

**THE PROGRESS OF PROPHECY: AN ANALYSIS OF THE RHETORIC OF
CHRISTIAN ZIONISM**

THESIS

**Presented to the Graduate Council
of Texas State University-San Marcos
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements**

for the Degree

Master of ARTS

by

Jacob H. Stutzman, B.A.

**San Marcos, Texas
August 2005**

COPYRIGHT

by

Jacob H. Stutzman

2005

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have to begin by thanking my wife, Phyllis. For eight years I've known her, for five I've loved her, and for one I've been able to call myself her husband. She has read much of this text, listened to me read parts of it to her, and helped me find the right words. More importantly, she gives me strength, support, a sense of perspective, and regularly reminds me why I'm doing this thing.

I am also deeply grateful for the help of my thesis committee. Of the 30 credit hours I have earned at Texas State, 21 of them have been in classes taught by Dr. Ann Burnette, Dr. Roseann Mandziuk, or Dr. Mary Hoffman. The things I got right in this thesis are right because I learned from them. Dr. Mary Hoffman deserves special thanks as my thesis advisor for the past year, more thanks than I can express here. She has been patient, encouraging, helpful, and wise. I am proud of this work because it has her approval.

Dr. Hoffman is not the first University of Kansas alumnus to get me graduated, and I owe deep thanks to my friend Dr. Kevin Minch. I hope that by attending Kansas for my PhD, I can learn a fraction of the compassion and comportment that my two advisors have exemplified. I hope that I can someday be as great a help to my students as Dr. Minch and Dr. Hoffman have been to me.

Dr. Minch was my last debate coach, but Ms. Peggy Dersch was my first. She as well deserves more thanks than I can put on this paper. Outside of my family, I do not

know that anyone has had a bigger impact on my life. Peggy was well-accompanied by her husband, Mr. Alan Mitchell, who passed away in February after an extended illness. I traveled Europe twice with Alan and Peggy, and my memories would be much diminished if either had not been there. Alan is deeply missed, and there is little else I can say.

Of course I have received support from many other friends and colleagues at Texas State, but I can only recognize a few. Amy Arellano has made sure that the last year was never too quiet, never too settled, always enjoyable, and probably a little more fun than should be allowed. When I debated for a national championship as a junior in college, I was thrilled to have Dan West on the panel. Who knew that four years later, I would be sitting next to him in class and traveling with him for tournaments? Dan is a great guy and I'm planning on stealing a bunch of his ideas when I'm coaching again. Maybe I shouldn't have put that on paper. Before Amy and Dan, I was in class with Kellie Clancy, Korryn Mozisek, and Jason Myres, and many of my good vibes about Texas State come from them.

I have to thank my family, or they would remind me that I missed them. My grandparents, Bobba, Pop, and Grandma, my aunts Barb and Julie, who always make sure Phyllis and I are taken care of, and my brother Zach, who will start his own master's program in the fall. Oh yeah, my Mom and Dad too. Just wouldn't be right to forget them now, would it? I love them all and whether they understand what I'm studying or not, they have all contributed to this thesis in some way. I'm just glad they didn't make t-shirts for my graduation.

This manuscript was submitted on May 20, 2005.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....iv

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE THESIS.....1

Theological Roots
The Role of Prophecy
Political Activity
Who Are the Christian Zionists?
Conclusion

II. METHOD OF ARTIFACT SELECTION AND ANALYSIS.....16

Selection of artifacts
Rhetorical Method

III. ANALYSIS OF MISSION RHETORIC.....28

Promise
Land
Nations
Church
Mission Worldview

IV. ANALYSIS OF PULPIT RHETORIC.....42

Nation
Land
Promise
Pulpit Worldview

V. CONCLUSION AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....55

The Terministic Screen
Extension of Other Critical Methods
Future Research

REFERENCES.....70

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE THESIS

I warn everyone who hears the words of prophecy of this book: if anyone adds to them, God will add to him the plagues described in this book, and if anyone takes away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God will take away his share in the tree of life and in the holy city, which are described in this book. He who testifies to these things says, 'Surely I am coming soon.' Amen. Come, Lord Jesus!

--Revelation 22:18-20

The word Armageddon derives from the Hebrew *har meggido*, the valley in northern Israel where the battle between the forces of the Antichrist and the Second Coming of Jesus will finally play out. A necessary precondition for such a battle includes the ingathering of 144,000 Jews to Israel. A necessary precondition for such an ingathering is the existence of Israel. That very simple line of reasoning, along with a particular mode of Biblical exegesis, has given rise to a movement called Christian Zionism.

As fundamentalism has grown in American Christianity, Christian Zionism has become a powerful force in American foreign policy, influencing as directly as possible those who occupy the highest levels of government. The influence of Christians on

government is directly related to their participation in political activities. Political participation is strongly influenced by an individual's perception of the norms for such participation in one's church (Djupe & Grant, 2001). Evangelical Christians, of which Christian Zionists are a subset, are most likely among all Christian groups to be targeted with messages promoting political participation and are also most likely to be positively affected by those messages (Wilcox & Sigelman, 2001). The effect of recent attempts to mobilize evangelical Christians has been to make them the dominant force in the activist base of the Republican Party (Wilcox & Jelen, n.d.).

The general importance of Christian Zionism is clear, but there remains an open question as to what unique advantages can be gained by studying the movement from a communication perspective. As I will explain in detail later, Christian Zionism differs in important ways from traditional Christian theology and the existing frameworks for understanding sociopolitical movements. The difference between Christian Zionism and the traditional forms of Christian advocacy is derived directly from the interpretation of scripture promulgated by Christian Zionists. Consequently, only by examining the rhetoric Christian Zionists use can we understand Christian Zionism as something apart from other Christian advocacy. Moreover, as a movement, Christian Zionism does not organize itself around individual leaders, central organizations, or tangible goals. Instead, rhetoric is both the method and mode of organization. In this light, a communication perspective is both necessary and desirable to achieve a complete understanding of Christian Zionism.

In this thesis, I will first outline Christian Zionism as a movement, then explicate the rhetorical method that will be used to analyze the rhetoric of Christian Zionism, apply

that method, and finally draw conclusions about both the rhetorical artifacts and the rhetorical methods. In this chapter, I will explain the theological and political background of Christian Zionism, introduce the rhetors whose work will be analyzed, and explain why Christian Zionism is an important subject of rhetorical study.

Understanding the Christian Zionist movement requires an exploration of the theological roots of the movement that distinguish it from other strains of Christianity, the role of prophecy in modern Christian Zionist thought, and the political goals and influence of Christian Zionists.

Theological Roots

Evangelism is a strong tradition in American Christianity. In the original sense, evangelism was simply the proclamation of the good news. As the Christian church evolved, “evangelist” became a specific office within the church (Efrid, 1989). More recently, however, evangelism has come to refer to a mode of Christianity that emphasizes the witness to and conversion of non-Christians.

Within the evangelical movement, there are a number of strains, most notably the fundamentalist strain. Fundamentalism is exemplified by a desire to replace or eliminate liberal theology and ritual-as-worship. Fundamentalists can be described as “angry evangelicals” (Marty & Appleby, 1991). They seek not only to practice in a particular manner but also to have their practices replace all others. It is important to note that evangelism is unique to Christianity, and thus fundamentalism as a subset of evangelism is also unique to Christianity. However, fundamentalism can have meaning outside of the Christian sense and includes Islamism and fundamentalist Judaism, among others

(Keddie, 1998). For the purposes of this research, however, only Christian fundamentalism is relevant.

To further distinguish the subjects of research, Christian fundamentalists can be divided based on their eschatological timelines. Eschatology is the study of the End Times, or the Armageddon as it is prophesied in Revelation. Fundamentalists fall into the amillennial, postmillennial, and premillennial camps. The amillennial believers assume that the coming and going of numbered years has little if anything to do with the End Times. Postmillennialists believe that the End Times will come after the passing of the millennium. Premillennialists, then, believe that the End Times will come prior to the end of the millennium, although the precise timeframe remains unclear. Within the realm of American fundamentalists, premillennialism is the preferred doctrine.

The final notable facet of fundamentalist theology is known as dispensationalism. Dispensationalism is a theological doctrine that is characterized by two necessary tenets. The first is a literal interpretation of scripture. Defenders of such an exegetical method will define “literal” as meaning a “plain or normal meaning to a word” (Dean, 1999). Critics of dispensationalism argue that it treats the Old and New Testaments as books that are unrelated in any significant way (Sizer, 2003). Rather than reading the New Testament as a sequel to the Old Testament, dispensationalism sees the two scriptures in much the same way a high school student sees her biology and English textbooks; sharing the characteristics of being books, but not linked by any measure of substance.

The second fundamental tenet of dispensational theology derives from the separation of Old and New Testaments and sees Israel and the Christian church as distinct manifestations of God’s plan (Dean, 1999). Specifically, dispensationalists believe that

the modern state of Israel is the manifestation of the promises made to the people of Israel in the Old Testament whereas the body of Christian believers exists under a distinct rule and covenant (Sizer, 2003). Rather than focusing on a unified body of believers under God, dispensationalists separate Jews from Christians in God's view and leave each to separate fates.

The Christian Zionist movement becomes definable in this distinction. Christian Zionists are fundamentalist evangelicals who subscribe to a premillennialist dispensational theology, as described above. The belief that God works through Jews just as God works through Christians is at the center of their beliefs about Israel. Since Israel is a Jewish state and represents the Jewish people, and since an infallible God works through that people, the state of Israel can do no wrong. Moreover, those who would oppose Israel to any degree can be said to oppose the Jewish people and by extension, God. On the other hand, those that believe in scriptural inerrancy would support Israel as part of God's plan to bring about the final dispensation by preparing the conditions for the End Times.

The Role of Prophecy

The implications of dispensationalist theology are clear. God has made promises to the people Israel, and those promises will be kept by God to the nation Israel (Keathley, 2004). Those who would oppose Israel in any degree then, are opposed to God's plan as outlined in scripture (Dean, 1999). Christians who oppose Christian Zionism on theological grounds may be attacked as anti-Semitic (Couch, n.d.). A similar label awaits those who would oppose Israel, to any degree, on non-religious grounds as well.

What is the goal of political support for Israel then? According to Bill Berkowitz (2003), it is "...to guard, protect, and defend Eretz Yisrael and its people until the Messiah comes to Zion". In short, Christian Zionists see their support of Israel as key to bringing about the Apocalypse described in Revelation. Specifically, they believe that prior to the coming of the End Times, the people Israel will be regathered in the land Israel (Lazerte, n.d.). One hundred and forty four thousand Jews who will accept Jesus as the Messiah halfway through the tribulation period will then serve as proselytizers who will reap a "soul harvest" (Hobeck, n.d). Dispensationalists believe that the prophecy of the Bible can be projected onto current events. Magog, named in Ezekiel 38 as one of the nations that will attack Israel during the tribulation, is widely assumed to be Russia since the Soviet Union once occupied the Central Asian region thought to be called Magog. This naming of Magog is nothing new, as some have moved since the fall of the Soviet Union to call newly independent Muslim states the Magog, and previously the label has been applied to Europe (with an "American Israel"), the Confederacy during the Civil War, and "indianised" American colonists (Railton, 2003). Despite the apparent inaccuracy, however, dispensationalists believe that they must spread their prophecies to as many believers as possible, and they will use whatever means available to achieve that end.

Indeed, the propagation of prophecy via the Internet is astounding. Hundreds of websites have sprung up that analyze news for signs of the impending Armageddon and televangelists make money selling videos and books that foretell the secrets revealed in scripture. RaptureReady.com features a "Rapture Index" that they claim will serve as a speedometer for the End Times based on world events. The recent consolidation of

power in the Russian prime minister's office, for example, was explained with a reference to the "evil thought" that will come into the head of Gog, the leader of Magog.

Europe is a major figure in the prophecy as well. Some Christian Zionists claim that "understanding that Europe has shed its former robes of Christianity to accept its prophesied economic and governmental role within the end-time Babylonian system of world domination is essential to understanding its beast nature" (James & Strandberg, n.d.). Iraq is seen as the modern equivalent of Babylon, another prominent nation in the End Times (Martin, 2003). Identification cards and biometric identification systems are seen as increased knowledge and evidence of the mark of the beast, both harbingers of Apocalypse (Van Impe, 2004). Jack Van Impe, one well-known televangelist, has no fewer than 14 "prophecy movies" for sale. David Allen Lewis Ministries makes available 18 books explaining his view of the coming fulfillment of prophecy and America's role in supporting Israel.

Political Activity

The exploits of Christian Zionists are not limited to prophecy and capitalism, however. In fact, fundamentalist Christians are becoming an important demographic in the national political scene. While the number of fundamentalists has not increased significantly, their influence on national politics has. In April 2003, the International Fellowship of Christians and Jews organized a rally in Washington, D.C., that featured notable political figures such as former presidential candidate Gary Bauer; the then-ambassador to Israel, Daniel Ayalon; and Congressmen from both dominant political parties. The rally was co-sponsored by the Christian Coalition and the American-Israel Political Action Committee (Wagner, D., 2003). Beyond political organizations,

fundamentalist Protestant churches, such as the Pentecostal churches, support Christian Zionism, as does the Southern Baptist Convention, the second-largest American religious denomination (Wagner, D., 2003).

In response to a call from mainline churches for a “shared Jerusalem” in 1997, the Israel Christian Advocacy Council organized an advertising campaign called “Christians for a United Jerusalem”. Sponsors included Pat Robertson; Ralph Reed, then director of the Christian Coalition; the president of the National Religious Broadcasters; and the president of the National Association of Evangelicals (Wagner, D., 2003). The connections, however, extend beyond mere advocacy.

