

**THE REPORT OF THE MIDDLE EAST STUDY COMMITTEE
AS APPROVED BY THE
219TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY (2010)**

INCLUDING

**THE REPORT OF THE MIDDLE EAST MONITORING GROUP
AS APPROVED BY THE
220TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY (2012)**



Copyright © 2012
The Office of the General Assembly
Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronically, mechanically, photocopying, recording, or otherwise (brief quotations used in magazine or newspaper reviews excepted), without the prior permission of the publisher.

The sessions, presbyteries, and synods of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) may use sections of this publication without receiving prior written permission of the publisher.

CONTENTS

Part One: We Bear Witness	1
A. Introduction	1
B. Letters to Our Church, Partners, and Engaged Parties.....	2
1. Presbyterian Brothers and Sisters in Christ.....	2
2. American Brothers and Sisters in the Ecumenical Community.....	2
3. American Jewish Friends.....	3
4. American Muslim Friends.....	4
5. Middle Eastern Brothers and Sisters in Christ.....	4
6. Palestinian Friends.....	5
7. Israeli Friends	6
8. American Neighbors, Friends, Fellow Citizens, Government Representatives, and Our American Administration	7
C. Witness of the Scriptures: A Biblical Theological Reflection.....	7
1. Justice.....	8
2. Zion—and Justice.....	9
3. Covenant and Land—and Justice.....	12
4. Reconciliation—and Justice	16
D. Our Witness:” What We Have Seen and Heard”.....	19
1. Introduction.....	19
2. Two Unparalleled Experiences.....	19
3. Dwindling Christian Presence and Influence.....	24
4. Refugees in the Middle East.....	24
5. Increasing Nuclear Threat	25
6. Reality on the Ground in Israel-Palestine	25
a. Violence by Both Extremes.....	25
b. The Israeli Occupation of the West Bank and Gaza.....	25
7. Palestinian Christians: Agents of Reconciliation and Nonviolent Resistance.....	28
8. A Time for Action	30
Part Two: Recommendations	30
1. Affirmation of Human Rights & Moral Principles.....	30
2. Affirmation of Previous General Assembly Policies & Statements	31
3. For the Witness of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.).....	32
4. Urgent Actions Toward Justice and Peace in Israel, the Occupied Territories of Palestine, and Jerusalem.....	33
5. Urgent Actions for a Comprehensive Peace with Justice in the Middle East.....	34
6. Addressing Our Own Government.....	35
7. Concerning Christian Presence in the Middle East.....	35
8. Engaging This Report	36
Rationale	36
Part Three: Middle East Monitoring Group Report [As received by the 220th General Assembly (2012)]	37
Preface to Narratives.....	39
Narratives.....	41

1. A Palestinian Narrative, August 2011—Dr. Mahdi Abdul-Hadi, Jerusalem.....	41
2. A Palestinian Narrative—Living in the Shadow of Conflict, the Reverend Alex Awad.....	43
3. An Israeli Narrative—The Doctrine of Peace, Avrum Burg.....	44
4. A Palestinian Narrative—The Lost City of Oranges, Nahida Halaby Gordon.....	47
5. A Israeli Perspective—Narrative on Israeli-Palestinian Conflict, Naamah Kelman.....	53
6. A Palestinian Narrative—Liberating Palestinians and Israelis, Mazin Qumsiyeh, PhD.....	55
7. An Israeli Narrative—Zionism: Past, Present and Hopes for the Future, David Rosen.....	58
8. An Israeli Narrative—At Home in Israel, S. Ilan Troen.....	60
Bibliography	64
Endnotes	72
Appendixes	77
Appendix 1: List of Contacts Made by Middle East Study Committee.....	77
Appendix 2: General Assembly Policy Review: A Continuing Witness for Middle East Peace with Current Application.....	80
Appendix 3: Presbyterian Panel.....	87, 115
Appendix 4: The Amman Call.....	87
Appendix 5: Kairos Palestine: A Moment of Truth—A word of faith, hope, and love from the heart of Palestinian suffering.....	90

Breaking Down the Walls

Part One: We Bear Witness

A. Introduction

Increasingly, we find that we are living in a world with numerous walls and barriers. These are walls that force us to live in sometimes small and isolated compartments. These walls and the resulting compartments often prevent us from seeing and understanding the lives of others who live in different compartments or on the other side of the wall from us. These walls are leading many to live in fear, isolation, and poverty; therefore, preventing all parties from living in peace.

This is no more obvious than with the conflict in Israel and Palestine. Ideological, theological, political, economic, and even physical walls have been erected that are preventing the establishment of a just peace in the Middle East.

Our Presbyterian confessions clearly affirm God's reconciling work in Jesus Christ and the church's mission of reconciliation as being the heart of the gospel. Since Christ "... has broken down the dividing wall, that is, the hostility between us,"¹ we are entrusted as "ambassadors of Christ" with this "message of reconciliation."² We are called to be those who work to break down these walls that stand in the way of the realization of God's peaceful and just kingdom.

The Middle East Study Committee of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), which was mandated by our 218th General Assembly (2008) and appointed by our current and two previous Moderators, has taken seriously this gospel mandate of seeking to break through these walls of hostility and to envision appropriate steps that we recommend which our church, our nation, and the other parties involved in this conflict take.

Our voice is one, which is priestly, prophetic, and pastoral. The first voice that will be heard in this report is a priestly voice speaking of our theological understanding of justice, Zion, the land, and reconciliation. The next voice is both prophetic and pastoral. Prophets and pastors are called first and foremost to truth telling. From the vast experiences and study of the members of this committee, from numerous meetings with people and leaders of diverse communities throughout the Middle East (including Iraqi and Iranian church leaders), from meetings with political and religious leaders in Washington and New York with a wide spectrum of perspectives, from debating and challenging one another, and from traveling together for two weeks in the Middle East³, we strive in this report to tell the truth as we see it and understand it. Based on this, we are compelled to speak pastorally to ourselves as a denomination and our partners in the region, and prophetically to other powers engaged in this ongoing conflict.

Our voice is one that has a definite sense of urgency. The time for action from all parties is now. We are witnessing a rapidly closing window of opportunity for action. Events are happening every day now in Israel and Palestine and the Middle East that are making it increasingly difficult to bring about this just peace for which we all pray. If we do not act now, our fear is that we will all look back with deep regret and shameful guilt. Our spirit, though, is not one of fear, but rather of hope. We do believe that the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A) will once again speak with a clear, priestly, prophetic, and pastoral voice.

Our prayer is that the 219th General Assembly (2010) and our Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) will seriously and prayerfully discuss and approve the contents of this report, embrace the recommended actions, and recommit our church to being an agent of reconciliation—to being a church that will wholeheartedly work to break down the ideological, theological, economic, and political walls that stand in the way of a just peace. It is also our prayer that the whole church will then engage in a thoughtful and

prayerful study of this report with a view to taking significant actions toward fulfilling God's vision of peace for all peoples.

B. Letters to Our Church, Partners, and Engaged Parties

Each of the following eight letters is addressed to one of the various parties with whom we are engaged in this discussion of the Israel-Palestine conflict. The letters are written primarily with a pastoral voice in the hope that each of these parties will continue to be fully engaged with us in our common struggle for a just peace.

1. Presbyterian Brothers and Sisters in Christ

Letter to Our Presbyterian Brothers and Sisters in Christ,

We come to this work hoping that we have brought Reformed theology, historical Presbyterian positions, and the present realities together in a way that gives honor and glory to Christ. This work is for his sake, and is intended to strengthen the conversation within the family. And we have been grateful to so many of you who have prayed for us and our ministry in this endeavor.

The Moderators of the 216th, 217th, and 218th General Assemblies (2004, 2006, and 2008) appointed us to "prepare a comprehensive study, with recommendations, that is focused on Israel/Palestine within the complex context of the Middle East" (*Minutes*, 2008, Part I, p. 1226) and to report back to the 219th General Assembly (2010).

There is much in our work that commends you to engagement with the issues of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict within the context of the broader Middle East. Above all, we want you to share our alarm at the continuing decline of the Christian community in the region. Through our work as a committee, we have had the gift of visiting with our partner churches and organizations. And we have grown in our appreciation for what the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) has done through the centuries to encourage, nurture, and strengthen these ancient communities who are our spiritual forebears. The time is critical, however, to continue that strong tradition for the sake of the gospel in the region of its birth.

There is much more in our report, however. And this work has been done with careful research, deliberation, and prayer. We hope that it will invite you in, that it may be an entry for your own study of the Middle East. And in our recommendations, we have offered tools that we think will assist us all in this endeavor. To the best of our ability, we have striven to bring a balance between the pastoral, priestly, and prophetic roles of our church's calling.

We are also aware that our recommendations have a much wider audience beyond the membership of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) who will be scrutinizing our work and ready to interpret it for their own means. Because of this, we have written other introductory letters that have a focus toward those constituencies. We are aware that such constituencies are far more diverse than any one letter could summarize. Even so, we hope that you will assist us by sharing these letters with those in your community to whom they are addressed. Our primary concern is that, no matter what the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) might say about the situation in the Middle East, we remain committed to a common cause toward justice and security for both sides, and breaking down dividing walls, even when we do not see eye-to-eye on matters of policy and practice.

May we continue to work together for the sake of all of God's children.

2. American Brothers and Sisters in the Ecumenical Community

Letter to Our American Brothers and Sisters in the Ecumenical Community,

For many years, we have partnered with you through the National Council of Churches and World Council of Churches in matters of common concern in the Middle East. It is our hope that we can continue to do so. We are

aware that our polities and structures are different. And while we do not always agree on details, we know that we share a common passion for the region and for the justice with peace.

Our practice has been to focus on those things that unite us; this not only makes sense practically, but also theologically. Now, with a regional situation that is so critical, and with a rapidly disintegrating hope for a two-state solution in Israel/Palestine, we think the time has come for us to study more closely those places where we might have different approaches so that we might challenge and encourage one another and grow in our unity for the sake of Christ our Lord. We also know, within your own polities, you continue to study the issues and make recommendations as well. There are subtle differences between our conclusions. And unfortunately, where we have disagreed on matters of practice and policy, this has become an opportunity for those who do not share our concern for all parties in the region to divide us and even to manipulate one denomination's policy to criticize another denomination's approach. Let us be of one voice.

In addition to what we in the United States have to say, there are the voices of our brothers and sisters in Christ in the Middle East. In our regional travels, we have been encouraged by their steadfastness, distressed by their challenges, and moved by their diversity, but also their unity. As their ecumenical voices have spoken, from the Amman Call to the Kairos Palestine document, the Middle Eastern Church has spoken clearly and directly to us. We ignore their voice at our own peril. Let us do all we can to show our oneness with them in Christ.

We know that you have been and continue to be engaged in the Middle East. Our hope is that our work will both encourage and challenge you and your members to deepen that engagement.

3. American Jewish Friends

Letter to Our American Jewish Friends,

For decades we have worked side-by-side in innumerable causes in our own nation for the sake of justice and human well-being. And yet, with the introduction of the corporate engagement process in 2004 (and the use of the word "divestment"), this relationship has been seriously tested.

We want to be sure to say to you in no uncertain terms: we support the existence of Israel as a sovereign nation within secure and recognized borders. No "but," no "let's get this out of the way so we can say what we really want to say." We support Israel's existence as granted by the U.N. General Assembly. We support Israel's existence as a home for the Jewish people. We have said this before, and we say this again. We say it because we believe it; we say it because we want it to continue to be true.

And, at the same time, we are distressed by the continued policies that surround, sustain, and consolidate the occupation of the West Bank, East Jerusalem, the Gaza Strip, and the Golan Heights, in particular. Many of us come to this work out of a love for Israel. And it is because of this love that we continue to say the things we say about the occupation, the settlement infrastructure, and the absolute death knell it is sounding for the hopes of a two-state solution, a solution that the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) has supported for more than sixty years.

We also want to make it clear that what we say in moral criticism of policies and actions of the Israeli government should not be used as a battering ram against Israel's right to membership in the community of nations nor to deepen anti-Semitism or any categorical blame of the Jewish people for the ills of the world. As those whose faith originated in the synagogues of the Fertile Crescent, our love of our common heritage is precious. Anti-Semitism has no place in faithful Christian expression.

Our hope is that we can work together for a more just and secure Israel. We have found this to be possible with local networks more often than with national organizations within the mainstream Jewish community. We are hard-pressed to find statements from such organizations that are willing to oppose the occupation or the settlement policy that has dominated Israel since 1967. Even so, we are hopeful as organizations like J-Street, B'Tselem, Jewish Voice for Peace, and others continue to raise the banner that being pro-Israel and being truly Jewish is not tantamount to complicity in the excesses of Israeli policy. It is our hope that the leadership of mainstream American Jewish organizations will catch up with this growing reality of Jewish identity in the U.S.

We are aware that our report will likely draw such critiques as being “unfair” or “imbalanced.” We believe that our report, however, is quite fair. Our analysis, both through careful research and through our experience of being in the Middle East, is that Israel is the most powerful party to the conflict. Therefore, Israel has both the responsibility and the ability to reverse the course of the current precipitous decline throughout the region.

May we continue to pray, and work, for the peace of Jerusalem, the Middle East, and our world.

4. American Muslim Friends

Letter to Our American Muslim Friends,

Our relationship in the Western Hemisphere is a more recent one than that of our connection with our Jewish neighbors. The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) has worked through the years for increased interfaith understanding in Muslim-Christian relations, and will continue to do so. Our sponsorship of the Interfaith Listening Program, bringing Christian and Muslim leaders from around the world to the U.S. to model what our society might look like, is evidence of this.

We are also encouraged by the open letter to the Christian churches, “A Common Word Between Us and You.” Our church responded favorably and continues to encourage our members and congregations to explore common ground with our Muslim neighbors.

We have resisted those who have attempted to stoke the fires of cultural conflict. We are aware that American Muslims have come under more scrutiny, pressure, and, indeed, racism since the tragedies of September 11th. Violence is a phenomenon of the human condition, not the exclusive domain of any religion or people group, as our own Christian history attests. We hope that we can continue to explore ways we can work together to bring attention to these injustices and work together for a future in which all of humanity is granted the dignity it deserves.

We also challenge you, especially those of you in the West, to take seriously your call to be bridge builders: both within the Muslim world (e.g. between Shi'ite and Sunni) and between the East and West. We know that more, much more, can be done. And while we are deeply aware of our own complicity (both for historic Western colonial influence in the Middle East and for more recent American intervention in the region), we are hopeful that more can be done from within the Muslim world to address the ongoing divides that erode our humanity.

We are grateful for American Muslims who continue to decry violence perpetrated in the name of Islam. We want to partner with you in amplifying your voices. And we would like to hear more, including voices from those in the Middle East where, as in our own country, violence, too often, can be a watchword and where religion, too often, can be used as a battering ram. We look to you, as leaders of the Islamic world, to speak and act strongly on behalf of justice for all, including Christians and your fellow Muslims.

We hope that you hear these words of challenge as from those who seek mutual friendship. May the common words between us and you be love, peace, and justice.

5. Middle Eastern Brothers and Sisters in Christ

Letter to Our Middle Eastern Brothers and Sisters in Christ,

You are the living stones of the Church. You are the salt of the earth, giving flavor to the whole region, despite your numbers or proportions. We have visited with you. You have challenged us. You have welcomed us. And you have taught us immeasurably.

We cannot fully identify with the struggles of being a minority religious community. As American Christians, we are only recently coming to terms with the possibility that we, too, might have to face this reality. And so we have much more to learn from you and your model of faithfulness. And we cannot imagine the land of Christ devoid

of the body of Christ. May our ongoing partnership be one that encourages your steadfast witness, not only on behalf of your own flocks, but on behalf of the worldwide body of Christ.

You cherish your national culture. This is a challenging word to us who can act as though the gospel originated in the West. And yet, as part of a society that has confused our culture with our faith at times, we feel that we have something to offer you. Be careful; be faithful. We often fall into the temptation to be more in line with culture. However, we also know that the gospel calls us to faithful obedience, even when facing risk to our own selves on behalf of Christ's truth. But when the wider society advocates violence, or when it seeks to marginalize one group or another, our encouragement to you is to discern the Spirit's call in the face of such circumstances. We pray that you will be led and strengthened in faithfulness.

To our Palestinian brothers and sisters in faith, we particularly want to commend the words above. We also want to commend you to unity. As Presbyterians, we have come to Israel and Palestine as partners; not seeking to establish our own congregations, but to support you in your continued witness. We pray for your unity. We encourage you not to compete over an increasingly shrinking number of Christians or over a decreasingly smaller influence in regional politics. We beseech you to remain focused on preaching Christ and him crucified, and risen. It is your own experience of his suffering that can teach us all. We will do what we can do amplify the word you preach from the heart of suffering, the Kairos Palestine document, and your resurrection hope.

We also know, our dear Palestinian friends, that your suffering is primarily under the weight of occupation. But we also know that this is not the only cause of suffering. At best, your numbers leave you marginalized by the wider Palestinian society and many ignorant of your practices and faith. At worst, there are elements that seek to eliminate the Christian presence from the region altogether. To you, we commend the example of our Lord, who, even faced with the loss of his own life, preferred to be an agent of healing, restoring the centurion's ear in the Garden of Gethsemane. Do not be afraid to speak out against injustice. But do not let temptation to injustice overtake you.

May your witness continue to encourage us; and may we continue to show our debt to you as our spiritual forebears.

6. Palestinian Friends

Letter to Our Palestinian Friends,

Our history in the Middle East goes back to the 1820s. For many of us, our personal histories and those of our Presbyterian forebears goes back nearly that far to Israel/Palestine. From 1948, we have made our stance clear on the unjust situation of Palestinian refugees since the Nakba. Your experience is one of displacement; as a people of faith, we are kinsfolk. Our challenge is to accompany you in exile.

For us, this is not only an issue of sympathy in the midst of suffering. We have come to know Palestinians as our brothers and sisters in our congregations in the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.). Their stories and witness have strengthened us. And yet, we confess, there are many in our own number who remain unaware of this.

Year after year our General Assembly has made our position known to the world, that the Palestinian people deserve justice and the right to their homeland. We have advocated for a two-state solution that affirms the right of return for Palestinian refugees, so long deprived of their home and their dignity. And when we included corporate engagement in these statements in 2004, you rejoiced in this act of solidarity. You let us know how pleased you were.

Because of this, we want to be clear to you: we hold in tension the rights and aspirations of Palestinians and Israelis to have safe and secure lives. We know that there is consensus in the international community around this, and we continue to work for this. Our corporate engagement in Israel/Palestine, reaffirmed by General Assemblies since 2004, focuses attention on companies that profit from the violence of the occupation. Our efforts that focus on Israel are those that focus on unjust policies, not on Israel as a nation.

We still see the occupation as the major obstacle to regional stability, and to the just solution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. We do not see it as the only obstacle. Being oppressed does not justify using the means of the oppressor; nor does suffering from the breach of international law permit similar breaches, even if smaller in scale. We are alarmed by acts of violence committed by militants and extremists.

We are also alarmed when we hear some Palestinians use anti-Semitic language against Jews and Israelis. We know that you are well-versed in the language of human rights; it has meant the building of a strong civil society in the face of incredible odds and overwhelming oppression of occupation. We hope that this zeal for equality would include all.

We have had experiences and know of Palestinian Christians and Muslims living side-by-side in peaceful coexistence. Yet we are also alarmed by the increase of targeted violence against Palestinian Christian institutions, be they from traditional or evangelical communities. For us, the presence of the Christian community is more than nostalgia for the time of Jesus; it is a vital part of the Palestinian fabric of society alongside their Muslim neighbors.

We commit ourselves both to pray and to work for the day that Palestine will be free and independent. May it come soon!

7. Israeli Friends

Letter to Our Israeli Friends,

Much of what we have said to our American Jewish friends we say to you. We are strong advocates for Israel's secure existence. The fact that we are deeply troubled by Israeli policies should not diminish this advocacy in any way, shape, or form. We continue to speak out against anti-Semitism, knowing that it is an evil which our forbears in faith inflicted upon you and your ancestors. We are fervent in our hope that Israel would continue to be a homeland for the Jewish people.

We say all this because we believe it. And we stand by it in word and in deed. Our corporate engagement process has been handled carefully so as to focus our attention on companies who profit from practices we do not support. We have also encouraged positive investment in the region, including companies whose policies and practices of coexistence within Israeli society's diverse tapestry and between Israelis and Palestinians are ones we can wholeheartedly support.

We grieve when anyone is a victim of violence, but especially civilians, be they Palestinian or Israeli. The number of casualties may give evidence to the imbalance in the conflict; however, each person is created in the image of God. We know that God's heart must be the first to break. Trauma is trauma, no matter who experiences it. They cannot compete with one another; instead, our hope is that trauma may lead to healing across divides, bound by a common humanity.

Our recent trip to the region, and to Israel and the Occupied Territories in particular, was marked by our own heartbreak. The situation on the ground is changing rapidly. The rise of the extremist settler movement within Israel belies the Israel as a nation for all of its citizens we so long to see. The ongoing land expropriation and settlement expansion, in East Jerusalem in particular, continues to undermine, and indeed, destroy the possibility for a just and secure peace for Israelis and Palestinians alike. The Separation Barrier (part wall, part fence) and its route are evidence of this. Beyond this, we are increasingly troubled by the rhetoric and actions that support and facilitate a growing radicalized settler population. Your government cannot credibly claim that the incumbent violence against and dehumanization of Palestinians are happening without their knowledge; indeed, your government is aiding and abetting these basic violations of human rights.

And just as we have spoken and acted against our own society's vision of itself as a nation when it behaved as though it were "above the law," we will do the same for Israel. We both have a place in the community of nations. Let us act as though we do.

We truly yearn for the day when Israel is secure, and when Israel and Palestine live side-by-side in peace and justice and mutual respect. And we will continue to work for that vision. We hope that we can work together in this endeavor.

8. American Neighbors, Friends, Fellow Citizens, Government Representatives, and Our American Administration

Letter to Our American Neighbors, Friends, Fellow Citizens, Government Representatives, and Our American Administration:

We are nine Presbyterians who are also American citizens. And while there are many audiences for our work, our hope is that we will also be able to encourage and challenge you to work with us, and allow us to work with you, to seek justice, security, and peace throughout the Middle East.

No doubt some of our words will come across as harsh rebuke; please hear them as our desire to speak the truth in love. We are grateful for the freedoms our nation provides us, and we see them as nothing short of God's grace for us as a nation and as individuals. It is because of this that we speak as bluntly as we do, following Christ's word to confess the log in our own eye before pointing out the speck in our neighbor's. In short, we think our American ideal of the equal dignity afforded each human being is one for which we commendably strive. And when we as a nation fall short of that ideal, we must be honest with ourselves.

Our nation is powerful. As a result, when we act well, our works of good will, opportunity, and equality spread far. By the same token, when we behave badly, the consequences are devastating. It is our hope that, as a nation, we will confess the latter while we strive for the former in relating to the rest of the world. May this especially be true in the Middle East, where our intervention has been, at best, inconsistent, and at worst, destructive.

We have seen in Israel/Palestine, and in the neighboring nations, how governments who receive extravagant benefits of our foreign aid consistently violate the most basic of human rights. This is a fact that should give every American pause and should move us to hold our elected officials accountable.

And to you, those whom we have elected, whether Republican or Democrat, we are tired of partisan politics. We are weary of pronouncements that do nothing to further the cause of peace and actions that obstruct it in the Middle East. It is our foreign aid and political impotence that enable the continued Israeli Occupation, among other regional injustices. We implore you: Hold nations accountable for what they receive from our taxes. And, at the very least, implement existing American laws that would do much to alleviate unconscionable suffering. Our stated policy has supported a two-state solution for decades; the opportunity for that to happen is disappearing rapidly.

We are ready to work with you to bring peace, security, and justice to Palestinians and Israelis alike. And where we believe you are amiss, we will continue to speak truth to power.

C. Witness of the Scriptures: A Biblical Theological Reflection

In developing policy statements and actions relating to critical world issues, the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) has always held it essential to study the biblical and theological concepts that establish an ethical foundation for our positions. As our denomination once again addresses the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, four biblical concepts and their interrelationship require specific examination: Justice, Zion, Covenant and Land, and Reconciliation.

The Middle East is the birthplace of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, and followers devoted to all three religions have continued to live there to this day. In the biblical and theological reflection below, care has been taken to include detailed references to "the Older Testament"⁴—first, because these books are held to be authoritative by both Judaism and Christianity;⁵ and second, because it is there in the Bible that one sees most clearly the struggle of a nation's leaders and people to exercise power with justice. And because the

concept of justice is also central to the morality of Islam, references to the Qur'an and the Islamic tradition have been included in the first section immediately below.

1. *Justice*

“Rabban Simeon ben Gamaliel says: By three things is the world sustained: by justice, by truth, and by peace, as it is said, *Truth and justice and peace judge ye in your gates* (Zech. 8:16).”⁶ This profound interpretation of a verse from the prophet Zechariah, spoken by a rabbi of the second century C.E. living in Roman Palestine, was in turn commented upon with great wisdom some two centuries later by another Palestinian rabbi, Rav Muna. He said, “These three things are actually one. When justice is done, truth is served, and peace is achieved. ... Wherever there is justice there is peace (and wherever there is peace there is justice).”⁷

“Justice” is central to the Older Testament (including Zech. 8:16), the Newer Testament,⁸ and the scripture of Islam, the Qur'an.⁹

First, in both testaments of the Bible justice is presented as an essential attribute of God's own nature as Sovereign of the universe. “For the Lord is a God of justice” (Isa. 30:18c); “... I am the Lord; I act with steadfast love, justice, and righteousness in the earth” (Jer. 9:24b); “Happy are those whose help is the God of Jacob, ... who keeps faith forever; who executes justice for the oppressed; who gives food to the hungry” (Ps. 146:5–7); “If we confess our sins, he who is faithful and just will forgive us our sins and cleanse us from all injustice” (1 Jn. 1:9); “Your throne, O God, is forever and ever, and the scepter [of straightness (i.e., justice)] is the scepter of your [reign]” (Heb. 1:8b–c); “You are just, O Holy One ...” (Rev. 16:5b); “Just and true are your ways, [Sovereign] of the nations!” (Rev. 15:3c); “[The Mighty One] has shown strength with his arm; he has scattered the proud in the thoughts of their hearts. He has brought down the powerful from their thrones, and lifted up the lowly” (Lk. 1:51–52). And in Islam, one of the ninety-nine “beautiful names” of God is *al-'Adl*, “The Just,” or “Justice” (itself).

Second, based on this identification of justice as central to God's sovereign role, the Bible also presents justice as essential to the role of human monarchs and of earthly governors in general. “At that time Deborah, a prophetess, wife of Lappidoth, was judging Israel. She used to sit under the palm of Deborah between Ramah and Bethel in the hill country of Ephraim; and the Israelites came up to her for [justice (*mishpat*)]” (Judg. 4:4–5); “So David reigned over all Israel; and David administered justice and equity to all his people” (2 Sam. 8:15); “... For time would fail me to tell of ... David ...—who through faith ... administered justice ... (Heb. 11:32b–33a); “Give the king your justice, O God ... May he judge your people with righteousness, and your poor with justice” (Ps. 72:1–2); “... as [Paul] discussed justice, self-control, and the coming judgment, Felix [, the Roman governor,] became frightened ...” (Acts 24:25a); “[King] Jehoshaphat ... said to the judges, ‘... Now, let the fear of the Lord be upon you; take care what you do, for there is no perversion of justice with the Lord our God, or partiality, or taking of bribes’” (2 Chr. 19:4a, 6a, 7). This same extension of the justice of the sovereign God to the role of earthly governments is found in Islam—for example, in this saying of the prophet Muhammad (or, *hadith*): “The Government (*al-Sultan*) is the shadow of God on the earth; all of His servants who are oppressed shall turn to it. When it is just, it shall be rewarded ...”¹⁰

Third, the Bible identifies the practice of justice as essential not only for those who govern but also for all of God's people. “... I have [known Abraham], that he may charge his children and his household after him to keep the way of the Lord by doing righteousness and justice; so that the Lord may bring about for Abraham what he has promised him” (Gen. 18:19); “Happy are those who observe justice, who do righteousness at all times” (Ps. 106:3); “... what does the Lord require of you but to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God?” (Mic. 6:8b–d); “... let justice roll down like waters, and righteousness like an everflowing stream” (Am. 5:24); “But strive first for the kingdom of God and his [justice], and all these things will be given to you as well” (Mt. 6:33); “... justice and mercy and faith. It is

these you ought to have practiced ...” (Mt. 23:23c–d); “... in every nation anyone who fears [God] and does what is [just] is acceptable to him” (Acts 10:35); “No longer present your members to sin as instruments of [injustice], but ... present your members to God as instruments of [justice]” (Rom. 6:13a, c); “For the kingdom of God is not food and drink but [justice] and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit (Rom. 14:17); “Stand therefore, and fasten the belt of truth around your waist, and put on the breastplate of [justice]” (Eph. 6:14); “You must not distort justice; you must not show partiality; and you must not accept bribes Justice, and only justice, you shall pursue, so that you may live and occupy the land that the Lord your God is giving you” (Deut. 16:19a, 20). In like manner, the Qur’an reads: “O ye who believe! Stand out firmly for justice, as witnesses to God, even as against yourselves, or your parents, or your kin, and whether it be (against) rich or poor...” (Sura 4:135).¹¹

Here an all-important question arises: “To whom is due this ‘justice, and only justice’ that, according to Deuteronomy 16:20, must be practiced by all God’s people? Is justice due only to persons of our own ethnicity and/or religion, or is it due as well to others different from ourselves?” How Jesus would answer this question seems altogether clear. For the Gospel of Matthew, drawing upon Isaiah 42:1, describes Jesus in this way: “Here is my servant, whom I[, God,] have chosen, ... and he will proclaim justice to the Gentiles” (Mt. 12:18a, d). And within the Jewish tradition, the second-century rabbi already cited above, Simeon ben Gamaliel, is quoted as having said while reflecting on Deuteronomy 16: “Justice must be accorded to non-Jews as to Jews; the former should have the option of seeking judgment before either a Jewish or a pagan court.”¹² And in Islam, Yusuf Ali cites a case in which the prophet Muhammad ruled in favor of a Jew over against a nominal Muslim, “according to the strict principle of justice,” and resisted communal pressure to do the contrary.¹³

Thus, “justice, and only justice, you shall pursue” on behalf of all persons and not just your own people. But what exactly constitutes the “justice” that is due to all? The Bible in general and Jesus in particular answer in this way. Justice is: promoting truth;¹⁴ upholding the cause of the poor, the weak, and the needy;¹⁵ loving those who are “other” and providing for their needs;¹⁶ restoring what has been stolen;¹⁷ humbling the proud;¹⁸ issuing fair and equitable judgments in court;¹⁹ ending oppression;²⁰ keeping God’s statutes and commandments;²¹ following God’s will rather than one’s own;²² fostering peace;²³ and not pursuing dishonest gain, not shedding innocent blood, not practicing violence, not trusting in military might.²⁴ In Islam, according to John L. Esposito, “The Quran envisions a society based on the unity and equality of believers, a society in which moral and social justice will counterbalance oppression of the weak and economic exploitation.... Exploitation of the poor, weak, widows, women, orphans ([Sura] 4:2; 4:12) is vividly condemned... False contracts, bribery, abuse of women, hoarding of wealth to the exclusion of its subordination to higher ends, and usury are denounced.”²⁵

As shall soon be seen, “justice” understood in biblical ways came to underpin ancient Israel’s beliefs about a person’s right to enter the temple precincts of Zion or even to live within the city of Jerusalem.

2. *Zion—and Justice*

The name “Zion” evolved and multiplied in its ancient applications. Originally, it designated the fortress of the pre-Israelite city of Jerusalem captured by David around the year 1000 B.C.E.²⁶ “Zion” then came to designate the rather small “City of David” of which the fortress was a part.²⁷ When the Ark of the Covenant was shifted to the new temple built by Solomon, the name “Zion” was transferred from the confines of David’s city to the new sacred space lying to its northwest—the temple precincts,²⁸ the place on earth where God most fully dwelled,²⁹ the “touchpoint” between heaven and earth.³⁰ Next, by metonymy—a figure of speech in which the name of one thing stands for the name of another thing with which it is associated—“Zion” came also to designate the entire city of Jerusalem together with its residents,³¹ and then, with the destruction of that city in 587 B.C.E., it came also to serve as a name for the whole people of Israel.³² Then, too, in the developing eschatology of ancient Israel’s prophets and psalmists after 587, “Zion” named the

about-to-be rebuilt (or, for somewhat later prophets and psalmists, the recently rebuilt) city of Jerusalem and temple that served as a focus of hope—hope for the restoration of God’s people after exile,³³ hope for the advent of peace throughout the world,³⁴ and hope for a renewed covenant with God.³⁵

Persons’ right to enter God’s presence within the temple precincts of holy Zion or even to live within the city of Jerusalem was closely linked to their living justly—that is, to their living in accordance with the demands of covenant law. In the eighth century B.C.E., the prophet Isaiah proclaimed that the people of Zion would be spared from judgment only through repentance and the leading of just lives (Isa. 1:27–28). Since justice and righteousness were divine attributes with which God had filled Zion (Isa. 33:5), justice would be the line and righteousness the plummet by which the people of Zion would be measured and weighed (Isa. 28:16–17). Only those in Zion “who despise the gain of oppression, who wave away a bribe instead of accepting it, who stop their ears from hearing of bloodshed and shut their eyes from looking on evil” would be able to abide in the presence of the God of justice (Isa. 33:14–16; cf. 30:18). A contemporary of Isaiah, the prophet Micah, condemned the rulers and leading citizens, “who abhor justice and pervert all equity” and thereby “build Zion with blood and Jerusalem with wrong” (Mic. 3:9–10). Because of their actions, “Zion shall be plowed as a field” (Mic. 3:11–12). Nearly 100 years later, the prophet Jeremiah called upon the refugees from the former northern kingdom of Israel to repent their evil so that God might again bring them to Zion (Jer. 3:14), and he denounced those of Judah who entered the temple to worship the Lord without having amended their ways and ceased their violations of God’s commandments (Jer. 7:1–15). Two psalms also state explicitly that those who enter the temple precincts—which is to say, Zion—should be persons who practice justice.

“O Lord, who may abide in your tent?

Who may dwell on your holy hill?

Those who walk blamelessly, and do what is [just (*tẓedeq*)],

and speak the truth from their heart,
who do not slander with their tongue,
and do no evil to their friends,
nor take up a reproach against their neighbors;
in whose eyes the wicked are despised,
but who honor those who fear the Lord;
who stand by their oath even to their hurt;
who do not lend money at interest,
and do not take a bribe against the innocent.

Those who do these things shall never be moved.”

Ps. 15:1–3, 5c³⁶

“Who shall ascend the hill of the Lord?

And who shall stand in his holy place?

Those who have clean hands and pure hearts,
who do not lift up their souls to what is false,
and do not swear deceitfully.

They will receive blessing from the Lord,

and [a just reward (*tẓdaqab*)] from the God of their salvation.”Ps. 24:3–5³⁷

Thus, the Older Testament closely connects the concepts of “Zion” and “justice,” for Zion is the principal earthly dwelling place of the God of justice.

The Older Testament also speaks of Zion as a place to which not only Jews but also other peoples and nations will come both to worship God and to receive God's teaching. Toward the end of the sixth century B.C.E., the prophet we call Third Isaiah proclaimed to those who had returned from exile in Babylon to the holy mountain that is Zion, "Maintain justice, and do what is right" (Isa. 56:1a). And he proceeded to tell his fellow Jews that what is just and right includes joining God in welcoming to the holy mountain and its sacred precincts those from other lands who love God and strive to keep the commandments, for God's temple "shall be called a house of prayer for all peoples" (Isa. 56:6–8). And according to Psalm 87, "Zion is the mother city of all who know the Lord, wherever they are born"—be that Canaan, Babylon, Philistia, Tyre, Ethiopia, or any other place.³⁸ Other passages as well share that vision:

"Let this be recorded for a generation to come, ...
so that the name of the Lord may be declared in Zion,
and his praise in Jerusalem,
when peoples gather together,
and kingdoms, to worship the Lord." (Ps. 102:18a, 21–22)

And:

"In days to come the mountain of the Lord's house
shall be established as the highest of the mountains,
and shall be raised up above the hills.
Peoples shall stream to it,
and many nations shall come and say:
'Come, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord,
to the house of the God of Jacob;
that he may teach us his ways
and that we may walk in his paths.'
For out of Zion shall go forth instruction,
and the word of Lord from Jerusalem.
He shall judge between many peoples,
and shall arbitrate between strong nations far away;
they shall beat their swords into plowshares,
and their spears into pruning hooks;
nation shall not lift up sword against nation,
neither shall they learn war any more;
but they shall all sit under their own vines and under their own fig trees,
and no one shall make them afraid;
for the mouth of the Lord of hosts has spoken. (Mic. 4:1–4 [see also Isa. 2:2–4])

Thus, according to the Older Testament, the final effect of the exiles' return to Zion will be the dawn of an age of peace and a joining with other peoples and nations to worship and study the teachings of the one true God. It is thus noteworthy that while Jerusalem has indeed become a place holy not only for Jews but also for Christians and Muslims³⁹ the longed-for age of peace and reconciliation has yet to come.

In the Newer Testament, "Zion" occurs just seven times. Four usages designate not "earthly" Jerusalem but instead "eschatological" Jerusalem. Two of these four arise from quoting the book of Isaiah. According to First Peter, God lays the solid cornerstone of Jesus Christ for all believers in eschatological Zion (1 Pet. 2:6, quoting Isa. 28:16), and from there also, according to Romans, the Deliverer for all of Israel will yet come forth (Rom. 11:26, quoting Isa. 59:21 from one particular manuscript tradition of the Greek Septuagint). Then, too, according to Hebrews, it is to eschatological Zion, the heavenly Jerusalem, that Christians have worshipfully "come ... to God, the judge of all, ... and to Jesus, the mediator of a new

covenant” (Heb. 12:22–24a). Finally, a vision in the book of Revelation describes eschatological Zion as the launch point for God’s end-time action to rid the world of evil. The Lamb (Christ) takes his stand on the solid high ground of “Mount Zion,” surrounded by 144,000 righteous faithful (Rev. 14:1), while the dragon (Satan) takes his stand on “the sand of the seashore” (Rev. 12:18), viewing from there the two beasts that are his proxies (symbolizing perhaps Rome’s emperors and priests of the imperial cult, Rev. 13:1–18). This vision of the Lamb on Mount Zion affirms Zion as the seat of justice for the world and anticipates Revelation’s later vision of the new Jerusalem (Rev. 21:9–22).

The other three usages of “Zion” in the Newer Testament do designate “earthly” Jerusalem. Two of these occur in gospel accounts of Jesus’ dramatic entry into that city on “Palm Sunday” (Mt. 21:5, quoting compositely from Isa. 62:11 and Zech. 9:9; and Jn. 12:15, quoting compositely from Zeph. 3:16 and Zech. 9:9). In calling to readers’ minds Zech. 9:9–10, both gospel texts affirm that Zion’s peaceable Messiah is the one who creates true shalom for the nations. The third “earthly” usage occurs in Paul’s Letter to the Romans (Rom. 9:33), where he uses the same prophetic image found in First Peter (Isa. 28:6) but employs it quite differently. Paul, interpreting this Isaian image through the lens of Isa. 8:14, speaks of God’s laying in Zion, earthly Jerusalem, “a stone” that is a stumbling block to Jewish faith—namely, the crucified and risen Christ. All three of these instances of “Zion” arise from quoting books of the prophets.

It appears that during the first century C.E., Christian authors rather fully transferred the locus of God’s concrete presence in the world of space and time from the place of Zion—that is, Jerusalem—to the person of Jesus, who had been crucified and raised from the dead just outside Jerusalem. The Roman destruction of Zion—that is, the temple in Jerusalem—in 70 C.E. doubtless hastened that process. So what do Christians make of the claim that a link endures between God’s covenant with Abraham and the promise of land?⁴⁰

3. *Covenant and Land—and Justice*

Nearly ten years ago, four American Jewish scholars offered as a basis for Jewish-Christian dialogue a set of eight propositions entitled “*Dabru Emet*.”⁴¹ The third of those read, “Christians can respect the claim of the Jewish people upon the land of Israel.” That proposition went on to present as part of its brief rationale this comment: “As members of a biblically-based religion, Christians appreciate that Israel was promised—and given—to Jews as the physical center of the covenant between them and God.”

So, do we Presbyterians—collectively and/or individually—“respect the claim of the Jewish people upon the land of Israel”? Do we Presbyterians “appreciate that Israel [geographic Israel? biblical Israel? political Israel?] was promised—and given—to Jews as the physical center of the covenant between them and God”?

Any answer to that question will be complicated and will most certainly prove controversial. At least five issues are involved in framing a context for reflecting on “*Dabru Emet*’s” third proposition and its rationale, and all of these issues are ones very much on the minds and hearts of many Presbyterians today.

First, most Presbyterians accept that the promise of offspring and land is in fact found throughout the book of Genesis⁴² and that that promise is conceptually central to God’s covenant with Abraham.⁴³ Yet most Presbyterians also hold that this promise is conditioned by concepts found elsewhere in the first five books of the Bible, such as: (a) the Jubilee theology found in the book of Leviticus, according to which the land belongs fundamentally to God and is a gift from God given to ancient Israel as a *leasehold* (25:23–24, 38); (b) the Sinai-covenant theology found in the book of Deuteronomy, according to which God’s gift of the land is dependent upon the people’s adherence to justice and obedience to the commandments (e.g., 4:40; 16:19–20; 30:15–20)—including the prohibition against subverting the rights of “strangers” and the needy (27:19);⁴⁴ and (c) Genesis’ own warning about the potential loss of the promises through deeds of injustice (18:19).

Thus, most Presbyterians hold that the “land-grant” to Abraham’s offspring described in Genesis is not so much a matter of “rights” as it is a matter of “responsibilities,” that “the land” is a place whose residents God holds responsible for what is being done in and with it, including dealing justly with “the stranger” and the poor.⁴⁵

Second, Presbyterians believe that the boundaries of ancient Israel varied throughout its history—first in the days of the patriarchs and matriarchs, then under the judges and kings, then in the aftermath of exile and diaspora. Furthermore, the boundaries of “Greater Israel” that are described in the book of Exodus (Ex. 23:31), are surely not to be taken literally, for those would extend Israel’s borders from the “Sea of Reeds” in the south—that is, deep into the territory of modern Egypt—to the Euphrates River in the north—that is, deep into the territory of modern Syria. And as the Jewish scholar Nahum Sarna has observed, “At no time in Israelite history, even at the height of the Davidic-Solomonic empire, were these boundaries a reality.”⁴⁶

Thus, Presbyterians believe that one cannot define “the land of Israel” with any kind of religious specificity. The varying boundaries of “the promised land” have always been more a matter of *realpolitik* than of theology.

