

# Article

## ***War and Peace Theology in German and Swedish Christian Zionism***

Kristian Steiner\*

*This is a comparative study of how Swedish and German Christian Zionist literature from 1967–2012 portrays the chances for peace and the risk for war, globally and in the Middle East. Christian Zionism is a theology supporting the establishment and the preservation of the modern state of Israel as a Jewish homeland. Christian Zionist literature, in Germany and Sweden, demonstrates very little hope for peace, since this world is assumed fallen, heading for the apocalypse, in the hands of the Devil, and inhabited by a sinful humanity beyond improvement. The image of Arabs is clearly that of an enemy image; so portraying them as inferior: permanently lying, violent, dangerous, and incapable. Thus, peace with Arabs is futile. Jews are given appreciative attributes: intelligent, democratic, progressive and capable. However, Jews are instrumentalized, being regarded as a tool in a fatalistic end-time schema. They are expected to “return” to Israel, a requirement for the return of the Messiah. In Israel, Jews will face Armageddon, leaving many to perish. The readership of this literature is required to pray for Israel and for the “return” of Jews. However, it is explicitly dissuaded from supporting peace initiatives, and never required to save Jews from Armageddon. German and Swedish literatures generally share the same beliefs, and the discourse has been largely consistent over the years.*

\* **Kristian Steiner** is senior lecturer in and responsible for peace and conflict studies at Malmö University, Sweden. Over the last years, Steiner has published extensively on the construction of Muslims in the Swedish Christian secular press.

## INTRODUCTION

A large proportion of practicing Christians, foremost Evangelicals in the United States, support a movement assuming that Christians are obliged to “bless Israel” (Nederveen Pietersen 1991: 75). This movement, called Christian Zionism, supports the establishment and preservation of the modern state of Israel as the Jewish homeland. There is considerable strength in this movement in the United States (Durham 2004: 145–46), and since it opposes Israeli territorial concessions it might have detrimental effects for prospects for peace between Israel and its neighbours (Goldman 2009: 270–71).

This is a project studying to what extent and how the Christian Zionist literature in Sweden and Germany from 1967–2012 legitimizes war or peace. The study has two further aims. The first is to see whether, and to what extent changes in the structure of the international system affect the rhetoric in this literature. In other words, changes and permanence in Christian Zionist discourse will be analysed *over time*, that is: the discursive development from the Cold War era (1967–89), the Post-Cold War era characterized by *détente*, peace negotiations, and democratization (1990–2001), and to the era of the war against terrorism (2002–12). A second aim is to see how different *domestic* political contexts affect Christian Zionist rhetoric. The fact that the situation for Jews has been very different in Sweden and Germany in the twentieth century may have influenced the discourse as well as the fact that Germany was the origin of philo-Semitic *Pietismus* (Paas 2012: 66–68). Thus, the study will identify discursive differences and similarities *spatially*.

## METHOD

This study has undertaken three major methodological steps. First, the study has *selected* German and Swedish Christian Zionist literature defined as monographs, published in Sweden or Germany, giving faith-based justifications to the establishment and the preservation of the modern state of Israel as the Jewish homeland (Spector 2009: 3). Christian literature supporting Israel without such justification is excluded, just as reprinted unrevised older literature, and *translated* literature.

Second, this study is a temporal and spatial *comparative qualitative analysis*. Using such a research design enables the study to identify rhetorical similarities as well as differences, also minor ones, over time and space (Landmann 2008: 4–5).

Third, when it comes to the analytical approach of the actual texts, an *ideal type method* has been chosen. Using such a method facilitates to analyse a complex reality without losing the general view (Lundquist 1993: 83). An ideal type is a theoretical construction stressing certain influential aspects and components of reality in order to make them more salient (Giddens 1971: 141–42), and can function as an instrument assessing the difference between an ideal type and an empirical case (Pettersson 1987: 31). In this study, *two* ideal types will be formulated, the ideal typical *war theology* and *peace theology*, functioning as a two counterpoints, creating an intermediate space wherein the study can place Christian Zionist literature.

### WAR THEOLOGY AND PEACE THEOLOGY

Analyses on language have become mainstream in social science (Boréus 2010: 172). The correlation between knowledge and power is accepted just as that control over public discourse is a power position (van Dijk 1995: 19). Discourse tends to influence (Fairclough 1993: 138; Winter Jørgensen and Phillips 1999: 13), and even distort (Wetherell and Potter 1992: 13) the way we understand and interpret social reality, particularly in contexts where we lack personal experience (Poole and Richardson 2006: 1). As the readership of Christian Zionist literature probably has limited personal contact with Jews, Muslims, and the Middle East, this literature might be influential.

The Norwegian peace researcher Johan Galtung claims that language even can be a kind of violence, “cultural violence.” Cultural violence refers to “those aspects of culture...that can be used to justify or legitimize direct or structural violence” (Galtung 1990: 291). Such a language “preaches, teaches, admonishes, eggs on, and dulls us into seeing exploitation and/or repression as normal and natural, or into not seeing them...at all” (Galtung 1990: 295) and makes reality opaque (Galtung 1990: 291). It “makes direct and structural violence look, even feel, right—or at least not wrong” (Galtung 1990: 291), it changes “the moral colour of an act.” This rhetoric also restructures the public’s value hierarchy. Truths, ethical considerations and individual rights become subordinate (Kempf 2010: 13). War becomes necessity and justified (Kempf 2010: 15).

In this section two ideal typical theologies will be presented; *war theology* and *peace theology*, forming the counterpoints of the analysis. War theology, like any war rhetoric, is defined as a discourse convincing an audience that violence is necessary, legitimate, and rational. Its aim is to justify different forms of violence, to prepare the

ground for escalation (Lynch and McGoldrick 2005: 9). Unlike secular war rhetoric, war theology also purports “a transcendent sanctity to certain acts of war,” giving them a “sacred jus-tification” (Firestone 1996: 100). Peace theology, on the other hand, is drawing from Scripture justifying non-violent solutions to conflicts, by describing its structures and actors, in a manner making non-violent solutions appear as possible, legitimate, and rational.<sup>1</sup>

This study assumes that a persuasive discourse *diagnoses, evaluates, and prescribes* (Entman 1993: 52). In the following discussion, these activities will function as organizational tools.

### DIAGNOSIS

To diagnose means to determine the nature of a system, its disorders, and the causes of those disorders. War rhetoric has a tendency to describe the international system in realist terms as volatile, anarchical, and insecure. In the same vein war *theology* assumes the nature of the imminent world to be fallen, since it is in the hands of the Devil, and inhabited by a wicked humanity, beyond improvement (Bainton 1960: 104). Since this situation is static, the prospects for imminent peace are dim. Still, God will redeem the world, but is resisted by Satan. Therefore, redemption is a process of increasing and inevitable clashes between God and Satan, culminating before the Messianic age. Thus, lasting peace cannot be achieved imminently; it will come transcendently, in the Messianic Kingdom.

On the other hand, peace theology is open-ended. Although this world is fallible and inhabited by imperfect humankind, the situation is not fixed, and not bound to a fatalistic process. Instead, the Kingdom of God will spread and has the potential to successively curb evil. Furthermore, although humankind is imperfect, humanity still has the potential to learn and change just as political systems (Yoder 1994: 153). Thus, peace theology assumes that imminent, but incomplete, peace is possible.

As was noted above, war theology holds that Satan will resist God’s plan for redemption. As a consequence, humanity will face escalating inexorable and insoluble conflicts. Although these conflicts are the fruit of the Devil’s resistance, they also function as door-openers for the Messianic age. Thus, escalation might indicate the closeness of redemption. Peace theology does not simply believe in unavoidable conflicts with a redemptive significance. It is not the presence of such conflicts that will lead to a Messianic age, but the imminent growth of the Kingdom.

All in all, since war theology fatalistically does not really see any prospects for long-term peace, it normalizes war as a human condition and as a legitimate tool to manage insoluble irreconcilabilities. In so doing, it makes any peace initiative appear as illegitimate, weak, insufficient, and even as against God.

## EVALUATION

To evaluate is to identify as well as morally assess the agents of a disorder (Entman 1993: 52). War rhetoric describes the enemy in a way that reduces a reluctance to expose it to violence. This is usually acquired by combining *three* strategies.

The first is to describe the enemy as *deserving* violence (Jones 2002: 11), since harming a person who seems much like oneself, as innocent, arouses pain (Sternberg and Sternberg 2008: 45). And they deserve violence since they constitute a concrete real threat, often urgent, to our core assets and values. Of course, this results in fear and stress.

The second strategy describes the enemy in such a way that makes any attempt to create a constructive relationship with it, as futile. War rhetoric is dualistic, dividing humanity into “us” and “them,” and claims that “they” are, as a group, genuinely and permanently evil. Empirically that is done by focusing on their depraved leaders, and on “their” negative behaviour (Lynch and McGoldrick 2005: 6), since “their” evil behaviour and depraved leaders define them. Furthermore, “their” evil behaviour is not contextualized and remains incomprehensible. “Their” commendable behaviour, on the other hand, is the consequence of peremptory factors, and never the outcome of “their” genuine character. Moreover, since “their” evil defines the entire group, “they” are stereotyped. Likewise, they cannot change, since they are static, and fatalistically bound to do evil indefinitely. In war *theology*, Scripture is used for the purpose of making them appear stereotypically and permanently evil. Since “their” teaching is false, “they” are not only different but heretics. “They” are also enemies of God and obstruct redemption. “They” are portrayed as demonized, and thereby both dangerous and inferior (Sternberg and Sternberg 2008: 98). Thus, like any war rhetoric, war theology dehumanizes.

The third strategy is to assess the other as an obstacle, or a necessary sacrifice, to a higher goal. As stated, Christian theology assumes redemption at the return of Christ. Humanity will be relieved from its wickedness, and experience eternal peace. However, war theology tends to have a fatalistic view of the process leading to redemption. Before

the advent of the Messianic era, certain events have to happen and certain things have to be in place. That means that suffering and war are unavoidable. Of course, a loving and almighty God allows this evil to occur since thereby God will bring about the Messianic kingdom, which could not be achieved in any other way (Swinburne 1995: 76). This instrumentalizes human beings in general, not only enemies. We might all be victims of redemption as a higher goal. A particular ethical problem arises when actors, without consent, are regarded as collateral damage on the pathway to the Messianic Kingdom.

Peace theology, as well as secular peace rhetoric, would question these three strategies. First, it would not instil fear, describing the other as an urgent threat. Second, and most important, it would attempt to form a language that enables “us” to understand “them,” making “us” believe in constructive and lasting relationships with “them.” Peace theology delegitimizes violence against other humans. Thus, it does not divide humanity into “us” and “them”; “their” evil behaviour never defines “them,” and would be given an explaining context. “They” would be described as a multifaceted and dynamic group, capable of change and progress. Peace theology would focus on individuals and fates within the other group that “we” can relate to, so “we” can identify with “them.” Peace theology would not regard “the enemy” as a threat to God’s redemptive plans. Moreover, peace theology uses Scripture as a resource to rehumanize “them.” And third, since it does not believe in a fatalistic program preceding the return of Christ, there is no need for regarding human beings as instruments for a higher end or for higher divine purposes.

