacks that can justifiably be termed genocide are downplayed, while God's universal love is highlighted. In short, PLT takes God's universal mission of salvation as its starting point. The term CP, on the other hand, takes the modern state of Israel, and others' attitudes to it, as its starting point.

Melanie Phillips, in her 2006 book *Londonistan: How Britain Is Creating a Terror State Within*, identifies Anglican Palestinian Christians as influencing the Anglican Church. She found an "extreme viciousness" and "monstrous mindset" in the Anglican Church,²⁵ whose 2006 synod decided to divest from "companies profiting from the illegal occupation..."²⁶ Former Anglican Bishop Riah Abu el-

Assal and Naim Ateek were identified, the former for claiming “the right to inherit the [Old Testament] promises” and the latter, whose “influence is immense,” for engaging in a “systematic vilification of the Jewish state.”²⁷

Phillips does not apply the terms Palestinianism or CP, but she has been associated with the latter term.²⁸ Presenting more nuances than Yeor, Phillips accuses Ateek of delegitimizing the state of Israel; yet, when engaging in theology, she contradicts herself. First, she seeks to delegitimize Ateek for writing that there is no theological basis for the modern state of Israel.²⁹ Then she claims the state of Israel “is not based on divine revelations. . . .”³⁰ Phillips’s contribution has been to reinforce a negative image of Palestinian Christians and some specific leaders, *not* to introduce the term CP.

In 2007, Paul Wilkinson’s PhD dissertation was published as a book. In a chapter titled “Christian Palestinianism,” he claims that the term CP was “classified” by him.³¹ Based on the analysis above, I agree. I do not, however, agree with his assertion that “Naim Ateek essentially founded Christian Palestinianism in 1994, when he launched the Palestinian Ecumenical Liberation Theology Center known as Sabeel.”³² He is alleging that PLT and CP are essentially one and the same.

Authors highly critical of Islam have popularized the term CP. While neither Phillips nor Yeor accuses Sabeel of directly promoting Islam, this has been done by others, using terms like “Chrislam.”³³ Jihad Watch has also attacked Sabeel.³⁴ It is noteworthy that this organization, whose purpose is to fight militant Islam, is focusing attention on a Christian organization seeking to mobilize justice-seeking and peace-seeking Christians, Jews and Muslims.

CLARIFYING THE TERM

Christian Palestinianism is a new term that has been presented as “a system of thought that opposes Christian Zionism.”³⁵ It is applied by CZ authors to delegitimize Christians who, according to Paul Wilkinson, share the following eight wide-ranging views, from standard Christian doctrine to fringe positions.³⁶ Only the third, seventh and eighth are both distinct and precise enough to be applied to understanding, assessing and — if necessary — challenging CP:

1. *The Bible is not Jewish, but Christian.*
No one engaged in the struggle for a just peace in Israel and Palestine has ever said anything that can be interpreted as questioning that the Bible was written down by Jews. Hence, there is no basis for such an allegation.
2. *The Church is not a new people, but the new Israel.* The term “Israel” is explained in several of the epistles in the New Testament, for instance Romans 9:6b: “For not all who are descended from Israel are Israel.”³⁷ The New Testament books assert that those believing in Jesus Christ are the chosen people of God or “Israel,” not those with a particular descent. This is conventional theology. Therefore, this position can hardly be so distinctive as to constitute an element in CP.
3. *Among CP actors, the land is not termed Israel, but Palestine.* CP actors support the establishment of a Palestinian state inside the 1967 borders, stressing that this represents only 22 percent of historical Palestine. They have lobbied their governments for recognition of Palestine. While Sabeel has promoted a

two-state solution, it has also expressed the following “vision for the future”: “One state for two nations and three religions.”³⁸ Many protagonists of CZ have a very different terminology. They refer to “Judea and Samaria” and use terms like Arabs or “Palestinians” (with quotation marks). Moreover, standard CZ claims that there has never been an independent Palestinian state and that Jordan is the Palestinian state.³⁹ This has been refuted by international lawyers.⁴⁰

4. *The Holocaust is not remembered, only resented.* The meaning of these two verbs here is unclear. No leading CP actors have expressed views that cast doubt on the Holocaust. Some have, however, presented the Holocaust as effectively being used to “immunize Israel from censure,”⁴¹ while another leading CP advocate, Sabeel founder Naim Ateek, clearly stated in his first book, published in 1989, that Palestinians must acknowledge the Holocaust, as it represents “the only justification ... today for the presence of Israel. ... [The Jews] have suffered for so long. Come share our land. This is God’s land.”⁴² Ateek’s acknowledgement of the Holocaust and general anti-Judaism is not uncommon among CP actors. In the absence of a clearer understanding of what “resent” and “remember” imply, I chose not to pursue this element in the analysis below.
5. *The state of Israel is not prophetic, but illegitimate.* The term “illegitimate” is also difficult to define. If this is about the basis of the state of Israel in international law, no person affiliated with CP will deny that Israel has legal standing in international law — even if it has never defined its physical borders and is there-

fore an abnormal state. Among those having accepted Israel is Naim Ateek.⁴³ If, on the other hand, the perspectives of the CZ actors are the basis, their support for Israel is based on what they consider to be the special divine status of the modern state. This position is not at all shared by CP proponents, who generally agree that Israel was not established by divine intervention and hence understand it as “non-prophetic.” The terms “prophetic” and “illegitimate” simply refer to two different spheres. Making them opposites is only logical if one accepts the CZ perspective of Israel’s having a “prophetic” status. This element is also too lacking in merit to deserve further attention.

