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Introduction: Eldad’s Three Sources of Zionism

The renowned1 Jewish theoretician of Zionism Israel Eldad2 defined three sources of Zionism, which he described as “two old and one new”, and then divided the old sources into “one positive and one negative”. The positive source is spiritual, found upon the Holy Scriptures. Its essential part is the Jewish longing for returning back to Zion, the Biblical homeland of the Jewish3 people, where the messianic hope of redemption will be fulfilled. The negative source is anti-Semitism: hostility towards the Jewish people, culminating in the 20th century and forcing many Jews to find rescue in their resettlement to Eretz Israel.4 Motivated by these two sources, the Jewish people began to build what may be the most fascinating political, economic, cultural, scientific, spiritual and societal phenomenon of the entire human history: the State of Israel. Thus, the two old sources of Zionism, the positive and the negative, met and produced “a third source”, the Jewish state.5

The emergence of the “third source” and the process of abandonment of a very negative Jewish attitude towards the national political activism, which had existed among the Jews from 135 AD to the 20th century, revealed a unique and complex interaction of historical, political and theological perceptions. After the Roman suppression of the Bar Kokhba revolt in 135, they renamed Jerusalem into Aelia Capitolina, Judea into Palestine, and forced most surviving Jews into exile. Jews, always susceptible to theological lessons of history, not only ceased to yearn for renewal of the kingdom through political messianic activism, but began to interpret such activism as theologically illegitimate. They started to perceive the exile (galut) as a form of national penance,6 imposed by God for their sins. Many Jews considered an untimely interruption of this penance to be an act of rebellion against God. That is why the Zionist movement was founded mostly by secular Jews whose worldview was closer to the intellectual tradition of the Enlightenment (Haskala) than to Judaism. Religious Jews mainly opposed early Zionism.7 They believed that Zionists were treading upon the terrain that was theologically prohibited. However, following the miraculous establishment and defence of the State of Israel, an increasing number of

1 For some ideas represented in this article, and for growing in affection and respect for the Jewish people and the Jewish State, I am very indebted to Ulf Ekman. For many fruitful conversations about Christian-Jewish relations and useful sources that he generously shared with me, I am thankful to Ivica Šola. All conclusions are mine.
2 Eldad (1910-1996) was an activist and one of the best-known theoreticians of Revisionist Zionism, a radical and non-socialist branch of the Zionist Movement, led by Vladimir Jabotinsky. The Likud Party, the strongest conservative party in present-day Israel, developed on tradition of Revisionist Zionism.
3 In this article, the ethnic denominations “Israeli” and “Jew” are treated like synonyms, although this is not always the case. For more on this see Zeitlin, 1953:365-379, in Croatian Havel, 2013a:84-85.
4 Until the early 1920s, the idea of Zionism attracted to Palestine only some 100,000 Jews, whereas the rest came fleeing persecution (Spero, 2000:322). Eretz Israel (ארץ ישראל) means “the Land of Israel” (cf. Matt. 2:20-21) and refers to the area called Palestine between the Biblical and the modern eras. I have avoided “Palestine” as an increasingly ideologically charged term.
7 For the exceptions, rabbis who are considered to be the forerunners of Zionism, see Goldwater, 2009.
Jews whose main identity was religious accepted the idea of Zionism, and in the last few decades they have become its key champions. The reason for this change is the same as two millennia ago when Jews opted for political passivity: the interpretation of history as a reflection of God's will. Indeed history, if interpreted in this way, confirmed that the State of Israel was not only not opposed to God's design for the Jewish people, but is its fruition.

**What is Christian Philo-Semitism?**

Remarkably, Eldad's theory about the development of the attitude of Jews to Zionism and statehood is to a significant degree applicable to analysis of the contemporary attitude of Christians to Jews and Israel. Since the 1980s, there has been an increasing, genuine, and cordial rapprochement of Christian and Jewish communities throughout the Western world. The rapprochement of the Catholic Church and the State of Israel was crowned with the establishment of diplomatic relations in 1993. The relations continued to expand, now even within an institutional framework, which provided new strength and incentive to the process. We may maintain that the Church today recognises soteriological importance and uniqueness of the Jewish people as never before in history. What is more, a new attitude, sentiment and theological phenomenon has emerged in the Church over the last decades, which we could call Christian philo-Judaism or, better yet, Christian philo-Semitism. Along with another new concept of “Judeo-Christian” tradition, civilisation and spirituality they constitute an ingrained part of the theological, social and political discourse in the contemporary Christian world. Only several generations ago, it would have been difficult to understand each of these concepts or they would have been interpreted as oxymorons. Despite an increasing presence of the term “philo-Semitism” coined in Germany in 1880, its