The Christian Zionist position is shared by so-called neoconservatives, or neocons. A number of neocons hold positions within the current Bush Administration, including Douglas Feith, Undersecretary of Defense for Policy since 2001; Richard Perle, chairman of the Defense Policy Board until 2003; and Paul Wolfowitz, Deputy Secretary of Defense. In 1996, Feith and Perle co-authored a policy paper advising then-Israeli prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu to abandon the Oslo peace process and return to a policy of military repression of the Palestinians. More recently, Donald Rumsfeld, Secretary of Defense, called the Israeli settlements in the occupied West Bank and Gaza Strip legitimate products of Israeli military victory. Dick Arme, Republican Majority Leader in the House of Representatives, called for the transfer of all Palestinians across the Jordan River (Lieven, 2002).

Fundamentalist Christians’ ardent and unflinching support for Israel is the single unique position that distinguishes them from other Christians. Mayer (2004) found that only fundamentalist Christians were distinct in their beliefs towards Israel. Mainline

Protestantism and Catholicism were not reliable predictors of support for Israel whereas fundamentalists were not only strong in their support for Israel but also in their opposition to the United States pressuring Israel to take certain actions. As expected, the same study found that fundamentalists' support of Israel was uniquely derived from their faith in Biblical accounts as inerrant historical facts, as opposed to a separable moral sense of fairness. Mayer (2004) also found that fundamentalism was the only reliable demographic predictor of opinion towards Israel, and ties such opinions directly to the statements of fundamentalist religious leaders. Clearly dispensationalist theology and prophecy is playing an ever-larger role in the political arena, giving a study of the rhetoric surrounding such theology an important purpose.

Who Are the Christian Zionists?

There are any number of well-known evangelists and figures in the Christian community who incorporate some measure of Christian Zionism and prophecy into their message. Only a few, however, center their ministries on Christian Zionism. Four of those individuals, and their organizations, are represented in this study: Rev. Malcolm Hedding of the International Christian Embassy in Jerusalem, Clarence Wagner of Bridges for Peace, Dr. David Reagan of Lamb and Lion Ministries, and Jan Willem van der Hoeven of the International Christian Zionist Center. I will provide a brief biography of each of these men, as well as a description of the organizations they represent.

The Rev. Malcolm Hedding is the Executive Director of the International Christian Embassy in Jerusalem (ICEJ). Hedding received his Bachelor of Theology from the Bible Institute of Southern Africa and is ordained through the Assemblies of God of Southern Africa. Between 1986 and 2000, Hedding alternated between working

for Christian Zionist groups in Israel and starting new congregations in South Africa. In November of 2000, Hedding took his current position with the ICEJ (About us, n.d.). Hedding has authored half a dozen books and a number of magazine articles that have been published around the world. In addition, Hedding has made multiple television appearance in the United States (ICEJ-Canada, n.d.).

The International Christian Embassy in Jerusalem (ICEJ) is one of the most influential Christian Zionist organizations in the world. Founded in 1980 to demonstrate their support for Jerusalem as the “eternal and indivisible capital” of Israel, the ICEJ maintains a strong presence both in Israel and around the world. With forty-three branches outside of Israel, the ICEJ has both a broad audience and a fundraising base. The ICEJ sponsors four major projects in Israel: the Social Assistance Program providing individual and group assistance in a variety of areas, Home Care for sick and elderly immigrants newly arrived from Russia, the Jerusalem Ministry Center which helps newly arrived immigrants with food vouchers, infant needs, and clothing donations, and finally Beit HaTikvah (Hebrew for “house of hope”) which provides new immigrants with a place to live until they are able to situate themselves permanently. Additionally, the ICEJ sponsors an e-mail news service and a bimonthly magazine, *Word From Jerusalem*.

Clarence Wagner is the International Director and CEO of Bridges for Peace (BFP). Wagner is an ordained minister and has lived in Israel for almost 30 years, first serving as an administrator for a children’s clinic in Jerusalem before working with BFP (BFP, n.d.). Mr. Wagner became the director of BFP in 1980. Wagner hosts the *Jerusalem Mosaic* television series and edits BFP’s stable of publications, including the monthly *Israel Teaching Letter*. Mr. Wagner also regularly appears at conferences and

events sponsored by Zionist organizations, and serves on a number of advisory boards and theological committees in Israel.

Bridges for Peace is based in Jerusalem and seeks to build relationships between Christians and Jews to encourage the former to “actively express their biblical responsibility before God to be faithful to Israel and the Jewish community (BFP, n.d.). Formed in 1976, BFP publishes a variety of periodicals, including the bi-monthly *Dispatch from Jerusalem* and the monthly *Israel Teaching Letter*. Additionally, BFP sponsors a number of charitable programs, including Project Ezra to provide new immigrants and the elderly with food assistance, and Project Rescue/Project Hope, which aids impoverished Jews from around the world in preparing for immigration to Israel.

BFP also has eight international branches in the United States, Canada, Japan, Brazil, South Africa, and elsewhere. In the United States, BFP-USA shows almost \$4 million in income during 2003 (ECFA, n.d.) and gets four of five stars for financial accountability and an “A” for transparency (MinistryWatch, 2005a). While such data are not available for the other branches of BFP, or for the organization as a whole, BFP-USA may be taken to represent the overall health of the organization with strong funding and a good reputation overall.

Dr. David Reagan, senior evangelist of Lamb and Lion Ministries, is well-respected in the Christian Zionist community as a “dependable source of reliable information” (Balnius & Strandberg, n.d.). Dr. Reagan attended the University of Texas at Austin and earned graduate degrees in International Relations from both Tufts University and Harvard University. According to his biography on the Lamb and Lion website, he held a number of administrative positions in higher education before turning

to ministry, including the President of South Texas Junior College, Director of the Center for International Business at Pepperdine University, and Vice President of Phillips University in Oklahoma. Dr. Reagan also served as a Fulbright lecturer and information officer for the United States Information Agency in Southeast Asia in the 1960's.

In 1976, Dr. Reagan was called as a pulpit minister for a church in north Texas, and was ordained as a full minister shortly thereafter. In 1980, he founded Lamb and Lion Ministries. In addition to his position as senior evangelist, Reagan serves on the board of trustees. Dr. Reagan has authored or co-authored eight books on prophecy and the end times, published a number of articles in religious periodicals, led more than two dozen pilgrimages to Israel, and hosts Lamb and Lion's weekly satellite television program, "Christ in Prophecy".

Lamb and Lion Ministries considers itself a "non-denominational, independent ministry" that "seeks to lift up Jesus and draw people to Him as Lord and Savior" (Nature and Purpose, n.d.). In addition to the aforementioned weekly television program, Lamb and Lion also sends out print, audio, and video materials, including a bimonthly magazine called *Lamplighter*. The Evangelical Council for Financial Accountability shows the ministry had over \$1.1 million in revenue for 2003 (ECFA, n.d.). Additionally, MinistryWatch, an independent non-profit organization that monitors the financial accountability of charitable Christian organizations, gives Lamb and Lion three stars (out of five) for overall financial efficiency, and an "A" for organizational transparency (MinistryWatch, 2005b). Overall, Lamb and Lion Ministries is reasonably well-funded, diverse in their offerings, and well-regarded as an organization.

Jan Willem van der Hoeven is the director of the International Christian Zionist Center, and the founder of the International Christian Embassy in Jerusalem, one of the largest and most important Christian Zionist organizations. Van der Hoeven lives in Israel and directs his ministries from Jerusalem. He is also in great demand among American Zionist organizations, both Christian and Jewish, and regularly appears in the United States to speak and receive recognition. Born in the Netherlands, van der Hoeven received his Bachelor of Divinity from London University before moving to the Middle East. In addition to his management of his Zionist organizations, van der Hoeven has written a book and a number of articles that are reprinted in publications around the world. Van der Hoeven maintains particularly close ties with the Zionist Organization of America and the former prime minister of Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu.

The International Christian Zionist Center (ICZC) was founded in order to fulfill the task of “the assembling of all true believers...to come to the aid of the People of Israel” (About, 2003). The ICZC aims to be politically involved in Israel and around the world in standing with God’s promises to the Jewish people, but their primary purpose is to provide immediate and tangible aid to Israel. The organization hosts an annual “Feast of Tabernacles” in order to emphasize the importance of the land of Israel. The Feast is open to Christians from around the world and is held every year in Jerusalem. Additionally, the ICZC has built a model of a third Jewish Temple that they believe is prophesied in Ezekiel. According to the ICZC website, they are seeking a hilltop near Jerusalem where they can place the model as the first step towards rebuilding the temple on the Temple Mount in Jerusalem. The ICZC has also participated in prayer vigils and demonstrations in Israel, including an event in which 100 ICZC members joined hands

with Jewish settlers in a town in the Gaza Strip to demonstrate solidarity (Jerusalem Newswire, 2004). All of the ICZC's activities are intended to provide direct and visible support for a Jewish presence throughout Israel and the occupied territories.

Each of these men is represented in the sample of rhetoric for this study by one or two artifacts published in the publications sponsored by their organizations. The organizations can be divided into two categories: Mission and Pulpit. Mission organizations work primarily to support Israel and Israeli Jews with contributions and direct aid. Pulpit organizations, on the other hand, serve to promote Christian Zionism as both an exegetical method and a political ideology. Of the four organizations represented here, Bridges for Peace and the International Christian Embassy Jerusalem fall into the Mission category, while Lamb and Lion Ministries and the International Christian Zionist Center fall into the Pulpit category. Of course, the division is not a total one as Mission and Pulpit organizations participate in some of the same events, and sometimes cooperate with and endorse each other. Nonetheless, the purposes of the various organizations are most likely to drive their creation of rhetoric, and thus any similarities or differences in their rhetoric. Thus, the division between Mission and Pulpit organizations is very useful for this study.

Conclusion

Christian fundamentalism is becoming a stronger political force in the United States and that strength is manifest on a single issue. Fundamentalist support of Israel is based in a particular reading of scripture and the resulting rhetoric of fundamentalist leaders. A textual analysis of that rhetoric is key to understanding the power of dispensationalist theology in American politics. As Christian Zionism exerts a powerful

influence over American foreign policy, it is important that we have a clear understanding of the ideology Christian Zionists promote. Moreover, the power of fundamentalist religio-political rhetoric is not unique to the United States either. Various pieces of Christian Zionist rhetoric likely share some commonality, one best illustrated through a cluster analysis as proposed by Kenneth Burke. Identifying the important clusters in Christian Zionist rhetoric will lead to a more complete understanding of the ideology of Christian Zionism as a whole, and provide a basis for comparison with religio-political rhetoric in other countries. With the history and theology of Christian Zionism explained above, this thesis next will turn to an explanation of the critical method that will be used for analysis, then the application of that method to Mission rhetoric, followed by Pulpit rhetoric. Finally, this study will draw some important conclusions about both the rhetorical artifacts and the methods of criticism available to explore those artifacts.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD OF ARTIFACT SELECTION AND ANALYSIS

The study of a previously unexamined set of rhetorical artifacts cannot begin with an assumption that the artifacts are linked through any commonality other than their selection as the sample for that particular study. Instead, the selection of the artifacts themselves must be subject to some sort of methodology before any critical analysis is generated. To that end, this chapter will first outline the methods used to select the artifacts analyzed in this study and name those artifacts, before turning to an exploration of the critical methods that will be used to analyze the artifacts.

Selection of Artifacts

Compiling a representative sample of Christian Zionist rhetoric requires attention to the rhetors and then consideration of the aspects of the specific artifacts. The criteria used to make such decisions are derived directly from the impetus for this study. Specifically, this study is important because of the growing role that Christian Zionism is playing in American foreign policy. Consequently, the criteria used to select rhetors and artifacts should reflect the influence that those rhetors and artifacts might have in the realm of foreign policy. There are two unique types of Christian Zionist groups: Mission and Pulpit. Mission groups are primarily interested in financial and logistical aid to Jews moving to Israel while Pulpit groups are primarily interested in spreading a religious

message. Rhetors in this sample represent both Mission and Pulpit purposes. Each rhetor also represents an organization with a membership of adherents. Each artifact is also easily accessible to that membership and is textual in nature.

To have some measure of influence on foreign policy, a rhetor must represent some form of larger constituency. The process of selecting appropriate rhetors for this study then becomes a matter of eliminating those rhetors who cannot credibly claim to speak for an organization or church. By the same token, the larger the audience for a rhetor's ministry, and the more accessible the discourse is, the more relevant that rhetor is to this study.

Once the field of available rhetors is narrowed, the next task is to select specific artifacts for analysis. In doing so, two criteria are again developed and applied. The first criterion is that of availability. Many Christian Zionist organizations have established a presence on the Internet and that presence is the dominant method for making their materials available. Moreover, Christian Zionism's online presence is constructed in a way that enhances the credibility of individual rhetors. Easily identifiable authorship, as well as self-contained information that does not get phased off of the websites are all important factors in judging credibility (Haas & Wearden, 2003). The Internet is a necessary tool for both Mission and Pulpit rhetors which justifies this study's exclusive focus on that material.

The second criterion is that of printed text. Many Christian Zionist organizations provide materials in a variety of media, including audio and video. For a number of reasons, those materials were excluded from this study. First among those reasons is that

the multimedia artifacts are rarely available for free, thus reducing the potential audience for those artifacts, and thus their influence.

Second, the multimedia materials tend to dramatize the events of prophecy rather than explicate the prophecies themselves. One example is the title “Revelation” advertised on the website of Jack Van Impe Ministries International. In the movie, a counter-terrorism expert must uncover the reason why his wife and daughter were among the 187,000,000 people who vanished three months earlier. In doing so, he finds his way into the conspiracy behind the new world government led by the false Messiah, and the task falls to him to stop the conspiracy before it is too late (Apocalypse II, n.d.). While the movie is no doubt exciting and interesting in its own right, it *dramatizes* rather than *explains* the prophecy and so does not serve as a prescriptive message to the audience.