6. *Israeli Jews are illegal occupiers.* This element makes sense only if the phrase “living in settlements beyond the 1967 border” is added. If this element is taken at face value without this addition, it must also be dismissed, as it is not an appropriate basis from which to identify the core of CP. Proponents of CP are calling for an end to the occupation as a crucial step in building a just peace but do not consider Israeli Jews living in Israel proper to be illegal occupiers. Whether those Jews currently living beyond the 1967 border who want to live in a possible future Palestinian state should be allowed to do so is a contentious issue.⁴⁴
7. *Biblical prophecies merely represent moral manifestos.* While this term is not clear, it is obvious that CP actors do not see current events in the Middle East as fulfilling prophecies. Nevertheless, those affiliated with CP do not ignore those parts of the Bible that are about land

promises, as illustrated by several chapters in the book from the 2013 Sabeel Conference, including those by Naim Ateek.⁴⁵ Hence, sayings and writings by CP advocates on how to understand the Bible are relevant to include in the analysis below.

8. *Jesus Christ is not Jewish, but Palestinian.* Both Palestinian political leaders and church leaders have referred to Jesus as a Palestinian.⁴⁶ It is relevant to discuss this element below, to elaborate on the basis for this understanding as well as its accuracy.

THREE SUBSTANTIAL ACCUSATIONS

As we have seen, there are serious problems in how CP is defined and applied by its opponents. Their antagonistic approach will, however, be further examined, in order to identify whether there exists a substantial basis for their accusations. The substantiated allegations (“elements”) identified above concerned CP actors talking about Palestine and not Israel, ignoring Biblical prophecies, and identifying Jesus as a Palestinian rather than a Jew.

The accusation that the term Palestine is preferred over Israel is substantial if it implies a lack of acknowledgement of the state of Israel. Both Israeli and Palestinian authorities publish maps that are incorrect, primarily by omitting the so-called 1967 borders or referring to the Green Line based on the 1949 Armistice Agreements. Under no circumstances can it be wrong to refer to Palestine as the historical name that traditionally was used. Moreover, even if the Palestinian Authority does not have unimpeded control over Palestinian territory, borders and airspace, it cannot be considered wrong to apply the term

“(occupied) Palestine” rather than the term “the Palestinian territories.” Neither of these implies a delegitimation of the state of Israel. If one accepts these two facts, no strong CZ allegations against CP have been found. Gary Burge, an Evangelical labeled as representing CP,⁴⁷ has specified that he uses the official names that have been applied in the different periods, such as Judea when describing events taking place in or around Jerusalem at the time of Jesus Christ and the first disciples, and Israel-Palestine for the current situation.⁴⁸

The second substantial accusation, ignoring Biblical prophecies, obviously represents an irreconcilable divide between CZ and CP. It might be somewhat difficult to grasp the core of the CZ position. Wilkinson’s approach is “to acknowledge the sovereign hand of God in Israel’s reestablishment in 1948.”⁴⁹ What exactly this “sovereign hand” did is not explained. A general understanding among CZ proponents is that God made use of the United Nations in the vote for Resolution 181 on November 29, 1947, presumably by affecting how delegates voted. It is general knowledge that, contrary to the advice of the U.S. State Department and the secretary of state, President Truman — known to be an Evangelical — instructed his UN ambassador to vote in favor of the partition and convinced other states to do the same. Moreover, there is a general understanding among essentially all CZ adherents that God has stood with the state of Israel in all subsequent wars, but they do not explicitly explain how God has acted. The general inspiration for this support is certain “blessing and cursing” verses (Genesis 12:3a; Isaiah 60:12a; Psalms 122:6). The “explanation” for the modern state of Israel is allegedly found in Isaiah 66:8b: “Can a country be born in a day...?”

Contrary to these views, CP adherents are convinced that neither theological land promises nor “blessing and cursing” verses directed to Abraham, “Zion” and “Jerusalem” (Genesis 12.3a; Isaiah 60:12a; Psalms 122:6, respectively), can be used in twenty-first-century negotiations or diplomacy. Rather, one must emphasize justice, dignity, nondiscrimination and mutual respect, or at least minimal levels of tolerance when establishing and running states. Hence, the accusation that CP advocates are undermining the theological or divine legitimacy of the modern state of Israel is factually true but, nevertheless, irrelevant. Religious texts cannot serve as a basis for state formation.

Turning to the third substantive accusation, on how Jesus is presented, it is true that Ateek, identified above as having an “immense influence,”⁵⁰ has referred to Jesus as “a Palestinian living under an occupation.”⁵¹ In a long note, Ateek explains his choice by stating that “Palestinian” refers to geography, not ethnicity. He reminds us of the use of the term Palestine by the first-century Jewish historian Josephus, stating that the term Palestine can be used figuratively.⁵² Ateek knew that this terminology would cause protests, and it has.⁵³

The principle of using the official names and correct denominations should generally apply. There was a relatively large Roman province called Judea from 6 to 135 A.D., and a smaller Roman province called Galilee. From 135 to 390, the name of the Roman province was Syria-Palæstina; subsequently Palestine continued to be the name. “Palestine” might have been in general use in the first century, but irrespective of this, Jesus was born, raised and died as a Jew — and carried out his mission among Jews. Hence, to identify

Jesus as a Palestinian is not correct, and it is fully possible to emphasize the fact that Jesus and his disciples lived under occupation while affirming their Jewishness.

ADDITIONAL ACCUSATIONS

Only one of the accusations characterizing CP can be considered reasonable: calling Jesus a Palestinian. These eight are not, however, the only criticisms raised against CP. Additional accusations, primarily directed against Ateek, can be sorted under four general headings: Using Biblical allegories to describe Israel’s policies and Palestinian suffering; justifying Palestinian violence; applying the term “apartheid” to Israel’s policies; and declaring Muslim extremism to be a lesser threat than Christian and Jewish extremism. Note that this list does not include the call for BDS, found initially to be the primary motivation for the increase in criticism against CP after 2005. For each of the accusations, I will first present Ateek’s writings and then analyze them.

