A "Practical Outlet" to Premillennial Faith: G. Douglas Young and the Evolution of Christian Zionist Activism in Israel

Daniel G. Hummel

Introduction

"The Old Testament makes it clear," wrote the evangelical George Douglas Young in 1960, "that there is a future for the Jewish people."[1] This sentiment, shared widely among American evangelicals in the 1960s, only increased in the aftermath of the Arab-Israeli War in June 1967, which saw the state of Israel expand its borders to more closely resemble those of Old Testament Israel. Evangelical Christians around the world marveled at Israel's military victory, but few did so with as much at stake as the fifty-seven-year-old, Canadian-born Young. In the spring of 1967, Young moved his life's work, the American Institute of Holy Land Studies, from its original small property in West Jerusalem to the Bishop Gobat School, an abandoned nineteenth-century Anglican complex next to the Old City's southern wall on Mount Zion. Straddling the line between East and West Jerusalem, the school's new campus sat squarely in the war's crossfire. For six days of fighting, Young and his students aided the Israeli war effort. They drove ambulances, served meals to soldiers, and prayed for Israel's survival. After Israel annexed East Jerusalem, Young gladly remarked that the new campus "could not possibly be more central to both halves of the city."[2]

G. Douglas Young was an evangelical Christian and a self-described Christian Zionist; he supported the state of Israel because of his Christian beliefs, rooted in his interpretation of the Bible and understanding of Jewish-Christian relations. He undoubtedly subscribed to dispensational premillennialism, a system of theology popular among evangelicals that elevated the role of Jews in biblical prophecy and divine history.[3] But he was also an enthusiastic participant in Jewish-Christian dialogue in Israel. He regarded his institute not just as

Religion and American Culture: A Journal of Interpretation, Vol. 25, Issue 1, pp. 37–81, ISSN: 1052-1151, electronic ISSN: 1533-8568. DOI: 10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37.

a graduate school for biblical archeology but also as a place to transform students into "good 'ambassadors' for the people and state descended from Abraham, Isaac, and Israel."[4] Young was, furthermore, intensely interested in politics and the media. His political activism was driven by the conviction that liberal Christians were anti-Israeli, the media were unbalanced in their coverage of the Arab-Israeli conflict, and most evangelicals in the United States were lackluster in their material support for Israel. These concerns, which were the product of the contentious political climate of the 1960s and the political fallout after the June 1967 War, became persistent issues for Christian Zionists into the 1970s and after.

Young was not the first evangelical to take an active interest in the fate of Jews or Israel. Though he was shaped by the particulars of his biography and the developments of the 1960s, Young stood among other evangelicals in his fascination with Israel and dedication to Christian Zionism. As a number of scholars have shown, Protestant fascination with a Jewish return to their homeland goes back centuries. Since the Reformation, various Protestant groups have based measurements of historical time on the pace of Jewish migration and settlement in Palestine. William E. Blackstone, a nineteenth-century forerunner to Young, wrote books about Israel's role in biblical prophecy and presented the "Blackstone Memorial" to President Benjamin Harrison in 1891, calling for European powers, including the Ottoman Empire, to form a new Jewish state in Palestine. He did so again to a more responsive Woodrow Wilson in 1916.[5] There were also contemporaries of Young who, after Israeli statehood in 1948, established relationships with Israel. William L. Hull, Gordon Lindsay, Elmer A. Josephson, Robert L. Lindsey, and the Dutch activist Jan Willem van der Hoeven are but a few evangelical figures who also worked in Israel for closer Jewish-evangelical cooperation.

