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Abstract

This study examines how the hope for peace in the Middle East is articulated in Swedish Christian Zionist movements, both publicly and in private interviews with leaders and speakers. The article shows that Swedish Christian Zionist movements’ public lectures and sermons rarely address political issues as peace. However, they do reiterate favourable images of Jews and occasionally negative images of Muslims and Arabs. It is apparent in interviews that these leaders and speakers are pessimistic regarding peace in the Middle East. For them, it is not attainable, and, in some cases, it is described as transcendent. In some interviews, Islam, Muslims, and Arabs—in some cases specific Muslim actors—are depicted as inferior, violent, and obstacles to peace. The favourable images of Jews reoccur, and they are instrumentalized, albeit infrequently. Lastly, Christians are repeatedly discouraged to support peace, since it might be false, or to demand Israeli territorial concessions.
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Introduction

Christian Zionism is a faith-based ideology, leading Christians, based on the Bible, to promote and support the establishment and the preservation of modern Israel as a Jewish homeland (Spector 2009: 3; cf. Smith 2013: 2). A large proportion of practicing Evangelical Christians have embraced Christian Zionism and believe that Christians are obliged to «bless Israel» (Nederveen Pieterse 1991: 75; Spector 2009: 29). The strength of this ideology is considerable in the United States (Durham 2004: 145–146, Smith 2013: 27; Weber 2004: 9, 11), and it might have detrimental effects on the prospects for peace in the Middle East (Goldman 2009: 270–271.), particularly as this Christian Zionism has «shifted from observers to participants» (Weber 2004: 15). It is significantly weaker in Europe (Hornstra 2007: 24–25), and there are indications that
it is losing even further ground among Evangelicals in Sweden (Ariel 2013: 29; Steiner 2013: 44f).

This project investigates how Swedish Christian Zionist leaders frame the obstacles and possibilities to peace in the Middle East as they are articulated in sermons and lectures in the movement’s most important and representative gatherings as well as in subsequent private interviews.

Christian Zionism in the academic eye

Although an abundance of academic literature has been published on Zionism, comparatively little has been published on Christian Zionism (Goldman 2007: 246, 2009: 1–2). Furthermore, there seems to be a particular gap regarding research on Scandinavian Christian Zionism (Ariel 2013: 29). Moreover, existing research mainly deals with its emergence, importance and influence, while only a smaller part concerns its understanding of peace.

The emergence of Christian Zionism

Academic studies suggest that Christian Zionism has, in a broad sense, been in existence since the Protestant Reformation (Goldman 2009: 7), or perhaps even before (Kobler 1956: 11–12). Already in the 16th or early 17th centuries, some English theologians, politicians (Goldman 2007: 247), and, above all, Puritan (Tuchman 1956/1983: 121) and pietist (Ariel 2013: 17) believers advocated the restoration of the Jews to the Holy Land. These ideas were revitalized again in the 19th and 20th centuries (Vreté 1972: 3); and during this period, American «prophecy conferences», bible institutes, journals, books, and pamphlets played a role in spreading early Christian Zionist ideas (Rausch 1981: 138ff). Hence, Christian Zionism, in a broad sense, predates Jewish Zionism by 300 years (Popkin 1992: 103), and it may even have inspired (Moruzzi 2006) and facilitated it (Goldman 2009: 103, 109).

Christian Zionist influence and importance

Scholars seem to agree that the importance of Christian Zionism among Evangelicals, Pentecostals, and charismatics has increased over the years and that it has become mainstream among them in the United States from the 1980s (Smith 2013: 33). However, they deem this not to be the case within mainline protestant churches, the Catholic Church, nor within the World Council of Churches (Merkley 2001: 45, 135). That being said, Evangelicals, Pentecostals, and charismatics are not a monolith: in the United States, Christian Zionist teaching has mainly influenced white Evangelicals (Stockton 1987: 246, 251). There is also an Evangelical opposition to this teaching.

The spread of Christian Zionist ideas has had political consequences. For example, Christian Zionists tend to be more hawkish in foreign policy generally and express more sympathy for Israel, while describing Islam as the world’s most violent religion (Baumgartner et al. 2008: 172–173). Furthermore, the new political landscape, which
emerged after 9/11, has affected the way Evangelicals grasp international politics. It is argued that there is a correlation between Evangelical beliefs and support of Israel and support of militant measures towards Iraq (Durham 2004: 147).

Christian Zionism and peace
In this section, we will discuss previous research on Christian Zionism and its understanding of the obstacles and possibilities for peace in the Middle East. This discussion will be used as a wider frame of reference, enabling us to evaluate and assess the Swedish Christian Zionist discourse.

Although the primary unifying character of Christian Zionism is its support for Israel, not its theology, one theology in particular has influenced it: dispensationalism. This theology was established in the 19th century (Ariel 2013: 39), and it explains God’s salvation of a mankind that is fallen and violent and lacks the capacity to make a lasting peace (Weber 2004: 45). Dispensationalism’s distinctive features are its division of history into seven different eras, that is, dispensations; the idea that history is bound to a fatalistic violent process, since the conflict between God and Satan is understood as «the very pattern of history» (Friend Harding 2000: 237); and the belief that Jews will return to the Middle East, establish a Jewish state, and rebuild the temple. Moreover, it holds that conflicts will escalate; and just before they culminate, during the Tribulation and the battle of Armageddon, the Church will be raptured. After Tribulation, Christ will return and rule, and now, transcendentally, peace will finally be possible. Accordingly, this means that dispensationalism has a pessimistic attitude to imminent universal or sustainable peace. Political and social reforms here and now are futile, even Satanically inspired (Weber 2004: 55). Since Christian Zionism generally adheres to dispensationalism (Lewis 2010: 68; Weber 2004: 10), it reiterates dispensationalist ideas of peace and conflict. In the same vein, Christian Zionism tends to focus on contemporary political events in order to see if they can be interpreted as signs of the imminent return of Christ. Escalating violence, particularly violence in the Middle East, is interpreted eschatologically (Steiner 2013: 45, 49).