Moreover, war rhetoric and theology has an uncritical self-image: “we” are supposedly superior in different ways. Although evil among “us” is recognized, it is never regarded as something inherent, or something defining “us.” Therefore, war rhetoric and war theology undertakes different strategies in order to separate “our” evil from “our” identity. Furthermore, “we” are dynamic, “we” can overcome “our” evil. Last, in war theology there is a tendency to describe “us” as vulnerable in spite of our superiority. Peace theology has a critical self-image, avoids describing “us” as superior, and tries to see oneself from the outside, how “our” behaviour might be understood and interpreted by outsiders. And just like war theology, peace theology holds the idea that “we” can change, and that “our” flaws do not define “us.”

### PRESCRIPTIONS

To prescribe is to offer a normatively justified and effective treatment for the problems in question (Entman 1993: 52). Since war rhetoric has a tendency to describe the international system, lately also domestic ones, in realist terms, as volatile, anarchical and insecure, it deems the prospects of peace to be dim, and it suggests solutions of a problem-solving kind. The only achievable peace is one limited to a temporary absence of military violence. Peace that is a far-reaching transformation of a political situation appears to be futile.

Christian theology also holds presumptions on how believers should live and cooperate with God, awaiting final redemption. War theology implies that one should not interfere with the predestined program preceding the advent of Messiah. Owing to a fatalistic historiography, the solutions suggested are of a problem-solving kind. That means that prescriptions are not based on any beliefs in fundamental changes of this world. Peace means merely temporary absence of violence, awaiting the Messiah.

Peace theology believes in change and emancipation already in this world, since the path leading up to the advent of the Messiah is open-ended. This means that the believer should cooperate with God in this world (Kling 2004: 164), to change it, transforming it into His Kingdom (Yoder 1994: 195; Volf 1996: 110). It means to change the dominant order of this world, not merely to reshuffling of cards of the same game (Volf 1996: 116).

### ANALYSIS

In the period under scrutiny, fifty Swedish Christian Zionist monographs were published representing different genres. None of the Swedish authors are affiliated to an academic institution. Almost all of them were pastors, mainly in Free Churches. In the first period well-known pastors representing a wide range of denominations published this literature. In the last period, Ulf Ekman from The Word of Faith Church was dominant, accompanied by older Pentecostal pastors, and less prominent independent authors. Also, the publishers were smaller and less known. This literature seems to have been marginalized. Most monographs can be categorized as either apocalyptic<sup>2</sup> where Israel only plays a secondary role or as tribute literature where Israel is primarily an object of admiration or political support.

In the German case, 101 monographs were published, representing a wide range of denominations, from the Catholic Church to Pentecostal movement. Evangelical pastors

dominate, although some journalists and a few scholars with a Ph.D. in theology are represented. German Christian Zionist literature does not seem to be marginalized in later years, as its Swedish counterpart; the same well-known publishers distribute over the years, and most contemporary authors do not seem to be marginal figures. Also, apocalyptic and tribute literatures are dominant in the German literature.

#### DIAGNOSIS

This section focuses on how Christian Zionism depicts prospects for peace and risks for violent conflict based on its understanding of humanity and the process of redemption.

*Swedish Christian Zionist Understanding of Peace and Violent Conflicts.* Swedish Christian Zionist literature consistently (1967–2012) holds the idea that imminent peace is unattainable and, thereby, adopts one important position of war theology. However, minor differences occur due to genre. Apocalyptic literature adopts some dispensational<sup>3</sup> notions and believes that end-time scenarios follow a strict schedule of escalating conflicts, making imminent peace infeasible. Tribute literature equally claims that imminent peace is infeasible, but for different reasons: Arab attitudes and threats. Other positions held by ideal typical war theology are less visible.

In the Cold War era, in line with war theology, apocalyptic literature stresses unavoidable clashes between cosmic powers as an explanation for violence (Dahlberg 1980: 32), thus placing peace in the Messianic Kingdom (Belfrage 1970: 26; 1974: 76; Thorell 1971: 171). And since clashes between God and Satan are unavoidable, work for peace is bad theology, (Lindblom 1975: 15), it could even be the work anti-Christ<sup>4</sup> (Ramstrand 1987: 46). It is also stated that anti-Christ will be a false peacemaker, offering the world long-awaited peace (Lindblom 1975: 51), a peace “the Jews” will embrace (Dahlberg 1980: 33). Also, peace conferences are “false” (Ramstrand 1982: 48), particularly if they suggest Israeli territorial concessions (Ramstrand 1974: 70).

However, it is also said that Israel is depriving the world from peace (Nilsson 1975: 10, 27–29). If Israel only had accepted Jesus as the Messiah, peace would have come, since Israel possesses the key to world peace. Some authors add that peace might come when the Jews worship the Messiah (Thorell 1971: 172) or when Israel has received their promised territories (Ramstrand 1974: 13; 1976: 84, 87, 89).



Quite a few authors focus on the prospects of peace for Israel. It is said that Israel will be facing a superior enemy, Gog, at the battle of Armageddon (Ramstrand 1974: 70; 1976: 28). Gog is in some accounts understood as Russia (Thorell 1971: 14, 67; Ramstrand 1974; Lindblom 1975: 31–32; Dahlberg 1980: 44), “the land in the far north” (Ramstrand 1974: 82), that will attack Israel in a new World War (Ramstrand 1967: 42–43; Hällzon 1967:75). Later, Russia is less prominent, and allegedly “a massive build-up of combat forces from all the world’s armies takes place” (Ramstrand 1987: 135). Some writers focus on anti-Christ who is allegedly based in the European Union (Thorell 1971: 206; Ramstrand 1976a: 54), mobilizing the world against Israel (Thorell 1971: 150). Therefore, “if we take these words (from the Book of Joel, KS) seriously, we cannot have any illusions regarding détente in the Middle East... it carries the seed to the most terrible military confrontation in world history” (Nilsson 1989: 95).

In accordance with war theology, it is assumed that violence accelerates, that in Tribulation, “an unrestricted” nuclear war will take place (Ramstrand 1982: 43, 58–59), and “in the evening of time...the fire of war will flame” (Hällzon 1967:65), so “at the return of Christ the earthly kingdoms lie in ruins” (Hällzon 1967: 93). Moreover, the accounts of Armageddon are graphic. Some authors predict the kind of weaponry to be used as well as their effects. Lindblom is convinced that Scripture foretells a huge air fleet (1975: 32) and an army of 200.000 men (Lindblom 1975: 85). Thorell is just as convinced that a large amount of horses (1971: 14), nuclear (1971: 127, 140), and chemical weapons (1971: 132, 139) will be used. The consequences will be devastating. The wars will cause enormous bloodshed (1971: 147) killing two-thirds, or a majority, of the Jews (Thorell 1971: 164; Belfrage 1970: 91; Ramstrand 1976b: 93; 1987: 26–27), and the remaining Jews will be scattered around the world once more (Thorell 1971: 166). Still, God will protect Israel and Gog will face perdition (Ramstrand 1974: 83; Thorell 1971: 125).

Yet Armageddon has a redemptive importance; it will be the war to ends all wars. After Armageddon, Christ returns and Satan will be bound for a thousand years (Ramstrand 1976a: 122) and a kingdom of peace will be established (Ramstrand 1987: 41). Swords will become ploughshares and spears will be pruning knives (Hällzon 1967: 96; Ramstrand 1982: 61).

Although 1990–2001 was characterized by détente and democratization, Swedish Christian Zionism was still pessimistic since “winds of peace” can rapidly turn into hate

(Strand 1990: 132), and “we who believe in the prophecies... find it hard to share profane peace enthusiasm” (Sollerman 1991: 77). The reason for this pessimism is the same as in previous era; unavoidable end-time conflicts. But now some authors also add *Arab threats*. None of the authors, however, believe that violence will last forever. Peace will come transcendently in the Messianic era. When violence peaks, the Messiah will return welcomed by Israel, and wars will be over forever (Strand 1999: 136; Sandstedt 1992: 51).

Apocalyptic literature continues to focus on global war, end-time scenarios and a clash between cosmic powers (Strand 1990: 57, 85; 1999: 15–16; Sandstedt 1992: 10; Nilsson 1994: 65, 67; Åkerlund 2001). Thus, peace is still regarded unattainable, even utopian, in an ungodly world (Sollerman 1991: 78). Violence accelerates, and finally the world will be drowned in blood (Strand 1999: 248).

Further, the tradition continues to make use of very graphic descriptions of Armageddon. Air forces and armies will be used at full scale, pushing Israel to the brink of extinction (Strand 1990: 134; Åkerlund 2001: 86), so will nuclear weapons (Strand 1990: 136; Åkerlund 2001: 56, 73, 104), this all leading up to the deafening thunders of war, suffocating gases, radiation, meteors (Strand 1990: 136), and horrendous bloodshed (Strand 1999: 156). “Horrific scenes” will be broadcast globally; and everyone will see the “horrific final drama” (Strand 1990: 135).

Still, the spirit of time affects the genre. Right after the dissolution of the USSR, Strand, Sandstedt, and Åkerlund, do not give Russia a prominent end-time role (Strand 1990: 132; Sandstedt 1992: 50; Åkerlund<sup>5</sup> 2001: 95). Later, as Russia recuperates, Strand seems to modify his position, and Russia is in again, alongside a huge demonized Asian army (Strand 1999: 183–84), pointed out as Gog (Strand 1999: 135, 148, 216). For Sollerman Russia was the primary actor throughout the period (Sollerman 1991: 38–40).

Ulf Ekman, Sven Nilsson, and Sven Reichmann represent a new trend. For them the Muslim and Arab character is the reason for the gloomy prospects for peace in the Middle East. They do not put Israel in a context of Armageddon. Although Ekman’s theology is influenced by dispensationalism (Ekman 1995: 226), large-scale end-time scenarios are not in focus. Armageddon is never mentioned, and Tribulation only briefly (Ekman 1995: 237). Thus, Israel is never located in a wider eschatological drama. Still, Ekman believes that “Israel is a land where God will act in the future” (Ekman 1996: 120), and that nations will be increasingly hostile against Israel (Ekman 1995: 237). The

same logic is also found in Sven Nilsson's and Reichmann's writing. The conflict in focus is the one between Israel and Islam (Nilsson 1994: 14–16; Reichmann 1995: 212–14; 1999: 80).

Literature published in 2002–12 still assumes that imminent peace is impossible, for the same reasons put forward in previous years; accelerated end-time conflicts and Arab character. An orchestrated end-time program makes imminent peace impossible (Swärd 2002: 99). Tribulation will come (Ibstedt 2006: 56), and so will nuclear wars (Johansson 2003: 82). Violence will accelerate (Ibstedt 2006: 42), as will ethnic wars (Johansson 2003: 78). Israel will be threatened (Ibstedt 2006: 42), almost annihilated (Lilja 2006: 159). All these events are regarded as “birth pains” announcing the end of history (Lilja 2006: 149–51), and the advent of the Messianic Kingdom (Swärd 2002: 37, 40).

As in the previous period, Reichmann emphasizes attitudes of corrupt Arab autocrats as one obstacle to peace (Reichmann 2006: 112). Likewise, he believes that Arabs glorify their ancient warlords to such an extent “that one cannot have great hope that peace negotiations will give a lasting peace” (Reichmann 2006: 53).