Third, most modern Presbyterians read not with approval but with something approaching horror the theology of the accounts in Deuteronomistic literature that describe the taking of “the land” from those who had long been dwelling there by means of “holy war.”⁴⁷ One cannot evaluate as “moral” deeds that achieve a concrete realization of “land promise” through extreme “land violence.”⁴⁸ And a number of Jewish scholars agree that the acts of “holy war” described in these biblical narratives are, at the very least, morally problematic. For example, Jon Levenson has written that the narrative tradition in which the Canaanites are demonized and dismissed offers an unsavory parallel in Israel’s sacred texts to the strand of anti-Semitism that runs throughout Christians’ Newer Testament.⁴⁹

Thus, most Presbyterians believe that “land promise” ought not to be realized through “land violence” and that the claiming of “promised land” does not justify the displacement of “the others” who have long lived there.

Fourth, most Presbyterians agree with the apostle Paul (Romans 9–11, esp. 11:26–29) that Jews remain to this day heirs of God’s covenant with Abraham. That, and not supersessionism, is what most hold.⁵⁰ Yet many Presbyterians also believe that Jews are not today’s only heirs of that covenant with Abraham—that we Christians, too, are heirs of that covenant. This understanding was stated first and most authoritatively by the apostle Paul, who, in the first century C.E., wrote in his Letter to the Galatians (Gal. 3:29), “... if you belong to Christ, then you are Abraham’s offspring, heirs according to the promise.” And in modern times it has been restated this way: “Two vital communities, Judaism and Christianity, claim direct descent from those who lived by and preserved the biblical stories; [and] a third, Islam, treasures the tradition as well.”⁵¹

Now, it is true that most Christians at most times and in most places have not strongly linked the concept of our descent from Abraham to the concept of the promise of “the land.” Still, a number of Christians throughout history have made that strong connection, and among them are some who are living in “the land” today—Palestinian Christians. Neither they nor their Palestinian Muslim cousins view themselves as filling the role of the “strangers” or “aliens” mentioned in the Older Testament.⁵²

For at least 300 years, between the fourth and seventh centuries C.E., the majority of those who lived in the Roman province of Palestine were Christians, and the city of Jerusalem, which had been the site of the death and the resurrection of Jesus the Christ, was viewed by these residents as “the Christian city *par excellence*.”

Also, many monks throughout the wider reaches of Christendom were taking to their own hearts God’s words to Abram, “Go up ... to the land that I will show you” (Gen. 12:1). Yes, many monks were

interpreting these words as a command that God was now directing to them. So a great number of them began to pick up and move to what they were beginning to call “the Holy Land”—where Jesus had been born, had lived, had died, and had been raised from the dead.⁵³

Now, “Byzantine Palestine was, for Christians, a Holy Land but [it was] also a *homeland*, a place where men and women tilled the ground and planted orchards, built homes and raised families, bought fish and sold olives, buried parents and grandparents.” And “when Jerusalem was captured by the Persians in the seventh century of the Common Era, it was the Christians, not the Jews, who sang a lamentation over the Holy City.”⁵⁴

Then shortly after the Persian conquest came the Arab conquest—and Islam. Yet most of the Christians who were indigenous to that region continued to live there—carrying on with their everyday lives, learning to speak Arabic either in addition to or instead of Aramaic and/or Greek,⁵⁵ and continuing to worship the God made known to Abraham and made known in Jesus. Many of today’s Palestinian Christians are direct descendants of these for whom Roman Palestine had become both their homeland and their Holy Land, where the central mysteries of their Christian faith had taken place.

So, no matter how many centuries have passed since the end of the Byzantine Christian hegemony over “the land,” and no matter in how many other countries the Christian religion has since set down roots, there are in the world Christians who remain strongly wedded to the land that gave birth to both Christ and the Christian religion, and none are more strongly wedded to “the land” than those who are Palestinian Christians.⁵⁶

Then, too, of course, as early as the 6th century some Muslims considered Palestine to be their home, and from the late-7th century onward Muslims constituted the majority of Palestine’s population. Indeed, since the end of the 7th century, two of Islam’s holiest places have stood in Jerusalem—the Al-Aqsa Mosque and the Dome of the Rock.⁵⁷

Thus, Presbyterians confront a dilemma. What are Presbyterians to do when Jews and Christians and Muslims find that their continuity to the past is in part dependent upon living in the same land and in the same city, the land and the city in which both Judaism and Christianity are native and Islam has had such a significant presence for more than 1,200 years?

Fifth, Presbyterians believe that God is sovereign over all nations, states, governments, and peoples, and that God calls upon persons of faith to be critical of those governments understood to be violating God’s commandments and God’s standards for justice and compassion. American Presbyterians believe that God urges us to stand ready to speak “like prophets,” to stand ready first and foremost to speak to our own government but also to speak to other governments. For the prophets of ancient Israel addressed their words-in-the-name-of-God not only to their own nation but to other nations as well.

Thus, if American Presbyterians are to speak “like prophets,” we must stand ready to speak not only to our own government but to others as well—including the government of the State of Israel and the governments of the Palestinian people.

Throughout the sixty-two years since the British mandate over the territory of Palestine ended, the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) has spoken out a number of times concerning the ongoing conflict between Israel and the Palestinian people. Although each of these themes has prompted spirited discussion, there have run throughout these statements four strong commitments:

- To the right of Israel to exist as a sovereign nation within secure and legitimate borders,⁵⁸ borders that are not contended for on the basis of some literal reading of “biblical” geography and that are arrived at through peaceful negotiation with the Palestinians. And accompanying this commitment have been two

calls: first, one to Palestinians and other Arabs to recognize Israel's existence within secure borders; and second, one to Israeli Jews to fulfill their "land responsibilities," responsibilities that include the covenant obligation to extend to "others" in their midst—that is, to Israeli Christians and Muslims—a full equality of civil rights and a full measure of justice.⁵⁹

- To the right of Palestinians to self-determination and to have their own separate, contiguous, economically viable, sovereign nation-state within the wider borders of "the land."⁶⁰ Arising from this second commitment has been our denomination's steady call for the government of Israel to put an end to its military, political, and economic occupation of Palestinian land after 1967 and its practice of establishing and expanding settlements there.

- To a nonviolent resolution to the conflict.⁶¹ The PC(USA) has continuously called upon all parties in the Middle East to settle their differences peacefully and also upon both Palestinians and Israelis to end all acts of violence against each other.

- To the concept that Jerusalem, like "the land" as a whole, does not belong to any one people alone, but is rather to be shared by two peoples (Israelis and Palestinians) and three religions (Judaism, Christianity, and Islam).⁶²

In 1987, the 199th General Assembly (1987) also received and commended to our congregations for study and reflection the paper entitled "A Theological Understanding of the Relationship between Christians and Jews."⁶³ It is the content of this paper that undergirds the paper "Christians and Jews: People of God," which is now also before the 219th General Assembly (2010). The sixth affirmation of the 1987 paper reads, "We affirm the continuity of God's promise of the land along with the obligations of that promise to the people of Israel."⁶⁴

In the explication accompanying that affirmation are these sentences: "because land is God's to be given, it can never fully be possessed"; "the blessings of the promise were dependent upon fulfillment of covenant relationships"; "those in possession of 'land' have a responsibility and obligation to the disadvantaged, the oppressed, and the 'strangers in their gates'"; "we disavow any teaching which says that peace can be secured without justice through the exercise of violence and retribution"; and "no government at any time can ever be the full expression of God's will. All, including the State of Israel, stand accountable to God. The State of Israel is a geopolitical entity and is not to be validated theologically."⁶⁵

In addition, the final draft of the 2010 paper says: "God's gift of land, and the potential and responsibility that goes with that gift, pertains both to the Jews and to the Palestinian people who live alongside them in what was the ancient, biblical land of promise. Both peoples have claims on the same land. Jews and Palestinians give voice to incompatible historical narratives and political claims, each assumed to be 'correct' by its narrators. What is not often clearly said in the midst of the conflict is that both people, in different ways, are recipients of God's gift and responsibility."⁶⁶

Finally, the 1987 paper states: "to understand [the] promise [of land] solely in terms of a specific geographical entity on the eastern shore of the Mediterranean is, in our view, inadequate. 'Land' is understood as more than place or property; 'land' is a biblical metaphor for sustainable life, prosperity, peace, and security. We affirm the rights to these essentials for the Jewish people. At the same time, as bearers of the good news of the gospel of Jesus Christ, we affirm those same rights in the name of justice to all peoples... . Thus we affirm our solidarity with all people to whom those rights of 'land' are currently denied."⁶⁷

We have set forth the biblical emphasis on Zion as a place for all nations and peoples to worship the God of justice and learn war no more and as a place where people's covenant responsibilities are to be fulfilled and God's justice is to be practiced toward all persons. We have also highlighted central emphases

of our denomination's past statements and of two of its study papers. We now turn to a consideration of one other biblical concept related to the present Israeli-Palestinian crisis: reconciliation.

4. *Reconciliation—and Justice*

The Newer Testament proclaims that humankind's alienation from God existed from the primordial time of Eden to the historical time of Jesus. But through the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, God accomplished a reconciliation with all of humankind—indeed, with the whole of creation. We note these passages, for example: “Jesus answered them, ‘The hour has come for the Son of Man to be glorified.... And I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all people to myself’” (Jn. 12:23, 32).⁶⁸ “For if while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son, much more surely, having been reconciled, will we be saved by his life” (Rom. 5:10). “For in [Christ] all the fullness of God was pleased to dwell, and through him God was pleased to reconcile to himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven, by making peace through the blood of his cross” (Col. 1:19–20).⁶⁹

Furthermore, the Newer Testament proclaims that this reconciliation between God and humankind accomplished through Christ is also the ground and empowering force for reconciliation among humans—between one person and another, between the individual and the group, between one group and another—in fulfillment of the eschatological vision of peace, of shalom, found in both Micah and Isaiah: “[T]hey shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks” (Mic. 4:3b, Isa. 2:4b). Ephesians says, “For [Christ] is our peace; in his flesh he has made both groups into one and has broken down the dividing wall, that is the hostility between us” (2:14). In its first century context, Ephesians was speaking of Christ's death having broken down the dividing wall of hostility between Jews and Gentiles within the Christian community. But in the twenty-first century, we are led by the Spirit to find in this verse, especially when viewed through the lens of Col. 1:19–20, a wider application—Christ's death having broken down the dividing wall of hostility between any two peoples or groups within God's creation.

And Second Corinthians says, “For the love of Christ urges us on, because we are convinced that one has died for all So if anyone is in Christ, there is a new creation ... ! All this is from God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ, and has given us the ministry of reconciliation For our sake [God] made him to be sin who knew no sin, so that in him we might become the justice of God” (2 Cor. 5:14a, 17a, 18, 21). Interpreting this last passage, J. Paul Sampley writes: “Reconciliation is at the heart of life's business. If the most important single factor about any of our lives is God's having reconciled us to God's very self, then the proper celebration of our reconciliation is to share it with others by fostering reconciliation ... wherever and whenever we can.”⁷⁰ It is in light of all this that we can hear afresh Jesus' words in the Sermon on the Mount: “So when you are offering your gift at the altar, if you remember that your brother or sister has something against you, leave your gift there before the altar and go; first be reconciled to your brother or sister, and then come and offer your gift” (Mt. 5:23–24). By so reconciling, we do become, as Paul says, “the [justice] of God” (2 Cor. 5:21).

A number of biblical accounts illustrate the processes of human reconciliation—whether frustrated or successful. We will focus here on just two: the narrative of the twins Jacob and Esau (especially Gen. 27:1–45, 33:1–17),⁷¹ and Jesus' parable of The Man and His Two Sons (Lk. 15:11–32).

Stolid Esau was his father Isaac's favorite son, while wily Jacob was his mother Rebekah's. Jacob had already duped Esau, the first-born twin, into selling his birthright (Gen. 25:27–34). Then, through an ancient version of identity theft, Jacob tricked blind-old Isaac into bestowing on him the paternal blessing Isaac intended for Esau (Gen. 27:1–29). When Esau learned of his lost blessing, he hated Jacob, yet bided his time until the opportune moment to kill him (Gen. 27:35–41). Rebekah warned Jacob of Esau's plan and sent him away to the home of her brother Laban outside Canaan, far to the northeast in distant Haran (Gen. 27:42–45).

Twenty years passed (Gen. 31:38–41), during which Jacob married first Leah and then Rachel (Gen. 29:1–30), begot eleven sons and a daughter (Gen. 29:31–30:24), and prospered at Laban’s expense (Gen. 30:25–43). Laban’s sons became angry at Jacob, so Jacob started to flee back to his home country of Canaan with his wives, children, and great wealth of livestock (Gen. 31:1–21). Laban chased them down, for one of the party had stolen his household gods (Gen. 31:22–32). Laban never found the gods (Gen. 31:33–35), yet in the end he made a covenant with Jacob that let him depart in peace (Gen. 31:36–55).

Jacob now feared that when he got home Esau would exact revenge; and when Jacob learned that Esau was coming to meet him accompanied by 400 men, he thought the worst and, to appease his twin, sent ahead a huge offering of livestock (Gen. 32:1–21).

That same night, when Jacob was alone, a “man” came and wrestled long and hard with him, finally at daybreak throwing Jacob’s hip out of joint (Gen. 32:22–25). The “man” then bestowed on the exhausted Jacob a new name, Israel, and, after blessing him, departed (Gen. 32:26–29). In the end, Jacob came to believe that the “man” was really God (Gen. 32:30–32).

Jacob next saw Esau and his retinue approaching. He arranged the women and children of his caravan defensively and limped ahead to meet his twin, bowing submissively to the ground seven times as he proceeded (Gen. 33:1–3). “But Esau ran to meet him, and embraced him, and fell on his neck and kissed him, and they wept” (Gen. 33:4; compare Lk. 15:20!). Having thus shown his forgiveness of Jacob, Esau greeted the women and children and told Jacob he would not keep his offering, for he already had quite enough livestock (Gen. 33:5–9). Jacob, however, insisted that Esau keep the gift, and Esau at last agreed (Gen. 33:10–11).

Esau, far from harboring bitterness or exacting revenge against Jacob, had initiated a model reconciliation, and it would seem that Jacob had completed it. Jacob, reflecting on his previous night’s wrestling with God, had even said to Esau, “[T]o see your face is like seeing the face of God—since you have received me with such favor” (Gen. 33:10b). Yet in the end Jacob remained characteristically untrusting and wily. In spite of having seen “the face of God” and received a new name, he had had no experience of “new being,” of “new creation.” So when Esau first volunteered to travel onward with him and then offered to lend him some men for help along his way, Jacob refused both offers, preferring that Esau’s future not be linked to his (Gen. 33:12–15). So the two parted and went their separate ways (Gen. 33:16–17).

Thus, Jacob kept Esau out of his future life, and they met only once more—coming together to bury their father Isaac (Gen. 35:28–29). Basically, theirs was but a partial reconciliation, its full success having been frustrated—perhaps by Jacob’s continuing suspicion of Esau, perhaps by his inability to accept Esau’s forgiveness, but most certainly by his insistence on going his separate way.

Family dynamics, sibling rivalry, and offered reconciliation also lie at the heart of Jesus’ parable of The Man and His Two Sons (Lk. 15:11–32). Like all of Jesus’ parables, this one lends itself richly to multiple interpretations. For example, the “man” can be seen variably, and correctly, as either a God-figure or a model human parent. The latter reading is followed here, where the parable is interpreted as a story of both successful human reconciliation (father and younger son) and frustrated human reconciliation (elder brother and younger brother, father and elder son).⁷²

The younger son asked his father prematurely, and insultingly, for his inheritance, yet surprisingly he was given it. He went off to a far country and there wasted it “in dissolute living” (Lk. 15:11–13). So this Jewish lad was reduced to slopping and feeding the hogs, while he himself, in the midst of a famine, had nothing at all to eat (Lk. 15:14–16). Finally, “he came to himself” and realized he would be far better off at home, even as a hired hand. So, feeling quite contrite, he thought through his speech of repentance and headed back to his father (Lk. 15:17–20a).

While this son was still a distance away, his father caught sight of him “and was filled with compassion; he ran and put his arms around him and kissed him” (Lk. 15:20b; compare Gen. 33:4!). The son began his speech of repentance, but the father interrupted him and commanded the servants to bring for this son a robe, ring, and sandals and to prepare a special feast. A joyful celebration followed, completing the reconciliation between father and son, a reconciliation brought about through the son’s humble acts of repentance and truth-telling and the father’s gracious acts of forgiveness and amnesty (Lk. 15:21–24).

But the elder son had received no speech of repentance from his brother. Instead, upon returning from his work in the field, he encountered an unexpected feast of celebration. Puzzled, he learned secondhand of his younger brother’s return and restored sonship (Lk. 15:25–27). Angered at the injustice of the whole situation and jealous of what he perceived to be his father’s favoritism toward his brother, the elder son refused to enter. So his father came out and pleaded with him. The elder son spoke angry and jealous words to his father, yet the father answered him with words that proclaimed both his enduring constancy toward his elder son and his newborn reconciliation with his younger son (Lk. 15:28–32).

Jesus’ parable concludes without any resolution between these two figures but with the ball in the elder son’s court, so to speak. Would he remain unreconciled to his father, either resentful forever or leaving the ranch altogether? Would he remain unreconciled to his younger brother, either entering the party sullenly and unforgivingly or turning on his heel and walking away? Then, too, would the younger brother ever have the chance, or the desire, to apologize to his elder brother and tell him the truth? Would the elder brother ever take the opportunity to forgive his brother and, like their father, offer him amnesty? Could a reconciliation between these brothers succeed without “justice” being done, and what would “justice” look like in this situation? Jesus left the answers to all these questions to our imagination—or rather, for our discernment.

It is tempting to apply the first of these two narratives to the present situation in the Middle East by identifying Esau with either the Israelis or the Palestinians and then Jacob with the other. One of the “brothers” has wronged the other, has never asked for forgiveness, and, despite the best overtures of the other, has perpetuated a separation that frustrates reconciliation and the realization of justice. Yet perhaps the real-world complication to such an application is that the historical parties have in fact been continually switching roles, in one instance playing the part of Esau and in the next playing that of Jacob.

Likewise it is tempting to apply the second of these biblical narratives by identifying the younger brother with either the Israelis or the Palestinians and then the elder brother with the other—acknowledging with regret that neither party seems to display the full virtue of the father. One of the “brothers” has wronged the other and has not yet acknowledged that wrong to the other and asked for forgiveness. Meanwhile the other brother is intent on demanding the kind of justice that is retributive rather than restorative. Again, perhaps the real-world complication to such an application is that the historical parties have in fact been continually switching roles, now playing the elder brother and then the younger brother.

Still, these two narratives frame for us ever so importantly the theological elements involved in human reconciliation—the needs for speaking truth, acknowledging wrong, accepting responsibility, asking pardon, offering forgiveness (and even amnesty), finding a just way to live side by side, and becoming “the [justice] of God” (2 Cor. 5:21).

Keeping in mind all four of the biblical and theological emphases studied in this opening section—justice, Zion, covenant and land, and reconciliation—and the relationship of each of the latter three to the first, we will now provide perspectives on the contemporary situation in the Middle East.

D. Our Witness: "What We Have Seen and Heard"

1. Introduction

The Middle East Study Committee (MESC) was created by the 218th General Assembly (2008) and appointed February 2009 by the current and two previous moderators.⁷³ The members of the MESC are: Susan Andrews, Hudson River Presbytery (New York); Frederick Bush, Los Ranchos Presbytery (California); Nahida Gordon, Presbytery of Muskingum Valley (Ohio); John Huffman, Los Ranchos Presbytery (California); Lucy Janjigian, Palisades Presbytery (New Jersey); Rebecca Reyes, New Hope Presbytery (North Carolina); Marthame Sanders, Greater Atlanta Presbytery (Georgia); Byron Shafer, New York City Presbytery (New York); Ron Shive, Salem Presbytery (North Carolina).

Our mandate was “to prepare a comprehensive study, with recommendations, that is focused on Israel/Palestine within the complex context of the Middle East” (*Minutes*, 2008, Part I, p. 1226). The scope of this study is fourfold:

- A description of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)’s mission and relationships, including an assessment of the future for the Christian presence and witness in the Middle East;
- An overview of the complex interactions among religions, cultures, and peoples that characterize the region;
- An analysis of U.S. policies that impact the area; and
- A [recommendation of] steps to be taken with our partners in the Middle East and the United States to foster justice, improve interfaith relations, and nurture the building of peace toward a secure and viable future for all. (*Minutes*, 2008, Part I, p. 1226)

The methodology for the study has been to engage as many representatives from a spectrum of perspectives on the Israel-Palestinian conflict and to embrace the witness and concerns of our Christian partners in the region. This approach involved conversations both in the United States and in the Middle East; with both Israelis and Palestinians; Jews, Muslims, and Christians. We have worked diligently to listen to the multitude of voices that are crying aloud in the midst of the Middle East conflict.⁷⁴ We have also consulted the Presbyterian Panel through its August 2009 survey for a sample of Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) convictions and attitudes regarding Israel/Palestine, and learned much about the extent to which Presbyterians care about the parties involved in the conflict.⁷⁵ Unfortunately, we must acknowledge that limited time, resources, and other circumstances prevented us from engaging some voices.⁷⁶ This report thus makes only limited observations and recommendations regarding the broader context, and devotes most summary here to the Israel-Palestine struggle. The Presbyterian church has in fact spoken prophetically on matters such as the Iraq war and its refugees and developed policies on just peacemaking that address the larger region. These also include the dynamics of Iran and preemptive warfare and are part of the policy review and application found in Appendix 2. We mention this here because our study, though with new approaches, also acknowledges this very Presbyterian history of social and ethical analysis of the Middle East.

2. Two Unparalleled Experiences

One does not have to be in the Middle East long before becoming aware of the two unparalleled traumatic experiences that grip the lives of the people of this region. The horror that both the Jews and the Palestinians have faced is unparalleled and has resulted in a state of psycho-trauma, which grips the lives of both people and results in fear, anxiety, and anger. The Jewish psycho-trauma and the Palestinian psycho-trauma, both of which underlie the region’s conflicts, cannot be compared, nor should they be allowed to compete with one another. A competition of traumas will only result in an endless argument over who is the greater victim.

One of these psycho-traumas is the Holocaust in which 6 million European Jews were annihilated at the hands of the Nazi party, its state apparatus and allies. The other trauma is the forced displacement of 750,000 Palestinians in 1948 from their ancestral homeland by the Israel Haganah [the pre-state militant force that was the precursor of the Israel Defense Forces].

Avraham Burg, Former Speaker of the Knesset and Cabinet Minister, speaks of the Jewish psycho-trauma and identifies the pain and power that the Holocaust still plays in the soul of Israelis today. He says,

To many, the Shoah [Holocaust or literally calamity] was and will forever be an incurable wound. To others, the Shoah is the nucleus of their identity. To everyone, the Shoah is a present, tangible experience wherever we go.⁷⁷

Another has described this Jewish trauma well:

To Israelis and most Jews, the Jewish State is a miracle that represents redemption from the unspeakable horrors of the Nazi Holocaust. Israel is an emotional insurance policy against the visceral vulnerability that many Jews still feel, a vulnerability born of centuries of persecution in Europe.⁷⁸

One of the results of this psycho-trauma is that every time the Palestinians, or the Iranians, or any other neighbor offer a threat, the Israeli Jews become engulfed in fear, their perceived vulnerability is heightened, and the question that arises is, “Is a second Shoah on the way?”⁷⁹

The atrocities that the Nazis committed against the Jews and this resulting psycho-trauma has become for many a rationalization to do whatever is necessary to maintain Israel’s security. Again, Burg says,

Since those days in Germany, we have been holding on painfully to the little that we have, not letting go. We hold the memories and the traumas and they do not leave us. We cling to the tragedy and the tragedy becomes our justification for everything else.⁸⁰

This sense of historical victimization creates for some Israelis a compensatory reflex to choose power and armament; to reject the claims and critique of others; and the adoption of a philosophy that the “end justifies the means,” even if that means the loss of human rights, life, and the dignity of others.⁸¹

A Vignette: Hostile Walls and Holy People

By Susan R. Andrews

This time I came home depressed and anxious—sobered by the bitterness, the polarization, and the hopelessness that seems to permeate the region. Very different from my last trip to Palestine/Israel, back in 1995 – in between the first and second Intifadas—when Oslo seemed promising, the Palestinian Authority had a strong voice, and Christians and Jews were talking and hoping and building tentative bridges together. But in 2010 the situation is bleak—and the window of opportunity for peace is rapidly closing.

The first six days we met with our Christian partners in Lebanon, Syria, and Jordan—soaking in the beauty of these ancient lands, hearing the lament about the rapid diminishment of the Christian voice and presence in the Holy Land, and feeling the urgency of this moment in time. We were heartened by the unity of the Christian voices, increasingly joined by moderate Muslim voices—all crying out for peace with justice. And yet we also heard a clear warning that the conflict in Israel/Palestine is a pervasive disease, poisoning the present and jeopardizing the future of the entire Middle East region—indeed a toxic combination of fear and anger and chronic displacement that is jeopardizing the harmony of the whole world.

Our final eight days were spent in Israel/Palestine—six days in Jerusalem and two days in the Galilee and Jericho. We stayed at a Christian Retreat Center in East Jerusalem, and a kosher Orthodox Jewish hotel in West Jerusalem—literally experiencing the cultural tension of this small, fierce and divided city. We spent a day in Hebron and a day in Bethlehem—and we talked and listened, and talked and listened, and talked and listened with Christians, Muslims, Jews, Israelis, Palestinians, human rights activists, rabbis, government officials, Bedouins, scholars, settlers, and displaced refugees.

Several images have been burned into my soul from our troubled days together. I see the elder-physician from Basra, Iraq, who remains faithful in his devastated city, keeping the doors of the church open, preaching every week, and ministering as a plastic surgeon, reshaping faces and bodies deformed by the bombs and pollution of the war. I hear the pastor from Iran, serving with a quiet joy amidst much pressure and civil unrest, rejoicing that his pews are full each Sunday with inquirers about the faith, in a country where it is illegal to proselytize.

I see the steady march of settlement expansion on confiscated Palestinian land—mammoth development dominating every hillside around Jerusalem—squeezing the Arab populations into valleys of poverty and despair. And I see bypass roads and towering security walls—literally fencing off the reality of the occupation from the Israeli families, many who live in these burgeoning suburban settlements with a 50 percent subsidy from the government.

I see and hear the seven rabbis who ate lunch with us—aware of the moral failures of the Israeli government, actively seeking ways to redeem the Israeli people by dismantling the occupation, and yet also fiercely committed to the security of their land and their people. I see the angry settler in Hebron—greeting us with contempt in his voice and a pistol on his hip. And the soldiers who kept us waiting as they cleaned up the early morning blood from a confrontation between a Palestinian resident and an Israel soldier.

I see a church packed with Christians in predominantly Muslim Amman, Jordan—most of them from families displaced by the 1948 invasion of Palestine by Israeli soldiers. I see Angela, a Jewish human rights activist working for the Israeli Committee Against House Demolitions, who showed us the inequities of roads and houses and schools and freedom between East and West Jerusalem, and who grieves the very loss of the soul of the Jewish people amidst the power politics of the Israeli government. And I feel the joy and the energy of Mitri Raheb, a Lutheran pastor in Bethlehem, who insists on being a resurrection Christian, living with hope amidst the contemporary suffering of his people—pouring all his energies and dreams into empowerment and encouragement of the youth of Bethlehem—giving them imagination and leadership skills through education and the arts.

Two ideas have stuck with me from our conversations in the Middle East. Avraham Burg, a former speaker of the Knesset, now a scholar and peace activist, encouraged us to see the conflict in the Middle East in a new light. It is not only about power politics, it is also about psycho-politics. As he sees it, the conflict is almost cosmic in proportion—a struggle between “competing traumas.” There is the trauma of 1948—and all the horror of violent displacement and the de-legitimization and demoralization of the Palestinian people. And there is the trauma of the Holocaust—the genocide of 6 million people feeding on the historical hatred that has tried to wipe out the Jewish people for more than 5,000 years. These traumas are not just about political conflict. These traumas permeate the very essence of identity and passion and life. And they will not be healed by high-sounding words in a peace agreement. They will only be healed by a global embrace of the radical grace of God.

The second idea that has stuck with me focuses on the mantra we so often hear from our Jewish friends. “Never again” —never again will the world allow the horror and hatred of a holocaust against God’s people. But that mantra can have two meanings—never again will MY people go through such devastation, even if it means oppressing and destroying others in the process. OR, never again will ANY people go through such ugly destruction. And all of us—Christian, Muslim, Jew—must work together to find true shalom in the Middle East and around the world.

I came home hearing a double message from our journey through the Holy Land. The first was a plea from our Christian brothers and sisters to stand with them in solidarity—naming the evil that is the occupation, and doing everything in our power to end it. The second was a plea from our Israeli Jewish brothers and sisters to engage our Jewish partners here in the United States in such a way that they can hear our message—and be transformed into peacemakers with and for the people of both Israel and Palestine. Those two pleas remain in tension as we submit our report as a task force.

My prayer is that God will give the PC(USA) the grace and the clarity to speak the truth in love—and to further God’s reign of peace and justice in the world. And my conviction is that the Living Christ can indeed be our peace, working to break down the dividing walls of hostility that are fragmenting this beautiful and broken world.

May it be so.

[The vignettes in this section of the report were written by individual members of the MESC as they reflected on their experience in the Middle East. Susan R. Andrews is general presbyter of Hudson River Presbytery and has long been involved in interfaith and ecumenical relations.]

The second psycho-trauma that one encounters in the Middle East is the trauma brought by Nakba [The Catastrophe], as the Palestinians call it, or the War of Independence, as the Israelis term the event. The term “Nakba” does not refer to the establishment of Israel itself, but rather the effect that the war had on the Palestinian people. This war resulted in the displacement of 750,000 Palestinians in 1948 from their ancestral homeland. This was a violent displacement and is overwhelmingly experienced as a de-legitimization of the Palestinian people. This is described well by Naim Ateek, a Palestinian Anglican priest and the president and director of Sabeel⁸² in Jerusalem.

On Israel’s Independence Day in 1958 the Israeli military governor had allowed the Palestinian Arabs living in Israel to move around without permits. My father took advantage of this temporary freedom to rent a pickup truck and take all of his children back for the first time to see our home in the town of Beisan, the home from which we had been forced out nine years earlier. Even today I clearly remember how we were not allowed even to look inside our home. The three houses built by my father that made up our home had been divided into smaller units, each occupied now by a Jewish immigrant family. It must have been very difficult for my father to see our house occupied by Jewish immigrants who had come from North Africa while he, the rightful owner, was prevented even from entering them. A few days after this traumatic experience, my father suffered a stroke from which he never fully recovered, leaving him unable to walk or speak clearly.⁸³

The inexplicable pain of the Nakba creates for some Palestinians a sense of historical victimization, which creates a compensatory reflex to choose violence; to reject the claims and critique of others; and the adoption of a philosophy that the “end justifies the means.”⁸⁴ The awareness of the Nakba is renewed every time a bulldozer knocks down a Palestinian house or uproots an olive tree, posing the constant moral test of how to respond non-violently—as almost all always do.

With both the Israeli Holocaust and the Palestinian Nakba, empathy is weakened, humiliation is remembered, hopelessness and fear increased, and when they confront each other “horns are locked.”

The defensive reaction seen by some in both communities is to move away from democracy and toward fundamentalism, theocracy, and exclusivism. This exclusivism is manifested in two peoples who have often looked at the world around them solely through the lenses of their own trauma, and who thereby fail to see the whole picture. Each people have become compartmentalized, resulting in further misunderstanding and conflict. This compartmentalization prevents each from knowing what is happening to the other and failing to accurately understand the other’s viewpoint. The walls or borders of each compartment become blinders that obscure the reality of the situation.⁸⁵

Compartmentalization also leads to living in isolation, permitting each party to think that their mistreatment of the other is both good and proper. “It is just the way it is.”⁸⁶ This has led some Zionists, who see themselves as an embattled minority, to justify the occupation and the invasion of Gaza because it is for Israel’s security. Likewise, this has led some extremist Arabs, who see themselves as the oppressed, to resort to violent resistance. Either way, “each side sees itself as a victim and the other side as an instigator.”⁸⁷

“The emotional baggage of the Holocaust and the displacement of hundreds of thousands of Palestinians affect people’s perceptions of the objective reality of the Israeli Palestinian conflict, a reality in which people are being killed. One side may perceive the blowing up a bus or a disco as justified retaliation; the other side may perceive the isolation of Gaza and the killing of far greater numbers of Palestinians with tanks and F-16s as justified retaliation. The objective reality remains the same: people are dying.”⁸⁸

We believe that the one person's pain does not justify the inflicting of pain on another. We also believe that breaking through the conflict created by both of these psycho-traumas is possible only with the work of outside parties. Both sides are so "locked in horns" that a third party breakthrough is imperative. This "outside-assisted breakthrough" must come from the U.S. government (which is a primary supporter of Israel), American Jewish voices for a just peace, Christian churches both within the Middle East and worldwide, and the many moderate Muslims who embrace a vision for peace.

A Vignette: Like the Lilies of the Field and the Birds of the Air

by Nahida H. Gordon

Like the lilies of the field and the birds of the air, "I am from there"* —Palestine. As we leave Jordan and enter Palestine at the King Hussein crossing, we are greeted by the flag of the government that has denied me my Palestine. My friends, the members of the Middle East Study Committee, are excited at seeing the desert wilderness where Jesus wandered for forty days. One of them begins to sing a hymn. They and I look at the same thing, but see very different realities. Palestine belongs to them in a way that it does not to me. I feel only sadness and loss.

I was born in Jerusalem and lived in Jaffa. My family, which had lived in Palestine for centuries, left Jaffa in May 1948 to flee the Israeli bombing of the business and civilian areas of Jaffa. As the bombs fell on our houses, my father was wounded and the church across the street was partially destroyed. We literally fled for our lives thinking that we could return when the violence abated. We heard about the massacre in Deir Yassin in early April and heard about the trucks with loudspeakers promising that if Palestinians stayed in their homes, they would suffer the same fate as the inhabitants of Deir Yassin, a Palestinian town near Jerusalem. I have a document, circulated in Jaffa by the Hagana (Israeli forces) on May 13, 1948, in which we were promised that they, the Hagana, will honor the Geneva conventions and allow our return to Jaffa. This was a lie, one of many, throughout the years. It is now sixty-one years later, and I am still waiting to return to my home.

As we traveled throughout Palestine, I looked at the birds of the air with envy. They fly about not worrying about checkpoints, earth mounds, Black Hawk helicopters, F16 jets, sulfur bombs, tear gas canisters, sound grenades, bullets, or the myriad variety of armaments that plague Palestinians and suicide bombs that plague Israelis. Birds, it seems, do not need passports or identity cards. Before Israel, we Palestinians were more like the birds—we lived in a multicultural society of Christians, Jews, and Muslims. I had friends who were Jews and Muslims. Why cannot the world allow us to strive for that again?

As we continued to travel throughout the land, we encountered the continuing dispossession of the Palestinians by the Israeli government to make way for Jewish immigrants from many parts of the world, including the United States and Europe. In West Jerusalem, we passed through the neighborhood called Ba'a where my grandmothers', uncles', and aunts' houses still stand—now occupied by Israeli citizens. The sights and sounds of Jerusalem, its sweet breezes, the trees, the song of the morning dove all evoke memories of the past. My family's dispossession seems complete and brings on a wave of intense sadness. And anger—why were the Palestinians deemed to be an expendable people for the purpose of assuaging the guilt of Western Christianity?

We ended our trip at the Sea of Galilee. Upon arriving, we celebrated communion. So for me, the trip into Palestine ended the same way it began. My friends see the biblical connections and I see the loss and grief. Because of my Christian Palestinian origin, Palestine is lost to me!

I am grateful for those who give of themselves and of their time to consider the question of Palestine and particularly to those who have the courage to speak the truth. Only truth will free Palestine-Israel.

*Title of a poem by Mahmoud Darwish.

[Nahida H. Gordon is a Palestinian American, who grew up in Jaffa, but currently is a professor of Statistics at Case Western Reserve University, and an elder at Westminster Presbyterian Church, Wooster, Ohio.]

3. *Dwindling Christian Presence and Influence*

The Christian community has maintained an unbroken presence and witness in Jerusalem since Pentecost, gradually spreading throughout Palestine, the Middle East, and the Mediterranean world.⁸⁹ There is continuing concern about the numbers of Christians remaining in the Middle East and particularly in Palestine. This was the message that was clearly heard from our Christian partners, particularly in Lebanon and Israel.

At present it is estimated that 9,246,000 to 16,206,000 Christians live in the Middle East. Currently, Christians have been emigrating from the Middle East, and reasons for the outmigration vary by country. Political upheavals in Lebanon; discrimination in Israel, Egypt, and Iran; the occupation and economic decline in the West Bank and Gaza; and security and discrimination in Iraq are some of the reasons. There are political reasons to try to inflate the numbers; we are told that the actual numbers are closer to the lower ends of each range. Christians in Jordan and Syria appear to experience the least difficulties in the Middle East; however numbers are reported to be declining there as well. The Table below provides estimates by country⁹⁰

Country	Estimated Numbers	Percentage of Population	Reasons for Decline
Lebanon	1.35 M ¹ to 1.6 M	34–41%	Political Situation
Israel	144 K ² to 196 K	2.1–2.8%	Discrimination
West Bank and Gaza	40 K–90 K	1.1–2.4%	Occupation, Economic Decline
Egypt	5.8 M–11 M	8–16%	Discrimination
Syria	970K–1.7 M	5.4–9.4%	None given
Jordan	163 K–220 K	3–4%	None given
Iraq	700 K–1 M	2.7–3.5%	Security
Iran	79 K–400K	0.1–0.6%	Discrimination
Gulf States	2,048.9 K to 2,083.9 K		

¹ ‘M’ denotes ‘Million’; ² ‘K’ denotes ‘Thousand’

Although the numbers of Christians in Israel and the Palestinian Territories have remained steady, or may have even increased slightly, they have not kept pace with the normal rate of population growth. Their proportions have declined significantly and their influence greatly diminished. The reduction to the present 1.37 percent in the proportion of Christians⁹¹ is attributed to lower birth rates and the higher rates of outmigration,⁹² which result from the occupation with its difficulties for daily life. A further concern of this outmigration is that those able to migrate, either Christian or Muslim, are those with education and whose political views are “liberals or seculars” thus tending to leave behind a greater proportion of those on the extremes in political orientation.⁹³

This dwindling presence of Christians in the Middle East is a deep concern due to the role that Christians have played in being a mediating, reconciling presence. Without that presence, we fear a more religiously polarized Middle East, more prone to extremism.

4. *Refugees in the Middle East*

As a result of the 1948 Arab-Israeli conflict, 750,000 Palestinians became refugees. The 1967 war resulted in an additional 140,000 refugees in Jordan and 240,000 in the West Bank. It is currently estimated

that there are 4.7 million registered Palestinian refugees in Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, the West Bank, and Gaza. The massive numbers of Palestinian refugees in surrounding countries continues to cause concern, conflict, and anger on the part of our respective partners there. For there to be a just peace, Palestinian refugees must be offered the right to return or compensation for their home and lands. One Jewish author has poignantly remarked, “Can the United States stop its support of Israel’s military and instead support Israel by offering to help in the repatriation of Palestinian refugees? We can, and we should.”⁹⁴

5. Increasing Nuclear Threat

The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) reported on February 8, 2010, the following news.

The IAEA can confirm that it has received a letter from the Atomic Energy Organization of Iran (AEOI) on 8 February 2010, in which the AEOI informed the Agency that production of less than 20 percent enriched uranium is being foreseen at the Pilot Fuel Enrichment Plant at Natanz for fuel for the Tehran Research Reactor.⁹⁵

The IAEA then reported ten days later that they had extensive evidence of “past or current undisclosed activities” by [Iran’s](#) military to develop a nuclear warhead.⁹⁶

That news sent waves of fear through Israelis and fueled their sense of vulnerability and insecurity.

While this growing fear is a deep concern, an equal concern is the number of nuclear warheads that Israel currently stockpiles and thus the growing sense of Iranian vulnerability and insecurity. While Israel will not confirm its possession of nuclear weapons or the number held, it is generally agreed that Israel has stockpiled close to 100 nuclear weapons.⁹⁷

The only just and peaceful solution to this growing concern is to work for a nuclear-free Middle East in both Iran and Israel.

6. Reality on the Ground in Israel-Palestine

a. Violence by Both Extremes

Inexcusable acts of violence have been committed by both the powerful occupying forces of the Israeli military and the Jewish settlers in the West Bank,⁹⁸ as well as, the Palestinians, of whom a relatively small minority has resorted to violence as a means of resisting the occupation.⁹⁹ Violence is not an acceptable means to peace, regardless of its rationale.

b. The Israeli Occupation of the West Bank and Gaza

As the MESC traveled throughout the region, the overwhelming consensus of all members was that Israel’s occupation of the West Bank and Gaza is a sin against God and other fellow human beings. While there are many subordinate factors that contribute to the lack of a just peace in Israel-Palestine, the major issue for a just peace is the continued occupation that has been ongoing for the past forty-three years.

The real concern that we all embrace is that the window of opportunity for an end to the occupation and the viability of a two-state solution is rapidly closing. This is due in large part to the rapid growth of settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem, the increasing number of bypass roads, the injustice of the separation barrier, and tragic numbers of house demolitions.

One of the growing concerns of the occupation is the dramatic increase of settlements that began after the 1967 war. One of the hopes of the Oslo Interim agreements was that settlement growth would cease;

however, the opposite has occurred, resulting in a current population of the West Bank settlements at 285,000 and 198,700 settlers in East Jerusalem.¹⁰⁰ The continued growth of the number of settlements and settlers is perceived by many as an attempt by Israel to prevent the establishment of an economically viable Palestinian state.

Another concern of the occupation is the number of “Israeli-only bypass roads” that carve up the Palestinian homeland and connect one settlement to another. This has a devastating effect on the ability of Palestinian residents to live out a normal life—to visit family, farm family property; to seek medical treatment; to secure employment; and to travel freely in one’s own country.

The separation barrier at times is an imposing twenty-six feet high, concrete wall and at other times, in less densely populated areas, it is a barbed-wire topped fence. Israeli supporters of the barrier argue that the wall is necessary to protect Israeli citizens in Israel and its West Bank settlements from Palestinian terrorists and attribute the decrease of incidents of suicide bombers to the existence of the barrier. While few would deny the right of any government to put a barrier on its own property line, thus along the 1967 borders, three-quarters of this barrier is inside the West Bank on Palestinian land.¹⁰¹ This is often perceived by the Palestinians as an effort to secure an illegal settlement, claim water sources, and annex Palestinian land. The location of the barrier is a violation of international law and thus is perceived as a means to preempt a just peace.