Though linked by some common beliefs, Young and these other evangelicals are also notable for their lack of consistent collaboration after Israeli statehood in 1948. With no overarching institutional structure or clear leadership, evangelicals approached the Israeli government in its first twenty years with numerous perspectives and objectives. What made Young unique in this context were his divergent attitudes on prophecy, missions, and cooperation with the Israeli state. Young made his appeal to evangelicals who yearned to act in the world, who sought a "practical outlet to their premillennial faith." The majority of premillennialists, Young lamented, "are interested in prophecy [but] have no time to help the people of prophecy." They were willing to speculate about Israel's role in the end times and argue with fellow Christians over the answers—thereby producing

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a daunting amount of prophecy literature—but they were unwilling to be "practical" about their belief. "One can only hope that every Christian who loves the prophetic word will be ready and willing to pray and work for the people [of Israel]," wrote Young. Young's beliefs were intensely pragmatic; he was most concerned with cooperation and results. In a typical call to action, he asked his readers, "In what concrete ways are you seeking to express [love for the Jewish people]? Are you helping them in your communities? Are you helping the new nation of Israel? Are you helping them in material and physical ways? Are you expressing real friendship always?" This call, in 1960, was unique among evangelicals—even Christian Zionists—who tended to observe but not seek influence over geopolitical events or international relations in the Middle East. The "idle speculation" of prophecy, in Young's words, had no place in his version of Christian Zionism.[6]

Similarly, unlike most evangelicals, Young had no interest in Jewish missions work. Upon granting Young permission to establish his institute in 1958, the Israeli government outlined strict regulations about religious activity for institute workers and students. By any measure, Young followed these regulations, sometimes with more enthusiasm than the government itself.[7] Instead of Jewish missions work, Young's "mission" was to evangelize his pro-Israel beliefs to his fellow evangelicals in Europe and North America. He used his international connections to build bases of credibility and funding sources, and he traveled widely in the 1960s and 1970s, sharing his views on Israel, the Arab-Israeli conflict, and interfaith relations to anyone who would listen. Through his speaking, writing, and teaching, Young became an important evangelist to the evangelicals for Christian Zionism in the 1970s.

Young also differed from his evangelical counterparts in his close relationship with the Israeli government. He successfully designed the institute to appeal to the larger Israeli project of improving Jewish-Christian relations rather than simply providing evangelical support for Israel. To a greater degree than his contemporaries, he captured the attention of Israeli officials and became one of Israel's most important Christian supporters. The opinion of Yonah Malachy, an official in the Ministry of Religious Affairs, was indicative of Young's status. Speaking in 1972 to a group of American academics, Malachy lamented the long history of liberal Protestant interest in Israel that had seemingly failed to produce Christian allies. "It is therefore strange," he continued, "that the American Institute of Holyland [*sic*] Studies, a body of Evangelical Christians, should be the first group to try to establish a true understanding between Jews and Christians."[8] This high praise from Malachy was not isolated.

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Over the course of his career, Young managed to hold together a potent combination of, on the one hand, evangelical theology about the Jews, and, on the other, pervading discourses about interfaith cooperation and Judeo-Christian solidarity that appealed to both American evangelicals and Israelis.

This article examines Young's distinctive theology and politics and argues that his relationship with the Israeli government, which reached its climax in the years 1967–1971, represents a distinct phase in the evolution of Jewish-evangelical relations and evangelical Christian Zionism. Young's limited appeal to prophecy, rejection of Jewish missions, and political pragmatism was a potent and highly attractive combination to Israeli leaders. Though he participated in a long line of evangelical Christian Zionists dating back to Blackstone and earlier, Young's approach was both novel and perceived differently by Jews in Israel and the United States than previous evangelical efforts. He represents an evolution of Christian Zionist engagement with the Israeli state that prefigured the Christian Zionist movement of the 1980s to the present.[9]

This article begins with the formative strands of Young's biography and theology, including his fundamentalist upbringing. Young crucially tried to synthesize the theology of dispensational premillennialism, which originally fueled his interest in the Jewish people, with the new wave of largely nondispensationalist evangelicalism gaining steam in the United States in the 1940s and 1950s. By appealing to a broad range of dispensational and nondispensational evangelical supporters, Young was able to link his institute to the influential center of postwar evangelicalism. After moving to Israel in 1963, Young successfully expanded his institute and broadened his network of pro-Israel evangelicals. The June 1967 War drastically altered Israel's approach to the Christian world, marking a new phase of Christian Zionist activity. In this transformation, Young was crucial, though he found himself increasingly at odds with other evangelicals over the place of Christian Zionism in evangelicalism. The Jerusalem Conference on Biblical Prophecy, held in Jerusalem in June 1971 under the supervision of Young and American evangelical leaders, laid bare these divisions and the limits of Young's distinct Christian Zionist vision.