Unlike in previous eras, Russia is no longer Gog, nor is it threatening Israel. Instead Gog will be an “evil king from the land of the north” without further definition (Ibstedt 2006: 22), a massive “international” army (Swärd 2002: 57, 72), or an alliance of a number of Muslim countries (Johansson 2003: 241). Holger Nilsson speculates in the mobilisation of a huge Chinese or Muslim army (Nilsson 2009: 48). Ibstedt avoids defining who Gog is (Ibstedt 2005: 139; 2006: 121), but vindicates that the anti-Christ will prepare in Syria (Ibstedt 2006: 145). And lastly, the anti-Christ is no-longer placed in Rome but in Istanbul, the descendent of Eastern Roman Empire, since it is a hub of Muslim power (Ibstedt 2006: 23). All in all, there is a greater emphasis on Muslim and Arab actors now than in previous periods.

Graphic descriptions of the end-time are less numerous in the past period, but they still occur. Ibstedt claims that “a third of the earth will burn in something described as a nuclear war: fire mixed with blood” (Ibstedt 2006: 89). More than half of the world population will perish in wars and in different disasters (Ibstedt 2006: 127), and a major part of the Jews living in Israel will perish (Ibstedt 2005: 140, 143).

Ekman, while living in Jerusalem, wrote a very appreciative book on Israel. Here again he avoids explicit and graphic descriptions of Armageddon. He merely says that “uneasiness” comes over him while reflecting on biblical end-time scenarios regarding

the end-time (Ekman 2004: 10). Later he indicates that end-time conflicts are unavoidable since God wants to fulfil his plan for salvation and an unspecified actor will “do everything to hinder the return of the people, the restitution of the land and the place and spiritual function of Jerusalem that the Bible gives her” (Ekman 2004: 128).

German Christian Zionist Understandings of Peace and Violent Conflicts. German Christian Zionism, just as Swedish, is in varying degrees influenced by dispensationalism, and *consistently*<sup>6</sup> delineates a fatalistic road to redemption. Thus, God’s plan for salvation follows a strict plan characterized by increasingly frequent as well as escalating military confrontations. The conflicts in the Middle East are unending and inescapable. It is also repeatedly stated that peace will come only at the return of the Messiah.

This discourse is apparent already in the Cold War. The prospects for peace are regarded as dim (Jaffin 1987: 74), particularly the purported eternal and natural wars in the Middle East.<sup>7</sup> Major wars are not only inevitable; they will be increasingly violent and occur with ever-higher frequency<sup>8</sup> with the Middle East and Armageddon as their epicentre (Buchwald 1982: 105, 126; Lorenz 1985: 67, 86). A global army, under anti-Christian leadership, will attack Israel (Hubmer 1987: 116). Thus, “no peace movement can bring us peace” (Ben-Israel 1985: 43) and major wars must come about (Hubmer 1968: 57–58).

In the German literature, human wickedness is by some authors put forward as a decisive factor explaining the failure of peace. Since wickedness is deeply ingrained in human character (May 1970: 207), “no human being can bring lasting peace” (May 1970: 222). And as long as humanity will not repent, peace will not come (Lubahn 1987: 79; Quadflieg 1987: 263), especially as this world is in the hands of Satan (Lubahn 1987: 110).

Also the conflicts between Israel and its neighbours are depicted in a fatalistic vein. “There will be war not peace” (Jaffin 1987: 74) since the conflict is ancient and insoluble, originating from the strife between Abraham’s two sons Isaac and Ismael (Hubmer 1987: 51).

It is widely held that true peace is transcendent.<sup>9</sup> The End-times are the time of war (Schlink 1968: 55), and only the Messiah can bring peace (Quadflieg 1987: 171).

Additionally, peace work is regarded as detrimental, since it will merely lead to a false peace (Baar 1984: 201) causing suffering for Israel (Baar 1984: 25).

German Christian Zionism holds the same pessimistic ideas following the Cold War. Fatalism still characterizes the discourse (Makatowski 1999: 42; Baar 1992: 30; Baar 1994: 43, 88) and is not questioned by one single author. We are still heading for an apocalypse. The authors emphasize this pessimism by calling détente a “respite” (Pülz 1998: 116), a “sham peace” (Baar 1994: 9), and a “peace carousel” (Baar 1994: 9). Again it is stated that anti-Christian systems will culminate in the end-time (Scheunemann 1993: 73), the coming battle of Armageddon is inevitable (Scheunemann 1993: 100), and war is the norm (Baar 1994: 196).

This period was not only a period of superpower détente, but also a period of peace negotiations in the Middle East. These initiatives are never positively received in German Christian Zionism, however. One reason being fatalism, the idea that peace in the region is impossible,<sup>10</sup> it is unending, starting with the birth of Ismael (Pülz 1998: 14). Schlink advises explicitly from such initiatives. *Peace Now* is marching for peace “where peace could not be expected” (Schlink 1991: 24). But Schlink dissuades from peace not only for military reasons. She believes Satan is behind it all, since he wants to “destroy Israel through a false tolerance and commonality with their enemy” (Schlink 1991: 24). Schlink claims that God has always warned His people from having relationships with their enemy. Israeli peace attempts indicated disobedience, and it caused the first Intifada (Schlink 1991: 25). Also, Klaus M. Pülz and Ernst Schrupp have a gloomy attitude to peace negotiations. A world without weapons is a mirage (Pülz 1998: 120) or a temptation (Schrupp 1997: 182), and a two-state solution will not guarantee a lasting peace since surrounding states want to eliminate Israel (Schrupp 2001: 29).

Some of the reasons why peace is unachievable are the same as in the Cold War. Humanity is wicked insofar as you cannot “create redeemed relationships with unsaved people” (Pülz 1998: 113, c.f. 77). Just as in the previous period, spiritual reasons are accentuated, and there is belief in a worldwide mobilization of anti-Christian forces in an end-time battle (Scheunemann 1993: 101; May 1994: 160). Just as in previous eras, Middle Eastern peace is depicted as unachievable since the conflict is eternal, it rose the moment Ismael was born (Pülz 1998: 14). But one new trend is evident; the focus on an allegedly malignant Arab or Muslim *culture*. It is said that peace means something else for Arabs (Pfisterer 1992: 131); peace is merely a time for recuperation in time of

weakness before making another offensive (Schrupp 1991: 76). It is also stated that Muslims are not required to keep an oath to non-believers (Pfisterer 1992: 132–33). Thus, there will be no peace with Arabs; “we” can merely expect limited ceasefires (Schrupp 1991: 76). Later in the period, when the peace process failed, it was again attributed to a deviant “Oriental” mentality (Schrupp 2001: 27). And again it is maintained that peace between Arabs and Israelis can only be accomplished by the advent of the Messiah (Pülz 1998: 49; Schrupp 1997: 182).

Supposedly, the prospects for imminent peace were equally gloomy during 2002–12 (Keil 2008: 31; Krimmer 2010: 119). We were still approaching a time characterized by a predestined spiral of violence<sup>11</sup> leading up to major conflicts (Penkazki 2002a; Kischkel 2003: 9; Penkazki 2002: 36) or to a global war (Krimmer 2010: 175, 227), perhaps even to Armageddon.<sup>12</sup> The Middle East conflicts are fatalistically bound to escalate (May 2002: 184; Krimmer 2010: 68, 175), since these conflicts are caused by Satan (Buchwald 2008: 63) and a part of God’s salvation plan (May 2002: 12; Schmidt 2007: 10).

Moreover, peace will only come after the return of the Messiah (Schrupp 2003: 44, 98, 122, 212, 242). A global trial of strength between good and evil is unavoidable, so is the Israel-Palestinian conflict. Every attempt to solve it will fail (Krimmer 2010: 134), the Middle Eastern conflicts are ancient (Buchwald 2008: 225), and the conflict over Jerusalem will be the last unresolved one (Krimmer 2010: 175; Kischkel 2003: 67).

Some German authors seem to have adopted Samuel Huntington’s thesis on clash of civilizations (Huntington 1996), believing in inevitable Christian-Muslim clashes (Penkazki 2002a: 22; Baar 2002b). The ultimate desire of some Arab politicians is no longer merely the extermination of Israel (Baar 2002a: 22), but an Islamic war against the entire Christian world (Schneider 2011a: 64). Allegedly, some Muslims have come to Europe “as conquerors” (Baar 2002a: 29), forming “parallel societies ruled by Sharia,” even ready to engage in low-intensity conflict (Penkazki 2002a: 23). It is also assumed, in accordance with Huntington’s ideas, that cultural differences cause conflicts per se. Given that Islam and Christianity have incompatible revelations of God, conflict is inevitable (Baar 2002a: 31; Schrupp 2003: 61).

Other factors explaining the aforementioned conflicts resemble the ones from previous periods. Humanity has no peace because it has rejected Christ (Penkazki 2002b: 58). Likewise, the Middle East conflict is insoluble because it is an ancient, almost

natural conflict (Schrupp 2003: 24; Buchwald 2008: 61, 225), even a “metaphysical problem” between good and evil (Baar 2002a: 21). And again, Muslim and Arab character are an obstacle; “they” do not want real peace (Schneider 2011a: 65), “they” are allowed to lie to non-Muslims (Baar 2002a: 36), “their” share of the global population is growing (Gassmann 2002: 42), and since “they” regard Israel as an unacceptable “foreign body” in the Muslim world (Reusch 2003: 91), Islamists will fight until the last Jews have been expelled (Schneider 2011c: 48).

This focus on culture and Islam also colours the narrative of the last battle(s). Now the Russian involvement is mentioned less frequently. Instead, the battle will be led by Babel (Baar 2002a: 10, 13), and will be between Jahve’s and Allah’s kingdoms (Penkazki 2002a: 36; 2002b: 36).

In this period, peace attempts are not only dissuaded, they are allegedly dangerous. Muslim leaders are supposedly undertaking a-Salami-tactics; they accept smaller victories now in order to return with new demands (Reusch 2003: 90). Peace agreements at most obscure an apocalyptic world conflict (Baar 2002a: 50). Peace, both globally and in the Middle East, is located in a Messianic millennium. Any peace that is not based on the word of God or on repentance will fail (Gerloff 2002: 64–65), and might be a plot of anti-Christ (Penkazki 2002a: 26). Only God can solve the current conflicts in the Middle East (Schrupp 2003: 68, 72; Krimmer 2010: 67–68). Only He has the roadmap to peace (Schneider 2007: 69).

## EVALUATION

This section analyses to what extent Swedish and German Christian Zionism, in accordance with war theology, describes the enemy as genuinely evil, as threatening, as deserving violence, as an instrument for a higher purpose, or whether, in keeping with peace theology, humanizes the enemy, thereby resulting in a reluctance to harm it and giving it an intrinsic value.

The present Christian Zionist literature deviates clearly from war theology in two aspects. “We” are not a part of the conflict. “They” do not threaten “us” directly. “We” are a third party, and the discourse is not about legitimating “our” violence, but Israeli violence. And yet, although the image of Jews is generally just as uncritical as the “us” in war theology it, as we will see, deviates from clear war theology.