The number of house demolitions is alarming and shocks the human conscience. It is estimated that some 24,145 Palestinian homes have been demolished in the Occupied Territories since 1967¹⁰² and that some 4,247 Palestinian homes were demolished in the Gaza Strip during Operation Cast Lead.¹⁰³ The Israeli reason given for these demolitions are as follows: houses demolished for lack of a building permit, houses demolished as punishment for the actions of people associated with the houses, and houses demolished by the IDF in the course of military operations.¹⁰⁴ Regardless of the reason, the demolition of houses is a tragic human experience for Palestinian homeowners and an unnecessary action if there were no occupation.

A just and lasting peace and security for Israel is possible when the occupation has ended and the Palestinian acts of violent resistance are no longer employed. A just and lasting peace and security for the Palestinians is possible when the occupation has ended and Israel does not need to resort to military force to maintain its illegal land possession. If there were no occupation, there would be no Palestinian resistance. If there was no Palestinian resistance, Israelis could live in peace and security.

The Israeli occupation leads to the denial of many human rights and the violation of international laws. The violent forms of Palestinian resistance to the occupation also leads to violations of international law. The only just solution is to insist that both Palestinians and Israelis abide by international law and justly respect the human rights of all. Double standards must give way to equal justice for all, which will result in peace for all.

A Vignette: Jesus Wept

by Lucy Janjigian

Jesus wept!

For more than two thousand years, Palestine has been the destination of Christian pilgrimages. Sadly, now about 1.5 percent of its population is Christian. This is the cry from all the leaders of Christian denominations.

Born in Jerusalem, I attended an English Anglican School with Arab (Muslim and Christian), Jewish, Armenian, and other girls of many nationalities. Our home was in an international quarter where Abyssinian, Arab, Armenian, Assyrian, English, French, Jewish, Polish, and Russian families lived in peace and within proximity to each other.

Around 1946, militant Zionists began blowing up British soldiers and policemen. July 22, 1946, was Palestine's September 11. Irgun Zionists blew up the King David Hotel that housed the British Mandate Government, killing 92 Arab, Armenian, British, Greek, and Jewish personnel, including my aunt's sister Eugenie, and a Greek girl I knew, a recent graduate from our school.

On November 29, 1947, the United Nations announced the Palestine Partition Plan. The house we lived in landed in no man's land with bullets flying through the windows between Arabs and Jews. One night, the four-story Mandelbaum Apartment Building (that was behind our house) whose Jewish residents had evacuated that day, was blown up by Jewish forces. Our windowpanes shattered, dogs barked, pictures and dishes crashed to the tiled floor. The blast terrified us and shook us out of bed.

The next morning we were uprooted. At the urging of Bishop Stewart, we abandoned our home and moved to St. George's School across the street, where my father had taught both Arab and Jewish students. For us to move safely, a temporary two-hour ceasefire was agreed upon. Carrying a few personal belongings, the street we crossed became the boundary between Israel and Jordan. Jerusalem was now a divided city. Travel between Jerusalem and Jordan had to be through the Mandelbaum Gate. This barbed wire fence in front of our demolished home was monitored by UN personnel. It was dismantled after the 1967 War when Jerusalem became a united city by illegal Israeli annexation that has not been recognized by the U.S. or by other international governments.

June 11, 1948—The first cease fire was signed by UN's Count Folke Bernadotte, with high ranking Israeli and Jordanian military and civilian officials, in our living room at St. George's School. During the ceasefire both sides rearmed. We left Jerusalem and found refuge at the Anglican Girls' Mission School, Amman, Jordan; where other refugees shared their room with extended family.

Upon our return to Jerusalem in 1950, I worked with United Nations Relief Works Agency (UNRWA) among Palestinian refugees in tented camps. That was an eye-opener and a heartbreak. In the past sixty years, the 750,000 refugees have since multiplied to millions. Sadly, they have not been allowed to return or compensated for their land and property.

It was an honor to be on this journey with the Presbyterian General Assembly-appointed study committee. Unfortunately, we were not able to visit Ramallah, Gaza, or refugee camps.

Israel evicts Palestinians, demolishes their homes and cisterns, confiscates their land, and cuts down their orchards, which are frequently their only means of livelihood. Palestinians are deprived of their human rights and are humiliated on a daily basis. We saw an example of this the day we visited Hebron. An Israeli soldier carrying his gun entered our bus to check our identities. As he was getting off, out of the blue, he spat at a young Arab boy passing by minding his own business.

Palestinians feel imprisoned and choked by the Separation Wall (sometimes referred to as Wall of Tears or Apartheid Wall) and continues to build illegal settlements on Arab lands and hilltops converging onto villages, even though President Obama asked for a freeze on settlement building. Palestinians are harassed, denied water and freedom of movement. They are required to carry identity passes that are checked at numerous checkpoints making travel difficult and time-consuming. Furthermore, they have to use unpaved, winding roads that prolong travel time, while Israelis have access to direct exclusive paved roads.

"Israel acts as a spoiled child," remarked one Israeli activist. "America has helped create this undisciplined child. It depends on the U.S. for its lifeline of funding and weapons." She continued to say "that even though the state of Israel is supposed to be a democracy, it acts as a Nazi state." She did not feel she could live in the country much longer if it continued to be an oppressor, ignoring human rights.

We were privileged to attend Dar Annadwa's 5th Annual Conference—"The Kairos & the Intersection Between Theology & Politics—A South African Perspective" in Bethlehem.

Israel has violated human rights, broken Geneva Conventions, ignored UN Declarations, and gotten away with it. This I cannot understand. The U.S. government must stop providing Israel with unlimited funds and weapons.

I weep, with Christ for
the Oppressor,
the Oppressed,
Jerusalem—The Holy City.
I pray,
hearts of stone to melt into hearts of flesh,
Peace to reign with Justice, resulting in a two-state solution
Reinstating the 1967 borders,
Jerusalem declared an International City
Open for ALL.
May justice and peace reign.
Amen.

[Lucy Janjigian is a Palestinian American born of Armenian descent in Jerusalem. She is also an artist. One of her works appears on the cover of this report. She has served as a short-term volunteer with the Armenian Missionary Association of America and is an elder at Westside Presbyterian Church in Ridgewood, New Jersey.]

7. Palestinian Christians: Agents of Reconciliation and Nonviolent Resistance

In the Middle East the voice of our Christian partners, though increasingly small, is both vital and promising.¹⁰⁵ While their percentage of the population continues to decline due to the Israel-Palestine conflict and the resulting political struggles and economic pressures, their unified witness in the recent past has been clear, concise, and challenging. In June 2007, the World Council of Churches brought together an international peace conference in Amman, Jordan. An urgent ecumenical plea, known now as “The Amman Call,”¹⁰⁶ came out of this gathering. This document was a call for churches to step forward in their role to “heal and to bring all sides to reconciliation.” In addition it called for the Palestinian right of return, a two-state solution that is “viable politically, geographically, economically and socially,” and a shared Jerusalem. From our partners we all took seriously their cry, “Enough is enough. No more words without deeds. It is time for action.” Hearing this plea, the 218th General Assembly (2008) endorsed and affirmed “The Amman Call.”

The Palestine-Israel Ecumenical Forum (PIEF) was launched out of this initial gathering in Amman and during the next two years it continued to meet, encouraging the writing of a defining statement from our Palestinian partners.¹⁰⁷ In December 2009, the forum met again in Bethlehem, Palestine, and there witnessed the unveiling of a Palestinian Christian statement: “Kairos Palestine: A Moment of Truth, A Word of Faith, Hope, and Love from the Heart of Palestinian Suffering.”¹⁰⁸

This Kairos Palestine document is a cry for the international community to stand with the Palestinian Christians who have faced great oppression and suffering. It is a call for us as Christians to oppose occupation theologies and to work for a just peace. This document clearly calls the occupation “a sin against God and humanity” and thus must be opposed by all who are concerned for justice and peace in the Middle East. It reaffirms “the establishment of an independent Palestinian state with Al-Quds [East Jerusalem] as its capital.” Throughout the document, even in the face of the separation wall that illegally confiscates Palestinian land and the growing number of settlements that recreate a growing obstacle to a political solution and Israel’s disregard of international law, the tone is one of hope and the method embraced is peaceful, nonviolent resistance. Kairos Palestine focuses, above all, on love and reconciliation.

While Kairos Palestine calls for divestment and boycott of everything produced by the occupation as an act of conscience and a method of nonviolent resistance, it lifts this up as part of the Christian affirmation

of speaking truth in love. We struggle with its call for solidarity in this area and confess that we have not fully answered it.

The hopes and prayers are that the Kairos Palestine document will “provide the turning point to focus all peace-loving peoples in the world,” because “liberation from the occupation is in the interest of all peoples in the region.”

A Vignette: 58 Years in Israel and Palestine

by John Huffman

I am theologically a moderate pro-Zionist. While I cannot embrace the triumphal enthusiasm of the ultra-dispensationalists with their detailed eschatological charts, I on the other hand cannot bring myself to deny the significant role of the Jews in both human history and salvation history. Even as in my Reformed theology, I affirm the Church to be the New Israel, I am stopped in my tracks as I see an exiled people return to a land once theirs, more than 2,000 years since they have had complete sovereignty over that land. There is nothing comparable in history. This convinces me that some of the prophecies of Scripture are being fulfilled in our day in a most amazing way.

At the same time, I am forced to raise issues with today’s zealous Jewish Zionism and the State of Israel in its present policies and actions in regard to the Palestinian people. There is no biblical mandate for such a lack of hospitality and such flagrant injustice. Something must be done.

I first visited the Middle East as a twelve-year-old in 1952. As my parents had tea with Dr. and Mrs. Thomas Lambie at the Berachah Tuberculosis Sanitarium south of Bethlehem, I stood on the roof of their house looking out into their backyard and the hillside beyond observing more than 30,000 Palestinian refugees of the 1947–48 war, still living in the squalor of camelhair tents, behind barbed wire fences, eking out an existence on United Nations rations. Seeing other such encampments, I then, as a youngster, sensed that these refugee camps would inevitably become hotbeds of resentment and even potential terrorism.

In my subsequent thirty trips to the area, the most recent being with our task force this past August, I have been perplexed by the complexity of the situation, troubled by acts of terrorism on both sides, and ultimately appalled by the arbitrary expropriation of Palestinian land and the exponential increase of that expropriation since 1967 and the use of that land in violation of international law, the most visible evidence of that being the building of Israeli settlements housing what soon will be one-half million settlers.

It was with great reservation that I accepted the invitation to join this General Assembly task force. I know how controversial is this topic and how viciously attacked any truth-tellers are by majority voices in the American Jewish community that are quick to attach the label “anti-Semitic” to anyone who even suggests that there are serious ethical and legal issues at stake. I support the security of the State of Israel and believe that American tax dollars should be used for that purpose. But it should not be done at all costs on Israeli-dictated terms resulting from a masterful manipulation of the United States political process.

Whatever else our report recommends, I personally plead for a reversal of the apartheid actions that now are integral to Israeli domestic and foreign policy. Something must be done to remove the ghastly wall that is such a reminder of the Soviet unjust endeavor to exclude. And I would hope for the negotiation of a land swap that will inconvenience the fewest possible Palestinians and Israelis in a realistic understanding that, as painful as it is, the clock cannot be turned all the way back to 1948 but that reparations can be made. I beg for a more humane approach by Israel to implement the conditions undergirding God’s covenant blessing on His people, an implementation that will not deny realistic security threats but will endeavor to alleviate the suffering of the second-class status of Palestinians in Gaza and the West Bank. If this is not forthcoming, I must reluctantly join that lonely minority of Jewish and Gentile voices that call for justice even if it takes divestment to force the issue. And I urge our American U.S. foreign policy to cut off our elaborate financial/military support of Israel until there is full compliance with international law and the standards of justice in any respected society. Short of such

actions on the part of the Israelis, I see a continued heightening of tensions and circumstances evolving in the larger Middle East that could even ultimately threaten the existence of Israel as a continuing Jewish homeland.

[John A. Huffman has just retired from his position as senior pastor of the St. Andrews Presbyterian Church, Newport Beach, California. During his life, he has traveled to Israel Palestine thirty-one times.]

8. *A Time for Action*

One last observation that the Middle East Study Committee encountered in the Middle East was the disparity between the fierce urgency felt by many whose lives focus on solving the conflict and the lack of urgency felt by many others whose lives are more removed from day-to-day contact with the conflict. Many give so much energy to the ending of the occupation and the resolution of a just peace; and, on the other hand, many simply are willing to live with the disparity of justice, perhaps because the insecurity of the current status quo is perceived to be better than the fear of the unknown that a dramatic change would bring.

On the floor of the Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, the words attributed to Martin Niemoller, which he wrote as an anti-Nazi German pastor, read:

First, they came for the socialist, and I did not speak out, because I was not a socialist.
Then they came for the trade unionist, and I did not speak out, because I was not a trade unionist.
Then they came for the Jews, and I did not speak out, because I was not a Jew.
Then they came for me, and there was no one left to speak for me.

We all do have a shared responsibility to guard human rights everywhere,¹⁰⁹ and now is the time for the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) to speak out, stand up, and take action. We must be those who will say, “Never again” not just for the Jew, but for every suffering victim in the world today,¹¹⁰ including the Palestinians.

Part Two: Recommendations

[Recommendations from the Middle East Study Committee (*Minutes*, 2010, Part I, pp. 50, 52, 1021–1117)]

In service to its ever-linked concerns for peace and justice in Palestine and Israel, and its concern for the enduring integrity and witness of the Christian Church there and in the United States, the Middle East Study Committee recommends that the 219th General Assembly (2010) approve the following recommendations:

1. *Affirmation of Human Rights & Moral Principles*

In accordance with past policy statements and the theological-ethical bases of our confessions, the 219th General Assembly (2010) of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) affirms the following human rights, moral principles, and goals guiding its recommendations:

a. The human right to self-determination through free elections and the rule of law, including the right to enjoy such basic freedoms as those of speech, press, and assembly.

b. The human right to religious freedom, including full access to religious sites and freedom from all discriminatory practices based on religious identity.

c. Those additional rights enumerated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and international human rights conventions, including the principle of universal jurisdiction.

d. The moral principle of applying humanitarian laws regarding warfare to all nations. These laws protect civilians and nonmilitary facilities prohibit such internationally recognized

violations as the use of anti-personnel weapons and weapons of mass destruction, the assassination of political opponents, collective punishment, detention without due process, and the torture or abuse of prisoners.

e. The moral principle of applying these same humanitarian laws regarding warfare to nongovernmental combatants as well. These laws prohibit such practices as suicide bombing, kidnapping, shelling civilian populations, and torturing or abusing prisoners.

f. The moral principle of granting to Red Cross, Star, or Crescent inspection teams access to all prison facilities.

g. The moral principle that all refugees have an individual right to return or to adjudicate or negotiate compensation for the loss of home and homeland, wherever those may be.

h. The moral goal for nations to create a nuclear-free world and, toward that goal, to sign and comply with the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and other relevant treaties.

i. The moral goal of demilitarizing conflict situations to levels consistent with a state's or people's right to self-defense.

j. The moral principle of respecting United Nations observers and peacekeeping forces and imposing disciplinary sanctions when nations or entities target UN facilities and personnel.

k. The moral principle of nonintervention in, noninterference with, and non-destabilization of other countries.

2. *Affirmation of Previous General Assembly Policies & Statements*¹¹¹

Given the daunting and mounting obstacles to the viability of a “two-state solution,” and following from the above principles, the 219th General Assembly (2010) affirms with greater urgency our historic Presbyterian stances with specific regard to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, calling for

a. an immediate cessation of all violence, whether perpetrated by Israelis or Palestinians;

b. the reaffirmation of Israel's right to exist as a sovereign nation within secure and internationally recognized borders in accordance with United Nations resolutions.

c. the end of the Israeli occupation of Palestinian territories and diversion of water resources;

d. an immediate freeze both on the establishment or expansion of Israeli settlements in the West Bank and on the Israeli acquisition of Palestinian land and buildings in East Jerusalem;

e. the relocation by Israel of the Separation Barrier to the 1967 border;

f. the withholding of U.S. government aid to the state of Israel as long as Israel persists in creating new West Bank settlements;

g. continuing corporate engagement through the Committee on Mission Responsibility Through Investment with companies profiting from the sale and use of their products for non-peaceful purposes and/or the violation of human rights;

- h. a shared status for Jerusalem;
- i. equal rights for Palestinian citizens of the state of Israel;
- j. the cessation of systematic violation of human rights by any party, specifically, practices of administrative detention, collective punishment, the torture of prisoners and suspects, home demolitions and evictions, and the deportation of dissidents;
- k. the immediate resumption by Israel and Palestine of negotiations toward a two-state solution.

3. *For the Witness of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)*

The 219th General Assembly (2010):

- a. Directs the General Assembly Mission Council to set 2010–2012 as a time of Presbyterian prayer and action for the Middle East, including: travel opportunities with a particular emphasis on visits with the Christian communities, study of Reformed theological understandings of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and of historical understandings that encompass various narratives and verifiable sources, itineration throughout the U.S. by Middle Eastern Christian partners, local dialogues and shared projects with American Jews and Muslims, participation in the ecumenical accompaniment program (EAPPI) in Palestine and Israel of the World Council of Churches, and robust publicity and promotion of these activities.
- b. Authorizes the creation of a Monitoring Group on the Middle East for the next two years that will consist of seven people appointed by the current and immediately past Moderators in consultation with the GAMC staff persons responsible for global mission in the Middle East and for Interreligious Affairs to assist the appropriate General Assembly Mission Council offices and the Middle East staff team in monitoring progress and guiding actions to ensure adequate implementation of policy directions approved by this General Assembly, given the growing complexity and interrelatedness of issues in the region. (It is the understanding that the group would be convened, as necessary and helpful, via teleconferencing or other means incurring minimal expense.) This committee shall be appointed by the end of August 2010. The monitoring group shall include at least one but no more than two members of the existing Middle East Study Committee (MESOC). New appointees shall be chosen on the basis of demonstrated experience with and knowledge of the complex dynamics of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict within the larger concerns of the Middle East, and shall together comprise an authentic balance representing the fullness of the spectrum of commitments within the PC(USA) toward the people and issues in the region.
- c. Strongly denounces Caterpillar’s continued profit-making from non-peaceful uses of its products and presses Caterpillar to review carefully its involvement in obstacles to a just and lasting peace in Israel-Palestine and to take affirmative steps to end its complicity in the violation of human rights.
- d. Calls on denominational agencies and entities, presbyteries, congregations, and individual members to invest positively, after due vetting, in sustainable economic development projects for the West Bank and Gaza (that do not support the occupation) sponsored by Palestinians or jointly by Palestinians and Israelis in equitable partnership
- e. Urges a visit to Israel/Palestine by a high-level joint delegation of Presbyterians (including representatives from the Board of Pensions, Presbyterian Foundation, and the General Assembly

Mission Council) and appropriate counterparts in the American ecumenical, Jewish, and Muslim communities, with costs shared among the participating faith groups, for the purpose of identifying opportunities for positive investment, with a report back to the 220th General Assembly (2012).

f. Commends for study the Kairos Palestine document ('A Moment of Truth'), and endorses the document's emphases on hope for liberation, nonviolence, love of enemy, and reconciliation. We lift up for study the often neglected voice of Palestinian Christians. We direct the monitoring group for the Middle East to create a study guide for the document.

g. Promotes contributions to Extra Commitment Opportunities for the support of Christian educational institutions throughout the region, especially in Lebanon and Iraq.

h. Encourages Presbyterians to travel to the region, especially Israel/Palestine, and when doing so to worship and visit with Palestinian Christians, support Christian businesses, engage Israeli Jews, Israeli Arabs, and Palestinian Muslims, and spend dedicated time in Israel and Palestine.

4. Urgent Actions Toward Justice and Peace in Israel, the Occupied Territories of Palestine, and Jerusalem

The 219th General Assembly (2010):

a. Advocates the immediate resumption of good faith negotiations to address comprehensively the issues of occupation, refugees, borders, shared status of Jerusalem, release of prisoners and detainees, and security, based on UN Security Council resolutions.

b. Calls on the U.S. government to exercise strategically its international influence, including making U.S. aid to Israel contingent upon Israel's compliance with international law and peacemaking efforts.

c. Calls upon Israel to release, without any further delay, withheld Palestinian tax moneys to the Palestinian National Authority.

d. Calls on the Israeli and Egyptian governments to limit their blockade of Gaza solely to military equipment/devices and to guarantee adequate levels of food, medicine, building supplies, and other humanitarian items, and to allow free commercial exchange in and out of Gaza, and calls on the U.S. government to end any support for the blockade that interferes with the adequacy of such items or such exchange.

e. Urges the main Palestinian political parties (Fatah and Hamas) to set aside their differences, to pursue an ideology of nonviolence, to reconcile immediately, and to work for peace with each other and with their neighbor, Israel, for the sake of their people, and also calls on the U.S. government to offer support for such reconciliation.

f. Supports the establishment of an international council for Jerusalem to ensure the nondiscriminatory treatment of all Jerusalemites, including fair allocation of housing and family unification permits, free movement of religious workers of all faiths, fair provision of city services in exchange for taxes, protection of all religious and historic sites, international scientific review of all archeological sites and labeling of historic sites, and equitably accessible mass transit from both Israeli and Palestinian areas and links to the West Bank and Gaza.

g. Encourages the participation of Palestinian and Israeli religious leaders (Christian, Jewish, Muslim, and Druze) to participate in the peace process and to lead efforts at reconciliation among both peoples, without governmental interference.

h. Calls for Bethlehem to be a free and open city accessible to all people.

5. *Urgent Actions for a Comprehensive Peace with Justice in the Middle East*

The 219th General Assembly (2010) does the following:

a. Calls on all parties in the Middle East, including Iran and Israel, to refrain from nuclear arms proliferation and to work actively and constructively toward a nuclear-free world especially in the Middle East, and calls on the U.S. to offer support for such a process.

b. Calls on all parties in the Middle East to cease rhetoric and actions that demonize others, whether that takes the form of anti-Semitism or Islamophobia, as well as rhetoric and actions that threaten the well-being of another nation or people. This includes threats by Iranians and members of Hamas and Hezbollah against Israel, sponsorship by Iran of Holocaust-denial conferences, Israeli efforts to deny the Nakba and threats of a mass transfer (expulsion) of the Palestinians into Jordan or elsewhere, and the perpetuation of maps and textbooks that deny the existence of internationally recognized borders, states, and occupied territories.

c. Commends as a model to all nations in the region the joint efforts of Bethlehem, Syracuse, and Tel Aviv universities to examine current Israeli and Palestinian government textbooks for existing biases and inaccuracies and encourages the application of the same examination to textbooks used in private religious schools, be they Christian, Jewish, or Muslim.

d. Condemns, as a matter of principle, the interference of one government in the internal politics of another country, such as Iranian support for Hamas and Hezbollah, American complicity in the Israeli occupation, Syrian interference in the Lebanese political process, and Egyptian collaboration in the enforcement of the blockade of Gaza.

e. Calls on the Lebanese government to address immediately the plight of Palestinian refugees living within its borders, providing them with access to work and the democratic process.

f. Calls on the Syrian and Israeli governments to resume negotiations toward a resolution of the Golan Heights occupation and security issues and calls upon the governments of the U.S. and Turkey to support these negotiations.

g. Commends the bravery and courage of Iranians who have taken to the streets peacefully to demand their democratic rights and calls on the Iranian government to cease its repression of democratic and religious freedoms.

h. Calls on the U.S. government to exercise strategically its international influence and the withholding of financial, economic, and military aid to countries other than Israel, as we might with Israel, until such a time as the civil, religious, and other freedoms of their peoples are fully exercised; and to end U.S. taxpayer support for regimes that perpetuate inequality and popular frustration.

i. Supports an accelerated shift of Iraq occupation activities to effective reconstruction, and the allocation of significant ongoing monetary reparations to help resettle refugees and those

internally displaced, compensate victims and survivors of violence, and restore economic sovereignty and productivity to its oil industry.

6. Addressing Our Own Government

For U.S. government policy to fulfill its “honest broker” aspirations and honor a region-wide human rights agenda, the 219th General Assembly (2010):

a. Calls on the U.S. government to repent of its sinful behavior vis-a-vis the Middle East, including its ongoing war in Iraq, its selectively undermining or supporting the democratic process in such places as Iran and the Palestinian National Authority, its continuing support of nondemocratic regimes for the sake of oil or leverage over oil, or its involvement with security services and contractors who engage in torture, surveillance, and other human rights violations.

b. Calls on the U.S. government to eliminate existing loopholes in tax codes that permit its citizens to make donations to organizations that support human rights violations and breaches of international law and UN Security Council resolutions—particularly those loopholes that allow tax-deductible donations that financially support the Israeli settlement enterprise on occupied territory or Palestinian militant groups.

c. Calls on the U.S. government to give a thorough accounting to its citizenry as to the amounts of its foreign aid to countries in the Middle East that have been used by the recipient nations to finance human rights violations, breaches of international law and UN Security Council Resolutions, ; and to redirect adequate allocations of aid toward (1) the rebuilding of Gaza and humanitarian assistance for its people, and (2) Palestinian reuse or dismantling of the remaining settlement infrastructure following the establishment of a Palestinian state.

d. Calls on the U.S. government to work with other governments to provide reconstruction aid with assurances that there would be no further destruction of infrastructure provided by this aid.

e. Call on the U.S. government to pursue the goal of guaranteeing continued security for Israel from an atmosphere of fear of rocket attacks or other forms of violence, while the U.S. also addresses the Palestinian needs for security and a just resolution of the conflict with Israel.

7. Concerning Christian Presence in the Middle East

For tolerance of religious pluralism, freedom of worship, and protection of Christian communities and in line with principles stated above, the 219th General Assembly (2010):

a. Views with respect the integrity of the religious faiths of Jews, Muslims, and other peoples, the value of noncoercion in religious life, and the benefits of public toleration of religious diversity to diminish extremism, discrimination, and bigotry.

b. Recognizes the current role Christian communities play in helping preserve cultural diversity, historical awareness, and political freedom.

c. Expresses its alarm at increasing waves of Christian emigration thus diminishing Christian presence and witness in the Middle East, and cites as positive counter-examples the inclusion and fuller participation of Christians in Syrian and Jordanian societies.

d. Calls on the government of Iraq to strengthen the protection of minority communities, especially Christian communities under threat, within contexts of increasing protection for all citizens.

e. Recognizes the efforts made by the Egyptian government and civil society to ease the growing climate of tension between the country's Christians and Muslims, and urges that the root causes of fear, anger, and the growing incidence of violent outbreaks be addressed, in order to restore mutual trust and to enable all citizens to enjoy their full and equal rights.

f. Urges the government of Israel to honor family reunification of Christians and others, to provide permits for home construction and improvement without discrimination for all its citizens and those Christians and Muslims under its occupation, to apply the 1967 Protection of Holy Sites law equitably, and to extend religious freedoms described in Recommendation IV.f. throughout Israel without discrimination and prejudice against non-Jews.

8. *Engaging This Report*

The 219th General Assembly (2010):

a. Receives Part One of this report (Introduction; Letters to Our Church, Partners, and Engaged Parties; Biblical Theological Reflections; “What We Have Seen and Heard”) as rationale for recommendations only, not as policy.

b. Delete Part Three, Items A and B (A. Notes from a Humanistic, Liberal Zionist: A Personal Narrative; B. A Plea for Justice: A Historical Analysis), and replace with a series of eight narratives of comparable length, four arising from the range of authentically Palestinian perspectives (including both Christian and Muslim), and four arising from the range of authentically Israeli perspectives, along with an annotated bibliography for additional understanding about the breadth and depth of both authentically Palestinian and Israeli spectrum of perspectives but above all authentically pro-justice and pro-peace. These narratives and the bibliography will be collected and approved by the Monitoring Group on the Middle East.

Rationale

These recommendations are in response to the following referral: *2008 Referral: Item 11-28. Appoint a Nine-Member Committee to Prepare a Comprehensive Study, with Recommendations, That Is Focused on Israel/Palestine within the Complex Context of the Middle East and Report Back to 219th General Assembly (2010)—From the 218th General Assembly (2008) (Minutes, 2008, Part I, pp. 45, 47, 1226).*

The mandate for this study is the action of the 218th General Assembly (2008): “to prepare a comprehensive study, with recommendations, that is focused on Israel/Palestine within the complex context of the Middle East” (*Minutes, 2008, Part I, p. 1226*). The complex context includes two, ongoing wars, one in Iraq and one in Afghanistan and the northwest border regions of Pakistan, wars that, like the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, involve issues of U.S. involvement, a use of force, an occupation, and religious tension. The context also includes ongoing struggles within particular nations: between religious and ethnic groups in Iraq and to a lesser extent in Lebanon; between the rulers and the ruled in Egypt and several other Arab countries; between the native-born and the guest workers in the Gulf region; between political factions in Palestine; between Israelis and Palestinians in Israel; between the ideals of democracy and theocracy in Iran, Israel, and Palestine; and between forces of modernization and tradition in all countries. The undue influence of outside forces continues a history of colonial interference throughout the Middle East. Yet most expert observers and popular opinion polls confirm that the Israeli-Palestinian struggle is playing a central role in exacerbating region-wide grief and grievance.

Even as this is a statement addressed first to Presbyterians and to the government of our own nation, the United States, it is also an invitation to respectful and frank conversation addressed to other Christians, to Jews, and to Muslims both here and abroad, and to persons of every nation who seriously seek peace. Still

because religious faith is to be lived out in an obedience of thoughts and deeds, our study does recommend to Presbyterians specific policies and particular actions.

To summarize at the outset our principal concerns, the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) seeks to strengthen its past positions on behalf of peace between Israelis and Palestinians and the cessation of violence by all parties, and its opposition to Israel's ongoing expansion of Jewish settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem and its continuing occupation of those territories. We also call upon the various Palestinian political factions to negotiate a unified government prepared to recognize Israel's existence. We proclaim our alarm and dismay: both over the increasingly rapid exodus of Christians from Israel/Palestine caused by anti-Palestinian discrimination and oppression, the growth of Islamic and Jewish fundamentalism, and the occupation-related absence of economic opportunity; and also over the exodus of Christians from other parts of the region caused by various military, economic, religious, and cultural factors. And we oppose the government of Iran's nuclear ambitions, its sponsorship of international guerilla warfare, and the threat these pose both to Israel and to Arab states.

We deeply value our relationships with Jews and Muslims in the United States, Israel, and the predominantly Muslim countries of the Middle East. Yet the bonds of friendship must neither prevent us from speaking nor limit our empathy for the suffering of others. Inaction and silence on our part enable actions we oppose and consequences we grieve. We recognize how great a burden past misguided actions by our government have placed on Christians throughout the Muslim world. We recognize that massive amounts of U.S tax money are feeding the various conflicts in the Middle East—including two current wars of arguable necessity and Jewish settlements in Palestine.

We also recognize that our concern to end support for both violence in all its forms and the ongoing occupation and settlement of Palestine places demands of integrity on how the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) uses its own resources and investments. Let us be clear: we do affirm the legitimacy of Israel as a state, but consider the continuing occupation of Palestine (West Bank, Gaza, and East Jerusalem) to be illegitimate, illegal under international law, and an enduring threat to peace in the region. Furthermore, we recognize that any support for that occupation weakens the moral standing of our nation internationally and our security.

Given the complexities of the issues of the Middle East and the diversity of this study committee, it was inconceivable that we achieve unanimity on all the details of the report's recommendations. However, every good faith effort has been made to negotiate differences, honor majorities, and come to consensus without forsaking our deepest convictions.

Part Three: Middle East Monitoring Group Report

[As received by the 220th General Assembly (2012)]

The Middle East Monitoring Group (MEMG) is seven people, appointed to serve a two year term by the current and immediate past Moderators Cynthia Bolbach and Bruce Reyes-Chow in consultation with GAMC staff. The mandate from General Assembly was to have the committee consist of at least one (but no more than two) members of the Middle East Study Committee (MESC). New appointees were chosen on their demonstrated experience with knowledge of the complex dynamics of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict within the larger concerns of the Middle East, and together comprise an authentic balance representing a fullness of the spectrum of the commitments of the PC(USA) toward the people and issues in the region.

This group was appointed in September of 2010: Roula Alkhouri, Laurie Anderson (chair), J. C. Austin, Bill Borrer, Laura Cheifetz, Jeffrey DeYoe, and Ron Shive.

Staff support: Gradye Parsons, Mark Koenig, and Amgad Beblawi.

After the first face-to-face meeting in Louisville in November of 2011, the group created a vision to guide them in living out the mandate of the General Assembly:

- To ensure that the work and spirit for the Middle East peacemaking that took root at the 219th General Assembly (2010) continues to bear fruit.
- To help the church hear and understand the needs, hopes, perspectives, and concerns of the multiple voices of the region.
- Lift up and respond to the particular voice of Palestinian Christians in their experience of suffering and faithfulness.
- Assist the General Assembly Mission Council as it fulfills the policy directions approved by the 219th General Assembly (2010).

The Middle East Monitoring Group had three main responsibilities, as outlined in the mandate (approved resolutions) of the 219th General Assembly (2010):

1. Assist the appropriate General Assembly Mission Council offices and the Middle East staff team in monitoring progress and guiding actions to ensure adequate implementation of policy directions approved by the 219th General Assembly (2010), given the growth in complexity and interrelatedness of issues in the region.
2. The Monitoring Group is tasked with the creation of a study guide for the Kairos Palestine document (A Moment of Truth). The 219th General Assembly (2010) commended this document for study and endorsed its emphases on hope for liberation, nonviolence, love of enemy, and reconciliation.
3. Replace the deleted items of *Breaking Down the Walls*, with a series of eight narratives of comparable length, four arising from the range of authentically Palestinian perspectives (including both Christian and Muslim), and four arising from the range of authentically Israeli perspectives, along with an annotated bibliography for additional understanding about the breadth and depth of both authentically Palestinian and Israeli spectrum of perspectives but above all authentically pro-justice and pro-peace. These narratives and the bibliography will be collected and approved by the Monitoring Group on the Middle East.

In May 2011 the MEMG released the Kairos Palestine Study Guide; designed for ordinary Presbyterians who may have little experience with the plight of Palestinian Christians or the dynamics of the larger Israeli-Palestinian struggle. The MEMG tried to emphasize the often-neglected voice of Palestinian Christians as mandated by the resolution. The guide is comprised of three sessions structured around the document's own governing themes of faith, hope, and love. The study guide integrates the General Assembly's endorsed emphases of hope for liberation, nonviolence, love of enemy, and reconciliation.

Since the summer of 2011 the MEMG has been focused on working towards replacing the deleted narratives to *Breaking Down the Walls* with the eight narratives as mandated by the 219th General Assembly (2010). In addition, the MEMG has worked to assemble an annotated bibliography to accompany these narratives. While acknowledging the challenges, the MEMG is confident that the eight narratives submitted are a faithful fulfillment of the directives given by the 219th General Assembly (2010). The expected release date of these works is March 2012.

As a committee without a financial line item, we held numerous conference calls. After the initial meeting in Louisville we realized the need for face-to-face meetings. The MEMG would like to thank Stony Point and Rick Ufford-Chase for generously making it possible for us to have three face-to-face meetings in

New York. It was in the face-to-face meetings and in the retreat setting we found the essentials to creating relationships in the group.

During our two-year appointment together we made some discoveries and as individuals we felt our representative viewpoints were heard and validated; the differences around the table reflected the diversity of views on the issue. We found ways of working together, not always agreeing, yet in the end, we could see the individual transformation that had taken hold; by definition this was not necessarily a transformation that changed one's mind or opinion, but a transformation as a way to work together in the midst of disagreement and commitment to justice and peace. The spirit of this model is a group committed to seeking, hearing, and responding; recognizing that addressing the conflict in the Middle East cannot be a question of winners and losers. We operated under the premise that if someone loses, everyone loses. We sought authentic balance in the study and teaching about the complexities of the Middle East while understanding such an endeavor requires all of us to remain partners in the Spirit.

We would like to thank the assembly for the risk taken in a new endeavor in assembling a monitoring group.

PREFACE TO NARRATIVES

The 219th General Assembly (2010) of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), through its approval of the Middle East Study Committee report, created the Middle East Monitoring Group (MEMG) and gave it the following mandate: (1) To create a study guide for the Kairos Palestine document entitled "A Moment of Truth;" and , (2) To replace Part 3 of the original Middle East Study Committee report with eight narratives arising from authentically Palestinian (Muslim and Christian) and Israeli perspectives that are pro-justice and pro-peace, along with an annotated bibliography for additional understanding about the breadth and depth of both Palestinian and Israeli perspectives, but above all authentically pro-justice and pro-peace (*Minutes*, 2010, Part I, p. 1026).

Shortly following the meeting of the 219th General Assembly (2010), the MEMG was appointed by the Moderators of the 218th and 219th General Assemblies (2008 and 2010) and began its work in November 2010. The Kairos Palestine document study guide was completed first and posted to the PC(USA) website in mid 2011. The group then turned to the gathering of narratives for the purpose of arriving at the mandated eight (four Palestinian, four Israeli). The first discussion that took place in this regard had to do with the definition of the following terms contained in the mandate: (1) "authentic"; (2) "narrative"; (3) "pro-justice"; and (4) "pro-peace." As the committee began to receive and consider narratives, the concern about these definitions became more acute as the Middle East Monitoring Group recognized that the terms were more complex and/or vague than what would be indicated at first glance. In addition to these concerns, the group also discussed seeking balance according to the gender and age of contributors.

The following initial steps were taken for the purpose of collecting narratives, a process that was subject to the denominational resources that were available to the group: (1) an open call for these narratives was made through PC(USA) media outlets; (2) MEMG members utilized their own networks for gathering names of potential contributors; and (3) MEMG members issued personal invitations to those suggested to us.

There was greater difficulty than anticipated when it came to the collection of narratives. The open call itself did not yield any responses. Following that, responses to MEMG members were mixed and initially called into question whether or not the MEMG would be able to fulfill the General Assembly's mandate. Eventually, an appropriate number of narratives to achieve the necessary balance was reached after extending the deadline multiple times.

While acknowledging those challenges, the MEMG is confident that the eight narratives submitted here are a faithful fulfillment of the directive given to us by the 219th General Assembly (2010). They are a set of diverse yet authentic perspectives within the spectrum of the Palestinian and Israeli narratives of the conflict that together represent a significant breadth of thought, both among each other and within their respective narrative streams. The MEMG wants to stress that neither we as a group nor as individuals are *endorsing* all these narratives in terms of our own agreement with their perspectives or positions; similarly, none of these authors have seen the others' work, and their inclusion should not be taken in any way to imply agreement or approval of one another's work. Rather, it is precisely because of disagreement between narratives that the General Assembly wisely directed the collection of multiple examples, in order to show the diversity of opinion among the primary stakeholders in the conflict.

However, we feel that there are still key stakeholders mission and that a strict reading of our mandate does not include the voices of American Jews, Christians, and Muslims who would identify with various positions across the spectrum of the conflict. Without including such voices, we feel that the General Assembly's mandate is fulfilled but its intentions are not yet complete.

Furthermore, the General Assembly mandate required that selected narratives embody a "pro-justice, pro-peace" perspective. While we agree that the denomination is best served by a breadth of narratives falling under this perspective, we wonder whether there might be a place for hearing narratives that have a notable constituency within the conflict yet would be difficult to justify in terms of their adherence to a strict definition of "pro-justice, pro-peace."

"Modeling the solution rather than modeling the conflict," continues to ring true in the life of the Middle East Monitoring Group that is part of the fruit of the work and the spirit of the 219th General Assembly (2010). The spirit of this model is a group committed to seeking, hearing, and responding; recognizing that addressing the conflict in the Middle East cannot be a question of winners and losers. If someone loses, everyone loses. It was the trust in the Holy Spirit as much as the trust in each other that sustained our ability to build relationships among each other. Central to achieving collaboration and having conversations is the spirit of creating and sustaining relationship with each other. This process began with an intentional act of the General Assembly to bring us together, including the manner in which we were appointed by the Moderator. In coming together, our monitoring group became bold enough to realize we were more faithful and effective in seeking peace and justice together, rather than separately. Even though there are still very passionate opinions and viewpoints held by individuals, we are willing to take the risk, and trust each other. Frankly, it takes intentional work of the spirit to maintain a process of discernment and consensus building to ensure this authentic fairness. We still have disagreements on some items, on methods to be used, and voices to be heard. But by God's grace we have discovered that together we are more faithful and more effective, than when we seek as individuals.

We tried to achieve a desire for broader understanding in the quest for peace and justice. We wanted to remain in the pursuit for authentic balance in the study and teaching about the complexities of the Middle East and at the same time realized it will require us all to remain partners in the Spirit.

At the end of our last face-to-face meeting, the style of meeting that we found essential to creating relationships, we made some discoveries; as individuals we felt our representative viewpoints were heard and validated, the differences around the table reflected the diversity of views on the issue, we found ways of working together but not always agreeing, and, in the end, we could see the individual transformation that had taken hold. By definition this was not necessarily a transformation that changed one's mind or opinion, but a transformation as a way to model the solution rather than modeling the conflict.

NARRATIVES

1. *A Palestinian Narrative, August 2011—Dr. Mahdi Abdul-Hadi, Jerusalem*

One way to read the current Palestinian-Israeli impasse is to look at it through a conceptual triangle. On the base of the triangle are the two political tribes of Fateh and Hamas. The PLO, with its head, Mahmoud Abbas, is at the top of the triangle. At the heart are the people, embodied in civil society. A number of major external players are crucial in influencing and, to a fair extent, shaping the decision of these component; they are the U.S., E.U., Islamic and Arab countries, as well as Israel, the occupying power.

President Abbas is leading the Palestinians to the international arena through a bid to the UN General Assembly in September requesting recognition of a Palestinian state on the borders of 1967 with East Jerusalem as its capital, and a solution to the refugee question. Abbas managed to water down the geopolitical separation between West Bank/Gaza and Hamas/Fateh by reaching a reconciliation document in Cairo on the fourth of May 2011. He also succeeded in obtaining a PLO Executive Committee decision as well as PLO Central Council endorsement for the UN September initiative. In addition, Abbas managed to keep this decision in the lap of the Arab Summit Committee, to support it at the UN. However, some members of the Fateh movement, in spite of the official decision they reached, are reflecting different views. Voices have been heard, suggesting that Abbas is climbing a tree and doesn't know how to come down, i.e. the UN September decision cannot be translated into reality on the ground by practicing sovereignty and challenging Israeli military occupation as well as a half million settlers in the West Bank. Other voices have been heard saying that we don't have a tree in the first place, with cynical remarks that the settlers chopped down most of the trees in the West Bank, poisoned the water, closed the roads, and burned the crops while the Palestinians have no power to stop them. In addition, people are living in the culture of a prison with fear and no tools to counter these aggressions. A third voice is heard to say that it is a contradiction to keep the two baskets together, the first, to go to the UN, and the second at the same time, saying we want to go to negotiating table. But, at the end of the day, there is an understanding in Fateh that this UN bid is the beginning of a process to internationalize the conflict and to challenge the Israelis from a different position, if and when negotiations can be resumed.