First, Ateek used three Biblical allegories in the early 2000s: a 2000 Christmas message (“modern day ‘Herods’ ... in the Israeli government”); a 2001 Easter message (“The Israeli government crucifixion system...”); and a 2001 sermon (“Israel has placed ... Palestinians in a tomb. It is similar to ... Jesus’ tomb”). All of them have been subject to harsh criticism.⁵⁴ These three allegories are allegedly making explicit links between the policies of the state of Israel and attempts to kill Jesus or prevent his resurrection, each representing a “deicide charge.”⁵⁵ Ateek has not directly countered this criticism but responded, “I certainly have never suggested the abhorrent idea that Jews bear collective responsibility for the death of Jesus.”⁵⁶ On the crucifixion, Ateek has

explained that it is a common Christian symbol of suffering and that he will “oppose anyone who abuses it by invoking it against Jews today.”⁵⁷

Ateek’s overall idea seems to be that Biblical allegories will create stronger empathy for Palestinian suffering. And it must be acknowledged that, as a priest seeking to make theology relevant in today’s world, Ateek should be allowed to present allegories that might be eye-openers. However, in view of the long and tragic history of anti-Judaism and its impact on Jewish-Christian relations, and the risk that Christian symbols and allegories might be exploited by uncompromising anti-Semitic actors, there are good reasons to be cautious in using such allegories in reference to the policies of the state of Israel. Ateek carefully distinguishes between Jews and the state of Israel, but some see his profound criticism of Israel’s policies as simply anti-Jewish.⁵⁸ Generally, terms such as “comparable to”⁵⁹ or “similar to” (the tomb allegory) are not wise; all situations are unique. While caution must be exercised when using allegories, this warning does not apply to substantive, specific and well-founded criticism of the policies of the state of Israel or any other political authorities.

The second accusation, justifying Palestinian violence, involves the booklet *Suicide Bombers: What Is Theologically and Morally Wrong with Suicide Bombings? A Palestinian Christian Perspective*, written by Ateek in 2003. He says that suicide bombing must be condemned, as it is not a legitimate form of resistance.⁶⁰ He also writes that, while the Arabic terms *shehada* (to witness) and *shahid* (a witness) originally had the same meaning as the Christian understanding of martyrdom, the term “shahid” has been used to refer to

those dying in the Palestinian struggle.⁶¹ Ateek affirms that, from a Christian perspective, it is never right to kill for God’s sake.⁶² Nevertheless, he makes serious attempts to understand Palestinian suicide bombers: “The suicide bombers have made the supreme sacrifice, the offering of themselves for their faith (in the way they understand God) and for their homeland.”⁶³ The formulation “high esteem for all those who have given their life...” is found in the *Kairos Palestine* document,⁶⁴ where suicide bombers can be understood as “shahid.”

This terminology can be explained in three ways. First, Ateek and the other authors of *Kairos Palestine* are under the influence of the current Islamic understanding of who is a “shahid.” Second, the audience for these messages is primarily Palestinian, a large percentage of whom have been found by the Pew Research Center to support suicide bombings, with only 16 percent saying they can never be justified.⁶⁵ Third, there is simply an inadequate understanding of the harm suicide bombing inflicts on both Israelis and Palestinians — harm to the latter from the retaliation by Israel in response to suicide bombers.⁶⁶ Which of these explanations is the most credible? As all of the authors possess both theological competence and compassion, it seems reasonable to place the heaviest emphasis on the second explanation. The strength of the messages of faith, hope and love are severely compromised by the “given their life” (*Kairos Palestine*) and “supreme sacrifice” (Ateek) formulations.

Third, on the apartheid terminology, Ateek does not employ it frequently⁶⁷ but has used the term “apartheid wall.”⁶⁸ He has, rather, referred to how many South Africans use the term apartheid when

describing the situation in occupied Palestine. Ateek has made use of the Hebrew terms *hafrada* (separation) and *nishool* (dispossession) as appropriate to describe Israeli occupation policies⁶⁹ and has also referred to *hafrada* and *nishool* as “an Israeli form of apartheid.”⁷⁰ In this context, it is relevant to note that an official Israeli name for the separation barrier is *geder hahafrada*. It is reasonable to infer that Ateek uses the term apartheid as an *illustration* of Israel’s policies, and not — as alleged by the Anti-Defamation League of B’nai B’rith — that Ateek has “accused Israel of practicing apartheid...”⁷¹

The definition of apartheid as contained in the 1973 International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid also applies to “similar policies and practices of racial segregation and discrimination ... as practiced in southern Africa” (Article I.1 and II). Nothing in the convention says that apartheid is characterized by a minority segregating and discriminating against a majority, even if this characterized apartheid as practiced is southern Africa. The majority/minority argument is implicit in two former Israeli prime ministers’ approaches on the question of one state versus two states in the context of Israel-Palestine.⁷² There are alternatives to apartheid in describing Israel’s policies — ethnocracy, for instance.⁷³ Non-Jews in Israel experience discrimination in different realms.⁷⁴ Moreover, at least in Jerusalem, Israel still maintains “official guidelines” on the distribution of Jews to non-Jews; initially 72:28;⁷⁵ currently 60:40.⁷⁶ Israel does, however, practice formal equality as regards political rights.⁷⁷

The fourth accusation involves declaring Muslim extremism to be a lesser threat than Christian and Jewish extremism. This

is illustrated in a letter to the former Anglican archbishop of Canterbury:

You singled out the extremist Islamists as a threat to Christian presence, but neglected to mention two other extremists groups, namely, Jewish extremists represented by the religious and racist settlers on the West Bank ... and Christian extremists ... that support Israel blindly and unconditionally. ...[T]he last two groups ... are a greater threat to us than the extremist Islamists.⁷⁸

The former archbishop also used terms “violent extremism” and “extremist atrocities,”⁷⁹ and he talked about terrorism atrocities, while Ateek primarily addressed attitudes and policies, including the “present extreme rightwing Israeli government.”⁸⁰

The two men were essentially talking about different issues. The archbishop could have used the term “religious terrorism,” instead of the term “extremist,” which is an ideological label and should be reserved for opposition to basic elements of democracy.⁸¹ This encompasses inadequate recognition of secular laws or institutions (as contrasted with God-given). It also applies to actions or the facilitating of actions that seek to prevent the enjoyment of political rights to groups of people. Based on this, it seems justified to characterize as extremist both the Jewish settlers who want to take control over more land, irrespective of the consequences, and their Christian supporters and funders.