Swedish Christian Zionist Descriptions of Arabs and Muslims. The image of Muslims and Arabs is negative in Swedish Christian Zionism throughout the years under scrutiny. Already in 1967–89 these descriptions correspond to the assumptions of war theology. Arabs are supposedly violent, underdeveloped, and immoral. For instance, “Arabs... cannot keep peace among themselves” (Sollerman 1978: 62), Arab leaders are “unreasonable” (Thorell 1971: 173), uncontrollable, and, just as Ishmael, compared to a “wild donkey” (Sollerman 1978: 62). Allegedly, Islam is “an intolerant religion” (Sollerman 1978: 54), and Arabs have declared to throw Israel into the ocean (Ramstrand 1974: 15; Sollerman 1978: 50). Arabs are lacking progression and development, maybe as an effect of authoritarian rule or Islam (Sollerman 1978: 63). Thereto, Arab nations treat Palestinian refugees unethically (Ramstrand 1974: 18). The only hope that these authors see for Arabs is conversion to the Christian faith (Ramstrand 1974: 13, 102). Without ever using direct dysphemistic labels, dehumanizing expressions are used a few times. For instance, Islam supposedly “swept like a *prairie fire*...and would have *overflowed* all of Europe...” (Wigholm 1986: 40, KS italics).

The critique of Arab behaviour often goes unexplained. It is said that “the Arabs conduct ruthless propaganda against the Jewish state” and that they lie without end (Sollerman 1978: 55), that they waged a “war of extermination” in 1948 (Wigholm 1986: 61), and did not “allow one single Jew to settle in Jerusalem” (Wigholm 1986: 39). All this is said without any attempt to explain. In only one case are Arabs described favourably. In the 1948 war, Arabs are not only numerous, but also “well-trained” (Ramstrand 1974: 61). Therefore, Israel’s victory is purportedly a sign of divine intervention (Ramstrand 1974: 61; Ramstrand 1976a: 45; op cit. Lundmark 1967: 7–8).

In 1990–2001, the image of Arabs and Muslims does not change significantly. Muslims are anti-Semitic (Reichmann 1999: 39); undemocratic (Reichmann 1999: 96); unreliable, petty and underdeveloped (Reichmann 1999: 98, 120). Unsurprisingly, Muslim violence is allegedly inexplicable (Reichmann 1999: 93, 105, 112) or, as in one case, explained by upbringing (Strand 1990: 66). In only one case is poverty used to explain Palestinian violent resistance (Reichmann 1999: 122). At one point, Reichmann discusses a commendable political Arab behaviour; Anwar Sadat’s peace initiative in the 1970s. Needless to say, Sadat did not make peace with Israel with any ethical motive. It was a peace that he had to make for financial reasons (Reichmann 1999: 107).



Moreover Muslims are allegedly cultural robots, in the sense that “they” unlike “us” cannot make mature individual ethical considerations, but merely follow Muslim instincts. Thus, since Islam condones violence, Muslims might be violent (Reichmann 1999: 103). Since Mohammed plundered Jews, Muslims today might do the same (Reichmann 1999: 69). Since Muhammad was violent, violence might characterize contemporary Muslims (Reichmann 1999: 16).

In accordance with war theology, there is a focus on corrupt leaders, such as the grand mufti of Jerusalem, Haj Amin al-Husseini. He had Nazi connections and leanings, and is repeatedly defined as an Arab or Palestinian leader (Ekman 1992: 62).

The image of Arabs in 2002–12 is still very negative. They are described as mendacious (Johansson 2003: 159). Alleged Arab violence is explained as an effect of an inheritance from Ishmael (Johansson 2003: 235; Swärd 2002: 74, 78), whose “genes reoccur among them also today” (Swärd 2002: 78). And when it comes to offensive behaviour of Arab states and peoples, it is equally hostile and evil: when Arab states engaged in war against Israel in 1948 “the goal...was to directly smash the new state formation” (Nilsson 2008: 51) and Palestinian opposition to Israeli territorial policies are a part of Satan’s strategies (Nilsson 2009: 37).

Ekman is sending varying signals regarding his image of Arabs and Muslims. In one case Ekman is initially declaring that Islam is not one “monolithic bloc” (Ekman 2009: 325), and Muslims are neighbours deserving “our” love (Ekman 2009: 326). However, in his following argument, he claims that Muslims are violent (Ekman 2009: 327), dominant and expansionistic (Ekman 2009: 334), and they will probably only change to a smaller extent, since religion is essential (Ekman 2009: 328), and handed over like a package from one generation to another (Ekman 2009: 328–29).

Still, there are a few exceptions. Nils Ibstedt hardly involves Arabs or any other nation in his end-time speculations. Instead, he finds Scriptural support for vindicating that Jordan will *not* take part in anti-Christ’s assault on Israel and will be a refuge for surviving Jews after Armageddon (Ibstedt 2005: 140).

*Swedish Christian Zionist Descriptions of Jews.* Throughout all the studied years, Jews are favourably described in Swedish Christian Zionism. They are supposedly talented, capable, democratic, progressive, and ethical. Sometimes Jews are not only talented in general, they are “probably the most talented people in the world” (Sollerman 1978: 47),

contributing eminently to the development of humanity (Wigholm 1986: 14). This fact has given Jews a prominent position in different societies (Sollerman 1978: 46). In fact, no country has given humanity so many scientists and Noble Prize Award winners as Israel (Ramstrand 1974: 57). Jews are capable (Sollerman 1978: 53), having discovered heavy oxygen, antibiotics against cancer, a cure for Parkinson's disease (Sollerman 1978: 34), and developed an aeroplane with "specific qualities" (Sollerman 1978: 37).

Jews have also the capability to "make the deserts bloom" (Ramstrand 1982: 55f, 1974: 13; Sollerman 1978: 11) and to "drain the marshes and to irrigate the moors" (Wigholm 1986: 44; Sollerman 1978: 11). Within a few decades, Israel received "rich harvests of wheat, barley, oranges, grapefruits, mandarins, grapes, apples..." (Thorell 1971: 169). The planting of trees, the urban development, and the development of agriculture indicate that Israel is a "far-sighted nation" (Sollerman 1978: 11) and will have a "bright future" (Hällzon 1967: 31–32).

Israel is also depicted as morally superior since it is "a democratic oasis in a desert of feudal *sheikhdoms and military dictatorships*" (Wigholm 1986: 82) and no country is more democratic (Ramstrand 1974: 57). Israeli development aid (Sollerman 1978: 38) and its reception of Jewish refugees (Ramstrand 1974: 57) are further signs of Israeli ethics. Lastly, it is also assumed that Jews in the Messianic millennium will be the leading nation, and Jerusalem a global capital (Ramstrand 1974: 117). Moreover, the Jewish nation is not only superior, but is also small and vulnerable to Arab threats (Wigholm 1986: 51, 61; Sollerman 1978: 34).

Yet, this philo-Semitism is not unequivocally positive. According to Christian Zionism, Jews should return to Israel (Ramstrand 1987: 57) not only for their own sake, but to facilitate God's plan for salvation. If the Jews are not *there*, God's universal rescue plan will be obstructed. Thus, Jews have an instrumental value. In fact, Jewish return to Israel is so important that God undertook radical measures in order to make unwilling Jews to move to Israel. "God sent Nazi and Communist 'hunters', that literally chased large numbers of surviving Jews from the Second World War to the forefathers' old homeland" (Dahlberg 1980: 18).

Jews are not only instrumentalized, but also mystified as a *Blut und Boden*-rhetoric appears. Stig Hällzon, for instance, depicts Jews, as "rootless, homeless" (Hällzon 1967: 27) and "despised" (Hällzon 1967: 30) outside Israel. "The Jew," Hällzon says, "is longing for his fathers' land" (Hällzon 1967: 38). This is a potentially anti-Semitic

statement, as if Jews living elsewhere have less right to claim those nations as their true homeland.

Furthermore, the character of Jews is essentialized, in some cases even racialized. Jews are not only referred to as “the Jew” (Hällzon 1967: 38; Sollerman 1978: 45) but also as a “race” (Wigholm 1986: 14). Usually racializing texts are not that explicit. Ramstrand, for instance, focuses on Abraham’s generous character as an indication of Jewish contemporary (Ramstrand 1976a: 85). Abraham’s generosity would be transferred from one generation to the next and now constitute a collective national characteristic (Sollerman 1978: 46).

This tendency to give Israel and Jews general positive attributes has severe side effects. The idea that Jews have extraordinary capacities can be regarded as a threat (Sartre 1944/1995: 22). It is said that “the Jews...rule world economy” (Thorell 1971: 163) and that Adolf Hitler was partly right describing “Jews as a threat to humanity” (Nilsson 1975: 9).

Some authors mix philo-Semitism with explicit anti-Semitic sentiments. Nilsson claims that “Judaism brings the best and the worst in humanity” (Nilsson 1975: 9), that “Trotsky the Jew” was Godless and possessed by Satan (Belfrage 1970: 33), and that Jewish martyrs, unlike Christian ones, call for revenge (Ramstrand 1982: 50). “The Jews” are “disobedient” (Wigholm 1986: 22), and they do not want to hear of Jesus (Thorell 1971: 7). Furthermore, this disobedience has consequences. Ramstrand indicates that the Holocaust was a consequence of the Jewish rejection of Christ (Ramstrand 1974: 24).

This image of Jews also appears in 1990–2001. Jews are still assumed to be talented, democratic, progressive, and capable. Israel supposedly has seven times as many scientists as Egypt (Sollerman 1991: 13). Jews have an immense cultural influence universally (Ekman 1996: 119). Israel is also morally superior, taking care of one-another like a single family while enduring Saddam Hussein’s missile bombings in 1991 (Ekman 1996: 124).

Now we can discern a tendency to whitewash Israeli unethical behaviour probably as an effect of increasing criticism against Israel in the Swedish media. In some cases, Israel is portrayed as having very few alternatives, “squeezed between the shields and fighting for its survival” (Strand 1990: 65). Therefore, evil behaviour, even a future alliance with anti-Christ (Strand 1990: 126), is described as something beyond Israeli responsibility, since Israel will be forced into it (Strand 1990: 194). In other cases, Israeli

oppression and violence are considered to be the work of insignificant groups and, hence, marginalized (Reichmann 1999: 55), or behaviour that is universalised, thereby diluting its Jewish character (Strand 1990: 53).

In this period, no clear instrumentalization occurs, merely slightly concealed ones. For instance, it is not only said that “Israel of today is a miracle,” but also that Jews are the key to redemption (Ekman 1996: 120). Likewise, it is not only stated that Jewish immigration is a work of God (Ekman 1992: 66), but also that the existence of Israel is “the clearest sign for the imminence of the second coming of Christ” (Strand 1990: 75). Similarly, there is a tendency to objectify. For instance, Ekman claims that the Lord told him to “take the Russian Jews out of the Soviet Union” (Ekman 1996: 125). Thus, Russian Jews are not subjects defining their own destiny, but an object for Ekman’s concern.

Furthermore, some anti-Semitic expressions are found. Jews are stereotyped, as when they are referred to as “this people” (Strand 1990: 53). But still worse is that Israel supposedly “without any regret” (Åkerlund 2001: 61–62) denied that Jesus is Messiah. This is regarded as the Jews’ greatest mistake (Strand 1990: 57, 138, 145, 246), and is a reason for their great suffering (Åkerlund 2001: 64, 86). The victim is hereby responsible for one’s own fate. It is also believed that this denial combined with Jewish propaganda will lead to Israel’s embrace of the anti-Christ (Åkerlund 2001: 69–70).

The favourable image of Jews remains the same in 2002–12. Jews are still notorious Nobel Prize award winners (Ibstedt 2006: 36), and they still make the desert bloom (Johansson 2003: 157). And just as in previous periods, it is assumed that Israel, in the Millennium, will be God’s tool and the leading nation in the world (Swärd 2002: 102; Ibstedt 2005: 86). And again, negative behaviour is whitewashed. Israeli involvement in wars is extorted by Arab threat (Nilsson 2008: 51; Johansson 2003: 168), and now even the fact that Jews rejected the Messiah is given an external reason: God hardened them (Ibstedt 2005: 40).

