Fundamentalisms and the Shalom of God:
An Analysis of Contemporary Expressions of Fundamentalism in Christianity, Judaism and Islam

By
Clinton Stockwell, Ph.D.
Executive Director, Chicago Semester

For
International Association for the Promotion of
Christians in Higher Education (IAPCHE)
Granada, Nicaragua
November, 2006

Contextual Statement

I currently administer and teach at Chicago Semester, an off campus program sponsored by six colleges in the Midwest. These Colleges are all related to two of the Dutch Reformed denominations, the Christian Reformed Church, and the Reformed Church in America. I have great sympathies with the Reformed tradition. Though I grew up Southern Baptist, I later became an elder in a Presbyterian church. I now attend the Wellington Avenue United Church of Christ, a church known for its commitment to social justice. I did a theology doctorate on the work of Emil Brunner, a Reformed theologian, and completed a second doctorate in urban history and wrote on the history of religious social movements in early Chicago. I also have earned Masters degrees from the University of Chicago (liberal arts) and from the University of Illinois at Chicago (urban planning and policy). I believe that my broad academic background gives me a good set of tools to interpret the world, albeit shaped by my social and historical experience as a U.S. citizen from a large city in the Midwest.

Introduction

This paper will attempt to map the Current Cultural/Religious Global Landscape, in the United States, and by extension, into the world at large. Due to space and time limitations, I will only be able to cover in some depth one of these perspectives, the rise of fundamentalisms in the U.S. and in the world. I will seek to do some brief comparisons with three other forces, but will not be able to treat them in the same manner as the relationship between fundamentalism and the biblical vision of shalom.

I believe that the current landscape is dominated by four dominant ideological movements, fundamentalism, nationalism/imperialism, secularism and pluralism. These “four strong winds” are not necessarily desirable, and I will employ a biblical measurement of shalom and torah (peace and law) as an interpretive methodology. Shalom is loosely translated as peace, but could also mean prosperity, wholeness, harmony, well-being. The Hebrew word, Torah, means law, but more than that, it means
also instruction and the revelation of the divine will to human beings. I will use this in the larger sense of revelation or law, as a plausible “norm” for society. I mean Torah not as law in the more restrictive senses of the Pentateuch (first five books of the Christian Old Testament), or the Levitical Laws. Rather, I use it to mean instruction or the revelation of God’s will to human beings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundamentalism</th>
<th>Secularism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationalism</td>
<td>Cultural Pluralism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The four strong winds that are shaping global cultures can be seen as representing four landscapes, four interactive quadrants that comprise a whole. The first quadrant, fundamentalism, describes a political economy that is less concerned with compassion or tolerance, but is more concerned with identity and purity. This quadrant might describe fundamentalist religious groups on the one hand, or tribalist groups who are in reaction to nationalism on their home turf, on the other hand. Many in the fundamentalist camp yearn to return to a theocratic state idea. Fundamentalism can be found almost everywhere, including in each of the great monotheistic religions. Fundamentalism might be characterized as emphasizing “bonding” rather than “bridging” social capital (Putnam, 2000, pp. 22-24).

The second quadrant, secularism, depicts the current lure of subjectivist, individualist, post-modern people who emphasize the sovereignty of the individual. Yet, this perspective also, in my view, extends to the cultural impact of multinational corporations, and its accompanying economic and political philosophy, neo-liberalism. Secular humanists might emphasize human capital over social capital, the ability of creative individuals to shape their worlds.

A third quadrant is represented by nationalism, and often it is found in a religious nationalism. An example of this is Judaism in its classic mold. In the Hebrew Old Testament, the law or torah was used to instruct, protect and insure the nation state of Israel, which was also to be a just and compassionate society. Today, this category could also encompass the “secular state,” like that of the United States, as states like the U.S. are bolstered by a strongly held civil or “publick religion” (Meacham, 2006).

The final quadrant, pluralism, describes groups who consciously exist in society with strong self-definition but who may have permeable boundaries. These include groups that attempt to advance in particular their on identity. These groups have been called variously “identity groups,” or the “politics of recognition.” These include churches and other community-based organizations who may be characterized by what Robert Putnam “bonding” rather than “bridging” social capital (Putnam, 2000).

For Todd Gitlin, the list of “identity groups” vying for recognition in society today is legion.

But today, the identity obsession is not just practiced by history’s most beleaguered people. American culture in the late twentieth century is a very stewpot of separate identities. Not only blacks and feminists, and gays declare
their identity rests on their distinctiveness, but so in various ways do southern Baptists, Florida Jews, Oregon skinheads, Louisiana Cajuns, Brooklyn Lubavitchers, California Sikhs, Wyoming ranchers, the residents of gated communities in Orange County, and “militias” at war with the U.S. government (Gitlin, 1995, 227).

For Gitlin, a self-acclaimed progressive, the problem is that, even for progressive groups, the whole notion of the commons, or what Gitlin calls common dreams, is fractured and undermined by identity politics. “If multiculturalism is not tempered by a stake in the commons, then centrifugal energy overwhelms any commitment to the larger good” (Gitlin, 1995, 236). Pluralism reflects the fracturing of the political landscape in American culture, and also in society in general.

While I will not have the space to devote to each of the “four winds” noted here, I would like to say something about comparisons. Each of the four quadrants described has the potential to merge into another. Fundamentalism can become a nation state, and even an empire. Iran is an example of this, and the empire envisioned by the Al Qaeda network, from India to Spain, is hoped for by Muslim extremists. In other countries, like the U.S., fundamentalism is still a sect, one more interest among other interests. Secularism, and in particular secular individualism is not a likely outcome hoped for by fundamentalists, but there are clear examples where religions, including Islam, is flourishing in an otherwise secular state. Indonesia and Pakistan are ready examples. Even so, the bulk of this paper argues that fundamentalism is one of four major winds blowing in global culture. This paper will seek to describe fundamentalism, and how it compares with the author’s understanding of the shalom of God.

A Shalom View of the World

Each semester in Chicago, I introduce the students that I serve to a particular text of scripture, Jeremiah 29:7. The text reads as follows:

But seek the welfare (shalom) of the city where I have sent you into exile, and pray to the Lord on its behalf, for in its welfare (shalom), you will find your welfare (shalom).

In a recent conference in Chicago, called the Congress for Urban Ministry, one speaker, Dr. Fred Smith of the Wesley Theological Seminary, called for a movement and a goal that he called “shalomification.” By this word, Dr. Smith argued that shalom could be a biblical norm for society, and especially for those who declare some allegiance to the biblical tradition. In Jeremiah chapter 29, I believe there are several things about shalom that gives credence to its normative character. The context for the verse is that ancient Israelites found themselves as captives and exiles in a foreign land. This people was faced with several choices. They could flee, and attempt to leave Babylon and try to make it back to the homeland, a fate that they managed to achieve 70 years later. They could rebel, and try to take over the political apparatus in the city, though they evidently had little means to do so. Or third, they could remain in the city as exiles, and do as
Jeremiah suggested, live in and seek the peace and welfare of the city where they were exiled.

For Jeremiah, the pursuit of shalom was the goal for the ancient Israelite exiles. Though the Israelites of Jeremiah were exiled and captive in the ancient city of Babylon, they were encouraged, even mandated, to seek the peace of the city, for in its peace, they would find their peace. In short, it was in the collective interest of the ancient Israelites to seek the peace of the city where they resided, for their peace was interconnected with the peace of the whole. So, shalom implies a certain interconnectedness, a certain interrelationship with a city (and society as a whole) with other peoples who represent different histories and cultural traditions.

Further, shalom means not only peace, but prosperity, welfare, harmony and well-being, among other meanings. It implies that a spiritual grounding for peace is also connected to economic and political realities. Shalom means that prosperity, peace and well-being are shared by all. “Shalom has a social dimension, being bound up with the political aspirations of Israel, and has a public significance far beyond the purely personal” (Brown, 1976, II, 777). It is “the opposite not so much of war as any disturbance in the communal well-being of the nation, a disturbance which, of course, may in certain circumstances make it necessary to go to war” (Brown, 1976, II, 777). A shalom society means that peace is not only the norm, but is the essence of social and political practice. It means that those less fortunate, including the “widows and the orphans” as well as the “strangers and the aliens,” and the “poor and oppressed” (all biblical categories) are attended to. In short, rather than fleeing the city, Jeremiah implores that the exiles settle in the city, plant vineyards, build houses, raise families, celebrate marriages—to live in the city as “resident aliens” or as “situated exiles.”

There are several individual authors who have written rather extensively about shalom as a biblical ideal. These include, Jack L. Stotts (1972); Roger S. Greenway (1978); George W. Webber (1979); Nicholas Wolterstorff (1983); Bruce W. Winter (1994); Cornelius Plantinga (1995, 2002); and Mark R. Gornik (2002). These writers, among others, recognize that shalom and the mandate to pursue the peace of the city and of society in general is a mandate. Plantinga (1995) argues that shalom captures the ultimate intention of a God-willed society. Shalom is “the way it’s supposed to be.”

They [Old Testament Prophets] dreamed of a new age in which human crookedness would be straightened out, rough places made plain. The foolish would be made wise, and the wise, humble. They dreamed of a time when the deserts would flower, the mountains would run with wine, weeping would cease, and people would go to sleep without weapons on their laps. People would work in peace and work to fruitful effect. Lambs could lie down with lions. All nature would be fruitful, benign, and filled with wonder upon wonder, all humans would be knit together in brotherhood and sisterhood; and all nature and all humans would look to God, walk with God, lean toward God, and delight in God (Plantinga, 1995, 9-10).