There are also methodological problems that would arise if visual texts were included in this sample. The Burkean methods that will be explained in detail later do not account for non-linguistic aspects of rhetoric. In fact, cluster analysis, which is the specific method chosen for this study, is based entirely in the frequency, intensity, and importance of certain words within an artifact. Attempting to assess non-linguistic discourse would be difficult with the methods at hand.

Finally, excluding non-textual artifacts leads to a consistency between the criticism and the prophecy. Since the prophecy is based in text and the interpretation thereof, then text seems the most appropriate media in which to encounter the prophecy. Textuality is also important to the selection and exclusion of critical methods, but that aspect will be explored in detail later in this chapter.

In keeping with these criteria, the artifacts analyzed in this study come from rhetors who represent both Mission and Pulpit organizations and credibly represent those organizations to audiences. The artifacts are available online and must be textual, as opposed to audio or video artifacts. To represent Pulpit rhetoric, I selected “The Land of Israel” and “The Palestinians” by Dr. David Reagan. Both are published on the website of his organization Lamb and Lion Ministries. I will also examine “God’s strategy for saving Israel” by Jan Willem van der Hoeven, published on the website of the International Christian Zionist Center. To represent Mission rhetoric, I selected the two part document “12 Keys to Israel in Prophecy”, authored by Charles Wagner as part of the *Israel Teaching Letter* series produced by Bridges for Peace, and two “Chaplain’s Corner” articles by Rev. Malcolm Hedding, published in ICEJ’s bimonthly *Word from Jerusalem* magazine.

All of the artifacts are, of course, concerned with the nature and resolution of the conflict over Israel/Palestine. Additionally, all of the artifacts rely heavily on scriptural evidence. In some cases, such as the work of Hedding, Wagner, and van der Hoeven, large blocks of scripture will be cited and then the rhetor’s specific arguments will build around those quoted sections. Reagan employs a style more reminiscent of his background in academia, providing information and then citing the relevant scripture parenthetically. For the purposes of this study, the quoted scripture is not considered an important part of the rhetoric, in part to avoid discrepancies between the differently-structured artifacts and in part to focus on the language that can be directly attributed to the rhetor.

The two articles from Reagan were both published in the *Lamplighter* magazine produced by his ministry organization. “The Land of Israel” is devoted to answering the question posed in the sub-title, “To whom does it belong?” “The Palestinians” is instead framed as a public response to a question posed by one of Reagan’s friends. The friend is naturally not identified, so we do not know if Reagan adequately addressed the question, but we are led to assume he did. The other sample of Pulpit rhetoric comes from Jan van der Hoeven, who published his work only on the website of the International Christian Zionist Center. “God’s strategy for saving Israel” is not addressed to any particular audience, but is one article under the heading “History & Prophecy” available on the website. No particular frame is specified for this artifact, nor are any specific circumstances leading to its creation explained. Instead, van der Hoeven’s piece is intended as part of a collection of readings on the Israel/Palestine conflict that are available for an interested individual to read and accept.

Hedding’s columns appear as regular features in the ICEJ publication *Word from Jerusalem*. The Hedding columns are structured in the style of some editorial writing, responding to nebulous claims without identifying either the specifics or sources of those claims. In another context, Hedding’s columns could function as short sermons as they focus on an explication of the lessons of scripture.

Finally, Wagner’s articles are explicitly intended for use as educational tools. Interested audience members are encouraged at the end of the documents to reproduce them or use them to teach others, provided proper credit is given to the author. The “Keys to Israel in Prophecy” pieces are more or less study guides for those interested in the Biblical commentary on the Israel/Palestine conflict. The Wagner artifacts help to

illustrate the diverse rhetorical forms employed in Christian Zionist writing. In fact, beyond their mere use of scriptural evidence, each of the artifacts used in the sample for this study evinces a somewhat different form while still maintaining the essential characteristics of written textuality and accessibility.

Rhetorical Method

The roots of the rhetorical methods of Kenneth Burke lie in his overall paradigm of dramatism. Burke (1966) defines dramatism as “a technique of analysis of language and thought as basically modes of action rather than as means of conveying information” (p. 54). Initially, dramatism is defined solely in opposition to the alternative “scientific” approach. Burke says that the “scientific approach begins with the questions of *naming* or *definition*” (p. 44). On the other hand, the dramaturgical approach views the definitional/descriptive power of language as secondary to the “attitudinal or hortatory” functions of language. The scientific approach operates primarily from a nominative framework, focusing on whether “it *is*, or it is *not*”. Dramatism operates instead from the framework of “thou *shalt*, or thou shalt *not*”.

The dramaturgical perspective is directly tied to Burke’s definition of man, in which the first characteristic of man is that he is a “symbol-using, symbol-making, and symbol-misusing animal” (1966, p. 6). The comparison that is of greatest importance is that between action and motion. Motion is animalistic and not consciously undertaken. Action however, is intentional, and thus influenced by the *shalts* and *shalt nots* of the dramaturgical paradigm. Beyond that influence, however, Burke contends that the use of symbols is, in and of itself, an action.

Humans thus use symbols, but Burke argues that we are also used by our symbols. The symbols we use affect the way we think and behave. The overwhelming majority of our knowledge is bound up in and passed along by symbol use. To the degree that past knowledge in some way constrains or directs our thoughts on a subject, the symbols that represent that knowledge are what constrain or direct us. Those thoughts necessarily direct behavior as well. Again, Burke's distinction between motion and action is relevant. Motion happens regardless of the symbols used by an individual whereas action is intentionally taken. Thus the symbols we use to define our knowledge direct the action we take.

Burke (1966) argues that "a symbolic act is the dancing of an attitude" in which a physical body "dances a corresponding state of mind" (p. 9). A physical body thus enacts the symbols that are important to it. As such enactment is controlled by the important symbols, it matters what symbols are important. A particular ideology (a term which will be explored more later) "makes the body hop around in certain ways; and that same body would have hopped around in different ways" had it been controlled by a different ideology (Burke, 1966, p. 6). Thus symbol use and misuse serve to constrain and guide voluntary actions.

The use of a collection of symbols by a rhetor forms what Burke (1966) calls a "terministic screen". Burke explains that a terministic screen is, essentially, a vocabulary, the use of which conveys a particular approach to reality. That approach necessarily involves a selection of certain aspects of reality and a deflection of other aspects of the same reality, constituting a specific perspective. Such perspective can only be created and shaped by language (Hawhee, 1999), which means the characteristics of

the language used in a set of artifacts are of special significance. Moreover, the use of symbols in a terministic screen can “direct a body somewhat differently from the way it would have moved” under the influence of another screen (Burke, 1966, p. 6).

Burke (1966) contends that “[w]e must use terministic screens, since we can’t say anything without the use of terms...they necessarily constitute a corresponding kind of screen” (p. 50). The choices made in constructing terministic screens, however, represent the choices between continuity and discontinuity, or what the rhetor chooses to identify with and what the rhetor disassociates from. Noting both the importance of terministic screens and the role screens have in directing identification and action, we can argue for a correlation between a rhetor’s terministic screen and that rhetor’s ideology. Essentially, a terministic screen is a function of ideology, both in what it highlights as important and in terms of what it ignores as irrelevant. The clusters serve to outline what is important, while the terministic screen aids the critic in examining what is utterly unimportant to the rhetor. The division of important and unimportant elements of reality is similar to the division between *shalt* and *shalt not*. The divide is created through symbol use, and offers both prescriptions and proscriptions for the rhetor’s audience. The analysis of a terministic screen can therefore provide powerful insight into the ideology that is both the cause and subject of a rhetor’s symbolic actions.

Terministic screens are elements in common between members of groups, including cultural groups (Rockler, 2002), and the existence of such screens limits what group members can see and comprehend by filtering out all other aspects of reality (Schiappa, 1989). In that way, the rhetoric of Christian Zionism may form a terministic screen by consistently highlighting certain aspects of Christianity and the conflict over

Israel/Palestine while deflecting other issues. Cluster analysis helps to identify what is highlighted and what is deflected, thus defining the terministic screen. As the rhetors of Christian Zionism choose what is important, they set up an ideology for their followers.

Rockler (2002) illustrates how terministic screens function to change an individual's perception. When exposed to two comic strips that featured African American characters, with one strip that glossed over issues of racial discrimination and another that made such issues central, white audiences operated from the terministic screen of "whiteness" which saw racial discrimination as aberrant and thus unworthy of the attention paid to it in the second strip. African American audiences preferred the strip that dealt with discrimination directly because their terministic screen ("race cognizance") lent great importance to issues of discrimination.

An outside actor can also help to frame terministic screens. Schiappa (1989) explains that the use of terministic screens is strategic, even if it is unintentional. At the same time, when those screens are created and maintained by an outside actor, they become self-fulfilling prophecies. In terms of nuclear war, Schiappa says the adoption of terministic screens that relinquish audience control makes war more likely. Christian Zionist rhetoric may be similar because of its basis in prophecy. Because the rapture is inevitable, the audience can only prepare for it and can do nothing to induce or slow the progress of prophecy.

Rockler (2002) and Schiappa (1989) illustrate the impact of terministic screens. In selecting certain aspects of reality, and thus filtering what adherents to a particular screen can see, terministic screens influence the choices made by individuals. Burke (1966) explains that the observations we make "are but implications of the particular

terminology in terms of which the observations are made” (p. 46). Burke (1954) incorporates the concept of a “trained incapacity” in which the skills a person has blinds him or her to possibilities outside of those skills. Terministic screens are a symbolic incapacity. By using a particular screen, one is able to understand some situations or some aspects of reality, but reliance on that screen makes one unable to see any other aspects of reality. In other words, by using a particular screen one’s thinking is constrained and so one’s conclusions are a result of the screen that has been used.

Applying these concepts to the selected texts involved a careful reading of each text to discover what the dominant terms in each document were and what terms were used in both positive and negative relationships with those dominant terms. I then identified a terministic screen based on the dominant positive and negative clusters as well as the elements of the sociopolitical situation that are absent (or “deflected” per Burke) in Christian Zionist rhetoric. Such a screen provides a template that may later be applied to other fundamentalist rhetorics to uncover any similarities common to all fundamentalist ideologies.

Given that symbols and collections of symbols are of such importance, we must have a specific critical method that explores the symbols that dominate a rhetorical artifact. Burke (1966) provides such a method in cluster analysis. Cluster analysis involves a “mapping” of texts to find key terms as determined by the frequency and intensity of their usage. The next step is to identify other terms that are used in relation to the key terms to find patterns in the rhetorical linkages, or “what goes with what” (p.20). Terms that are linked back to the key terms may be linked via proximity, a direct conjunction, or a cause-and-effect relationship (Foss, 1996). Burke (1966) notes that in

identifying clusters “we...may disclose by objective citation the structure of motivation operating” in a given piece of rhetoric (p. 20). Understanding a rhetor’s motivation sheds light on the action the rhetor will take, and, following Burke, that understanding can best be achieved through an analysis of the symbols that cluster in the rhetor’s discourse.

The use of cluster analysis for religious rhetoric is well established. Foss (1984) used clusters to analyze the response of the Episcopal Church to the irregular ordination of women as clergy, identifying four significant clusters around which the Church displayed its theology. Pullum (1992) used clusters to analyze the rhetoric of a popular Jewish preacher. Pullum argues that the relevant issues are: 1) what view of the world the rhetor wants the audience to accept; and 2) how the rhetor gets the audience to accept such a view. Pullum argues that because cluster analysis reveals the associations between key terms and ancillary terms, it serves to illustrate the rhetor’s worldview, what Burke would call a “terministic screen”.

Specific religious texts such as Revelation, the final book of the Bible, also have been analyzed through clusters. Snyder’s (2000) analysis concluded that Revelation’s persuasive power was derived largely from the use of clusters around “truth” and “purpose” to connect readers to the transcendent themes that are also prominent. Foss’ (1984) identification of “establishment” clusters in religious rhetoric may serve as a useful point of comparison for the rhetoric of a religious organization that is not based in a particular church. Snyder (2000) and Pullum (1992) demonstrate the usefulness of cluster analysis for prophetic and evangelical rhetoric, like Christian Zionism. Cluster analysis of Mission and Pulpit rhetoric requires a mapping of the clusters present in each

category, which will lead to an illustration of the textual similarities between those two categories.

Once the similarities between Mission and Pulpit rhetoric are made clear through cluster analysis, those similarities will form a terministic screen that is common to Christian Zionist rhetoric. In describing such a screen, we can understand both the ideology of Christian Zionism and the “dancing” of that ideology that one would see from those people who follow it.

CHAPTER 3

ANALYSIS OF PULPIT MISSION RHETORIC

And there came one of the seven angels who had the seven bowls, who were laden with the seven last plagues; and he spake with me, saying, Come hither, I will show thee the bride, the wife of the Lamb. And he carried me away in the Spirit to a mountain great and high, and showed me the holy city Jerusalem, coming down out of the heaven of God.

--Revelation 21:9-10

Mission organizations are those Christian Zionist groups whose primary purpose is to serve Israel directly through charitable donations. Mission organizations also will usually maintain a physical presence in Israel, sometimes placing their headquarters there. The sample of Mission rhetoric in this study includes four artifacts from two rhetors. Bridges for Peace publishes a monthly "Israel Teaching Letter" intended for clergy, activists, and other interested parties to use in explicating their views on Israel and the Palestinians. In consecutive months, Bridges for Peace published the two-part "12 Keys to Israel in Prophecy", and those two artifacts are examined here. Also, the International Christian Embassy in Jerusalem, directed by Rev. Malcolm Hedding, publishes a bimonthly "Word from Jerusalem" magazine which includes a "Chaplain's

Corner” segment authored by Rev. Hedding. Two such articles are also included in this sample.