*German Christian Zionist Descriptions of Arabs and Muslims.* Like Swedish Christian Zionism, the German equivalent is throughout the period describing Arabs and Muslims in accordance with war theology. Muslims are allegedly generally and inflexibly violent. Occasionally they are also shrewd, unreliable, satanic, and intellectually inferior.

Already in the Cold War this literature describes Muslims as powerful in spite of their alleged inferiority.<sup>13</sup> Furthermore Muslims are cruel (Baar 1984: 47) and blood-thirsty terrorists (May 1987: 161, 165). They fight with the sword (Gerth 1983: 114), they kill (Schneider 2007: 81), and lie (Dipper 1977: 235). They are unreliable (261) since they break peace (Gerth 1984: 57) and other agreements (Dipper 1977: 236). They are the enemy of God (Ben-Israel 1985: 31; Pasedag 1974: 21), and they try to exterminate Israel (Lorenz 1985: 86). They are bloodthirsty (Pasedag 1974: 28), incompetent (Pasedag 1974: 11), and terrorists (Pasedag 1975: 92). Egyptians are unreliable like crocodiles (Jaffin 1987: 74). Arabs are also likened to the Arab ancestor Ismael, a “wild donkey” in constant conflict with everyone (Pasedag 1975: 92; Gerth 1984: 87).

Christian Zionist literature also focuses on corrupt Arab leaders and makes them personify Arabs. The Grand Mufti Haj Amin al-Husseini and his Nazi leanings receive particular attention (Jaffin 1987: 72). Likewise, Arafat is called a “mass murderer” (Quadflieg 1987: 188) and Khomeini is “blood-thirsty” (Quadflieg 1987: 189). Nasser and Sadat are purportedly “double-dealing” (Pasedag 1975: 107), and Nasser is oppressing Jews (Jaffin 1987: 73). Arab states, lastly, are willing to exterminate Israel (Schlink 1968: 18), and a part of “Satan’s murder plan” (Pasedag 1974: 2).

Likewise, Arabs are repeatedly connected to unexplained and unacceptable behaviour. This discourse Willy Pasedag takes to a new level, making Arabs guilty of behaviour that has not yet been committed, claiming that Arabs in the end-time *will be* siding with Satan “with shouts of joy” (Pasedag 1975: 106).

Last, not one single text in this first period can be identified, in which the readership is given a chance to understand the Arabs. Even Palestinian *Christians*, who could be used for this purpose, are disregarded and in one case referred to as “so-called Christians” (Jaffin 1987: 72).

The description of Arab or Muslim political elites follows the same logic also in 1990–2001. There is still a focus on corrupt Arab leaders (May 1990: 173; Tlach 1991: 46; Schrupp 2001: 13). Arafat is untrustworthy (Schrupp 2001: 20; Ziegler 2001: 80), a “mass murderer” (Jaffin 1987: 72) comparable with Hitler (May 1990: 9; Makatowski 2001: 22) with anti-Semitic values (Schrupp 1991: 84), but without any desire for peace (Schrupp 2001: 17).

Likewise, Islam is considered as the heir of Nazism (Baar 1992: 116; Baar 1994: 33), as Satan’s tool (Wagner 1995: 139), and striving for world domination (Baar 1994:

81; Schrupp 1991: 37). Its world mission is carried out as a religious war (Schrupp 1997: 19), or as an Arab war of aggression (Pülz 1998: 11), motivated by the Quran (Schrupp 1991: 76), and “hate” (Schlink 1991: 6). Muslims, furthermore, are unreliable peace-breakers (Ziegler 2001: 80).

Arabs are allegedly lazy, destructive (May 1994: 43), hateful (Schneider 1996: 83), and “ruled by their religion” (Schrupp 1991: 37).<sup>14</sup> They rearm (Baar 1994: 152; Schrupp 1992: 161) and in 1948, 160 million Arabs declared war against Israel (Schneider 1996: 27; Hornung 1998: 41).<sup>15</sup> In spite of their inferiority, Arabs are dangerously powerful through their oil reserves (Schrupp 1991: 38; Schrupp 1992: 146; Baar 1992: 26, 110; Baar 1994: 28) and high nativity (Schrupp 1992: 80, 83). It is even stated that the birth of Ismael was according to Satan’s wish and has become Israel’s curse (Baar 1994: 30–31).

There is no volition in these texts to understand Arabs or give them universal human characters. On the contrary, they are portrayed as cultural robots, lacking the ability to think independently, following religious teaching without reflection (Pfisterer 1992: 132–33).

The portrayal of Arabs and Muslims in 2002–12 follows the same basic logic as previous years, but has become more aggressive. Comparisons between Hitler and different Muslim and Arab leaders are more pervasive, as well as the idea that Arabs are Satan’s tool.

Arabs are associated with a desire to exterminate Israel (Schneider 2011a: 45, 47, 68; Schneider 2007: 45, 68), with crime (Schneider 2007: 68), escalating hatred (Kischkel 2003: 71), and violence (Schneider 2007: 38). Arab parents are even willing to sacrifice their own children as martyrs (Moser 2004: 17). Furthermore, Palestinians are Satan’s tool (Krimmer 2010: 134), proud idolaters (Krimmer 2010: 137), and “a plaything of dark forces” (Makatowski 2003: 47). Their political struggle against Israel’s settlements is not only an obstacle to peace (Moser 2004: 15), but also a struggle against God’s own promises (Schneider 2011c: 52).

Just as in the previous periods, Islam ostensibly teaches Muslims to lie (Schneider 2003: 69). Furthermore, Islam is supposedly evil (Baar 2002a: 76), loveless (Schneider 2007: 47; Schneider 2011a: 47), prone to use terror (Penkazki 2002b: 32; Schneider 2007: 45, 47, 68; Schneider 2011a: 41; Schneider 2011b: 70, 83), and the enemy of God (May 2002: 134, 145). Muslims, furthermore, are deceitful (Reusch 2003: 92), violent (Reusch 2003: 92), and fanatic warriors (Penkazki 2002b: 48). They worship a desert

demon (Keil 2008: 29), strive for world dominance (Penkazki 2002b: 32; Schneider 2007: 61).<sup>16</sup> And “everywhere where Muslims live, a ‘Holy War’ is in process” (Reusch 2003: 92). Thus, interfaith dialogue is a disaster (Schneider 2003: 66).

Just as in the previous periods, there is a focus on Arab leaders (Krimmer 2010: 134) and their standpoints (Schneider 2011c: 57, 60). And again, the Grand Mufti Haj Amin al-Husseini is getting attention for his support for Hitler and the Holocaust (Schrupp 2007: 53). Arafat is allegedly a warmonger (Penkazki 2002b: 46), a master liar (May 2002: 122), and an obstacle to peace (Schneider 2011b: 85). Mohammed, the founder of Islam, and Yasser Arafat are both compared to Hitler (Penkazki 2002a: 29; Baar 2002a: 16, 36, 56). It is also suggested that “the parallels between National Socialism and Islam are remarkable” (Baar 2002a: 56, 90). Arab states, lastly, are waiting for the opportunity to assault Israel (Kischkel 2003: 57), and thereby held responsible for *future* deeds. Neither Arab nor Muslim violence is explained (Schneider 2011a: 39, 66; Gerloff 2002: 7, 16, 39). It is even stated that social problems do not explain violence, but Islam does (Gerloff 2002: 55).

Neither Arabs nor Muslims are described as dynamic, learning from past failures and misdeeds. However, they will change when they meet Christ in His coming Kingdom, and they will live as equal citizens in Israel (Schneider 2007: 67).

Just as in previous periods Arabs and Islam are described as inferior. Arabs managed to turn Israel, a granary, into a desert (Schneider 2007: 81). Still, in spite of their inferiority, they constitute a threat: Islam is growing rapidly (Baar 2002a: 78; Gassmann 2002: 42) and Arab dominate in the UN (Schneider 2011c: 41), and turn Israel into a small island in a sea of hostile Arabs (Gerloff 2002: 27) Their oil resources are emphasized (Baar 2002a: 49), and they constitute a huge market, much bigger than the Israeli (Schneider 2007: 63), which might turn the Western world against Israel.

*German Christian Zionist Descriptions of Jews.* Although German Christian Zionism is like its Swedish counterpart insofar as it is generally philo-Semitic, there are some unexpected, and mostly implicit, anti-Semitic components.

Already in the first period, Jews are depicted uncritically; they are supposedly special or superior, the nobility of humankind (Jakober 1977: 120, 136), however, with a deviant “Jewish mentality” (Gerth 1983: 82). Jews are God’s loved people (Schlink 1968: 106), they make the desert bloom (Pasedag 1973: 147) and rebuild a formerly devastated

country (Kirsten-Herbst 1986:26). Even more so, the Holy Land will not bloom unless Jews are residing in it (Jaffin 1987: 51). Likewise, Jews are more intelligent and inventive, and have more Nobel Prize Award winners than any other nation (May 1975: 310). Moreover, Jews are noble, courageous and effective (Koch 1968: 8, 20). They have sworn that Masada shall not fall again (Gerth 1983: 82). Lastly, this philo-Semitism also colours eschatology; in the Messianic era God will supposedly rule through the Jews (Lorenz 1985: 83), and the Jews will resume their legitimate prioritized position (Lorenz 1985: 83), being a leading nation (Hubmer 1987: 75), with supremacy over all nations (Schlink 1968: 109).

Unlike Arab violence, Israeli violence, such as military operations, is repeatedly explained (May 1970: 202; Pasedag 1974: 5), described as self-defence (Jaffin 1987: 75) or as regrettable evil (Jaffin 1987: 77). Undeniably malicious behaviour is described as exceptions (Jaffin 1987: 72). Military victories are described as divine miracles (Pasedag 1974: 11). And lastly, Israeli Defence Forces kill with tears in their eyes and only because they have to (Jaffin 1987: 77). Thus, violence never becomes a part of Jewish identity.

Still, some, perhaps unintentional, anti-Semitic themes occur. First, since Jews are so important, their mistakes have extraordinary consequences. For instance, Jewish “disobedience” turned them into a universal curse (Clöter 1979: 128; Hubmer 1968: 58; Schlink 1968: 60–61), and caused their own suffering (Pasedag 1974: 22). Likewise, the authors claim that there is a correlation between Jewish rejection of Christ and Jewish persecution. For instance, it is said that as long as Jews do not recognize Messiah they will have no peace (Pasedag 1974: 22), and that this rejection has led to the destruction of Israel, diaspora, and persecution, including the Holocaust (Hubmer 1968: 58). It is also stressed that Israel’s curses in diaspora “are no coincidence...but God’s acting, in accordance with the behaviour of His people” (Schlink 1968: 61, c.f. 38), and a part of God’s education (Pasedag 1974: 22).<sup>17</sup>

Second, the Jewish return to Israel is instrumentalized. The basic idea is that Jews return, not for their own sake, but in order to pave the way for the advent of the Messianic Kingdom. Jews have to return (Gerth 1984: 21), and Jerusalem has to be Jewish (Jaffin 1987: 74). However, once in place two-thirds will perish at Armageddon (May 1987: 239; Hubmer 1968: 57), or there will at least be a Jewish mass slaughter where only 144.000 god-fearing Jews will survive (Schlink 1968: 80).