Plantinga goes on to say that shalom is “the webbing together of God, humans and all creation.” Shalom he writes, is more than just ceasefire, but “in the Bible, shalom means universal flourishing, wholeness, and delight, a rich state of affairs in which
natural needs are satisfied, and natural gifts fruitfully employed…Shalom, in other words, is the way things ought to be” (Plantinga, 1995, 10). Furthermore, despite the violence in the middle east, the genocide in Darfur, the crime on the streets of America and elsewhere, a shalom vision means that these things are “not the way its supposed to be.” Further, while unlikely in the present age, “shalomification” means that another world is possible, a new world is coming. For many of us, the kingdom is both here (realized) but also coming (not yet). As stewards of the creation and ambassadors of another realm, our job is to represent and recreate shalom on earth, “as it is in heaven.”

Torah as the Way of Life

Many years ago, in the 1970s, I remember going to seminary and being interested in the theme of biblical and theological ethics. One very helpful book that I read in that period, still a good one today, is the book, The Way of Israel, by James Muilenburg (1961). Muilenburg explored the foundation for biblical ethics, and found it to be in an understanding of Torah. For Muilenburg, the Torah was anything but a legalistic doctrine of dead laws. Rather, torah is a way of life. Humans live by “every word that comes from the mouth of God,” and this includes not just obedience to God, but also service and the practice of justice and love (Muilenburg, 1961, 73). The keeping of the Torah in this perspective is the key to life and happiness.

For Muilenberg, there are several key features to hearing and obeying the torah. The ancient Israelites (as distinguished from contemporary Zionists) were admonished to read the torah and to practice its teachings. They were admonished “to hear the word of the Lord,” and to “choose life.” In Isaiah, this meant that the Israelites were to “wash yourselves… cease to do evil, learn to do good, seek justice, correct oppression, defend the fatherless, plead for the widow” (Ibid, 20). Here, as elsewhere, torah is “instruction or teaching. Often it is tantamount to revelation and is indeed referred to as God’s word” (Ibid., 25). If one obeys the torah, then the result would be favor, peace, prosperity, security, blessing. In short, shalom is a consequence of hearing and doing the torah.

A key theme in the torah is the theme of justice. Amos, an eighth century prophet, wrote, “let justice roll down like waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream.” Micah also said: “he has told you mortal what is good, but to do justice, practice compassion and walk humbly with your God.” In short, justice and the practice of it is at the heart of the Old Testament torah. Further, this justice is not vengeance or even punishment at heart, but rather the restoration of shalom.

His (God’s) will is the supreme issue for her (Israel’s) life, exalted above the wills of human judges and leaders. But more than that, while his function is to maintain justice, to uphold the right, to preserve the peace and well-being (shalom) of the community, it is not his punitive judgment that is central in the legal contexts but rather his desire to protect the right and to establish it, to help and to save Israel, to come to the rescue of those who have no voice in court. Therefore, as Judge, he is the Helper and Savior and Deliverer and Redeemer of his people (Muilenburg, p. 57).
For Old Testament Israel, God was the giver of the Torah, and also that God was the redeemer and liberator of a captive people. The God of the Torah was the advocate for the poor, and the deliverer of the oppressed, and a voice for the voiceless. This God was motivated by chesed or lovingkindness.

The love of God is to evoke Israel’s answering love to him, and this love expresses itself in humanitarian legislation, which is not mere legalism but the joyous response of obedience to the love and compassion of God. To forget the demand for obedience is to forget what God has done and to be heedless of the love that motivated it (Deut. 8:11-20). (Muilenburg, 52).

The ethical foundations, “the way of Israel,” that one finds in the Hebrew Old Testament, is based on a covenant relationship (Hebrew= berith). A primary word in the Hebrew vocabulary is the word chesed. Like shalom, chesed is a rich word with a variety of textured meanings. “It can mean kindness, covenant, love, steadfast love, devotion, fidelity, even grace” (Muilenburg, 59). Hesed is God’s gift to Israel. It is unmerited, and flows out of God’s compassion, out of God’s character of faithfulness and devotion to the covenant people. Regardless of Israel’s behavior, God would be faithful to the covenant, and God’s lovingkindness remains a key attribute of God’s steadfast character. Another aspect of God’s character, and expectation, is that of righteousness, tsedeqah, which denotes a relationship between two persons. Similarly, mishpot (justice) is a significant word, and like chesed has a wide variety of meanings, including “custom, manner, way of acting, decision, judicial sentence, ordinance, right.” A “right” is what is due every person as a member of a community of brothers and sisters. Then, for Muilenburg, the word most intimately connected with the covenant is shalom. On shalom, Muilenburg writes

It often means prosperity, completeness, tranquility, welfare, even friendship, but in covenantal contexts well-being. It is the covenant that secures and establishes shalom. It is this well-being that gives stability to the relationship, and as such it is the gift of God to his people. The later prophets look forward to berith shalom, a covenant of well-being and peace. Yahweh promises peace and well-being to his people (Muilenburg, p. 60).

Taken together, “the way of the leaders” should reflect the character and expectations of the creator, not as self-serving, but as a good, for the well-being of the people in covenantal community. Furthermore, for Muilenburg, the liberation from captivity has an impact on “Israel’s communal life: “all men (humankind) are equal under God. But there is a second feature of this Code which is quite striking and one which also runs its course through the Old Testament: the prevailing concern for the oppressed, the disinherit, the weak, the poor and afflicted” (Muilenburg, pp. 68-69). The divine economy is one that provides for and protects the weak. The force of God’s covenantal love is that of compassion, a passionate concern for and attention to the most vulnerable, especially the “widows and the orphans,” as well as the “strangers in the land.” Further, “even the enemy must be treated as a neighbor, and the faithful Israelite is under obligation to render him the justice that is his due, to treat him as a brother.
within the brotherhood of the called and consecrated people (Exod. 23: 4-5). This is the justice of God” (Muilenburg, p. 70).

Citing Deuteronomy 16:20, “justice, and only justice you must pursue in order that you may live and may possess the land which the Lord your God is giving you.” Granted, the concept of Land in the Old Testament is problematic today, but it was the responsibility of those given such a gift to practice justice and fairness to others, even the “enemy.” There must be no partiality in the administration of justice, as leaders “must act impartially, without regard to rich or poor, patrician or peasant, great or small” (Muilenburg, p. 71). Even so, God has a “special concern for the weak, the poor, the disinherited, the alien, and all those who stand in need.” In the same way, the prophets spoke for Yahweh and often confronted Israel for its injustice.

The prophets keep calling for justice, justice for every man, and especially for those most liable to be treated unjustly, but they spell out what justice means in the particular situation, and they can do so with such passion and wrath because they speak for the God of justice and compassion who intervenes in behalf of the exploited and weak and defenseless…. A historical revelation means to be concrete and relevant to particular history (Muilenburg, pp. 76-77).

For Muilenburg, it was the mission of Israel to “lead the nations of the world to peace” (Muilenburg, p. 147). So, when the prophets imagine the world as it should be, the world as it is supposed to be, it is a world of peace, justice, and well-being for all God’s creatures. In that new age, “men will lay down their arms; the instruments of war will be destroyed, and men will enjoy the comforts of home and the joys of family life without fear or dread. The King of the future will usher in an age of peace (shalom), chariot and battle-bow will be cut off from the land.” God’s people know that we can “summons the nations to peace, for she knows that the resources for peace lie with him who is her peace and whose will is peace for all the nations” (Muilenburg, pp. 147-148).

In the New Testament, a standard for the nations is laid out in the Gospel of Matthew, chapter 25. There Jesus lays out an expectation, not just for his disciples, but for the nations as well. For, “before him will be gathered all the nations, and he will separate them from one another as a shepherd separates the sheep from the goats” (Mt. 25: 31). From this comes a passage that describes what peoples and nations should strive for. Do we feed the hungry? Do we give drink to he thirsty? Do we clothe the naked? Do we welcome the stranger? Do we visit the sick and the infirmed? Do we visit also those in prison? These are of course the most vulnerable of any society. In a sense, while directed to the nations, all of us have to answer this question. “when did we see you hungry or thirsty, or a stranger, or naked or sick, or in prison and did not minister unto you? The answer was of course, “if you do this to the least of these, you did it to me” (Mt. 25: 44-45). “The way of Israel” and the ethics of the New Testament have much in common. Each rejects war as a standard, and each rejects poverty and the immizeration of the most vulnerable of society as a gross miscarriage of justice.

For myself, and for many people of faith, a religious vision of society rooted in torah and shalom is both a mandate, and an ideal that is possible and even necessary for a better world. This normative vision will be employed to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the four strong winds that are now shaping global cultures.
Fundamentalism

This past year, February of 2006, I had the fortune of attending a conference on “The Psychology of Fundamentalism” in Chicago. It was sponsored by the Chicago Institute for Psychonalysis. You might suspect that the conference was led by left wing psychiatrists who have little respect for religion, and many of whom may still be wrestling with the horrors of the Jewish holocaust. This was for the most part true. However, it was also an intense investigation of the subject, especially the extremes inherent particularly in the Muslim and Christian worlds. But even in the conference description, there was some latitude on the word’s meaning.