Young and the Evangelical World

Like most Protestants of his generation, George Douglas Young (who preferred "Doug") was shaped by the fundamentalist-modernist controversies of the early twentieth century. Born in Korea

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in 1910 to Canadian missionaries, Young was taught from an early age that the Christian life was lived in submission to the Bible as God's inerrant Word. He also learned from an early age to think about the Jewish people with a special reverence. He recalled an early interest in Jewish and biblical history. "Whenever Father and Mother read stories from the Bible there was a catch in the voice, a surge in the emotion, when Israel or the city of Jerusalem was mentioned."[10]

Young's education in fundamentalist institutions only reinforced this Christian faith, even as he witnessed dramatic church splits around him among conservative Protestants. In 1929, New Testament scholar J. Gresham Machen stormed out of Princeton Seminary to establish the more conservative Westminster Theological Seminary. Young's father, a conservative Presbyterian preacher from Nova Scotia, insisted that, if his son pursued a life in the ministry, he receive a Westminster education. Although Young had planned to enter medical school, a lack of money forced him into journalism before he decided to follow his younger brother to Westminster. Young quickly developed an aptitude for ancient languages, including Hebrew, Greek, and Aramaic. In his third year, Westminster's faculty suffered another split, this time over differences in eschatology. While most Reformed Christians subscribed to amillennialism, believing the kingdom of God is manifest in the Christian church today, a smaller faction of premillennialists had formed, believing the kingdom of God awaits the return of Christ to be established or, in its non-dispensationalist variety, to be consummated. Disagreements between amillennialists and premillennialists proved irreconcilable. The firebrand preacher Carl McIntire and Old Testament professor Allan MacRae left Westminster to establish their own premillennialist seminary called Faith Theological Seminary in 1937. As a premillennialist, Young followed his language instructor MacRae and finished his degree at Faith the next year. By 1953, Young had completed a Ph.D. in Hebrew and Cognate Learning from Dropsie College in Philadelphia.[11]

During his seminary years, Young began to see himself not only as a premillennialist but also as a dispensationalist. As a subtype of premillennialism with intense millenarian expectations, dispensationalism appealed to many interdenominational fundamentalists who attended prophecy conferences, Bible institutes, and revival meetings.[12] As a rule, strongly confessional traditions such as the Reformed Presbyterianism of Westminster Theological Seminary did not embrace dispensationalism because of its relative novelty and theological differences. But in the wake of fundamentalist separations from mainline denominations in the 1930s, which impacted both confessional and nonconfessional fundamentalists, debates over dispensationalism

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

turned bitter and explosive. "Dispensationalism," wrote one Reformed critic in 1945, "has been becoming increasingly in recent years a seriously divisive factor in evangelical circles. . . . The result is a situation that is deplorable. It is more than deplorable; it is dangerous."[13] Young inhabited a religious world increasingly shaped by fights over eschatology.

One of the key points of contention between dispensationalists and other premillennialists, as well as amillennialists, was the belief in a secret rapture of the church that could happen at any moment. This belief, and its attendant ideas about the role of the church, drew the ire of conservative Protestants who worried about the orthodoxy and social effects of dispensationalism on an already beleaguered church. Through the 1920s, conservatives had looked past theological differences in order to present a united front on issues of modernism, biblical authority, and reliability against liberals, but, with their numerous defeats, many fundamentalists and conservatives turned inward in the 1940s. The dispensationalism question was tangled up in the self-evaluation of conservative Protestantism. Even fellow premillennialists in Presbyterian and Baptist denominations began to challenge dispensationalism's popularity among rank-and-file conservatives. The debates, as one might expect, raged most furiously among conservatives because they were forced to inhabit the same cultural space and share the same limited resources.[14]