Third, holocaust is instrumentalized, a tool used by God to give back the Promised Land to the Jewish people (Buchwald 1982: 46; Hubmer 1968: 55–56).

Fourth, even the Christian Zionist claim that Israel belongs to the Jews can be an expression of covert anti-Semitism, since it is also said that “every Jew, who lives abroad, lives in exile” (Jaffin 1987: 50), giving Jews a less self-evident belonging elsewhere.

And last, Jews are reoccurring understood as different from other nations, and in most cases “innocuous” (Clöter 1979: 125). However, there are allegedly other malign Jews, connected to freemasonry, who control the financial markets (Clöter 1979: 125). Likewise, Jews were allegedly playing a decisive role in establishing Communist rule in Russia (Clöter 1979: 125).

In the period 1990–2001 Jews are still depicted benevolently, though combined with unexpected anti-Semitic utterings. Jews are still intelligent and capable (Schrupp 1991: 24); “Jewish physics, psychology, music has revolutionized our century” (Schrupp 1991: 24). Moreover, they are pious, engaged in prayer, repentant, and give thanks to God for His protection during the Iraqi rocket attacks (Schlink 1991: 10–12). Furthermore, Jewish faith and longing for the Messiah is described in such a way that Christians can relate to it (Schrupp 1991: 80). Again, Jews make the land bloom (Schrupp 1997: 87; Schneider 1996: 78), they give the land new life, and without Jews it will turn into desert (May 1994: 42–43). Last, Israel will be a global power center in the coming Kingdom (Heide 1992: 20; Gensing 1991: 55).

The Israeli military is described as highly qualified (May 1990: 32) and civilized (Schrupp 2001: 28). It fires a gun only in self-defence (Schlink 1991: 6; Schneider 1996: 79) or maybe when in a panic (Bremer and Geppert 1998: 12). Jews are also suffering (Schlink 1991: 6), enduring daily PLO-terror (Schlink 1991: 19) that affect the life of ordinary Israelis (Schlink 1991: 9).

Moreover, the tendency to write concealed anti-Semitism continues. For instance, it is claimed that Jews living outside Israel are guests and strangers (Schlink 1991: 22; Schrupp 2001: 66), and without Israel, Jews lack a homeland (Schrupp 1991: 58), thereby indicating that they do not entirely belong in other countries.

The Holocaust and persecution are still instrumentalized since they facilitated the establishment of Israel (Baar 1994: 25; Pfisterer 1992: 99; Scheunemann 1993: 110–11; Pülz 1998: 39).

Explicit anti-Semitism occurs as well, putting forward negative stereotypical Jewish characters. It is said that unintelligent Jews at least have the capacity to make money (Jaffin 1995: 12), they control banks and the financial system (Ziegler 2001: 111, 118; c.f. Baar 1994: 10), just as they are responsible for the creation of world Communism (Ziegler 2001: 121; Quadflieg 1995: 109).

Lastly, the discourse surrounding Ethiopian Jews is intriguing since they belong both to a high-status Jewish community and an African one. Indeed, Ethiopian Jews are not described in the same manner as Jews with European or American descent. They were “discovered” by Dr. Rosen (Makatowski 2001: 14), thus objectified. They are never depicted as successful or intelligent, but as an ignorant (May 1998: 111) and a destitute group from “the African almshouse” who have come to the Promised Land (May 1998: 111) in need of rescue (May 1998: 57, 84).

This mixture of philo-Semitism and anti-Semitism continues in 2002–12. Jews are supposedly still intellectually and ethically superior. For instance, Jews are vastly overrepresented as Nobel Prize Award winners (Schneider 2011c: 15), Israel has a rapidly growing economy in spite of global financial crisis (Schneider 2011c: 23), Jews have made the desert bloom (Schmidt 2007: 64; Buchwald 2008: 87; Schneider 2011a: 38), and have the capacity to uphold a democratic system in the Middle East (Buchwald 2008: 69; Schrupp 2003: 42; Schneider 2011c: 19). Last, many in Israel hunger for holiness and for God (Kischkel 2003: 55).

In spite of its superiority, Israel is understood as vulnerable. What is feared in this last period is the risk that Arab and Muslim states within shortly will have a nuclear capability (Schrupp 2003: 84; Krimmer 2010: 46). Furthermore, Israel is also a victim for media’s anti-Semitic prejudice (Schneider 2011a: 40). Thus, they still need their “assigned region on the earth” (Kischkel 2003: 21), a true and safe Jewish homeland (Schrupp 2003: 41).

Just as in previous periods, Israeli violence is made acceptable. This violence is described in euphemistic terms (Kischkel 2003: 28) as restrictive (Gerloff 2002: 11), an unfortunate necessity (Schneider 2007: 53; Schneider 2011a: 41), a reactive measure for self-protection (Schneider 2011a: 38, 40; Schneider 2011c: 56), unintentional mistakes (Schneider 2011a: 39), and a struggle for survival (Schneider 2007: 54). Ludwig Schneider cannot deny that Arabs are discriminated by Israelis at check-points and other

controls, but manages to transfer the responsibility on Arabs by claiming that Arab “terror attacks destroyed the trust between Jews and Palestinians” (Schneider 2011c: 46).

As in previous periods, both Nazism and Jews are instrumentalized. The Third Reich was instrumental in increasing the awareness of the necessity of a Jewish homeland (Penkazki 2002a: 16). Furthermore, it is said that the return of Jews to Israel is no end in itself, but merely a phase in God’s plan (Schrupp 2003: 72), and two-thirds of the Jews will for the same reason perish at Armageddon (May 2002: 299).

Some clearly anti-Semitic voices are also heard during this period. It is claimed that the rejection of Christ not only caused the diaspora (Pritzlaff 2003: 15), but also delayed the Messianic Kingdom (Mücher 2004: 10). Furthermore, Werner Penkazki expresses explicit anti-Semitic stereotypes. He makes Israel responsible for a presumed future alliance with the anti-Christ, whom they will greet as a political liberator (Penkazki 2002b: 54). Furthermore, he depicts Jews as a people contradicting God, with an “unbending neo-pharisaic, unteachable attitude, obsessed with legalism, believing that thereby the advent of Messiah can be provoked” (Penkazki 2002a: 26; 2002b: 52). Yet in the very end, facing the last battle, Jews will repent and they will accept Messiah (Penkazki 2002b: 53).

#### PRESCRIPTIONS

According to Christian theology, humanity should cooperate with God while awaiting final redemption. In this section the study will analyse to what extent Swedish and German Christian Zionism adheres to the logic of war theology, implying that humanity should comply with a predestined program preceding the advent of Messiah, or whether it is approaches peace theology suggesting that humanity should spread the Kingdom and thus transforming the world while expecting Messiah.

Swedish Christian Zionist Prescriptions. Unsurprisingly, Swedish Christian Zionism puts forward a war theology also when it comes to prescriptions. Work for imminent peace is never promoted, but primarily not because of the dangers in an anarchical political situation, or because of human evilness. No, peace is explicitly dissuaded in the cold war era, since peace initiatives might be against God (Belfrage 1970: 25), and later it is said it might pave the way for anti-Christ (Nilsson 2009: 44; Ibstedt 2005: 142; 2006: 42), and obstruct God’s promises to Israel (Swärd 2002: 74). It is particularly warns against a division of Jerusalem since that can be “Satanic power trying to hinder God’s plan”

(Swärd 2002: 103). Still, few deviating voices are heard. Strand warns against Israeli usage of military, since it might not lead to sustainable peace (Strand 1990: 61).

German Christian Zionist Prescriptions. German Christian Zionist prescriptions are based on war theology. The readership is never suggested to work for any solution of the Middle East conflict. On the contrary, the conflict is unavoidable (Wagner 1995: 169) and one is only encouraged to support Israeli policies (Quadflieg 1987: 179), even its mistakes (Kischkel 2003: 70). Christians are also encouraged to praise Israel wherever Israel is being defamed (Schneider 2011a: 56). Although this discourse is fatalistic, some authors encourage its readers to avoid resignation and act until Messiah's advent, and to urge Israel to avoid policies triggering Palestinian "hate and enmity" (Krimmer 2010: 135). And peace *will* come, in a single state and in a Messianic era, when Palestinians and the Israelis will worship the same God (Schneider 2011c: 48).

Second, the readership is dissuaded from supporting peace initiatives or peace movements, since peace is regarded as impossible (Bergmann 1980: 52), and after (Wagner 1995: 169; Ziegler 2001: 85). Anti-Christ probably will be behind peace initiatives (Schneider 1996: 67), particularly peace at the expense of Israel (Schlink 1968: 83).

Third, Quadflieg puts forward a theological argument claiming that Jesus never spoke about changing the world, but changing the hearts of people (Quadflieg 1987: 262). Taking part in such movements would lead the church astray (Quadflieg 1987: 263).

The fact that the image of Muslims is getting increasingly negative after 2001, affects the prescriptions. At a global level, it is never possible to have a peaceful relationship with Islam, since Islam "either rules or is ruled" (Baar 2002a: 54). It is said that an appeasement policy will not do, since Islam is the new Hitler, and that the world is underestimating Islam today, as it was underestimating Hitler in the 1930s (Baar 2002a: 56).

## CONCLUSION

Swedish and German Christian Zionist literature, with very few exceptions, clearly adheres to war theology. It normalizes violence in the Middle East and it ethically dulls its readership into *neither* recognizing current violence against Arabs in the Middle East

*nor* expected violence against Jews at Armageddon. Peace, both universally and in the Middle East, is unattainable because of Satan's obstructions of God's plan for redemption, human wickedness, and Arab aggressiveness. Therefore, peace initiatives are dissuaded, or they appear as futile, even hazardous since peace initiatives can be satanic manoeuvres.

Christian Zionism describes Arabs stereotypically and consistently as inferior, violent, and unreliable. Some authors also describe Muslims as demonized, as obstructing God's plans for Israel and mankind, as Satan's tool. Thus they appear as deserving violence, and a constructive relationship with them is beyond reach.

Discursive changes over time are small. The ones that do occur concern the image of Muslims and Arabs. As said, the image is consistently negative but particularly the German discourse is getting more aggressive after 2001 and is drawing on Samuel Huntington's thesis on expected clashes of civilizations.

Likewise, differences between Swedish and German literature are small. However, German Christian Zionism is more inclined to instrumentalize Jews and even the Holocaust! The Holocaust is never defended, but given a function in the fatalistic process towards redemption.

Surprisingly, two prescriptions are missing: Although Israeli territorial concessions are rejected, the future of Palestinians on the occupied territories is never addressed. Although the readership is supposed to bless Jews, it is *never* encouraged to save Jews from expected horrors of Armageddon, where millions supposedly will die. On the contrary, Christians are supposed to encourage Jews to return to a region where this manslaughter will take place. Thus, Jews are instrumentalized, and considered to have a great value as a key to the return of Messiah, but only to have a limited intrinsic value.

Most importantly, some Christian Zionist authors are cautious, and do not share *all* of these Christian Zionist beliefs. Still no authors are explicitly challenging its core values or dogmas.

## NOTES

1. According to Roland H. Bainton, these differing attitudes are "not rooted in different views of God and only to a degree in different views of man, because all Christians recognized the depravity of man. The question was how to treat his depravity" (Bainton 1960: 14f).