As for Hamas, their leadership in Damascus has issued various statements saying that the UN bid is President Abbas's full responsibility; he did not share his decision with Hamas and they will leave its consequences upon his shoulders. At the same time, some Hamas members in the West Bank are reflecting cynicism, saying, "Of course we will celebrate statehood by bidding farewell to the Israeli occupation army on their withdrawal day, as well as to settlers leaving the West Bank, and we will hoist up the Palestinian flag in every city and town, village and refugee camp."

As for the civil society, we come to notice that most leading NGOs and research institutes are conducting a series of public and closed meetings debating the UN bid in September, and issuing reports endorsing, encouraging, or trying to inject a few scenarios or alternatives in case of obstacles. Meanwhile, the youth of Palestine have been empowered with the contagious Jasmine Fever of Tunis and the Arab Spring in every Egyptian city and town, mainly Tahreer Square in Cairo. However they, as most of the youth in the Arab World, are without leadership and confused as to the priorities of the democratization process, i.e. civil state and not religious, a new constitution, new elections, and ending the corrupted Arab political system as well as keeping a distance with the West and the influence of their donors.

A small window was opened in the West Bank during the election of the Chamber of Commerce last May. We witnessed the interest of the many independents from the business community running for election and demanding to share decision-making and shaping their own future. Although the elections brought back major Fateh and Hamas representatives, there is a strong component of independents sharing the chambers. This might be an example of future elections for the PLC and the president, which has been a

demand of the people: *as-shaab yureed intikhabat*: “the people demand elections.” Another window was opened the first week of August by resuming the reconciliation talks between Fatah and Hamas in Cairo where an agreement was reached to start implementing major items in the reconciliation agenda, as long as there was no decision on naming the prime minister. President Abbas emphasized again that the new government is not a unity government, nor a factional government, but independent professionals and technocrats for a transitional mission, i.e. the reconstruction of Gaza, implementing the reconciliation agenda, and conducting elections within a year. In spite of all the above, the status quo of geopolitical partition/separation between West Bank/Gaza, Fatah/Hamas is very much there and uncertainty lies ahead.

As for Israel, the official strategy has been laid down in the consecutive Herzliya Conferences where the top Israeli military and strategic officials have for the last three years promoted the policy of Israelization of three main areas: the Galilee, Jerusalem, and the Negev, a policy of moving Israeli Jewish Citizens to these areas and expelling Palestinians by various methods through Israeli political and administrative laws.

In addition, Netanyahu’s favorite political slogan has been the demand of recognizing Israel as a “Jewish state.” As for negotiations, Netanyahu was very clear with his “seven no’s” statement and speeches during his Washington visit last May, and by challenging the Palestinian leadership to resume negotiations with no conditions on freezing settlements or halting the Israelization of Jerusalem. Although the Arab Spring contagious fever reached Israel on the socioeconomic level, shaking the right wing government, Netanyahu and Barak are redirecting attention through military incursions on Gaza, expecting from their provocations a counter-response from Palestinians in Gaza, in particular Hamas. This strategy is in order to contain the Israeli awakening about where Netanyahu is hijacking the future of the two-state solution: towards an apartheid system and a culture of fear and war, blood and destruction. These politics will empower a school of thought that says this is an endless conflict, a question of land, identity, history, culture, obsession, exclusivity, and religion: a zero-sum game. This is taking us towards the end of a two-state solution, and a process towards an apartheid system governing two people in one state.

In Israel today, there is a majority of two million Russians, two million religious, and one million Israelis with EU passports (dual citizens who are chasing Europe and would rather be part of Europe), and one and a half million Arabs who are demanding equal citizenship and the recognition of their culture, heritage, and belonging to the land of Palestine. The Russians (who are primarily businessmen with their own newspapers, ignoring the Palestinian question) and the religious (who are exclusive, believing “God gave us the land, it is only ours, anybody else should leave”) are four million who are hijacking the future of Israel. There are not currently enough sufficiently credible vocal opponents ranged against them to challenge them. The one million looking towards Europe are only looking for a better life, Western-style. Meanwhile the Labor Party and the Peace Now movement are with no influence whatsoever, and the Kadema party is desperate to return to power. The three political groups are happy to use the socioeconomic awakening in the streets of Tel Aviv and other major cities to challenge Netanyahu for early elections.

The second school of thought is saying that, since the whole Middle East is moving from pan-Arabism through the political left and recently political Islam, and now towards the human dignity and the pride of identity and the right of sharing the political system on an equal basis, Israel is very much invited to reconsider the idea of Zionism, at the core of which has been the separation between Jews (i.e., Jewish immigrants) and the indigenous population. This required the transfer of the latter and has *de facto* led to a movement concentrating on colonization and land acquisition, not last in a bid to meet some expectations of the Jewish question that has transferred from Europe to the Middle East. This worked for a while, like pan-Arabism, like communism, like political Islam, but it is time for it to end as the political culture we are entering is now about citizenship and a civil state system with an end to the colonization process. People must be identified as equal human beings with a recognized culture, heritage, and language. However, their lifetime aspiration is a shared future ending occupation and colonization.

Voices are heard in the Israeli civil society saying that the Israeli government has been misleading the people towards fear of the Arabs who are now in their second Arab awakening, toppling their dictatorships and looking for democracy and rule of law, with no mention of Israel as an obstacle or a challenge. At the same time, the Israeli government has been misleading the people into fearing the Palestinians who are unarmed, divided, and contained in two big prisons (West Bank and Gaza), and controlled by military forces as well as half a million settlers. The voices are saying, it is time to free ourselves from this false fear and get out of the ghetto, demand a better life, advance democracy, and open borders with our Arab neighbors by recognizing Palestinian rights for self-determination and statehood.

In the U.S., it is well-known by now that President Obama will not come out with an “historic” initiative during his reelection campaign, nor support the Palestinian bid at the UN—if not veto it. On the other hand, some of the twenty-seven EU member states will have the confidence to support the Palestinians in September and continue their financial backing. Turkey, along with the newly-elected general secretary of the Arab League, Nabil Al-Arabi, are in full support of Palestine’s statehood bid and consider the September episode as a “test” in a process to internationalize the conflict and call for international protection for the Palestinians.

One thing is sure: Palestinians after the September mission will not be the same before. The Palestinian leadership and the people will have to translate the state recognition into real issues on the ground. The most important challenge, however, will be to hinder Israel from disturbing the new Palestine enjoying “sovereignty.” Then, international protection is the key to follow words (recognition with deeds or Palestinians will continue bleeding and suffering.

2. A Palestinian Narrative—Living in the Shadow of Conflict, the Reverend Alex Awad

I lived all of my life under the shadows of the Arab-Israeli conflict and throughout my life I have struggled to reconcile my faith in Christ with a persisting conflict. When I was born in Jerusalem in 1946, Great Britain ruled Palestine under what was called the British Mandate. At that time, Jerusalem was restless and the British were looking for a way out. A year after my birth, the United Nations drew a map to partition Palestine in order to tackle the competing claims from Jewish and Palestinian factions. The partition angered the Palestinians and created the conditions for the eruption of the first Arab-Israeli war. Although I was only two years old at the outbreak of that war, I still did not escape its horrible consequences. My father, who was a civilian, was shot and killed in crossfire between the Hagana militia fighters and the Jordanian army. A few days after my father’s death, my family received orders to evict our home. In fear for our lives and under rounds of sporadic shooting, we fled at night with just the clothes on our backs from our neighborhood of Musrara in the western side of Jerusalem and ran to the Old City. We never again were able to return to live in our home. My mother had the challenge to make sure that her seven children survived in an East Jerusalem that became home to nearly 30,000 Palestinian refugees. Through the grace of God and the hard work of a dedicated and determined Christian mother we all survived. My mother’s motto in life was, “Never look back, but always look forward. Never ask ‘Why God?’ but always ask ‘How God?’ Never harbor feelings of bitterness or hate in your heart, but always forgive.” Her attitude helped me and my siblings as we struggled to survive in war-torn East Jerusalem.

As I grew up I wanted to follow mother’s advice and forget the conflict. I sought refuge in faith and religion in order to find meaning for life. But the conflict and its negative effects on my life, on my family, and on my people did not disappear but rather it got more complicated as I grew up.

In 1966, I left Jerusalem (at that time it was ruled by Jordan) to pursue theological education in Switzerland. The following year, as a result of the conquest of the West Bank in the 1967 War, I became *a man without a country*. Our home in Bethlehem was occupied by the Israeli forces. When I applied for a reentry visa to the West Bank, I was refused. At the same time, the Swiss government did not want me. This became the fate of thousands of Palestinian students and workers who lived in foreign countries during the war.

Through an act of God's grace, in 1968, I was granted a scholarship by a biblical and liberal arts college in Cleveland, Tennessee. Although I appreciated the opportunities I was given and valued the education in what is sometimes referred to as the Bible Belt in the United States, I found myself at the heart of Christian Zionism. Most students and faculty at my college believed that the victories of Israel in both the 1948 and 1967 wars were due to divine intervention on behalf of Israel. Many of my teachers and fellow students did not make a distinction between ancient Israel and the modern State of Israel. Arabs, Muslims, and Palestinians were considered by many as the enemies, not only of Israel, but of God. I was astonished, in the U.S., to see how both the secular media and the religious media were extremely anti-Arab and anti-Palestinian. Meanwhile, my family in Bethlehem were struggling to adjust to living under a brutal military occupation. One of my brothers was arrested in the aftermath of the 1967 war and several of my siblings determined to flee the country rather than live under Israeli military control. Upon finishing my bachelor degree in the U.S., once again I requested reentry from the Israeli authorities and once again I was refused.

In 1979, the only brother that was left in Bethlehem sent me a letter asking if I and my wife, Brenda, would come and help him start a Bible college in Bethlehem. We accepted the challenge, left our teaching positions and the church that we were serving, and returned to Bethlehem on a tourist visa. We helped my brother to start Bethlehem Bible College. On one occasion, when our visas on our U.S. passports expired, the Israelis threatened to deport us from the country or worse to imprison me if we stayed without a permit. In spite of the fact that I was born in Jerusalem, as a Palestinian, I have no protection by the Israeli Law of Return. Palestinian refugees live with the agony of seeing thousands of Jews welcomed to their land of birth while they are banned from reentering it. Consequently, we left Palestine and our ministries and were not allowed to return until a year after the signing of the Oslo Peace Accords in 1994. Our return was not due the benevolence of the Israeli government but rather as a result of a campaign on our behalf that was initiated by the Methodist Church and several human rights and social justice organizations.

Since 1994, we have been serving the church in Bethlehem and in Jerusalem under the sponsorship of the General Board of Global Ministries of the United Methodist Church. In our ministries we have not only been witnesses of the daily injustices against the Palestinian people, but we stand in solidarity with people who daily face land confiscation, house demolitions, imprisonment, closures, and expulsions.

We continue to pray and hope for the day when Israelis and Palestinians will discover that they can live in peace in Israel/Palestine and that they can create a model of reconciliation that will inspire all nations that are going through conflicts around the world.

3. An Israeli Narrative—The Doctrine of Peace, Avrum Burg

My grandfather was the Rabbi of Hebron until the summer of 1929. Then, on one horrific Saturday, a local Arab mob mercilessly slaughtered the Jews of Hebron and the relationship between Jews and Palestinians changed forever, not only in Hebron, but throughout the region between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean Sea. Dozens of people, including one half of my family, were murdered on that deadly Shabbat. The second half of my family, my beloved mother amongst them, was saved from the onslaught by their Arab landlord. This brave and human gentile risked his own life to save not just my mother and her sisters, but about saving humanity, no less.

Many times throughout my life I imagined myself in this situation that occurred so many years before my birth. This significant event has a great impact on the historic community and it remained embedded in the collective memory that shaped the twisted relationship between Israelis and Palestinians to date. Much was written about this tragedy, about its barbaric nature, about the deaths of the innocent who gradually acquired a mythological status. Others looked into the major role played by British negligence in allowing such a bloodbath to occur. Little attention, however, has been attributed to the astounding heroism of Abu Shakar and other Palestinians like him who, amidst the terror, planted seeds of peace and dialogue. Today,

when everything seems so uninspiring and at a deadlock, we must go back to such historical moments; in order to retell the story—yet differently—from the beginning.

Abu Shakar could have had many reasons to play the hero on that dreadful day. Maybe this is how his parents raised him. It is possible that his values of humanism and justice, although deep and existential, were abundant in him. There was also a deep personal relationship between him and my grandfather, of blessed memory, as he was their landlord for many years. In my family the story is remembered slightly differently. It is said that at an old age, two sons were born to a man. The eldest son—Shakar—became sick one day and the doctors were hopeless. In Hebron during the 1920s, there was no advanced medicine and penicillin had not yet been discovered. On his deathbed, when the entire community feared for the eldest son's life, my grandfather sat by the sick boy's bed and prayed. God listened to him. God did not differentiate between the religion and faith of my praying grandfather and that of the young, sick Muslim boy. To God—then—all of mankind was equal. God sent his medicine from heaven and the next morning, a miracle happened. The boy came back to his health. His parents never forgot my grandfather's spiritual gesture.

This story was about my grandfather, a humanist and a Jew, and Abu Shakar, a humanist and a Muslim, and God who they both share.

For me and half of my family, peace begins with prayer; prayer to the Creator of the world, to the One responsible for all of creation. There is no defined prayer intended exclusively for others who *do not* share my religion and my faith. This is a prayer to God of Adam, the first human and his counterpart, Eve. It is a prayer for the world that preceded the schisms between different faiths and nationalities. We do not belong to a world where our God wins and all the other peoples' gods are defeated and their memories' obliterated. Oh no. We believe, respect, and contain. We are fearful for every person who is sick, especially when the sick person is the entire world, our entire society. We pray for the well-being and for peace to all who were created because we are all, together, partners in the act of creation.

When we proclaim “peace” we mean that peace is, first and foremost, a religious narrative and only then can it be a political goal and policy matter. Especially now when the long conflict between us and our Palestinian neighbours seems to be spiralling out of control, passing from the national dimension to dangerous and absolute religious expanses, we must ask again: what is the role of religion in the conflict and in the conflict's deterioration and what are the chances of being assisted by other values of faith to end the bloodshed.

In order to suggest a new key to the locked Middle East, I must describe—if only in short—the paradigm that brought us to this new low point. In the beginning there was much ignorance and denial. Early Zionists related to Israel with the following phrase, “a people without a homeland is coming to a land without a people.” They believed they were coming to an empty unsettled land. When they arrived, some of them ignored the existence of those that were already living on the land, while others denied the just historical arguments of the Palestinians. Nearly everyone saw a desolate land. Maybe this was because the landscape was emptier than the cities, villages, and metropolises from which they emigrated. Or perhaps it was because they considered the locals to be inferior just as all of white Europeans used to ignore the presence of the natives in their colonized empires. And they never bothered to examine the depths of the local narrative that began its journey towards modern nationalism at the same time as Zionism.

This strategy of ignoring and denying reality was not exclusively a problem of that time. It has been characterizing the patronizing-ignoring attitude of the Israeli institution until today. Time and again this pattern is repeated. During her tenure as Israeli Prime Minister, Golda Meir, who should have known by then that the picture was larger than the simplistic image accepted by the mass public, said: “when I made Aliya to Israel, there was no such thing as the ‘Palestinian people.’” This message was not even hidden in her words. When Israeli heads of state say, “we have no partner,” they essentially see the other side as void of any human existence, because there are plenty of partners there. Maybe they are not easy partners, maybe they have

demands and claims, but they certainly exist. The height of this model occurred during the unilateral withdrawal from Gaza that relied heavily on the psychological feeling that there was no one to talk with on the other side. We were free to enter and leave at will, since, the house next door was already vacant.

While I have no intention of analyzing herein the models on the Arab-Palestinian side, I cannot ignore the sense that their models are in line with ours. Just as Israelis tend to ignore Palestinian existence, the Arab-Palestinian narrative also ignores Jewish and Israeli claims and calls for “pushing us into the sea”—a phrase that is understood as: the Israeli presence here is temporary and will soon cease to exist. Therefore, according to this model, there is no reason to relate to Jewish claims as an actual and binding reality.

Human models are, at their core, dynamic. Very few human situations stagnate. By ignoring the existence of Palestinians in Israel, we fail to acknowledge them and their rights as individuals and as a collective. But as the act of ignoring continues, the obsession grows, focusing on the Arab presence in our lives as a coercive and ceaseless traumatic disturbance. It is apparent that the ongoing confrontation with the Palestinians crystallized the Israeli national identity. While it is hard to define who we are in a positive way, by standing next to them we know better who we are not—we are not Arabs!

As time passed, this model of ignoring the Palestinians developed and cleared the way for the next model of the conflict—national identification. The new Israeli nationalism is a renewed version of Jewish identity. Its definition is based on a combination of ethnic origins, religious faith, and geographic location with sovereignty and a common language. Only some of these elements characterize the historic Jewish nation.

As this new Jewish-Israeli nationalism emerges, a new kind of nationalism develops: the new Palestinian nationalism. Some say it originally emerged from nothing, while others say it grew naturally from previously existing roots. However, there is one thing that cannot be disputed: today there is a Palestinian people with a compelling collective consciousness, narrative, and loyalty that is engaged in an enveloping nationalistic confrontation with its Israeli neighbor.

The Palestinians’ honest and legitimate desire for their own state derives much of its energy from Israeli national homeland models that originated in the national policy dialog of old Europe. However, movements all over the world have worn out the terms “state” and “homeland” since the time when these concepts dominated European thought. Israeli secular nationalism, among others, was worn out by the reemergence of the religious element within our national identity. The same Zionism that rebelled against the “Jewish mother” has now become the main carrier of resurrecting the same powers against which it rebelled. The Jewish state that was founded as a secular and socialist state has become a religious and capitalist state. On the other side, the emergence of religion as part of the Palestinians’ values is very well-known and does need to be repeated. This intertwining of nationalism that is largely comprised of extremist and fundamentalist patriotism and religion feeds the unending Israeli-Palestinian confrontation that no longer seems to have a solution. It is possible to overcome community-based conflicts and it is possible to find compromises to national conflicts. However, it is nearly impossible to build bridges over faith-based chasms driven by religion and extremism. Even if this was possible, overcoming everything described above is overwhelming and full of despair.

Now, the fourth model: after ignoring each other, nationalism and religion, it is time to introduce ideology into the equation. The largest missing element in today’s peace dialog is ideology. Without ideology, any peace dialog lacks hope and faith. Peace, in any language, is one of the most ideologically saturated words. However, in its realistic and political contexts, it has become superficial and empty. In Israel we immediately associate peace with security, border arrangements, and land deals. Regional peace has become equal to “no war” and is void of the values of justice, loving thy neighbor, and transforming your enemy into your friend.

In this context it is hard to ignore the decisive element that is brought to the table by the negative influence of religion in current political processes. Religions play such an important role here both in terms of defining issues in absolute terms and fanaticism. Jewish Messianic fanatics who are supported and funded by Christian Messianic fanatics are fighting the growing fundamentalist Muslim movement in the region. This situation of absolutes has turned our complicated Israeli-Palestinian conflict into a global iconic conflict. Nearly every conflict around the world somehow involves our conflict. Al-Qaida against the West covers the Israeli Palestinian conflict and emigrants in Europe direct their anger towards us. White supremacists all over the world—those who wish all of Europe and America to be exclusively white and Christian—suddenly see Jews as an alibi in their Islamophobic arguments, which are directed at them. Our greatest challenge opposing these religious fundamentalists is to change the iconic conflict into no less of an iconic solution. For this reason we must replace the religious element that is exacerbating the conflict with pacifying and settling religious elements. Therefore, we need entirely new partners and a partnership unlike what we have known until now.

The borders and delimitation lines can no longer pass in one dimension between religions and faiths. Not every Jew is entirely my partner. The same as not every Christian and Muslim are entirely and forever my enemy. There is an unwritten coalition that crosses camps. There are Jews, Christians, and Muslims that uphold—each one in his or her own way—faith that is based on humanity and on liberties, peace, and the understanding that we are all God’s children. And in spite of ourselves, there is another coalition that is not human-centric that strives, with all its might, to achieve a decisive, violent war. God against Elohim against Allah. These believers do not believe in the power of dialog and accepting differences between the different theologies. They do not believe in their respective god’s power to exist alongside other gods. These are people who see the world as black and white and from here they march towards the third and final world war. They look to Armageddon, to blowing up the Dome of the Rock or to relentless global Jihad that recognizes no borders.

Today, these fanatics are making the religious content in global and local conflicts. As a result, we witness so much bloodshed and so many tears. The time has come for a religion of love, of respect between synagogue, church and mosque and of holding hands, together. Not in order to fight, but rather to scatter again and again the DNA of peace. This is how Shakar’s father from Hebron and my mother from Jerusalem were raised. This is how my children are brought up and this is how we believe the entire world should behave—believing in peace and not war.

4. A Palestinian Narrative—The Lost City of Oranges, Nahida Halaby Gordon

I was born in Jerusalem to a Presbyterian family in 1939, the year that marked the end of the Great Palestinian Uprising (1936–1939) and the beginning of the Second World War. These two events served as bookends to the year of my birth and defined my life in ways I could not appreciate until much later.

At the age of two, our family moved from Jerusalem to Jaffa, known to me in Arabic as “Yafa.” Yafa’s history as well as most of Palestine has been one of occupation by invaders and empires. The most recent invaders were the British and the Irgun Zva’i Leumi and Hagana forces of the Yishuv (the Jewish community in Palestine). Yafa, before its surrender on May 13, 1948, was sometimes called the Bride of Palestine. It was a major cultural center with twelve newspapers, and many business and commercial interests. Yafa’s seaport was believed to be one of the oldest continually used seaports in the world. Yafa was also famous for its oranges and was at times called the City of Oranges.

Some of my most vivid memories are connected with our home, which I visit whenever I am in Palestine. The latest visit was in October 2010. It is emotionally distressing to think of my lost home in Yafa. The distress arises not from the loss of bricks and mortar as some people think, but the loss of my

Palestinian life and a sense of belonging in my own community. To Palestinians, connectedness within family, community, and land is vital and extends over generations.

We lived in the land of the Bible and so much of our surroundings made it seem alive as though the events told there happened only yesterday. Yafa is the city where Simon the tanner (Acts 9) lived. His home is thought to be close to the shore and a short walking distance from our house. Peter was staying with Simon when he had a vision that he interpreted as God telling him to carry the message of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles. It is a message of inclusiveness of people of differing ethnicities. In Acts 9:36–40, we read the story of Tabitha who was brought back from death by Peter. My school, the Tabitha School for Girls, was named after Tabitha of Acts and was established in 1863 by the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. It was a short two blocks from our home, and my memories of school, as everything else in my life in Yafa, was a mixture of the happy and sad.

In November 1947, not too long after the beginning of the school year, the United Nations General Assembly, with strong lobbying by the world Zionists and the support of the United States' Truman Administration, chose to recommend partition of Palestine against the wish of the majority of its people. This was an egregious violation of my human rights and the human rights of all Palestinians who were the majority population. In addition to being against international law, the partition plan privileged the Jewish minority population at the expense of the Christian and Muslim majority population. Yafa was to be part of the Palestinian state surrounded completely by the new Israeli state thus making Yafa a target of the New Israeli State. As the battle for Yafa began, it had its effects on every part of our lives.

A few of my childhood memories will draw a picture of the atmosphere then—an atmosphere filled with the tension among the adults in our lives and among the visitors to our home. Our house was adjacent to the old city and near the waterfront a few hundred yards from the lighthouse. Its sweeping light would shine through the door transoms from the veranda and I could watch it at night as I was falling asleep. It was a constant and a comfort. It made me feel safe from the chaos outside. In the spring of 1948, we fell asleep at night to the sound of bombs aimed at Yafa. In my childish imagination, the bombs sounded like large pipes being thrown around by giants. The memory is strong and vivid to this day. It was frightening and going to sleep was difficult. The lighthouse became a friend as I watched its hypnotic recurring sweep of light through the transom of my bedroom door and this friend lulled me to sleep every night. To this day, a lighthouse elicits a feeling of warmth and safety.

Snatches of sound and sights from this period persist vividly in my mind to this day. As a historical background to one of my most frightening memories is a description I read in Adam LeBor's *City of Oranges* (Adam LeBor, *The City of Oranges: An Intimate History of Arabs and Jews in Jaffa*. W W Norton & Co.). "On January 4, 1948, a truck, piled high with oranges, was parked in an alley off Clock Tower Square, alongside the New Seray, which housed Yafa's municipal offices, welfare workers, and a kitchen for needy children." My father's office was in the Clock Tower Square. "Soon after the truck driver and his companion left, a thunderous explosion shook the city. Broken glass and shattered masonry blew out across Clock Tower Square. The New Seray collapsed in a pile of rubble. Windows shattered for yards around, and a thick choking cloud of dust billowed out. After a moment of silence, the screams and moans began. Twenty-six were killed, and hundreds injured. Most were civilians, including many children who had been eating at the charity kitchen" (Ibid).

That day Mother was nervous. It was cold outside with a persistent rain with thunder mixed in with the sound of explosions. She was worried because Father was late arriving home. We heard a car up the street. She asked me to run out to the veranda to see if it was Father. He had come into the side gate and garaged his car. When I arrived at the veranda and looked over the parapet, I saw him walking below me. He had his over coat on with the collar turned up high. He had what looked like a dirty handkerchief around his forehead and his hair was smoky white. I ran in to tell Mother that it was indeed Father and that he was

dirty and had pebbles in his hair. My next memory is looking into the bathroom. Father was standing over the washstand and Mother was trying to clean him up. His necktie and shirt were soaked in blood and he had grit and dirt all over his face and hair. The handkerchief was one lent to him by a fellow victim and was also soaked in blood. My father, the anchor of our life, had just survived a Zionist terror bombing. Father was wounded, but he had remained behind to help move some of the wounded to the hospital. That evening as we sat by the fireplace, I told my father that I was cold. His reply to me was “you are not cold—you are frightened!”

During this time, the students in my class were thinning out. It came to a point when I remember that class consisted of three students and no teacher. We played school and took turns playing the role of teacher. Our favorite pastime was drawing the flag of Palestine. Soon after that, the bombing in our neighborhood increased. The Zionist paramilitary, probably the Hagana, used to come in an armored car and pepper the street with bullet fire. One day, as my sister recalled, there was a fight outside our house between the Israelis and the defenders of Yafa. Father was not at home and Mother was terrified. She locked up all the windows and doors and we hunkered down. My brothers collected empty bullet shells and the spent bullets that landed on the veranda from the previous night’s fighting. As Ilan Pape relates in his book, ethnic cleansing “operations were also Yigael Yadin’s brainchild. They began on 13 February 1948 and focused on several areas. In Jaffa, houses were randomly selected and then dynamited with people still in them.” (Ilan Pape, *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*, published by One World, 2007). Yigael Yadin was the acting chief of staff of the Israeli armed forces.

No wonder we were never allowed out on the street! As a child I have no memories of the streets of Yafa. I thought that school was far away from home because my older sister and I were driven there each school day in the morning and home at the end of the school day. It was only when I visited our old neighborhood as an adult, that I was astounded to discover that school was a short two blocks away from home. The house had two large verandas overlooking the Mediterranean Sea. One adjacent to my parents’ bedroom and the second much larger veranda was our playground from which we could see and interact with the children living in the Old City. Interacting with other children was always a matter of setting a play date, to use the modern language of my grandchildren. Mothers and their children would come to visit. Mothers would visit with each other and we children would play together. We were never allowed out on the street and never went anywhere unescorted.

An event in April of 1948 lives very clearly in my memory. On the night of April 9, 1948, the Irgun Zva’i Leumi (Menachem Begin’s terrorist group), surrounded the Palestinian village of Deir Yassin, located on the outskirts of Jerusalem and attacked the village of 700 people, killing and wounding men, women, and children. I remember clearly the terror I felt when hearing about the loudspeaker broadcasts from vans of the newly arrived European immigrants going about telling the inhabitants that if they do not want the same thing to happen to them as what happened in Deir Yassin that they should flee. I agonized as a child about what I would do if they were to come to my house to kill my family as they did in Deir Yassin.

One day, I heard a noise out on the street. I ran to the balcony outside my brothers’ bedroom which faced the street. I saw a coffin cover carried vertically by a man who was walking down the street towards me. The cover had a cross down its entire length. Following the coffin cover was the coffin itself being carried by six pall bearers. The noise I heard was the shuffle of their feet. As the coffin arrived just below me, I saw its occupant—a very young smooth faced man. He was incredibly beautiful and peaceful. He was dressed in charcoal gray pants with pin stripes and a black jacket. He looked as though he was dressed for his wedding which was never to be. Then I noticed a woman walking behind—she was my mother’s friend—a frequent visitor to our house. She was dressed in black and had a veil down across her face. She was weeping inconsolably, and was supported on each side by two other women whom I did not recognize. The funeral cortege continued to move below me and then went into the churchyard that was further down the street towards the waterfront. Later I found out that he was her younger brother who was killed by the Zionist forces.

Days later during the night, the bombs fell across the street and hit the church where the funeral of the brother of Mother's friend was held. A few feet farther northeast and they would have hit our house! By now, April 1948, my father, having had enough of violence, decided to take our family to safety away from Yafa. It was our custom to leave every summer to the mountains of Lebanon or to Ramallah to escape the heat of the seacoast. So my father decided that we would leave early for our summer stay and return at the end of the summer in time for school. Alas, we were not allowed to exercise our right to return!

On April 22, we hurriedly packed and drove to the Liddeh airport, which now is the location of the Ben Gorion Airport. On the way, I remember seeing houses burning. My father and mother worried about whether the Jewish soldiers would let us leave. Again we did not realize that they would be more than glad to have us leave. We boarded a small twin engine plane that my father had chartered. We flew to Beirut and arrived in the evening. I remember several men bringing steps to the airplane door and helping us out with the few suitcases we had. All was left behind—our pets, a dog and cat, all family pictures, all mementos of a life—all gone! As soon as we were safely settled in Lebanon, my Father returned to Yafa and remained for a few weeks, but then shortly after May 15, rejoined us in Lebanon.

And what would we have experienced had we stayed in Yafa? “By April 25, 1948, using the tons of shells that the Irgun had taken from the British munitions train, the battle for Jaffa began in the early hours of Sunday, 25 April. Irgun gunners directed a steady rain of mortar fire onto the city. In theory the gunners were not supposed to target hospitals, religious sites, or consulates. In practice the shells fell indiscriminately across Clock Tower Square, smashing into the markets, and south into the heart of Ajami (where our house is located), killing and wounding large numbers of civilians. Panic and hysteria swept through the city” (Adam LeBor, *op.cit.*)

Going through my father's papers after his death, I discovered a three-page document issued by the Hagana. The document is dated May 13, 1948, just two days before Israel declared itself a state and the U.S. shamelessly recognized it within hours. This document is discussed in some detail by Rosemary Esber (Rosemarie M Esber, *From Under the Cover of War: The Zionist Expulsion of the Palestinians*, 2008). In this document, signed by the Hagana and four leaders of the Yafa community, the Hagana admonishes the citizens of Yafa to obey all statements in the agreement and the Hagana pledged to the Palestinians of Yafa that “IT IS UNDERSTOOD that the Hagana always does respect and will respect the Geneva Convention and all International Laws and Uses of war.” This is just another deception presented to the Palestinian people and to the international community that continue to the present day, first by the Hagana and then the Israeli government once it came into existence.

The fourth article of the instructions proclaims: “(a) All males in the area defined in the Agreement will concentrate in the area between Feisal Street, Al Muktar Street, Al Hulwa Street and the Sea until everybody has identified himself under arrangements, the particulars of which will be notified later, and (b) During this, any male found outside this area will be severely punished, unless in a possession of a special permit.” I had two teenaged brothers at this time. We knew what this meant—that they will probably at best be transported elsewhere leaving my mother, sister, and me alone and defenseless. In the eighth article, it assured residents of Yafa that if they left, they can return. Article nine claimed: “All public offices, Municipal and Government, must be kept intact and all documents and registers therein must be kept safely in good condition so that any claim of residents may be checked.” Articles 8 and 9 together reassured residents that leaving would be alright since a return was assured. In fact, shortly after Yafa fell, the Hagana destroyed documents in municipal and government offices as well as schools. They entered Tabitha School, where I and my sister were students and destroyed school registers. The registrar of the Tabitha School, who is a Palestinian, managed secretly to save a few registers. When visiting her in Yafa in 2006, she showed me the register where I could see my name. Here is another deception from the Hagana and the new Israeli government. They never intended to let us return!

One frequently hears that Palestinians wanted to drive the Israelis out to sea. When in fact in Yafa and Haifa, it was the Israelis who put many of its Palestinian inhabitants into small boats and pushed them out to sea where many drowned. Furthermore, as these frantic Palestinians went to the boats they were shot at by Israeli snipers (Ilan Pape, op. cit.). I often wonder had we stayed in Yafa after May 15, would we have been forced onto one of these boats! Another claim by the Israeli government is that the Arab leaders told the Palestinians to flee. Reality was quite the contrary. We were terrorized and fled for our lives.

On occasion I think about one of my childhood friends from Palestine. Her mother, I was told, was Jewish and her father was Christian. She would come with her mother and mothers and daughters visited. My musings on this is that here we were in Palestine, probably in 1944–46 and Mother had a Jewish friend and I had a Jewish/Christian friend both of Palestinian origin.

I have visited our house several times since April 22, 1948. Our property consisted of my father's place of business below and our home above. We think the property was formerly a consulate building for a South American country. My father bought it and remodeled it to suit our family. The first time I went back to Yafa to visit our home, it was made into a restaurant and the lower floor of the property was made into a small shopping mall. They had removed the small verandas outside the doors of the two bedrooms facing the street. One was my brothers' bedroom and the second was a guest bedroom. They also had covered the veranda next to my parents bedroom and made it part of the restaurant. Wanting to see the backend of the property, my sister, husband, and I walked through an alley east of the house and then climbed a set of stairs leading to a second story apartment in the Old City complex. When we reached the top of the steps, we were able to take photographs of the restaurant, which was vacant and abandoned at that time. We also encountered the occupant of the apartment whose steps we climbed. She was a young woman, sitting on her doorstep and smoking a cigarette. When asked whether she felt guilty about living in someone else's home she replied "No. I have had a hard life and deserve this apartment. I was born on a kibbutz and life was hard there." So here we have a glimpse into why some Israelis seem to have no compunction about living in stolen property. They feel entitled because of their past suffering. They do not seem to understand that it was not we Palestinians who caused their suffering. They may not be the original thieves but they are benefiting from their government's theft.

My second visit was in 2003 at which time the property was undergoing a major renovation. The façade was the same and this time they had replaced the two small verandas adjacent to the street facing bedrooms. When my driver told one of the workmen that I used to live in the house, their reaction was "she better leave if she knows what is good for her." At a later visit in 2006, the house was further transformed with apartments below and some above. Our large playground veranda now contained apartments with views of the Mediterranean Sea. Surprisingly, the door leading to the steps to our house was still there. However, the two steps leading to the door were removed. These two steps contained a little treasure. My father said that when he remodeled the property, he built in a chamber within the steps into which he placed several bottles of wine. He planned to remove the bottles and serve the guests at my older brother's wedding. That wedding did not take place in Yafa but in the Diaspora. Someone else had the pleasure of drinking that wine!

On October 20, 2010, I had the opportunity to visit Yafa once more and of course I included a side-trip to view our old house. My travelling companions were my husband, my older brother, the pastor of Westminster Presbyterian Church in Wooster, and two friends from church. The entire trip was a memorable experience and may be the last time that I will ever visit Yafa. I had two encounters with Israelis that afternoon. They were as totally different as two encounters can be. The first one was a man of about forty who was coming out of a small shop on the first floor of the property and facing west. His shop is called the "The Israeli Experience," and as he was walking to his motorcycle, I asked him why he does not also talk about the "Palestinian Experience"? He became irritated and started talking rapidly telling me that he knew nothing of these things. I told him softly that I had the deed to the property. The volume of his talk increased markedly and he started yelling at me, telling me that I am attacking him with unsubstantiated claims

My second encounter was very different. Thanks to my brother who pressed every one of the buzzers of the fifteen apartments carved out of our family home, we were invited into one of them by its Israeli occupant, a woman. She generously welcomed us to her living room and gave us water to drink. I will preface my remarks by saying that she was a brave and thoughtful person. She allowed us into her home even though she knew who we were. We sat and reminisced about the house as though it was a common acquaintance, which it was! We told her about her apartment—that it used to be part of the veranda next to our parents' bedroom. I asked her if the lighthouse still operates, and she said “No.” I told her how I used to go to sleep watching its light move across the walls of the hallway leading out to the veranda. She listened with respect, acknowledging my sorrow and loss. She told us that she rents the apartment and that she thought that it was owned by the Catholic Church, which had a large property on the high point of the old city overlooking our house. She now had in front of her the previous dispossessed owners.

We then began talking about present day politics in Israel. She told us that even though she owns a house in Jerusalem, she prefers to live in Yafa. She was concerned about the rising fascism in Israel. I asked her if she thought Lieberman could or would become prime minister. She shrugged her shoulders and said that she hoped that he would not. She was progressive in her thinking and I found much with which to agree. In a different place and time, I think we could have been friends. With gentle questioning, she told us about her life and her parents' life. They came from Pinsk in Eastern Russia to Palestine in the 1920s. The family wanted to escape discrimination and the pogroms. She ended her recounting of her family's experiences by saying that she just wants to live a normal life. This is yet another tragedy—how can she live a normal life when she is living in stolen property and a stolen country. I felt her suffering and was deeply touched. We both struggled with our emotions. I hugged her when we left and she returned the hug. We shared a bond of suffering inflicted by a senseless and unfeeling world.

I began this account by asking myself why it is so distressing to visit my home in Yafa. I think the answer may be in seeing the present day reality, which is a death to warm and wonderful childhood memories. It may be less painful to forget the present and just hold onto old memories. This is particularly so when I see what has been done to my grandmother's house in Jerusalem. I always envied those Palestinians who were able to remain. During this last visit to Yafa, I met with three of our friends from childhood days. During dinner, one of them asked me: “Nahida, who do you think is better off—you who left Yafa or me who stayed?” Her question was asked with a combination of bitterness and sadness. I then realized that even though she is still living in her childhood home, she also lost her community. I and all Palestinians are scattered throughout the world—she was just as cut off from our Palestinian community as I was!

To continue my family story, we emigrated from Lebanon to the U.S. in 1951. I arrived here barely a teenager. It was here that I and my sister received our high school and university educations and my brothers their university educations. I am now a grandmother happily married to my husband of fifty years. We are immensely proud of and grateful for our three children. I am also a professor of statistics in the Schools of Medicine and Nursing of a prestigious American university. My husband's ancestors were immigrants from Scotland, England, and Germany who came to America, some decades before this country was founded, to escape political persecution.

I am active in my local Presbyterian church and in the PC(USA) at the national level on behalf of Palestinians, especially the Palestinian Christians who remain in Palestine. But, I sometimes wonder whether my church here in the U.S.A. has room in it for Palestinians. When Presbyterians continue to affirm Israel's “right to exist” even though they qualify it by saying “within secure borders,” I feel hurt, rejection, and sadness. To me, these Presbyterians are saying that Israel had and has a right to dispossess me, my family, and other Palestinians, and to continue to kill, terrorize, and repress to the present day. To me the church, as well as much of Western Christianity, is complicit in not only the theft of my home, but also the loss of a life that should have been lived as a Palestinian among other Palestinians and family. The Bible, the basis of

my faith, has been used to dispossess me of the land where I was born and of the people to which I belonged. But I am among the fortunate of the dispossessed for I had the privilege of having a father with the means to protect his family and I have lived a productive life, albeit in a land not of my birth. But what of the Palestinians who were not so fortunate, who lost their homes, land, villages, and communities, and who were killed or dispossessed as the immigrants from Europe drove them from their land? What of those Palestinians who fled to live elsewhere, many in refugees camps in Palestine or adjacent countries? What of the dispossessed Palestinians who live in Gaza, many of whom came from Yafa and its surrounding villages and who now live in the world's largest open-air prison; who are demonized as terrorists; and who only wish to return to their land and homes? Now near the end of my life, I know that some losses can never be compensated—either for me or all other Palestinians.

The year 1939, my birth year, marks a period of history of profound tragedy for human kind with the outbreak of World War II. Persecution, pogroms, and discrimination experienced by Jews for many centuries in Europe and in addition the killings during World War II brought some of them to Palestine in search of a safe homeland. The leaders of these Europeans proceeded to compound their tragedy by inflicting upon Palestinians a modern form of programs, persecution, discrimination, and killings. But this has not always been the history of the Land of Palestine. For centuries Christians, Jews, and Muslims lived together peacefully in Palestine. This Palestinian and many others only wish for the two peoples to live together in this land that both call their own. It should be one land where we all enjoy equality, an equality of political, legal, economic, cultural, religious, and educational rights. I echo the wish of the Israeli woman who is currently living in one of the apartments of my former home. I wish that we both can live a normal life united as human beings in the common suffering of our humanity.

5. An Israeli Perspective—Narrative on Israeli-Palestinian Conflict, Naamah Kelman

This morning, the report on the radio brought a smile of hope to my face—some 200 Palestinians were joining a bike ride in the area of Sodom. These Palestinians are from the territories; Ramallah, Jenin, etc. The organizer reflected, if we are not getting anywhere in the “high places” of diplomacy, then perhaps on the ground, shoulder to shoulder let's start “peddling towards peace.” I had just come back from that area, the expanse of raw beauty of the Dead Sea and Jordan Valley. There it seems that there is room for everyone. There exciting innovations in re-harnessing the earth's energies offer a possibility of living together on this fragile planet without fighting over square miles. The sun's energy is endless, wind too; and thoughtful recycling of everything may give our grandchildren and great grandchildren a chance.

It is Friday morning, when I have some time to listen to the radio, and then go to the open air market, where Israelis of every stripe gather to shop and sightsee. It is a festival of sights, smells, and tastes. Israeli Arabs work alongside Israeli Jews. One of my favorite stalls employs an Arab. Recently, some rightwing extremists threatened to “out” any shops with Arab employees. This was squelched pretty fast by the shop owners, not necessarily known for leftwing positions. I want to ask my stall guy what he thinks, but I do not have to; they are working side-by-side. Hard to imagine the years when so many fled the market. The “shuk” was a scary place, where too many terrorist attacks hit hard. The Intifada seems far away ... but so does the “two-state solution.”