Dispensationalism originated from the teachings of John Nelson Darby, a nineteenth-century Irish theologian and leader of the Plymouth Brethren. Darby was a voluminous writer and intense thinker, positing most famously his idea of a secret rapture but also criticizing to great effect the supposed apostasy of much of organized Christianity in his day. Yet the idea that most influenced evangelical understandings of the Jewish people, and the view Young placed at the center of his own theology, was that of humanity's "anthropological dualism"—the doctrine that God had two chosen people: the Jews and the believing church.[15] Darby, and subsequent dispensationalists including Young, believed the millennial kingdom of the Old Testament, described in prophetic books such as Isaiah and Daniel, was distinct from the Christian church.[16] In taking literally—that is, materially—the Old Testament prophecies for a coming utopian, millennial kingdom of Israel, dispensationalists rejected the nineteenth-century view that Christians and the universal church made up a "New Israel" that inherited the Old Testament blessings. For dispensationalists, the view that the church had superseded or replaced the genealogical nation of Israel in God's plans was one of the gravest mistakes in church history. In dividing biblical prophecy and moral injunctions

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

along these hermeneutical lines, dispensationalists emphasized that the church's role lay in world evangelization and in keeping the true faith, while Christ's political kingdom lay in the future with the Jewish millennial kingdom. The church existed for the present age between periods of God working through ancient Israel and the future millennial kingdom. The "church age" comprised a veritable "parenthesis" in divine history.[17]

Dispensationalist eschatology was intimately linked to broader questions of biblical hermeneutics, ecclesiology, and, for many, basic orthodoxy. As one dispensationalist theologian put the stakes, "[Dispensational] premillennialism is a system of Biblical truth. It is not merely an interpretation of one passage in the last book of the Bible." Because of its conservative views on biblical authority, its dissemination in the *Scofield Reference Bible*, and its seeming validity in the face of world events, dispensationalism grew popular in the fundamentalist movement, though it was never hegemonic. Reformed institutions such as Westminster Theological Seminary especially detested dispensationalism's millenarian zeal and populist appeal. The fragile alliance between dispensationalists and Westminster's conservative Reformed following began to break apart in the 1930s. For Young, his education at Westminster and his deepening dispensationalist convictions presented a growing problem. How could he reconcile his dispensational beliefs with his Reformed institutional commitments?[18]

Young's outlook was grounded in the anthropological dualism of dispensationalism, but his impulse to find a "practical outlet" for that dualism stood antithetical to the majority of dispensationalists who de-emphasized political action.[19] Instead, Young found motivation in the movement, beginning in the 1940s, of neo-evangelicalism, which sought to "reform fundamentalism" and pull conservative Protestantism from its cultural isolation in the United States. In the words of Carl F. H. Henry, a leading theologian, the neo-evangelicals promoted "a rediscovery of the revelational classics and the redemptive power of God" in order to "lift our jaded culture to a level that gives significance again to human life."[20] One supporter summarized the movement as "the post-fundamentalist, post-war expression of evangelical Christianity that concentrated on a positive, more ecumenical doctrinal and social stance."[21] The "social stance" of vigorous cultural engagement drew Young into the high orbit of the neo-evangelical movement. He joined both the Evangelical Theological Society, a postwar creation that fostered neo-evangelical biblical scholarship, and the Evangelical Free Church of America, a denomination prominent in the National Association of Evangelicals; and he

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

established lasting relationships with important neo-evangelical institutional leaders such as Arnold T. Olson, Jared F. Gerig, and Kenneth Kantzer.[22]

For most neo-evangelicals, dispensationalism had to go along with the unsightly vestiges of separatism. The leading neo-evangelicals argued that fundamentalists, in large part due to their adherence to dispensationalism, had surrendered too much in the area of politics and lost their passion to engage in social or political activism outside the realm of missions.[23] Henry and others sought to strip the antipolitical elements of dispensationalism but retain the urgency of millenarianism, to suppress the "speculative accretions" of dispensationalism and to elevate "a world-relevance for the Gospel." This theological project broke down the anthropological dualism of dispensationalism and replaced it with various views that regarded the Christian church as the "new Israel."[24]