2. Apocalyptic literature is a genre that on the basis of divine revelation aims at interpreting the course of world history, and especially revealing the Last Days.
3. Dispensationalism originates from John Nelson Darby (1800–82) in the nineteenth century Great Britain. According to this view, all believers in Christ will be raptured in the end-times, i.e., lifted up in the sky. The ones left behind will experience a tribulation, a relatively short period of time characterized by hardships, disasters, famine, war, pain, and suffering.
4. ‘Anti-Christ’ is a Christian term used throughout church history, referring to a deceiver who will become a world leader and appearing before the return of Christ (Lat. ante-Christ). According to some Christians he will claim to be Christ, appear as a false peacemaker, and fill the earth with evil. However, Christ will defeat him at his second coming.
5. Although sharing the same basic assumptions and sees the Great Tribulations coming, John Åkerlund (2001) is not a fatalist, he does not discourage from peace work. On the contrary, he claims that arms race is a gender issue and encourages women to work against this “insanity” (Åkerlund 2001: 41).
6. Only one author questions this idea (Lubahn 1976: 35).
7. Hubmer 1987: 51; Gerth 1983: 115; Baar 1984: 63; May 1975: 259–60; Quadflieg 1987: 171.
8. Hubmer 1987: 23; Pasedag 1973: 148; Salomon 1980: 161, 164; Gerth 1983: 64; May 1987: 232; Mink 1987: 465; Hubmer 1968: 57, 84; Pasedag 1975: 150; Schlink 1968: 84–87.
9. Clöter 1979: 49; Jakober 1977: 124; Buchwald 1982: 138; Baar 1984: 290; May 1975: 302; Lorenz 1985: 81.
10. May 1994: 160; Bremer and Geppert 1998: 6; Bremer and Geppert 1998: 6; Makatowski 2001: 15; Baar 1994: 33; Gassmann 1993: 21; Schrupp 2001: 29.
11. Mücher 2004: 39; Kischkel 2003: 9, 67, 71; Penkazki 2002: 26; Baar 2002a: 51; Baar 2002b: 120.
12. Penkazki 2002a: 26; 2002b: 36, 58; Krimmer 2010: 41, 68, 118, 175; Baar 2002a: 51; Buchwald 2008: 194; Penkazki 2002: 56, 58.
13. Gerth 1984: 87; Gerth 1983: 114; May 1987: 162; Baar 1984: 66; Bergmann 1980: 10, 17; Pasedag 1974: 11.

14. Two deviant cases are found: Fritz May mentions peace-longing Arabs (1990: 190), and Rainer Wagner claims that Arabs are blessed through their ancestor Abraham (1995: 78).
15. Hans Eißler and Walter Nanny shed some light on the attack on Deir Yassin (2001: 190).
16. One deviant voice is found: Johannes Gerloff quotes a Palestinian who is longing for peace (Gerloff 2002: 47).
17. Some authors reject the idea that the diaspora was God's verdict for rejecting their Messiah (Schrupp 1997: 36; Lamparter 1977: 135–36). Pasedag stresses that diaspora is Divine education, not punishment (Pasedag 1974:22).

## REFERENCES

### METHOD AND THEORY

- Bainton, Ronald H. (1960). *Christian Attitudes toward War and Peace, A Historical Survey and Critical Re-evaluation* (New York: Abingdon Press).
- Boréus, Kristina. (2010). Den försynta diskursiva vändningen i svensk statsvetenskap, in Magnus Jerneck and Jonas Badersten (eds) *Kontraster och nyanser* (Lund: Statsvetenskaplig tidskrift).
- van Dijk, Teun A. (1995). Aims of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Japanese Discourse* 1, 17–27.
- Durham, Martin. (2004). Evangelical Protestantism and Foreign Policy in the United States after September 11. *Patterns of Prejudice* 38, 145–58.
- Entman, Robert. (1993). Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm. *Journal of Communication* 43 (4), 51–58.
- Fairclough, Norman. (1993). Critical Discourse Analysis and the Marketization of Public Discourse: The Universities. *Discourse & Society* 4 (2), 133–68.
- Firestone, Reuven. (1996). Conceptions of Holy War in Biblical and Qur'ānic Tradition. *The Journal of Religious Ethics* 24 (1), 99–123.
- Galtung, Johan. (1990). Cultural Violence. *Journal of Peace Research* 27 (3), 291–305.
- Giddens, Anthony. (1971). *Capitalism and Modern Social Theory, An Analysis of the Writings of Marx, Durkheim and Max Weber* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

- Goldman, Shalom. (2009). *Zeal for Zion, Christian, Jews and the Idea of the Promised Land* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press).
- Huntington, Samuel P. (1996). *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (London: Touchstone).
- Jones, Melinda. (2002). *Social Psychology of Prejudice* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall).
- Kempf, Wilhelm. (2010). War Propaganda versus Peace Journalism, in Wilhelm Kempf (ed) *Readings in Peace Journalism* (Berlin: Verlag Irina Regener).
- Kling, David William. (2004). *Bible in History: How the Texts Have Changed the Times* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Landmann, Todd. (2008). *Issues and Methods in Comparative Politics, An Introduction* (3d ed) (London and New York: Routledge).
- Lynch, Jake, and McGoldrick, Annabel. (2005). *Peace Journalism* (Stroud, UK: Hawthorn Press).
- Nederveen Pieterse, Jan. (1991). The History of a Metaphor: Christian Zionism and the Politics of Apocalypse. *Archives de science sociale des religions* 36, 75–103.
- Paas, Steven. (2012). *Christian Zionism Examined, A Review on Ideas on Israel, the Church and the Kingdom* (Hamburg: VTR Publications).
- Petersson, Olof. (1987). *Metaforeernas makt* (Stockholm: Carlssons Bokförlag).
- Poole, Elizabeth and Richardson, John E. (2006). Introduction, in Elizabeth Poole and John E. Richardson (eds) *Muslims and the News Media* (London: I.B. Tauris).
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. (1944/1995). *Anti-Semite and Jew* (New York: Schocken Books).
- Spector, Stephen. (2009). *Evangelicals and Israel, The Story of American Christian Zionism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Sternberg, Robert J. and Sternberg, Karin. (2008). *The Nature of Hate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Volf, Miroslav. (1996). *Exclusion and Embrace, A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press).
- Wetherell, Margaret and Potter, Jonathan. (1992). *Mapping the Language of Racism, Discourse, and the Legitimation of Exploitation* (New York: Columbia University Press).



- Winter Jørgensen, Marianne and Phillips, Louise. (1999). *Diskursanalyse som teori og metode* (Roskilde: Roskilde Universitetsforlag).
- Yoder, John Howard. (1994). *The Politics of Jesus* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Erdmans Publishing Company).

#### SWEDISH CHRISTIAN ZIONIST LITERATURE

- Belfrage, Daniel Oscar. (1970). *Profetisk världshistoria* (Örebro: Evangeliipress).
- Dahlberg, Gotthard. (1980). *Guds plan med Israel* (Stockholm: Förlaget Filadelfia).
- Ekman, Ulf. (2009). *Andliga rötter* (Uppsala: Keryx/Livets ords förlag).
- Ekman, Ulf. (1996). *Denna välsignade press* (Uppsala: Livets ords förlag).
- Ekman, Ulf. (1995). *Doktriner, Den kristna trons grundvalar* (Uppsala: Livets ords förlag).
- Ekman, Ulf. (1992). *Judarna. Framtidens folk* (Uppsala: Livets Ords Förlag).
- Ekman, Ulf. (2004). *Älskade hatade Israel* (Uppsala: Livets Ords Förlag).
- Hällzon, Florentinus. (1967). *Vad skall ske när Jesus kommer?* (Örebro: Evangeliipress).
- Ibstedt, Nils. (2006). *Samtal om tidens tecken, Kristi återkomst och de yttersta dagarna, En studiecirkel där olika tolkningar bryts mot varandra* (Broby: IBE-förlaget).
- Ibstedt, Nils. (2005). *Samtal om profeten Daniels visioner och Apokalypsen, Tre tolkningsteorier* (Broby: IBE-förlaget).
- Johansson, Dan. (2003). *Hur kommer det att gå? Profeterna tittar in i framtiden* (Malmö: Dan Johansson).
- Lilja, Tommy. (2006). *Judarna. Evighetens hjältar* (Uppsala: Relevant Media).
- Lindblom, Eric. (1975). *Världssituation och den bibliska profetian* (Örebro: Evangeliipress).
- Lundmark, John. (1967). *Möte med Israel* (Uppsala: Urisförlaget).
- Nilsson, Erik. (1975). *Israel, inte som andra folk* (Stockholm: Westerbergs Förlag).
- Nilsson, Holger. (2009). *Bibelns sista budskap (Uppenbarelseboken)*, Forserum: KM & Bornelings).
- Nilsson, Holger. (2008). *Midnattstid, Var vaken i ändens tid* (Forserum: KM & Bornelings).
- Nilsson, Sven. (1994). *Det hotade och välsignade Israel* (Mullhyttan: Shalom Ministry).
- Nilsson, Sven. (1989). *Välsigna Israel. För Guds skull!* (Örebro: Evangeliipress).

- Ramstrand, Karl. (1974). *Israel—angår det oss, dagshändelser, historia, profetia* (Jönköping: Karl Ramstrand Förlag).
- Ramstrand, Karl. (1976a). *På väg mot 1984, Israel, världen och vi* (Jönköping: Karl Ramstrand Förlag).
- Ramstrand, Karl. (1987). *Rymdåldern och Uppenbarelsboken* (Gränna: Ramstrands).
- Ramstrand, Karl. (1976b). *Uppenbarelsboken* (Bromma: Förlaget Filadelfia AB).
- Ramstrand, Karl. (1982). *Världsfred eller världskrig, Mellanöstern i fokus* (Stockholm: Förlaget Filadelfia).
- Reichmann, Sven. (1999). *Den religiösa politiken, När religionen får makt eller makten blir religiös...* (Örebro: Marcus Förlag).
- Reichmann, Sven. (1995). *Judarna, Det nya förbundets folk* (Mölnadal: Uttrycket Förlag).
- Reichmann, Sven. (2006). *Världens medelpunkt, Det moderna Israels historia* (Haninge: XP media).
- Sandstedt, Olle. (1992). *Snart är han här* (Stockholm: Förlaget Filadelfia).
- Sollerman, Samuel. (1978). *Fakta om judar och araber i Mellersta Östern* (Örebro: Evangeliipress).
- Sollerman, Samuel. (1991). *Israel, islam och andra tecken i profetiskt perspektiv* (Örebro: Evangeliipress).
- Strand, Ingemar. (1999). *Dramatiska slutscener, Med Uppenbarelsboken i tiden...* (Örebro: Marcus Förlag).
- Strand, Ingemar. (1990). *Kristus kommer åter, Världsdramats slutakt* (Örebro: Evangeliipress).
- Swärd, Bertil. (2002). *Jesus kommer synligt för alla, Vad händer sedan?* (Stockholm: Södermalm Media).
- Thorell, Folke. (1971). *Israel vaknar* (Örebro: Evangeliipress).
- Wigholm, Anders. (1986). *Israel, Männslighetens ödesfråga* (Örebro: Evangeliipress).
- Åkerlund, John. (2001). *Atomålderns ödestimma* (Kungsbacka: Kerysso förlag).

#### GERMAN CHRISTIAN ZIONIST LITERATURE

- Baar, Marius. (2002a). *Eskalation in Nahost, Heiliger Krieg im heiligen Land* (Dillenburg: Christliche Verlagsgesellschaft).