---

8 More about the change in understanding of the political efforts to renew Jewish statehood, see Havel, 2020:215-227 (in Croatian).
9 Ratzinger specified 1989 as the year of “historic upheaval” and “new urgency” in relationship between Church and Israel, due to *inter alia* “awareness of a long-repressed guilt, which has branded the Christian conscience in the wake of the terrible events of the twelve lamentable years from 1933 to 1945” (Ratzinger, 1999:17).
10 In this article, “the Church” means Western Church, primarily but not exclusively the Catholic Church.
11 I prefer “philo-Semitism” to “philo-Judaism” since the latter emphasises religious affiliation, whereas the former is broader and comprises all Jews regardless of their religious, ideological or any other identity self-perception and perception. Despite the etymology, “philo-Semitism” refers to Jews only, not to all Semitic peoples, just like “anti-Semitism” does.
12 The term “Judeo-Christian” was used in 1889 for the first time. However, it was only in the 20th century that it began to be used in the sense of common Jewish and Christian values and spiritual heritage (Silk, 1984:65-66). Webster's dictionary indicates 1847 as the year of its first use (https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/Judeo-Christian#h1 accessed July 24, 2020).
13 Karp and Sutcliffe, ed. 2011:1. The authors also explained that this neologism was coined by anti-Semites to mock their adversaries. However, the opponents of anti-Semitism declined to be called philo-Semites claiming that they look upon the Jews as any other people, without any special preference or non-preference (ibid.). These were actually German liberals, supporters of the Enlightenment, who attributed to Jews certain negative characteristics just as anti-Semites did, but unlike anti-Semites they believed that the Jews could be educated and “morally regenerated” because of which Goldhagen called them “antisemites in sheep's clothing” (Goldhagen, 1999:58).
meaning remains rather ambiguous. Its interpretations may be somewhat anachronistic, if associated only to eschatological expectations\textsuperscript{14} and evangelizing ambitions,\textsuperscript{15} which were indeed a main idea behind Christian philo-Semitism when it first appeared.\textsuperscript{16} Contemporary authors use it differently. Suspicion about the objectives behind this neologism is not unusual.\textsuperscript{17} This is understandable, since, on the one hand, the Christian religious pro-Jewish and pro-Israeli stance is sometimes connected to bizarre ideas and politicised theology, while on the other, there are very few Christian scholarly studies on mainstream Christian philo-Semitism. To the extent to which this is a religious phenomenon, which is extensive, it is hard to expect its systematic understanding from scholars whose hearts and minds do not know the Risen Christ. Therefore, due to the ambiguity of the concept and for the purpose of this article, I propose a definition of Christian philo-Semitism as Christian love for the Jewish people that is not based solely on the Christian calling to love all people, nor on attributing any characteristics to Jews as being immanent to Jews alone, but on a grateful recognition of the unique role of the Jewish people in God’s plan of salvation as an undeserved, irrevocable gift.\textsuperscript{18} We may include in the definition Christian regret for the suffering inflicted on Jews throughout history, although that is more an inspiration to philo-Semitism than its inevitable content, as I will expound on further below.

Therefore, in congruence with the pattern of Eldad’s theory on the three sources of Jewish Zionism, I would suggest three sources of Christian philo-Semitism, also two old ones and one new. Of the two old ones, one is a positive and one is a negative source. In likeness to Eldad’s thought, the first, positive source is spiritual, and refers to Biblical promises to Is-

\textsuperscript{14} “Philosemitism has figured particularly in Christian eschatological thought, in which the conversion of the Jews constitutes a key element in the unfolding of prophecies concerning the end of time” (Karp and Sutcliffe, ed. 2011:11).

\textsuperscript{15} According to D. S. Katz: “The desire to convert Jews to Christianity and thereby save their souls has been one of the most powerful motivating forces behind philo-Semitism” (Katz, 1992:238). Belief in the conversion of Jews was also a reason for philo-Semitism among Zinzendorf’s Pietists (Gerdmar, 2009:61).