Based on a close reading of the four artifacts, a series of four major clusters were evident in Mission rhetoric. Those clusters center on the terms “promise”, “land”, “nations”, and “church”. In this chapter, I will illustrate the dominance of these clusters in Mission rhetoric, explain their importance to Mission rhetoric, and describe the common worldview of Mission rhetors.

Promise

Central to the reasoning of Mission rhetors is the notion of “promise”. “Promise”, also called a “plan” or a “purpose”, is primarily conceptualized as God “bequeath[ing] to the Jewish people” the land of Israel (Hedding, 2005). Christian Zionism then justifies itself because of the “promise” and the historical validity of the “promise”. The terms that cluster around “promise” describe the unique nature of the promise from God, the “people” to whom the promise is made, and the characteristics of the promise itself.

A promise, broadly speaking, is the guarantee of one party to another that something will or will not happen, usually for the betterment of the promised party. Mission rhetors seek to emphasize the unique nature of this “promise” by also calling it a “covenant” and “prophecy”. “Covenant” is a term they use to set God’s promise apart from other promises. The Abrahamic Covenant, as a proper noun, stands out from other promises and gives unique import to the notion of “covenant”. The relationship between God and the Jewish people is defined by this covenant, and the Jews themselves are “covenant people” (Wagner, 2003b).

The promise of God is also more reliable than any other promise. God's promises are "prophecy", preordained events that are explained to believers in advance of their happening. The Abrahamic Covenant is not a promise that is bound by time, but instead is true at all times. The "promise" of God is unique because it does not describe what is or what was, but instead what will be. The prophecy of Amos describes a return of the Jewish people to Jerusalem; Ezekiel also speaks of a return of the Jews, as well as "restoration" and "redemption" (Wagner, 2003b). These are events that will come to pass, and Mission rhetors have faith that "not one word of all that He has promised will fail" (Hedding, 2004) and that "His mercies do endure forever" (Wagner, 2003b). The implication is that the fulfillment of the "promise" is inevitable; humans are powerless to stop it.

As a "covenant" and as "prophecy", God's "promise" is unique. Similarly, God's "promise" is unique because it is not made to a single person but instead an entire group of people. God's "covenant people" (Wagner, 2003b) are the Jews who are promised the land of Israel through their proxy, Abraham. The promise cannot be divorced from the "people" whom God seeks to use as "redemptive products...to save the world through the Jewish people" (Hedding, 2005). The covenant specifically enjoins the Jewish people as "custodians of the word of God" (Hedding, 2005) and thus sets them apart from others. The Jewish people "were and are part of God's plan today" (Wagner, 2003b). Jews are key to fulfilling the prophecies of God by making the land of Israel "fruitful...beginning the restoration of the land" (Wagner, 2003a).

Jews are defined as a "people" and not as a religion or as a nation because the "people" label absolves individual Jews of religious obligations. As discussed below,

Christian Zionist rhetoric identifies unique roles for the Jewish “people” and the Christian “church”. As such, the rhetoric also portrays scripture as providing different messages to the Jews and the Christians. For Christians, scripture is a prescription that outlines what they “should” do. Christians have “a debt to pay” and an obligation to pray and “[speak] out to your government leaders” (Wagner, 2003b). Scripture serves as a positive command from God to go and take action.

There is no such prescription for the Jewish people, however. Jews do not need to follow the laws of God in order to maintain the covenant. Whereas scripture tells Christians what they “should” do, scripture tells Jews what “will” happen. Through the citation of scripture, Rev. Hedding (1999a) confirms that God will maintain the covenant even in the face of blatant misdeeds by the Jews. Simply by being Jewish, by being part of the relevant class, Jews are blessed by God.

The paucity of Jewish obligation is related to the prophetic nature of the covenant with God. Three terms are particularly important in describing the characteristics of God’s promise: “unbreakable”, “fulfillment”, and “redemption”. Because the promise is “unbreakable” (Wagner, 2003a) and “everlasting” (Hedding, 2005), the conduct of the Jewish people is not relevant. The promises of God have “been faithfully fulfilled and only those that await a future fulfillment remain to be realised” (Hedding, 2004). In fact, many of God’s promises “we are seeing fulfilled before our eyes” (Wagner, 2003a). God’s promises will be fulfilled, despite the disobedience of the Jewish people, because those promises are unbreakable.

In the end, God’s promise leads to “redemption”. The Jewish people are “redemptive products” (Hedding, 2005), the Church was simply an addition to an

“ongoing redemptive process” (Wagner, 2003a), and the only purpose of the Jewish people and the land of Israel is redemption (Wagner, 2003b). Indeed, absent such a purpose, the “covenant” would have little meaning. The first cluster of Mission rhetoric, therefore, reveals that God has made a particular kind of promise to the Jewish people, that promise is unconditional, and the purpose of the promise is the ultimate redemption of the world.

Land

The second dominant cluster focuses on the term “land”, which is the primary goal of Christian Zionism. As with the notion of unbreakable prophecies, the aim is not spiritual but instead tangible and measurable. The possession of certain pieces of land is key to the promise of God. The “land” itself gains meaning through three related terms: “people”, “exile”, and “restoration”. Through the “people”, and only through the “people”, does the “land” fulfill its purpose. The “land” is a destination for those people who are returning from a long “exile”, and through their possession of the “land”, it will be restored.

The relationship between “people” and “land” is very clearly illustrated in the associated cluster. Wagner (2003b) says “the exploration of the biblical land of Israel has seen its greatest efforts since the return of the Jewish people”. Other nations “took turns occupying the land” which led to the “deterioration of the land at the hands of the enemies of Israel” (Wagner, 2003a). The occupation of the land in previous eras has always been followed by the return of “a remnant” of Jews to live in that place (Hedding, 2005). Without the presence of Jews, the “land” of Israel withers.

Here, for the first time, there is a notable difference between the Mission rhetors. Wagner (2003a, 2003b) names the land “Israel” and makes it distinct from the Jewish people. Hedding (2005) names the Jewish people “Israel” and calls the land “Canaan”. This difference points to a minor difference in their paradigms. For Wagner, the land has no history prior to God’s promise. For Hedding, on the other hand, the land was once called Canaan and became Israel only through a Jewish covenantal presence. The idea that a certain plot of land was not holy until the Jews occupied it implies that the Jewish presence is the necessary condition for such holiness, as Hedding explains. Wagner seems to be of the opinion that the land itself was holy and the Jews derived their blessing from being on the land. While this makes little difference in the ultimate advocacy of these two rhetors, their divergence on the relationship between the “land” and the “people” is notable.

While these rhetors have differing views on the ancient history of the land, both understand the importance of the modern state of Israel as a homeland for exiled Jews. Exile is seen as an unnatural state, a state against God. Jews were exiled “at the hands of the Romans” and remained exiled for 1900 years (Wagner, 2003b). The exile directly caused the “barrenness” of the land (Wagner, 2003a). Exile is also prophesied repeatedly in scripture.

Fortunately, exile is always followed by a return. The aforementioned “remnant” returned after the Babylonian occupation of Israel in the 6th century BCE (Hedding, 2005). The prophecy of Amos speaks of a return, as does Ezekiel (Wagner, 2003b). Again, the question of whether the “land” derives its blessings from the “people” or the

“people” from the “land” is unresolved, but the return of the Jewish people to the “land” of Israel is beneficial for both and is made manifest in the bounty of the “land”.

If the deterioration of the land follows the Jewish exile, then the “restoration” of the “land” must follow the Jewish return. In this context, modern events are paramount. References to prophecy being fulfilled are explained through the establishment of the Jewish state in 1948 (Wagner, 2003a) and the unification of Jerusalem in 1967 (Wagner, 2003b). Less dramatically, advances in archaeology and agriculture (Wagner, 2003b) have increased Israel’s “fruitfulness” and “cultivation” (Wagner, 2003a). Hedding (2005) points to the coming of Jesus after the Babylonian exile as the culmination of earlier “restorations”.

Possession of the land is the ultimate goal, although there is some difference as to why. Are the Jewish people made holy by their possession of the “land” or is the “land” made holy when the Jews possess it? Regardless, the return of exiled Jews to a specific location is key, and once there, those Jews will restore the “land” by cultivating it and caring for it. Only through the reciprocal relationship between the “people” and the “land” can either fulfill its ultimate purpose in God’s redemptive plan.

Nations

In contrast to the Jewish “people”, those who are not Jewish are “nations”. “Nations” are set apart from Israel and the Jewish people in God’s redemptive plan. Scripture explains that the “nations rage but God laughs at them” and that they “are a drop in the ocean” (Hedding, 2004). The “nations of the world” occupied Israel after the Jewish exile (Wagner, 2003a). Jews have returned from those “nations” to Israel, and the “nations” in the north have received different scriptural instructions than the “nations” in

the south (Wagner, 2003a). Jerusalem will be used to judge the “nations” of the world, according to their support of Israel and God’s plan (Wagner, 2003b).

While the scripture obviously predates the modern concept of a “nation”, the use of the term in Mission rhetoric is grounded directly in the modern concept. Israel is a nation with “an exceedingly great army” (Wagner, 2003a), which both couches nationhood in terms of military sponsorship and draws a comparison between the military success of Israel and the relative failures of Israel’s Arab neighbors. Wagner (2003b) also defines Israel by “population”, “social services”, and “economic prosperity”. Clearly the use of “nation” is consistent with our contemporary understanding of the term.

The focus on the nation as the primary agent of action within Mission rhetoric is interesting. Despite modern Christianity’s focus on personal relationships with God and scripture, Christian Zionism is rooted in collective action: “Scripture is clear that if your nation supports a blockade of Jerusalem for the purpose of dividing the city again, it will be judged severely by God” (Wagner, 2003b). There seems to be no room for or consideration of individual beliefs or actions. Entire nations will be judged rather than individual actors. This cluster suggests that the advocacy of Mission rhetors is squarely aimed at national power and foreign policy. This cluster advances the idea that the only way to achieve the goals of Christian Zionism is to influence the governments of the world. Outside of the power that they can wield within government, individual actors are unimportant.

At the same time, this perspective sets up the argument that because the actions of the Jewish people are immaterial to their possession of the land, the actions of the Jewish

people should also be immaterial to the support they receive from the “nations” of the world. National support of Israel should be unwavering and uncritical to avoid the harsh judgment of an otherwise redemptive God. With this third cluster then, a more complete picture of the Mission paradigm has emerged. The goal is “land”, which is promised by God and thus inevitable, but the “nations” of the world will be judged according to their support for God’s “promise”. The final cluster revolves around the last major agent in the drama, the Church.

Church

The cluster centering on the term “church” clarifies the intended audience for the rhetoric by identifying the “church” as the relevant agent. “Church” refers to the entire corporate body of Christian believers, without denominational fragmentation. The only division that matters within the church is that between Biblical Zionism and “Replacement Theology” that does not actively support the right of Jews to the land of Israel. In terms of external identification and dissociation, the church is distinguishable from the “nations” and from Israel. The terms in this cluster include “mercies”, “blessings”, and “miracles”, which serve to distinguish the “church” from Israel while reinforcing the nature of God as an active and immanent force in history.

The “church” is both a historical and contemporary phenomenon. In times past, the church has been divided over the role it is to play in God’s plan of redemption. Replacement theology asserts that God’s blessings were passed to the church after the expulsion of the Jews from Jerusalem. Replacement theology is a “malevolent teaching” that has “fueled much of Christian anti-Semitism”. (Wagner, 2003a). Replacement theology divides the church from the Jewish people and from itself and as a result, is

bankrupt of truth. Frequent reference is made to the metaphor of the olive tree, which represents the promises and plans of God. Christians “are grafted into the olive tree” (Wagner, 2003b) rather than planted as a separate crop. In this way, Christian Zionism holds that Christianity and Judaism are closely interrelated, so dividing the two is against God’s plan.

At the same time, the rhetoric argues that God uses Israel in ways that the church is not used, making Israel and the church distinct. God’s land and people are being prepared in Israel, while “millions of Bible-believing Christians are praying for the peace of Jerusalem” (Wagner, 2003b). Christians are not in Israel to facilitate the fulfillment of prophecy, but the Jews are. To extend the olive tree metaphor a bit further, both branches are part of the same tree, but one will be used for firewood and the other will be used to hang a tire swing. Each has a role, but those roles differentiate the branches. In that way, the “church” and Israel are united but different. Jews earn the restoration of the land while Christians earn God’s “blessings” and “mercies” (Wagner, 2003b). The difference between Jews and Christians is based in God’s handling of the two entities.

The church is also divided from the “nations”. Believers are called to “bless our Churches within the Nations” (Hedding, 2004) rather than churches among the nations or churches and the nations. The events of the world are out of control, but the Word of God maintains God’s control over those events (Hedding, 2004). The “nations” will be shown that God keeps promises while the “church” receives the “mercies” of God (Wagner, 2003b). The differing dispensations clearly delineate the boundaries between “church” and “nation”.

What those dispensations share, however, is an immanent and active God. God “rules over the world...laughs at the nations...raises up kings and leaders and puts them down again” (Hedding, 2004). God does not allow the nations to determine their own courses, but instead controls the nations directly. “God does not undertake ‘half-jobs’” (Hedding, 2005), but instead “is not only fulfilling His miracles for His people Israel, but for His Church” (Wagner, 2003b). God takes an active role, and has done so historically as well. To return once more to the olive tree, God added the “church” onto the tree, which is a complex and intensive process (Wagner, 2003b). In short, the nature of the church is determined by the active role of God.

This creates something of a problem for the audience. The rhetoric is clearly addressed to the “church”, as opposed to the “nations”. At the same time, “nations” will be judged and not individuals. Furthermore, even individuals who are part of the “church” are also part of “nations” and will be judged according to the stance of their respective “nations”. Therefore, individuals who support Israel may still not find favor with God if they are unable to translate their personal support for Israel into national policy. Wagner (2003b) says “Only through your prayers and speaking out to your government leaders can you keep your nation from being among those who come up against the continuation of a united Jerusalem under Jewish sovereignty. Please note, however, the Scripture is clear that if your nation supports a blockade of Jerusalem for the purpose of dividing the city again, it will be judged severely by God.” The goal of Christian Zionism is to harness the political power of the various nations, but that goal is to be achieved through the influence of religion on democracy, not through the direct control that would come from running candidates for office.