Christian Zionism focuses on two sets of agents: Israel and Jews, on the one hand, and Arabs, Muslims and Islam, on the other. In the Christian Zionist ideology, these agents play very different but crucial roles in the eschatological end-time drama (Steiner 2013: 61). Generally, Arabs, Muslims and Islam play a destructive role, increasingly so after the end of the Cold War (Wojcik 1996: 316; Weber 2004: 207) and after 9/11 (Cimino 2005: 166; Smith 2013: 191). Arabs are depicted as obstacles to world peace (Spector 2009: 58), to the survival of the planet (Cimino 2005: 167), and to God’s plan (Weber 2004: 219; Spector 2009: 50); and they will, at the end of time, side with Satan and his plans (Kamphausen 2013: 57). In addition, Arabs and Muslims are portrayed as static: they cannot be transformed (Spector 2009: 51). Christian Zionism without a clear dispensational theology claims that imminent peace, particularly in the Middle East, is unfeasible because of these aforementioned Arab attitudes and threats (Steiner 2013: 53ff, 57ff).
Arabs/Muslims/Islam are given negative attributes: they are depicted as being essentially violent, brutal, fundamentalist (Spector 2009: 80, 85), unreliable, undemocratic (Steiner 2013: 53ff, 57ff), underdeveloped (Carenen 2012: 80), evil (Smith 2013: 8), terrorists (Smith 2013: 18), and as Satan’s army (Spector 2009: 91). The founder of Islam, Mohammed, is represented as wicked (Spector 2009: 76), demonized, and as a terrorist (Durham 2004: 148).

Israel and Jews, on the other hand, are generally revered. Jews are still God’s chosen people; they are talented, capable, democratic, progressive, and ethical (Steiner 2013: 54ff, 60ff). Moreover, Jews, particularly those returning to Israel, play a constructive eschatological role, cooperating with God and paving the way for the return of the Messiah (Steiner 2013: 54ff, 60ff). Still, the depiction of Jews and Israel is problematic. Firstly, there is a tendency to instrumentalize Jews, to reduce them to a tool for salvation (Ariel 2013: 45), emphasizing their prophetic significance (Glass 1985: 66). Dispensational Christian Zionism claims that Jews should return to Israel, not only for their own sake but also for the sake of facilitating God’s plan for salvation (Ariel 2013: 3; Sharif 1976: 127). If the Jews do not return to Israel, God’s universal rescue plan will be obstructed (Weber 2004: 13). Occasionally it is claimed that Jewish immigration to Israel is so important that God undertook radical measures, such as Nazism and Communism, to make hesitant Jews willing to move to Israel (Steiner 2013: 55, 62, 64; Kamphausen 2013: 71; Carenen 2012: 28), or to turn to Christ (Carenen 2012: 29; Weber 2004: 148). When the Jews finally are back in Israel, they will eventually encounter overpowering enemies at Armageddon. Many Jews will perish, and they will endure suffering worse than the Holocaust (Weber 2004: 149), which is deemed a necessary sacrifice for the return of Christ (Ariel 1991: 120). It has to be underlined that this sacrificial image of Jews does not dominate Christian Zionist discourse (Spector 2009: 23), yet it is difficult to find Christian Zionists explicitly denouncing it.2

Secondly, in some cases the love for and positive attitude towards Zionism, Jews, and Israel is conditional. When Jews or Israel refuse to be an instrument, that is, not acting according to the dispensational schema, there is a risk that their key position leads to resentment towards them (Ariel 2013: 41). For instance, Israeli attempts to reach peace through territorial concession are in some cases understood as «the second time the Jews rejected God» (Ariel 2006: 86).

Thirdly, in a few cases the attitude to Jews is explicitly anti-Semitic. In the 1930s, it was vindicated that anti-Semitism was God’s punishment, a «rod of correction» (Glass 1985: 67). Likewise, Jews are supposedly rich (Ariel 2013: 65), greedy, shrewd business people (Ariel 2004: 146; Steiner 2013: 56, 61, 63). They are Christ-deniers (Ariel 1991: 32–33; Steiner 2013: 56–57, 61, 64), which reflects their rebelliousness (Weber 2004: 129). They are Communists (Ariel 1991: 111; Steiner 2013: 56, 62–63) and have a conspiratorial role in history (Goldman 2009: 39; Ariel 1991: 53).

Christian Zionism hardly ever supports work for imminent peace (Spector 2009: 141). Indeed, peace initiatives might be against God (Frykholm 2004: 172; Steiner 2013: 64–65) and pave the way for the anti-Christ (Steiner 2013: 64–65; Kamphausen 2013: 59). Peace initiatives are regularly described as «appeasement» (Spector 2009: 71) or Satanic (Lienesch 1993: 238). Accordingly, American pressure on Israel to
accept concessions for peace is rejected as this might unleash God’s wrath on America (Spector 2009: 175; Durham 2004: 152).