\textsuperscript{16} Linking Christian affinity to Jews, Jewish return to Zion and the establishment of a Jewish national state with the eschatological expectations is an essential part of the Evangelical tradition. However, the eschatological argument cannot be attributed to Catholic philo-Semitism as the prevailing factor, primarily because the eschatology of the Evangelical movement and of the Catholic Church differ: what is more, their “differences and oppositions are at their most glaring in the area of eschatology” (Hocken, 2016:49; cf. also p. 57). According to the same author, the same applies to the Catholic Charismatic Movement, which the Evangelical eschatology has never systematically penetrated. In his earlier work, however, Hocken cautiously relates Jewish return to Palestine to the Eschatology and calls it “a sign and harbinger of the future fulfilment at the second coming” (Hocken, 1994:146). He did not include the issue of the Jewish State in his analysis, though. Explicitly and not without reason, D’Costa warns against “eschatological confidence of many Protestants who imagine the State of Israel as the fulfillment of prophecies about the end times” (D’Costa, 2020:1-7). This issue demands caution and balance, and not a decisive rejection of eschatological considerations since “the ‘eschatological’ is always [...] somehow present” (Benedict XVI, 2018:169) when it comes to the Jewish past and the Jewish future. Cf. also Ekman, 2009:234.

\textsuperscript{17} See for example Katz, 1992, who attributes philo-Semitism to those who “see the Jews as essential to Christian interests, and, in some cases, to the destiny of mankind” (p. 360), and Gerdmar, 2009, who in the context of analysing Pietism indicates that the philo-Semitic view on the high value of the Jews of the Biblical times “does not guarantee a positive attitude to contemporary Jews” (p. 193), Ariel who argued that “Evangelical Christians cannot [...] be described as philosemites” (Ariel, 2002:42), Wertheim, ed. 2017, etc.

\textsuperscript{18} Cf. Rom. 11:29.
rael. The second, negative source, is two millennia of Christian anti-Judaism and the Holocaust as a turning-point which prompted a final and utter Christian alteration of their attitude to Jews. The third and new source of Christian philo-Semitism is, just as in Eldad’s theory on Zionism, the State of Israel.

The Positive Source of Christian Philo-Semitism

One of the central themes of the Holy Scriptures is Israel’s history and spiritual significance, often in the sense of Israel being distinct and chosen “out of all the peoples.”¹⁹ Philosopher and theologian David Novak explains: “With the probable exception of some of the so-called ‘Wisdom Literature’ (most notably Proverbs, Job, and Ecclesiastes), the Bible can be seen as one long discussion of what differentiates Israel from all the other peoples of the world.”²⁰ These differences, in terms of the importance of the Jewish people, are also found in the New Testament. Jesus Christ, the Messiah, is a Jew. Jesus’ mother Mary is Jewish. Her husband, Saint Joseph, the patron saint of Croatia, is a Jew. All the Apostles were Jews. They were Jews not just accidentally, by birth, only to abandon their ethnicity when they became Jesus’ disciples. Definitely not. They never turned into dull cosmopolites or into some avant-garde hippies who advocated abolition of nations, borders, and patriotism. We may rest assured that none of them would join Lennon in singing *Imagine*. Quite to the contrary, the very first question the disciples asked Jesus after His Resurrection was about the most important Jewish national and political issue of their time: “Lord, is this the time when you will restore the kingdom to Israel?”²¹ Moreover, the Apostle Paul proudly states that he is “a Hebrew born of Hebrews”²² warning Christian gentiles that they were wild olive shoots, grafted into the olive tree, which is Israel and which supports them. He sharply admonishes Christian gentiles: “remember that it is not you that support the root, but the root that supports you.”²³

Promises of the Old Testament made to the Israelites, later Jewish people, are even more numerous, though not necessarily also more palpable than those of the New Testament. God promised to Abraham and his posterity through Isaac and Jacob (Israel) that “in you all the families of the earth shall be blessed.”²⁴ Then, He said to the Israelites, “you shall be my treasured possession out of all the peoples.”²⁵ In the context of the Holy Scriptures, Starčević’s popular slogan “God and Croats” (*Bog i Hrvati*) borders on heresy, since it implies a special relationship between God and Croats, which does

---

¹⁹ Ex. 19:5. Unless otherwise indicated, all Scripture quotations are from the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV).


²² Phil. 3:5.

²³ Rom. 11:17.

²⁴ Gen. 12:3.

²⁵ Ex. 19:5.
not exist; election belongs to Israel alone: “the Lord your God has chosen you [Israel] out of all the peoples on earth to be his people, his treasured possession.”26 Similarly, the prophet Amos says: “You only have I known of all the families of theearth.”27