Turning back to whether Ateek’s “greater threat” formulation can justifiably be criticized, one must take some facts into account. First, neither the archbishop nor Ateek defined extremism, but were addressing different issues. Second, they

focused on different geographical areas (the Middle East versus Israel-Palestine), as the term “us” in Ateek’s response must be understood as Palestinian Christians. Third, this exchange happened in 2011, before the full-scale civil war in Syria and the rise of the so-called Islamic State (IS) and new threats to the security of states and individuals. Thus, while it is fully justified to oppose Zionism and Israel’s occupation policy and warfare tactics as violating the principles of international humanitarian law (proportionality, distinction and military necessity), to claim that Jewish and Christian extremism are “greater threats” than Islamic extremism seems difficult to justify. Current forms of both Christian and Jewish Zionism do, however, impede necessary compromises, and the former, in particular, views violence from an end-time perspective.⁸²

The first, second and fourth accusations discussed above have been substantiated, but the third has not: that Ateek says Israel’s policies are apartheid. In addition, the term does not feature in the *Kairos Palestine* document, despite allegations that it does.⁸³ The terms “apartheid wall,” “Apartheid Paradigm,”⁸⁴ and “an Israeli form of apartheid” do occur in Ateek’s writings.⁸⁵ The Hebrew term “*hafrada*” (separation) has been used by Ateek, but less often since his 2008 book.⁸⁶

Acknowledging the merits of the other three accusations does not imply that Ateek or others should refrain from being prophetic, justice-centered and Bible-centered — rather the opposite, as their writings have inspired and changed the views of many. Moreover, it does not imply that there should be less-specific demands on Israel, the most powerful actor in the conflict but rather the opposite, as Israel has the keys to solving it. Accountability must

also, of course, be demanded of Palestinian authorities and political actors.

IS THE TERM CP USEFUL?

This article has revealed that there is a legitimate basis to challenge CP. The CZ authors have, however, been imprecise in their accusations against CP actors — for instance, how *Kairos Palestine* is presented.⁸⁷ The harshest claim against Ateek is that he is anti-Jewish or anti-Semitic. According to the Anti-Defamation League (ADL):

Harsh and strident criticism [of Israel’s policies] and advocacy does [sic] not constitute anti-Semitism. [...] [E]ven if strident anti-Israel activism is not motivated by anti-Semitism, at times, these campaigns create an environment which makes anti-Semitism more acceptable.⁸⁸

While Ateek has been vocal in calling for BDS,⁸⁹ he promotes a “narrow” BDS, directed against actors of any nationality who undertake activities for Israel and Israeli settlements in occupied Palestine.⁹⁰ Distinguishing between Israel proper and occupied Palestine is termed “differentiation” by the EU, is official EU policy, and represents neither anti-Semitism nor delegitimation/demonization of the state of Israel. Maintaining this position, therefore, cannot be termed illegitimate, even if one disagrees with the policy.

The second accusation, that Ateek is anti-Israeli, also appears. The ADL has listed the Friends of Sabeel North America (FOSNA) among its top 10 “Anti-Israel Groups.”⁹¹ In his 1989 book, Ateek argued that the state of Israel should be maintained, because the alternative would mean too much injustice; however, Israel has to end its occupation of the territo-

ries conquered in the 1967 war.⁹² If one recognizes Israel within its internationally recognized (1967) borders — the only approach compatible with international law — Ateek cannot be said to be anti-Israeli. If, on the other hand, one understands Israel to be an expansionist state promoting gradual conquest through settlements, both Ateek and international law would oppose it.

The third accusation, that Ateek is anti-Zionist, is justified. The problem with the term Zionism, however, is that it has so many diverse meanings. Its conversion from a left-wing, secular ideology to a religiously justified one is remarkable. Ateek does not subscribe to the religious justification for Zionism, as he identifies Zionism with injustice, for which he finds no Biblical basis.⁹³ This position does not imply that Jews do not have a historical, religious, cultural and emotional attachment to the territory between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean Sea.

Hence, all “anti” labeling is problematic. For that reason alone, an alternative term is worth investigating, even if it is developed by one’s opponents. Is the term Christian Palestinianism appropriate? On the face of it, it was developed in opposition to CZ. Since the divides between Christians on the issue of Israel-Palestine are wide in all respects, it is useful to briefly consider CP and CZ in terms of their scope, content and simplicity.

On scope, CP might erroneously indicate that it is a special theology applying to Palestine, while Christian theology is universal. On the other hand, as the Bible is used to justify Israeli expansionism, it is relevant to have a particular theological approach to counter this.⁹⁴ Note also that Palestinian theologians identified in the article would prefer to have the Palestinian

Liberation Theology (PLT) label applied to their position.

On content, in order to adequately describe CP, those actors affiliated with it should be invited to define their position. Such effort will elucidate dimensions other than those presented by Wilkinson, such as the dichotomy between human rights (CP) and divine rights (CZ).

On simplicity, CP is applied as a negative label that might have appeal among CZ actors and other supporters of the modern state of Israel. Their starting point — the modern state of Israel as the alleged fulfillment of biblical prophecy — is so far removed from those who are being criticized (God’s universal love inspiring efforts for a just peace in Palestine-Israel) that it is unlikely the term CP can gain general support.

CONCLUSION

Christian Palestinianism is applied as a negative label by authors with antipathies; some who apply the term identify CP as a new form of anti-Semitism.⁹⁵ Therefore, the CP terminology must be understood as a discourse that seeks to build religious-political alliances with Christian Zionists and other supporters of the modern state of Israel. Moreover, by ascribing contentious and subjective characteristics to those allegedly belonging to CP, its adversaries have robbed the term of its intellectual value.

While this analysis has primarily been done through a CP “lens,” this does not imply that the term CP is valued over the term PLT — rather the opposite. However, in order to investigate the potential as well as the weaknesses of those aligning with a CP worldview, it has been necessary to elaborate in depth on CP perspectives and accusations.