Christian Zionism requires Christians to bless Israel and to restore Jews to Zion. This is due to the idea that God’s covenant with the chosen people remains valid (Spector 2009: 37) and that blessing Israel will imply blessing in return (Smith 2013: 13–14). Also, and this is a secular argument: Israel should be blessed because it is a friendly democracy (Spector 2009: 34).

In the nineteenth century, this support could imply freeing Palestine from Arabs (Davidson 2005: 160). Today it could mean to facilitate Jewish immigration to Israel (Coleman 2000: 94; Perko 2003: 3f). One legitimating argument occasionally used is colonialist: the land should belong to those who have the competency to develop it (Davidson 2005: 162). Over the last 40 years, Christian Zionism has increasingly supported a Greater Israel and settlements on the West Bank (Popkin 1992: 99; Goldman 2009: 270ff, 302; Durham 2004: 153; Weber 2004: 225–226) and has articulated a general support for Israel (Ariel 2006: 81), particularly Israel’s right wing (Mayer 2004: 699) and its agenda (Goldman 2009: 300–301). Lastly, sometimes it is underlined that Christians should participate in rebuilding a third temple on the Temple Mount (Weber 2004: 250–260).

Framing theory and research questions

In framing theory, social movements are «viewed as signifying agents actively engaged in the production and maintenance of meaning» (Benford and Snow 2000: 613). Frames are «schemata of interpretations» (Goffman 1974: 21), enabling us to understand and interpret our environment. Within social movements, the development of frames is important for inspiring, motivating, legitimating, and mobilising actions of a movement (Jämte 2013: 6), and for demobilising antagonists (Snow and Benford 1988: 198).

Traditionally, framing theory aspires to explain how actors spread their frames and how they construct, interpret and describe the world. In this study, we are not dealing with dispersion strategies. Rather, we deal with the production and maintenance of meaning, of how Swedish Zionist movements frame obstacles and possibilities for peace. Robert Entman (1993) maintains that a frame usually contains three elements. A frame typically diagnoses, evaluates and prescribes. According to Robert Entman, to frame

is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation and/or treatment recommendation for the item described. Typically frames diagnose, evaluate and prescribe. (Entman 1993: 52)

This study will be using Entman’s concepts as tools organizing the analysis.

To diagnose means to determine the nature of a system, primarily its main disorders (Jämte 2013: 80). The way a problem is diagnosed often reveals ideological positions.
Likewise a shared understanding of a problem is a foundation of a collective identity (Jämte 2013: 81) and can potentially mould a movement (Jämte 2013: 81).

To evaluate means to morally assess the agents of a disorder (Entman 1993: 52), in this case the agents behind obstacles to peace. Benford and Snow imply that «since social movements seek to remedy or alter some problematic situation or issue, it follows that directed action is contingent on identification of the source(s) of causality, blame, and/or culpable agents» (2000: 616).

In Christian Zionism, Arabs and Muslims play pertinent roles. Therefore, in this study, we will investigate their roles, positions and functions in Christian Zionist thinking: more concretely, what functions do Arabs and Muslims have in Christian Zionist discourse, and what attributes are ascribed to them explicitly as well as implicitly? We will also assess Jews and Israel: principally, what functions do Jews and Israel have in Christian Zionist discourse, and to what extent and how are they seen as instruments for an end time agenda?

To prescribe is to offer a normatively justified and effective treatment for the problems in question (Entman 1993: 52). Benford and Snow call it prognostic framing that «involves the articulation of a proposed solution to the problem, or at least a plan of attack, and the strategies for carrying out the plan» (2000: 616). According to Christian theology, humanity should cooperate with God while awaiting final redemption. In this final section, we will analyse how Christians are supposed to cooperate with God in His redemptive plans.

Research methods

Selection of cases

We have selected four Swedish Christian Zionist gatherings. We include a church and para-church organizations, as well as Pentecostal/charismatic and non-charismatic organizers. These gatherings seem to be generally recognized as important and representative within the movement.

Shalom over Israel (Shalom över Israel) is an organization of conservative Evangelicals with Lutheran roots. The leadership initially denied us all access to their (present and future) conferences; but after some discussion, they allowed us to attend one evening meeting. Friends of Israel (Israels vänner) is a non-denominational organization which mainly attracts people from Pentecostal environments. Here too, we were initially met with some hesitation, but they did accept our presence at their summer conference in Värnamo. The Oasis Movement (Oasrörelsen) is a Lutheran charismatic renewal movement within the Church of Sweden. The organization does not take an explicit Zionist position but Hans Weichbrodt, who is one of its key leaders, is a revered and regular speaker at Christian Zionist meetings, such as this year’s Friends of Israel conference. As we visited, the Oasis conference entailed an elective seminar with a Christian Zionist theme. Word of Life (Livets ord), a neo-Pentecostal church with prosperity theological past, is explicitly Christian Zionist. During its annual week-long summer conference, one day is dedicated to Israel.
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Data collection

We collected data through listening to recorded sermons and conducting interviews with some of the speakers and leaders from the conferences, combined with a few observations.