Religious fundamentalism is one of the most powerful forces in the world today. In some ways, fundamentalism improves people’s lives. For many individuals, their strict religious beliefs give them a sense of meaning and encourage them to be caring and benevolent. But for others, fundamentalism can have dire consequences for adherents, as well as for those deemed “enemies” of the belief system.

Fundamentalism in the U.S.: Beginnings to the Present

Historically, “fundamentalism” described a unique historical movement in U.S. based evangelical protestantism. Humphreys and Wise (2004) describe how in the U.S, fundamentalism was a reaction to four movements in US culture. These were the enlightenment, biblical criticism, liberal theology and evolution (Humphreys/Wise, 2004, 18-19). The leaders of fundamentalism in America included a variety of scholars, including Gresham Machen, James Orr, and B.B. Warfield. They were initially not hostile to evolution, but thought that God may have formed the world using an evolutionary process. They were not dispensational premillennialists, but scholars like Warfield and A.A. Hodge were actually postmillennial. Warfield believed that evangelical work in the present would usher in the coming Kingdom. They represented a variety of theological perspectives, though Warfield and Machen were influenced by “Scottish Realism,” or the “common sense philosophy” that gave 19th century Protestants confidence that they could discuss and argue via reason for the truth of scripture and for the God-hypothesis.

Others, such as R.A. Torrey and A.T. Pierson were dedicated to evangelism and Protestant missionary activity. Despite its diversity, “Fundamentalism” as a late nineteenth century and early twentieth century movement was a reaction to higher criticism, modernism, evolution and theological liberalism (Sandeen, 1970). In its first use, “fundamentalism” was not viewed in a pejorative manner. It would be like stating what was essential, fundamental or necessary to the faith. It was assumed that evangelical Christians would be in wide agreement. The fundamentals included the

---

1 Premillennialists believe that the world will steadily get worse, and the Second Coming of Christ will come at the end to set up a Millennial Kingdom of 1000 years. Dispensational premillennialists divide scripture into seven ages or dispensations, and the final one, the age of the church ends with a Great Tribulation, where all true believers are “raptured” to heaven before a time of great cataclysm. Postmillennialists believed that the Kingdom of God comes at the end following intense missionary activity. The world gets “better” in this view and is not interrupted by a Great Tribulation.
inspiration and authority of the scripture, the belief in miracles, the virgin birth of Christ, and the deity of Christ. For the first group of fundamentalists, it was enough to believe simply in the Return of Christ.

The name fundamentalist was derived from a 12 volume collection of essays written from 1910-1915 by 64 British and U.S. scholars and ministers. By 1919, this group founded the “World’s Christian Fundamentalists Assocation.” After World War One, the confidence that Protestant missions would lead to world conversion, or the belief that progress and the march of the Gospel would bring on a millennial kingdom was on the wane. With the violence of the Great War, Protestants were skeptical that any social gospel would make a difference in the world. John Nelson Darby’s dispensationalism, and premillennialism began to take hold among those who called themselves fundamentalists. “[I]n the 1920s, simple belief in the Second Coming of Christ qualified as fundamental, but in the 1930s one might have to believe in Christ’s pretribulational and premillennial Second Coming” (T.P Weber in DCA, 1990, 464).

Premillennialists believed that the world was getting worse, and that the world systems would collapse into a battle of Armageddon, and the true believers would be raptured just before the Great Tribulation. Revivalists like Dwight L. Moody or Billy Sunday sought to save individuals for heaven, and were less concerned on making the world better in the here and now. Further, the Scopes Trial brought led to the 1920s “fundamentalist controversy,” where fundamentalists were militated against evolution, and therefore presumably against science.

Scholars in the post World War II era like Ernest Sandeen or Norman Furniss saw in fundamentalism a pervasive anti-intellectualism. Fundamentalisms seemed to also adopt a conservative social ethic that decried movies, Hollywood, public drinking, smoking, card playing, loose morality, sexual perversion, and anything that seemed to challenge a literal interpretation of the Bible. George S. Marsden argued that the central characteristic of fundamentalism historically was vigorously anti-modernist (Marsden, 1980). In the 1970s, evangelical scholar Francis Schaeffer argued that “secular humanism” was a grave threat to Protestant orthodoxy. Schaeffer also went on a campaign to place the “pro life” issue centerstage for conservative evangelicals. Schaeffer was militantly against abortion, and argued that abortion was a central practice among “secular humanists” (Schaeffer, 2005).

Fundamentalists in the post world war II era embraced dispensational premillennialism. Theologians who gravitated to the Dallas Theological Seminary placed dispensational premillennialism as a centerpiece of fundamentalist theology. Hal Lindsay, a graduate of Dallas, popularized dispensational premillennialism in his book, The Late Great Planet Earth (1970). In 1980, the President of the Dallas Theological Seminary, John F. Walvoord, wrote a book, Armageddon: Oil and the Middle East Crisis (HarperCollins, 1980). In this book, Walvoord argued that Armageddon would occur in the Middle East, and this war would be the result of an international conflict over oil. Other professors at the Dallas Theological Seminary, like J. Dwight Pentecost, championed the writing of biblical prophecy. In the past ten years or so, the authors of Left Behind: A Novel of the Earth’s Last Days, Timothy F. LaHaye and Jerry B. Jenkins (Tyndale House, 1986) have reintroduced “bible prophecy” to a reading audience that has gone beyond the conservative evangelical reading public. Terms like “rapture,”
“millennium,” “antichrist,” or “Second Coming” are now part of popular religious lore. The “Left Behind” series now has twelve volumes and is a huge best seller.

Today, many fundamentalists have been on the forefront of the so-called “culture wars” in America, insisting that Christians should become involved politically to save “America” as a Christian land. Hallmarks of religious fundamentalism include the pro-life movement, Christian home-schooling, a belief in American exceptionalism, and a foreign policy determined in no small part by the particular reading and interpretation of bible prophecy and the end times as advanced by Dallas Theological Seminary. The bogeyman of American fundamentalists today is “secular humanism.”

By the 1970s they had identified new enemies and supported new causes. They organized to oppose secular humanism, the decline of traditional values, feminism, legalized abortion, homosexuality, and the elimination of prayer in public schools. They even revised the old anti evolution crusade by sponsoring legislation to provide equal time for what they called “creation science” (T.P. Weber, DCA, 1990, 465).

But, not all “evangelicals” are fundamentalists. From the 1950s, a new breed of evangelical scholars sought to separate themselves from fundamentalists. Carl F. H. Henry would argue that “evangelicals” were very different from “fundamentalists.” These evangelicals would insist on the inspiration and authority of scripture, but they would be more friendly to science and technology, more open to ecumenical relations, more committed to academic scholarship, and less dogmatic about a premillennial eschatology. They would also use biblical (higher) criticism, in small doses, though many would hold that the bible was inerrant “in the original autographs.” These evangelicals founded several evangelical colleges and theological schools—schools known for their academic rigor. These include Fuller Theological Seminary, Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, Wheaton College Graduate School and the Trinity Evangelical Divinity School (now part of the Trinity International University). The latter three schools hold to inerrancy and to a premillennial eschatology.

Dogmatic believers sometimes question the validity of science, demonize those who disagree with them, and some may adopt violence to advance their views or to react to threats (Goldberg, 2006).” In fact, in the American Heritage Dictionary, there are two definitions of fundamentalism. Definition number one states that fundamentalism is a “Protestant movement characterized by the literal truth of the Bible.” Definition two states that fundamentalism is “a movement or point of view characterized by rigid adherence to fundamental or basic principles.” My basic concern here is with the latter group.

Michelle Goldberg, author of Kingdom Coming: The Rise of Christian Nationalism (2006), thinks that Evangelicals are perhaps 30% of the total US population, but that only 10-15% (half or less than half the total) are “fundamentalists” in the way she uses the term. Still, she argues that this group of fundamentalists have a disproportionate influence on the U.S. government, and she is particularly concerned about what some have termed “dominion theology, reconstructionism, theonomy, and apocalypticism that together comprises a movement she calls “Christian Nationalism.” This group is adverse to any form of pluralism, and believes that the doctrine of the separation of
church and state is a contrivance to keep “fundamentalists” out of power. And note, what Goldberg is describing is not extreme sects such as the KKK or the various “Christian identity” movements, but rather evangelicals with power who are impacting US domestic and foreign policy. In another recent book, Kevin Phillips notes how fundamentalist leaders have had a strong influence on George W. Bush’s Presidency, especially with respect to domestic policy (environment) and foreign policy (the invasion of Iraq and the single minded support of Israel) (Phillips, 2006).