Even if the term CP is not frequently applied in scholarly or popular circles, there are many who adhere to its basic premise: that the modern state of Israel is the starting point for understanding world events, and that one's relationship to this state is decisive for both individual and national destinies. This is simply because God is believed to be behind the establishment and thriving of this modern state, and those who oppose it are allegedly opposing God.⁹⁶

Some of the criticisms from Christian Zionists are valid. Five of the criticisms raised against Naim Ateek were found to be justified: arguing that Jesus is seen as a Palestinian; using Biblical allegories on Israel's policies; indirectly justifying Palestinians' sacrificing themselves; holding Islamic extremism as a lesser threat;

and being anti-Zionist. Ateek is, however, neither anti-Semitic nor anti-Israeli, if the modern state of Israel is understood in secular terms. Rather, he is an advocate of justice who finds inspiration in biblical prophets and the teachings and life of Jesus Christ.

Some of the terminology applied by both *Kairos Palestine* and Ateek can be understood to communicate with a Palestinian audience, and not only with a global (Western) one. I believe Palestinian theologians and churches should be ready to confront Palestinians and any other actors who apply terminology and perspectives that deserve to be confronted, as when murderers are called shahids (martyrs) on Fatah's official Facebook page.⁹⁷ Both religious values and belief in human rights provide adequate justification.

¹ The strongest call from a mainstream church concerning sanctions against the state of Israel came from the Lutheran Church in America at its 2016 General Synod; it asked all members to call for ending U.S. financial and military aid to Israel; see <http://isaiah58.info/resolutions> [background information is available at <http://tinyurl.com/z6eq2f2>, 93-105]. A similar call applying to military aid was made by the secretary general of the National Council of Churches in the USA, Jim Winkler, and the secretary general of the World Council of Churches, Olav Fykse Tveit, in a letter of September 14, 2006, using the softer term "reconsider," <http://ccmalaysia.org/index.php/2016/09/wcc-news-statement-by-general-secretaries-rev-dr-olav-fykse-tveit-wcc-and-jim-winkler-neccusa>.

² Robert O. Smith, "Towards a Lutheran Response to Christian Zionism," *Dialogue: A Journal of Theology* 48, no. 3 (2009): 279-291, 280. For a similar definition by the same author, see Robert O. Smith, *More Desired than Our Own Salvation: The Roots of Christian Zionism* (Oxford University Press 2013), 2.

³ Note the term "Jew" began to be used during the Babylonian exile in the 6th century B.C.

⁴ Only once are these texts about land promises explicitly mentioned in the New Testament, in Acts 7:5.

⁵ The Pre-Trib Research Center, established by Tim LaHaye, and whose members include Paul Wilkinson, notes 12, 13 and 14, says in its mission statement that it "is committed to the study, proclamation, teaching and defending of the Pretribulation Rapture (pre-70th week of Daniel) and related end-time prophecy." Among its doctrines is that history "culminates in Christ's millennial kingdom," www.pre-trib.org/about/what-we-believe.

⁶ For more in-depth analysis of these distinctions, see Hans Morten Haugen, "Christian Zionism: How to Understand, Assess and Challenge?" in Niclas Blåder and Kristina Helgesson Kjellin, eds., *Mending the World* (Pickwick Publications, 2017, forthcoming).

⁷ *Israel and Christians: Friends and Foes of the Jewish People*, International Christian Embassy Jerusalem (2010), <http://us.icej.org/media/israel-and-christians>.

⁸ *Proclamation of the Fourth International Christian Congress on Biblical Zionism*, International Christian Embassy Jerusalem (2010), www.ikaj.no/content/proklamasjon-fra-den-fjerde-internasjonale-kristne-sionist

kongress.

⁹ “Bibi: Christian Zionists Our Top Friends,” *Jerusalem Post*, July 4, 2008.

¹⁰ For one comprehensive assessment, see chapter 2 in Paul Wilkinson, *Understanding Christian Zionism: Israel's Place in the Purposes of God* (The Berean Call, 2013).

¹¹ On replacement theology, illustrating that CZ actors have shifted from viewing it as the Jewish people being replaced by the church, to labeling as replacement theology those who do not agree that the state of Israel is established in accordance with God's intervention, see *Replacement Theology* (International Christian Embassy Jerusalem, 2013), <http://int.icej.org/media/replacement-theology>. The central formulation — which replacement theology is said to have abolished — is “promises to Israel [of] eternal ownership of the land of Canaan (Genesis 17:7-8).”

¹² Paul Wilkinson, “Prophets Who Prophecy Lies in My Name: Christian Palestinianism and the Anti-Israel Crusade,” March 4, 2011, www.godspodcast.co.uk/christian_palestinianism.pdf.

¹³ Paul Wilkinson, “The Church at Christ's Checkpoint: A Response to the Second Christ at the Checkpoint Conference in Bethlehem,” March 5-9, 2012, 2, <http://caryltv.com/pdf/TheChurchAtChristsCheckpoint.pdf>.

¹⁴ Paul Wilkinson, “Modern Day Heresy! Israel Betrayed within the Professing Church,” speech at Calvary Chapel, September 16, 2015, www.youtube.com/watch?v=_1BF45uVXQs, at 47:56-48:06 and 52:15-52:20, respectively.

¹⁵ *A Moment of Truth: A Word of Faith, Hope and Love from the Heart of Palestinian Suffering* (Kairos Palestine, 2009), www.kairopalestine.ps/content/kairos-document. There are no references to apartheid, genocide, ethnic cleansing or war crimes; and the term “sin” is applied three times, in 2.5, 4.1.2 and 6.1, in the context of the Israeli occupation, not in the context of the state of Israel. On WorldVision, see “Response to Recent Criticism of World Vision's Position on and Work in the Middle East,” WorldVision, 2015, www.worldvision.org/press-release/response-recent-criticism-world-visions-position-and-work-middle-east. The text that WorldVision disapproves of is available at www.lausanne.org/content/lga/2015-01/all-of-me.