Israel’s election was not based on some extraordinary attributes or virtues of the people of Israel. The Israelites were not \textit{per se} spiritual, pious, righteous, or ethical more than other peoples. Scriptures are scarce with verses that imply Israel’s exceptionality based on ethnos rather than election. Arguably, the only such place in the Old Testament is found in Ezra, who described Jews as “holy seed” (עַֽיִן שֶׂרֶץ).28 In the New Testament, we may find Jesus’ description of a “true Israelite” as one “in whom there is no deceit”29 very indicative. It is difficult to disregard the difference between Jesus’ words and subsequent ingrained Christian perception of Jews as deceitful, cunning, sly schemers. On the other hand, the Holy Scriptures abound in harsh reproofs of the people of Israel for their unfaithfulness, unrighteousness, rebelliousness, and wickedness, all duly recorded and canonized by the very same people of Israel. Self-criticism is one of the fundamental features of the Holy Scriptures, and we may safely conclude that the Jews were “the only people to canonize their critics.”30 Israel’s election had a purpose: revelation of God to humankind. According to both Jewish and Christian theologies, revelation is the only method by which man may know God, and God has given it only to Israel: “He declares his word to Jacob, his statutes and ordinances to Israel. He has not dealt thus with any other nation; they do not know his ordinances.”31 Israel served as exclusive, “one and only recipient of His revelation.”32 The same message is found in the New Testament. When talking to the Samaritan woman, Jesus explained that “salvation is from the Jews.”33 In reference to these very words of Jesus, the Catechism of the Catholic Church confirms the unique importance of Israel and the Jewish people: “pagans can discover Jesus and worship him as Son of God and Savior of the world only by turning toward the Jews and receiving from them the messianic promise as contained in the Old Testament.”34 As “the womb and cradle of the Christian faith and the Church,”35 Jewish faith holds a singular, distinct place within Christian theology.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[26] Also cf. Deut. 7:6, Deut. 26:18-19, Ps. 105:6 etc.
\item[27] Amos 3:2.
\item[28] Ezra 9:2. The word זֶרַע (zer‘a) means “seed” (as translated in NRSV, KJV) and figuratively “offspring” (as translated in WEB). Some English translations (NET, NIV, NASB, RSV, RSVCE, NLT, AMP) use the word “race” instead.
\item[29] John 1:47 (NET).
\item[31] Ps. 147:19-20. Cf. also the Dogmatic Constitution \textit{Dei verbum} (14) of October 18, 1965 (Vatican Council II), where it reads: “First He entered into a covenant with Abraham (see Gen. 15:18) and, through Moses, with the people of Israel (see Ex. 24:8). To this people which He had acquired for Himself, He so manifested Himself through words and deeds as the one true and living God that Israel came to know by experience the ways of God with men.”
\item[33] John 4:22.
\item[34] 2000:133 (528), cit. also in Ratzinger, 1999:25.
\item[35] Ekman, 2015:37.
\end{footnotes}
The positive source of Christian philo-Semitism is the Holy Scriptures, the Word of God written and the Word of God incarnate; gratitude to which we have been called by the Gospel, “for the gifts and the calling of God are irrevocable.”

The Negative Source of Christian Philo-Semitism

The negative source of Christian rapprochement to the Jewish people is the persecution of the Jews throughout the centuries culminating in the greatest crime in human history, the Holocaust. The Church, herself persecuted during the Nazi era, is innocent of the emergence of this totalitarian ideology and its crimes, although there were at times perfidious attempts at imputing to her the guilt through defamations and forgeries, especially in Communist countries (the trial of Blessed Aloysius Stepinac and his martyrdom is an example of the persecution of the Church on account of her alleged support to a pro-Nazi regime). Nazism was an anti-Christian movement, a pagan cult of veneration of race, blood, and soil, incompatible with the Biblical worldview and Church teaching. It was in this sense that the rapprochement between Christians and Jews began even before the collapse of Nazism: “in the Nazi concentration camps, where often Jews and Christians were confronted with a barbaric neopagan totalitarian system [they] together discovered their common heritage and common values.” However, anti-Jewish sentiment endorsed by the Church for centuries greatly contributed to the emergence of anti-Semitism and racial hatred of Jews, which ignited flames of genocide in Nazi Europe. Accusations that the Jews are guilty of deicide first appeared in the Church in the second century, and eventually developed into perception of Jewish collective guilt by a major part of the Church. In many polemics and homilies adversus Judaeos of the Church Fathers, the Jews were denounced as adversaries of faith, truth and morality, rejected by God and replaced by the Church as God’s chosen people. Christian contempt, distrust and hostility towards the Jews inspired or reintroduced fabrications about Jewish scheming, paranormal powers and blood libel, for which Jews were, mainly since the times of the Crusades, exposed to persecution, exile, forced conversion to Christianity and sporadic mass murder. Compelling Jews to wear badges and