On my wall there are two remarkable photographs that define my biography. One hangs at home, and one in my office. At home, is a picture of a family sitting around a table, it is both Old world and New world. It is my father's family; my father is seven years old. His mother is immigrating to Canada, with five children and an aging father. They are saying goodbye to his mother. She is a tiny, aged woman surrounded by her three sons, my great-grandfather, dressed in traditional Chasidic garb that originated in the 17th century and his two brothers, who are seated with their wives dressed as the “visiting Americans.” They are clean-shaven, in modern dress. What a picture! It encapsulates Polish Jewry in 1930. My father and his

family will be saved, the two American uncles are already on their way to modernization, and the other couple in the corner, my grandmother's sister, husband, and daughter will perish in the Holocaust.

The other photo is in my office. It is a photograph of my father, now a leader of American Judaism. He is attending the convention of his Rabbinic organization of which he is the chief executive. They have invited the Reverend Martin Luther King Jr. to speak. This is a photo of Dr. King, Rabbi Abraham Joshua Heschel (the great Jewish theologian of the late 20th century), and my father. King was assassinated two weeks after this picture was taken. These two images have followed me everywhere, in every home and every office. In my office, I yearn for a religious leadership working side-by-side for justice; like King and Heschel. At home, I look at my family table; they are sitting at a Passover Seder, reciting hymns and prayers for redemption from slavery. They believed, despite their poverty, their lives so precarious and full of change, that we have to have hope and celebrate hope!

In 1976, I arrive in Israel. I have been here before, but now I will live here for a year or two perhaps, no firm plans. I am an American Jewish feminist liberal Jew. This does not flow with ease with the Zionist narrative. The Zionist narrative envisioned a new kind of Jew and Judaism living as a sovereign people on their land, able to protect themselves and sustain themselves without fear or dependence on others. The Zionist ethos and the first generations were secular Zionists with a Socialist bent. There was little room for a Judaism that tries to bridge tradition and modernity, it was either/or. You were either a Hebrew speaking, Bible quoting, secular Israeli who eschewed religious worship but re-envisioned the traditional Jewish holidays with a civic and cultural meaning ... OR you were Orthodox, hopefully modern enough to serve your country and pray in the synagogue that reflected your ethnic background. This was the deal made at the founding of the Jewish state. All matters religious regarding personal status would be handled by an official Rabbinate that would see to your needs at birth, marriage, divorce, and death.

No one could foresee the incredible rise and growth of the Ultra-Orthodox, whom do not define themselves as Zionist. No one could foresee the turn of the majority of Modern Orthodox veering right in wholehearted support of the Settler Movement in the West Bank and Gaza. No one could predict a growing secular population alienated from Jewish sources although they speak fluent Modern Hebrew.

Yet, I could never have imagined that I would become the first woman rabbi in Israel. Nor the fact that over these thirty-five years, there is an emerging Reform Movement. We are committed to equality and inclusiveness.

All these phenomena and more occur over decades, while the Palestinian story is emerging. Whether we Israelis like it or not, there are two competing claims on this piece of land. And after all my years here, and all the time spent marching for peace, seeking justice, praying for a just solution, it boils down to this. Does the Occupation begin in 1948 or in 1967? If the Occupation begins in 1948, well, we are looking at a "one-state "resolution." If it is a one-state solution then the demographic will determine which state will prevail. At the moment the Ultra-Orthodox and Orthodox settlers are reproducing, as are the Palestinians. So a one-state solution would mean a stand-off between extremists. A two-state solution will keep Israel a Jewish Democratic state and make room for Palestine.

The narrative of suffering doesn't work anymore. It is a competition, or worse, two tone-deaf monologues. In order for reconciliation to begin, we must listen to the suffering of the *other*. We must listen to the stories of the other. It is remarkable that it was the daughter of Pharaoh who heard the cries of baby Moses, and she risked her station and position to save him. Even more remarkable, that some passages later, Moses is grown up and running from Egypt and he encounters God. God speaks to Moses from a burning bush and proclaims "I have heard the suffering of the children of Israel!" God is following the daughter of Pharaoh, God is imitating her! Can we risk our station and status or can we give up our state of suffering and reach out to the other side?

The Occupation must end. We must find a way to negotiate coexistence. We must find a way for healing and perhaps forgiveness. Lately, this seems more distant. While terror has subsided; extremism has not.

So, I remain an anomaly. I remain a religious progressive, Jewish feminist, a socialist Zionist. There are not many of us. But we are a voice and a movement. To this I remain passionately committed; to teach and raise the next generations of progressive Jews ready to make peace with our Palestinian brothers and sisters.

6. *A Palestinian Narrative—Liberating Palestinians and Israelis, Mazin Qumsiyeh, PhD*

My late grandfather was a spiritual kind man who got along with everyone but he was not a religious man. He explained to his grandchildren (thirty-two in all) how he also had great respect for all people who lived here. He would describe life before the state of Israel was created on the destruction of Palestinian civil society. He would mention how his family (Palestinian-Arab Christians) lived in peace and harmony with another minority (Palestinian-Arab Jews) and both lived in complete harmony with the Palestinian-Arab Muslim majority. Life was bountiful and good until World War I when Ottoman conscription of men (of all religions), destruction of the environment, and moving the food towards war efforts all created a humanitarian catastrophe. My grandfather lost his siblings and his parents and was left penniless and homeless orphan. But there were always kind helping hands along the way and they came from various backgrounds. My grandfather did well with hard work despite British occupation, upheaval, and economic dislocation in the 1930s, the ethnic cleansing of 1948, and the numerous deadly wars that took some of his friends and transformed our country.

My grandfather would tell me that this multiethnic, multireligious, multicultural society had its flaws before 1948 (tribalism, male domination, weak educational system). But he insisted it was the best place on earth and had more things than people gave credit for. It was a land of milk and honey and also of great religious shrines, great scenery, great and bountiful agricultural fields (olives, figs, citrus, grapes, wheat, barley, vegetables of all kinds). It had great cuisine, music orchestras, libraries, publishers, tourist industries. Our own area of Bethlehem was a Mecca for tourists from around the world and people did well selling souvenirs made from olive wood and mother pearl in addition to the bountiful agricultural products.

My grandfather was born in 1908 and died in 1997 so he saw the transformation of his country in ways that made him die satisfied with his own accomplishments despite incredible odds but sad for the state of this “holy Land.” Looking out the balcony of his house the last time I saw him, he lamented the beginning of a new colonial settlement (called Har Homa on Jebel Abu Ghneim) that was being built and that would change the landscape.

My village of Beit Sahour (the Shepherds’ field where Shepherds were told of the birth of Jesus just up the hill in Bethlehem) joined the protests against the Balfour Declaration and the British occupation starting in 1919. Two thousand years ago, our ancestors did not just get the message of peace on earth, good will to man, but they thought it was their duty to pass it on. We still feel the same obligation and this is part of why I write and work for human rights and justice, which are the pre-requisite for peace.

My grandmother, Emilia, comes from Nazareth and it became part of the newly founded state of Israel in 1948. Five hundred thirty-one Palestinian villages and towns were depopulated (the largest ethnic cleansing post-World War II). Half the refugees were actually created before the state of Israel was formally declared on 15 May 1948. It is thus a myth that this had to do with war between the nascent state and “Arab countries.” There was also a secret agreement between the Royal Family that was ruling Trans-Jordan (appointed by the British) and the Zionist leaders before 1948 to allow splitting Palestine between them and thwart Palestinian self-determination (see Avi Schlam’s books on the subject).

Later I would find out that some relatives, even before I was born, had confrontations with the ruling Jordanian royal family. Two of my uncles on my paternal side were jailed by the Jordanian government for advocating Palestinian nationalism. My mother delivered my older brother in 1956 during the riots in Bethlehem against Jordanian rule.

I was ten-years-old in 1967 and that year provides some of my most terrifying memories. I remember panicked people passing through our village and heading toward the Jordan River. I remember ducking under beds when the sirens sounded. I remember Israeli tanks rolling down the hills toward our village, my father hiding us in a cave while an Israeli tank passed, until neighbors motioned us that the coast was clear. I remember Israeli jets streaking overhead. I remember sleeping with cloths and shoes on in case we had to run. I remember heated discussions among the adults about the wisdom of leaving; those who had left their homes in 1948, during the conflict when Israel became a state, were never allowed back. But in just six days, Israel took the remaining 22 percent of Palestine—the West Bank from Jordan and the Gaza Strip from Egypt (plus the Sinai and the Golan).

For a few days after the guns fell silent, no one knew what to expect. The Israeli authorities took their time before giving us any instructions. They were busy securing a long new border to keep out the more than 300,000 Palestinians who'd fled (some becoming refugees a second time). A few managed to get back, but many, like my cousins Samir and Makram, we would not see for more than twenty years. We waited while food and supplies trickled in, followed by some semblance of order imposed by village elders. Schools were closed, and my cousins and I spent even more time at my grandparents' house.

Two weeks after the war ended and on a day I will never forget, my grandfather received an extraordinary visitor: a Jewish friend separated from him for nineteen years. In the years between 1948 and 1967, no one could travel in either direction between the parts of Palestine that became Israel and the parts that came under Jordanian and Egyptian rule. I recall watching, not really understanding, as the two old men cried on each other's shoulders. Later that evening my grandfather tried to explain why people could not visit each other across borders. Sido (as we affectionately call a grandfather) talked about how, against the wishes of its native people, including his Jewish friend, Palestine was divided.

The years of the Israeli occupation of the West Bank were not kind to our people. While we exchanged Jordanian for Israeli rule, there were stark differences. Immediately after 1967, Israel started to confiscate Palestinian land in the areas acquired and to build Jewish-only colonies/settlements there. Palestinians were mostly employed in agriculture, and as their best land was being taken, many were forced to find other jobs. Thousands were forced to work in building the Jewish settlements and the roads that now cover 42 percent of the Palestinian occupied territories.

Our own Bethlehem district is a case in point. Tens of thousands of refugees had flooded here 1948–1950. Some later would be forced out again (in 1967 and beyond). The district has a population of more than 180,000 and of those more than 45,000 are refugees or displaced people. Israel built more than twenty-one colonial Jewish settlements and sixteen outposts since their military occupation of Bethlehem in 1967. The Israeli colonial settlement activity meant that nearly 90,000 Jews moved into our district and we were reduced to a ghetto (Bantustan) representing 13 percent of its size before 1967. Further, most of the water sources and other natural resources have been taken over by Israel. And increasingly, a wall is being built around the remaining 13 percent (<http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=30731&Cr=palestin&Cr1>), a wall that the International Court of Justice deemed illegally built deep inside Palestinian lands.

I am proud of the history of nonviolent resistance carried out despite brutal violence from the occupiers. While international law says we have a right to armed resistance to occupation, a tiny minority of our people picked up arms. By contrast Israel is a militarized society where everyone is supposed to serve in the army. As a result, ten times more Palestinian civilians were killed by Israeli occupiers than the other way

around. But a less reported issue is that most of us resist occupation and colonization by nonviolent methods (see my article “Where Is the Palestinian Gandhi,” *The Link*, Volume 43, Issue 3, July–August 2010 <http://www.ameu.org/page.asp?iid=291&aid=621&pg=1>). In my latest book, I showed examples of hundreds of forms of nonviolent resistance from the thousands of forms and millions of cases that we engaged in over the past 130 years.

We still struggle to describe the Orwellian reality we live in. In this land, a new colonial settler from Russia or Poland or America can roam free, get all sorts of financial gifts (from U.S. and other taxpayers), and settle on land stolen from people whose ancestors farmed it and cared for it for 4,000 years. The natives, considered children of a lesser God, are removed from their lands, live in nearby countries in refugee camps, or live in shrinking concentration camps in their own homeland. They cannot return to their homes and lands simply because they are Christians or Muslims. Those of us who remain here are living in increasingly shrinking concentration areas—people warehouses are what a friend calls them. We are not even allowed to travel freely between these warehouses. I am not even allowed to visit friends and colleagues in East Jerusalem (merely five miles away).

The Zionist program is unwavering in its original goals, goals that are shared by all major factions in Israeli politics (Likud, Labor, Shas and other religious parties). Its consensual program includes: the rejection of complete withdrawal from all areas illegally occupied in 1967; the rejection of refugees’ right to return to their homes and lands; the rejection of concepts of full sovereignty or self-determination for Palestinians; and a refusal to change Israel’s basic laws that discriminate against non-Jews. While all of these policies are contrary to basic human rights and international law, Western countries have been reluctant so far for various reasons to pressure Israel like they did with Apartheid South Africa.

Because of the Israel lobby, billions of U.S. tax money is spent on a country that has the largest number of violations of UN resolutions and provisions of international and humanitarian laws. Because of this lobby, eighty-one of our U.S. Congress decided to spend the August recess not dealing with their constituents’ concerns but instead took a trip paid for by this same lobby to Israel (for many of them it was their first trip abroad). Indeed, how else to explain a superpower being stripped of its dignity, its wealth, and its reputation around the world by a domestic lobby working for a foreign country to push for endless wars “on terror” when they are the ones perpetrating the worst terror on earth?

I am optimistic. Many have shed the illusions of “us here, them there.” The racist laws in this apartheid state are simply not sustainable on long-term basis. Peace cannot be built upon injustice; restorative justice is a prerequisite for peace. I got arrested regularly with Israeli human rights activists who join us in nonviolent resistance against occupation and colonization.

The efforts of some people to defend apartheid and separation can only be described at best as symptoms of cognitive dissonance and at worse as symptoms of racism. In their Orwellian world, occupation becomes “security,” a relentless war of colonization and occupation becomes “advancing democracy,” and a “peace process” that goes on for twenty years while more land is gobbled. The apartheid and land-theft wall becomes a “security fence.” Being anti- or post-Zionist is morphed into being anti-Jewish or being a “self-hating Jew.”

In July 2005, more than 170 Palestinian civil society organizations issued a historic document. It articulated Israel’s persistent violations of international and humanitarian laws and conventions and called upon “international civil society organizations and people of conscience all over the world to impose broad boycotts and implement divestment initiatives against Israel similar to those applied to South Africa in the apartheid era.”

The call stated that “these non-violent punitive measures should be maintained until Israel meets its obligation to recognize the Palestinian people’s inalienable right to self-determination and fully complies with the precepts of international law by: ending its occupation and colonization of all Arab lands and dismantling the Wall; recognizing the fundamental rights of the Arab-Palestinian citizens of Israel to full equality; and respecting, protecting, and promoting the rights of Palestinian refugees to return to their homes and properties as stipulated in UN resolution 194.”

We propose that global civil society take this call seriously and build a coalition open to all people for a global movement against Israeli apartheid. This would bring peace with justice to all people regardless of their religion or ethnicity. We believe this is good for the Israeli society in the long-term. We believe occupation and repression not only harms its intended victims but distorts and harms the occupiers. By challenging the system of repression we help reclaim our collective humanity.

My grandfather and his Jewish friend died years ago and their bodies long became part of the soil and air that surrounds us all in this land. Their molecules were incorporated in new life that has since arisen here. Children who are born here or in refugee camps in Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, and elsewhere are not born “Jewish” or “Muslim” or “Christian” or “Israeli” or “Palestinian.” They are born human babies. It is up to us to get them to see this common humanity and teach them to share this (still beautiful) land without walls, without ghettos, without racist laws. Working to achieve it together, we made thousands of friends over the years. The journey itself has been a rewarding experience. The Promised Land is not some distant area to be received by a subset of human being in the past or in the future. This is the promised land of peace with justice in the present and it is for all human beings who believe. We ask ALL to come be part of it. Ahlan wa sahan.

Mazin Qumsiyeh, PhD, is Professor at Bethlehem and Birzeit Universities, President, Palestinian Center for Rapprochement Between People.

7. An Israeli Narrative—Zionism: Past, Present and Hopes for the Future, David Rosen

Names often acquire different meanings and associations that are very different from the intention of their originators. The term “Zionist” is seen in much if not most of the Arab world—and indeed in the wider Muslim world—as reflecting some kind of expansionist Jewish territorialism that is hostile to Arab and Muslim interests.

However for most of us who would describe ourselves as Zionist—and for the founders of the Zionist movement more than a century ago—nothing could be further from the truth.

The name Zion was originally an ancient Jewish synonym for Jerusalem. It appears more than a hundred and fifty times in the Hebrew Bible (the TaNaKh) especially in the book of Psalms. Perhaps the most famous of these references is in Psalm 137 that gives expression to the distress of the Jewish exiles expelled from the land in the 6th century BCE by the Babylonians.

“By the rivers of Babylon, there we sat down; yea, we wept, when we remembered Zion. ... For there, our captors required of us to sing a song ... [saying] sing us a song of Zion. How shall we sing the Lord’s song in a strange land? If I forget you, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget its ability. If I do not remember you, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth; if I do not place Jerusalem above my main joy.”

The bond between the Jewish people and the land of their origins was also maintained in the second exile that followed Roman occupation (and the destruction of the Temple in the years 70 C.E.)

In addition to turning to Jerusalem in prayer three times a day and praying for the return to the land and the city in these prayers and in grace after every meal, the whole Jewish calendar and its seasonal religious celebrations was orientated to the land of Zion. (Thus Jews who live in Australia for example, celebrate the Passover Spring festival in their autumn season.) Indeed the names Zion and Jerusalem were used as synonyms for the land as a whole.

While some Jews continued to live in the land and others returned to it over the ages out of religious ties, for most Jews it was simply the land of their dreams, of a future hope.

With the Enlightenment in Europe that ushered in a spirit of universal freedom (often rejecting the traditional attachments of religion) and with the gradual collapse of empires, the nineteenth century saw more and more nations seeking to take their destinies into their own hands. It was against this backdrop that a Jewish nationalist movement also emerged, seeking to give political form to the abovementioned age old bond between the people and the land; and because the name Zion served to personify the land as a whole, the movement took the name Zionism.

However this movement was predominantly secular, reflecting the zeitgeist of the enlightenment and nascent nationalisms. For most Zionists, the attachment of the Jewish people to the land of Palestine was of essential cultural and historic national importance; but religious ideas or practice were irrelevant for them. In fact it was a secular socialist world view that emerged as the dominant strand within the Zionist movement. Nevertheless, in addition to including other secular nationalists, the movement also included those who described themselves as Religious Zionists.

For many of these, Zionism was a Divinely inspired movement, not only fulfilling the promise in the Torah and the Prophets guaranteeing the people's return to the land, but actually ushering in the Messianic era. Other Religious Zionists were more modest in their view and saw Zionism simply as the means to enable them to live a full and independent Jewish religious life in the land.

All strands of Zionism however, saw the movement as having an ethical purpose, not only in terms of the well-being of the Jewish people, but also in relation to others. They envisioned a Jewish state (in the sense that it would be a state of the Jewish people) that would at the same time guarantee franchise, dignity, and equality before the law for all its citizens, Jews and non-Jews alike (and this vision is expressed in Israel's Declaration of Independence).

Accordingly the Zionist movement as a whole sought early on to achieve a *modus vivendi* both with the local Arab communities and with the Arab world. In 1919 the preeminent Arab leader, the Emir Faisal, co-signed a document with the president of the World Zionist Organization, Dr. Chaim Weizman (later to become the first president of the State of Israel), welcoming the Zionist enterprise and expressing the hope that Jews and Arabs would work together to bring about a flourishing of the region for the benefit of all. The unfolding political developments meant that that dream was lost and conflict ensued with both Arab nationalism and nascent Palestinian nationalism.

This conflict has caused much bloodshed, suffering, displacement, and enmity. The consequences for Palestinian Arabs have been tragic—a source of much distress to us who are proud to be called Jews and Zionists, for the vision of Torah and the vision of Zionism is one in which not only Jews, but all people live in peace and dignity.

And the conflict has been painful and costly for Israeli society.

Generally, I believe that Israel can be proud of the fact that despite the conflict, it has guaranteed equality of franchise and equality before the law for all its citizens. However it would be disingenuous to

deny that the conflict does also impinge on the freedoms and opportunities of Israeli Arabs citizens—a matter of ongoing political and legal debate in Israel’s robust democracy.

Similarly, Israeli settlement policy, while motivated by a historic attachment as well as political, security, and in certain cases religious agendas, affects both Palestinian and Israeli society. This matter is not only one of fierce debate on the national level in Israel, but also within Religious Zionism itself.

That is why many Israelis like myself believe that a peaceful resolution of the conflict and the establishment of a democratic, non-militarized Palestinian state alongside the State of Israel is essential not only for Israel’s security, and for the right of Palestinian national self-determination, but also for the health of Judaism, and of the principled enterprise of Zionism.

The primary debate in Israel is not whether a negotiated two-state solution is desirable but whether it is feasible. Recent and past experiences do not instill Israelis with much confidence in that regard; Palestinian efforts to circumvent talks and internationalize the conflict have only heightened Israeli skepticism. Tragically, the absence of a resolution to the conflict and the ongoing violence will continue to impinge deleteriously on the lives of both Israelis and Palestinians.

There is arguably no parallel in human history to the success of Zionism, in restoring the Jewish people to independent life in its ancestral homeland; just as there is no parallel to the degree of fidelity that an exiled people maintained in relation to its land for two millennia. However the future success of Zionism depends substantially on finding a way out of the present political stalemate, so that the land that contains two peoples, and which different faiths call holy, may be a place of flourishing for us all.

Rabbi David Rosen is the AJC’s International Director of Interreligious Affairs and the AJC’s Robert and Harriet Heilbrunn Institute for International Interreligious Understanding. He also serves as the Honorary Interfaith Advisor and Representative of the Chief Rabbinate of Israel. He is the former Chief Rabbi of Ireland (see: www.rabbidavidrosen.net).

8. *An Israeli Narrative—At Home in Israel, S. Ilan Troen*

My name is Selwyn Ilan Troen. My mother named me Selwyn, an Anglicized version of the name of her mother who was murdered in a pogrom during World War I. Ilan is the Hebrew name I took for myself, a name that means tree, recalling the more than 250 million trees planted in Israel by the Jewish National Fund to reforest the land and halt desertification. Thirty-five years ago I built my home in Omer, a garden community outside Beer-Sheva in the northern Negev desert. Our six children as well as their children all live in Israel and are rooted in this land.

When we built our home, aside from a couple of tents inhabited by a Bedouin family, there were no houses or tents between our home and the old “Green Line,” the armistice border that separated Israel and Jordan, about five miles to the north. We erected a chain link fence to keep our little ones in, and to prevent the Bedouins’ goats from devouring what slowly became a garden, the first trees and green shrubs planted in the vast brown and ochre desert that surrounded us. In those early years, there were no sidewalks or streetlights and no other settlements beyond. We had an unhampered view of the Judean Hills, and at night a clear view of the uncountable bright stars and the Milky Way, much as Abraham and his earlier descendants must have seen them.

Today this area is dotted with Jewish settlements and planned Bedouin towns as well as Bedouin squatter encampments built without government approval. Today the Negev landscape reflects the diverse populations that inhabit it. In addition to Jewish cities and development towns it includes the green fields of Jewish kibbutzim and moshavim (cooperative farms), suburban garden settlements, Bedouin cities and

towns like Rahat, Tel Sheva, and Laquiya, and numerous unrecognized/illegal villages and encampments, all with mosques and towering minarets for calling Muslims to prayer.

This filling in of landscapes with separate communities is consistent with the history of the country at-large over the last two centuries. In 1800 there were only 250,000 inhabitants in all of Palestine, the land between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean and between The Lebanon and the Sinai desert. By 1900 the population had grown twofold to 500,000. Today, following a century of extraordinary growth, the population is around 10 million, twenty times greater than just 100 years earlier. In the 20th century Israel/Palestine became one of the most dynamic regions on the face of the globe. This area that until so recently was an underdeveloped backwater of the defunct Ottoman Empire now supports a population larger by a factor of at least three than was found at any time in the ancient period.

Jews played the key role in this growth and vitality. It is not mere coincidence that Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, the university I joined in 1975, is a world leader in arid zone research. It is not a metaphor to assert that Jews have made the desert bloom, enabling all the inhabitants of the region, Jews and non-Jews, to live better and healthier lives. The university draws students from Palestine, Jordan, and Egypt, as well as China and Africa, where rampant desertification is devastating the environment and threatening to decimate the population with drought and famine. The commitment to this field of research and teaching manifests the biblical injunction and Zionist intent to be a light unto the nations.

Founded by the state with the generous assistance of Diaspora Jewry, the university serves a diverse population of students, including immigrants and the children of immigrants from the former Soviet Union, Ethiopia, and North Africa, Israeli Arabs and Palestinians, and both male and female Bedouin students who are actively recruited and supported in their studies. Currently, chairs of such departments as Social Work and Computer Science are Arabs who received part of their education at the university. The university-affiliated hospital, the Soroka Medical Center, the only hospital in the area, similarly serves the medical needs of close to 750,000 of this very diverse Negev population. A majority of the 13,000 babies born each year at Soroka are Bedouins. It isn't by chance that the first Bedouin woman to join the faculty of an Israeli medical school trained at the Ben-Gurion University Medical School and now teaches there. These are examples of a national Jewish and Zionist commitment that I take personal pride in. They do not pretend that Israel has created a perfect social fabric. They do demonstrate that education to further the pursuit of social justice is an ongoing moral and ethical commitment in what has been a very complex and often hard context.

In my private life, I also have deep personal satisfaction that diverse paths are available in education. Two of our grandchildren attend a Keshet school where religious and secular Jews learn together in a context that highlights shared values. Four are enrolled in the more liberal end of Orthodox Jewish education. Several attend a bilingual Jewish/Arab school where classes are taught jointly by two teachers, Jewish/Hebrew and Muslim or Christian/Arabic. The parents and staff are committed to learning about each other's cultures, concerns, and fears, and spend long and intense hours, within their own group and with "the others," negotiating what their children will learn about the more difficult parts of this shared past in a curriculum that includes the Naqba along with Israel Independence Day and Passover together with Ramadan and Easter. Our oldest granddaughter, a third-year student in Social Work at Sapir College, where rockets fired from Gaza killed a student just a few years ago, is currently recruiting Palestinian and Jewish youth for an extracurricular project she's undertaken.

Lest it appear I am painting a deliberately rosy picture, let me emphasize that I am painfully aware that the pluralistic and tolerant intimacy and amity I am describing are too rare in Israel/Palestine. Israel struggles with an immense number of ethical and moral questions that arise from the conflicting demands of a very diverse population that includes recent Jewish immigrants, Palestinian Arabs, Druze, Bedouin, Christian, and Circassian minorities, as well as increasingly significant numbers of African refugees who cross our borders legally and illegally.

But none of our failures justifies or supports the all too frequent portrait drawn to demonize Israel and the Zionist endeavor. It is this point that I feel compelled to address head on. It is my perspective on rectifying what I see as a misinformed and often malicious campaign to delegitimize the Jewish state that I want to share.

We live in a conflicted land where distance is geographical and social. We do have mixed Jewish/Arab cities and towns like Haifa and mixed Muslim/Christian Arab ones like Nazareth. Nevertheless, most Israelis tend to be separated from one another even within the same city or village by such internal bonds as family, clan, place of origin, religious custom, and cultural tradition. This is the norm in our part of the world, reflected in, and by no means an imposition of the Zionist state. It is an ongoing and publically addressed challenge to Israel as both a Jewish and democratic state to maintain a basis for unity and harmony that simultaneously allows for political and ideological diversity and safeguards social justice for individuals and groups in this contentious and multifaceted polity.

Vociferous critics, whether they are residents or observers, often fail to provide useful insight because they do not grasp and grapple with the very complexity of the context. They seem satisfied to condemn Israel with infuriating smugness without acknowledging and confronting the reality of the “other.”

To rephrase a truism that reflects this “other” reality as I see it: Jews are the majority in Israel but in important respects, they view themselves as a minority. Arabs in Israel are a minority but in significant ways, they act as if they are the majority.

Israeli Jews are uneasy and lack security, their military and economic power notwithstanding. For one thing, no other state in our tumultuous world, however iniquitous, is denied repeatedly in vehement public attacks its right to exist. The repeated assaults in the UN and other international forums cause continual distress. It is no secret that we are surrounded by Arab and Iranian Muslim states. It is less well-known and not often publically acknowledged that many of these reject the reality or possibility of Jewish independence and sovereignty, at best accepting the traditional view that Jews must remain in their proscribed place as “dhimmis”—a second-class community. Yet simultaneously, the Palestinian Arab minority that constitutes only 20 percent of the population of Israel proper makes extraordinary demands. In their recent Future Vision document (2006) and elsewhere, a significant part of the Palestinian intellectual leadership protest the legitimacy of Israel and its Jewish identity and claim forms of autonomy that are granted nowhere else, not even in democratic Europe.

Neutering Israel into a “state of all its citizens,” has long been recognized as unfeasible. The British acknowledged this in concluding Palestine must be partitioned into Jewish and Arab states in the Peel Commission Report of 1937, later the basis for the UN partition plan of 1947 and for a host of international position papers through the present. Why should we still have to defend the idea that Jews are entitled to sovereignty and independence?

The League of Nations granted Britain a Mandate over Palestine to enable Jews to “reconstitute” themselves [the term used in the document] as a modern people with responsibility for a polity of their homeland. This is how Zionists understood themselves: we have “re-turned,” “re-claimed,” and “re-built” ourselves and the land.

The “re” is crucial: it emphasizes the notion of “again.” International and legal institutions acknowledged that we Jews are a historic people with deep and longstanding ties to the land. The current discourse brands us as colonial-settlers, interlopers with no prior claim and no rights to the land. It asserts that the land belongs to others. I resent the charge and reject the claim that we are a colonial-settler society. The four generations of my family currently living in Israel are all deeply rooted there. The fact that some family members trace their roots back 500 years in the Land of Israel, that some of our children were born here and others were not, does not entitle them to “belong more” than recent arrivals. All our individual and collective identities are real and inseparable from this land.

We live in Hebrew. Zionism revitalized this language spoken and written in the land in the past, kept alive over two thousand years, and recovered for modern use. Hebrew is the language of sacred texts and their commentaries composed by long-deceased Jews. It is also the authentic and living language in which a vigorous national life is conducted with advanced science, great literature, slang, and popular songs. It is the language in which I converse, write, and dream.

This same process of recovery is expressed in naming the land. European colonizers established New England, New Amsterdam, and New Orleans. In Israel there is no *New* Berlin, Vienna, Warsaw, Lodz, or Odessa. Even our street names resonate with biblical associations and with those who dreamed of the return and worked for it.

Contemporary critics might enhance the discourse if, like those engaged in the Peel Report and in earlier UN discussions over Palestine, they did not presume to judge who was right and who was wrong. Both sides in this conflict are committed to their beliefs and love the land. Giving thoughtful, attentive, and sympathetic reception to the narratives of each side without assigning virtue or truth to either, might make it possible to reach a pragmatic compromise.

I personally deplore the steady growth of Israeli occupation that threatens the desired outcome, a final and lasting peace based on partition of the land into two states for two peoples. But I do not see the Israeli occupation of the West Bank in a vacuum.

Israeli settlers were rightly compelled by government decision to leave flourishing settlements they had built in the Gaza strip, but this unilateral withdrawal did not result in peaceful coexistence. The development town of Sderot and other Israeli cities, towns and agricultural settlements within range of rockets and missiles have been and continue to be subject to repeated missile attacks. On too many occasions, and as recently as November 2011, a siren warned my family that we had forty-five seconds to get adults and children into our home bomb shelter. These attacks are generally ignored in the media since they are local, not massive. But I assure you they take a toll. As I pointed out above, we feel uneasy. Missiles were rained on the Galilee in the aftermath of withdrawal from Lebanon. Missiles fell on Haifa. We do not see an end to this; we are promised, in fact, that the attacks will continue.

In this same vein, I do not like the separation barriers between Israel and the West Bank in the central part of the country but these are not “apartheid” walls. They provide some security, a barrier to terrorists, and have been effective. Like many observers, I too see hope in the “Arab spring.” But I am acutely aware there are many “Arab streets” and no one knows which will prevail.

So for me, this is a core issue: I want and need you to recognize the legitimacy of my existence and purpose in the Promised Land. It is disturbing to have my belonging rejected and my country viewed as a pariah-state. The threats are physical but also made through wrongly critical and often sanctimonious discourse. I believe they are often founded on distorted history, couched in misapplied theoretical, legal, and moral principles, and at times offered in theological undertones.

Muslims freely imagine the night ride of Mohammed on the winged horse el-Burak to the *masjid al-aqsa* on Jerusalem’s holy mountain; Christians walk in the footsteps of Jesus and offer devotions at Gethsemane or at the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. Why is the authenticity and validity of the connection of Jews to the land open to question?

For the first time in history fundamentalist Muslims have claimed all of Palestine as a Waqf in which Jews are proscribed and under threat. Even secular and moderate Palestinians have denied the connection of Jews to Jerusalem and have yet to affirm the legitimacy of the Jewish presence even if they accept the need for pragmatic compromise. While some Christian fundamentalists support Israel, anticipating the role Israel

may play in an awesome Christian drama, other Christians have refused or been reluctant to offer Israel a place in history. With more than a whiff of Supersessionism, some still reject the reality of an active Jewish presence in the modern world. The Vatican opposed the creation of a Jewish state and recognized it only in 1993, or after the Oslo Accords. Liberation theologians supplant the Hebrews with the Palestinians in an appropriation of the Exodus story.

My impression is that the voice of Israel is rarely heard within Christian churches. Two years ago I was apparently among the first Israeli Jews ever invited to address a committee of the Synod of the United Churches of Christ on the issue of BDS. One may inquire how often church movements engage in dialogue with moderate Israelis as they consider yet another resolution criticizing Israel and call on opposition to the Jewish state through one means or another.

My own work is in the field of Israel Studies. I try to sensitize my students to the complexity of the issues. I offer neither templates nor advocacy. Rather I attempt to bring multiple perspectives. My students can only learn if they address contradictory and competing narratives. This is no mere relativism. Human actions must be subject to scrutiny and moral judgment. Yet simplistic moralizing distorts truth and inhibits appreciation for the complexities of the conflict.

Another way of expressing this is that, while in geometry parallel lines do not meet, apparently parallel narratives in human affairs are often intricately interwoven. Examining them together is unlikely to produce a unitary and agreed replacement. Rather, genuine attention to the other may engender mutual respect and understanding.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Introduction: The following is an annotated bibliography compiled by the Middle East Monitoring Group as mandated by the 219th General Assembly (2010) to serve as a resource for individuals and congregations. The intent was not to compile a list that conformed to current PC(USA) positions, but rather provide some of the more important works from a breadth of perspectives for those who wish to engage in further study of this complicated and multifaceted issue.

1. *Historical Perspective*

Armstrong, Karen. *Jerusalem: One City, Three Faiths*. New York, N.Y.: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996.

Venerated by three faiths, torn by conflict, conquered, and rebuilt again and again, Jerusalem a sacred city that has endured terrible tragedy. Armstrong traces the history of how Jews, Christians, and Muslims have all laid claim to Jerusalem as their holy place, and how three radically different concepts of holiness have shaped and scarred the city for thousands of years.

Asali, K. J., ed. *Jerusalem in History*. New York, N.Y.: Olive Branch Press, 2000.

Scholars from seven countries explore the historical treatment of Jerusalem and its multi-religious tradition. The book ranges from the fourth century B.C.E. to the present, covering Jewish, Muslim, and, to a lesser extent, Christian heritage. The essays present a balanced picture, helping to correct often distorted images of the city presented over the last forty years.

Avineri, Schlomo. *The Making of Modern Zionism: intellectual origins of the Jewish state*. New York: Basic Books, 1981.

A leading Israeli political philosopher for decades, Avineri traces the rise of the Zionist idea from its origins in the 19th century to the present day. He argues that Zionism was not primarily a religious response to persecution, a common view, but rather a complex and diverse conglomeration of ideas, motives, and hopes. Considered a modern classic on the subject.

Fromkin, David. *A Peace to End All Peace: The Fall of the Ottoman Empire and the Creation of the Modern Middle East*. New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1989 & 2009.

This is a definitive study of the events, secret diplomacy, and politics during WWI by the European powers in the Middle Eastern theatre. Particular attention is paid to the various often-contradictory policies and promises made by the British to both Arab and Jewish factions and the post war carving up of the Ottoman Empire.

Khalidi, Walid, ed. *All That Remains: The Palestinian Villages Occupied and Depopulated by Israel in 1948*. Institute for Palestine Studies, 1996.

The culmination of nearly six years of research by more than thirty participants, this authoritative reference work describes in detail the more than 400 Palestinian villages that were destroyed or depopulated during the 1948 war. The body of the text is devoted to describing the villages before 1948, summarizing their history from a wide variety of Arab and Western sources and a description of the current status of the sites, including post-1948 Israeli settlements established on confiscated village lands.

Laquer, Walter and Barry Rubin, eds. *The Israel-Arab Reader: A Documentary History of the Middle East Conflict*. New York, N.Y.: Penguin Group, 2001.

This work covers the spectrum of the Israel-Arab conflict from the earliest days, through the wars and peacemaking efforts, up to the Israel-PLO and Israel-Jordan peace accords. It includes speeches, letters, articles, and reports dealing with all the major interests in the area from relevant political parties and world leaders.

Mattar, Philip, ed. *Encyclopedia of the Palestinians*. New York: Routledge, 2000.

This is a collection of more than fifty scholarly and historical perspectives to help shed light on the historical and contemporary issues affecting the Palestinian people. Topics covered include politics, culture, society, history, economics, and geography.

Montefiore, Simon Sebag. *Jerusalem-The Biography*. New York: Alfred A Knoff, 2011.

Noted British historian and international bestseller Simon Sebag Montefiore's comprehensive and balanced study traces the history of the city from its prehistoric inhabitants to its emergence as the religious center for the three major monotheistic religions. Particular attention is paid to the dichotomy between the "earthly" and the "heavenly" cities from the perspectives of pilgrims, conquerors, and its diverse citizens throughout the ages.

Morris, Benny. *Righteous Victims: A History of the Zionist-Arab Conflict 1881-2001*. New York: Vintage Books, 2001

Morris provides an inclusive history of the conflict, detailing relations between Israel and the Arabs since the beginning of the modern Zionist movement in the late-19th century. Relying on a vast array of Hebrew, Arabic, and English sources, he digs beneath politics and diplomacy to get at the broader social and cultural history of Palestinian Arabs and Israeli Jews.

Oren, Michael. *Faith Power, and Fantasy: America in the Middle East: 1776 to the Present*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2007

A fascinating study that traces the history of America's fascination and involvement in the Middle East, that looks at the interplay between religion, millennialism, politics and U.S. foreign policy. Oren is an historian and the current Israeli Ambassador to the United States.

Pappe, Ilan. *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*. London: Oneworld, 2007

This book revisits the formative period of the State of Israel. Pappé argues that the claim about the Palestinian population leaving of its own accord during the War of Independence is myth and offers archival evidence to demonstrate that a central plank in Israel's founding ideology was the forcible removal of the indigenous

population. This book makes a plea to acknowledge the ethnic cleansing of Palestine in 1948 as the root cause of the ongoing Palestine-Israel conflict.

Qumsiyeh, Mazin B. *Popular Resistance in Palestine: A History of Hope and Empowerment*. London: Pluto Press, 2011.

Dr. Qumsiyeh synthesizes data from hundreds of original sources to provide the most comprehensive study of nonviolent civil resistance in Palestine. The book contains hundreds of stories of the heroic and highly innovative methods of resistance employed by the Palestinians over more than 100 years, analyzing the successes, failures, missed opportunities, and challenges facing ordinary Palestinians. This is the only book to critically and comparatively study the uprisings of 1920–21, 1929, 1936–39, 1970s, 1987–1991, and 2000–2006.

Simha Flapan, *Zionism and the Palestinians: 1917–1947*. London: Croom Helm, 1979

Simha Flapan (1911–1987) was an [Israeli](#) historian and politician. He served as the national secretary of the [left Zionist Mapam](#) party, and the director of its [Arab](#) Affairs department from 1959 to the mid 1970s; he also edited *New Outlook* magazine—a non-party monthly that promoted Arab-Jewish rapprochement.

2. *Theological*

Ateek, Naim. *A Palestinian Christian Cry for Reconciliation*. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 2008

In this book Ateek outlines a vision that is threefold: the unity of all Palestinian Christians, dialogue between Christian and Muslim Palestinians, and peace between Israelis and Palestinians. Ateek, who is an Episcopalian priest and an Arab citizen of Israel, presents a critical voice to this discussion through his passion for justice and his biblical and theological perspective.

Burge, Gary. *Jesus and the Land: The New Testament Challenge to “Holy Land” Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.

This book describes first-century Jewish and Christian beliefs about the land of Israel and surveys New Testament passages that directly address the question of land and faith. It also looks at present-day tensions surrounding “territorial religion” in the modern Middle East, helping contemporary Christians develop a Christian theology of the land. Gary M. Burge is professor of New Testament at Wheaton College in Illinois.

Hoffman, Lawrence A. ed. *The Land of Israel: Jewish Perspectives*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1986.

A collection of essays from a group of scholars that touches on various themes of Jewish theology regarding the Land of Israel. Of particular importance is the essay, “The Biblical Concept of the Land of Israel: cornerstone of the covenant between God and Israel,” by Harry Orlinsky, which provides a broad examination of this crucial theme.

Korn, Eugene. *The Jewish Connection to Israel, the Promised Land: A Brief Introduction for Christians*. Woodstock, Vt.: Jewish Lights, 2008.

A historical review of Jewish theological commitments to the Land, this thorough book is written by a rabbi prominent in the field of Jewish-Christian relations. Korn moves from a deep examination of Scripture to the meaning of covenant and Jewish understandings of the modern State of Israel.

Lux, Richard C. *The Jewish People, the Holy Land, and the State of Israel*. Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 2010.

A scholarly Roman Catholic reappraisal of Jewish theologies of land and the state of Israel as analogous to Christian sacramental thought. He traces both the supersessionist tendencies of many Christian theologies prior to World War II and reviews different Christian theologies regarding the Jews through a covenantal lens, examines Christian attachment to the Holy Land, and wrestles with the theological significance of the modern State of Israel.

March, Eugene W. *God's Land on Loan-Israel, Palestine, and the World*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007.

This book presents a biblical theology of land that interweaves the contemporary Israeli and Palestinian conflict over territory with theological reflection on the biblical claim that God owns all land and that humans are never more than momentary caretakers. The book is structured around a dual focus on the past of the Bible and the contemporary history of war in the Middle East. It provides a clear summary of the evolution of treaties, wars, and negotiations between the two parties in the past sixty years. It also has many helpful many maps that bring the geopolitical developments into clear light.

Merali, Arzu and Javad Sharbaf, eds. *Towards a New Liberation Theology: Reflections on Palestine*. Islamic Human Rights Commission, 2009.