Zionism and the Birth of a Jewish State in Israel

Judaism is divided into three main groups, Conservative, Orthodox and Reformed Judaism. However, neither of these three main groups should be confused with Zionism. Zionism is the Jewish nationalist movement that focuses on the rebirth and renewal of the nation state of Israel in the land of Palestine. Modern Zionism emerged in the late 19th century in response to the persecution of the Jews in Eastern and Western Europe. According to the Anti-Defamation League, Zionism “continues to be the guiding nationalist movement of the majority of Jews around the world.” Further, it is probably true that most US residents support the Jewish state. There are many who have strong connections to a successful state for economic and political reasons. Also, there are many who are supportive of Zionism who are evangelical Christians or Christian fundamentalists who’s view of bible prophecy elicits their support based on a premillennial eschatology. These include “Christian Zionists” who are convinced that the restoration of the Jewish state is the fulfillment of prophecy.2

Christian Zionists find themselves against the World Council of Churches and moderate Christians who are more sympathetic to the Palestinian cause, and more critical of Jewish territorial objectives. The WCC has been bold, denouncing Israel for the “systematic perpetration of racist crimes including war crimes, acts of genocide and ethnic cleansing.” Similarly, the Anti Defamation League (ADL) has argued that Jews have been historically marginalized for centuries, and have had to overcome “centuries of struggle” including “foreign conquest and exile.”3

The origins of Zionism may be traced to Moses Hess (1812-1875) and Theodor Herzl (1860-1904). I will refer to Herzl as the most significant figure. Herzl moved to Vienna in 1878 and received the Doctor of Laws from the University of Vienna. He first encountered anti-semitism while studying at the University of Vienna, and this experience colored his life. In the play, The Ghetto (1894), assimilation to the secular or Christian civilization was rejected as a solution. In 1894, Captian Alfred Dreyfus, a Jewish officer in the French army, was accused of treason. Herzl witnessed mobs crying “death to the Jews” in France. As a result of this experience, he began to argue that the only solution was for Jews to immigrate to a land that they could call their own. Herzl later published the book, The Jewish State (1896) to argue that the solution to the Jewish
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problem was not individual, but national and political. This was the birth of “Political Zionism.”

Herzl then proceeded to gain support for a charter from the world’s leading nations that would pave the way to the development of a Jewish State. Herzl was instrumental in adopting the “Basle Program,” a document drawn up by “Zionist” leaders to establish a “secure haven, under public law, for the Jewish people in the land of Israel.” Herzl then developed a platform that became the essence of Zionism. This platform included the following proposals.

1. The promotion by appropriate means of the settlement of the Eretz Israel of Jewish farmers, artisans and manufactures.
2. The organization and uniting of the whole of Jewry by means of appropriate institutions, both local and international, in accordance with the laws of each country.
3. The strengthening and fostering of Jewish national sentiment and national consciousness.
4. Preparatory steps toward obtaining the consent of governments, where necessary, in order to reach the goals of Zionism.

Herzl was made President of the Zionist Organization, and the Zionist Congress was held every one or two years to World War II. Since World War II, it has been held every four years.

The term “Zionism” comes from the hill of Zion, where the original temple of Jerusalem was situated. Zionism’s goal is to establish a Jewish homeland with geographical boundaries. However, inside Zionism has been several orientations: “spiritual and cultural; work ethical; Marxist; and Orthodox Jewish.” The central motif was the notion of founding a homeland for the Jewish diaspora, which was in exile to Babylon, Europe and the world since the sixth Century BCE. Other motifs in Zionism include the expectation of Messiah, socialism (Kibbutzim), nationalism, and Jewish religious identity. The history reflects an focused attempt by Zionists to appeal to European powers and to lobby for a nation state in Israel. Early Zionism in Herzl’s time was secular in nature, and looked for a nation like other nations.

A sketch is as follows:

1862- Moses Hess publishes the book Rome and Jerusalem, and urges the return of the Jews to Palestine.
1881- Pogroms in Russia result in heavy immigration to the USA, but a few migrate to Palestine and establish a small enclave there.
1893- Nathan Birnbaum introduces the term, Zionism.
1896- Thedor Herzl publishes, The Jewish State.
1897- First Zionist Congress held
1917- Balfour Declaration- official Brittish support to establishing a Jewish homeland in Palestine.

---

6 Ibid.
1922- The British gives the World Zionist organization madate to immigrate to Palestine.
1939- British “White Paper” gives Arabs of Palestine defacto control over Jewish immigration. This was not supported well and was ignored by Zionists.
1942- Call from Zionist leaders for Jewish homeland to be established after WW II ends.
1948, May 14- Jewish State of Israel estalbished. Jewish immigration to Israel increases.
1970s- Jews of Soviet Union assisted to immigrate to Israel.
1975- UN General Assembly passes Resolution 3370 declaring Zionism to be racist.
1979- UN General Assembly revokes Resolution 3370.8

A Zionist Perspective on Israel/Palestine

While not all Zionists are fundamentalists or racists, it is clear the Zionism reflects the convergence of two dangerous forces, fundamentalism and nationalism. Jewish historian and Zionist supporter Solomon Grayzel critiques the convergence of such forces in the Arab world, even as he minimizes it among fellow Zionists.

But nationalism’s usual concomitants are racialism and religious uniformity. Consequently, the struggle for independence was everywhere accompanied by anti-Jewish words and acts, the excuse being that Jews were Zionists and therefore anti-Moslem. Ancient Jewish communities were broken up as a result, and obstacles were placed in the way of exiled Jews going to Israel (Grayzel, 1968, 818).

Grayzel argues, therefore, that the state of Israel was necessary because of the resurgence of Arab nationalism. At the very same time that a Jewish state in Israel was being considered, he wrote that Jewish people in Arab nations such as Iraq, Tunisia, Morocco, Algeria and other places were repressed due to Arab and African nationalism and the emergence from colonialism. Following the holocaust in Europe and liberation from colonialism in Africa and the Arab world, more persons were forced to migrate to Israel.

By 1948, Grayzel writes, the British were ambivalent regarding a Jewish state, the French had armed Israel, but were backing off, and the United Nations was impotent in resolving the situation, so Israeli leaders took up arms and sought to ward off Arab insurgency to set up a state for Jewish people in Palestine. The population of Israel grew dramatically, so that by 1965, the eve of the Six Day war, there were 2,299,000 Jews, 212,000 Moslems, 57,000 Christians and 29,000 others in Palestine (Grayzel, 1968, 833).

By 1966, Tel Aviv was a bustling city of 400,000 people. Grayzel, a supporter of Zionism, argued that Egypt started the six day war with a blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba. Israel responded militarily in a swift fashion. The result was the capture of the city of Jerusalem and portions of the West Bank. For Evangelical Christians, and for Zionists, this was the “fulfillment of biblical prophecy.”

Poorly trained, badly led, unable to use their superior weapons, the soldiers of Egypt were no match for those of Israel. Hussein of Jordan was urged by Israel to stay out of the fighting; but he replied by bombarding the Jewish sector of Jerusalem. On the second day of the war, Israelis attacked the Old City, and Mount Scopus was the first spot to be liberated. On the third day, Israeli tanks fought their way into Jordanian Jerusalem. Forbidden the use of heavy guns, lest injury be done to the holy sites of several religions, the Jewish soldiers limited themselves to the use of small arms. Late that day, the ancient city was completely under Jewish control. By Thursday, the fourth day, the entire western sector of Jordan, including the cities of Nablus (Shechem), Jericho, and Bethlehem, was in the hands of the Israeli army (Grayzel, 1968, 840).

Grayzel complains that the United Nations and other nations argued unfairly that Israel was the aggressor, even as Americans cheered Israeli victories. Unfortunately, the occupation of Palestine, the capture of Jerusalem, and now the occupation of lands in the West Bank and in the Gaza strip paved the way for conflict that has lasted for decades. Grayzel writes of the goal of “peace” in Zionist perspective (see below on Zionist fundamentalist perspectives on peace).

But their [Gentile nations] efforts to turn the clock of history back by compelling Israel to withdraw from all the territory it had overrun during the six days of fighting did not stop. Israel, on the other hand, through the eloquent foreign secretary, Abba Eban, insisted that it sought peace, and that such peace could be obtained only through a treaty negotiated and signed in direct confrontation of the participants in the fighting. The old situation, in which the Moslem nations refused to recognize the existence of Israel and openly agitated for its destruction, he pointed out, could only lead to more border incidents and eventually to further warfare. Until a genuine peace could be arranged Israel would continue occupying the territory it had won (Grayzel, 1968, 841).

Grayzel completes his massive history of Israel with the assessment that Israel now had the task of fighting “Arab nationalism,” even as “Christendom” was on the verge of renouncing its antisemitic past in support of a Jewish state.

Progressive Jewish Assessments of Zionist Fundamentalism

Not all Jews of course accept Zionism. and not all accept the preceding interpretation of history. In recent times authors like Israel Shahak and Norton Mezvinsky, Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel (1999.2004); Ian S. Lustick, For the Land and for the Lord: Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel (1988); and most recently Gershom Gorenberg, author of The End of Days: Fundamentalism and the Struggle for the Temple Mount (2000), and The Accidental Empire: Israel and the Birth of the Settlements, 1967-1977 (2006), have called into question the legitimacy and the impact of Zionism, especially Zionist fundamentalism. For these authors, most Jews are not Zionists, and most are not fundamentalists. Zionism in this perspective is viewed as a betrayal of Judaism, and a chief force of destabilization in the world. Shahak and Mezvinsky argue that Jewish fundamentalism in
Israel is not as well known as Arab fundamentalism, which is virtually identified with terrorism; or Christian fundamentalism, which is influenced heavily by a literal interpretation of Bible prophecy and the end times (Weber, 2004; Boyer, 1993). Yet, Jewish fundamentalism for these authors, is just as deadly and disturbing, and is a major contributor to destabilization in the Middle East and the world at large. Though not at all universally applauded, many in Israel were shocked and dismayed. Still the assassination of Yitzak Rabin by Yigal Amir, a religious extremist, was greeted by the fundamentalist element in Israel as necessary for the sake of “true” Jewish religion. “The basic principles of Jewish fundamentalism are the same as those found in other religions: restoration and survival of the “pure” religious community that presumably existed in the past” (Shahak and Mezvinsky, 1999).9

Shahak and Mezvinsky go on to describe characteristics of Jewish fundamentalism. These include a messianic tendency, an oppositon to human freedoms, especially freedom of expression in Israel, the support of occupation of Arab lands, support of discriminating policies versus Palestinians, a repression and opposition to democratic values, and the condemnation of homosexuality and lesbianism. Further, Jewish fundamentalism has adopted an extreme form of biblical literalism, arguing that the destiny of Israel requires Israeli control of all lands from the Suez Canal to lands West and South of the river Euphrates, including the Sinai Peninsula, Jordan, Lebanon, most of Syria, much of Iraq and Kuwait (Brownfield, 2000). Christian fundamentalists (Christian Zionists) share the views of Jewish fundamentalists, that it is Israel’s destiny to control these lands as natural frontiers, and that the repression of Arabs and “sexual deviants” is consistent with a theocratic state. Not only do Jewish fundamentalists strive for religious purity and for geographic expansion, but they also believe in religious, moral and racial superiority. Beliefs in superiority feed policies that discriminate against Muslims, alternative sexualities, and non-Jewish people without impunity.