The speakers at the four conferences differ in several aspects. Some have a formal standing with an organization: Göte Ragnarp is Chairperson of Friends of Israel, Henry Nordin is both a member of its board and is legally responsible for the association’s journal; Siegfried Luikert is also a board member, while Brith Aspenlind is a substitute member. Stefan Sturesson is the chairperson of Shalom over Israel, and both Bengt Berggren and Jonas Lönn gren are board members. Joakim Lundqvist is senior pastor of Word of Life, while Roar Sørensen is responsible for its activities in Israel. Others are freelancing speakers or temporary guests: Hans Weichbrodt, Göran Duveskog, Emanuel Minos, and KG Larsson at Friends of Israel’s conference, and Peter Andersson at The Oasis Movement’s conference. Most informants are theological autodidacts, the most notable exception being Weichbrodt and Sørensen, both of whom hold advanced degrees from universities in Sweden and Israel.

During the meetings, we managed to establish contact with key persons to carry out more formal, semi-structured interviews (Kvale 2009). Informants were speakers and organizers of the conferences: Göte Ragnarp, Stefan Sturesson, Roar Sørensen, Peter Andersson, and KG Larsson. We also interviewed Dan Johansson, a member of Friends of Israel’s board, whose book on Israel was announced at its conference. Finally, we interviewed a member of one of the organizations, who wishes to remain an anonymous informant. Since these informants mentioned by name are public figures articulating their views publicly, and since the interviews were based on their public speeches, we have not anonymized them. Some interviews took place on site; others took place after the conferences, in the homes of the informants. The interviews were recorded, whenever possible, and transcribed (O’Reilly 2005: 175).

Conducting participant observation is an ethnographic method that gives access to fields that are hard to understand using other methods. In this case, we immersed ourselves into the social world of Christian Zionism, trying to understand its beliefs, norms, and behaviour from within the context (May 2001: 149; Jämte 2013: 8). Throughout observations, we made field notes that were expanded into complete journals as we left the field. During observations, our role was observation participant. We were open about our presence and aim at all times (Bryman 2004).

Analysis of data

When analysing the sermons, we looked for the themes we had discovered in earlier research (see section “Christian Zionism and Peace”); that is, we searched for attitudes and claims found to be prevalent in other studies. The analysis therefore follows a pattern found in earlier research.

During the interviews, we used a semi-structured technique where we had an opportunity to follow up and to develop themes from the sermons. Often during these sessions, informants were forced to search within themselves for an answer. We found an
active work of interpretation in order to make sense of the current situation (political and humanitarian). Consequently, the activity of interviewing has a hermeneutical approach (Gilje and Grimen 2007).

As we are both Christians with backgrounds in Lutheran evangelicalism (KS) and the Pentecostal movement (AL), we have encountered Christian Zionism over the years and have notions that need to be made conscious to ourselves (cf. Buttolph Johnson and Reynolds 2012: 267; May 2001: 148). On the other hand, this insider knowledge may have been to our advantage since some conservative Christians hold a sceptical attitude towards academia and intellectuals, particularly regarding Israel. Therefore, the fact that we are Christians and that we are known to some of the participants might have enabled us to establish trust and rapport (Seligmann 2005: 238).

We have attempted to secure reliability in the collection and interpretation of data. In interviews we have been posing the same question in different ways, we have been comparing answers amongst informants, including both verbal statements and non-verbal behaviour, and asking informants to comment on our impressions and interpretations (cf. Seligmann 2005: 239; O’Reilly 2005: 154). Finally, we have been comparing our individual interpretations with one another in order to achieve a more multifaceted and balanced analysis.

Analysis
During the four conferences, at least 15 different persons appeared on the platform as speakers and preachers, with a few more as intercessors, worship leaders, and facilitators. We have analysed 15 public sermons and lectures and interviewed six people with leading functions.

Although different in other aspects, the speakers appeared to be theologically conservative, reading and interpreting the Bible literally. The speakers and informants are not theologically consistent among themselves, but it seems as if dispensationalism functions as an intellectual resource in which the speakers pick and choose without clear systematics.

Only two of the meetings had a focus on the conflicts in the Middle East (Sørensen 2014; Lundqvist 2014a, 2014b; Lönngren 2014). The most important occasion where the present military conflict was given any lengthier attention was the appearance of Isaac Bachman, Israel’s ambassador to Sweden, at Word of Life. In the other meetings, these conflicts were not in focus. Instead, the speakers focused on themes like Jewish holidays (Weichbrodt 2014a, 2014b), eschatology (Ragnarp 2014c; Duvskog 2014a; Larsson 2014b; Minos 2014; Berggren 2014; Andersson 2014b), and the election of the church and the Jewish people (Luikert 2014; Larsson 2014c).

Some other conflicts appear in the public speeches, as speakers argue, sometimes vehemently, against replacement theology (Andersson 2014b; Luikert 2014; Lönngren 2014; Larsson 2014b, 2014c; Duvskog 2014a; Johansson 2014), Liberal theology (Andersson 2014b; Larsson 2014c), the Catholic Church (Andersson 2014b), the present Pope (Berggren 2014), the media and the secular and humanist society
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Andersson 2014b; Lönnengren 2014; Lundqvist 2014a; Sørensen 2014; Duveskog 2014a; Johansson 2014; Larsson 2014a; Anonymous Informant 2014), Swedish foreign policies (Lundqvist 2014a), a perceived Swedish cowardice in its attitude towards anti-Semitism (Lundqvist 2014a), and what was considered to be an unfair, even demonic, critique of Israel (Weichbrodt 2014b).