¹⁶ Kenneth Cragg, *The Arab Christian* (Mowbray, 1971).

¹⁷ Naim Ateek, *Justice and Only Justice: A Palestinian Theology of Liberation* (Orbis Books, 1989).

¹⁸ Bat Ye'or, *Eurabia: The Euro-Arab Axis* (Associated University Press, 2005), 176.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 177.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² “Vision,” Sabeel, www.sabeel.org/vision.php.

²³ *The Jerusalem Sabeel Document: Principles for a Just Peace in Palestine-Israel* (Sabeel, 2001).

²⁴ Ateek, *Justice and Only Justice*, 6. Ateek specifies that he is not under any Marxist influence, but clarifies that the PLT seeks to make theology “meaningful for “Palestinian Christians...,” but “does not create a brand-new, unique, and separate theology for Palestinian Christians.”

²⁵ Melanie Phillips, *Londonistan: How Britain Is Creating a Terror State Within* (Gibson Square, 2006), 230.

²⁶ For the full text of the decision, see *The New York Times*, February 9, 2006, “Anglicans Vote to Divest from Concerns in Israel-Occupied Areas.”

²⁷ Phillips, *Londonistan*, 231; the quote from el-Assal is from an interview with Julia Fisher made in 2002.

²⁸ Johan Malan, *The Palestinian Threat to Israel* (undated), www.bibleguidance.co.za/Engarticles/Palestinianism.htm, alleging: “She describes the rise of Christian Palestinianism...” See also Thomas Ice, *Christian Palestinianism* (undated), 1; www.pre-trib.org/data/pdf/Ice-ChristianPalestinian2.pdf; and David Dunlap, “Stephen Sizer and ‘Christian Palestinianism,’” *Bible & Life* 20, no. 3 (2013), both writing about Phillips: “She notes the rise of Christian Palestinianism...” (the latter applying “” around CP; both giving a wrong reference of p. 152; the correct is p. 231).

²⁹ Phillips, *Londonistan*, 231-232.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 232.

³¹ Paul Wilkinson, *For Zion's Sake: Christian Zionism and the Role of John Nelson Darby* (Paternoster, 2007), 48; in Wilkinson, *The Church at Christ's Checkpoint*, 2, the term is “labelled”. Note that the 2007 book was relaunched with a new title in 2013 (*Understanding Christian Zionism*).

³² *Ibid.*, 49.

³³ Johan Malan, *Palestinianism and the Kairos Document*, 2011, www.bibleguidance.co.za/Engarticles/KairosEng.htm. The same author identifies a “new form of replacement theology...,” saying that the “Bible

is robbed of many of its basic statements on Israel and gradually reinterpreted in terms of the Koran"; see Malan, *The Palestinian Threat*.

³⁴ Robert Spencer, "Powerful Lobby Sabeel Trying to Influence Church to Delegitimize Israel," *Jihad Watch*, March 30, 2015.

³⁵ Ice, *Christian Palestinianism*, 1.

³⁶ Wilkinson, *Prophets Who Prophecy*, 51.

³⁷ All Bible verses quoted are from the New International Version. Romans 9 continues in v. 8 (extract): "...it is not the children by physical descent who are God's children, but it is the children of the promise..."

³⁸ Sabeel, *Vision*.

³⁹ Eli E. Hertz, "Mandate for Palestine:" *The Legal Aspects of Jewish Rights to a National Home in Palestine* (Myths and Facts, 2008), 12, referring to Jordan as "Eastern Palestine." The report has extensive references to the Palestine Royal Commission ("Peel Commission"), *Report Presented by the Secretary of State for the Colonies to Parliament by Command of His Majesty* (1937), which says at 39: "Unquestionably, however, the primary purpose of the Mandate, as expressed in its preamble and its articles, is to promote the establishment of the Jewish National Home" (emphasis in original). The Peel Report is available at <http://unispa.un.org/pdfs/Cmd5479.pdf>.

⁴⁰ For a counterargument against those CZ actors who claim that Jordan is the Palestinian state, as there originally was a mandate for Palestine that encompassed Jordan, see John Quigley, *The Statehood of Palestine: International Law in the Middle East Conflict* (Cambridge University Press, 2010); see also Daniel Pipes and Adam Garfinkle, *Is Jordan Palestine?* (1988), www.danielpipes.org/298/is-jordan-palestine.

⁴¹ Stephen Sizer, *Christian Zionism. Road-map to Armageddon?* (Inter-Varsity Press, 2005), 21. Together with Don Wagner, Sizer wrote the 2006 *Jerusalem Declaration on Christian Zionism*, adopted by three Jerusalemite bishops and one patriarch; on the Declaration's response, see <http://int.icej.org/media/jerusalem-declaration-christian-zionism>. For alleged, highly problematic statements by Sizer on the former president of Iran, Ahmadinejad, see Dunlap, "Stephen Sizer," 2; see also Wilkinson, *Prophets who Prophecy*, 8. After linking a conspiracy site titled "9/11 Israel Did It!" to his blog in January 2015, Sizer made an agreement with his bishop. In a subsequent letter, Sizer said that he would: "refrain from writing or speaking on any theme that relates, directly or indirectly, to the current situation in the Middle East... [...] should I break [the agreement] ... [I] will offer you my resignation," www.cofeguildford.org.uk/docs/default-source/news-documents/stephen-sizer-letter.pdf?sfvrsn=2. In 2017, Sizer was forced to resign: <http://www.cofeguildford.org.uk/whats-on/news/detail/2017/03/10/a-statement-by-the-bishop-of-guildford-andrew-watson-re-stephen-sizer>; for Sizer's attendance at a meeting in 2016, see <https://www.thejc.com/news/uk-news/stephen-sizer-warned-after-attending-anti-israel-meeting-1.54499>.