Shahak and Mezvinsky provide a reading of Jewish history that includes a survey of perspectives on Judaism and the Jewish state, an interpretation of talmudic literature, and a portrayal of Jewish history from biblical times to the present. They argue that Jewish fundamentalists are largely ignorant and are highly selective of talmudic and biblical teachings. The authors describe the failure of Judaism in the first century CE, and the emergence of Messianism and hope for a revived Jewish temple in Palestine. This they argue, is an extreme interpretation of Judaism, and does not represent the complex history of the religion nor of the Jewish people. They argue that much of the teachings of Jewish fundamentalism derives from the mystical teachings of the Kabbalah, not from the mainstream teachings of the Torah or of major bodies of Jewish history and mis interpretations of Jewish literature such as the Talmud.

Perhaps the most radical of fundamentalist groups in Israel in the post 1967 era for Israel is the Gush Emunim. The Gush Emunim (Block of the Faithful) is a right-wing ultranationalist, religio-political movement. It was formed in March 1974 in the aftermath of the Yom Kippur War of October 1973. A major focus of the Gush Emunim was to support and establish Jewish settlements on the West Bank of the Jordan River. From 1977-1984, the Likud Party (of Menachem Begin) gave Gush Emunim resources to develop settlement on the West Bank. This group believes that the West bank is part of biblical Judea, and along with Samaria, constitute the lands of ancient Israel. Like other

---

fundamentalist groups, Gush Emunim believes in “the literal truth of the Bible and total commitment to the precepts of modern secular Zionism, it may be called Zionist fundamentalism” (Sprinzak, 1986, 4). Zionism was historically more of a secular movement, but the Gush Emunim has succeeded in combining the idea of a global state with religious fundamentalism.

Sprinzak notes that at first the Gush Emunim was a faction of the National Religious Party (NRP), but has evolved as a separate entity now concerned particularly with reclaiming the lands of “biblical Israel” (Sprinzak, 1986). The NRP was established in 1956 to oppose any state but a Jewish state East of the Jordan River to the Mediterranean Sea. The Gush Emunim and the NRP have supported settlements on the West Bank. Going beyond the Gush Emunim, Gush members attempted to bomb the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem, attempted assassinations of three mayors of West Bank cities and plotted to bomb five Arab buses. In 1983, members stormed the Islamic College in Hebron and killed three Muslim students (Weber, 2004, 256-257). The fundamentalist ideology of the Gush Emunim includes the following. Redemption for Israel is directly tied to Zionism and the recapturing of the lands of ancient Israel at its imperial height. The recapture of Jerusalem in the six day war of 1967 is a sign to fundamentalist Jews, as well as fundamentalist Christians, that the “messianic age” has begun. Rabbi Zvi Yehuda Kook, a leader of the NRP, defined the state of Israel as the “halakhic” Kingdom of Israel, and the Kingdom of Israel as the Kingdom of Heaven on earth. Every Jew living in Israel was holy; all phenomena, even the secular, were imbued with holiness” (Sprinzak, 1986, 12).

There are other key elements to the Jewish fundamentalist worldview. First, is the sanctity of the land of Israel. The land of Israel, for Jewish extremists, is based on the biblical covenant with Abraham. It therefore extends from the current boundaries of Israel to the River Euphrates on the Northeast, and to the Nile River on the southwest (Sprinzak, 1986, 13). This includes the southern lands of present day Lebanon, which in biblical times belonged to the tribes of Asher and Naftali. For Jewish fundamentalism, ownership of the holy land should not be granted to “foreigners.” Arabs living in Israel would receive full civil rights if they acknowledge Jewish sovereignty, but no political rights nor could they own any part of the “holy land.” Some members are more radical, and would not extend any rights to Arabs, and some would favor complete removal or even the extermination of Arabs from Israel. Rabbi Israel Hess likened Arabs to the biblical Amalkites (cited by Sprinzak, 1986, 16). For Hess, the Arabs who live in Israel today are “direct descendents of the Amalakites,” and deserve to be exterminated.

Adherents to Gush Emunim ideology are opposed to democracy and to the rule of civil law. Like fundamentalists in Christianity and in Islam, this group appeals to a “higher” religious ideology. They believe that their interpretation of the Torah is alien to democracy and to the laws of a secular state. Officially, democracy is acceptable as long as it can be practiced in the context of Zionism, but if the two polities collide, Zionism takes precedence. Zionists are willing to tolerate a civil society in the interim, but in the end, like other fundamentalist movements, they look to a theocratic state ruled by a strict interpretation of the Torah.

Today the political and spiritual principles of the Gush Emunim are prevalent in Israel. For Sprinzak, “it would not be erroneous to speak today of the invisible kingdom of the Gush Emunim, which is acquiring the character of a state within a state” (Sprinzak,
In 1978, Amana, Gush Emunim’s official settlement organization was established. Amana was able to gain political support from Menachem Begin, and Ariel Sharon worked with Amana while aggressively pursuing a policy of “creeping annexation” of “biblical” lands (Sprinzak, 1986, 23). However, Gush Emunim was never completely happy with Likud, because it perceived Begin and Sharom as too secular, lacking Gush’s religious perspective.

Lustick believes that Jewish fundamentalism is wider than Gush Emunim. However, he believes that the Gush Emunim captures the basic force and ideology of Jewish extremism in Israel. He writes that for all practical purposes contemporary Jewish fundamentalist ideology I Israle is ‘the ideology of Gush Emunim’” (Lustick, 1988, chapter IV). Lustick believes that Jewish fundamentalism is grounded in seven basic beliefs. The first belief is the “abnormality of the Jewish people.” Lustick notes that, for Jewish fundamentalism, the Zionism of Leo Pinsker and Theodor Herzl argued that the Jews should become like other nations, a nation within other nations. This would follow the historical beginnings of ancient Israel in First Samuel. The solution for Herzl was for Israel to become a nation like other nations, but not to assimilate, but rather to establish their own homeland. But, Jewish fundamentalists go beyond Herzl arguing that Jews should not seek a process of normalization as a national culture no different than other nations. Rather, Jews should embrace their own abnormality, and their own peculiarity. Rather, “authentic Zionism…entails rejection of classical Zionism’s use of other nations as models for how the Jewish people behave and what it might or should become. Jews are not amd cannot be a normal people; they are, in fact, irrevocably abnormal. The eternal uniqueness of the Jews is the result of the covenant God made with them at Mount Sinai—a real historical event with eternal and inescapable consequences for the entire world” (Lustick, 1988, IV, 2). Key to this understanding is the notion of chosenness and exceptionalism. For Zionists, Jews are unique, they are not normal, and they are endowed with a unique destiny, distinct from every nation that has ever existed. For Jewish fundamentalists, fundamental values were not to be found in civil society or even in reason, but in a “theonomous scale rooted in the will of the Divine architect of the universe and its moral order….” (cited by Lustick, 1988, IV, 2).

A second characteristic of Jewish fundamentalism is its view of Arabs, Muslims and the Arab world. The meaning of the Arab hostility to Israel is that this is natural and should be expected. This conflict is the latest conflict in the history of the Jews, a conflict between good and evil. “Arab hostility springs, as does all anti-Semitism, from the world’s recalcitrance in the face of Israel’s mission to save it” (Lustick, 1988). Hence, the Lebanon wars are viewed as just the latest evidence of of anti-Semitism, but also as evidence of the advance of historic Judaism’s goal of world healing and redemption. While some Zionists on the Left recognize legitimate Palestinian rights, and argue for peace and for a two state solution, not so Jewish fundamentalism. Jewish fundamentalism views that it is impossible to see Palestinians and Jews in comparable terms. Underlying an essential dualism between good and evil is the belief that Palestinians, and all Arabs, are embarking upon a a suicidal mission. Jews must, according to this logic, be ready to destroy Arabs that are bent on destroying Israel. Zionist zealots must be ready to grant to Palestinians their “deathwish.” “The image of Palestinians as doomed and suicidal in their opposition to Jewish rule in the Land of Israel corresponds to a more fundamental categorization of them… as ‘Canannites’ or
‘Ishmaelites’ (Lustick, 1988, 4). For Jewish fundamentalists, Palestinians have three choices, to flee, accept Jewish rule, or to fight. As a consequence, it is easy to see how many categorize Jewish fundamentalism as racist, anti-democratic, and hegemonic.