36 Rom 11:29.
38 First accusations of deicide are connected to Bishop Melito of Sardis (Werner, 1966:199, 207) and they also appear in the works of Justin, and subsequently Gregory of Nyssa, Origen, Tertullian etc. For a fine introduction into the development of Christian anti-Jewish ideas in the second century see Skarsaune, 2002:259-276.
39 For a brief overview of Christian anti-Jewish beliefs and views, which “eventually developed into the hatred of Jews simply because they were Jews (anti-Semitism)” see e.g. Lux, 2010:2-3. For early Christian anti-Judaism see Paula Fredriksen and Oded Irshai, Christian Anti-Judaism: Polemics and Policies: From the Second to the Seventh Centuries in: Katz, ed. 2006:977-1035.
40 Forced conversion to Christianity appeared in Spain in the 7th century. However, this was for the most part not the reflection of the official Church policy, but was “forced by mobs or secular rulers” (Pritz, 2007:43). Some gentile accusations against Jews, in particular blood libel (refuted by Josephus in Against Apion), was known even before the Church was born.
to live in ghettos in Europe was introduced by Church ordinances. Liturgy of Good Friday contained from 1570 to 1959 a prayer “pro perfidis Judaeis.” In modern times, the Church accused the Jews of spreading or inventing Communism, atheism, liberalism, Free Masonry and other ideologies and movements hostile to Christian teaching and ethics. Even though Nazism was an anti-Christian movement, some parts of Nazi ideology and some reasons for its grassroots appeal, can be linked to Christian anti-Judaism. After the War, as the extent of the Holocaust became known, the Church entered a hitherto unprecedented process of self-examination of her relationship with the Jewish people. This resulted in recognition of heinous crimes and many sufferings inflicted upon the Jews by Christians throughout history, and in consequent deep and sincere repentance. It has been determined by Nostra aetate that “the Jews should not be presented as rejected or accursed by God, as if this followed from the Holy Scriptures.” Thus began a re-discovery of the importance of the Jewish people in God’s work of salvation and the spiritual indebtedness Christians owe to Israel. In the years following the Second Vatican Council, often through incentive by the future Pope Benedict XVI and all the while alerted by the Holocaust, significance of the Jewish people was increasingly recognized by Christians and the Church. As explained in the opening sentences of The Jewish People and Their Sacred Scriptures in the Christian Bible by the Pontifical Biblical Commission:

Modern times have made Christians more aware of the close fraternal bonds that unite them to the Jewish people. During the Second World War (1939-1945), tragic events, or more precisely, abominable crimes subjected the Jewish people to a terrible ordeal that threatened their very existence throughout most of Europe. In those circumstances, some Christians failed to exhibit the spiritual resistance to be expected from disciples of Christ, and did not take the appropriate initiatives to counter them. Other Christians, though, did generously aid Jews in danger, often at the risk of their own lives. In the wake of such an enormous tragedy, Christians are faced with the need to reassess their relations with the Jewish people.

In the Preface to the same document Ratzinger wrote: “In its work, the [Pontifical] Biblical Commission could not ignore the contemporary context, where the shock of the Shoah has put the whole question under a new light.” In an earlier text

For more on this expression see Oesterreicher, 1947.

The link between Christian anti-Judaism and the Nazi anti-Semitic idea is a comprehensive topic on which there are many and often opposed standpoints. Wistrich, 2001, and Chazan, 2016, are two examples of more recent studies dealing with this issue. Although they contain many useful data, they should not be read uncritically. For German Protestant theological anti-Semitism and its influence on the Nazi anti-Semitic idea see Gerdmar, 2009.

Ekman, who was at the time a leading Evangelical theologian and minister, observed that after the Holocaust and the birth of the State of Israel, within the Christian world it was the Catholic Church that took the initiative in changing Christian relationship with Jews (Ekman, 2009:226-227).

The Declaration Nostra aetate (4) of October 28, 1965 (Vatican Council II). Similarly, as part of the preparations for the Great Jubilee in 2000, Pope John Paul II singled out two sins from the past for the penitence of Catholics. The first is the sin against Church unity, and the second is intolerance and “violence in the service of truth” committed by Christians, especially against Jews (Hocken, 2016:201). Hocken explained that “While this appeal did not specifically mention the Jewish people, it is clear that the troubled Jewish-Catholic history was on the Pope’s mind.”


he petitioned: “After Auschwitz the mission of reconciliation and acceptance permits no deferral,”47 and “since Auschwitz, it has been clear that the Church needs to think anew about the question of the nature of Judaism.”48 Nazi genocide against European Jews thus prompted repentance49 and a subsequent change of Christian attitude to Jews in virtually all aspects: from attitude to the individual and the people, to attitude in matters of faith and politics.