- Baar, Marius. (2002b). *Kollision der Kulturen, Apokalypse der Zukunft* (Dillenburg: Christliche Verlagsgesellschaft).
- Baar, Marius. (1984). *Nahost—Auftakt zu Weltbrand oder Weltfreunden?, Erbschaftsstreit zwischen Ismael und Isaak um Volk, Land und Segen* (Bad Liebenzell: Verlag der Liebenzeller Mission).
- Baar, Marius. (1992). *Zeitbomben der Weltgeschichte, Nahost—die Folgen eines jahrhundertealten Missverständnisses* (Lahr: Verlag der Liebenzeller Mission).
- Ben-Israel, Arie. (1985). *Hass oder Liebe?* (Friedberg: Zion-Verlag).
- Bergmann, Gerhard. (1980). *Die Herausforderung des Islam* (Neuhausen: Neuhausen).
- Bremer, Jörg and Geppert, Karl-Heinz. (1998). *Israel, Wo Zeit und Ewigkeit sich treffen* (Lahr: Verlag der Liebenzeller Mission).
- Buchwald, Willi. (1982). *Israel und die Zukunft der Welt* (Moers: Brendow Verlag).
- Buchwald, Willi. (2008). *Die Zukunft der Welt und Israel* (Holzgerlingen: Hänssler).
- Clöter, Christoph. (1979). *Prophetie und Enthüllung* (Battenberg: Philadelphia-Verlag).
- Dipper, Karl. (1977). *Gerechtigkeit für Israel, Gottes Volk braucht sein Land* (Wuppertal: R Brockhaus Verlag).
- Eißler, Hans and Nänny, Walter. (2001). *Wegbereiter für Israel, Aus der Geschichte der Anfänge 1850–1950* (Metzingen: Ernst Fran Verlag).
- Gassmann, Lothar. (2002). *Globalisierung und Antichrist* (Wuppertal: Verlag für Reformatorische Erneuerung).
- Gassmann, Lothar. (1993). *Die Zukunft findet doch statt, Krisen der Welt und die Zeichen der Zeit* (Lahr: Verlag der Liebenzeller Mission).
- Gensing, Erich. (1991). *Israel und die Gemeinde Jesu* (Pforzheim: Missionsverlag Gottlob Ling).
- Gerloff, Johannes. (2002). *Jüdische Siedlungen, Kriegsverbrechen oder Erfüllung biblischer Prophetie?* (Holzgerlingen: Hänssler).
- Gerth, Klaus. (1983). *Der Antichrist kommt, Die 80er Jahre—Galgenfrist der Menschheit* (Asslar: Schulte und Gerth).
- Gerth, Klaus. (1984). *Endzeit, Krise und Ausweg* (Asslar: Schulte und Gerth).
- Hornung, Andreas. (1998). *Israel und wir Christen, Eine biblische Einführung* (Lübeck: Christliche Kommunikation und Verlagsgesellschaft).
- Hubmer, Fritz. (1968). *Der Heilsplan Gottes* (Stuttgart-Hohenheim: Hänssler-Verlag).

- Hubmer, Fritz. (1987). *Endzeitprophetie, Die Aktualität der Zukunftsreden Jesu Christi* (Neuhausen: Hänssler).
- Jaffin, David. (1987). *Israel am Ende der Tage* (Bad Liebenzell: Verlag der Liebenzeller Mission).
- Jaffin, David. (1995). *Israels Erwählung und endzeitliche Bedeutung* (Bad Liebenzell: Verlag der Liebenzeller Mission).
- Jakober, Walter. (1977). *Israel ist erwählt* (Metzingen: Sternberg-Verlag).
- Keil, Waltraud. (2008). *Um Zions Willen schweige ich nicht* (Solingen: Bernard).
- Kirsten-Herbst, Ruth. (1986). *Der Feigenbaum grünt, Israel mit dem Herzen erlebt, Lahr-Dinglingen* (Verlag der St.-Johannis-Druckerei Schweickhardt).
- Kischkel, Arnd. (2003). *Der Herr ruft Israel, Das Licht des Evangeliums kehrt zurück nach Zion* (Leipzig: DDF).
- Koch, Kurt. (1968). *Der Kommende, Israel in der Erfüllungszeit* (Berghausen: Evangelisationsverlag).
- Krimmer, Heiko. (2010). *Ich habe dich erwählt, Israel im Licht des Propheten Sacharja* (Holzgerlingen: SCM Hänssler).
- Lamparter, Helmut. (1977). *Die Hoffnung der Christen, Das Ende der Welt und die Wiederkunft* (Wuppertal: Aussat Verlag).
- Lorenz, Friedhelm. (1985). *Und es wird keine Zeit mehr sein* (Stuttgart: Christliches Verlagshaus).
- Lubahn, Erich. (1976). *Licht an einem dunklen Ort* (Stuttgart: Christliches Verlagshaus).
- Lubahn, Erich. (1987). *Was kommt auf uns zu? Apokalyptik—Endzeitfragen* (Metzingen: Verlag Ernst Franz).
- Makatowski, Birger. (2003). *Die Messianische Bewegung und die Christen* (Solingen: Verlag Gottfried Bernard).
- Makatowski, Birger. (2001). *Der Plan Gottes für die letzte Zeit, Der Stellenwert Israels dabei* (Solingen: Verlag Gottfried Bernard).
- May, Fritz. (2002). *Apokalypse über Jerusalem, Die Heilige Stadt im Brennpunkt dramatischer Endzeitgeschichte* (Asslar: Schulte und Gerth).
- May, Fritz. (1998). *Aufbruch im Heiligen Land* (Asslar: Verlag Klaus Gerth).
- May, Fritz. (1990). *Israel heute—Ein lebendiges Wunder, Ein aktueller Streifzug durch die Gegenwart Israels* (Asslar: Verlag Klaus Gerth).

- May, Fritz. (1987). *Israel zwischen Blut und Tränen, Der Leidensweg des jüdischen Volkes* (Asslar: Schulte und Gerth).
- May, Fritz. (1975). *Israel zwischen Weltpolitik und Messiaserwartung* (Moers: Telos Verlagsgruppe).
- May, Fritz. (1970). *Menschheit wohin?* (Neuhausen: Hänssler Verlag).
- May, Fritz. (1994). *Schalom, Gelobtes Land* (Asslar: Schulte und Gerth).
- Mink, Paul. (1987). *Christus oder anti-Christus, Maranatha, Andachtsbuch für ihren Herrn wartende Christen* (Hirzenhain: Maranatha-Mission).
- Moser, Tilbert. (2004). *Der Nahost-Konflikt, Seine Hintergründe im Licht der biblischen Prophetie und unsere christliche Antwort* (Hamburg: Hamburg: GGE aktuell).
- Mücher, Werner. (2004). *Tausend Jahre Frieden, Biblische Prophetie aktuell* (Retzow: Daniel-Verlag).
- Pasedag, Willy. (1973). *Enthüllte Endzeit* (Bieselsberg: Morgenland-Verlag).
- Pasedag, Willy. (1974). *Israels vierter Krieg im Licht biblischer Prophetie* (Bieselsberg: Morgenland-Verlag).
- Pasedag, Willy. (1975). *Letztes Geschehen nach der Bibel* (Bieselsberg: Morgenland-Verlag).
- Penkazki, Werner. (2002a). *Israel, Der dritte Weltkrieg und wir* (Wuppertal: Verlag für Reformatorische Erneuerung).
- Penkazki, Werner. (2002b). *Was kommt, Die Zukunft aus biblischer Perspektive* (Wuppertal: Verlag für Reformatorische Erneuerung).
- Pfisterer, Rudolf. (1992). *Israel oder Palästina?, Perspektiven aus Bibel und Geschichte* (Wuppertal: Brockhaus).
- Pritzlaff, Dietmar. (2003). *Dokumentation biblischer Endzeitprophetie* (Holzgerlingen: Hänssler).
- Pülz, Klaus M. (1998). *Brennpunkt Israel, Endzeitliche Alarmsignale aus der Sicht eines Judenchristen* (Münster: Telos Verlag).
- Quadflieg, Kurt. (1995). *Ohne Jesus kein Heil, Das Elend des modernen Israel* (Hamburg: Verlag C.M. Fliß).
- Quadflieg, Kurt. (1987). *Wie in den Tagen Noahs, Ein aktuelles Sittenbild* (Fürth-Erlenbach: Verlag Peter Assmus).

- Reusch, Haim Heinz. (2003). *Israel zwischen Freunden und Feinden* (Holzgerlingen: Hänssler Verlag).
- Salomon, Gerhard. (1980). *Was bald geschehen wird* (Lahr-Dinglingen: Sankt-Johannis-Druckerei Schweickhardt).
- Schlink, M. Basilea. (1991). *Israel im Brennpunkt des Weltgeschehens* (Darmstadt-Eberstadt: Verlag Evangelische Marienschwesternschaft).
- Schlink, M. Basilea. (1968). *Um Jerusalems willen* (Darmstadt-Eberstadt: Evangelische Marienschwesternschaft).
- Schmidt, Rainer. (2007). *Jesus und die Israel-Frage* (Dillenburg: Christliche Verlagsgesellschaft).
- Schneider, Doron. (2011b). *Israel, Mehr als Kibbuz und Orangen* (Holzgerlingen: SCM Hänssler).
- Schneider, Doron. (2011a). *Israel, Mehr als man denkt* (Holzgerlingen: SCM Hänssler).
- Schneider, Ludwig. (2003). *Brennpunkt Jerusalem, Was Sie schon immer über Jerusalem wissen wollten* (Holzgerlingen: SCM Hänssler).
- Schneider, Ludwig. (1996). *100 Fragen an Israel* (Neuhausen-Stuttgart: Hänssler).
- Schneider, Ludwig. (2007). *Israel als Herausforderung, Warum Israel für Christen so wichtig ist* (Holzgerlingen: SCM Hänssler).
- Schneider, Ludwig. (2011c). *120 Mal Israel, Antworten auf häufig gestellte Fragen* (Holzgerlingen: SCM Hänssler).
- Schrupp, Ernst. (2001). *Die Gewalt endet am Kreuz, Wie der Messias Juden und Christen Frieden bringt* (Wuppertal: Brockhaus).
- Schrupp, Ernst. (2003). *Israel, Hat der Frieden noch eine Chance?* (Wuppertal: Brockhaus).
- Schrupp, Ernst. (1991). *Israel in der Endzeit* (Wuppertal: Brockhaus).
- Schrupp, Ernst. (1992). *Israel und das Reich des Islams, Die Bibel als Schlüssel zum Weltgeschehen* (Wuppertal: Brockhaus).
- Schrupp, Ernst. (1997). *Israel und der Messias, Versöhnung durch Christus in endzeitlicher Perspektive* (Wuppertal: Brockhaus).
- Scheunemann, Volkhard. (1993). *Licht am Horizont, Weltuntergang oder Weltvollendung—Was geschieht mit uns?* (Neuhausen-Stuttgart: Hänssler).

76 *Kristian Steiner*

Wagner, Rainer. (1995). *Arbeitsbuch, Heilsplan, Glaubenlehre* (Lahr: Verlag der Liebenzeller Mission).

Ziegler, Helmut. (2001). *Die Endzeit begann vor 2000 Jahren mit Jesus* (Solingen: Bernard).