Chances for peace and causes of war
Since the Middle Eastern conflicts are relatively absent in public speeches, it is mainly in interviews that we find data on how Swedish Christian Zionists depict the conditions for peace. Most of the attitudes found in Christian Zionism generally are also found here. The Swedish informants are highly pessimistic as to the prospects for peace in the Middle East. According to them, suffering will escalate at the end of time (Weichbrodt 2014b) just as will conflicts (Sørensen 2014; Johansson 2014; Andersson 2014b; Larsson 2014b). These conflicts are assumed to have Old Testament roots (Larsson 2014a; Sturesson 2014; Andersson 2014b) and are even considered permanent (Andersson 2014a; Sturesson 2014; Larsson 2014a). Some informants express the dispensational idea that Armageddon is an unavoidable apocalyptic endpoint (Johansson 2014; Andersson 2014a; Larsson 2014b, 2014c), leading to the death of approximately 4–5 billion (sic) people (Andersson 2014a).5 Therefore peace lies in a transcendent future and will only come through a divine intervention (Andersson 2014a; Larsson 2014b, 2014c; Ragnar 2014c; Berggren 2014; Johansson 2014; Sørensen 2014). Moreover, it is postulated that peace here and now, for instance with Islam (Johansson 2014), will eventually turn into a peace with the anti-Christ (Andersson 2014a) and per definition a false one. Moreover, any political and secular attempts to build peace will fail (Andersson 2014b).

In the data, we have found three main factors put forward which explain this escalation of violence. The first concerns human sin and the incapacity to reform (Andersson 2014a; Sørensen 2015). A second factor is Satanic influence over the conflicts (Johansson 2014). The final factor concerns Islam, either the unchanging immorality of Muslim actors (Lundqvist 2014a) or its quest for world domination (Larsson 2014a) which leads to confrontations (Larsson 2014a; Johansson 2014).

Images of Muslims and Jews
Swedish Christian Zionists reiterate most of the negative images of Arabs and Muslims that are found in general Christian Zionist teaching. However, these images are rarely explicit, at least not in the public meetings. Moreover, there is no sign that the dissemination of anti-Muslim or anti-Arab ideas is the main purpose of these conferences. On the contrary, we observed a few acts that we interpret as genuinely empathetic. Before Friends of Israel’s collections for the benefit of Palestinian children, there was an empathetic prayer depicting Palestinian children and their social needs, just as it would be with any other children (Observation 2014b). Further, Duveskog (2014b) claimed that God will bless Friends of Israel because it blesses Palestinian children. When
asked directly in interviews, the interviewees claimed that God loves every Muslim and Arab (Andersson 2014a; Anonymous Informant 2014).

Interestingly, very few informants had a consistent image of Muslims and Arabs. Within a given talk, the image often changed. For instance, Sturesson (2014), on the one hand, depicts Ismael and Hagar in a positive vein underlining that God abandoned neither Ismael nor Hagar, that Ismael was precious to Abraham, and was loved by God. But in spite of this attempt to restore the image of Ismael and Hagar, there is no general restoration of the general image of Arabs. According to Sturesson (2014), the Bible states clearly that Ismael’s descendants became enemies of Israel, that God’s curse over Middle Eastern tribes and polities approximately 4000 years ago is valid for contemporary nations today, and that the same conflict is present even today. However, Sturesson underlines that God has not forsaken Arabs and that they are welcome into God’s Kingdom, but only as repented Christians (Sturesson 2014).

Most of the Christian Zionist leaders harbour negative images of Arabs and Muslims: they are allegedly violent and threatening, undemocratic, immoral, intellectually inferior, and uncompromising. Occasionally it is indicated, usually in interviews, that these attributes are constant. During the conferences, assumptions seem to be silent; something one can read between the lines.

The idea that Arabs and Muslims are violent and threatening reoccurs. In an interview, Johansson contends that violence and conflicts lie at the heart of the Arab character. As the interviewer quoted a passage in one of Johansson’s books, which depicted Arabs as violent, Johansson replied:

The words in the original text (referring to the Bible) is that he (Ismael) will live in hostility towards all his brothers… I think that is what you can trace through the entire Muslim history.

There are wars and wars and wars. (Johansson 2014)

Johansson was asked whether or not this was an abuse of the Bible:

I understand what you… but I see only that his hostility to his brothers has continued ever since. It is escalating today. … I am only noting the facts history shows… history has shown… look at Syria… There is war in every country where they are. (Johansson 2014)

For Sørensen, the picture is clear. Referring to Bernhard Lewis, he says, «not all Muslims are terrorists, but all terrorists are Muslims» (Sørensen 2015). When the interviewer questions this «fact», Sørensen replies, «that is news to me». In a similar vein, Sørensen contends that the fact that Hamas has killed so few Israelis says nothing about its intentions. Rather, Hamas’6 intentions are evil, and not being able to achieve what they set out to accomplish is simply a reflection of their limited capacity (Sørensen 2014). For Andersson (2014a), Hamas’ evil intention is also underlined by its shooting of hundreds of thousands (sic) of rockets against Israel.

Secondly, Arab nations are undemocratic. According to Larsson, they are even «the cradle of dictatorships,» indicating that this is a constant and, perhaps, an essence of Arab culture (Larsson 2014a). Other informants are less explicit. Instead of underlining that Arab states are undemocratic, they mention the failure of the Arab Spring (Anders-
son 2014b), or they underline that Israel is the only democracy in the Middle East (Lundqvist 2014a; Weichbrodt, 2014b; Duveskog 2014b).