⁴² Ateek, *Justice and Only Justice*, 170. Ateek writes on pp. 168-169 that Palestinians "must understand the importance ... of Holocaust to the ... Jews, while insisting that the Jews understand the importance ... of the tragedy of Palestine for the Palestinians." For an assessment of how Holocaust memories shape Israeli policies, see Naim Ateek, "God Is Love, Not Empire, Naim Ateek Tells Sabeel Conference," 2011, www.sabeel.org/news.php?eventid=181.

⁴³ Ateek, *ibid.* at p.166, states that "we should put aside the idea of one democratic Palestine and insist on preserving the Jewish character of Israel so as to alleviate the insecurity of the Jewish people." More attention has been devoted to his sentence on p. 164, that he does "accept the establishment of the State of Israel and its need — although not its right — to exist."

⁴⁴ For positions on the future of settlers, by both Israeli and Palestinian leaders, expressed in 2014, see Ynet-news.com, "Will Jews Be Able to Live in Future Palestine?" January 27, 2014.

⁴⁵ Naim Ateek, Cedar Duaybis and Tina Whitehead, eds., *The Bible and the Israel-Palestine Conflict* (Sabeel, 2014); see also Naim Ateek, *A Palestinian Christian Cry for Reconciliation* (Orbis, 2008), specifying how the Old Testament (Hebrew Bible) itself has tensions between the exclusivist and inclusivist approach.

⁴⁶ Palestine Media Watch, *Rewriting History* (2013), <http://palwatch.org/main.aspx?fi=505&page=2&all=1>.

⁴⁷ Wilkinson, *Prophets Who Prophecy*, 13, 24 & 27; Wilkinson, *The Church at Christ's Checkpoint*, 17-18.

⁴⁸ Gary Burge, *Jesus and the Land. The New Testament Challenge to 'Holy Land' Theology* (Baker Publishing Group, 2010), xiv.

⁴⁹ Wilkinson, *Prophets Who Prophecy*, 26.

⁵⁰ Phillips, *Londonistan*, 231.

⁵¹ Ateek, *A Palestinian Christian Cry*, 11.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 197.

⁵³ Melanie Phillips, "'Jesus Was a Palestinian; The Return of Christian Anti-Semitism,'" June 1, 2014; and Susan Warner, "Palestinian Liberation Theology Exposed. Eradicating the Jewishness of Jesus," January 19, 2015.

⁵⁴ Phillips, *Londonistan*, 232-233; and Stephen Spector, *Evangelicals and Israel: The Story of American Christian Zionism* (Oxford University Press, 2009), 132 (not including the tomb allegory). For more comprehensive quotes, see Dexter van Zile, *Sabeel's Teachings of Contempt. A Judeo-Christian Alliance Report* (2005) notes 13-15 and accompanying text, www.discoverthenetworks.org/Articles/Sabeels%20Teachings%20of%20Contempt.html.

⁵⁵ van Zile, *Sabeel's Teachings*.

⁵⁶ Ateek, *Sabeel's Teachings*.

⁵⁷ Naim Ateek, "For a Just and Lasting Peace in God's Land," *Huffington Post*, March 16, 2012.

⁵⁸ For one example, see Jonathan Rynhold, *The Arab-Israeli Conflict in American Political Culture* (Cambridge University Press, 2015), 130-131. Rynhold works at the Bar-Ilan University.

⁵⁹ Naim Ateek, "Shame," *Cornerstone* 52 (2009), 2-3 ("Many of us find [Jewish children burned in the Holocaust] comparable to what the government of Israel has done to the people of Gaza today."). Comparisons between the sufferings of Jesus Christ and current Palestinian suffering are also central in Sabeel's "Contemporary Way of the Cross"; see <http://sabeel.org/wayofthecross.php>.

⁶⁰ Naim Ateek, *What Is Theologically and Morally Wrong with Suicide Bombings? A Palestinian Christian Perspective* (Sabeel, 2003), 22.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 20.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 22.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 20.

⁶⁴ Kairos Palestine, *A Moment of Truth*, chap. 4.2.5 (extract): "We respect and have a high esteem for all those who have given their life for our nation. And we affirm that every citizen must be ready to defend his or her life, freedom and land." Moreover, chapter 1.5 applies the term "legal resistance," understood as to encompass suicide bombers. The *general* basis in international law for legal resistance is Article 1.4 of the 1977 Additional Protocol I to the 1949 Geneva Conventions, encompassing "armed conflicts in which peoples are fighting against colonial domination and alien occupation and against racist régimes in the exercise of their right of self-determination..."

⁶⁵ Pew Research Center, *Muslim Publics Share Concerns about Extremist Groups*, September 10, 2013.

⁶⁶ Spector, *Evangelicals and Israel*, 136. Ateek stated in a 2001 interview that it is "easier for Israel to justify its violence when there is violent resistance on the Palestinian side"; see www.thewitness.org/archive/sept2001/grievesateekinterview.html.

⁶⁷ Wilkinson, *Prophets Who Prophecy*, 30, specifically mentioning Stephen Sizer, Rosemary Radford Ruether and Ben White.

⁶⁸ Naim Ateek, "The Apartheid Paradigm," *Cornerstone* 48 (2008), 2; Ateek, *A Palestinian Christian Cry*, 44 and 159 (the index lists two more, but they do not apply the term apartheid); and Ateek, *God is Love*.

⁶⁹ Ateek, *A Palestinian Christian Cry*, 160, stating that pursuing "hafrada" and "nishul" leads to racism, which Israel must abandon.

⁷⁰ Ateek, *The Apartheid Paradigm*, 2.

⁷¹ ADL, *Profile: Friends of Sabeel – North America* (2013).

⁷² "Olmert to Haaretz: Two-state Solution, or Israel Is Done," *Haaretz*, November 29, 2007 ("we face a South African-style struggle..."); "Barak: Make Peace with Palestinians or Face Apartheid," *Guardian*, February 3, 2010, ("If ... millions of Palestinians cannot vote, that will be an apartheid state.").