The positive and the negative sources thus formed in the Church an attitude to Jews and Judaism unique in comparison to all other non-Christian religions: not only an attitude of love and respect which Christians owe also to everybody else, but a recognition of common spiritual roots, correlation and family ties which exclude everybody else. Today, Christians turn to Jews sincerely and officially as “our elder brothers.”50 It is tragic how many centuries had to pass and what historical atrocity had to occur for the Church to articulate her position on the Jewish people that is the only defendable one from the perspective of the Holy Scriptures.

The State of Israel as a Source of Christian Philo-Semitism

With the emergence of a political movement advocating the creation of a Jewish State, both Jews and Christians faced what might be the greatest spiritual challenge that some political phenomenon could place before both these communities.51 Many Jews and many Christians initially responded with restraint, if not with outright hostility. During the first decades of Zionism, most religious Jews considered its objectives theologically illegitimate. Its key initiators and proponents were left-wing secular Jews,52 which was repulsive to many Christians as well. Pope Pius X coldly received the founder of the Zionist movement Theodor Herzl, a secular Jew who advanced his vision of Jewish statehood on the tradition of the Enlightenment and European nationalism. During their conversation the Pope recognised that “Jewish religion is the basis of our own” but warned that Catholics could not support Jewish settlement in Palestine since the Jews failed to recognise Jesus as the Messiah and were still waiting for one; even less so if they went there “as a people

48 Benedict XVI, 2018:163. Later in the article (p. 169) he explained that Judaism “was not simply submerged in the world of other religions,” which was the understanding of the Church as early as in the Middle Ages, when Judaism was the only non-Christian religion regarded as religio licita. The same is explained by Cardinal Kasper in his description of the development of the document Nostra aetate (Walter Kasper, Paths Taken and Enduring Questions in Jewish-Christian Relations Today: Thirty Years of the Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews in: Cunningham, Hofmann and Sievers, ed. 2007:5).
49 Cardinal Kasper writes: “For Christians, it has become the object of shameful repentance and, thorough historical and theological reflections, the starting point for our own conversion and new relations with the Jewish people” (Walter Kasper, Paths Taken and Enduring Questions in Jewish-Christian Relations Today: Thirty Years of the Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews in: Cunningham, Hofmann and Sievers, ed. 2007:9).
50 Pope John Paul II called the Jews “our elder brothers” during his historic visit to the synagogue of Rome in 1986 (Carlebach and Schacter, ed. 2012:528).
51 E.g. Ekman writes: “The modern Jewish state of Israel undoubtedly represents a theological challenge to many and a stumbling block to some” pointing that “classical theology [...] disregards the possibility of Israel's renewal. Such an idea is more or less non-existent [in the works] of the Church Fathers and in medieval theology ” (Ekman, 2009:223).
52 As a political movement, Zionism is primarily a fruit of efforts by secular Jews, cf. Havel, 2013c.
without any religion at all.”53 However, thirteen years later, in 1917, his successor Benedict XV during a meeting with Nahum Sokolow in Rome expressed enthusiasm for the idea of the return of the Jews to their land, making attentive enquiries about the manner and the progress of Zionist activities. He concluded their conversation with: “Si, si, Io credo che noi saremo buoni vicini.”54 Towards the end of his life, the British Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary Arthur Balfour concluded that the most valuable thing he accomplished in life was what he did for the Jews.55 Colonel and diplomat Sir Mark Sykes (1879–1919) supported the Balfour Declaration on account of his faith.56 Major General Orde Charles Wingate (1903–1944) was one of the most important early supporters of the idea of Jewish statehood on the basis of Christian belief. Today, he is considered “father of the Israeli army.”57 Unlike Evangelical communities, which had no elaborate ecclesiology and assumed ad hoc positions on Jewish statehood, the issue of the Catholic standpoint was more “controversial.”58 In his renowned 1992 book Church and Jewish People, Cardinal Willebrands evaded the issue of the State of Israel as a theological topic altogether.59 A number of Catholic priests and theologians, such as Oesterreicher, Hocken, Lux, and D’Costa cited in this article, supported Zionism as a reflection of God’s will in history, although there are also proponents of alternative view.60 Indeed, forming a theological view on almost any national political issue is sensitive,61 but when it comes to the Jewish state it is de facto inevitable. Ekman writes that “for many Christians, the birth of [the State of] Israel rendered a spiritual alarm clock.”62 One of the key reasons is the unique understanding of


55 Dugdale, 1937:171. Arthur Balfour (1848–1930) was the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and subsequent Foreign Secretary. It was in this capacity that he issued the Balfour Declaration, one of the fundamental documents of Jewish statehood. For a more recent overview of Christian Zionism as a form of philo-Semitism before the establishment of the State of Israel see Yaakov Ariel, “It’s All in the Bible”: Evangelical Christians, Biblical Literalism, and Philosemitism in Our Times in: Karp and Sutcliffe, ed. 2011:261-267. Ariel has apparently changed his position (cf. Ariel, 2002:42) regarding whether or not it is philosemitism.