This book through different articles explores the potential that religion has in resolving conflicts that have been irresolvable through secular initiatives. The contents of this volume reflect contributors' responses to the conference title and range from polemical, jurisprudential, sociological, through to esoteric. Based on experiences in the Holy Land and beyond, including Lebanon, Ireland, Central and South America, and South Africa, this book articulates the religious challenge to oppression and injustice in the context of the Palestinian struggle for justice.

Wilken, Robert. *The Land Called Holy: Palestine in Christian History and Thought*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1992.

As the title indicates, this book focuses on the Christian relationship to historic Israel/Palestine and the theological understanding of it. He traces the origins and development of the Christian concept of "Holy Land," paying particular attention to the key period of the fourth through the seventh century, and considers how Jews have reacted to those developments.

3. *Biographical/Memoir*

Baltzer, Anna. *Witness in Palestine: A Jewish American Woman in the Occupied Territories*. Paradigm Publishers, 2007

Anna Baltzer is a Jewish American Columbia graduate, former Fulbright scholar, granddaughter of Holocaust refugees, and an activist for Palestinian human rights. *Witness in Palestine* follows Baltzer's eight months of working with the International Women's Peace Service in the West Bank, documenting human rights abuses and supporting Palestinian-led nonviolent resistance.

Ben-Ami, Shlomo. *Scars of War, Wounds of Peace: the Israeli-Arab tragedy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Ben-Ami is a former foreign minister of Israel and played a major role in the 2000 Camp David peace talks as well as many other negotiations. As such, he is able to give a firsthand account of many of the most important events and figures in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict of the last few decades, and provides his own take on the major historical issues from Israel's independence (such as the 1967 war and its impact) to the present day.

Braverman, Mark. *Fatal Embrace*. Austin, Tex.: Synergy Books, 2010

Trained in clinical psychology and crisis management, Mark Braverman devoted his professional career to working with groups and individuals undergoing traumatic stress. Tracing his own journey as a Jew struggling with the difficult realities of modern Israel, he shows how the Jewish quest for safety and empowerment and the Christian endeavor to atone for centuries of anti-Semitism have united to suppress the conversations needed to bring peace.

Chacham, Ronit. *Breaking Ranks: Refusing to Serve in the West Bank and Gaza Strip*. New York: Other Press, 2003.

In a series of moving and provocative conversations, nine members of the Israeli Defense Force tell why they refused to serve in the Occupied territories of the West Bank and Gaza. In this book, the nine describe their risky moral decision against the background of the Israeli-Palestinian struggle.

Chacour, Elias. *Blood Brothers*. Grand Rapids: Chosen Books, 1984

Elias Chacour is the archbishop of [Akko](#), [Haifa](#), [Nazareth](#), and All [Galilee](#) of the [Melkite Greek Catholic Church](#). Noted for his efforts to promote reconciliation between [Arabs](#) and [Israelis](#), he is the author of two books about the experience of [Palestinian people](#) living in present-day [Israel](#).

Gordis, Daniel. *If a place can make you cry*. New York: Crown, 2002

In 1998, Gordis and his family went to Israel on what he thought was a one-year sabbatical from his congregation in Los Angeles. Once in Israel, though, they decided they needed to move there permanently. This book is a unique set of reflections based on emails and articles that Rabbi Gordis sent to friends in the United States over time, describing how and why his family made their home in Israel, what life was like as the Second Intifada broke out, and how his own understandings of both Israel and the dynamics of the conflict evolved during this time.

Izzeldin Abuelaish: *I Shall Not Hate: A Gaza Doctor's Journey on the Road to Peace and Human Dignity*. New York: Walker and Company, 2010

A Palestinian medical doctor and founder of the Daughters of Life Foundation, Abuelaish describes his pain and grief at the loss of three daughters in the January 2009 incursion into Gaza when they were killed by an Israeli tank shell. It is a redemptive story describing how this horrific tragedy strengthened his resolve to act for the whole of humanity.

Mandell, Sherri. *The Blessing of a Broken Heart*. New Milford: Toby Press, 2003.

A spiritual memoir of grief, faith, and healing by an American-born Israeli whose thirteen-year-old son was murdered in 2001 near their home in the West Bank. Hauntingly beautiful and unflinchingly honest, Mandell invites the reader into her journey of loss and hope.

Peled, Miko. *The General's Son*. Charlottesville, Va.: Just World Books, June, 2012

In this memoir Miko Peled chronicles his journey as the son and grandson of renowned Israeli leaders and pioneers who, in his own life, has become committed to building a single democratic state in Israel/Palestine in which Palestinians and Israelis will all enjoy full equality. Miko was born in Jerusalem in 1961 into a well-known Zionist family. His grandfather, Dr. Avraham Katsnelson was a Zionist leader and signer on the Israeli Declaration of Independence. His father, Matti Peled was a young officer in the war of 1948 and a general in the war of 1967 when Israel took control of the West Bank, Gaza, Golan Heights, and the Sinai.

Peres, Shimon. *Ben-Gurion: A Political Life*. New York: Schocken, 2011.

Written by a Nobel Peace Prize winner, the current president of Israel, and a protégé of ben-Gurion himself, this book examines the dominant figure of the Zionist movement in British Mandate Palestine who became the first prime minister of the independent State of Israel and exerted massive influence over the creation and development of the state.

Shipler, David K. *Arab and Jew: Wounded Spirits in a Promised Land. Revised Edition*. New York, N.Y.: Penguin Books, 2002.

In portraits of Arabs and Jews from all walks of life and political perspectives, Shipler examines the “attitudes, images, and stereotypes that Arabs and Jews have of one another, the roots of their aversions, and the complex interactions between them.” The effects of war, nationalism, terrorism, religion, and history come to life, illuminated by insights drawn from Shipler’s five-year residence in Jerusalem.

Zaru, Jean. *Occupied with Nonviolence: A Palestinian Woman Speaks*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008.

Jean Zaru is a longtime activist and Quaker leader from Ramallah. In this book, she shares her convictions about Christian nonviolence in the context of the Israeli/Palestinian conflict. Zaru presents an alternative vision for peace and justice through a theology of nonviolence.

4. *Contemporary Issues*

Abunimah, Ali. *One Country: A Bold Proposal to End the Israeli-Palestinian Impasse*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2006.

Citing decades of impasse in negotiating an equitable two state solution, Ali Abunimah contends that Israeli's and Palestinians are so intertwined geographically and economically that separation cannot lead to the security Israelis need or the rights Palestinians must have. Modeling his approach on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Belfast Agreement, he attempts to envision a single federated state that protects both Jewish and Palestinian interests.

Omar Barghouti: *BDS: The Global Struggle for Human Rights*. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2011

Omar Barghouti is an independent Palestinian commentator and human rights activist. He holds a graduate degree from Columbia University and another from Tel Aviv University. Barghouti's book argues for a rights-based Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions Campaign for the purposes of ending Israel's occupation of Palestine.

Ben-Ami, Jeremy. *A New Voice for Israel: Fighting for the Survival of the Jewish Nation*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Ben-Ami is the founding director of J Street, the new "pro-Israel, pro-peace" Jewish advocacy organization. While his family helped found Tel Aviv, Ben-Ami believes that the traditional Jewish defense of Israel is problematic and that a new conversation needs to take place that combines an affirmation of Israel's future with letting go of some of the myths used to support that affirmation in the past. A crucial resource for understanding some of the dynamics of the debate among mainstream American Jews over the best way to support Israel.

Benvenisti, Meron. *Intimate Enemies: Jews and Arabs in a Shared Land*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1995.

Benvenisti, former deputy mayor of Jerusalem, raises the possibility of a confederation of Israel/Palestine, the only solution that he feels will bring lasting peace. He argues that the seven million people in the territory between Jordan and the Mediterranean are mutually dependent regarding all spheres of human activity. Each side must accept the realities that two national entities live within one geopolitical entity and that their conflict will not be resolved by population transfers or land partition

Burg, Avraham. *The Holocaust Is Over; We Must Rise From its Ashes*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Burg argues that the Jewish nation has been traumatized by its memories of Hitler and the Holocaust and has lost the ability to trust itself, its neighbors, or the world around it. He contends that this is one of the causes for the growing nationalism and violence that are plaguing Israeli society and reverberating through Jewish communities worldwide. Burg uses his own family history—his parents were Holocaust survivors—to inform his innovative views on what the Jewish people need to do to move on and eventually live in peace with their Arab neighbors and feel comfortable in world at large. Avraham Burg is the former speaker of the Knesset in Israel (1999–2003). He has been active in politics as a leader in the Labor Party and the One Israel party.

Goodman, Hirsh. *The Anatomy of Israel's Survival*. New York: PublicAffairs, 2011.

Written by an Israeli journalist and security analyst, Goodman reviews the real and perceived threats to Israel's existence beyond its borders, but also argues that these threats have enabled Israel to ignore its pressing threats from within, particularly the problem of Israel's ability to maintain its democratic character and Jewish identity while continuing to maintain control over the Palestinian Territories captured in 1967. Goodman argues that these internal issues are the most dangerous current threats to Israel, even the rise of Iran.

Frankel, Jonathan and Ezra Mendelsohn, eds. *The Protestant-Jewish Conundrum. Studies in Contemporary Jewry*. Vol. XXIV. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

This volume offers a wide range of articles from both Jewish and Christian scholars exploring an assortment of issues that have risen in the modern period between Judaism and different Protestant groups. Included are articles on WCC

relation with Judaism; Cooperation between Christian and Jewish millennial groups; Presbyterian-Jewish relations; American evangelicals and the state of Israel.

Gorenberg, Gershom. *The Unmaking of Israel*. New York: HarperCollins, 2011.

Gorenberg provides a provocative critically acclaimed analysis of the contemporary state of Israel in the aftermath of the Six Day War. He traces how the rise of influence from the religious right and the consequences of the occupation have created the current crisis that threatens the very principles of the Israeli democracy.

Horovitz, David. *Still Life with Bombers: Israel in the Age of Terrorism*. New York: Knopf, 2004.

Horovitz takes the reader into the daily experience of violence experienced during the Second Intifada by both sides, both in actual attacks and in the constant tension of expecting the next one. An invaluable insight into the grim effectiveness and impact of violence on prospects for peace and the ability to believe that the other side would be willing to live in peace.

Small, Joseph D. and Gil Rosenthal, eds. *Let Us Reason Together: Christians and Jews in Conversation*. Louisville: Witherspoon Press, 2010.

Co-written by the former director of the Office of Theology, Worship, and Education in the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) and the executive director of the National Council of Synagogues, this book is the fruits of a sustained conversation in 2005 between the two groups on various issues and differences between Judaism and Christianity.

Smith, Jane I. *Muslims, Christians, and the Challenge of Interfaith Dialogue*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

The author brings many years of scholarship and experience in the area of Islamic Studies and Christian-Muslim dialogue. The great portion of the book is taken up with three general topics: models of Christian-Muslim dialogue in the United States, what can go wrong in the exercise of dialogue, and Christian and Muslim perspectives on religious pluralism. Smith reviews the history and legacy of engagement between Christians and Muslims.

Raheb, Mitri. ed. *The Invention of History: A Century of Interplay between Theology and Politics in Palestine*. Jerusalem: Diyar Publisher, 2011

This book is a collection of addresses from “The Invention of History” conference held in Bethlehem, Palestine, in 2009. It analyzes major theological trends and shifts of the twentieth century in several contexts and focuses on the interplay between theology and politics regarding Israel and Palestine. The Reverend Dr. Mitri Raheb is the pastor of the Evangelical Lutheran Christmas Church in Bethlehem and is the president of the Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Jordan and the Holy Land.

Edward Said. *The End of the Peace Process: Oslo and After*. New York: Vintage Books, 2001.

The late Edward W. Said was University Professor of English and Comparative Literature at Columbia University. In fifty essays (most of which were originally published in the *Cairo Abram Weekly* and London’s *al-Hayat*), Palestinian writer and Columbia University literary scholar Said offers a bleak view of the Middle East peace process since Oslo. Deeply concerned with the Palestinian people, Said argues that peace can exist only if equality and respect exist.

Unger, Peter C. “The Inevitable Two-State Solution,” *World Policy Journal*. Summer 2002.

The author, a member of the *New York Times* editorial board and adjunct professor at Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, argues that by the middle of the 21st century, there will be an uneasy peace established between Israelis and Palestinians, manifested through the creation of an independent state of Palestine alongside Israel. Unger sketches the possibilities and problems inherent in other potential solutions, acknowledges the challenges to achieving a two-state solution, and then makes a case for why a two-state solution will eventually be accepted by both sides as the only acceptable resolution to the conflict.

Wagner, Donald E. *Dying in the Land of Promise*. London: Melisende, 2001

The history of Palestinian Christianity is tragic and inspiring, calling for a response to a community that is endangered in the “land of promise,” given the present rates of emigration, economic blight, and an all too delayed resolution to the political conflict in the Holy Land today. With a just resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, Wagner envisions Palestinian Christians playing a pivotal role in building bridges of reconciliation. With the help of Western Christians, these Palestinians might well see a different future whenever peace follows justice.

5. *Filmography & Literature*

Susan AlbuHawa: *Mornings in Jenin*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2010

The daughter of Palestinian refugees of the [1967 War](#), Susan AlbuHawa grew up in Kuwait, Jordan, occupied East Jerusalem, and the United States. In this novel, she tells the story of the Abulhejas who are forcibly removed to the Jenin refugee camp. This is the Palestinian story told through four generations of a single family.

Sandy Tolan: *The Lemon Tree*. New York: Bloomsbury, 2006

Tolan is a teacher and radio documentary producer. The *Washington Post* selected this book among its top nonfiction titles for 2006. He has reported from more than thirty countries, especially in the Middle East, Latin America, the Balkans, and Eastern Europe. This novel is the story of Dalia, an Israeli college student, and Bashir, a Palestinian, who began a rare friendship, forged in the aftermath of war and tested over the next thirty-five years in ways that neither could imagine on that summer day in 1967. Based on extensive research, Tolan brings the Israeli-Palestinian conflict down to its most human level, suggesting that even amid the bleakest political realities there exist stories of hope and reconciliation.

Paradise Now. 2005 Augustus Film, produced by: Warner Brothers

Golden Globe award winning film (also an Academy Award nominee for Best Foreign Language Film) that tells the story of Said and Khaled, two young Palestinians who plan a suicide mission into Tel Aviv. It ultimately tells of two different outcomes, laying bare both the humanity and horror of acts that are impossible to understand, arising from a context in which there are no easy answers.

2048—a film by Yaron Kaftori (Israel 2010)

A young cinematographer discovers that his grandfather, who was a documentary filmmaker, made a film about Israel's 60th Independence Day. However Israel no longer exists and its former citizens are scattered all over the globe, living as modern day refugees. After watching his grandfather's tapes and in an effort to understand what went wrong, the young man travels the world interviewing former Israelis who, each from his own perspective, tells the story of what happened during the last forty years.

Beaufort (2007) by Joseph Cedar

Set as the last Israeli soldiers are withdrawing from Lebanon in 2000, it explores the feelings, fears, and moral dilemmas posed by the eighteen-year war and occupation in Southern Lebanon. Based on [Ron Leshem's](#) novel, *If There's a Heaven*, and nominated for an Academy Award.

Dolphin Boy (2011) by Dani Menkin and Yonatan Nir.

Provides a basis for questions about societies within Israel, trauma, psychology.

Precious Life (2010) by Shlomi Eldar

With the help of a prominent Israeli journalist, *Precious Life* chronicles the struggle of an Israeli pediatrician and a Palestinian mother to get treatment for her baby, who suffers from an incurable genetic disease.

Three Faiths, One God: Judaism, Christianity, Islam (2005) by Auteur Productions.

This production thoughtfully examines the religious beliefs and practices shared by Jews, Christians, and Muslims to illustrate how many individuals in the Abrahamic faith communities are dealing with historical conflicts yet remain

dedicated to facilitating understanding and respect. *Three Faiths, One God* captures a broad range of voices and ideas of ordinary people and respected scholars in the interfaith field. The program contrasts the religious practices of the three faiths, including the rituals of fasting and marriage.

ENDNOTES

1. Eph. 2:14.
2. 2 Cor. 5:16–20.
3. The Middle East Study Committee is deeply thankful for the gracious welcome and engaging conversations that we had during this time with our Middle Eastern Christian partners, their Jewish and Muslim neighbors, and other political and religious leaders.
4. The terminology for the two testaments of the Christian Bible used throughout this paper is “Older Testament” and “Newer Testament,” following a suggestion made in another paper that is before the 219th General Assembly (2010), “Christians and Jews: People of God.” “Older”/“Newer” emphasizes that the relationship between the two testaments is one of chronology, not of supersession. That is, the Newer Testament has not superseded the Older and has not rendered the Older obsolete and without authority.
5. In Judaism, these books are divided into three sections: the Torah (Genesis through Deuteronomy), first in its hierarchy of biblical authority; the Prophets (the books of the major and minor prophets, excluding Daniel, plus Joshua, Judges, 1–2 Samuel, and 1–2 Kings), second in its hierarchy of biblical authority; and the Writings (all the other books, including Daniel), third in its hierarchy of biblical authority.
6. *Mishnah*, Tractate Abot 1:18, as translated by Judah Goldin in *The Living Talmud* (Mentor Books, 1957), p. 75.
7. From “*Perek Ha-shalom*,” an appendix to “*Derek Eretz Zuta*,” a minor treatise in the *Babylonian Talmud*, as quoted from Avi Weinstein, “My Truth or Our Peace, You Choose!,” p. 3 of 4. Weinstein also provides a Hebrew text of the saying. His paper was accessed on October 26, 2009, at the website: www.hillel.org/NR/rdonlyres/729CB895-1832-4F6A-9585-3944D435E190/0/truth_or_peace.pdf.
8. Please note that in the Newer Testament, the Greek word *dikaïos* may often be translated “just” even in texts where the NRSV translates it “righteous,” and that *dikaïosune* may often be translated “justice” even in texts where the NRSV translates it “righteousness.” In many of the NT texts quoted below, “just” and “justice” translate *dikaïos* and *dikaïosune*. In others, “justice” translates the Greek word *kerisis*.
9. See, for example, Suras 4:58, 4:105, 4:135; 5:9; 7:29; 16:90; and 57:25.
10. As preserved by Bayhaqi from ‘Umar’s son, according to the anthology of *hadith* entitled *Mishkat al-Masabih* (*Niches of Lamps*), compiled by al-Khatib al-Tibrizi. Translated by John Alden Williams, in *Themes of Islamic Civilization* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971), p. 67.
11. Translation by Abdullah Yusuf Ali, in *The Holy Qur’an* (Islamic Propagation Centre International, 1946), p. 223; not printed stichometrically here, unlike Ali’s translation.
12. *Sifre Deut. 16* (ed. Meir Friedmann, Vienna, 1864, p. 68b), as quoted by Wilhelm Bacher, in “Simeon (Ben Gamaliel II),” *The Jewish Encyclopedia* (Funk and Wagnalls, 1901–1906): accessed on October 26, 2009, at www.jewishencyclopedia.com/view.jsp?artid=732&letter=S.
13. Footnote 621 (p. 214) in Ali’s translation of *The Holy Qur’an* [see above, fn. 12].
14. Isa. 28:17; 59:14–15; Hos. 10:13; Mt. 22:16; Jn. 18:37–38.
15. Ex. 23:6; Deut. 10:18; Isa. 1:17; Jer. 5:28; 22:3, 16; Pss. 72:2–4, 82:3–4, 140:12, 146:7; Mt. 1:19, 25:37–40; Lk. 4:18–21, 7:22, 14:13, 16:19–31.
16. Deut. 10:18; 24:17, 19; Mt. 7:12; Lk. 7:1–10, 10:25–37.

17. Jer. 21:11, 22:3; Lk. 19:1–9.
18. Dan. 4:37; Mt. 23:12; Lk. 1:51.
19. Deut. 1:16–17, 16:19; Ezek. 18:8; 2 Chr. 19:7; Lk. 18:2–5. Unjust judgments are illustrated by Herod Antipas’ beheading of John the Baptist (Mt. 14:3–12) and Pilate’s crucifixion of Jesus (Lk. 23:13–25).
20. Isa. 1:17, 58:6; Jer. 21:12, 22:17; Ezek. 18:7; Pss. 72:4, 103:6, 146:7; Mk. 12:38–40; Lk. 1:51–53, 4:18, 19:1–8.
21. 1 Kings 11:38; Ezek. 18:5–9; Ps. 19:9; Mt. 5:17–20; Mk. 12:28–34; Lk. 1:5–6; Rom. 2:13, 8:4; Phil. 3:6b.
22. Lk. 23:50–51; Jn. 5:30; Eph. 5:9–10; 1 Jn. 3:7b.
23. Isa. 9:7, 32:16–17; Mk. 9:50; Lk. 1:78–79; Jas. 3:18.
24. Jer. 22:3, 17; Mt. 6:24; Lk. 19:1–8; Isa. 1:21, 5:7; Mt. 27:3–4; Lk. 13:1; Mt. 11:12; Acts 12:1–2; Hos. 10:13; Ps. 33:16–17.
25. *Islam: The Straight Path*, expanded ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), pp. 30–31.
26. 2 Sam 5:6–7a.
27. 2 Sam. 5:7b; 1 Kings 8:1.
28. Pss. 20:2–3, 76:2, 78:68–69.
29. Isa. 8:18; Pss. 48:12–14, 65:1–4, 74:2c, 76:2, 132:13–14; cf. Deut. 12:5; 1 Kings 8:28–29.
30. Pss. 50:2, 84:7; cf. Isa. 6:1–8.
31. 2 Kings 19:20–21, 31; Ps. 87:1–3; Isa. 10:24, 30:19, 33:20; Lam. 2:8–10.
32. Isa. 51:16; Zech. 2:7 NIV/KJV, 9:13.
33. Isa. 35:10; 46:13; 51:3, 11; 61:1–4; 62:1, 11–12; Joel 3:17; Zeph. 3:14–20; Zech. 1:14–17, 2:10–13, 8:3–8; Pss. 69:35–36, 102:12–22, 126:1–3.
34. Isa. 2:2–4; Micah 4:1–4; Zech. 9:9–10.
35. Jer. 50:4–5; Zech. 9:11–13.
36. Cf. Gen. 6:9, 17:1; Deut. 18:13 NIV. Zeph. 2:3MT (Masoretic Text). Jer. 9:5; Zech. 8:16. Jer. 32:31–32, 44:2–3. Ex. 22:25; Lev. 25:37; Deut. 23:19. Ex. 23:8; Deut. 16:19, 27:25; Prov. 17:23. Ps. 125:1.
37. Cf. Deut. 24:15MT (Masoretic Text); Hos. 4:8MT; Ex. 20:7MT, 23:1MT. Lev. 19:12; Jer. 5:2, 7:9; Mal. 3:5. Deut. 6:25MT, 24:13MT.
38. Quoting from the note on Ps. 87:4–6 by Patrick D. Miller, a professor emeritus of Princeton Theological Seminary, in *The HarperCollins Study Bible*, fully revised and updated edition, edited by Harold W. Attridge *et al.* [HarperSanFrancisco, 2006], p. 803.
39. Jerusalem is holy to Muslims primarily because of the Prophet Muhammad’s Night Journey (*al-Isra’*), during which: he was transported on the winged beast *Buraq* from Mecca to Jerusalem; he prayed there with Abraham, Moses, Jesus, and other prophets; and he then ascended from the rock of the Jewish Temple Mount to the Divine Presence through the seven heavens (*al-Mi’raj*). Both the Al-Aqsa mosque and the Dome of the Rock were built at the end of the 7th century to commemorate that journey and experience.
40. This section has addressed only the biblical uses of the term “Zion” and does not at all address the phenomenon of either Jewish Zionism or Christian Zionism. Jewish Zionism is too complex and diverse a set of historical movements to be defined or described in brief. For a Jewish perspective, go to: www.mideastweb.org/zionism.htm. For a Palestinian perspective, see the presentation by Professor Munther S. Dajani, “Judaism and Zionism and

Human Rights from a Palestinian Perspective.” Do a Google search by entering “Munther S. Dajani” and “Judaism and Zionism”; then click on “(Cached).” For a PC(USA) document describing Christian Zionism, go to: www.pcusa.org/worldwide/israelpalestine/resources/21christianzionism.pdf.

41. The date was Sept. 10, 2000, and the four scholars were Tikvah Frymer-Kensky, David Novak, Peter Ochs, and Michael Signer. The text of “*Dabru Emet*” can be found at: www.jcrelations.net/en/?item=1014.

42. Gen. 12:2, 7; 15:5–7, 18; 17:3–8; 24:7; 26:2–5; 28:4, 15; 35:11–12; 48:3–4, 21–22; 50:24–25.

43. Cf. Ex. 2:24–25, 6:8, 32:13, 33:1; Lev. 26:42; Deut. 1:8, 34:4; Ps. 105:7–11; 1 Chr. 16:14–18.

44. The Hebrew word *ger*, translated “stranger” or “sojourner” or “alien,” designates foreigners who live among the Israelites. “Strangers” were not full members of ancient Israelite society and were considered to be of lower status, but they were afforded a measure of legal protection. Needless to say, Palestinians do not consider themselves to be “strangers” in the land, and this term should not be interpreted as in any way describing them.

45. See, for example, the book by W. Eugene March, former dean of Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary, entitled *Israel and the Politics of Land: A Theological Case Study* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994), pp. 53–57.

46. In the *Exodus* volume of the Jewish Publication Society Torah Commentary (Philadelphia, 1991), p. 149.

47. E.g., Deut. 2:31–36, 3:3–7, 7:1–6, 13:12–18, 20:16–18; Josh. 6:20–21, 8:24–29, 10:34–42, 11:10–12, 11:18–20; Judg. 1:17; 1 Sam. 15:1–3.

48. See the preface to the second edition of *The Land: Place as Gift, Promise, and Challenge in Biblical Faith* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), by Walter Brueggemann, a professor emeritus of Columbia Theological Seminary in Decatur, Georgia, p. xiv.

49. “Is There a Counterpart in the Hebrew Bible to New Testament Antisemitism?” *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 22 (1985), 242–260.

50. “Supersessionism” holds that Christians have supplanted Jews so that now Christians are the only legitimate heirs of God’s covenant with Abraham. See also fn. 5.

51. March, *Israel and the Politics of Land* (fn. 46 above), p. 68.

52. See the text above at fnn. 45 and 46.

53. Robert Wilken, in *No Religion Is an Island: The Nostra Aetate Dialogues*, ed. Edward Bristow (Fordham University Press, 1998), pp. 128–129. For much greater detail, see Wilken’s *The Land Called Holy: Palestine in Christian History and Thought* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992).

54. Wilken, in *No Religion*, pp. 129–130.

55. See Sidney Griffith, “From Aramaic to Arabic: The Languages of the Monasteries of Palestine in the Byzantine and Early Islamic Periods,” in the *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 51 (1997), 11–31.

56. See Wilken, in *No Religion*, p. 133.

57. See fn. 40.

58. See, for example, the General Assembly statements of 1974 (*Minutes*, UPCUSA, 1974, Part I, p. 584), 1978 (*Minutes*, UPCUSA, 1978, Part I, p. 276; *Minutes*, PCUS, 1978, Part I, p. 39), 1987 (*Minutes*, 1987, Part I, p. 870), 1995 (*Minutes*, 1995, Part I, pp. 688–89), and 2003 (*Minutes*, 2003, Part I, pp.635–37, Item B.1.). The phrase “the right of Israel to exist” is a source of pain for some members of the 2009–2010 Middle East Study Committee, who are in solidarity with Palestinians who feel that the state of Israel has denied them their inalienable human rights.

59. See, for example, the General Assembly statements of 1974 (*Minutes*, UPCUSA, 1974, Part I, p. 584), 1978 (*Minutes*, PCUS, 1978, Part I, p. 39; *Minutes*, UPCUSA, 1978, Part I, p. 276), 1982 (*Minutes*, PCUS, 1982, Part I, p. 93), 2002 (*Minutes*, 2002, Part I, p. 732, Item 1.b.), and 2003 (*Minutes*, 2003, Part I, pp.635–37, Item B.).

60. See, for example, the General Assembly statements of 1978 (*Minutes*, UPCUSA, 1978, Part I, p. 276; *Minutes*, PCUS, 1978, Part I, p. 39), 1987 (*Minutes*, PCUSA, 1987, Part I, p. 870), 1995 (*Minutes*, 1995, Part I, pp. 688–89), 2002 (*Minutes*, 2002, Part I, p. 732, Item 1.c.), and 2003 (*Minutes*, 2003, Part I, pp.635–37, Item B.1.).
61. See, for example, the General Assembly statements of 1978 (*Minutes*, PCUS, 1978, Part I, pp. 79, 190), 1997 (*Minutes*, PCUSA, 1997, Part I, pp. 560–84), 2001 (*Minutes*, 2001, Part I, pp. 54–55), 2002 (*Minutes*, 2002, Part I, p. 732, Item 1.a.), and 2003 (*Minutes*, 2003, Part I, pp.635–37, Item B.2. and C.).
62. See, for example, the General Assembly statements of 1974 (*Minutes*, UPCUSA, 1974, Part I., p. 584), 1995 (*Minutes*, 1995, Part I, pp. 688–89), 1998 (*Minutes*, 1998, Part I, pp. 655–56), 2000 (*Minutes*, 2000, Part I, p. 498), and 2002 (*Minutes*, 2002, Part I, p. 733, Item 1.f.).
63. For the text, see www.pcusa.org/oga/publications/christians-jews.pdf.
64. See p. 17 of 40 in the pdf file (p. 13 of the paper).
65. See pp. 18–19 of 40 in the pdf file (pp. 14–15 of the paper).
66. See the final draft of “Christians and Jews: People of God.”
67. P. 19 of 40 in the pdf file (p. 15 of the paper).
68. See also 2 Cor. 5:14–15; 1 Tim. 4:6.
69. Intriguingly, several ancient witnesses to the text of John 12:32, quoted just above, reflect the same “cosmic” theology found here in Colossians, reading *panta* (all things) rather than *pantas* (all people).
70. “The Second Letter to the Corinthians,” in *The New Interpreter’s Bible*, vol. XI (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2000), p. 98.
71. Within those congregations that follow the Revised Common Lectionary strictly, neither ch. 27 nor ch. 33 is ever read or preached on during worship. In fact only one passage about Jacob and Esau (their birth and Esau’s lost birthright) and three other episodes from the life of Jacob (his dream of the heavenly ladder at Bethel, his marriage to Leah and Rachel, and his wrestling with the “man” at Peniel), are ever read. For this reason, the story of these twins is summarized rather fully in the following paragraphs.
72. This parable is well known to Presbyterians. In churches following the Revised Common Lectionary it was just read on the Fourth Sunday in Lent, March 14, 2010, along with 2 Cor. 5:16–21 (see above, at fn. 68)! Still, the interpretation of the parable offered here may not be familiar to many.
73. This committee represents a considerable diversity in life experiences, theological perspectives, and views of current reality in the Israel-Palestinian conflict. This will become obvious through reading the four individual vignettes that have been written by committee members and are included in this section of the report. It has been encouraging to see how the committee has worked to respect the struggles, pains, experiences, and opinions of each of its members. We have worked hard to find consensus of opinion as we have proceeded with each section of this report and with our recommendations. As one can imagine given the complexity of the situation, this has not always been possible.
74. The Middle East Study Committee (MESC) met four times: April 1–3 (Washington, D.C.), August 17–September 1 (Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, Israel, and Palestine), November 11–13 (New York City), January 29–30 (Louisville, Ky.). A complete list of all the individuals with whom the committee met is available in Appendix 1. Great care was taken to assure that equal voice was given to all viewpoints.
75. The results of that survey are included in Appendix 3.
76. The MESC was not able to gain access to Gaza due to the recent war and blockade, under which Israeli forces have prevented most church representatives from entering that territory; and therefore we did not have the opportunity to hear the voice of Hamas. Our time limitations did not permit us to have conversations with members of the Likud in Israel or Hezbollah in Lebanon. From the time of the appointment of this committee in February

- 2009 until the submission of this report on March 5, 2010, the committee has attempted to make the best use of the limited time and resources that we have been provided.
77. Avraham Burg, *The Holocaust Is Over; We Must Rise From Its Ashes* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 5.
 78. Abunimah, Ali, *One Country: A Bold Proposal to End the Israeli-Palestinian Impasse* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2006),
 79. Burg, 8.
 80. Burg, 9.
 81. This is not the case with Avraham Burg and a growing number of American and Israeli Jews.
 82. Sabeel is an ecumenical theological center in Jerusalem, which work for the liberation of Palestinians.
 83. Ateek, Naim Stifan, *A Palestinian Christian Cry for Reconciliation* (New York: Orbis Books, 2009), 3.
 84. This is not the case with Naim Ateek or with Nahida Gordon, whose vignette follows.
 85. Steven R. Feldman, *Compartments: How the Brightest, Best Trained, and Most Caring People can Make Judgments That are Completely and Utterly Wrong* (Xlibris, 2009), 10.
 86. Feldman, 132.
 87. Feldman, 147.
 88. Feldman, 148.
 89. Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.). *Christian Presence in Israel and Palestine, Resource Sheet 5 of 27: Developed February 2005, updated March 2006*, www.pcusa.org/worldwide/israelpalestine/resources.htm.
 90. Christians in the Middle East, BBC News, Last Updated: Thursday, 15 December 2005. Can be accessed at http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/4499668.stm. Data sources were: World Christian Database, *Al-Nahar* (a major Lebanese national daily newspaper), the Government of Israel, U.S. State Department reports on religious freedom; CIA World Factbook, the UN special representative for Iran; UNDP, the World Bank, Egyptian government, the Palestinian Authority, the Government of Jordan, and the Government of Iran.
 91. Collins, Rania Al Qass; Rifat Odeh Kassiss; and Mitri Raheb, Editors, *Palestinian Christians: Facts, Figures and Trends 2008* (Bethlehem, Palestine: Diyar Consortium, 2008), 6.
 92. Soudah' Romell. *Christians in the Holy Land: Across the Political and Economic Divide. The Sabeel Survey on Palestinian Christians in the West Bank and Israel, 2006.*
 93. Khoury, Samia. Member of the board of Sabeel. Personal communication.
 94. Feldman, 161.
 95. <http://www.iaea.org/NewsCenter/PressReleases/2010/prn201002.html>
 96. <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/19/world/middleeast/19iran.html>
 97. The Federation of American Scientist estimates the number less than 100 (<http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/israel/nuke/>). The Wisconsin Project on Nuclear Arms Control reports that Israel is currently the sixth most powerful nuclear state, with a stockpile of over 100 nuclear weapons (<http://www.wisconsinproject.org/countries/israel/nuke.html>).
 98. From September 29, 2000, to December 26, 2008, 4,860 Palestinians were killed (Gaza Strip, West Bank, and Israel) by occupation forces and 47 by Israeli civilians for a total of 4,907. (Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs web site: <http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/>) We know that violence takes various forms, overt and then more structural, and these figures only portray the overt violence.

99. According to records from the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the first recorded suicide bombing occurred in April 6, 1994. Total deaths recorded due to suicide bombings in Israel for the years 2000 to 2008 are listed as 553 from a total of 147 attacks. (Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs web site: <http://www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/>). According to the Israeli Central Bureau of Statistics, the population of Israel at the end of 2008 was composed of 1,487,600 ethnic Palestinians (Israeli Central Bureau of Statistics, Statistical Abstracts of Israel 2009 No. 60, Table 2.1) and there have been 147 suicide bombers, thus .0098 percent of Palestinians resort to this extreme violence.
100. B'Tselem – The Israeli Information Center for Human Rights in the Occupied Territories, 2008 Annual Report: Human Rights in the Occupied Territories, 15. Can be accessed at http://www.btselem.org/download/200712_annual_report_eng.pdf.
101. UN's Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs Occupied Palestinian Territory, The Humanitarian Impact on Palestinians of Israeli Settlements and other Infrastructure in the West Bank, 48.
102. Israeli Committee Against House Demolition. See <http://www.icahd.org/eng/docs/ICAHD's%20updated%20House%20demolition%20statistics.pdf>.
103. Ibid, <http://www.icahd.org/eng/docs/Cast%20Lead%20demolitions.pdf>.
104. Ibid.
105. For example, the Middle East Council of Churches through its Department of Service to Palestinian Refugees (DSPR) continues to bear a strong and necessary Christian witness and to resist the occupation and the siege of the Gaza Strip by providing educational and vocational training and health services in Gaza. A detailed description of this work can be found in the DSPR–Gaza Area *Annual Report 2009*, see <http://www.neccgaza.org/>.
106. “The Amman Call” can be found in Appendix 4.
107. In August 2009, the Middle East Study Committee was invited to participate in part of a PIEF week of study in Bethlehem at the Dar Annadwa Conference Center.
108. “Kairos Palestine: A Moment of Truth” can be found in Appendix 5.
109. Feldman, 163.
110. Burg, xiv.
111. See Appendix 2, General Assembly Policy Review

APPENDIXES

Appendix 1:

List of Contacts Made by Middle East Study Committee

April 1–3, 2009—Washington, D.C.

- Bill Somplatsky-Jarman, associate for Mission Responsibility Through Investment, Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)
- Archbishop Viken Aykazian, Armenian Orthodox Church; then-president of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.
- The Reverend Dr. Canon John Peterson, representative of the Bishop of Washington and the Bishop of Jerusalem, Episcopal Church
- Dr. Noura Erakat, adjunct professor, International Human Rights Law in the Middle East, Georgetown University
- Dr. Stephen M. Colecchi, director, Office of International Justice and Peace, U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops
- Attorney Mark Pelavin, associate director, Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism

Rueben Brigety, director of the Sustainable Security Program, Center for American Progress

Dr. Marc Braverman, clinical psychologist and author, executive director of the Holy Land Peace Project

HE Ambassador Thomas Goldberger, director, Office of Israel and Palestinian Affairs, Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs, U.S. Department of State

HE Ambassador Warren Clark, director, Churches for Middle East Peace

August 16–30, 2009—Travel Trip to Middle East

1. Lebanon

Dr. Joseph Jabbra, president, Lebanese American University, Beirut, Lebanon

Dr. Mary Mikheal, president, Near East School of Theology, Beirut, Lebanon

Dr. Paul Haidostian, president, Haigazian University, Beirut, Lebanon

HE. Metropolitan Mar Theophilos George Saliba, archbishop of Mount Lebanon, Syrian Orthodox Church

The Reverend George Mourad, moderator, National Evangelical Synod of Syria and Lebanon

The Reverend Fadi Dagher, general secretary, National Evangelical Synod of Syria and Lebanon

National Evangelical Synod of Syria and Lebanon Leadership (about twenty-five persons)

Guirgis Saleh, general secretary, The Middle East Council of Churches

The Reverend Dr. Habib Badr, presiding pastor, The National Evangelical Church of Beirut; representative of Middle East Council of Churches Executive Committee

The Reverend Dr. Riad Jarjour, general secretary, Arab Group for Christian-Muslim Relations; Participated in the Group's Monthly Meeting (Panel Presentations on the subject "The Diminishing Christian Presence in the Middle East") Beirut, Lebanon

Representatives of the Iraqi Presbyterian Church

HE Metropolitan Elias Audeh, Archbishop, The Greek Orthodox Church of Antioch and All the East, Beirut and Mount Lebanon

2. Syria

HE Archbishop Boulos Matar, archbishop of Beirut Maronite Bishopric, and president of the Catholic Member Churches of the Middle East Council of Churches

His Beatitude Igantius IV Hazim, Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch and All of the East, Damascus, Syria

His Beatitude Gregorios III, Greek Catholic Patriarch of Antioch and All the East, Damascus, Syria

The Reverend Boutrus Zaour, pastor, and a leadership group of the Evangelical (Presbyterian) Church of Damascus, Syria

Madame Colette Khoury, cultural advisor to President Bashar Al-Assad and author (also, a member of the Evangelical Church, Damascus)

Presbyterian pastor and representative of the Evangelical (Presbyterian) Church of Iran

3. Jordan

His Excellency Senator Akel Biltaji, former minister of Tourism and Antiquities and special advisor to His Majesty King Abdullah II, Amman

Wafa Goussous, director, the Middle East Council of Churches' Amman Liaison Office

Father Nabil Haddad, the Jordanian Interfaith Co-existence Research Center, Amman

The Reverend Fadi Diab, pastor, Redeemer Church in Amman, Jordan (The committee also worshiped and engaged in a time of fellowship and conversation with the congregation.)

The Reverend Fa'eq Haddad, Episcopal Diocese of Jerusalem and Middle East, Amman

The Reverend Samer Azar, pastor, Evangelical Lutheran Good Shepherd Church, Amman, Jordan

4. Israel/Palestine

Dr. Mahdi Abdel Hadi, director of PASSIA (The Palestinian Academic Society for the Study of International Affairs), Jerusalem

His Beatitude Fouad Twail, Patriarch, Latin (Roman Catholic) Patriarchate of Jerusalem

Rabbi Dr. Ron Kronish, director, The Interreligious Coordinating Council in Israel

Rabbi Na'amah Kelman, dean, Hebrew Union College, Jerusalem

Rabbi Shelton Donnell, retired rabbi living in Jerusalem

Ophir Yarden, director, The Center for Interreligious Encounter with Israel, ICCI

Rabbi Navah Hefetz, director of Education, Rabbis for Human Rights

Stuart Schoffman, senior fellow, The Shalom Hartman Institute, Jerusalem

Yael Stein, research director at B'Tselem (The Israeli Information Center for Human Rights in the Occupied Territory), Jerusalem

The Reverend Cannon Robert Edmunds, St. George the Martyr Episcopal Cathedral Church, Jerusalem. (The Committee also worshiped with the congregation of St. George's parish church.)

Judith Harel, Information and Advocacy Unit, UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs in the Occupied Territories, Jerusalem

Rabbi Edward Rettig, associate director for Legislative and Educational Affairs, The American Jewish Committee, Jerusalem

Daniel Rossing, director, The Jerusalem Center for Jewish Christian Relations

HE Avraham Burg, Former MK and Speaker of the Knesset and Cabinet Minister and author

David Wilder, spokesman, The Jewish Community (Israeli Settlement Association) of Hebron

Christian Peacemaker Team, Hebron

The Reverend Mark Brown, regional representative, The Lutheran World Federation, Jerusalem

Dr. Tawfiq Nasser, chief executive officer, Augusta Victoria Hospital, Mt. of Olives, Jerusalem

The Reverend Ian Alexander, international coordinator, SABEEL Ecumenical Liberation Theology Center, Jerusalem

Nora Carmi, Cedar Duaybis, Samia Khoury, directors, SABEEL

Dar Annadwa's 5th Annual Conference: The Kairos and the Intersection of Theology and Politics, Bethlehem

Angela Godfrey-Goldstein, Israeli Committee Against Home Demolition, Jerusalem

November 11–13, 2009—New York

HE Ambassador Riyad Mansour, permanent observer of the Palestine Authority to the United Nations

HE Ambassador Daniel Carmon, deputy permanent representative of Israel to the United Nations

Chris Ferguson, representative to the United Nations from the World Council of Churches

Appendix 2:

General Assembly Policy Review

A Continuing Witness for Middle East Peace with Current Application

Introduction:

This summary begins with a very brief historical review of the context for Presbyterian mission and relationships in the larger Middle East since 1856 and then concentrates on positions taken by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), including its predecessor denominations, on Israel/Palestine and on the several wars that have occurred in the recent period (including the Iranian revolution, the first Gulf War, and the Iraq war begun in March 2003). Presbyterian-founded educational and medical institutions remain particularly notable in Cairo and Beirut but mission partnerships and ecumenical relations link us with 15 million Arab Christians throughout the region. Their presence, the importance of the “Holy Land” for our faith, the tragic frequency of violence, and enormous U.S. geostrategic investments in oil and Israel, have prompted frequent General Assembly attention, averaging a policy or shorter resolution every other year since 1967.