Thirdly, some informants characterize Muslims as immoral: they lie and they manipulate their children. According to Larsson, not only are Muslims allowed to lie whenever it suits Muslim interest, but Islam also regards lying as a «fundamental idea». And this, Larsson claims, has implications: it is hard to trust Arafat or Abbas in negotiations (Larsson 2014a).

Furthermore, it is recurrently, and publicly, claimed that Hamas educate children to participate in Jihad against Israel (Lönngren 2014) and that they use their children in the construction of the Gaza Strip tunnels (Lundqvist 2014a). Likewise, Palestinians manipulate their children, teaching them anti-Israeli violence, anti-Semitism (Sørensen 2014), and disrespect of non-Muslims (Larsson 2014a, cf. Lönngren 2014). These allegations are something we have not found in Christian Zionism elsewhere.

Fourthly, the claim that Arabs and Muslims are intellectually inferior and unable to make social and political progress is rarely present in public discourse, but it is present in our interviews. According to Larsson, «they are not stupid, but… something is missing. … There is no manufacturing. They have oil» (Larsson 2014a). Similarly, when talking about the inability of the Syrian army to curb the IS rebels, Larsson claims that «there is something missing in their strategic thinking» (2014a). Having emphasized the academic achievements of Jews, Larsson states, «not more than one or two Nobel Prize laureates are Arabs» (2014a; cf. Anonymous Informant 2014).

Lastly, Muslims are deemed as uncompromising. Lönngren, in a lecture, and Andersson and Larsson in interviews, underline that Islamic theology teaches that God wants Islam to dominate the world (Larsson 2014a). Moreover, «Islam cannot make territorial concessions» (Andersson 2014a, 2014b), and it wants to exterminate Israel (Larsson 2014a; Lönngren 2014); this is allegedly the reason why Arafat obstructed the chances for peace at the Camp David negotiations (Lönngren 2014). The root of this «spiritual problem» is in the Quran; and since it is spiritual, it remains incomprehensible for secular politicians (Andersson 2014a).

On the other hand, the image of Israel and Jews is generally positive. The Swedish speakers’ and informants’ representation of Jews and Israel is more or less in the same vein as that of Christian Zionism in general. Jews and Israel are given a unique spiritual position through being characterized as God’s chosen people, as spiritually gifted and pious, as subjects of God’s supernatural intervention, and as the roots of Christianity. Furthermore, Jews are regarded as moral, progressive, creative, and innovative, and academically gifted. Surprisingly, some informants instrumentalize Jews and express almost anti-Semitic notions.

In the conferences, replacement theology is forcefully rejected, and it is repeatedly underlined that the Jews still are the chosen people. A consequence of this election is that Jews are especially blessed and have a particular «charisma» (Anonymous Informant 2014). Moreover, Duveskog does not refer to Jews as «the natural branches» that once more will be grafted into the olive tree (Romans 11: 24). Rather, he calls them «noble branches» (Duveskog 2014b). This attitude, that the Jews somehow are nobil-
ity, was obvious during the Friends of Israel conference when a leader welcomed a Jewish guest on the stage and bowed to him, as if in reverence (Observation 2014b).

Jewish spirituality and piety is repeatedly exaggerated. According to Andersson, unlike the conversion of non-Jews, «when a Jew has a divine revelation, he knows everything» (2014b). In times of crisis, they pray (Lönngren 2014), and they feared God in the queue to the gas chambers (Ragnarp 2014c). Jews, in general, pray for the coming of the Messiah (Larsson 2014c), and they are even waiting for the discovery of a red heifer (Larsson 2014b): something required for inaugurating the third temple. According to Duveskog (2014a), Prime Minister Ben Gurion heard the footsteps of the Messiah in his office.

The unique position of the Jews is also underlined by God's supernatural intervention in different periods in the history of Zionism. Not only is Zionism as an ideology inspired by God (Duveskog 2014b) but its history is also clearly divinely supported. For instance, Israel, not having had rain for 1600 years, had its first rain when the Jews returned (Andersson 2014b). Moreover, the mere establishment of Israel in 1948 indicated a Divine intervention (Duveskog 2014a), and, more recently, falling unemployment rates in the midst of immigration is understood as a divine miracle (Lönngren 2014).

A recurring theme during the conferences is the Jewish roots of Christianity (Lönngren 2014; Larsson 2014c), which provided the Jewish creed with an elevated position. Andersson (2014b), for instance, states, «what are we without them? Nothing!». In the same vein, Lundqvist (2014b) repeatedly refers to God as the God of «Abraham, Isaac and Jacob», and Weichbrodt (2014a) emphasizes the relevance of a Jewish holiday to Christianity. Andersson (2014b) underlines that gentile Christians are grafted into the olive tree and are thus dependent on Judaism, and that God could easily graft the Jews back into the tree. Lastly, at both the Word of Life and the Friends of Israel conferences, the Star of David hangs right beside the Crucifix; and at three of the conferences, Hebrew worship songs were sung (Observation 2014a, 2014b). Jews are repeatedly depicted as moral; and whenever Israel is acting immorally, either a mitigating factor is presented, or its behaviour is set forth in stark contrast to that of the Arab. During the Word of Life’s conference, the Israel-Gaza conflict dominated the news. Despite negative media coverage, Israel is regarded as moral at a «strategic level» (Sørensen 2014), and its violence is supposedly necessitated (Lundqvist 2014a): an effect of stress, unintentional, and not a free choice (Sørensen 2014). Usage of unnecessary violence is glossed over through being described as «accidents» and «misjudgements» taking place on an «operational level» (Sørensen 2014), or as faux pas (Lundqvist 2014a). In an interview, Sørensen (2015) reiterates this position by stating that Israel is ethically correct but commits individual errors.