In general, neo-evangelicals did not hold a special role for a modern Jewish state in their theology. Indeed, an important commonality among many neo-evangelicals was their rejection of dispensationalism.[25] George Eldon Ladd, a New Testament scholar at the neo-evangelical flagship Fuller Theological Seminary, spoke for many when he ascribed only a general theological significance to Israel's founding in 1948, and only in relation to Israel's mass conversion to Christianity. "The Church is the spiritual Israel . . . literal Israel is yet to be saved," Ladd reiterated.[26] Ladd, Henry, and other neo-evangelicals challenged their followers to pour their energy into missions and cultural reform, including missions to the Jews. They argued Jewish conversion, not a Jewish state, presaged Christ's return. Of course, individuals transgressed these neo-evangelical-dispensationalist divides—Young being a prime example—but such cases were the exception. Evangelical dispensationalists such as Young, Arnold T. Olson, and Wilbur Smith, inspired by neo-evangelicalism's social and political engagement, eventually found each other in their Christian Zionist activism.

By the time Young began fulltime ministry in the early 1950s, he had to retain the dispensationalist hope of a future Jewish kingdom and capture the activist energy of the neo-evangelicals. Institutionally, these impulses were at odds. Theologically, in the 1950s, this was a difficult, seemingly incompatible, match. Young sought a hybrid view that retained anthropological dualism and emphasized action. He found flaws in the social lethargy of dispensationalists but also, conversely, in the theological anti-Judaism of the neo-evangelicals. Both sides, wrote Young in 1960, comprised those "who are interested in prophecy [but] have no interest in or time to help the people of

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

prophecy." His theological synthesis arose out of the desire to appeal to the most evangelicals possible and work closely with Jews and Israelis.[27]

The future of the Jewish people, insisted Young, was a logical extension of God's protection of the Jews and Judaism throughout church history. In quoting John 4:22, "Salvation is of the Jews," Young argued, "If these tremendous benefits [the Old and New Testaments, Jesus, the Apostles] have been given to us by the Jewish community, it becomes extremely important that our attitude toward their descendants be commensurate with the debt." For Young, belief without action was useless; mere interest in the future did not fulfill the Christian's duty to repay this debt. The shadow of the Holocaust hung over much of Young's moralizing. "The silence of the world in general," including especially Christians, "while six million Jews were being massacred . . . should add to [evangelical] concern and interest" in Israel. Looking back on his conduct during the Holocaust, Young felt the weight of his own silence over the Christian slaughter of Jews in Europe. The European church's complicity in the slaughter, and the lack of a clear call to aid by American churches, became one of Young's most consistent arguments for action. He chastised fundamentalists for their disinterest in the world and their penchant to divide "bible-believing people" at moments when unity was crucial. To "seek cooperation . . . pool ideas and resources," these goals better fit the calling of evangelicals, no matter their theology.[28]

Though he was certain that Israel had a providential future, Young remained uninterested in specific prophecies or details of the end times. He resisted speculating about the rebuilding of the Jewish temple, nuclear warfare, the place of the United States in prophecy, or the machinations of the antichrist—all ordinary themes in midcentury dispensationalism.[29] Dispensationalist identifications of Armageddon with Russia or the state of Israel, Young said, "are pure cabala." Instead, he focused on the shared messianic hopes of Jews and Christians, believing that the general orientation toward millennial anticipation "provides [both communities] at this point with a basis for mutual exchange of ideas. . . . Let us therefore be understanding and helpful. Let us understand [the Jewish] point of view and work with them in any way which will further the idea of the Messianic Era." Instead of a tract on prophecy for the financial supporters of his work in Israel, Young promised "a list of informative books on the history of Palestine and the history of Israel and the Jewish people . . . helpful information on the practices and religion of the Jewish people."[30] The contrasts with traditional dispensationalist emphases were striking. Rather than defending the faith against liberals or winning adherents

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to his theological system, Young's program resembled the interfaith efforts of mainline Protestants.[31] He wanted to "help Christians to better understand their Jewish neighbors, and give them the kind of information necessary to provide a mutual basis for conversation so necessary if better relations and mutual understanding are to be established."[32]