The General Assembly Social Witness Policy Compilation (available on the Advisory Committee on Social Witness Policy (ACSWP) website: www.pcusa.org/acswp) includes excerpts from most of social policy statements of the General Assembly. The latest comprehensive statement on the Middle East dates from 1997; it shows great continuity with the statement of 1949 concerning Palestinian refugees and with the equally comprehensive policy statement of 1974. General Assembly statements generally consist of study or rationale sections (partly in appendices in this study) accompanied by recommendations for study, action, and witness. Copies of the 1997 statement may be downloaded free of charge from the ACSWP website. Similarly, resolutions on the Iraq war (2003, 2004, and 2008) and “Violence, Religion, and Terrorism” (2004) are available in both print and cyber form and in several issues of *Church & Society* magazine (2003, 2004, 2006). In shortest summary, this policy stream consistently finds the Israeli occupation of Palestine to be at or near the heart of too many regional conflicts, although the U.S. invasion and occupation of Iraq has created both new refugees and new forms of ideological response.

Context and History of Mission

Although the Orthodox Churches of the Middle East (Coptic, Syrian, Armenian, Assyrian, and Byzantine [also known as Greek]), and Catholic churches (Coptic, Maronite, Melkite, Greek, and Latin Rite [Roman]) maintain continuity with the earliest Christian communities and have generally lived under Islamic governments since the early Islamic conquests of the late 600s and early 700s, any treatment of the Middle East must note the history of the Crusades and the fall of Constantinople, now Istanbul, the removal of Islam from most of Europe by 1492, and then the relatively brief European colonial history that followed the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire after Turkey’s defeat in WWI. The Protestant denominations entered the Middle East in the 19th century, with each denomination taking particular areas. The Presbyterians (with the Congregationalists) began work in Syria and Lebanon in the early mid 1820s, in Iran in the mid 1830s, in Iraq (jointly with the Reformed and Congregational Churches) in the mid 1840s, and in Egypt in the mid 1850s. The Anglicans (Church of England), as well as the Lutherans (i.e., the “German Mission” consisting of the German Lutheran “state church” and the German “Free Church,” i.e., Reformed) focused their mission activity in Jerusalem, Jordan, and the Holy Land. The post-WWII period was marked by the independence (decolonization) of a variety of Middle Eastern countries (some with relatively recent boundaries), the rise of the oil states generally, and through Saudi Arabia particularly, the influence of a very conservative Wahabist strain of Islam. Pan-Arab and Pan-Islamic movements have had some influence in the post-war period, but nationalism has been the prevailing model, with Islam providing a counterweight to Western cultural (if not economic) influence.

Overview of Positions on Arab-Israeli-Palestinian Peace Efforts

From 1948 forward, recognition of Israel has been accompanied by concern for the original refugees (about 750,000) displaced during the 1947–49 period. Statements note the role of Egypt and Jordan in controlling Gaza

and the West Bank, respectively, until 1967. Historical summaries are found in the 1974 and 1997 church background reports. These note the 1956 Suez-Sinai war between Egypt and Britain and France, joined by an Israeli attack across Sinai and slow withdrawal. The Eisenhower administration effectively backed Egypt's right to control the Suez canal, but Cold War and other developments led to Egypt and other Arab states aligning themselves more or less with the Soviet Union, while Israel's ties with the U.S. became closer and included U.S. acceptance of Israel's nuclear weapons development.

The major 1974 United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. (UPCUSA) statement was begun at the General Assembly's request in 1971 and speaks consistently of the "Palestinians," whose organizations were being developed in the 1964–65 period. The 1974 report summarizes the political-military situation in Israel/Palestine as follows:

In the 1967 war, Israel occupied positions in the Golan area of Syria, the whole of Sinai with its strategic position on the Suez Canal and at Sharm-el-Sheik, all of Jerusalem, and the West Bank of the Jordan. In 1970, Egypt, Jordan and Israel accepted the provisions of United Nations Resolution 242, adopted in November of 1967, which called for Israeli withdrawal from occupied territory and Arab recognition of Israel and secure and recognized boundaries, but differing interpretations of these provisions and the means to implement them led to continual impasse ... the stage was set for the October, 1973, fighting. (*Minutes*, UPCUSA, 1974, Part I, p. 15)

The 1974 recommendations include "criteria" for "the evaluation of any proposed settlement," as well as encouragement for study, interfaith dialogue, advocacy, and ecumenical coordination. The presupposition was that the occupation should end in accordance with international law, even though the pattern of Israel's resisting any United Nations involvement, except to care for refugees, was already visible.

The later 1970s were marked by the achievement of Camp David agreement in 1980 by Jimmy Carter, Menachem Begin, and Anwar Sadat, but no substantial progress followed. Thus the 1995 statement sums up many resolutions in this excerpt:

The 207th General Assembly (1995)

1. Reaffirm[s] actions of previous General Assemblies (1974, 1984, 1988, 1990) supporting the status of Jerusalem. [A shared status, reflecting the "international city" status recommended by the UN—ed.]
2. Reaffirm[s] the actions of previous General Assemblies (1974, 1977, 1983, 1984, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991) acknowledging the right of Israel to exist within secure, internationally recognized borders and the right of the Palestinians to self-determination.
3. Urges the president and the United States Congress to:
 - a. support the United Nations in the implementation of its resolutions on the future of Jerusalem;
 - b. renew efforts to make U.S. aid to Israel conditional upon the cessation of the appropriation of Palestinian land in and around Jerusalem and the establishment of new settlements in the occupied territories, especially those that are a part of the ongoing efforts to create a Greater Jerusalem.

At that time, a new peace process had started in 1993 following the First Intifada (1987 forward) that, notwithstanding its non-violent origins, had been met with massive arrests, long term detentions, and deportations, leading to further violence. Here the pattern of disproportionately more Palestinian than Israeli civilian deaths is marked.

The 1997 PC(USA) policy continues the presumption that a two-state solution can be negotiated with the role of the U.S. as "honest broker," although there is less faith about the role of the U.S. Recommendations include:

Call upon the United States to take effective measures, including withholding aid and joining in efforts of the United Nations Security Council, to oppose expansion of Israeli settlements in Gaza and the West Bank, and in the Jerusalem area, where unilateral action, without negotiations, exacerbates national and religious tensions, and runs the risk of generating violent confrontation. (*Minutes*, 1997, Part I, p. 14)

Unilateral Israeli settlement expansion continued and great violence continued in a Second Intifada partly triggered by Ariel Sharon's provocative visit to the Dome of the Rock, following the failure of both the Oslo Accords and President Clinton's attempt at a new Camp David agreement. The 2004 resolutions of the PC(USA) against the "security barrier" or "wall" and for "selective divestment" followed recognition of the role of continuing Israeli expansion and collective punishments of Palestinian people, including overwhelming military responses to sometimes terrorist acts of Palestinian resistance, coupled with passivity on the part of the Bush Administration, passivity that continued through Israel's war on Lebanon in the summer of 2006 (after the General Assembly).

The 204th General Assembly (2006) rephrased and broadened the focus of PC(USA) corporate responsibility efforts, clarifying that "divestment" of stock in companies collaborating in the occupation would be the culmination of an explicit process of dialogue and shareholder proposals. Disagreement with "Christian Zionism" by the General Assembly remained in place, as did a call for justice for the Palestinian people and particular concern for Christians being squeezed out by the occupation. The 204th General Assembly (2006) almost supported the campaign to condemn suicide bombings sponsored most notably by the Simon Wiesenthal Center, but generalized the concern to include all innocents subject to bombing and effective terror. It should be noted that the Advocacy Committee for Racial Ethnic Concerns spoke out against the war in Lebanon, and that the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) provided relief supplies afterward to Muslims and Christians alike. Many Christian churches, including several Presbyterian churches, as well as mosques and thousands of homes and fields were destroyed in the very widespread Israeli shelling. The survival of the Shiite Hezbollah forces was seen by them as a triumph, reinforcing religiously motivated Islamic parties throughout the region and leaving the government of Lebanon increasingly weak.

Particular Positions, Primarily as Expressed in the 1997 Middle East Policy

1. Concerning Political Violence

The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) recognizes, "the legitimate right of the state to defend itself and the right of oppressed peoples to resistance and revolution" (*Resolution on the Middle East*, pp. 38–39). While the church recognizes these rights it also consistently called for cessation of violence. The admitted tension in these views is explored in a 1999 resolution that looks at the dilemmas of military intervention for humanitarian purposes and the development of "Just Peacemaking" rather than simply "Just War" criteria for primarily nonmilitary engagement (see Iraq War below). Complex political dynamics are present in the Middle East. Different factions of people within each nation support political violence and sometimes religious and ethnic cleansing. Governance (including in tribal and colonial times) has traditionally not been democratic; several states explicitly favor state religions and many discriminate. Thus struggles present within and among faith traditions aggravate an already volatile context.

2. Concerning Stereotypes

We recognize our biases and fears regarding our American understanding of the Middle East. Two dominant perspectives exist: one fearful of Islam through the portrayal of Islamic Fundamentalism, the other involving the "stereotyping of Arabs as shifty, sinister, and terrorist, reflecting ongoing patterns of racism in American life" (*Ibid.*, p. 38) At an emotional level, unhelpful rhetoric, labels, and other designations justify denials of human rights and the use of violence rather than negotiation. This is part of the church's rationale for encouraging the U.S. government to support serious negotiation and open communication that may lead to peace (*Resolution on the Middle East*, p. 40). The church's repeated condemnation of anti-Semitism can also be considered an opposition to anti-Jewish stereotypes.

3. Concerning Terrorism

The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) has consistently opposed terrorism by all entities and by all means. The "Resolution on Violence, Religion, and Terrorism" (2004) quotes the Federal Bureau of Investigation definition of terrorism as, "the unlawful use of force or violence against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a government, the civilian population, or any segment thereof, in furtherance of political or social goals" (FBI

Terrorist Research and Analytical Center, *Terrorism in the United States: 1990*, Washington, D.C.:U.S. Department of Justice, 1991, p. 25). This operational definition includes the motivation of the groups involved, attempting to make the classification of who or what constitutes terrorism less dependent upon one's own perspective and more on its impacts. Without equating coercive (and surveillance-monitored) situations with violent action itself, the paper addresses the legitimacy of official uses of force. It finds unilateral uses of force to be morally destabilizing. The resolution cautions against overreacting to the fear created by terrorism, advises on understanding and if possible removing its causes, advocates treating it as a form of crime when possible, and warns against possible misuses of the broad surveillance features of the U.S.A. Patriot Act of 2001.

4. Concerning Arms Control

Many governments, and in particular the United States, export weapons to countries in the region in order to support military efforts and existing regimes; others smuggle weapons to resist or change groups in power. The church has opposed the flood of weapons that weaken democracies and the development of new military and security technologies that imprison populations.

The actions of the 209th General Assembly (1997) stand clearly for the de-escalation of the arms race and call for further moderation, urging Congress to enact a Code of Conduct to govern the arms exports of the United States. We have called upon all Middle Eastern countries to join the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Chemical Weapons Convention, and other treaties (Ibid., p. 44). In the wake of claims about nonexistent “weapons of mass destruction” in Iraq, repeated but disputed claims of nuclear weaponization by Iran, and the dangers of nuclear weapons in India and Pakistan, the church has stood by its pro-monitoring and comprehensive treaty positions.

5. Concerning Economic Issues

With much of the economy of the Middle East based upon the production and exportation of oil, there is great concern for the future sustainability of all nations in the region. Further, much of the land has been scarred by the impact of war and continuing strife. The economic burdens of war and costs of occupation are both unsustainable and unjust. The General Assembly urges all nations to assist in developing more sustainable, self-reliant, and socially equitable agricultural systems. We also encourage governments to support economic development by supporting non-petroleum trade with Middle Eastern countries, and call for a more equitable redistribution of U.S. aid funds that presently go mainly to Israel (\$3 billion plus) and Egypt (\$1 billion, based on the Camp David accord). Where the United States and other governments have compromised the infrastructure of countries in the region, especially in Iraq, the church calls for serious reconstruction and re-development (*Iraq: Our Responsibility and the Future*, approved by the 217th General Assembly [2006], pp. 9–10). The General Assembly has also urged caution in the use of economic sanctions to protect the least privileged even when such sanctions have international approval (*Resolution on the Middle East*, p. 52).

6. Concerning Water

Water is in precious, short supply for many in the Middle East. Wars and disputes have been waged over the control of water rights in order to provide growing populations with potable drinking sources and irrigation. The General Assembly has supported both equitable distribution and new technologies to create more sources of fresh water and food self-sufficiency (*Resolution on the Middle East*, pp. 57–58).

7. Concerning Petroleum, Energy, and the Environment

Given massive U.S. dependence on foreign oil, it has been hard to separate security needs from military commitments to “protect our way of life” (*Resolution on the Middle East*, p. 62). The PC(USA) has sought to distinguish our commitments to freedom and democracy from our oil-dependent and carbon-producing transportation, housing, and food production habits. The 1997 Middle East policy included the call to “reduce significantly the American demand for petroleum so as to conserve this nonrenewable resource, protect the environment, reduce balance of payments pressures, and lower energy costs for developing countries” (*Resolution on the Middle East*, p. 64), and thus reduce the need for military presence in the region. While the Iraq war reversed this direction, it was reinforced in the 218th General Assembly (2008) resolution on energy, *The Power To Change*.

Along with consumption patterns, the PC(USA) has long been concerned for wise population control in the Middle East and other regions, noting these while calling upon “the United Nations and its member states to exercise their influence in ... assisting Middle Eastern countries in their efforts to protect and preserve the environment” (*Resolution on the Middle East*, p. 69).

Recent Israeli-Palestinian and related developments

1. The Occupation, the Wall, and Questions about the “Two-State” Solution

The “two-state” solution remains the official international position of most nations, including Israel, the United States, and, at least implicitly, the main Palestinian parties and most Arab states. However, the scope of Israeli settler presence, the scale of the “security barrier” or Wall that largely follows their presence, and the network of roads almost exclusively for Jewish Israeli use, all call the Two-State solution into question. These matters, discussed extensively at the 2004, 2006, and 2008 General Assemblies, led the 218th General Assembly (2008) to authorize a new study of the Middle East with a focus on the Israel-Palestine struggle.

The economic and humanitarian stranglehold on Gaza, following the withdrawal of settlements, efforts to pressure the Hamas government, and finally a disproportionately devastating bombing and invasion in late December of 2008 and early 2009, has only made the two-state solution more remote. Yet, as it stands today (2009), the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) supports an economically and environmentally viable and contiguous Palestine existing peacefully next to an Israel that has internationally-recognized borders. The PC(USA) has been clear in its condemnation of terrorism and its concern for an end for violent attacks of Palestinians on Israelis and vice versa. Rather than focusing on ethnic and religious hatreds, however, the church has understood Israel’s fundamental security problem to be based in the injustice of the occupation of Palestinian land by now more than 450,000 settlers.

2. Christian Population Decline, Muslim Dialogue, and U.S. Re-engagement

Three other elements affect the current mission and witness of the church: the continued pressure on and at least relative decline of the Christian population in Israel/Palestine and elsewhere, the desire of moderate Muslim leaders across the region (and world) to develop an expanded conversation with Christian leaders (as seen in the public statement, “A Common Word”), and the tentative U.S. re-engagement with an Israeli-Palestinian peace process, due in part to international pressure on both the U.S. and Israel. The human rights and humanitarian law implications of the Gaza invasion (detailed in the Goldstone Report) continue to be debated even as a new U.S. administration commits millions of dollars to rebuild structures largely destroyed by U.S.-provided weapons. The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) carries on a range of dialogues with Jewish and Muslim groups, trying to hear both perspectives, and is also conducting a study of Muslim-Christian relations similar to an earlier study of Jewish-Christian relations.

3. Public Witness and Corporate Engagement, Including Divestment of Securities

Along with other forms of public witness, since the early 1970s the PC(USA) has sought to “put its money where its mouth is,” both in positive investment (such as Self-Development of People and OikouCredit) and by using the influence of its foundation and pension investments in companies. The push for corporate social responsibility generally has been very influenced by the churches; it is also controversial for the association of campaigns against South African apartheid—which included divestment—with the use of economic pressure on Israeli occupation and land annexation policies, or continuing violence by Israelis and Palestinians against innocent civilians. The 216th General Assembly (2004) stated that continued Israeli occupation and expansion of settlements required the church to examine which of its investments supported and profited from that occupation and hence posed questions of moral integrity for the church. The 216th General Assembly (2004) action also stated that “selective, phased” divestment (that is, aimed at companies supporting the occupation, not Israeli companies in general) should be a form of witness in a worsening situation. [The 2004 phrasing was the same language that had been used in 1985 for the South Africa policy: See Endnote].

The 217th General Assembly (2006) clarified that divestment was always part of a larger effort of dialogue and engagement with companies, but did not disavow corporate engagement, which continues through the work of the Committee on Mission Responsibility Through Investment (MRTI). The 217th General Assembly (2006) restated its commitment that "... financial investments of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), as they pertain to Israel, Gaza, East Jerusalem, and the West Bank, be invested in only peaceful pursuits, and affirm that the customary corporate engagement process of the Committee on Mission Responsibility Through Investment ... is the proper vehicle for achieving this goal" (*Minutes*, 2006, Part I, p. 944).

Many but not all Jewish groups oppose any corporate pressure on Israeli policies. Conversely, most Palestinian groups, both Christian and Muslim, support such nonviolent pressure, as in "A Moment of Truth," December 11, 2009, statement by Palestinian Christians: Section 4-2-6 "*Palestinian civil organizations, as well as international organizations, NGO's and certain religious institutions call upon individuals, companies and states to engage in divestment and in economic and commercial boycott of everything produced by the occupation. We understand this to integrate the logic of peaceful resistance ...*"

Alongside concerns for the unity of the church and for friendship with the Jewish community, the basic issue is the right of the church to make its own moral decisions about what it will profit from or invest in. This was clearly stated by the 218th General Assembly (2008)'s invocation of the Barmen Declaration in its combined action on the Atlanta and other Middle East overtures. Barmen and other confessions make it quite clear that the church has every right and a basic responsibility under God to witness against any country, company, or policy that deprives God's children of justice. Of several overtures seeking to limit the assembly's voice to general statements deploring violence, one was affirmed that cautioned against "over-identification" with any party to conflicts. At the same time, in also affirming the Amman Call, one may judge the assembly to have identified itself with the ecumenical Christian community.

4. The Impacts of the Iraq and Afghanistan Wars and Iranian Developments

The 218th General Assembly (2008) "commended for study" a paper on the Iraq war entitled, *To Repent, To Restore, To Rebuild, and To Reconcile*. Attached to an overture clearly calling for responsible and timely withdrawal of U.S. and remaining "coalition" forces, the assembly recognized the need for massive reconstruction and the moral responsibility of the United States for thousands of Iraqi and U.S. deaths. Those actions also recognized the crisis caused by more than 4.5 million displaced Iraqis, 2 million internally and 2.5 million in Jordan, Syria, and other neighboring countries. Throughout the six years of this conflict, Arab TV and public commentary has compared the U.S. invasion and presence in Iraq to the Israeli occupation of Palestine. In some quarters, such linkage has fueled the appeal of terrorism and mixtures of anti-American and anti-Israel feeling.

Perhaps most clearly in the "Baker-Hamilton" Report, the U.S. government began to recognize the detrimental role played by the continued "impasse" between Israel and Palestine on other countries and popular attitudes within the region. Within the larger Middle East, the clear desire of many in Israel for an Israeli or U.S. attack on Iran has reinforced continued hostility to both countries in some quarters. The larger sets of issues raised by "preventive" or, conceivably in the Sudan, by humanitarian intervention, were addressed in the 1998 General Assembly policy on "Just Peacemaking," a phrase that has also been used in ecumenical circles for a set of war prevention and conflict resolution approaches.

As the U.S. returns its focus to the war in Afghanistan, attention focuses on the prosecution of the war, whose initial aims were widely supported: ending the Taliban support for Al Qaeda. The 217th General Assembly (2006) approved a "Resolution on Human Rights in a Time of Terrorism and Torture" critical of all weakening of Geneva Conventions, extraordinary rendition, and extraterritorial prison facilities. With the slow closure of the Guantanamo Bay indefinite prison facility, and clearer policies against torture, it is hoped that diplomatic and development initiatives will replace the primary use of military force. In terms of church policy, it will be important to encourage support for humanitarian reconstruction despite the increasingly clear financial havoc wrought by carrying on both the Iraq and Afghanistan wars as "emergency appropriations" rather than as part of the regular budget.

The General Assembly had in 2004 already determined that the invasion of Iraq was “unwise, immoral, and illegal,” a viewpoint confirmed in the subsequent tragic disaster of the occupation and neglect of Afghanistan. The 2008 Iraq study paper notes how the exploitation of Shia and Sunni religious differences was underestimated, and how “terrorism” has become a blanket phrase for all kinds of non-state violence.

The 2009–10 Middle East Study Committee received a briefing on geostrategic issues and discussed these framework questions with representatives of several religious communities, as well as with State Department officials. As in previous policies, it noted the predominant presence of undemocratic governments—often supported and allied to the U.S. government and oil interests—and the social tensions building among young, relatively uneducated populations throughout the region. The Sunni elites in some of these governments themselves look with apprehension at any growth in Iran’s power, although militant Islam throughout the region focuses on the trauma of Gaza and the West Bank, much more visible on their televisions. This overall context becomes most important in assessing the actual threat posed by Iran’s increasingly military-linked government, its links to Hezbollah and Hamas, and the results of previous preemptive military solutions.

Lebanon bears many scars from the military campaign carried out by Israel in the summer of 2006 that focused on Shiite areas in South Lebanon and Beirut but which also targeted many bridges and pieces of infrastructure serving all Lebanon. Hezbollah, while classified a “terrorist organization,” demonstrates through its social services and governmental participation that it is a more broadly political body guided by an Islamist viewpoint of some flexibility. Iran’s past support for Hezbollah is part of its appeal to Muslim Arab nonelites across the region who are willing to overlook its difference of sect and ethnicity (note: the dimensions of documented and alleged support for Hezbollah and Hamas by Iran, Syria, or other countries are subject to wide debate).

Lebanon’s recent history has seen the withdrawal of overt Syrian presence, following the assassination of Rafik Hariri (allegedly by Syrian forces, though this remains unconfirmed). Following the election of Barack Obama and hopes of progress in the Middle East, Hezbollah’s candidates were outvoted by more moderate parties, an outcome accepted peacefully. Lebanon’s politics have, in fact, been long interfered in by powerful neighbors, with Israel invading in the 1980s and occupying Southern Lebanon—perhaps the largest factor in the development of Hezbollah in the first place. Syria’s standing in the region has in fact grown since its overt withdrawal from Lebanon and it, like Lebanon and Jordan, remains stable and occupied with dealing with refugees from Iraq.

Iran and Hezbollah did not play a significant role in the threats to Israel made in the 1991 Gulf War and Israel’s subsequent focus on Iraq related to Saddam Hussein’s continuing in power. At the same time, since Iran’s Islamic revolution in 1979, the U.S. government and Israel cooperated in a “dual containment” strategy—the “axis of evil” identified by the second Bush Administration reflected some of that background, despite several efforts by moderates in Iran to make positive overtures to the West—particularly after 9/11. Iran remembers U.S. support for both the CIA coup against democratically-elected Mohammed Mossadeq in 1956 (installing the Shah’s dictatorship) and U.S. support for Saddam Hussein’s 1980–81 war with Iran (including the then un-protested use of chemical weapons). All of this background of invasion and interference in the affairs of neighbors—in which the U.S. and Israel have been major players since long before the current Iraq war—needs to be kept in mind when assessing Iran’s threat.

Iran’s current leaders have repeatedly shown their disdain for both democracy and public protest, but they have also been under repeated threat of “regime change” by U.S. political leaders and preemptive military strike by Israel. Israel’s stated willingness to bomb neighboring countries, as in the early 2009 case of a possible Syrian nuclear facility, may reinforce the Iran military’s desire for a deterrent, as Iran itself has not invaded any other country for centuries.

Conclusion

The church remains attentive to conflicts in the Middle East and remains painfully aware of the number of lives that have been lost as those conflicts continue. The church is committed to continuing to study the issues and pray for lasting peace. We are called upon to join in this prayer and to work on building networks of support for lasting peace among both members of our churches and within our nation, including support for transnational efforts at peace-building. The General Assembly has also called upon Presbyterians to create and maintain

interreligious dialogue among Christians, Muslims, and Jews within their communities and has opposed the oversimplifications of Christian Zionism and other one-sided efforts. The church stands for the even-handed application of international humanitarian law and human rights protections, including protections for all religious and ethnic minorities (such as Armenians historically or Kurds today [*Resolution on the Middle East*, pp. 70–72]). Because there are various forms of violence and oppression, General Assembly policy has addressed religious and ethnic exclusivism, economic opportunities, ecological and especially water and energy issues, as well as formal peace processes and alternatives to military invasions and occupations.

ENDNOTE ON CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY: The corporate engagement of the church in support of a just peace in Israel and Palestine clearly builds on a history—unknown to some—of Presbyterian “mission responsibility through investment” or MRTI going back to 1971. Notable in this is not only the “selective, phased divestment” related to South Africa and later Sudan, but the church’s “Military-Related Investment Guidelines,” adopted by the General Assembly in 1981. Reflecting the church’s commitment to the 1980 policy, “Peacemaking: The Believers’ Calling,” these guidelines restrict the church from profiting from nuclear weapons producers and the largest and most war-dependent military contractors. There has also been corporate engagement with companies active in countries with repressive regimes in Latin America, Asia, and Africa, most notably the Sudan before this became an organized focus of divestment. (The church has traditionally also proscribed investments in alcohol, tobacco, and gambling: the “sin stocks.”)

In assessing any corporate engagement strategy, the 1984 General Assembly study, “The Divestment Strategy: Ethical and Institutional Context,” is an important analysis of trusteeship and Christian mission. The key factors of integrity (not unattainable purity), effectiveness (the full impact is not financial), and ecumenical solidarity were presented. A year later the assembly adopted its South Africa-related divestment policy. A 1991 review of the implementation of that policy found that the church had divested of securities in thirteen companies while joining in ecumenical efforts that influenced the legitimacy of investment in South Africa for many more companies. In terms of effectiveness, church-led, nonviolent economic pressure of all kinds, including divestment, had led to the departure of 214 of 324 U.S. corporations in South Africa in 1981, representing an equity decline from \$2.6 billion to \$714 million, a substantial move toward isolating South Africa economically. Also, the churches played a key role in persuading international banks to stop long-term lending and accelerate repayment of short-term loans. As is well-known, after liberation, figures such as Nelson Mandela, Desmond Tutu, and Allan Boesak credited the churches with decisive impact, as did studies such as Robert K. Massie’s *Loosing the Bonds: The United States and South Africa in the Apartheid Years* (Doubleday, 1998). That 1991 review, “*The Dividends of Hope: An Evaluation of Divestment for South Africa: An Investment in Hope*,” led to the General Assembly action to “affirm a continued policy of selective, phased divestment until the South African Council of Churches and other ecumenical partners determine that irreversible change in the dismantling of apartheid ... has occurred or is occurring” (*Minutes*, 1991, Part I, p. 727).

This endnote does not review or duplicate MRTI’s work.

This policy review and application were prepared by the Reverend Christian Iosso, Ph.D., coordinator of the Advisory Committee on Social Witness Policy, General Assembly Mission Council, Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), serving as co-opted staff to the Middle East Study Committee.

APPENDIX 3:

PRESBYTERIAN PANEL

Appendix 3: Presbyterian Panel can be found in the Middle East Study Committee Art, Charts, and Maps.

Appendix 4:

The Amman Call

[The Amman Call was issued at the World Council of Churches’ International Peace Conference,

“Churches together for Peace and Justice in the Middle East,” in Amman, Jordan, June, 18–20, 2007.]

Amman imperatives:

1. Almost sixty years have passed since the Christian churches first spoke with one voice about Arab-Israeli peace. For the last forty years the Christian churches have called for an end to the Israeli occupation of Palestine. In the very place where Jesus Christ walked upon the earth, walls now separate families and the children of God—Christian, Muslim and Jew—are imprisoned in a deepening cycle of violence, humiliation and despair. The

Palestinian Christians from Gaza to Jerusalem and to Nazareth, have called out to their brothers and sisters in Christ with this urgent plea: “Enough is enough. No more words without deeds. It is time for action.”

2. We welcome the timely and prophetic statement of the Heads of Churches in Jerusalem. We affirm that “the Churches are part of the conflict, because the Churches cannot remain silent while there is still suffering. The role of the Churches is to heal and to bring all sides to reconciliation.” Our belief in God reminds us “that all God’s children of all religions and political parties are to be respected.” We assure the Churches of Palestine and Israel of our prayers, collaboration and resources.

3. Thus, in Amman, Jordan 18-20 June 2007, days that have witnessed a deepening of the crisis in the occupied Palestinian territories, and also includes the United Nations World Refugee Day, we representatives of Christian churches and church-related organizations from every corner of the earth, affirm the decision of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches and launch the “Palestine Israel Ecumenical Forum” as an instrument to *“catalyze and co-ordinate new and existing church advocacy for peace, aimed at ending the illegal occupation in accordance with UN resolutions, and demonstrate its commitment to inter-religious action for peace and justice that serves all the peoples of the region.”*

4. This action has been taken in response to three fundamental imperatives that call us to action:

- The ethical and theological imperative for a Just Peace
- The ecumenical imperative for unity in action
- The Gospel imperative for costly solidarity

5. The premises of this action are the following:

5.1. That UN resolutions are the basis for peace and the Geneva conventions are applicable to the rights and responsibilities of the affected people.

5.2. That Palestinians have the right of self-determination and the right of return.

5.3. That a two-state solution must be viable politically, geographically economically and socially.

5.4 That Jerusalem must be an open, accessible, inclusive and shared city for the two peoples and three religions.

5.5 That both Palestine and Israel have legitimate security needs.

5.6 That the Israeli settlements in the occupied Palestinian territories are illegal, and constitute an obstacle to peace.

5.7. That the “Separation Barrier” constructed by Israel in the occupied Palestinian territories is a grave breach of international law and must be removed from the occupied territory.

5.8. That there is no military solution for this conflict. Violence in all its forms cannot be justified whether perpetrated by Israelis or Palestinians.

5.9. That comprehensive regional peace is indivisible from a just peace in Israel and Palestine.

5.10. That the life and witness of local churches is at the center of worldwide church advocacy for a just peace.

6. We understand the mandate of the Palestine Israel Ecumenical Forum to be a space where we will develop comprehensive strategic approaches to the two processes of peace making and peace building. An inclusive core group convened urgently by the WCC should be mandated to facilitate this and also ensure improved

coordination between all actors. The core group will be informed by the reports of the working groups of the Amman conference, and that its composition and mechanism be designed and announced by the WCC.

7. Peace building will include the following:
 - 7.1. Furthering theological and biblical perspectives and Christian education resources around those issues central to the conflict.
 - 7.2. Developing strategies that will support the processes of justice and reconciliation, including inter-religious dialogue and cooperation.
 - 7.3. Strengthening the churches' responses to the occupation.
 - 7.4. Recognizing, encouraging and cooperating with all efforts of Israeli and Palestinian civil society that are in accord with the vision and goals of the PIEF.
8. Peace making will include the following:
 - 8.1. Defining and promoting measures, including economic ones, that could help end the occupation and enhance sustainable growth and development.
 - 8.2. Strengthening existing efforts and identifying new models of church solidarity in action. Supporting local churches and church related organizations not only to survive and continue their powerful ministries, including educational, health, cultural and social services, but also to thrive and be witnesses of hope.
 - 8.3. Developing a long-term advocacy strategy in order to mobilize all of our constituencies and influence change.

Amman challenges:

9. We have heard the voices of the Christian churches of Palestine and Israel challenging and saying to us:
 - 9.1. Act with us to liberate all peoples of this land from the logic of hatred, mutual rejection and death, so that they see in the other the face and dignity of God.
 - 9.2. Pray with us in our efforts to resist evil in all of its guises.
 - 9.3. Raise your voices along with ours as we speak "truth to power" and name with courage the injustices we see and experience. The illegal occupation has stolen two generations of lives in this tortured place, and threatens the next with hopelessness and rage.
 - 9.4. Risk the curses and abuse that will be aimed at you and stand in solidarity with us and with our Palestinian brothers and sisters of all faiths as we defiantly reject the possibility that occupation will continue.
 - 9.5. Help us to tear down walls and build and rebuild bridges among all peoples in the region. Extremism on all sides produces chaos. It threatens to divide us and to destroy bridges among peoples that would lead to reconciliation and peace.
 - 9.6. Add your hope to ours in the knowledge that evil and despair have been overcome through the death of our Lord on the Cross and through His Resurrection.
 - 9.7. Insist with us that all dispossessed peoples, all refugees, have the right to return.
 - 9.8. Partner with us as we seek peace and pursue it. Peace is possible. Christians and Muslims and Jews have, can and will understand one another and live together as neighbors.

10. And we representatives of Christian churches and church-related organizations from every corner of the earth, we respond:

11. Yes, we will. Together we will act and pray and speak and work and risk reputations and lives to build with you bridges for an enduring peace among the peoples of this tortured and beautiful place -Palestine and Israel- to end these decades of injustice, humiliation and insecurity, to end the decades of living as refugees and under occupation. We will work with you to seek peace and pursue it. We have allowed too much time to pass. Time has not served the cause of peace but has served the cause of extremism. This is our urgent cause that cannot wait.

APPENDIX 5:

Kairos Palestine: A Moment of Truth

A word of faith, hope, and love from the heart of Palestinian suffering

[Kairos Palestine: A Moment of Truth was issued by a group of Palestinian Christians at the meeting of the Palestine Israel Ecumenical Forum, in Bethlehem, December 11, 2009.]

Introduction

We, a group of Christian Palestinians, after prayer, reflection and an exchange of opinion, cry out from within the suffering in our country, under the Israeli occupation, with a cry of hope in the absence of all hope, a cry full of prayer and faith in a God ever vigilant, in God's divine providence for all the inhabitants of this land. Inspired by the mystery of God's love for all, the mystery of God's divine presence in the history of all peoples and, in a particular way, in the history of our country, we proclaim our word based on our Christian faith and our sense of Palestinian belonging – a word of faith, hope and love.

Why now? Because today we have reached a dead end in the tragedy of the Palestinian people. The decision-makers content themselves with managing the crisis rather than committing themselves to the serious task of finding a way to resolve it. The hearts of the faithful are filled with pain and with questioning: What is the international community doing? What are the political leaders in Palestine, in Israel and in the Arab world doing? What is the Church doing? The problem is not just a political one. It is a policy in which human beings are destroyed, and this must be of concern to the Church.

We address ourselves to our brothers and sisters, members of our Churches in this land. We call out as Christians and as Palestinians to our religious and political leaders, to our Palestinian society and to the Israeli society, to the international community, and to our Christian brothers and sisters in the Churches around the world.

1. The reality on the ground

1.1 *"They say: 'Peace, peace' when there is no peace"* (Jer. 6:14). These days, everyone is speaking about peace in the Middle East and the peace process. So far, however, these are simply words; the reality is one of Israeli occupation of Palestinian territories, deprivation of our freedom and all that results from this situation:

1.1.1. The separation wall erected on Palestinian territory, a large part of which has been confiscated for this purpose, has turned our towns and villages into prisons, separating them from one another, making them dispersed and divided cantons. Gaza, especially after the cruel war Israel launched against it during December 2008 and January 2009, continues to live in inhuman conditions, under permanent blockade and cut off from the other Palestinian territories.

1.1.2 Israeli settlements ravage our land in the name of God and in the name of force, controlling our natural resources, including water and agricultural land, thus depriving hundreds of thousands of Palestinians, and constituting an obstacle to any political solution.

1.1.3 Reality is the daily humiliation to which we are subjected at the military checkpoints, as we make our way to jobs, schools or hospitals.

1.1.4 Reality is the separation between members of the same family, making family life impossible for thousands of Palestinians, especially where one of the spouses does not have an Israeli identity card.

1.1.5 Religious liberty is severely restricted; the freedom of access to the holy places is denied under the pretext of security. Jerusalem and its holy places are out of bounds for many Christians and Muslims from the West Bank and the Gaza strip. Even Jerusalemites face restrictions during the religious feasts. Some of our Arab clergy are regularly barred from entering Jerusalem.

1.1.6 Refugees are also part of our reality. Most of them are still living in camps under difficult circumstances. They have been waiting for their right of return, generation after generation. What will be their fate?

1.1.7 And the prisoners? The thousands of prisoners languishing in Israeli prisons are part of our reality. The Israelis move heaven and earth to gain the release of one prisoner, and those thousands of Palestinian prisoners, when will they have their freedom?

1.1.8 Jerusalem is the heart of our reality. It is, at the same time, symbol of peace and sign of conflict. While the separation wall divides Palestinian neighbourhoods, Jerusalem continues to be emptied of its Palestinian citizens, Christians and Muslims. Their identity cards are confiscated, which means the loss of their right to reside in Jerusalem. Their homes are demolished or expropriated. Jerusalem, city of reconciliation, has become a city of discrimination and exclusion, a source of struggle rather than peace .

1.2 Also part of this reality is the Israeli disregard of international law and international resolutions, as well as the paralysis of the Arab world and the international community in the face of this contempt. Human rights are violated and despite the various reports of local and international human rights' organizations, the injustice continues.

1.1.2 Palestinians within the State of Israel, who have also suffered a historical injustice, although they are citizens and have the rights and obligations of citizenship, still suffer from discriminatory policies. They too are waiting to enjoy full rights and equality like all other citizens in the state.

1.3 Emigration is another element in our reality. The absence of any vision or spark of hope for peace and freedom pushes young people, both Muslim and Christian, to emigrate. Thus the land is deprived of its most important and richest resource – educated youth. The shrinking number of Christians, particularly in Palestine, is one of the dangerous consequences, both of this conflict, and of the local and international paralysis and failure to find a comprehensive solution to the problem.

1.4 In the face of this reality, Israel justifies its actions as self-defence, including occupation, collective punishment and all other forms of reprisals against the Palestinians. In our opinion, this vision is a reversal of reality. Yes, there is Palestinian resistance to the occupation. However, if there were no occupation, there would be no resistance, no fear and no insecurity. This is our understanding of the situation. Therefore, we call on the Israelis to end the occupation. Then they will see a new world in which there is no fear, no threat but rather security, justice and peace.

1.5 The Palestinian response to this reality was diverse. Some responded through negotiations: that was the official position of the Palestinian Authority, but it did not advance the peace process. Some political parties followed the way of armed resistance. Israel used this as a pretext to accuse the Palestinians of being terrorists and was able to distort the real nature of the conflict, presenting it as an Israeli war against terror, rather than an Israeli occupation faced by Palestinian legal resistance aiming at ending it.

1.5.1 The tragedy worsened with the internal conflict among Palestinians themselves, and with the separation of Gaza from the rest of the Palestinian territory. It is noteworthy that, even though the division is

among Palestinians themselves, the international community bears an important responsibility for it since it refused to deal positively with the will of the Palestinian people expressed in the outcome of democratic and legal elections in 2006.

Again, we repeat and proclaim that our Christian word in the midst of all this, in the midst of our catastrophe, is a word of faith, hope and love.

2. A word of faith

We believe in one God, a good and just God

2.1 We believe in God, one God, Creator of the universe and of humanity. We believe in a good and just God, who loves each one of his creatures. We believe that every human being is created in God's image and likeness and that every one's dignity is derived from the dignity of the Almighty One. We believe that this dignity is one and the same in each and all of us. This means for us, here and now, in this land in particular, that God created us not so that we might engage in strife and conflict but rather that we might come and know and love one another, and together build up the land in love and mutual respect.

2.1.1 We also believe in God's eternal Word, His only Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, whom God sent as the Saviour of the world.

2.1.2 We believe in the Holy Spirit, who accompanies the Church and all humanity on its journey. It is the Spirit that helps us to understand Holy Scripture, both Old and New Testaments, showing their unity, here and now. The Spirit makes manifest the revelation of God to humanity, past, present and future.

How do we understand the word of God?

2.2 We believe that God has spoken to humanity, here in our country: *"Long ago God spoke to our ancestors in many and various ways by the prophets, but in these last days God has spoken to us by a Son, whom God appointed heir of all things, through whom he also created the worlds"* (Heb. 1:1–2)

2.2.1 We, Christian Palestinians, believe, like all Christians throughout the world, that Jesus Christ came in order to fulfil the Law and the Prophets. He is the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end, and in his light and with the guidance of the Holy Spirit, we read the Holy Scriptures. We meditate upon and interpret Scripture just as Jesus Christ did with the two disciples on their way to Emmaus. As it is written in the Gospel according to Saint Luke: *"Then beginning with Moses and all the prophets, he interpreted to them the things about himself in all the scriptures"* (Lk 24:27)

2.2.2 Our Lord Jesus Christ came, proclaiming that the Kingdom of God was near. He provoked a revolution in the life and faith of all humanity. He came with *"a new teaching"* (Mk 1:27), casting a new light on the Old Testament, on the themes that relate to our Christian faith and our daily lives, themes such as the promises, the election, the people of God and the land. We believe that the Word of God is a living Word, casting a particular light on each period of history, manifesting to Christian believers what God is saying to us here and now. For this reason, it is unacceptable to transform the Word of God into letters of stone that pervert the love of God and His providence in the life of both peoples and individuals. This is precisely the error in fundamentalist Biblical interpretation that brings us death and destruction when the word of God is petrified and transmitted from generation to generation as a dead letter. This dead letter is used as a weapon in our present history in order to deprive us of our rights in our own land.

Our land has a universal mission

2.3 We believe that our land has a universal mission. In this universality, the meaning of the promises, of the land, of the election, of the people of God open up to include all of humanity, starting from all the peoples of this land. In light of the teachings of the Holy Bible, the promise of the land has never been a political programme,

but rather the prelude to complete universal salvation. It was the initiation of the fulfilment of the Kingdom of God on earth.