A third characteristic of Jewish fundamentalism is Israel’s isolation as proof of Jewish chosenness. In this perspective, persecution is not only normal, but it is to be expected, and in fact, persecution is clear evidence of chosenness. Persecution by the Gentiles is “a theological sign of election.” It follows that “Israel’s maximal territorial and political ambitions are therefore right because Jews are the chosen people of God” (Lustick, 1988, IV, 5). For Jewish fundamentalism, these values contradict the values that most people live by. Enmity is therefore normal and to be expected. “Jewish fundamentalism expects rationally unwarranted persecution of the Jews and the Jewish state to continue until the culmination of redemption” (Lustick, 1988, IV, 6).

The fourth characteristic of the worldview of Jewish fundamentalism is the impossibility of arriving at a final negotiated peace. For Jewish fundamentalists, two kinds of peace are possible. The first is a temporary peace based on Arab and international perceptions of Israeli power, and the second kind of peace, “real peace,” happens when “the completion of Israel’s inheritance of the whole land and will be preceded by the coming of the Messiah to rule over the reunited people of Israel” (Lustick, 1988, IV, 6). For Jewish fundamentalists, this coming of Messiah completes the process of redemption when all nations “acknowledge the truth that it is Israel’s task to bring to the world, the message of justice and peace of which the holy mountain is the visible symbol” (Cited in Lustick, 1988, IV, 6). The coming of Messiah will usher in the shalom-emet, the true peace that will last until all eternity. This peace transcends all temporary peace settlements, as the war between Israel and the rest of the world will continue until Messiah comes. Wars are therefore natural and to be expected. Peace will occur only when Israel’s territorial and political objectives are fulfilled. “The Redemption is not only the Redemption of Israel but the Redemption of the whole world. But the Redemption of the world depends on the Redemption of Israel” (cited by Lustick, 1988, IV, 7).

A fifth characteristic of the Jewish fundamentalist worldview is the cardinal importance of the land of Israel. For the Gush Enumim, God’s covenant rests on three relationships: God, land and people. The unofficial slogan of the Gush Emunim is “The Land of Israel, for the People of Israel, according to the Torah of Israel.” In this mythology, the Land of Israel was chosen before the people of Israel were chosen. Further, God, the chosen land, and the chosen people comprise a completed divine unity, and cannot be separated. This connection of the Jews with the land is unique among peoples of the earth, much more entrenched than the ties to land by other people, including German, French, American or Chinese ties to their lands. For Jewish fundamentalists, “the Land of Israel is a land of destiny, a chosen land, not just an existentially defined homeland” (cited in Lustick, 1988, IV, 7). To express this tie to the land, fundamentalists speak of the loss of the settlements as the equivalent to the severing a limb from a living body. The settlements are, for Jewish fundamentalists, “flesh of our flesh.” In this view, territorial concessions are tantamount to sacrilege.

The sixth characteristic of Jewish fundamentalism is providence, the belief that current history represents the unfolding of the redemption process. Like other fundamentalisms, Jewish fundamentalism claims a special and direct access to
transcendental truth. For Jewish fundamentalists, history is the process of redemption, and redemption is the successful reclamation of the lands of ancient Israel. The march of history supports this ideology. The 1948 war led to the establishment of Israel as a state. The six day war led to the annexation of Jerusalem and key lands on the West Bank. History is on the side of Jewish fundamentalism in this view. The Holocaust was a way of disciplining the Jews, coercing them to find their way back to Israel. The Holocaust was the “birthpangs of the Messianic Age (which) fell upon our generation and thus opened for us the way to Redemption” (cited by Lustick, 1988, IV, 9). In this view, history is not random, but rather reflects the providential hand of God.

The seventh characteristic of Jewish fundamentalism is its faith and ideological dedication. These Jews believe that they are God’s assistants, and that their task is the repair of the world (tikkun olam). This healing of the world will culminate in the Messianic Age. “Accordingly, a key element in the fundamentalist worldview is the belief that the success of the efforts to accomplish redemptively necessary political objectives will be determined by the vision of Jewish leaders, their sensitivity to the imperatives of the hour, and especially, the single-minded faith and spiritual discipline of the Jewish people as a whole” (Lustick, 1988, IV, 10).

Jewish fundamentalists eschew the vain search for normalcy. Rather, they see themselves as unique, special, carriers of the divine purpose of redemption, for themselves and for the earth as a whole. Their ideology supports not only national defense, but military aggression if it means that their destiny is to be fulfilled. “It is this intimate connection between what is felt as transcendentally imperative and what is perceived as one’s personal, political duty, that is the distinguishing mark of a fundamentalist political vision” (Lustick, 1988, IV, 11).

The danger of the fundamentalist mind is its conviction that reality is bound to follow ideology and not vice versa. Facts can simply be disregarded: For Jewish fundamentalists, the Palestinians do not exist, the Arab countries do not count, world public opinion is rubbish, and the U.S government is merely a nuisance. The only reality that counts is Jewish redemption, which is imminent—to be realized by massive aliyah, the negation of the Diaspora, and the building of the Third Temple. Throughout Jewish history there have been true believers like Gush Emunim who were convinced that the Messiah was at the door. Fortunately these messianic believers were in the most cases few and isolated. Their messianic vision was not translated into operative political programs. This is not the case with Gush Emunim (Sprinzak, 1986, 31).

Muslim Fundamentalism and the Temple Mount

Most Muslims are not fundamentalists, and even fewer are committed to a terrorist program. A few years ago, I took a number of students to the American Islamic College in Chicago. President Julaam Haider Aasi participated in a panel discussion and gave a brief thumbnail history of Islam for our students. Among his points was the idea that Islam is not a homogenous religion. Not only are there Sunni, Shia and Sufi groups but many others. Also, and this was a key point, Dr. Aasi pointed out that the history of Islam evolved in very different ways in the divergent national contexts where Islam is be found. So, Islam in Turkey is very different from Islam in Iraq, Iran, Jordan, Syria or
Egypt. Each of these countries have experienced very different historical evolutions of Islam. Further, there is much that Christians, and Jews, have in common with Muslims, and there is also much for each to learn about each other. In dialogue with them, for example, we discovered how strong a commitment Muslims had to what we might call “family values.” Muslim women do not feel that they are oppressed, but feel that they are in a sense free to be a woman, and, for Ayesha Mustafa, editor of the Chicago-based Muslim Journal, free to believe and express their ideas as well. Muslims also have much to teach Christians about moral purity, humility, reverence, dedication to a consistent worldview and belief system.

It is ironic that in October of 2006, I conducted a tour of Chicago, my home city, with a group of Muslims from Indonesia. This group is here for five weeks exploring how to develop a more tolerant and peaceful society. At the same time the tour was occurring, Al Qaeda leader, Ayman Al Zawahri, released a video on the anniversary of the U.S. September 11th tragedy. Zawahri urged “jihadists” to continue the holy war versus Westerners in the middle east, and against the “Zionist crusader conspiracy” in Israel/Palestine. Clearly among the goals of Al Qaeda are the eradication of Western powers from the Middle East, the destruction of Israel, and the economic destruction of the West, especially the United States. The contrast between the Indonesian Muslims visiting Chicago and the harsh warnings of Zawahri could not be more stark.

Islam is of course a major world religion, the second largest in the world, claiming approximately 1.4 billion adherents. Like Judaism and Christianity, it claims to be an Abrahamic religion. It is monotheistic, and claims that what Christians know as the Old Testament is part of Islam’s canon of holy writings. Islam is the second largest religion in the United Kingdom, and is well on its way of becoming the second largest religion in the United States. However, only 18% of all Muslims live in the Middle East, as most Muslims reside in South East Asia, including Bangladesh, India and Pakistan. And, the largest Muslim nation in the world is Indonesia. 20% of Muslims live in Sub-Saharan Africa, and 30% reside in Asia. France claims six million Muslims in its country, the largest of any European nation. Islam is very diverse in its theology, history and geographical dispersion.

Islam means to surrender to God, Arabic word is Allah. It rejects polytheism. The word Islam is a derivative of the word, salaam, which means peace. Salaam means freedom from all harm, so that the greeting, assalumu aliaum wishes the recipient peace, and specifically health or freedom from harm or danger. A Muslim is a person who submits to the tenets of Islam. Among the tenets are the belief that Muhammed is the true prophet, the Koran (or Quran) is the holy book that supasses the Torah or the Christian writings. Muslims confess the Shahadah, the two testimonies: “I testify that there is no god but God (Allah) and I testify that Mohammed is the Messenger of God.” True Muslims engage in several disciplines to be a loyal devotee, including zakat (almsgiving), salat (praying five times a day), Sawn (fasting during the month of Ramadan), and if possible, joining other Muslims in the Hadji, the pilgrimmage to Mecca (“Islam” in Wikipedia).

The Quran is the holy book of Islam, and means “recitation.” Muslims believe that the Quran was revealed to the prophet Mohammed through the angel Gabriel. Since most Muslims believe that the Quran is perfect only in Arabic translation, many seek to memorize key portions in the Arabic language. Most controversial is the notion of Jihad,
“struggle.” While many Muslims interpret Jihad as a personal struggle, many also understand Jihad as a holy war against “unbelievers.” Historically, while there are numerous examples of Islamic tolerance regarding Christians and Jews as fellow “peoples of the book,” there are also examples of intolerance, just as there are also among Christians toward Muslims (the Crusades and currently as a result of the current “war on terror.”).