⁷³ While Oren Yiftachel, *Ethnocracy. Land and Identity Politics in Israel/Palestine* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), is frequently identified as the originator of the term ethnocracy, its originator is Nils Butenschön, *Politics of Ethnocracies: Strategies and Dilemmas of Ethnic Domination* (Institute of Political Science, University of Oslo, 1993), both applying it in the context of the Israeli policy of privileging Jewish citizens over non-Jews. *Encyclopedia of Social Work*, 20th ed. (Oxford University Press, 2008) refers to Yiftachel, but the term ethnocracy does not appear as an index word in any Oxford dictionary. On ethnocracy in Israel, see Haugen, *Christian Zionism*.

⁷⁴ For a list of Israel's discriminatory laws, see www.adalah.org/en/law/index.

⁷⁵ B'Tselem, *A Policy of Discrimination. Land Expropriation, Planning and Building in East Jerusalem. Comprehensive Report* (B'Tselem, 1995), 52 (DOC [word] version), quoting Amir Cheshin, a former Advisor on Arab affairs to the Mayor of Jerusalem.

⁷⁶ Francesco Chiodelli, *Shaping Jerusalem: Spatial Planning, Politics and the Conflict* (Routledge, 2017).

⁷⁷ This does not apply to Palestinians holding ID cards being either blue (Jerusalem) or orange (West Bank) (Gaza cards are no longer issued).

⁷⁸ Naim Ateek, Sabeel's Open Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury June 23, 2011. Wilkinson, in *The Church at Christ's Checkpoint*, p.44, declares this as "playing the moral equivalence card."

⁷⁹ For a transcript of the interview with BBC see <http://rowanwilliams.archbishopofcanterbury.org/articles.php/2071/christians-in-the-middle-east-archbishop-on-world-at-one>.

⁸⁰ Ateek, *Sabeel's Open Letter*.

⁸¹ Cas Mudde, *Populist Radical Right Parties in Europe* (Cambridge University Press, 2007), 258.

⁸² As specified by Haugen, in *Christian Zionism*, this view is central in dispensationalism, but less so in other forms of Christian Zionism; note that the Jerusalem Declaration on Christian Zionism, issued by the three bishops and the (then) Latin Patriarch, primarily describes dispensationalism.

⁸³ ADL, *Profile: Friends of Sabeel — North America*. Note, however, that the home page of Kairos Palestine has the following sentence: "We urge the international community to stand with the Palestinian people in their struggle against oppression, displacement, and apartheid"; see: www.kairopalestine.ps.

⁸⁴ Sabeel, *Cornerstone* 58 (spring 2008). The term Apartheid Paradigm was originally the title of a Friends of Sabeel North America conference in 2007.

⁸⁵ Ateek, *The Apartheid Paradigm*, 2.

⁸⁶ Ateek, *A Palestinian Christian Cry*, 160.

⁸⁷ Wilkinson, *Modern Day Heresy* and associated text. In the same youtube-link, Wilkinson's host Jack Hibbs at 1:00-1:12 claims with an implicit reference to the BDS movement that it stands for "boycott the nation of Israel, deny Israel's existence as a nation, and to turn any support away from the Jewish people."

⁸⁸ ADL, *Response To Common Inaccuracy: Israel Critics Are Anti-Semites* (undated).

⁸⁹ Naim Ateek, *Interfaith Trumps Justice. Naim Ateek's Response to the Episcopal Bishops' Vote, July 13, 2015*, www.friendsofsabeel.org.uk/news/interfaith-trumps-justice/.

⁹⁰ Naim Ateek, *A Call for Morally Responsible Investment: A Nonviolent Response to the Occupation* (Sabeel, 2005). Note that Kairos Palestine, *A Moment of Truth*, chap. 7 endorses the "broad" BDS, applying to activities in Israel, not only in occupied Palestine.

⁹¹ ADL, *News: Ranking the Top 10 Anti-Israel Groups in 2013*; see also ADL, *Profile: Friends of Sabeel — North America*.

⁹² Ateek, *Justice and Only Justice*, 164.

⁹³ Naim Ateek, "Bible Study. 'Land of Promise: How Do We Understand the Promise of the land,'" in Ateek et. al, *The Bible and the Israel-Palestine Conflict*.

⁹⁴ See Ateek, *Justice and Only Justice*, 112-114. For an attempt at "palestinizing" the Bible, where "the land of Palestine" is said to represent the fifth Gospel and "the people of the land" is said to represent the sixth Gospel, see Mitri Raheb, *Faith in the Face of Empire: The Bible through Palestinian Eyes* (Orbis Books, 2014), 97 and Mitri Raheb, "Toward a New Hermeneutics of Liberation: A Palestinian Christian Perspective, in *The Biblical Text in the Context of Occupation. Towards a New Hermeneutics of Liberation*, Mitri Raheb, ed. (Diyar Publishing, 2012); for a criticism of attempts to "recentralize" Palestine among Christians being delegitimized as operating within an "integral supersessionist theological frame..." see Atalia Omer, "The Cry of the Forgotten Stones. The Promise and the Limits of a Palestinian Liberation Theology as a Method for Peacebuilding," *Journal of Religious Ethics* 43, no. 2 (2015): 369-407, at 398.

⁹⁵ In addition to Wilkinson and other authors, Melnick in *Is Christian Palestinianism Part of Eschatological Anti-Semitism?*, http://www.lcje-na.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/Is-Christian-Palestinianism-part-of-Eschatological-Anti-Semitism-Olivier-Melnick_LCJE_NA_042215.pdf, answers his own question in the affirmative, concluding on p. 20 that CP is "Satan's final weapon used against Israel and the global Jewish community."

⁹⁶ For more details on this thinking, see Haugen, *Christian Zionism*.

⁹⁷ Itamar Marcus and Nan Jacques Zilberdik, "PA and Fatah Quick to Honor Murderer Who Killed 13-Year-Old Girl in Her Sleep," *Palestine Media Watch*, June 30, 2016, www.palwatch.org/main.aspx?fi=157&doc_id=18302.