2.3.1 God sent the patriarchs, the prophets and the apostles to this land so that they might carry forth a universal mission to the world. Today we constitute three religions in this land, Judaism, Christianity and Islam. Our land is God's land, as is the case with all countries in the world. It is holy inasmuch as God is present in it, for God alone is holy and sanctifier. It is the duty of those of us who live here, to respect the will of God for this land. It is our duty to liberate it from the evil of injustice and war. It is God's land and therefore it must be a land of reconciliation, peace and love. This is indeed possible. God has put us here as two peoples, and God gives us the capacity, if we have the will, to live together and establish in it justice and peace, making it in reality God's land: *"The earth is the Lord's and all that is in it, the world, and those who live in it"* (Ps. 24:1).

2.3.2 Our presence in this land, as Christian and Muslim Palestinians, is not accidental but rather deeply rooted in the history and geography of this land, resonant with the connectedness of any other people to the land it lives in. It was an injustice when we were driven out. The West sought to make amends for what Jews had endured in the countries of Europe, but it made amends on our account and in our land. They tried to correct an injustice and the result was a new injustice.

2.3.3 Furthermore, we know that certain theologians in the West try to attach a biblical and theological legitimacy to the infringement of our rights. Thus, the promises, according to their interpretation, have become a menace to our very existence. The "good news" in the Gospel itself has become "a harbinger of death" for us. We call on these theologians to deepen their reflection on the Word of God and to rectify their interpretations so that they might see in the Word of God a source of life for all peoples.

2.3.4 Our connectedness to this land is a natural right. It is not an ideological or a theological question only. It is a matter of life and death. There are those who do not agree with us, even defining us as enemies only because we declare that we want to live as free people in our land. We suffer from the occupation of our land because we are Palestinians. And as Christian Palestinians we suffer from the wrong interpretation of some theologians. Faced with this, our task is to safeguard the Word of God as a source of life and not of death, so that "the good news" remains what it is, "good news" for us and for all. In face of those who use the Bible to threaten our existence as Christian and Muslim Palestinians, we renew our faith in God because we know that the word of God can not be the source of our destruction.

2.4 Therefore, we declare that any use of the Bible to legitimize or support political options and positions that are based upon injustice, imposed by one person on another, or by one people on another, transform religion into human ideology and strip the Word of God of its holiness, its universality and truth.

2.5 We also declare that the Israeli occupation of Palestinian land is a sin against God and humanity because it deprives the Palestinians of their basic human rights, bestowed by God. It distorts the image of God in the Israeli who has become an occupier just as it distorts this image in the Palestinian living under occupation. We declare that any theology, seemingly based on the Bible or on faith or on history, that legitimizes the occupation, is far from Christian teachings, because it calls for violence and holy war in the name of God Almighty, subordinating God to temporary human interests, and distorting the divine image in the human beings living under both political and theological injustice.

3. Hope

3.1 Despite the lack of even a glimmer of positive expectation, our hope remains strong. The present situation does not promise any quick solution or the end of the occupation that is imposed on us. Yes, the initiatives, the conferences, visits and negotiations have multiplied, but they have not been followed up by any change in our situation and suffering. Even the new US position that has been announced by President Obama, with a manifest desire to put an end to the tragedy, has not been able to make a change in our reality. The clear Israeli response, refusing any solution, leaves no room for positive expectation. Despite this, our hope remains strong, because it is from God. God alone is good, almighty and loving and His goodness will one day be victorious over the evil in

which we find ourselves. As Saint Paul said: *'If God is for us, who is against us? (...) Who will separate us from the love of Christ? Will hardship, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? As it is written, 'For your sake we are being killed all day long' (...) For I am convinced that (nothing) in all creation, will be able to separate us from the love of God'* (Rom. 8:31, 35, 36, 39).

What is the meaning of hope?

3.2 Hope within us means first and foremost our faith in God and secondly our expectation, despite everything, for a better future. Thirdly, it means not chasing after illusions – we realize that release is not close at hand. Hope is the capacity to see God in the midst of trouble, and to be co-workers with the Holy Spirit who is dwelling in us. From this vision derives the strength to be steadfast, remain firm and work to change the reality in which we find ourselves. Hope means not giving in to evil but rather standing up to it and continuing to resist it. We see nothing in the present or future except ruin and destruction. We see the upper hand of the strong, the growing orientation towards racist separation and the imposition of laws that deny our existence and our dignity. We see confusion and division in the Palestinian position. If, despite all this, we do resist this reality today and work hard, perhaps the destruction that looms on the horizon may not come upon us.

Signs of hope

3.3 The Church in our land, her leaders and her faithful, despite her weakness and her divisions, does show certain signs of hope. Our parish communities are vibrant and most of our young people are active apostles for justice and peace. In addition to the individual commitment, our various Church institutions make our faith active and present in service, love and prayer.

3.3.1 Among the signs of hope are the local centres of theology, with a religious and social character. They are numerous in our different Churches. The ecumenical spirit, even if still hesitant, shows itself more and more in the meetings of our different Church families.

3.3.2 We can add to this the numerous meetings for inter-religious dialogue, Christian–Muslim dialogue, which includes the religious leaders and a part of the people. Admittedly, dialogue is a long process and is perfected through a daily effort as we undergo the same sufferings and have the same expectations. There is also dialogue among the three religions, Judaism, Christianity and Islam, as well as different dialogue meetings on the academic or social level. They all try to breach the walls imposed by the occupation and oppose the distorted perception of human beings in the heart of their brothers or sisters.

3.3.3 One of the most important signs of hope is the steadfastness of the generations, the belief in the justice of their cause and the continuity of memory, which does not forget the “Nakba” (catastrophe) and its significance. Likewise significant is the developing awareness among many Churches throughout the world and their desire to know the truth about what is going on here.

3.3.4 In addition to that, we see a determination among many to overcome the resentments of the past and to be ready for reconciliation once justice has been restored. Public awareness of the need to restore political rights to the Palestinians is increasing, and Jewish and Israeli voices, advocating peace and justice, are raised in support of this with the approval of the international community. True, these forces for justice and reconciliation have not yet been able to transform the situation of injustice, but they have their influence and may shorten the time of suffering and hasten the time of reconciliation.

The mission of the Church

3.4 Our Church is a Church of people who pray and serve. This prayer and service is prophetic, bearing the voice of God in the present and future. Everything that happens in our land, everyone who lives there, all the pains and hopes, all the injustice and all the efforts to stop this injustice, are part and parcel of the prayer of our Church and the service of all her institutions. Thanks be to God that our Church raises her voice against injustice despite the fact that some desire her to remain silent, closed in her religious devotions.

3.4.1 The mission of the Church is prophetic, to speak the Word of God courageously, honestly and lovingly in the local context and in the midst of daily events. If she does take sides, it is with the oppressed, to stand alongside them, just as Christ our Lord stood by the side of each poor person and each sinner, calling them to repentance, life, and the restoration of the dignity bestowed on them by God and that no one has the right to strip away.

3.4.2 The mission of the Church is to proclaim the Kingdom of God, a kingdom of justice, peace and dignity. Our vocation as a living Church is to bear witness to the goodness of God and the dignity of human beings. We are called to pray and to make our voice heard when we announce a new society where human beings believe in their own dignity and the dignity of their adversaries.

3.4.3 Our Church points to the Kingdom, which cannot be tied to any earthly kingdom. Jesus said before Pilate that he was indeed a king but *“my kingdom is not from this world”* (Jn 18:36). Saint Paul says: *“The Kingdom of God is not food and drink but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit”* (Rom.14:17). Therefore, religion cannot favour or support any unjust political regime, but must rather promote justice, truth and human dignity. It must exert every effort to purify regimes where human beings suffer injustice and human dignity is violated. The Kingdom of God on earth is not dependent on any political orientation, for it is greater and more inclusive than any particular political system.

3.4.4 Jesus Christ said: *“The Kingdom of God is among you”* (Luke 17:21). This Kingdom that is present among us and in us is the extension of the mystery of salvation. It is the presence of God among us and our sense of that presence in everything we do and say. It is in this divine presence that we shall do what we can until justice is achieved in this land.

3.4.5 The cruel circumstances in which the Palestinian Church has lived and continues to live have required the Church to clarify her faith and to identify her vocation better. We have studied our vocation and have come to know it better in the midst of suffering and pain: today, we bear the strength of love rather than that of revenge, a culture of life rather than a culture of death. This is a source of hope for us, for the Church and for the world.

3.5 The Resurrection is the source of our hope. Just as Christ rose in victory over death and evil, so too we are able, as each inhabitant of this land is able, to vanquish the evil of war. We will remain a witnessing, steadfast and active Church in the land of the Resurrection.

4. Love

The commandment of love

4.1 Christ our Lord said: *“Just as I have loved you, you also should love one another”* (Jn 13:34). He has already showed us how to love and how to treat our enemies. He said: *“You have heard that it was said, ‘You shall love your neighbour and hate your enemy.’ But I say to you, Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, so that you may be children of your Father in heaven; for he makes his sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the righteous and on the unrighteous (...) Be perfect, therefore, as your heavenly Father is perfect”* (Matt. 5:45–47). Saint Paul also said: *“Do not repay anyone evil for evil”* (Rom. 12:17). And Saint Peter said: *“Do not repay evil for evil or abuse for abuse; but on the contrary, repay with a blessing. It is for this that you were called”* (1 Pet. 3:9).

Resistance

4.2 This word is clear. Love is the commandment of Christ our Lord to us and it includes both friends and enemies. This must be clear when we find ourselves in circumstances where we must resist evil of whatever kind.

4.2.1 Love is seeing the face of God in every human being. Every person is my brother or my sister. However, seeing the face of God in everyone does not mean accepting evil or aggression on their part. Rather, this love seeks to correct the evil and stop the aggression.

The aggression against the Palestinian people which is the Israeli occupation, is an evil that must be resisted. It is an evil and a sin that must be resisted and removed. Primary responsibility for this rests with the Palestinians themselves suffering occupation. Christian love invites us to resist it. However, love puts an end to evil by walking in the ways of justice. Responsibility lies also with the international community, because international law regulates relations between peoples today. Finally responsibility lies with the perpetrators of the injustice; they must liberate themselves from the evil that is in them and the injustice they have imposed on others.

4.2.2 When we review the history of the nations, we see many wars and much resistance to war by war, to violence by violence. The Palestinian people has gone the way of the peoples, particularly in the first stages of its struggle with the Israeli occupation. However, it also engaged in peaceful struggle, especially during the first Intifada. We recognize that all peoples must find a new way in their relations with each other and the resolution of their conflicts. The ways of force must give way to the ways of justice. This applies above all to the peoples that are militarily strong, mighty enough to impose their injustice on the weaker.

4.2.3 We say that our option as Christians in the face of the Israeli occupation is to resist. Resistance is a right and a duty for the Christian. But it is resistance with love as its logic. It is thus a creative resistance for it must find human ways that engage the humanity of the enemy. Seeing the image of God in the face of the enemy means taking up positions in the light of this vision of active resistance to stop the injustice and oblige the perpetrator to end his aggression and thus achieve the desired goal, which is getting back the land, freedom, dignity and independence.

4.2.4 Christ our Lord has left us an example we must imitate. We must resist evil but he taught us that we cannot resist evil with evil. This is a difficult commandment, particularly when the enemy is determined to impose himself and deny our right to remain here in our land. It is a difficult commandment yet it alone can stand firm in the face of the clear declarations of the occupation authorities that refuse our existence and the many excuses these authorities use to continue imposing occupation upon us.

4.2.5 Resistance to the evil of occupation is integrated, then, within this Christian love that refuses evil and corrects it. It resists evil in all its forms with methods that enter into the logic of love and draw on all energies to make peace. We can resist through civil disobedience. We do not resist with death but rather through respect of life. 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.

4.2.6 Palestinian civil organizations, as well as international organizations, NGOs and certain religious institutions call on individuals, companies and states to engage in divestment and in an economic and commercial boycott of everything produced by the occupation. We understand this to integrate the logic of peaceful resistance. These advocacy campaigns must be carried out with courage, openly sincerely proclaiming that their object is not revenge but rather to put an end to the existing evil, liberating both the perpetrators and the victims of injustice. The aim is to free both peoples from extremist positions of the different Israeli governments, bringing both to justice and reconciliation. In this spirit and with this dedication we will eventually reach the longed-for resolution to our problems, as indeed happened in South Africa and with many other liberation movements in the world.

4.3 Through our love, we will overcome injustices and establish foundations for a new society both for us and for our opponents. Our future and their future are one. Either the cycle of violence that destroys both of us or peace that will benefit both. We call on Israel to give up its injustice towards us, not to twist the truth of reality of the occupation by pretending that it is a battle against terrorism. The roots of “terrorism” are in the human injustice committed and in the evil of the occupation. These must be removed if there be a sincere intention to remove “terrorism.” We call on the people of Israel to be our partners in peace and not in the cycle of interminable violence. Let us resist evil together, the evil of occupation and the infernal cycle of violence.

5. Our word to our brothers and sisters

5.1 We all face, today, a way that is blocked and a future that promises only woe. Our word to all our Christian brothers and sisters is a word of hope, patience, steadfastness and new action for a better future. Our word is that

we, as Christians we carry a message, and we will continue to carry it despite the thorns, despite blood and daily difficulties. We place our hope in God, who will grant us relief in His own time. At the same time, we continue to act in concord with God and God's will, building, resisting evil and bringing closer the day of justice and peace.

5.2 We say to our Christian brothers and sisters: This is a time for repentance. Repentance brings us back into the communion of love with everyone who suffers, the prisoners, the wounded, those afflicted with temporary or permanent handicaps, the children who cannot live their childhood and each one who mourns a dear one. The communion of love says to every believer in spirit and in truth: if my brother is a prisoner I am a prisoner; if his home is destroyed, my home is destroyed; when my brother is killed, then I too am killed. We face the same challenges and share in all that has happened and will happen. Perhaps, as individuals or as heads of Churches, we were silent when we should have raised our voices to condemn the injustice and share in the suffering. This is a time of repentance for our silence, indifference, lack of communion, either because we did not persevere in our mission in this land and abandoned it, or because we did not think and do enough to reach a new and integrated vision and remained divided, contradicting our witness and weakening our word. Repentance for our concern with our institutions, sometimes at the expense of our mission, thus silencing the prophetic voice given by the Spirit to the Churches.

5.3 We call on Christians to remain steadfast in this time of trial, just as we have throughout the centuries, through the changing succession of states and governments. Be patient, steadfast and full of hope so that you might fill the heart of every one of your brothers or sisters who shares in this same trial with hope. *"Always be ready to make your defence to anyone who demands from you an accounting for the hope that is in you"* (1 Pet. 3:15). Be active and, provided this conforms to love, participate in any sacrifice that resistance asks of you to overcome our present travail ..

5.4 Our numbers are few but our message is great and important. Our land is in urgent need of love. Our love is a message to the Muslim and to the Jew, as well as to the world.

5.4.1 Our message to the Muslims is a message of love and of living together and a call to reject fanaticism and extremism. It is also a message to the world that Muslims are neither to be stereotyped as the enemy nor caricatured as terrorists but rather to be lived with in peace and engaged with in dialogue.

5.4.2 Our message to the Jews tells them: Even though we have fought one another in the recent past and still struggle today, we are able to love and live together. We can organize our political life, with all its complexity, according to the logic of this love and its power, after ending the occupation and establishing justice.

5.4.3 The word of faith says to anyone engaged in political activity: human beings were not made for hatred. It is not permitted to hate, neither is it permitted to kill or to be killed. The culture of love is the culture of accepting the other. Through it we perfect ourselves and the foundations of society are established.

6. Our word to the Churches of the world

6.1 Our word to the Churches of the world is firstly a word of gratitude for the solidarity you have shown toward us in word, deed and presence among us. It is a word of praise for the many Churches and Christians who support the right of the Palestinian people for self determination. It is a message of solidarity with those Christians and Churches who have suffered because of their advocacy for law and justice.

However, it is also a call to repentance; to revisit fundamentalist theological positions that support certain unjust political options with regard to the Palestinian people. It is a call to stand alongside the oppressed and preserve the word of God as good news for all rather than to turn it into a weapon with which to slay the oppressed. The word of God is a word of love for all His creation. God is not the ally of one against the other, nor the opponent of one in the face of the other. God is the Lord of all and loves all, demanding justice from all and issuing to all of us the same commandments. We ask our sister Churches not to offer a theological cover-up for the injustice we suffer, for the sin of the occupation imposed upon us. Our question to our brothers and sisters in the Churches

today is: Are you able to help us get our freedom back, for this is the only way you can help the two peoples attain justice, peace, security and love?

6.2 In order to understand our reality, we say to the Churches: Come and see. We will fulfil our role to make known to you the truth of our reality, receiving you as pilgrims coming to us to pray, carrying a message of peace, love and reconciliation. You will know the facts and the people of this land, Palestinians and Israelis alike.

6.3 We condemn all forms of racism, whether religious or ethnic, including anti-Semitism and Islamophobia, and we call on you to condemn it and oppose it in all its manifestations. At the same time we call on you to say a word of truth and to take a position of truth with regard to Israel's occupation of Palestinian land. As we have already said, we see boycott and disinvestment as tools of non violence for justice, peace and security for all.

7. Our word to the international community

7. Our word to the international community is to stop the principle of "double standards" and insist on the international resolutions regarding the Palestinian problem with regard to all parties. Selective application of international law threatens to leave us vulnerable to a law of the jungle. It legitimizes the claims by certain armed groups and states that the international community only understands the logic of force. Therefore, we call for a response to what the civil and religious institutions have proposed, as mentioned earlier: the beginning of a system of economic sanctions and boycott to be applied against Israel. We repeat once again that this is not revenge but rather a serious action in order to reach a just and definitive peace that will put an end to Israeli occupation of Palestinian and other Arab territories and will guarantee security and peace for all.

8. Jewish and Muslim religious leaders

8. Finally, we address an appeal to the religious and spiritual leaders, Jewish and Muslim, with whom we share the same vision that every human being is created by God and has been given equal dignity. Hence the obligation for each of us to defend the oppressed and the dignity God has bestowed on them. Let us together try to rise up above the political positions that have failed so far and continue to lead us on the path of failure and suffering.

9. A call to our Palestinian people and to the Israelis

9.1 This is a call to see the face of God in each one of God's creatures and overcome the barriers of fear or race in order to establish a constructive dialogue and not remain within the cycle of never-ending manoeuvres that aim to keep the situation as it is. Our appeal is to reach a common vision, built on equality and sharing, not on superiority, negation of the other or aggression, using the pretext of fear and security. We say that love is possible and mutual trust is possible. Thus, peace is possible and definitive reconciliation also. Thus, justice and security will be attained for all.

9.2 Education is important. Educational programs must help us to get to know the other as he or she is rather than through the prism of conflict, hostility or religious fanaticism. The educational programs in place today are infected with this hostility. The time has come to begin a new education that allows one to see the face of God in the other and declares that we are capable of loving each other and building our future together in peace and security.

9.3 Trying to make the state a religious state, Jewish or Islamic, suffocates the state, confines it within narrow limits, and transforms it into a state that practices discrimination and exclusion, preferring one citizen over another. We appeal to both religious Jews and Muslims: let the state be a state for all its citizens, with a vision constructed on respect for religion but also equality, justice, liberty and respect for pluralism and not on domination by a religion or a numerical majority.

9.4 To the leaders of Palestine we say that current divisions weaken all of us and cause more sufferings. Nothing can justify these divisions. For the good of the people, which must outweigh that of the political parties, an end must be put to division. We appeal to the international community to lend its support towards this union and to respect the will of the Palestinian people as expressed freely.

9.5 Jerusalem is the foundation of our vision and our entire life. She is the city to which God gave a particular importance in the history of humanity. She is the city towards which all people are in movement—and where they will meet in friendship and love in the presence of the One Unique God, according to the vision of the prophet Isaiah: *“In days to come the mountain of the Lord’s house shall be established as the highest of the mountains, and shall be raised above the hills; all the nations shall stream to it (...) He shall judge between the nations, and shall arbitrate for many peoples; they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more”* (Is. 2: 2–5). Today, the city is inhabited by two peoples of three religions; and it is on this prophetic vision and on the international resolutions concerning the totality of Jerusalem that any political solution must be based. This is the first issue that should be negotiated because the recognition of Jerusalem’s sanctity and its message will be a source of inspiration towards finding a solution to the entire problem, which is largely a problem of mutual trust and ability to set in place a new land in this land of God.

10. Hope and faith in God


10. In the absence of all hope, we cry out our cry of hope. We believe in God, good and just. We believe that God’s goodness will finally triumph over the evil of hate and of death that still persist in our land. We will see here “a new land” and “a new human being,” capable of rising up in the spirit to love each one of his or her brothers and sisters.

Middle East Study Committee Art, Charts, and Maps



Cover art (Lilies of the Field II [2003], 24" by 36" acrylic, by Lucy Janjigian); submitted for use on the cover by Lucy Janjigian.

Figure 1



Palestinian Academic Society for the Study of International Affairs (PASSIA)

Figure 2



Figure 3




Figure 4



Figure 5



Figure 6



Figure 7




Figure 7. Number of Palestinian rockets fired monthly in 2008, (adapted from [the Israeli Consulate in NYC](#))

Figure 8



Expulsion from Lydda by Ismail Shamout

Figure 9




Figure 10





Figure 11




ATTACHMENT I MAPS

MAP 1. THE WEST BANK AND GAZA STRIP, MARCH 2000.




Palestinian Academic Society for the Study of International Affairs (PASSIA)

MAP 2. JEWISH SETTLEMENTS IN THE WEST BANK




MAP 3. WEST BANK WALL—MAP 2006.




PALESTINIAN ACADEMIC SOCIETY FOR STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
PASSIA

MAP 4. THE FORBIDDEN ROADS REGIME.




MAP 5. WATER RESOURCES





Adapted from: 'Water and War in the Middle East' Info Paper no.5, July 1996, Centre for Policy Analysis on Palestine/ The Jerusalem Fund, Washington D.C.

Palestinian Academic Society for the Study of International Affairs (PASSIA)

MAP 6. FOOD INSECURITY LEVEL IN THE WEST BANK (JUNE, 2009), BY THE UNITED NATIONS WORLD FOOD PROGRAM.



MAP 8. THE WALL, BETHLEHEM DISTRICT—DECEMBER 2003.



**PALESTINIAN ACADEMIC SOCIETY FOR STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
PASSIA**

Appendix 3: Presbyterian Panel

ISRAEL/PALESTINE AND THE REST OF THE MIDDLE EAST

Priorities for Improving the Situation in the Middle East


- ✓ At least one-third of panelists in each group believe that pursuing the following actions is *very important* for improving the situation in Israel/Palestine and the rest of the Middle East:
 - Addressing extremism and the threat of violence (members, 72%; elders, 74%; pastors, 71%; specialized clergy, 70%).
 - Freedom of worship at all major religious sites (65%; 62%; 51%; 62%).
 - Achieving a nuclear-free Middle East (59%; 52%; 40%; 40%).
 - Providing for religious freedom throughout the Middle East (52%; 52%; 47%; 51%).
 - Reconciliation among racial-ethnic groups within Middle Eastern countries (45%; 43%; 57%; 57%).
 - Compliance with United Nations resolutions and human rights treaties (41%; 40%; 37%; 46%).
 - Supporting Christian minorities in Israel/Palestine (36%; 38%; 45%; 42%).

- ✓ More than one-third of laypeople—but fewer ministers—view as *very important* both maintaining positive relations between Presbyterians and members of the U.S. Jewish community (members, 40%; elders, 37%; pastors, 32%; specialized clergy, 27%) and maintaining the close diplomatic and military relationship between the U.S. and Israeli governments (38%; 38%; 23%; 22%).

- ✓ Two other principles are seen as *very important* by at least two in five ministers, but by fewer laypeople: reducing economic inequality within Middle Eastern countries (members, 25%; elders, 24%; pastors, 42%; specialized clergy, 48%) and refugee resettlement (26%; 25%; 40%; 47%).

- ✓ Relatively few panelists (members, 27%; elders, 28%; pastors, 23%; specialized clergy, 19%) believe that promoting democracy throughout the Middle East is *very important* (see also Figure 1).

Figure 1. Importance of Various Actions for Improving the Situation in Israel/Palestine and the Rest of the Middle East




1140

ISRAEL/PALESTINE AND THE REST OF THE MIDDLE EAST

Possible Peacemaking Strategies

- ✓ Large majorities of panelists in each group *strongly support* or *moderately support* the following peacemaking strategies:
 - Permitting Gaza residents to enter the West Bank and Israel for trade or other legitimate purposes (members, 69%; elders, 72%; pastors, 84%; specialized clergy, 87%).
 - Delivery by international organizations of humanitarian aid to people living in Palestinian territory occupied or controlled by Israel (70%; 68%; 85%; 90%).
 - The presence of United Nations peacekeepers to help supervise the borders between Israel and Palestine (73%; 70%; 77%; 85%).
 - Limiting the influence and military capacity of the Iranian government (64%; 66%; 66%; 60%).
- ✓ Almost half or more of ministers—but fewer members and elders—*strongly support* or *moderately support*:
 - Permanent Israeli withdrawal from all of Gaza, the West Bank, and East Jerusalem (members, 36%; elders, 33%; pastors, 50%; specialized clergy, 61%).
 - The inclusion of democratically elected Hamas leaders in negotiations about the future of Israel/Palestine (35%; 41%; 48%; 61%).
- ✓ Around two in five members (38%) and elders (43%)—but fewer ministers (pastors, 27%; specialized clergy (21%)—*strongly support* or *moderately support* maintaining a U.S. military presence in Iraq.
- ✓ Few panelists in each group *strongly support* or *moderately support*:
 - Construction of a separation barrier between territory that the Israeli government administers and the Palestinian authorities administer (members, 18%; elders, 24%; pastors, 18%; specialized clergy, 17%).
 - Expansion of Israeli settlements further into the West Bank and East Jerusalem on Palestinian land (10%; 10%; 6%; 5%). (Figure 2 provides additional information.)

Figure 2. Support for Various Peacemaking Strategies in the Middle East



ISRAEL/PALESTINE AND THE REST OF THE MIDDLE EAST

A Two-State Solution?

- ✓ Seven in eight specialized clergy (86%), four in five pastors (78%), and two-thirds of members (65%) and elders (68%) support a two-state solution in the Middle East, with both a state of Israel and a state of Palestine.
- ✓ Three in ten members (30%) and one-quarter of elders (24%)—but fewer ministers (pastors, 15%; specialized clergy, 11%)—don’t know whether or not they support this solution.

Comparing Responses of 2009 Panelists with Those of Earlier Panelists

Presbyterians’ opinions about issues related to Israel/Palestine and the Middle East have been relatively stable, results of the August 2009 Panel survey and earlier surveys suggest.

The May 2002 Panel survey on Peacemaking, International Conflict, and Related Issues and the August 2009 survey asked virtually identical questions about support for a two-state solution in the Middle East, with both a state of Israel and a state of Palestine.

The November 2004 Panel survey on Current Issues in Church and Society and the August 2009 survey asked somewhat similar questions about support for the building of a wall between Israeli- and Palestinian-held areas.

The 2004 survey asked panelists whether they *favor*, *oppose*, or have *no opinion* about the “current construction by Israel of a security barrier or wall between it and occupied Palestinian territories.” The 2009 survey asked panelists whether they *strongly support*, *moderately support*, *neither support nor oppose*, *moderately oppose*, *strongly oppose*, or have *no opinion* about the “construction of a separation barrier between territory that the Israeli government administers and the Palestinian authorities administer.”

The levels of support for a two-state solution and building a wall have not changed over time with two exceptions. Members’ support for building a wall declined over time, and specialized clergy’s support for a two-state solution declined. (Table 1 provides additional information.)

Table 1
Support for a Two-State Solution and for Building a Wall

	% Favor a Two-State Solution		% Support the Building of a Wall	
	2002	2009	2004	2009
Members	71%	65%	30%	18%†
Elders	72%	68%	29%	24%
Pastors.....	82%	78%	22%	18%
Specialized Clergy	92%	86%†	17%	17%

† statistically significant difference (p < .001)

ISRAEL/PALESTINE AND THE REST OF THE MIDDLE EAST

Support for Israeli Withdrawal Among Presbyterians with Different Theological and Political Leanings

Presbyterians with different theological orientations and those linked with different political parties have very different opinions about permanent Israeli withdrawal from Gaza, the West Bank, and East Jerusalem.

Table 2 shows that larger fractions of panelists in each group who are theologically *liberal* or *very liberal* than are theologically *moderate strongly support* or *moderately support* Israeli withdrawal, and more theologically *moderate* panelists support withdrawal than *very conservative* or *conservative* panelists. This is also the case among panelists who have different political preferences. More Democrats than Independents support withdrawal, and more Independents than Republicans support withdrawal.

Table 2
Support for Israeli Withdrawal from Gaza, the West Bank, and East Jerusalem, by Theological Orientation and by Political Party

	Members	Elders	Pastors	Specialized Clergy
Theological orientation †				
Very conservative or conservative.....	20%	16%	26%	34%
Moderate.....	29%	37%	50%	52%
Liberal or very liberal.....	62%	61%	72%	76%
Political party †				
Democratic.....	54%	49%	68%	69%
Independent.....	38%	41%	43%	62%
Republican.....	22%	22%	22%	25%


† statistically significant difference within each of the four constituencies (p < .001)

Presbyterian Involvement?

- ✓ At least three in five panelists in each group (members, 61%; elders, 66%; pastors, 74%; specialized clergy, 76%) *strongly agree* or *moderately agree* that Presbyterians *can* contribute to building peace in Israel/Palestine and the rest of the Middle East.
- ✓ Majorities of panelists in each group (members, 55%; elders, 59%; pastors, 74%; specialized clergy, 76%) *strongly agree* or *moderately agree* that Presbyterians *should* try to improve the situation in Israel/Palestine and the rest of the Middle East.

Figure 3. Opinion about Presbyterian Engagement in Middle East Issues

Presbyterians should try to improve the situation in Israel/Palestine and the rest of the Middle East.



ISRAEL/PALESTINE AND THE REST OF THE MIDDLE EAST

PC(USA) Investments and Israel/Palestine

- ✓ At least two-thirds of panelists in each group (members, 68%; elders, 71%; pastors, 70%; specialized clergy, 84%) *strongly agree* or *moderately agree* that the PC(USA) should avoid making investment profits from unjust situations and should use its investments in corporations to promote justice and other Christian values.
- ✓ Similar proportions of panelists in each group (members, 67%; elders, 68%; pastors, 74%; specialized clergy, 84%) *strongly agree* or *moderately agree* that the PC(USA) should try to dissuade corporations from doing things that directly or indirectly support violence against Israeli or Palestinian civilians.
- ✓ At least three in five panelists in each group (members, 66%; elders, 66%; pastors, 64%; specialized clergy, 80%) agree that the PC(USA) should shift its investment funds away from such corporations if it is unable to dissuade them from doing things that directly or indirectly support violence against Israeli or Palestinian civilians (as it already does from corporations involved in tobacco, military-related production, and human rights violations). (Figure 4 provides additional information.)


Figure 4. Opinion about PC(USA) Investment Policies

The PC(USA) should . . .

avoid making investment profits from unjust situations and use its investments in corporations to promote justice and other Christian values.

try to dissuade corporations from doing things that directly or indirectly support violence against Israeli or Palestinian civilians.

shift its investment funds away from corporations that it is unable to dissuade from doing things that directly or indirectly support violence against Israeli or Palestinian civilians.



M = Members
 E = Elders
 P = Pastors
 SC = Specialized clergy

■ Strongly agree
 ■ Moderately agree
 ■ Neither agree nor disagree/No opinion
 ■ Moderately disagree
 ■ Strongly disagree

THE PRESBYTERIAN PANEL
CONFESSIONS AND OTHER TOPICS
 AUGUST 2009 SURVEY
 Survey Questions and Responses

	Members	Elders	Ministers
Number of survey invitations sent	888	1,083	1,454
Number of undeliverable surveys and ineligible respondents	9	7	11
Number of surveys completed	354	533	785 ‡
Response rate	40%	49%	54%
‡525 pastors; 251 specialized clergy			

	Members	Elders	Pastors	Specialized Clergy
--	---------	--------	---------	-----------------------

Israel/Palestine and the Middle East

Q18. How important is each of these for improving the situation in Israel/Palestine and the rest of the Middle East?

a. Achieving a nuclear-free Middle East				
Very important	59%	52%	40%	40%
Important	23%	30%	34%	36%
Slightly important.....	7%	9%	14%	12%
Not at all important.....	4%	4%	6%	3%
No opinion.....	7%	6%	7%	9%
b. Addressing extremism and the threat of violence				
Very important	72%	74%	71%	70%
Important	20%	19%	23%	25%
Slightly important.....	3%	3%	2%	2%
Not at all important.....	1%	1%	*	*
No opinion.....	5%	3%	4%	2%
c. Compliance with United Nations resolutions and human rights treaties				
Very important	41%	40%	37%	46%
Important	37%	37%	39%	36%
Slightly important.....	10%	12%	14%	10%
Not at all important.....	5%	7%	4%	2%
No opinion.....	7%	5%	6%	5%
d. Freedom of worship at all major religious sites				
Very important	65%	62%	51%	62%
Important	26%	29%	36%	28%
Slightly important.....	3%	4%	7%	5%
Not at all important.....	*	1%	1%	1%
No opinion.....	6%	4%	5%	2%

Note: Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding

* = less than 0.5%; rounds to zero

— = zero (0.0); no cases in this category

+ = nonresponses of 10% or more on this question (reported percentages for all questions omit nonresponses)

n = number of respondents eligible to answer this question

‡ = percentages add to more than 100 because respondents could make more than one response

1145

Q18. How important is each of these for improving the situation in Israel/Palestine and the rest of the Middle East?

[cont.]

c. Maintaining positive relations between Presbyterians and members of the U.S. Jewish community				
Very important	40%	37%	32%	27%
Important	36%	40%	37%	39%
Slightly important.....	15%	15%	22%	23%
Not at all important.....	3%	4%	5%	9%
No opinion.....	6%	4%	4%	2%
f. Maintaining the close diplomatic and military relationship between the U.S. and Israeli governments				
Very important	38%	38%	23%	22%
Important	36%	37%	36%	32%
Slightly important.....	14%	17%	28%	30%
Not at all important.....	4%	4%	7%	10%
No opinion.....	8%	4%	6%	5%
g. Promoting democracy throughout the Middle East				
Very important	27%	28%	23%	19%
Important	34%	36%	32%	34%
Slightly important.....	24%	23%	32%	31%
Not at all important.....	7%	8%	8%	12%
No opinion.....	8%	6%	6%	3%
h. Providing for religious freedom throughout the Middle East				
Very important	52%	52%	47%	51%
Important	34%	35%	38%	39%
Slightly important.....	7%	8%	9%	6%
Not at all important.....	1%	1%	1%	1%
No opinion.....	7%	4%	5%	2%
i. Reconciliation among racial-ethnic groups within Middle Eastern countries				
Very important	45%	43%	57%	57%
Important	36%	38%	32%	35%
Slightly important.....	10%	10%	5%	6%
Not at all important.....	2%	3%	1%	—
No opinion.....	8%	6%	4%	2%
j. Reducing economic inequality within Middle Eastern countries				
Very important	25%	24%	42%	48%
Important	38%	36%	35%	33%
Slightly important.....	23%	25%	15%	12%
Not at all important.....	4%	6%	3%	3%
No opinion.....	10%	9%	5%	4%

Q18. How important is each of these for improving the situation in Israel/Palestine and the rest of the Middle East?

[cont.]

k. Refugee resettlement				
Very important	26%	25%	40%	47%
Important	37%	40%	40%	36%
Slightly important.....	20%	22%	13%	10%
Not at all important.....	4%	4%	2%	2%
No opinion.....	12%	10%	6%	4%
l. Supporting Christian minorities in Israel/Palestine				
Very important	36%	38%	45%	42%
Slightly important.....	17%	14%	12%	14%
Not at all important.....	2%	2%	2%	2%
No opinion.....	8%	5%	5%	3%

Q19. Do you support a two-state solution in the Middle East with both a state of Israel and a state of Palestine?

Yes	65%	68%	78%	86%
No.....	5%	8%	7%	3%
Don't know	30%	24%	15%	11%

Q20. How much do you support or oppose each of the following?

a. Construction of a separation barrier between territory that the Israeli government administers and the Palestinian authorities administer				
Strongly support	5%	8%	6%	6%
Neither support nor oppose	25%	28%	14%	15%
Moderately oppose	19%	17%	22%	18%
Strongly oppose.....	16%	17%	37%	42%
No opinion.....	21%	15%	9%	9%
b. Delivery by international organizations of humanitarian aid to people living in Palestinian territory occupied or controlled by Israel				
Strongly support	34%	34%	58%	65%
Moderately support.....	36%	34%	27%	25%
Neither support nor oppose	13%	18%	6%	5%
Moderately oppose	3%	3%	1%	1%
Strongly oppose.....	2%	3%	1%	—
No opinion.....	13%	9%	7%	4%
c. Expansion of Israeli settlements further into the West Bank and East Jerusalem on Palestinian land				
Strongly support	4%	3%	2%	1%
Moderately support.....	6%	7%	4%	4%
Neither support nor oppose	20%	22%	14%	6%
Moderately oppose	18%	20%	19%	15%
Strongly oppose.....	33%	34%	53%	68%
No opinion.....	19%	14%	8%	6%

Q20. How much do you support or oppose each of the following?
[cont.]

d. The inclusion of democratically elected Hamas leaders in negotiations about the future of Israel/Palestine				
Strongly support.....	13%	11%	13%	24%
Moderately support.....	22%	30%	35%	37%
Neither support nor oppose.....	22%	24%	18%	15%
Moderately oppose.....	8%	8%	14%	7%
Strongly oppose.....	10%	14%	12%	7%
No opinion.....	24%	13%	9%	9%
e. Limiting the influence and military capacity of the Iranian government				
Strongly support.....	35%	40%	30%	24%
Moderately support.....	29%	26%	36%	36%
Neither support nor oppose.....	12%	17%	16%	24%
Moderately oppose.....	4%	4%	5%	5%
Strongly oppose.....	5%	3%	3%	3%
No opinion.....	15%	10%	9%	9%
f. Maintaining a U.S. military presence in Iraq				
Strongly support.....	14%	13%	7%	3%
Moderately support.....	24%	30%	20%	18%
Neither support nor oppose.....	12%	15%	14%	11%
Moderately oppose.....	24%	18%	28%	28%
Strongly oppose.....	18%	17%	26%	35%
No opinion.....	9%	6%	5%	5%
g. Permanent Israeli withdrawal from all of Gaza, the West Bank, and East Jerusalem				
Strongly support.....	14%	11%	20%	35%
Moderately support.....	22%	22%	30%	26%
Neither support nor oppose.....	23%	28%	20%	18%
Moderately oppose.....	11%	13%	12%	6%
Strongly oppose.....	11%	11%	11%	6%
No opinion.....	19%	15%	8%	9%
h. Permanently disabling the military capacities of any Palestinian government				
Strongly support.....	10%	8%	5%	6%
Moderately support.....	14%	12%	11%	8%
Neither support nor oppose.....	24%	33%	28%	23%
Moderately oppose.....	18%	23%	32%	29%
Strongly oppose.....	11%	10%	16%	25%
No opinion.....	22%	14%	9%	9%
i. Permitting Gaza residents to enter the West Bank and Israel for trade or other legitimate purposes				
Strongly support.....	34%	32%	46%	59%
Moderately support.....	35%	40%	38%	28%
Neither support nor oppose.....	11%	15%	8%	6%
Moderately oppose.....	1%	1%	2%	1%
Strongly oppose.....	1%	1%	1%	*
No opinion.....	18%	11%	6%	5%

Q20. How much do you support or oppose each of the following?
[cont.]

Israel	j. The presence of United Nations peacekeepers to help supervise the border between Israel and Palestine				
	Strongly support.....	33%	29%	38%	50%
	Moderately support.....	40%	41%	39%	35%
	Neither support nor oppose.....	11%	14%	13%	8%
	Moderately oppose.....	3%	3%	3%	2%
	Strongly oppose.....	3%	4%	3%	1%
	No opinion.....	10%	8%	4%	4%

Q21. How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

a. Presbyterians can contribute to peace-building in Israel/Palestine and the rest of the Middle East.				
Strongly agree.....	18%	21%	30%	38%
Moderately agree.....	43%	45%	44%	38%
Neither agree nor disagree.....	20%	22%	11%	12%
Moderately disagree.....	9%	5%	7%	8%
Strongly disagree.....	3%	3%	4%	2%
No opinion.....	7%	5%	3%	2%
b. Presbyterians should try to improve the situation in Israel/Palestine and the rest of the Middle East.				
Strongly agree.....	21%	19%	29%	38%
Moderately agree.....	34%	40%	45%	38%
Neither agree nor disagree.....	25%	23%	11%	13%
Moderately disagree.....	8%	9%	7%	7%
Strongly disagree.....	4%	4%	4%	2%
No opinion.....	7%	4%	3%	2%
c. The PC(USA) should avoid making investment profits from unjust situations and should use its investments in corporations to promote justice and other Christian values.				
Strongly agree.....	43%	41%	40%	59%
Moderately agree.....	25%	30%	30%	25%
Neither agree nor disagree.....	12%	13%	14%	7%
Moderately disagree.....	6%	7%	8%	3%
Strongly disagree.....	4%	5%	5%	3%
No opinion.....	9%	4%	4%	3%
d. The PC(USA) should try to dissuade corporations from doing things that directly or indirectly support violence against Israeli or Palestinian civilians.				
Strongly agree.....	41%	40%	42%	62%
Moderately agree.....	26%	28%	32%	22%
Neither agree nor disagree.....	13%	13%	10%	9%
Moderately disagree.....	6%	7%	6%	3%
Strongly disagree.....	6%	7%	6%	2%
No opinion.....	7%	4%	4%	2%

Q21. How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?
 [cont.]

- e. If the PC(USA) is unable to dissuade corporations from doing things that directly or indirectly support violence against Israeli or Palestinian civilians, it should shift PC(USA) investment funds away from those corporations (as it already does from corporations involved in tobacco, military-related production, and human rights violations).

Strongly agree.....	41%	42%	38%	59%
Moderately agree.....	25%	24%	26%	21%
Neither agree nor disagree.....	16%	13%	13%	9%
Moderately disagree.....	5%	7%	9%	5%
Strongly disagree.....	6%	8%	9%	2%
No opinion.....	8%	6%	5%	4%

Q22. Please use this space or another page for any additional comments.

[Not tabulated]

Response from:

Paper	70%	65%	50%	56%
Web.....	30%	35%	50%	44%