Islamic fundamentalists believe that the problems of the world are the result of secularism. They believe that the path to peace and justice occurs only by returning to the original message of Islam. Islamic fundamentalists hold to a high view of moral purity, and are scandalized by Western permissive attitudes toward dress, sex, food, and material consumption. Many are resentful of Western presence and interference in the Middle East, particularly over oil reserves in Arab lands. Many also allege that the United States in particular sides exclusively with Israel, and has had a one-sided foreign policy against Arab interests. Christians, and the Western world in general, have been critical of Islam, especially its more conservative tendencies. Westerners allege that Islam rejects the United Nations Declaration of Universal Rights, though this declaration is hardly practiced in the advanced capitalist nations as well. Islam rejects the equality of men and women, it rejects the doctrine of the separation of church and state, and, further, some Muslim groups reject the right of Muslims to leave their religion, including in particular the acceptance of Christianity or any other non-Muslim religion (“Islam” in Wikipedia).

Sayyid Abul Ala Mawdudi (1903-1979) was one of the first in the Post World War II era to press for a strict application of the Sharia (Islamic Law), and to press for Jihad. He migrated from India to Pakistan in 1947, and influenced the establishment of an Islamic Constitution for that country in 1956. Mawdudi was a prolific scholar and promoter of Islam. He wrote over 120 books and pamphlets, and gave over 1000 speeches in his career. Mawdudi called for jihad against Western secularism, and argued that jihad was a central tenet to Islam. According to Jihadists, Muslims must use anything in their power to subdue Western secularism and imperialism (Armstrong, 2002, 168).

The most important figure for religious fundamentalism in the Sunni world was Sayyid Qutb (1906-66). Qutb was originally favorable to the West, but was imprisoned for being a member of the Muslim Brotherhood by al Nasser (1918-1970) of Egypt, a secular leader attracted to state socialism. A member of the Muslim Brotherhood made an attempt on Nasser’s life, and as a result the Egyptian leader began repressing the Muslim Brotherhood. Qutb became radicalized in prison, and became a major force for Islamic fundamentalism as a result. He urged fellow Muslims to pattern themselves after Muhammad, and to separate themselves from mainstream society, and to help institute the Jihad (Armstrong, 2002, 169-170). Qutb was convinced that toleration of non Muslims was only possible after the Muslims had established a true Muslim state. Qutb was influenced by Mawdudi, and in 1994, he influenced the Taliban who came to power in Afghanistan and were able to initiate a very strict Muslim fundamentalist state there. The Taliban (students of madrashas) sought to return to the original vision of Islam (as they understood and distorted it). Women were to be veiled and could not participate in public life. Only religious broadcasting was permitted, and ancient execution rites of stoning and mutilation were re-introduced. Armstrong writes:
The Taliban’s discrimination against women is completely opposed to the practice of the Prophet and the conduct of the first ummah. The Taliban are typically fundamentalist, however, in their highly selective vision of religion… [it] perverts the faith and turns it in the opposite direction of what was intended. Like all the major faiths, Muslim fundamentalists, in their struggle to survive, make religion a tool of oppression and even of violence (Armstrong, 2002, 170-171).

After the humiliation of the Six Day War versus Israel in 1967, many Arabs turned to Muslim fundamentalism. As a response, several radical Muslim groups emerged in the Middle East, among them Hamas, Hizbollah, the Islamic Jihad and Al Qaeda. In the Iranian revolution of 1978-9, Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeneini (1902-89) replaced the pro-western government of Reza Shah Pahlavi, the Shah of Iran. Iran became a model fundamentalist Muslim state.

Osama Bin Laden’s militant brand of radical Islam was influenced by Qutb, and he found a haven in Afghanistan. Bin Laden was the son of a wealthy Saudi family, later studied in Germany and found himself in the 1980s assisting local Afghans, while being funded by US interests, to oust the Soviets from Afghanistan. After the Soviets left, Bin Laden moved to Saudi Arabia, but opposed US presence in Saudi Arabia. Because of his militant views, was expelled. Bin Laden set up shop in the Sudan, but was expelled from the Sudan in 1994, thereafter returning to Afghanistan as a guest of the Taliban. In 1996 Bin Laden declared war on the United States, and by 1998 was in league with terrorist organizations worldwide. After the World Trade Center bombings in September 2001, the US invaded and toppled the Taliban later that year. Since that time Bin Laden and the Al Qaeda network have used terrorist activities to bomb embassies, Western vacation havens in Muslim worlds, and to foment bombings and violent attacks on western interests. Al Qaeda’s goals are to eliminate Western, especially U.S., influence from the Middle East, to topple governments in the Middle East that are pro-Western in orientation, to destroy Israel, and to unite Muslims under the banner of a conservative interpretation of Islam ruled by Sharia law.

John L. Esposito calls Islamic fundamentalism “Islamic Revivalism” and outlines its “ideological worldview” as follows:

1. Islam is a total and comprehensive way of life. Religion ist to be integrated to politics, law and society.
2. The failure of Muslim societies is due to its departure from the straight path of Islam and its acceptance of Western values and secularism.
3. Renewal of society requires a return to Islam, the Quran and the teachings of the prophet Muhammed.
4. Western inspired civil codes must be replaced by Islamic law.
5. Although Westernization is condemned, science is not, although science is to be subordinated to Islamic beliefs and values.
6. The process of Islamization, requires a struggle against corruption and social injustice (jihad) (Esposito, 2005, 165).

Esposito notes that Islamic fundamentalism goes beyond even these tenets to urge adherents to fight Zionism, the Western crusader mentality, and to move toward establishing an Islamic system of government. As such, a jihad against unbelievers is
warranted, even necessary, and Christians and Jews are generally regarded as “infidels” because of their connections with Western neo colonialism and Zionism. A major goal is to rid Muslim lands of these forces of colonization (Esposito, 2005, 166).

Islamic Fundamentalism in Palestine

Perhaps the most significant religious symbol of fundamentalist conflict among world religions is the Temple Mount in Jerusalem. Muslims believe that the Temple Mount is holy, as it was the place where Muhammed ascended. Christian fundamentalists believe it is holy, because, after the building of a new temple, Christ will return to the site. Jewish fundamentalists believe that the Temple Mount is holy, and that a new Third Temple must be built for the Messianic age to begin (Weber, 2004, 18). Jerusalem is a place of Messianic dreams and expectations. Gorenberg writes that such millennialist expectation is a prescription for violence.

For redemptive Zionists, physically possessing Hebron, Jericho, Shiloh, Old Jerusalem, and the Temple Mount proved that the final act was under way. Watched through a very different theological lens, the conquest had the same meaning for premillennialist Christians in front-row seats. Both literalism and the false hope of history’s end fed the enthusiasm. Those two fallacies were joined with a third ancient error: That God could be owned by owning a place (Gorenberg, 2000, 248).

Ziad Abu-Amr of the Palestine Center traces the development of Islamic fundamentalists or radical Islam in Palestine/Israel since World War II in a brief essay. Abu-Amr is a professor of political science at Bir Zeit University. He holds a Ph.D. in Comparative Politics from Georgetown University and specializes in Palestinian affairs and Islamic movements. Dr. Abu-Amr is the author of several publications including, Islamic Fundamentalism in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. In this monograph, the author describes the rise of Islamic fundamentalism among Palestinians as the result of a number of historical factors. The first was the “loss of Palestine” in 1948 and the establishment of an independent Jewish state. This event was perceived by Palestinians as an encroachment on Muslim lands. To Islamic fundamentalists, Israel is an alien body in the heart of Arab and Muslim worlds. They are also considered to be the vanguard of Western hegemony in the Middle East. The second event was the 1967 war and the defeat of a coalition of Arab nations by Israel. The occupation of Jerusalem and the West Bank has led to the wholesale displacement of Palestinians, and the resettlement of the West Bank by Jews. Muslims believed that this happened because of secularism and the failure of Muslims to unite and embrace Islam.

A third event was the Islamic revolution in Iran in 1979. This is perhaps the most significant event in the rise of Islamic fundamentalism. The revolution in Iran demonstrates a successful development of Islam as a viable alternative to Western secularism. Iran has also provided the rest of the Muslim world a model of what it means to be a Muslim-controlled state. In the 1970s, another factor was the decline of the effectiveness of the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO). The PLO failed to
achieve an independent Palestinian state, and failed also at uniting more moderate Muslims versus the settlements, the “accidental” empire of Israel (Gorenberg, 2002). Abu-Amr writes that the PLO’s “consequent evolution from ideological purity to political pragmatism created an ideological vacuum that was soon filled by [radical] Islam, the only available alternative” (Abu-Amr, www.palestinecenter.org, nd).

Fifth is the emergence of the Palestinian Popular uprising in 1987, called the intifada. The intifada, for Abu-Amr, is the most important factor in the rise of Islamic fundamentalism. The intifada defined Islam as a nationalist, political movement of resistance against Israel. Its political objectives became the charter of Hamas, and has been characterized by violent resistance to Israeli settlements, with the goal of the liberation of Palestine from the settlements. Hamas has emerged as the serious rival to the PLO. Hamas is considered to be the most influential of Palestinian fundamentalist groups. Other groups such as the Islamic Jihad or the Izz al Din al Qassam Brigades are more narrowly based and more focused to forging violent acts of resistance versus Israel and the West. Palestinian fundamentalist groups such as Hamas have refused to participate in a negotiated peace process, and have refused to acknowledge Israel as a legitimate state. Without having or desiring to participate in mainstream peace negotiations, more radical groups have elected violent tactics, such as terrorism or war to damage Israeli political objectives if not eliminate Israel as a state in the Middle East.