56 Dugdale, 1937:167. Mark Sykes was Catholic, whereas Balfour and later Orde Wingate were Protestants.

57 M. Oren in: Hazoni, ed. 2006:390-404. The incumbent Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu has a similar view. He considers the Jewish Legion under Jabotinsky’s command, Hashomer from the 1920s, Wingate’s fighters from the 1930s, and the Jewish Brigade, which was during the Second World War part of the British Army, to be the infancy of the Israeli Defence Forces (Netanyahu, 2000:361). For more on Wingate see Havel, 2013b:139-147 (in Croatian), and for his comprehensive biography in English Sykes, 1959. In opposition to Wingate, Lieutenant-General John Bagot Glubb, a British officer and Protestant, also known as Glubb Pasha, led the most efficient army in the 1948-1949 war against Israel, namely the Arab League. To a certain extent, Glubb, “a believing Christian” (Morris, 2003:23), was in his struggle against Jews motivated by his Christian convictions.

58 Benedict XVI, 2018:178.

59 Hann, 1994:625. In his review of the book, Hann observes that “Israel” was not mentioned at all in the Index.

60 Cf. e.g. Prior, 2005.

61 Thus, Oesterreicher advises: “For the theologian, Israel’s future cannot be a mere political problem. Heaven forbid that he allow the cry ‘Politics!’ to prevent him from taking a stand [of support for the State of Israel]” (Oesterreicher, 1970:241).

history as a way of God’s revelation in Judaism, but also in Christianity, which is “a revelation of God in history” and in which “historical knowledge […] is one of the ways to the knowledge of spiritual reality.” For a Christian, it is impossible to neglect historical development in Eretz Israel inasmuch as “More than two-thirds of the biblical mentions of the covenant are explicitly linked to the promise of the land.” Since the New Testament and subsequently *Nostra aetate* and a number of later Catholic documents affirm the validity of the Covenant, the connection of the Jewish people to Eretz Israel is unquestionable from the Christian perspective. Due to Israel’s amazing accomplishments from its establishment in 1948 to the present day, many Christians concluded that God fulfilled Biblical promises in this time and returned His people to their land. In addition, Israel today enjoys the reputation of a strong, successful, and free nation, which many Christians consider a role model. The impression is that more and more Christians perceive the Jews through the prism of Israel and Israeli accomplishments, and less and less through anti-Semitic traditions, prejudices of the past, and unpopular Jews like George Soros. Israeli courage, brainpower, creativity and patriotism expressed through many difficulties encountered in the process of building and defending their state, linked to the understanding that this is a people with distinct divine favour, radically changed the image of “Jew” among Christians. Negative perception, historical hostility, distrust and indifference gave way first to a cautious, then to an outspokenly positive perception. The State of Israel has become a “new source” of Christian philo-Semitism. In relation to the two “old sources” this new source has, over the past several decades, most probably exerted the strongest influence on many lay believers, particularly those without systematic knowledge of history and theology. Therein lies both its advantage and its danger. Inasmuch as it often builds on emotions, enthusiasm, ideological leaning and activism, and at times on opposition to something (jihadism) more than on support for something (welfare of the Israeli State), it should be restrained and directed by evangelical principles (e.g., it does not absolve of the Christian duty to love one’s enemies) in order to preserve it within the framework of Christian philo-Semitism. Otherwise, it may turn into zealous political, ideological, or religious activism, which still may pose a praiseworthy enterprise, but not necessarily a reflection of Christian philo-Semitism.

---

63 “Essential to our world view is the belief that the God of Israel is the God of History, meaning that manifestations of God are to be sought more in the events of history and in the social process than in the area of nature. And since Israel is the people of the Covenant, every major event in the history of our people is to be viewed as revelational…” (Shubert Spero: The Religious Meaning of the State of Israel in: Spero and Pessin, ed. 1989:41). Similarly, Rabbi Heschel in the context of the establishment of the State of Israel writes: "Ultimately the significance of history must be understood in terms of theology" (Heschel, 1987:220).