Mission Worldview

These four clusters combine to form a powerful and animating ideology. Christian Zionists are concerned with what they believe is an inevitability. The prophetic nature of God's promise means that the covenant will be fulfilled, regardless of the action of any agent. Such inevitability preemptively dejustifies any opposition to Christian Zionism. Since what God has promised will come to pass, opposing it is not only opposing God, but ultimately futile. Supporting God's promise is thus the natural course of action.

Once the decision to identify as a Christian Zionist is made, the ideology makes it very clear what the goal is. Religious influence should be brought to bear on national power to ensure that all of the land of Israel is occupied and controlled by Jews. The ultimate target is national power, but religious influence is the critical agency. It is not sufficient for individuals to believe for themselves, but they must spread that belief to others in order for it to be effective. The "church", therefore, is a critical agency in the ideology behind Christian Zionism. The "church" is demonstrably separate from both Israel and the nations, but the "church" must move to influence the nations in favor of Israel. By tying the futures of the "nations" so closely to the ideology of the "church", Christian Zionism justifies the commingling of national and religious power.

The focus on national power over individual belief mirrors the lack of concern for the individual as a whole. Mission rhetoric includes no discussion of the impact of Israel and Israel's policies at the individual level. The creation of the state of Israel displaced hundreds of thousands of Palestinians, but there is no apparent concern for those refugees. It would be easy enough to imagine that Christian Zionism would naturally

ignore a problem that is confined to the Muslim population, but a significant number of Palestinians are, in fact, Christian. Approximately 175,000 Christians remain in Palestinian-controlled areas (Strindberg, 2004) but they are given no quarter as Christians. That Mission rhetoric would ignore those Christians as individuals and instead think of them in terms of their national identity is expected.

Also missing from the sampled rhetoric are appeals to ethics and standards other than religious morals. In seeking to influence what are presumably secular governments, it would naturally follow that appeals to secular reason would be employed to some degree. Mission rhetors violate that expectation, couching the entirety of their advocacy in religious terms. In doing so, they are clearly not seeking some measure of influence on politics, but to effect the explicit commingling of politics and religion. By arguing only from religious bases, Mission rhetors implicitly endorse the influence of religion on government.

The ideology and purpose of Mission rhetors is made clear by their reliance on four major terministic clusters. The combination of those four clusters, “purpose”, “land”, “nations”, and “church”, paint a clear picture of a world in which religion is used to push governments to unconditionally support Israel and the Jewish possession of the land of Israel. Individual Christians are not justified by their belief alone, but instead by the actions and policies of their respective governments. Jews are essentially free from their obligation to moral behavior because their covenant with God is unbreakable and prophetic. It is both acceptable and desirable to have religion directly influencing government.

In this worldview, Christians are obligated to take action and Jews are blameless. All other people are part of the “nations” whom God will later judge. Palestinians are more or less invisible in Mission rhetoric, except as illegitimate intruders on otherwise holy land. The danger of this ideology is clear. If Palestinians are simply intruders, and Jews are free of obligation, then there is no restraint on Israeli abuse of Palestinian refugees, prisoners, and civilians. Whatever restraint might come from international diplomatic pressure is easily labeled in opposition to God’s decree and negated by God’s ultimate judgment. Mission rhetoric then leaves the audience to hope for and support the rapid fulfillment of prophecy rather than adherence to fundamental moral principles.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF PULPIT RHETORIC

And I saw another angel flying in mid-heaven, having eternal good tidings to proclaim unto them that dwell on the earth, and unto every nation and tribe and tongue and people

--Revelation 14:6

The divide between Mission and Pulpit Christian Zionist organizations exemplifies the divide between faith and works in Christian theology. While Mission organizations exist primarily to support the state of Israel in material ways and maintain a physical presence within Israel, Pulpit organizations exist primarily to spread the theology and ideology of Christian Zionism. As Christian Zionists, their ultimate purpose is to use their religious beliefs to influence both other Christians and those who hold government office.

The sample of Pulpit rhetoric in this study includes three artifacts from two rhetors. Dr. David Reagan, through his Lamb and Lion Ministries, publishes a monthly magazine called *Lamplighter*, the contents of which are reproduced on the Ministry's website. In September 1998, Reagan authored a piece titled "The Land of Israel: To whom does it belong?", which is included in this study. A second, undated piece from Reagan is also included here, called "The Palestinians: Victims of Jewish Oppression or

Pawns in an Arab Conspiracy?” Finally, an article titled “God’s Strategy for Saving Israel” by Jan Willem van der Hoeven is included in this sample. Van der Hoeven is the director of the International Christian Zionist Center and his article was published on the organization’s website in 2002. Based on a close reading of these three artifacts from Pulpit rhetors, three key clusters emerged from Pulpit rhetoric: “nation”, “land”, and “promise”. In this chapter, I will outline those clusters, explain their importance, and draw conclusions regarding the worldview of Pulpit rhetors.

Nation

The term “nation” is central to the discourse of Pulpit rhetors. The cluster that forms around “nation” shapes the advocacy and, literally, the worldview, of Pulpit ideology. The fundamental advocacy of Pulpit ideology is the support of an extant Jewish state in opposition to a potential “Palestinian” state. There are four terms clustered around “nation”, serving to identify the important actors in the conflict and their particular roles. “Arab nations” are the primary instigators, creating problems through obstinance and agitation. “Western nations” support the “Arab nations” and are portrayed as unwitting dupes. Both the “Arab” and “Western nations” are allied against “Israel”, the archetypal good guy. Even as “Israel” is opposed by the “Arab” and “Western nations”, however, their true enemy is the “Palestinian state”, a hypothetical entity that would coexist with “Israel”. The “Palestinian state”, of course, is supported by the “Arab” and “Western nations”.

In the Pulpit rhetoric, the “Arab nations” already control a substantial amount of land and the bulk of the world’s oil supply, which fulfills God’s promise to them (Reagan, 1998). One piece of the land is Jordan, which “herded them [Palestinian

refugees] into horrible refugee camps and let them live like rats” (Reagan, Palestinians). Because their promise has already been fulfilled, and because no “Arab nation” has ever claimed Jerusalem as its capital, the “Arab” claim to the land of “Israel” is diminished.

Nonetheless, the “Arab nations” seek dominion over the land of “Israel” to create a “Palestinian state”. The plan to trade land for peace was Yassir Arafat’s, and he was able to find supporters at the highest levels of Israeli government. In the end, Iran will control the “Palestinian” territory through their funding of Hamas which will induce an Israeli attack. In response, the “Arab nations” will ultimately call on Russia to aid them (Reagan, 1998). Despite the “Arabs” need for an enforcer, Christian Zionists see the “Arab nations” as decidedly in control of military conflict in the Middle East.

The “Arab nations” do still need help in their plan, however, and that help comes from the “Western nations” who serve as the executors of force against “Israel”. “Western” support coalesced behind Arafat’s “deceptive diplomacy” in the early 1990’s and sought to minimize the appearance of a threat from Arafat (Reagan, 1998). It should be noted that the “Western nations” did not do anything to reduce that threat, only the perception of such a threat. The “nations of the world” advocate turning over Jerusalem to the “Arabs” (van der Hoeven, 2002). The “Western” demands are “hypocrisy of the first order” (Reagan, Palestinians). The “Western nations” will ultimately focus their military wrath on Israel, thus fulfilling more prophecy (Reagan, 1998).

Third, of course, is “Israel”, the Jewish state that is set upon by the “Arab” and “Western nations”. “Israel” is isolated, and very clearly separate from the “Arab states”. While the “Arab states” are large and resource-rich, “Israel” is small and without natural resources (Reagan, 1998). Spacious and numerous “Arab nations”, who are almost never

discussed individually, refused to absorb “Palestinian” refugees, while “Israel” opened her doors to scores of Jewish refugees (Reagan, Palestinians). Despite those disadvantages, “Israel” will become the “prime nation” (Reagan, 1998) and will be the key to the end times (van der Hoeven, 2002). Even in light of her obvious inadequacies, “Israel” will be triumphant.

“Israel” must have an enemy, of course, and that enemy is the hypothetical “Palestinian state”, which is proposed by the “Arab” and “Western nations” as a solution to the conflict. Pulpit rhetoric distinguishes between “Israel” and a “Palestinian state” on a number of grounds. Jews were “regathered...from the four corners of the earth” to form the state of “Israel” (Reagan, Palestinians). As the national representation of the Jews, “Israel would become the prime nation of the world” (Reagan, 1998) by God’s prophecy. Legally, “Israel” was created as a Jewish state via the Balfour Declaration, providing further justification for the existence of this particular “nation”.

A “Palestinian state”, on the other hand, has no historical or modern justification. Jordan, as an “Arab nation” is primarily “Palestinian”, thus negating the need to create “A Palestinian state within the boundaries of current day Israel” (Reagan, 1998). Moreover, “there has never been a Palestinian state in all of history” (Reagan, Palestinians). The “Arab nations” and “Western nations” solution to the modern conflict is the recognition of a “Palestinian state” and such a solution is “a danger to the very survival of a sovereign Jewish state” (van der Hoeven, 2002). Reagan (1998) argues that the goal of the Palestinians is not simply their own state, but the destruction of the extant Jewish state, thus placing “Israel” and a “Palestinian state” forever in conflict.

As a result, coexistence is not a possibility within Pulpit ideology. Much more so than Mission rhetoric, Pulpit rhetoric considers the geopolitical strategies employed by their ideological opponents. Yassir Arafat had objectives which he achieved through international pressure on Israel (Reagan, 1998). The Temple Mount, holy to both Jews and Muslims, will be stolen “as part of the conceived plan of a Palestinian state” (van der Hoeven, 2002). Because of these strategies, a “Palestinian state” is diametrically opposed to “Israel”. Even the supposed middle ground which would turn Jerusalem into an “international” city is rejected (Reagan, 1998). The focus on national identity through political statehood creates a dilemma that is unresolvable.

“Nation” is always used with a modifier that specifies which class of “nations” are relevant. Such a construction makes very clear what role each “nation” plays as well as the resulting advocacy central to Pulpit rhetoric. “Arab nations” oppose “Israel” and seek to create a “Palestinian state”. “Western nations” have fallen in line behind the “Arab nations” and also support a “Palestinian state”. The extant “nations of the world” can be easily trisected into the weak but controlling “Arab nations”, the brutish pawns of the “Western nations”, and the unlikely but ultimate victor in “Israel”. Thus Pulpit rhetoric focuses very heavily on national power and the role foreign policy will play in fulfilling prophecy, setting the stage for the other evident clusters.

Land

The second dominant cluster in Pulpit rhetoric centers on the term “land”. This cluster illustrates the importance Christian Zionism places on not just national identity, but on a physical space in which to exercise that identity. Pulpit rhetors claim that Jews have a historic “right” or “title” to the land of Israel, and that the land is characteristically

“Jewish” and “ancestral”. In modern times, the land takes on importance because of its proximal relation to the Arab states and its “transformation” under the hands of its Jewish inhabitants. “Land” is an important cluster because it reinforces the need for physical “possession” of Israel, and conditions that “possession” on Jewish piety.

The most salient issue regarding “land” is the Jews’ “right” or “title” to the land given by God; “God gave the land of Israel to Abraham and to his descendants through Isaac and Jacob” (Reagan, 1998). More importantly, God granted “title of the land to Jews in perpetuity” (Reagan, 1998). Consequently, when Jews return to Israel, they reoccupy land “of their fathers” (van der Hoeven, 2002) that “belongs to the descendants of Jacob” (Reagan, 1998). God made it clear that the Jewish people “have both the right to the land of Israel and the right to be back in it today” (Reagan, 1998). The notion of a permanent “right” or “title” to the “land” is central to the justification of Israel’s existence as a Jewish state.

The “right” of Jews to the “land” is contrasted with the notion of “possession” of the “land”. The “right” and “title” are granted via the Abrahamic Covenant. Following the Abrahamic Covenant, however, God created the “Land Covenant” which governed the Jews’ use of the “land”. Violating the “Land Covenant” would bring on “many curses” (Reagan, 1998). Failing to adhere to Biblical principles is called “Neo-Zionism...[which is] a danger to the very survival of a sovereign Jewish state” (van der Hoeven, 2002). The threat, however, is only to Jews’ “possession” of, not “right” to the “land” (Reagan, 1998). With this distinction then, Pulpit rhetors are able to support Israel as a nation even as they oppose some Israelis for being “scornful...towards God’s holy purposes” (van der Hoeven, 2002). Even if Jews will always have a “right” to the land of

Israel, the political existence of the state of Israel is contingent, to some degree, on following God's law.

Finally, the "land" cluster explains the modern importance of the "land" to Christian Zionism. Initially, Pulpit rhetors note the division of the land covered by the British Mandate into Jordan and Israel. Jordan is called an "Arab" nation (Reagan, Palestinians) and controls seventy-seven percent of the Mandate "land" (Reagan, 1998). As a result, Pulpit rhetors argue that there is no need to create a separate Palestinian state, as it would be redundant; Jordan already fills the need for a Palestinian state. It seems notable that Pulpit rhetors do not attempt to undermine the national legitimacy of Jordan, given their claim that "the British originally promised all the Palestinian Mandate to the Jews" (Reagan, 1998). By not attacking Jordan, Pulpit rhetors implicitly accept the notion of a Palestinian state, simply not one within the bounds of modern-day Israel. The land occupied by Jordan is assumed to not be a part of the "Abrahamic Covenant", or else Pulpit discourse would call for the occupation of Jordan by Jewish settlers.