Abu-Amr argues that the occupation of Jerusalem by Israel is a central issue. Since 1967, Palestinian activists have seen Jerusalem as “a source of inspiration and mobilization” (Abu-Amr, 1995). Abu-Amr argues that Jerusalem and the Muslim religious sites (including the Temple Mount) are holy, and that Palestinians must control these sites. Gershom Gorenberg, a Jewish moderate, argues that while Christians and Muslims have claims to Jerusalem and to the Temple Mount, that for practical reasons, it is the Jews [read Zionists] that must control the city and its holy sites (Gorenberg, 2002). These goals appear to be irreconcilable. Writes Abu-Amr:

Israel’s declared insistence on considering a “united Jerusalem” as the eternal capital of Israel is likely to complicate efforts at finding a common denominator between the Palestinians and the Israelis regarding an acceptable agreement on the city…. Jerusalem may continue to be an issue of severe contention between the two sides…. If control over Arab Jerusalem, and definitely over Muslim religious sites, is not granted to the Palestinians, the Arabs, or the Muslims, the city will remain a source and a symbol for Muslim resentment, indoctrination, mobilization and perhaps agitation and struggle (Abu-Amr, 1995).

Conclusion

Fundamentalisms of all faiths share some similar characteristics. They reject modernism and with it, secularism. Fundamentalists seek to return to what they believe to be the root teachings of their faith. As a result, fundamentalists yearn for a previous era, even a state that returns to “conventional, agrarian gender roles, putting women back in their veils and into the home” (Armstrong, 2002, 166). In its more extreme forms fundamentalism attempts to replace secularism with some form of theocratic state, be it
Zionism in Israel, Sharia law in Islam or “Christian nationalism” in the U.S. Most particularly, fundamentalisms seem to share a literalism when it comes to the interpretation of a sacred scripture. They tend to believe that only a particular “chosen” group of people can interpret scripture in the right way. As Gorenberg points out, such literalism is dangerous, and could turn out violently, particularly for groups who are disappointed with a failed timeline for the end, and as a result believe that it is up to them to help the process along.

We live in a time when extremism is confused with religious authenticity, and not just in Protestantism. Purveyors of “literal” readings of sacred books claim to represent old-time religion, unadulterated by modernity. Yet literalism, apparently a mark of a conservative, is often the method of millennialists who look forward to an entirely new world. The place prophetic texts at the center of religion—and insist that the words must be read as factual, tactile accounts of the future (Gorenberg, 2000, 245).

Fundamentalism is a widespread phenomena. While as a movement, it began in the United States with the fundamentalist controversy in the early 19th century, fundamentalism as a religious ideology described here has been around since tribal and prehistoric times. Not all fundamentalists are extremists or are overtly violent. Fundamentalism can be found in all the great religions, and sometimes fundamentalism becomes an extremist sect in an otherwise broad religious movement. What seems to tie together Protestant fundamentalism, Zionist Nationalism and fundamentalism in Islam is a literal interpretation of a sacred tradition, and a conviction that the “true faith” is under attack.

James F. Mattill writes that, ultimately, what ties fundamentalisms together is fear.

Religious fundamentalists are united by fear. Whether they are Christian, Muslim or Jew, fear is the common denominator. They fear change, modernization, and loss of influence. They fear that the young will abandon the churches, mosques and synagogues for physical and material gratification. They fear the influence of the mass media and its ability to subvert the young with song, dance, fashion, alcohol, drugs, sex and freedom. They especially fear education if it undermines the teachings of their religion. They fear a future they can’t control, or even comprehend.  

Mattill goes on to say that religious fundamentalism is a danger to world peace. When under attack, it has the potential to react violently to perceptions of moral decay, cultural decadence, and what is defined narrowly as impiety. Charles Kimball describes what happens “when a religion becomes evil.” Religion becomes a menace to society when it boasts absolute truth claims that belittle anyone else’s claim to truth; when it demands absolute, unquestioning and uncritical obedience of one’s followers; when it establishes a time line to an end or a time of fulfillment, that forces or encourages humans to behave in
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such a way as to encourage the “end” to come; when any end justifies the any means to get to the end time and finally; when a holy war is established to gain those ends. In short, when a religion justifies intolerance, hatred and violence, it becomes an evil force in human history (Kimball, 2002). While not all Jews, Muslims or Christians are fundamentalists, and not all fundamentalists are violent, fundamentalism, and the many, many expressions of it, are powerful and pervasive forces in the world today.

In 1893, Chicago hosted the World’s Parliament of Religions. It was perhaps the first time that Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Jews, Zoroastrians and others met and discussed their distinctivnesses and similarities under one roof. Among the attendees was one Mohammed Alexander Russell Webb of New York City. Granted, he was an American Muslim, but nonetheless he raised a standard for all of the world’s religions, and all the world’s peoples, to emulate.

We should only judge of the inherent tendencies of a religious system by observing carefully and without prejudice its general effects upon the character and habits of those who are intelligent enough to understand its basic principles, and who publicly profess to teach and follow it. If we find that their lives are clean and pure and full of love and charity, we may fairly say that their religion is good. If we find them given to hypocrisy, dishonesty, uncharitableness, and intolerance, we may safely infer that there is something wrong with the system they profess (Mohammed Webb, cited in Hansen, 1894, 524).

The Shalom of God as described in the Old Testament strives for similar goals. Shalom in the Old Testament describes a peace that is interconnected with prosperity, and this prosperity extends to all members of a society. Shalom, unlike “inner peace” or “peace through strength” means “shared prosperity.” Today, in response to the conflicts that exist between religions and other social groups, we desperately need a theology and a worldview that can somehow foster a respectful meeting of peoples across boundaries and ideologies, the charitableness that Imam Webb describes. I believe that a worldview nurtured by shalom as shared prosperity provides a viable and biblical alternative.

If shalom means peace, prosperity and well-being for each constituent member, even if one is an immigrant (sojourner/alien), or the the poor (widow and orphan), then to what extent does any nation state measure up to the standard of God’s shalom? The Torah demands that the most vulnerable be protected, and that the poor and oppressed (usually widows and orphans, certainly women and children) be protected and supported. This view of Torah is not a legalistic doctrine of punishment, but is the garantor of social justice and the extension of distributive justice, not retributive justice. The great text regarding the judgment of the nations found in Matthew chapter 25 in the New Testament is one expression of this standard. There, the question is whether or not a nation state has provided for the thirsty, the homeless, the hungry, the sick and the imprisoned. Shalom is the standard by which nations are judged. A “shalom” society is a society where even the visitor is protected, where even the “alien” and the “enemy” can prosper. Shalom means that all nation states can come to the table to dine and share gifts with one another. The Old Testament notion of shalom is not just a good idea, but can be a norm and a standard for all nations. For theologian Cornelius Plantinga, Jr, it is “the way its sposed to be.”
## Appendix One: The Four Winds of Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundamentalism (Religious/Racial/ethnic sector)</th>
<th>Secularism/Neo liberalism (Private Sector)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority- Sacred Scripture understood literally, charismatic leader/Militia</td>
<td>Authority- Individual/Reason/May seek protection or pursue alliance with state or global governing bodies – NAFTA/ IMF/ World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heirarchical Social Structure/Persons</td>
<td>Competitive Social Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on Law and Moral Codes-Sharia/Torah/Old Testament</td>
<td>Emphasis on Freedom from restraint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible to Sect or In Group</td>
<td>Responsible to Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social glue- familial, covenant, loyalty to charismatic leader, ideology</td>
<td>Social glue- Laissez faire, deregulation, organizational loyalty, bureaucracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Evil”- moral impurity, whether by individuals or by whole culture.</td>
<td>“Evil”- regulation on individual behavior or restraints to self interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice- defined by religious authority</td>
<td>Justice is for rights of individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Peace” is submission to authority</td>
<td>“Peace” is freedom to act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom- knowledged of sacred scripture or moral law</td>
<td>Wisdom- one’s investment portfolio, keys to individual economic success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal is self propagation, moral purity, oneness with spiritual authority</td>
<td>Goal is achievement of individual self-interests, individual prosperity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationalism (Public Sector)</th>
<th>Cultural Pluralism (Social Sector)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority- the state/Laws/Police or Military/quasi or civil religious</td>
<td>Authority-Popular sovereignty/ democratic process, civil discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heirarchical Social Structure/ Bureaucracy</td>
<td>Egalitarian Social Structure- may emphasize cooperation and tolerance of difference, or may seek to advocate for the rights of one particular grouping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on Law, may emphasize rights groups, individual or corporation</td>
<td>Emphasis on Freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible to Nation State</td>
<td>Responsible to In Group, but tolerant of other groups that co exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Group- Contract/ citizenship Demands, loyalty to state</td>
<td>Social Group- Voluntary – covenant with in-group (union, church, NGOs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Evil”-crime vs state property or person</td>
<td>Evil-social injustice, lack of respect for Group rights (natives, women, gays, blacks, immigrants, children etc).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice is decided by Laws of the state</td>
<td>Justice is for rights of the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Peace” is acceptance of nationalist goals and ambition.</td>
<td>Peace is co existence with other groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom- how the system works, how to achieve or influence those in power</td>
<td>Wisdom- spirituality for social justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal is harmony/order within the state</td>
<td>Goal is freedom to exist as a group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