64 Berdyaev, 1936:33, 14.


67 Cf. Matt 5:44.
**Conclusion: Correlation of the Sources and the Challenge of Christian Philo-Semitism**

Since the second half of the 20th century, reflections on Jews, Judaism and the State of Israel have featured ever more prominently within the framework of Christian considerations of spiritual and historical issues and of *Weltanschauung*. It inspired Christian philo-Semitism as a unique phenomenon in the history of the Church. It is on the other hand inevitably, strongly, closely, and almost obtrusively linked to political, ideological, humanitarian, security-related, and other issues, over which many other contemporary protagonists outside the Church and Israel ponder, clash and debate. Since 1967, a position regarding Israel has become more clearly articulated in almost all movements and States of the world. Hostility towards Israel has allied motley groups and regimes based on Marxist, leftist, revolutionary, national-socialist, national-Islamist and jihadi ideologies into a bizarre, eclectic coalition. Free democratic societies with strong conservative political options tend to adopt pro-Israeli policies and pro-Jewish attitudes. Over the past several decades, the State of Israel has grown into an important protagonist in the economy, industry, medicine, education, science, computing, communications, and security, which has additionally influenced the visibility and appreciation of this exceptional nation. Israel's image as a country of hard-working, creative, innovative people has often dominated the presentations of the Jewish state over recent years. However, many conflicting political, religious, and ideological issues, more often than not, can be found lurking in the shadows, even when topics discussed do not concern politics, religion and ideology. We may generally argue that there is no other nation or political entity in the world about which almost everyone – state or non-state protagonists, individuals, or groups – have such as a strong opinion. That opinion often indicates the ideological direction, spiritual condition, and values of its holder.

Even though the Christian view on Jews and Israel primarily stems from Biblical faith, we as Christians – whether we want it or not – partake in political and ideological processes, disputes, and concerns, which at times only marginally overlap with Christian faith. Understanding of Jews as the chosen people entitled to their land inevitably communicates not only religious, but also political views. Since Christian love is not a matter of abstract spirituality, but of active faith visible and fruitful in everyday life and in concrete circumstances, the same holds true for Christian philo-Semitism. It seems that a main challenge many contemporary Christians face is not rejection of anti-Jewish prejudices and acceptance of Biblical understanding of Jews, since that process is here to stay. The challenge is to thoughtfully distinguish between the part of that understanding that is founded on faith, and the part that is founded on political reality. At its very core is the State of Israel, which is a political phenomenon, but then again, a phenomenon beyond politics. There is a danger that the part, which is political but inspired by faith, turns rogue and starts to govern the spiritual life of a Christian. At a time of fierce ideological polarisation throughout the Western world, it is easy for a Christian to sharpen his political views, and act under the pretext of fervency for the absolute spiritual truth, even in matters of entirely this-worldly political goals. Such a peril may be kept at bay, like in other spheres of Christian life, by proper prioritisation, curbing enthusiasm for worldly
things and focusing on what is eternal, according to Paul’s instruction: “Set your minds on things that are above, not on things that are on earth.”

Despite ongoing challenges, it is hardly possible to respect and love the Jewish people without recognising Jewish historical, identity and religious connection to their land. Moreover, support for political Zionism can be understood as compliance with the Golden Rule. Would we as Croats want someone to respect us but deny us the right to live in our own country and have a state of our own? The issue of particular political form in which the return of Jews comes about, cannot be lightly interpreted as the fulfillment of God’s promises since “to do so would give divine authority to a nation-state” which would demonstrate a “dangerous conceit.” As Ratzinger puts it, no theological meaning can be attributed to the State of Israel, but then again “the Jewish people, like every people, had a natural right to their own land,” and in this sense the Jewish State “expresses God’s faithfulness to the people of Israel.” Since this is a very visible expression, for a Christian to be inspired by it is more than acceptable; it is expected.

According to Israel Eldad, in the development of Jewish Zionism the two old sources of Zionism point to, and merged into a third one, the State of Israel. The state is their objective, but in a way its own objective too: “the fruit of Zionism has turned into the seed of new Zionism.” Christian philo-Semitism is based on three similar sources, but their mutual relationship is different. The “second” and the “third” source, neither of which is a theological category, point to the “first” one, the Biblical promise, which is a theological category. Considerate, contemplative approach to complex interrelation of those three sources, based on history and the Gospel, should surely provide for a Christian philo-Semitism that serves the dual purpose of being a blessing to Israel, while at the same time adding to the spiritual advancement of the Church.

The English translation of Prof. Havel’s paper was finally edited by the author.

---

68 Col 3:2.
69 Matt 7:12.
72 Eldad, 2007:23. Eldad refers to a difference between Jewish secular and religious visions. For believers, the Jewish State is not a purpose in itself but is “the bridge to salvation” (p. 22). Jewish and Christian believers have much in common in their understanding of history, including the history of the State of Israel and its future.
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