What is perhaps most important about the modern-day notion of "land" is the relationship between the land and the Jews. Specifically, God "regathered" the Jews from the world, "reestablished" the Jewish nation in Israel, and "transformed" Israel into a prosperous place (Reagan, 1998). Jews have returned to "the land of their fathers", with history justifying their presence in the "reborn state of Israel" (van der Hoeven, 2002). There seems to be an unfortunate contradiction, however. For the "land" to flourish under Jewish control, it would seem that Jewish "possession" would be a necessary precondition. As mentioned above, religious observance is a prerequisite for

“possession”, and Israeli leaders are demonstrably not observant, so how can the “land” flourish under their control?

Despite the apparent contradiction, the cluster makes clear the importance of Jews to the “land” and vice versa. The Jews have historical claims to and divine guarantees of the “land” and that “land” is distinctly Jewish in character, because of the religious piety required for “possession” of the “land”. Finally, we can see that the modern state of Israel gains its importance from the “regathering” and “reestablishment” of Jews in the “land”. It is clear that the specific location of Israel is holy, and not made sacred by the presence of a Jewish state. A Jewish state established in South America would not be holy; only the one established in the specific location promised to the Jews would be acceptable.

Promise

The final dominant cluster in Pulpit rhetoric centers on the term “promise”. “Promise” is synonymous with a series of terms, the use of which create two distinct categories of terms: God’s “promises” and broken “promises”. God’s “promises” are “covenants” that are both “everlasting” and “will” be fulfilled at some point in the future. All other “promises” are eventually broken by the people who made them. Once the rhetors outline the “promises”, then it remains to be seen how people in the world relate to those “promises”. There are some who believe in the “promises” and will work to aid the completion of God’s “plan”. On the other hand, some actors oppose God’s “plan” and have created their own “plan”. Pulpit discourse also outlines that counter-“plan” in order to further contrast God’s “promises” and “plans” against the “plans” of those on the other side.

The most important “promises” in the worldview of the Pulpit rhetors are those made by God. Those “promises” are also called “covenants” (Reagan, 1998; van der Hoeven, 2002) and it is constantly noted that the “covenants” are “not nullified” (Reagan, 1998), but are in fact “everlasting” (van der Hoeven, 2002). Additionally, Pulpit rhetoric makes clear that “God’s promises are going to be fulfilled” (Reagan, 1998). By speaking of fulfillment always in the future tense, Pulpit rhetors make clear their understanding that while God’s “promises” are “everlasting”, they are also not complete. Work remains to fulfill those “promises”. “What can we do in and for His Name to see this come to pass?” (van der Hoeven, 2002). The future fulfillment of God’s “promises” provides the necessary impetus for individual action in the present, as well as absolute assurance that such action will be rewarded.

Two specific promises to the Jewish people are identified: the “Land Covenant” and the “Abrahamic Covenant” (Reagan, 1998; van der Hoeven, 2002). Both of these are partially fulfilled, although the distinction between the two is somewhat blurry. The “Land Covenant” has been partially fulfilled because the Jews were dispersed (van der Hoeven, 2002) and have been “regathered” in the holy land. All that remains is the “spiritual salvation” of a small band of Jews in Israel (Reagan, 1998). Once that is complete, the “Land Covenant” will be fulfilled.

The “Abrahamic Covenant” is the “everlasting” “promise” God made to the Jewish people for “title” to Israel. Because of the “Abrahamic Covenant”, Jews will always have a claim to the land of Israel, even if they are disobedient (Reagan, 1998) or if the Christian church seeks to replace them (van der Hoeven, 2002). Even as Jews were dispersed from Israel in accordance with the “Land Covenant”, the “Abrahamic

Covenant” maintained its force and effect, thus demonstrating again the “everlasting” nature of God’s “promises”.

God made one more relevant “promise” in the Christian Zionist worldview. In addition to promising Abraham land, God also promised Ishmael, Abraham’s son and forebear to all Arabs, that his descendants would be numerous. God made no promise that those descendants would have land on which to live, however (Reagan, 1998). There are now 22 Arab states (Reagan, Palestinians) with 175,000,000 people and untold oil wealth to be tapped (Reagan, 1998). Pulpit rhetors take this as further evidence that God’s “promises” are unbreakable, even to those with whom Christian Zionists disagree.

In comparison, the rhetoric identifies “promises” that come from actors other than God. Specifically, the British promise to turn all of the Palestinian mandate into a Jewish homeland and Yassir Arafat’s promise to end his call for the destruction of Israel were both “broken” (Reagan, 1998). The comparison between the yet-to-be-fulfilled “promises” of God and the already-“broken promises” of other actors creates a simple dilemma. On the one hand, individuals can believe in and support God’s “promises” or, on the other, they can disbelieve and oppose.

There are two distinct groups of people who believe in and support God’s “plan”. One group is the settler Jews in Israel who “stand firm in their determination to maintain the territorial integrity of their land” (Reagan, 1998). Settlers “believe wholeheartedly in the promises of [God’s] book” (van der Hoeven, 2002). As people who occupy disputed “land”, the settlers are the closest of all Jews “in spirit and lifestyle to biblically oriented Gentile believers” (van der Hoeven, 2002). Their support of God’s “plan” makes them models of behavior for Jews and Christians alike.

The second group in support of God's "plan" are "believing, biblically-minded Gentiles" that include the President and many of his senior advisors (van der Hoeven, 2002). This group has a special responsibility to "influence others to act in accordance" with God's "plan". Influential Gentiles in government must work with "the right Zionist Israeli leadership" (van der Hoeven, 2002) to fulfill God's "promises".

Of course, there are people who oppose God's "plan". Chief among them is "Satan", also known as "the Evil One" (van der Hoeven, 2002; Reagan, 1998). Also in this group are those who support a Palestinian state through the peace negotiation process (van der Hoeven, 2002), "humanistic" Israeli leaders, and the Western nations (Reagan, 1998). This side of the conflict also has a "plan" or a "strategy", but not a "promise". The world "hates" Jews (Reagan, 1998) and Satan will "attack...this divinely inspired plan" (van der Hoeven, 2002). As mentioned above, Pulpit rhetoric focuses much more on the means by which actors exert their power than does Mission rhetoric. Consequently, the centerpiece of the "satanically-inspired strategy" (van der Hoeven, 2002) is the Muslim claim on the Temple Mount in Jerusalem. This strategy aims to "[steal] away the very mountain that is key to the fulfillment of this plan" (van der Hoeven, 2002). Following that step, the world will demand that Israel trade "land" for peace (Reagan, 1998).

The difference is clear in the terms clustered around "promise". God's "promises" are "everlasting" "plans", and waiting to be fulfilled. God's "promises" are even fulfilled to the enemy of God's "plans". That enemy also has "plans", but those "plans" are "strategies" and "attacks", not buttressed by "promises" or "covenants". The notion of "promise" is thus the difference between the "plans" of the enemy and God's

“plans”. Those “plans” with “promises” behind them have been or will be fulfilled, and since the “promises” stand in opposition to the other “plans”, those “plans” will surely fail.

Pulpit Worldview

The worldview of Pulpit rhetors is clearly illustrated in the clusters they employ in their rhetoric. Through the “nation” cluster, we can see the ultimate goal of Pulpit rhetors. Israel is the national representation of the Jewish people, justified by faith, piety, divine promise, history, and legal principles. In the light of these five justifications, there is a clear demarcation between Israel and the rest of the world. That demarcation renders compromise and coexistence between Jews and Arabs impossible, which only serves to reinforce the existence of two mutually exclusive positions in the conflict.

The “land” cluster demonstrates the important sense of place that goes along with Christian Zionist discourse. The modern state of Israel is unique among nations and places unique burdens on her inhabitants while also providing unique benefits. The land of Israel is the stakes in the conflict, over which the mutually exclusive sides are fighting. Finally, the cluster of “promise” explains how one side of the conflict will emerge victorious in the face of overwhelming opposition. The end result of Pulpit discourse is militant opposition to the “strategies” of those who oppose God’s “plans”, even when that opposition is no more than indifference.

Pulpit rhetoric has the elements of a powerful, mobilizing discourse, especially with the guarantee of victory. In that regard, Pulpit rhetors represent the strongest element in the Christian Zionist movement but also the element with the least specific prescriptions. Because the ability to wield influence is admittedly limited to a very small

number of people, the rest of the audience is left to praise those people and pray for additional leaders in the same mold. Rather than supporting charities or specific governmental initiatives, the audience for Pulpit rhetoric is not directed in their actions, but simply encouraged to act.

Pulpit rhetoric provides Christian Zionism with its image as a primarily political movement. By focusing so heavily on the role of governmental power in achieving their objectives, Pulpit rhetors create a simplistic ideology that allows their followers to easily identify who is right and who is wrong. Rather than asking those followers to take specific action, Pulpit rhetors are comfortable in having their followers simply support and oppose as directed.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This study of the rhetoric of Christian Zionism raises as many questions as it answers. In this final chapter, I will attempt to summarize the results of this study and draw some critical conclusions. First, I will address the conclusions about the Christian Zionist terministic screen. Second, I will address how this study advances rhetorical criticism. Finally, I will outline some questions for future research.

The Terministic Screen

The clusters outlined in the previous two chapters provide powerful insight into the terministic screen of Christian Zionism. The terministic screen is an understanding of the way language shapes and controls a rhetor's worldview (Burke, 1945). An audience that is swayed by a rhetor adopts, to some degree, his or her worldview by accepting his or her terministic screen and then filters future information through that screen. There are, to be sure, some differences between the terministic screens of Mission and Pulpit rhetoric, but in the end, the similarities between the two are considerably more important. The most notable aspects of the Christian Zionist terministic screen are the invisibility of Palestinian Christians, the dominance of governmental authority as an agency for change, and the inevitability of the progress of prophecy. In explicating these aspects of Christian Zionist ideology, we achieve a deeper understanding of the goals behind the movement.

Christian Zionist rhetors routinely describe the conflict over Israel as dichotomous. As indicated by the clusters identified in previous chapters, the conflict is Arab-Israeli, or Israeli-Palestinian, or Jewish-Arab. The same rhetors define Israel as a land for the Jews. The conflict is between a Jewish state and non-Jews who want to destroy Israel. Christians are urged to side with Israel and support a Jewish homeland. What of those Christians for whom Israel is a homeland?

Despite the theological and historical pleadings of opposition groups, Christian Zionists continue to cast the conflict over Israel as dichotomous and simplistic. On one side are Jews who have a right to the land and on the other are intruders who must be expelled. Christians should support the Jewish right to the land and nothing else is acceptable or necessary. According to some critics, “Christian Zionism also relegates the Church’s status to irrelevance, [so] the faithful Christian’s only duty now [is] to unconditionally support the state of Israel” (Issues, n.d). In fact, Christians make up approximately 15 percent of the world’s Palestinian population (Muzher, 2003) but only 2 percent of the population of Israel currently (Wagner, 2002). By some estimates, a larger percentage of Christians than Muslims were displaced by the creation of Israel in 1948 (Wagner, 2002). Christian Zionists ignore the presence of Christians in Israel, and as a result, Christian Zionism is actively opposed by Christian organizations both in Israel and the United States.

One such organization is Sabeel. Sabeel is “an ecumenical liberation theology movement among Palestinian Christians” (Sabeel, n.d.) Formed in 1989 to generate a liberating exegesis of the Bible for Palestinians, Sabeel is active in denouncing Christian Zionism as “a wedge between Arab Moslems and Christians” (Zoughbi, 2003). Al-

Bushra is an Arab Roman Catholic organization that opposes the notion that the Jewish people are entitled to the land of Israel (Kobti, 1996). B'Tselem is an Israeli organization that monitors and advocates for human rights in Israeli-occupied territory (About, n.d.). In short, anti-Zionist organizations also maintain a presence in Israel.

Organizations and churches in the United States also buttress organizations in Israel. The Holy Land Ecumenical Christian Foundation seeks to “increase awareness among American Christians of the urgent needs of Christians in the Holy Land” (What Is, n.d.). Evangelicals for Middle East Understanding is an organization composed of American church representatives with the aim of “build[ing] solidarity with Middle East Christians and their churches” (Objectives, n.d.). The Center for Middle Eastern Studies at North Park University serves as a sort of clearinghouse for academic study of Christian Zionism under the direction of Dr. Don Wagner, a prolific scholar on Christian Zionism. Just as importantly, mainline Christian churches in the United States have distanced themselves from Christian Zionism. The Reformed Church in America adopted a study guide that is very critical of Christian Zionism at their 2004 General Synod meeting (Synod Acts, 2004). The United Church of Christ also adopted a resolution opposing Christian Zionism in 2003 and sent a letter explaining their position to President Bush in 2004 (Church leaders, 2004). The Presbyterian Church (USA) also adopted a resolution declaring that “Christian Zionism is inconsistent with the basic values of Reformed theology” (Christian Zionism, n.d.). Between these official church organizations and unaffiliated academic organizations, American opposition to Christian Zionism is diverse.

What unifies that opposition, however, is an attempt at reframing the debate over Israel-Palestine by including new terms. The notion of a Palestinian Christian is alien to Christian Zionism, but central to their opposition. Theology tailored for the Palestinian Christian experience, media projects that highlight the same experience, and statements that differentiate between Christian Zionism and theology are all necessary to transform the terministic grounds of the debate.

In short, Christian Zionism views all Palestinians as an undifferentiated mass that is the responsibility of the (primarily Muslim) Arab states. In that view, Christian Zionists make an enemy out of their fellow Christians. Palestinian Christians are an active part of the problem because they oppose, by their very presence, the state of Israel. Within the Christian Zionist ideology, there is no place for Christians in Israel. Instead, Christians are relegated to supporting Israel from wherever they happen to be. There is no sense of place for Christians as there is for Jews. Consequently, Palestinian Christians are on the wrong side of the dichotomy, and punished by the foreign policy espoused by Christian Zionists.