Throughout the Word of Life conference, Israel’s violence is relativized, as it is compared to the cruelty of Hamas (Lundqvist 2014a) and depicted as reactive (Lundqvist 2014a; cf. Andersson 2014a; Ragnarp 2014b; Observation 2014c). Israel has been enduring Hamas’ rockets for years, something we as Swedes «cannot imagine». (Lundqvist 2014a; cf. Andersson 2014a; Ragnarp 2014b; Observation 2014c).
Furthermore, Jews are portrayed as progressive, creative, and innovative (Anonymous Informant 2014). Israeli economic growth (Duveskog 2014b), its democracy (Lundqvist 2014a), and Jewish academic and intellectual superiority, and their high number of Jewish Nobel Prize laureates, are repeatedly emphasized (Duveskog 2014b; Larsson 2014a; Johansson 2014; Anonymous Informant 2014).

Unexpectedly, there is also a tendency to instrumentalize Jews, particularly among Christian Zionists influenced by dispensationalism. They believe that the establishment of Israel is required for the second coming of Christ (Andersson 2014b). Therefore, Jews do not really belong in other countries, and, accordingly, they are not amalgamated into the American melting pot like non-Jews (Minos 2014). Even violent expulsions from their current nations function as a prophetic tool (Andersson 2014a; Johansson 2014), and the death of millions of Jews at Armageddon is required for the return of Christ (Andersson 2014a; Johansson 2014).7

In a few cases, the aforementioned Philo-Semitism turns into anti-Semitism. On four occasions, we observed such utterings. Andersson (2014a) claimed that a Jew is not forgiving in the same way as a Christian. Duveskog (2014a) stated that «the Jews», not a Roman-Jewish leadership, pierced Christ, and Larsson (2014a) maintains that «they» are obstinate. Lastly, Larsson and Duveskog exaggerated Jewish wealth and influence. Larsson stated that Jews in Sweden own 80 per cent of «the national wealth». The interviewer confronted Larsson, explaining that there are no statistics in Sweden on particular Jewish wealth, and that any estimation of supposedly Jewish wealth would never amount to such levels. Vexatiously, Larsson repeated that he knew what he was talking about, claiming to quote Statistics Sweden (Larsson 2014a). Likewise, in his attempt to describe the blessing Jews are to the world, Duveskog (2014b) exaggerated Jewish influence. It is not hard to imagine that this alleged superiority or uniqueness is problematic. Although unintentional, emphasizing Jewish deviance, competence, influence, and exaggerated wealth can come in handy for anti-Semites.

What should be done

Swedish Christian Zionism reiterates most of the imperatives found in Christian Zionism elsewhere; it is coloured by a pessimism and end-time fatalism. The most dominant prescription is that one should not support a two-state solution since such a solution is «stillborn» (Johansson 2014), and one should not pressure Israel to make territorial concessions (Larsson 2014c). On the contrary, Israel should remain a Jewish state (Anonymous Informant 2014), and the West Bank should be annexed, and the Palestinians living there should be given autonomy without Israeli citizenship (Sørensen 2015). When asked if this solution is not undemocratic, Sørensen (2015) refers to it as being «constructive». This position was also manifested in a prayer cloth where a map portraying Israel including the West Bank was handed out. The partakers were encouraged to lay hands over the map and pray for this extended Israel (Observation 2014c).

We have found three basic arguments supporting this position. One argument is divine right: Jerusalem is given to the Jews by God (Duveskog 2014a; Johansson 2014;...
Anonymous Informant 2014), and the West Bank is the heart of the promised land (Andersson 2014a, 2014b), harbouring the most important biblical sites (Larsson 2014a; Lönngren 2014). Therefore, dividing the land contradicts God’s long-term plans (Johansson 2014). A second argument is legal: because a two-state solution is not in accordance with the San Remo Resolution (Anonymous Informant 2014) and the West Bank is not really occupied, according to the Haag Convention (Larsson 2014a). On the contrary, it is «liberated» (Andersson 2014a), and area C was given to Israel permanently in the Oslo Accords (Johansson 2014). A third argument, suggested by Larsson only, is that a two-state solution is not attractive to Palestinians, as the mayors on the West Bank do not want to be a part of Palestine and all Palestinian Jerusalemites «have applied for Israeli citizenship» and would leave it if Jerusalem is to be a part of Palestine (Larsson 2014a). Lastly, a fourth argument is pure self-preservation. Swedish attempts to force Israel to give up Eastern Jerusalem will have severe repercussions (Lönngren 2014), probably implying that Sweden will lose God’s blessing. Although these ideas dominate, there are other voices. Ragnar (2014a), the chair of Friends of Israel, supports a two-state solution and a permanent border, more or less along the 1967 borders. A second important, and reoccurring, idea is that working for imminent peace may lead to a false peace, resulting in support for an anti-Christ (Andersson 2014a; Johansson 2014; Larsson 2014b).