The second point of comparison between Mission and Pulpit rhetoric is the role of governmental power. Both branches of Christian Zionism identify “nations” as the key agencies in achieving their goals, but each branch conceptualizes the use of governmental power differently. Mission rhetors, as we have seen, characterize governments as targets of influence. Christian Zionists should attempt to persuade their respective governments to support Israel. Governmental power is conceptualized as a positive force, fighting for Israel’s existence and safety.

Pulpit rhetors, on the other hand, conceptualize governmental power as a force to push the Palestinians out of Israel. Rather than being a positive force on Israel's behalf, governments in Pulpit rhetoric are a force against the Palestinians. This difference is notable, but rather than fundamentally separating the two branches, the differing conceptions of governmental power serve to reinforce the similarities between them. As much as they want to influence foreign policy, Christian Zionists prefer to operate from outside the foreign policy structure rather than becoming a part of it by holding office. No Christian Zionist rhetoric calls for specific political action, such as voting for or against a candidate. That absence may be related to legal restrictions on their status as non-profit religious organizations, but such restrictions are instrumental in shaping their rhetoric and thus their terministic screen. Political action is a matter of gaining influence from the outside, not gaining it through elections.

Political candidates do not run as Christian Zionists, and the exercise of power from outside of the formal governmental system makes such power invisible. As a result, a democratic electorate is never given the opportunity to directly assess the foreign policy implications of Christian Zionism. American presidential politics is dotted with candidates who ran heavily on their foreign policy positions. Wilson wanted to establish the League of Nations to prevent future wars, Goldwater adopted a very hard line against the Soviet Union, and Reagan alternated between appeals for *glasnost* and demonstrations of strength. In each case, the voters were able to judge a candidate based on his preferred foreign policy. Christian Zionism allows for no such referendum. The movement's exercise of power is hidden and not tied to any single candidate. As a result, Christian Zionism can persist after an officeholder has been replaced with relative ease.

This differs from most religio-political movements, particularly fundamentalist movements. Most religio-political movements seek to take control by holding office and run based on the religious base of their policies. Muslims have sought control throughout the Middle East (Keddie, 1998; Tugal, 2002), as have Hindus in India (Roy & Rowland, 2003), and non-Arab Muslims in Senegal (Sow, 2003). In comparison, Christian Zionism seeks only to exert influence as a third party rather than sponsoring candidates directly. This is likely due to the single-issue nature of Christian Zionist advocacy.

Much like minor political parties in parliamentary governments, Christian Zionists are interested in a single issue with no clear opinion on other relevant matters. In this, Christian Zionists may find themselves supporting candidates and policies to which they do not object, but which do not directly concern their primary advocacy. Rather than running candidates for office, Christian Zionists will be content to have other, broader groups hold office while taking advice from Christian Zionist ideology. As the role of religion in American politics grows, Christian Zionists seek to play a larger advisory role, but nothing more.

Finally, Christian Zionists are united on the issue of inevitability. As illustrated by the reliance on “promise” and “covenant” in Christian Zionist rhetoric, and the clusters around those terms, Christian Zionists believe that the reestablishment of Jews in Israel is permanent and that the end times are coming. Certainly this inevitability raises the question of what Christian Zionists are supposed to be doing. Since the fulfillment of prophecy is inevitable, what role can people play in bringing it about?

Mission rhetoric answers those questions somewhat more clearly than does Pulpit rhetoric. By pointing to the need for people to influence government, and the corporate

judgment that will come based on a nation's support for Israel, Mission rhetors provide both the problem and the solution. Pulpit rhetors, on the other hand, do not provide a clear answer to the question. Individuals should support Israel, and so should the nations of the world. At the same time, the nations of the world are cast as opposed to Israel with no particular means to reform them.

In this comparison, we find the first real divide within Christian Zionism. Mission rhetors make very clear both the impetus and appropriate avenue for individual action. In Mission rhetoric, salvation is dependent on the ability of believing individuals to persuade their governments to support Israel. There is hope for the nations, and through them, individual believers.

Pulpit rhetoric leaves the question unanswered. Individuals may be saved through faith alone, as is the traditional Christian view of salvation, but what if those individuals live in a nation that does not support Israel? Both Mission and Pulpit rhetoric makes "nations" central to the Christian Zionist ideology. Mission rhetoric makes "nations" central to judgment as well. Pulpit rhetoric ends with "nations" as the agency to enact the ideology. If "nations" are central to the ideology, then why are they not central to judgment as well? Nations that do not support Israel will be judged harshly, but the fate of individuals within those nations is not explicitly linked to the fates of the nations at large. The Pulpit position does not contradict the Mission position, but it certainly is not consistent either.

On the issue of inevitability then, Christian Zionism does not promote a single, coherent ideology regarding the judgment of individuals compared to the judgment of nations. The fulfillment of prophecy, and thus the coming judgment, is inevitable, but

Christian Zionism is not clear on what can be done to ensure that one is judged positively. Such judgment is, to some degree, beyond the individual's control. This leads to some ambiguity in the Christian Zionist ideology. Kenneth Burke (1966) divides the functions of language between the scientific issues of *is* and *is not* and the dramatic issues of *shalt* and *shalt not*. Without specific prescriptions for believers, Christian Zionism initially seems to fall short of issuing a *shalt* or *shalt not*. In reality, however, the prescriptions of Christian Zionism are as much about attitude as action. Burke can still rest easy knowing that Christian Zionists are intent on inculcating a particular attitude into their believers, and attitude which will only later manifest itself in action. Rather than *thou shalt do*, Christian Zionists say *thou shalt believe* and they allow action to follow from proper belief.

As an ideology, Christian Zionism is extremely flexible and applicable across a wide variety of issues. Individuals are called to support Israel and oppose those nations that oppose Israel. That support may come in the form of charitable donations, proselytizing, investment decisions, decisions on how to spend leisure time, and certainly on voting decisions. What differentiates Christian Zionism from other political ideologies is that it guides both foreign and domestic policy without any need for additions or modifications.

The combination in Christian Zionism of domestic and foreign policy also calls for some analysis that is outside of the realm of rhetoric. As discussed above, foreign policy tends to not be an important factor in voters' behavior, but public opinion does have an influence on foreign policy after a candidate is in office. Game theory is a concept that guides some political science scholarship on decision making. Assuming a

certain number of actors, with a specified amount of information and a specified goal, how does each actor work to maximize her/his returns? In international relations, game theory is understood to operate at two levels. One level sees nations as individual, unitary actors that compete and cooperate with each other. The second level recognizes that each nation is composed of many powerful actors in government who must answer to an electorate (Putnam, 1988). When discussing free trade, for example, the first level of the game says that free trade empirically increases economic growth and efficiency, and is therefore beneficial. The second level, however, recognizes that the benefits of growth are not evenly distributed to all members of a society, and that inequality may lead to unrest and instability, both negative outcomes. Therefore, the two-level game theory recognizes that multiple theories may be necessary to understand and explain a phenomenon.

Christian Zionism violates that expectation. Unlike other ideologies, no modification or qualification of Christian Zionism is needed to guide domestic and international affairs. At the same time, the inevitability of prophecy and judgment renders all other issues more or less irrelevant, especially given Christian Zionists' representation of the end times as imminent. Social Security reform, to choose but one current issue, does not matter simply because pension plans are not germane to the fast-approaching judgment. John Collins, a scholar of apocalyptic literature at Yale Divinity School, notes that apocalyptic stories represent the ultimate in hopefulness (2005). Those who believe will be rewarded, while those who do not will be punished. Such judgment is coming and it is inevitable. Collins (2005) also notes that such literature can be very dangerous when it becomes less a projection of what will happen and is seen as a

reflection of what is happening. Because apocalyptic stories most often focus on judgment and the resulting reward or punishment, those who believe that the apocalypse is nigh are likely to act without much concern for the worldly impacts of their actions. Being sure of their individual rewards, believers may quickly ignore the worldly consequences of their actions when they believe the era of judgment has arrived. Certainly the Christian Zionist perception of the end times as imminent, and the impending judgment as based on one issue alone, is the perfect example of Collins' analysis. For those who subscribe to the Christian Zionist ideology, it provides an easy answer to all policy decisions. Anything that does not support Israel is either opposed to Israel or irrelevant. Concern for Palestinian well being necessarily opposes Israel's well being. Concern for the well being of Israelis is only relevant as it impacts the fortunes of the nation as a whole.

Extension of Other Critical Methods

One additional outcome of this study is the recognition that existing social movement criticism to account for movements like Christian Zionism. Christian Zionism, as a movement, carries four unique characteristics: it is a religious movement, it includes no appeals to a secular audience, it operates without an individual or organizational leader, and it has no tangible goals. By identifying and analyzing those characteristics in Christian Zionism, perhaps those characteristics can be better accounted for with regard to other movements as well.

Social movement scholarship has acknowledged the role of religion and "religious culture" (Wood, 1999) in the mobilization of social movements (Williams, 1996). Social movement scholarship has also recognized the importance of religion to specific

movements, including the animal rights movement (Peek, Konty, & Frazier, 1997), labor strikes (Mirola, 2003), and civil rights (Selby, 2001; Williams, 2002). What is common to these movements is that they are relatively limited in scope and focused in purpose. The civil rights movement in Arkansas was enabled by religious institutions but those institutions also limited the goals of the movement (Williams, 2002). Because religious animal rights supporters are animated by the notion that science is evil, they support the animal rights movement against testing on animals, but do not support the movement in encouraging more drastic, personal options (Peek, Konty, & Frazier, 1997). Religious supporters of a newspaper strike in Detroit were limited in their advocacy because of the clash between religious organizations and union culture (Mirola, 2003).

Scholarship that links religion and social movements has thus far focused on religious involvement in movements that have secular appeal and the involvement of central religious institutions. Christian Zionism presents a challenge to traditional social movement literature because it is a movement devoid of secular appeal and because it operates without a leader, either an individual or a dominant institution. Existing social movement literature cannot adequately account for the Christian Zionist movement. This study serves to push movement criticism in a different direction by accounting for the rhetorical tactics of an entirely religious, leaderless movement through rhetorical choices. Rather than treating organizations as central and rhetoric as a tool to fulfill certain requirements, this new approach treats rhetoric as central and organizations as the means to effect desired change. Rhetoric is the one unifying element of the movement, and helps account for the lack of secular appeals as well as the lack of a central point of organization.

Moreover, the goals of religious involvement in social movements have tended to be fairly measurable. The civil rights movement was able to achieve tangible goals with the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Right Act. Religio-political movements elsewhere are able to measure their success by their occupation of government positions. Social movement scholarship looks to the need for movements to justify the existence of the movement in the face of both delays and successes (Stewart, 1980; Stewart, Smith, & Denton, 1994). Christian Zionism cannot be addressed through that traditional framework because it does not seek nor achieve tangible success. Unlike legislation or the occupation of political office, maintaining influence on foreign policy is a constant process. Foreign policy may be changed more easily and less visibly than domestic laws, such as the Civil Rights Act. Foreign policy is also subject to the beliefs and needs of political officeholders, who change on a fairly regular basis. Consequently, Christian Zionism is always attempting to influence the current officeholders and preparing to influence new ones. Without tangible goals, the movement does not face the same requirements to justify itself in the face of either victories or defeats.

The common animating goal is to be found in the rhetoric of Christian Zionism. Support for God's "plan" and "promise" is more important than achieving political office or getting laws passed. The purpose of the movement directs the measurement of its success. Christian Zionism is successful when governments support the state of Israel, but since that support is never guaranteed or unconditional, the movement always has future goals to achieve and work to do. Only through a shared terministic screen can a movement without tangible goals motivate its followers to action.

Social movement literature represents a growing understanding of what

movements are and how they function. Christian Zionism is a new kind of movement, one that operates without a leader, with no secular appeal and without tangible goals. Maintenance of such a movement requires a powerful ideology that can only be shared and transmitted through language. Terministic analysis thus provides a unique insight into a unique movement, and thus extends the reach of movement criticism.

Future Research

The identification of Christian Zionism and its unique characteristics leaves many questions unanswered regarding both Christian Zionists themselves and the implications of this study for other rhetors. Scholarship exists on the theological and historical basis of Christian Zionism, but very little can be said about individual followers. Given the lack of political aspiration within the movement, it would seem that followers would have to turn elsewhere to identify candidates who would properly represent their views. Where do Christian Zionists turn to find such candidates and how prominently does the Israeli-Palestinian conflict play into their political decision making? How active are Christian Zionists in other organizations, both religious and non-religious? How active are Christian Zionists in other single-issue advocacy groups? Some research has been done into the membership of other Christian groups, but none so far into Christian Zionists. A more complete picture of the movement requires a clearer understanding of its membership and their political involvement beyond Christian Zionism. Obviously this is an avenue of research better suited to sociology than communication studies, but an interdisciplinary approach to social movements is both advantageous and necessary.

A second suggestion for future research calls for comparing the rhetoric of Christian Zionists to the rhetoric of other fundamentalist Christian groups and then to

other non-Christian fundamentalist groups. Some scholars have noted similarities among religio-political groups, regardless of their religious affiliation (Keddie, 1998) and it would certainly be relevant to discover if those similarities extend beyond political prescriptions to rhetorical strategies. Such a study would rely on the work done in this paper to explicate the terministic screen of one fundamentalist Christian group and then illustrate the similarities and differences with another fundamentalist Christian group.

Research comparing the terministic screen of fundamentalism and the terministic screens of non-religious rhetors would provide an added level of significance to the above findings. A terministic screen for fundamentalism must, of course, be unique to fundamentalism. The notion of inevitability, for example, animates Christian Zionism, but is also a significant factor in the rhetoric of non-religious advocacies. Research that delves further into the conception of the relevant terms to compare them to other groups would be necessary to establish a terministic screen unique to fundamentalist religious groups.

This program of study could lead to a broader understanding of individual religious groups as well as a broader understanding of such groups' involvement in political affairs. Particularly because Christian Zionism works towards goals that differ so greatly from other fundamentalist movements, the discovery of a common terministic screen would be important.

Finally, this study suggests that social movement criticism can be expanded to make room for new types of movements and rhetorical strategies. Christian Zionism is one example of a movement that is leaderless and without tangible goals. Naturally, one would think other such movements exist as well, both religious and secular. Social

movement scholarship should turn to address these new categories of movements that are relevant to today's political and social affairs. The involvement of religious groups in political issues is not necessarily a new trend, but it is a notable one nonetheless. As religion becomes more important to politics, so does politics become more important to religion. Only by achieving a clear picture of the rhetors on all sides of a given debate can we adequately address their impact on the debate. Christian Zionism is one movement that will be followed by other movements concerned with different issues but employing similar tactics. Understanding those tactics is central to understanding the influence of religious belief on society's contemporary affairs.

REFERENCES

- _____. (n.d.). Issues. Retrieved February 9, 2005 from
<http://www.saltfilms.net/issues.html>.
- _____. (2004, June 22). Synod acts on Middle East issues. Retrieved February 9, 2005 from <http://www.rca.org/news/archives/20040622.html>.
- _____. (2004). Church letters. Retrieved February 9, 2005 from
http://www.cmep.org/Statements/2004May_CGM.htm.
- _____. (2003). About the ICZC. Retrieved May 31, 2005 from
<http://israelmybeloved.com/about/organization.htm>.
- _____. (n.d.). Nature & purpose of Lamb & Lion Ministries. Retrieved May 31, 2005 from <http://lamblion.com/Web01-01.php>.
- Balnius, N., & Strandberg, T. (n.d.). The who's who of prophecy: Dr. David Reagan. Retrieved May 31, 2005 from
http://www.raptureready.com/who/David_Reagan.html.
- Berkowitz, B. (2003, November 11). Religious Right relishing road map's collapse. Retrieved October 12, 2004 from
<http://www.workingforchange.com/article.cfm?itemid=16028>.
- Bridges for Peace. (n.d.). Bridges for Peace: Your Israel connection. Retrieved May 31, 2005 from <http://www.bridgesforpeace.com/>.

- B'Tselem (n.d.). About B'Tselem. Retrieved April 19, 2005 from
http://www.btselem.org/English/About_BTselem/Index.asp.
- Burke, K. (1945). *A Grammar of Motives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Burke, K. (1966). *Language as Symbolic Action*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Collins, J. (2005, March 8). Apocalypticism. Lecture delivered at Texas State University-San Marcos
- Couch, M. (n.d.). Getting rid of Israel. Retrieved October 18, 2004 from
<http://www.christiansforisrael.org/>.
- Dean, R.L. (1999). Essentials of dispensational theology. Retrieved October 10, 2004 from <http://www.prestoncitybible.org/BP/bp1-1.htm>.
- Djupe, P.A., & Grant, J.T. (2001). Religious institutions and political participation in America. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 40, 303-314.
- Efird, J.M. (1989) In *HarperCollins Bible Dictionary*, Achtemeier, P.J. (ed.). p. 314.
- Evangelical Council for Financial Accountability (n.d.). Retrieved May 31, 2005 from
<http://ecfa.org/ContentEngine.aspx?PageType=Control&PageName=HomePage>.
- Evangelicals for Middle East Understanding. (n.d.). Objectives. Retrieved April 19, 2005 from <http://www.emeu.net/objective.html>.
- Foss, S.K. (1984). Women priests in the Episcopal Church: A cluster analysis of establishment rhetoric. *Religious Communication Today*, 7, p. 1-11.
- Foss, S.K. (1996). *Rhetorical criticism: Exploration and practice*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

- Haas, C. & Wearden, S.T. (2003). E-credibility: Building common ground in web environments. *L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature*, 3, 169-184.
- Hawhee, D. (1999). Burke and Nietzsche. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 85, 129-145.
- Hedding, M. (2005, Jan/Feb). Biblical Zionism and its foundations. *Word from Jerusalem*. Retrieved April 19, 2005 from http://www.icej.org/news/WFJ/WFJ_Jan_Feb_2005.pdf.
- Hedding, M. (2004, May/June). Looking for "that day". *Word from Jerusalem*. Retrieved April 19, 2005 from http://www.icej.org/news/WFJ/WFJ_May_June_2004.pdf.
- Hobeck, C. (n.d.) End Times/Tribulation primer. Retrieved October 15, 2004 from <http://www.the-truth.i-p.com/articles/tribPrimer.html>.
- Holy Land Ecumenical Christian Foundation. (n.d.). What is HECF? Retrieved April 19, 2005 from <http://www.hcef.org/hcef/index.cfm/ID/22.cfm>.
- ICEJ-Canada. (n.d.). International Christian Embassy Jerusalem, Canada. Retrieved May 31, 2005 from <http://www.icejcanada.org/>.
- James, T. & Strandberg, T. (n.d.). European Union in prophecy. Retrieved October 1, 2004 from <http://www.raptureready.com/rr-eu.html>.
- Keathley, H. (2004). The relationship of the church to Israel. Retrieved October 15, 2004 from http://www.bible.org/page.asp?page_id=534.
- Keddie, N.R. (1998). The new religious politics: Where, when, and why do "fundamentalisms" appear? *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 40(4), 696-723.

- Kobti, L. (1996). Al-Bushra. Retrieved April 19, 2005 from <http://www.al-bushra.org/bushra/albushra.htm>.
- Lazerte, A.C. (n.d.) Biblical reasons for Christian support of Israel. Retrieved October 18, 2004 from <http://www.cdn-friends-icej.ca/judeochr/biblical.html>.
- Lieven, A. (2002, October 3). The push for war. *London Review of Books*, 24(19). Retrieved December 20, 2004 from http://www.lrb.co.uk/v24/n19/liev01_.html.
- Martin, A. (2003, 19 November). "Left-Behind" author says Iraq will be prominent in End-Times events. *AgapePress*. Retrieved October 3, 2004 from <http://headlines.agapepress.org/archive/11/192003f.asp>.
- Marty, M.E. & Appleby, R.S. (1991). *Fundamentalism Observed*, University of Chicago Press: Chicago.
- Mayer, J.D. (2004). Christian fundamentalists and public opinion toward the Middle East: Israel's new best friends? *Social Science Quarterly*, 85, 695-712.
- McAlister, M. (2003). Prophecy, politics, and the popular: The Left Behind series and Christian fundamentalism's new world order. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 102, 773-798.
- MinistryWatch. (2005a). Summary profile: Bridges for Peace, Inc. Retrieved May 31, 2005 from http://www.ministrywatch.org/mw2.1/F_SumRpt.asp?EIN=411334042.
- MinistryWatch. (2005b). Summary profile: Lamb and Lion Ministries. Retrieved May 31, 2005 from http://www.ministrywatch.org/mw2.1/F_SumRpt.asp?EIN=751717049.

- Mirola, W.A. (2003). Religions protest and economic conflict: Possibilities and constraints on religious resources mobilization and coalitions in Detroit's newspaper strike. *Sociology of Religion*, 64, 443-461.
- Muzher, S. (2003, July 3). Palestinian Christians ignored. *Jordan Times*. Retrieved February 9, 2005 from <http://www.aljazeeraah.info/Opinion%20editorials/2003%20Opinion%20Editorials/July/3o/Palestinian%20Christians%20ignored,%20By%20Sherri%20Muzher.htm>
- Peek, C.W., Konty, M.A., & Frazier, T.E. (1997). Religion and ideological support for social movements: The case of animal rights. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 36, 429-439.
- Presbyterian Church, USA. (n.d.). Christian Zionism. Retrieved February 9, 2005 from <http://www.pcusa.org/israelandjewishrelations/christianzionism.htm>.
- Pullum, S.J. (1992). Common sense religion for America: The rhetoric of Jewish televangelist Jan Bresky. *Journal of Communication and Religion*, 15, 45-54.
- Putnam, R.D. (1998). Diplomacy and domestic politics: The logic of two-level games. *International Organization*, 42, 427-460.
- Railton, N.M. (2003). Gog and Magog: The history of a symbol. *Evangelical Quarterly*, 75(1), 23-43.
- Reagan, D. R. (1998 September). The land of Israel: To whom does it belong? *Lamplighter*. Retried April 19, 2005 from <http://www.lamblion.com/articles/prophecy/Jews-Israel/Jews-02.php>.

- Reagan, D.R. (n.d.). The Palestinians: Victims of Jewish oppression of pawns in an Arab conspiracy? Retrieved April 19, 2005 from <http://www.lamblion.com/articles/prophecy/Jews-Israel/Jews-06.php>.
- Reuther, R.R. (n.d.). Challenging Christian Zionism. Retrieved January 3, 2005 from <http://www.sabeel.org>.
- Rockler, N. R. (2002). Race, whiteness, "lightness", and relevance: African American and European American interpretations of Jump Start and Boondocks. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 19, 398-418.
- Roy, A. & Rowland, R.C. (2003). The rhetoric of Hindu nationalism: A narrative of mythic redefinition. *Western Journal of Communication*, 67, 225-248.
- Sabeel International (2004). The 5th international Sabeel conference statement: Challenging Christian Zionism. Retrieved January 3, 2005 from <http://www.sabeel.org>.
- Schiappa, E. (1989). The rhetoric of nukespeak. *Communication Monographs*, 56, 253-272.
- Selby, G.S. (2001). Framing social protest: The Exodus narrative in Martin Luther King's Montgomery bus boycott rhetoric. *Journal of Communication and Religion*, 24, 68-93.
- Sizer, S. (2003). Christian Zionism: Justifying apartheid in the name of God. *Churchman*, October 20.
- Snyder, L. (2000). Invitation to transcendence: The book of Revelation. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 86, 402-416.

Sow, F. (2003). Fundamentalisms, globalisation and women's human rights in Senegal.

Gender and Development, 11, 69-76.

Stewart, C.J. (1980). A functional approach to the rhetoric of social movements.

Central States Speech Journal, 31, 298-305.

Stewart, C.J., Smith, C.A., & Denton, R.E. (1994). *Persuasion and Social Movements*.

Long Grove, IL: Waveland.

Strindberg, A. (2004, May 24). Forgotten Christians: Not all displaced Palestinians are

Muslims: *The American Conservative*. Retrieved April 19, 2005 from

http://www.amconmag.com/2004_05_24/article.html.

Strother-Jordan, K. (2002). On the rhetoric of Afrocentricity. *The Western Journal of*

Black Studies, 26, 193-203.

Tugal, C. (2002). Islamism in Turkey: Beyond instrument and meaning. *Economy and*

Society, 31, 85-111.

Van der Hoeven, J.W. (2002). God's strategy for saving Israel. Retrieved April 19, 2005

from

[http://www.israelmybeloved.com/history_prophecy/prophecy_in_our_day/gods_s](http://www.israelmybeloved.com/history_prophecy/prophecy_in_our_day/gods_strategy.html)

[trategy.html](http://www.israelmybeloved.com/history_prophecy/prophecy_in_our_day/gods_strategy.html).

Van Impe, J. (2004, August). Mark of the beast technology. *Intelligence Briefing*.

Retrieved October 10, 2004 from <http://www.jvim.com>.

Wagner, C.H. (2003a). 12 keys to Israel in prophecy today (Part I). *Israel Teaching*

Letter. Retrieved April 19, 2005 from

<http://www.bridgesforpeace.com/pics/12keyspart1.pdf>.

- Wagner, C.H. (2003b). 12 keys to Israel in prophecy today (Part II). *Israel Teaching Letter*. Retrieved April 19, 2005 from <http://www.bridgesforpeace.com/pics/12keyspart2.pdf>.
- Wagner, D.E. (2002). The Palestinian Christians: An historic community at risk? Retrieved February 9, 2005 from <http://www.thejerusalemfund.org/carryover/pubs/20020312ib.html>.
- Wagner, D.E. (2003, June 28). Marching to Zion. *Christian Century*. pp. 20-24.
- Wilcox, C. & Jelen, T.G. (n.d.). Religion and politics in an open market: Religious mobilization in the United States. Retrieved June 1, 2005 from <http://www.georgetown.edu/faculty/wilcoxc/US.PDF>.
- Wilcox, C. & Sigelman, L. (2001). Political mobilization in the pews: Religious contacting and voter turnout. *Social Science Quarterly*, 82, 524-535.
- Williams, J.E. (2002). Linking beliefs to collective action: Religions beliefs and the civil rights movement. *Sociological Forum*, 17, 203-222.
- Williams, R.H. (1996). Religion as political resource: Culture or ideology? *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 35, 368-378.
- Wood, R.L. (1999). Religious culture and political action. *Sociological Theory*, 17, 307-332.
- Zoughbi, Z. (2003, Winter). Christian Zionists or misguided zealots. *Cornerstone*, 8-9.

VITA

Jacob Harmon Stutzman was born in Charleston, West Virginia, on August 9, 1979, the first son of John and Janie Stutzman. After graduating from Parkway West High School in Chesterfield, Missouri in May 1997, Jacob enrolled at Truman State University in Kirksville, Missouri. In May 2001, Jacob graduated from Truman State with a Bachelor of Arts majoring in Communication Arts. From August 2001 through May 2002, Jacob studied in the Master of Arts program in English at Truman State University. In August 2002, Jacob enrolled in the Graduate College at Texas State University-San Marcos majoring in Communication Studies. From August 2004 through May 2005, Jacob was employed as a Graduate Assistant for the basic communication course at Texas State.

Permanent Address: 2302 Hawthorn Dr
Lawrence, Kansas 66047

This thesis was typed by Jacob H. Stutzman.