We registered only a few explicit imperatives during the conferences: the conference participants were encouraged to bless (Weichbrodt 2014a), comfort, protect (Andersson 2014b), support (Sørensen 2014), and pray for both Israel (observation 2014b; Larsson 2014a) and the Palestinians (Lundqvist 2014a), and to avoid adopting mainstream critical positions against Israel (Ragnar 2014c; Andersson 2014b). In two interviews, informants affirmed that a morally correct undertaking is to assist the Jewish Diaspora to immigrate to Israel (Sørensen 2015; Johansson 2014). Lastly, we observed performativity: at the Friends of Israel conference, a flag ceremony took place where the Israeli flag and the Swedish flag were raised side by side. Israel’s national anthem, Hatikva, was sung in Swedish translation and the Aronitic blessing was read in a revised version (Observation 2014b). At one public meeting, we prayed for the peace of Israel (Aspenlind 2014); while in other meetings, Duveskog recited the Aronitic blessing over Israel (2014a), we prayed for its protection (Lundqvist 2014b; Levin 2014), once with symbolically lifted hands (Duveskog 2014b).

When explicitly asked in interviews how Christians should relate to Arabs and Muslims, all the informants underlined that we are to love Arabs as well as Jews since we have to love our enemies (sic) (Andersson 2014a). We «show them love on a practical level and pray for them… I think God loves Arabs just as much as the Jews» (Anonymous Informant 2014). However, this was never said in the public meetings.

Concluding discussion

In this article, on how Swedish Christian Zionist leaders frame the obstacles and possibilities to peace in the Middle East, we have found that most of the notions present in
Christian Zionism in general are also found in the Swedish case. There is a general pes-simism regarding peace: conflicts and suffering will escalate. The reasons for this are the human character in general and the negative behaviour and character of Arabs and Muslims in particular.

Jews are portrayed in a very positive vein. They are blessed, and they are a blessing to the world. Still, some informants tend to instrumentalize Jews and unknowingly spread anti-Semitic notions. Arabs, on the other hand, are, just as in Christian Zionism generally, depicted in a very negative vein. They are ethically and academically inferior, unwilling to compromise, portrayed as liars and as unreliable. In one case, Swedish Christian Zionism seems to deviate from Christian Zionism elsewhere: Palestinians allegedly brainwash their children, using them in Jihad. Moreover, Swedish Christian Zionism does not support a two-state solution, nor does it support work for an imminent peace. Christians are supposed to bless, support and pray for Israel. Christians should also help Jews move to Israel. It was also said that Christians should love Arabs and Muslims too.

There are some reflections on our data that we would like to discuss. First of all, there is a remarkable difference between the public rhetoric during the observed conferences and the discourse in subsequent private interviews. It is in the interviews that it is stated that peace is unattainable and that the Middle Eastern conflict is permanent. It is also in the private interviews that prejudice against Arabs and Muslims appear explicitly. Public discourse is, however, restrained. One may wonder whether this prejudice is generally accepted attitudes shared by the majority of the conference participants.

Secondly, the level of education among the speakers as well as the quality of the arguments varies considerably. Some arguments seem to be well thought out. Others are ridiculous and fictional.

Thirdly, in the Christian Zionist understanding of salvation history, the work of God will have unfortunate implications for Arabs and Jews. Christians are supposed to cooperate with God in the end-time events, while at the same time never being encouraged to ethically reflect on the implications that this eschatological schema might have. The fact that Palestinians are suffering, as a consequence of the «Divine» plan, is neglected. In this case, it is not a Christian’s calling to alleviate injustice.

Fourthly, it is interesting how the concept «to love» is understood in different contexts. Loving Jews implies that one supports a Zionist political agenda; that is, one supports fundamental political and structural changes in the favour of Israel. Some informants even supported solutions to the Middle East conflicts that can be regarded as Apartheid-like. Loving Arabs and Palestinians, on the other hand, merely means that you mitigate the effects of Zionism and the consequences of a future eschatological schema. To support a Palestinian national agenda out of love is out of the question.

Fifthly, Israeli and Arab violence is interpreted differently. While years of frustration, caused by the conflict, give an explanatory context to Israeli unethical behaviour, the informants never used frustration as a context to explain Arab immoral actions. Arab violence remains unexplained or is, in a few cases, regarded as an outcome of an essential Arab character.
Finally, this Arab character, combined with the conflict-prone character of Islam, is presented as the main obstacle to peace. These characters and conditions are depicted as an Arab anthropological constant. Divine curses 4000 years ago are still valid and supposedly explain Arab behaviour and regional conflicts.

Notes
1 Stephen Spector challenges this image in his report, claiming that he «found instead an unexpected pragmatism, flexibility, and nuance in evangelicals» (Spector 2009: viii).
2 Merkley (2001: 177) underlines that the International Christian Embassy Jerusalem, an important Christian Zionist actor, does not subscribe to the ideas that Israel will go through tribulation.
3 We have been asked by Hans Weichbrodt of Oasis to acknowledge that the invited speaker at their Israel seminar is not an official spokesperson of Oasis.
4 In the case of the Oasis conference, our introductory letter was less clear about our roles as observers than intended, which caused some irritation. We apologized for our lack of clarity, and promised to state clearly that which we have already stated in footnote 3.
5 Duveskog (2014a), Berggren (2014), and Sørensen (2015) denounced this kind of teaching on Armageddon.
6 It should be noted that Lundqvist and Sørensen do not let Hamas represent Palestinians in general. Their «other» is well defined.
7 Göran Duveskog (2014a) clearly denounces this teaching.

References
Published sources
Kristian Steiner and Anders Lundberg: Peace and End Time Expectations in Christian Zionism


*Interviews*


*Christian services and teachings*


Observations