Contrary to most evangelicals in the 1950s, Young rejected direct evangelization to Jews. Centuries of strife, when Jews refused to integrate into Christian Europe through conversion, proved to Young that God's will was for the Jews to remain a distinct people. The common evangelical practice of specially targeting Jews for conversion had reaped little reward; the history of Jewish evangelization was abysmal and a current barrier to interfaith relations. "Tragically," wrote Young, "some Christians will not support anything unless it is a direct effort to enforce Christianity upon others. . . . These are days in which the Christian church has a unique opportunity to dissociate itself from the 'Christian' persecution of the Jewish people down the centuries." In place of direct evangelism, Young offered the model of *witnessing* to Jews through supportive political action. The establishment of the state of Israel "in a manner analogous to that which was predicted by the Old Testament prophets" meant that Christians could support Zionism without ulterior missionary motives. They were, in the end, argued Young, following God's words of affirmation to Abraham in Genesis 12:3: "I will bless those who bless you, and him who curses you I will curse." [33]

Through 1952, Young taught at Faith Seminary and the National Bible Institute (NBI), another school run by Carl McIntire, but he eventually recoiled from the fundamentalist separatist subculture as the NBI came even more under the authoritarian sway of McIntire. His inability to reconcile fully the Reformed and dispensationalist identities also led him to leave the Presbyterian fold. In 1953, he joined Northwestern Bible College in St. Paul, Minnesota, as an academic dean. Established by the fundamentalist William Bell Riley (also a premillennialist), Northwestern suffered at the time of Young's arrival from Riley's legacy of vociferous anti-Semitism. Riley's successor, a young Billy Graham, was skyrocketing to international fame in the wake of his 1949 Los Angeles crusade. However, he did little to repair relations with the Twin Cities' Jewish community. That task fell to Richard Elvee, Northwestern's third president, who sought to rebrand the college as a positive influence in the St. Paul area. As an administrator and scholar of biblical languages, Young's interest in Jewish history dovetailed with Elvee's new agenda. Young and Sam Scheiner, a leader in the Minneapolis Jewish community, developed

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a mandatory "human relations seminar" for freshmen to acquaint themselves with minority communities in the Twin Cities and foster warmer relations. By 1956, Young also served as the local representative of the American Christian Palestine Committee at the behest of Scheiner and other Jewish leaders in Minneapolis.[34]

During his time at Northwestern, Young began attending the Central Evangelical Free Church in downtown Minneapolis. The church was a member of a new denomination, the Evangelical Free Church of America (EFCA), whose "doctrinal stance," wrote Young's biographer, "appealed to Doug Young. Its tradition held to the belief that God has a special future for the nation of Israel." Young's decision to join the EFCA was fortuitous. The EFCA became a key participant in the emerging evangelical movement.[35]

Founded in 1950 with the merger of the Swedish Evangelical Free Church and the Norwegian-Danish Evangelical Free Church Association, the EFCA typified the Americanization of ethnic denominations. Based in the Midwest (its headquarters in Minneapolis and its denominational seminary in Chicago), the immigrant churches were staunchly antistatist, pietistic, and theologically conservative. Through the interwar years, the immigrant churches conducted services in their native northern European languages. Yet both older denominations, observed the EFCA's longstanding first president Arnold T. Olson, underwent significant changes in the 1940s. They "gradually dropped the old country languages; the people and leaders in both groups became better acquainted as they moved out of their ethnic enclaves and on to peninsulas which began to reach into the American scene." Though it meant eradicating distinct religious identities from the Old World, Americanization also promised a new national identity as a replacement. E. A. Halleen, a longtime Norwegian-American pastor, reflected a common sentiment at the first postmerger conference: "I am looking west tonight. . . . It is an honor to be a Norwegian. . . . By tomorrow we'll all be Americans."[36]

Americans, and also evangelicals. In the 1950s, the newly constructed religious identity of "evangelical" had similar binding power as "American" for immigrant churches eager to assimilate. Though evangelical had been a label for both liberal and conservative Protestants alike, by the 1950s, the term increasingly designated conservative Protestants who emphasized a personal conversion experience and a high view of biblical authority. Neo-evangelical leaders in particular sought to reform fundamentalism by appropriating the name. The National Association of Evangelicals (NAE), an organization founded in 1942 for the express purpose of facilitating "united

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

evangelical action," was a primary vehicle for this unity. Neo-evangelicals such as Harold Ockenga, a Boston minister and an alumnus of Westminster, were driven by a vision of loose organizational unity between conservative denominational and parachurch organizations. The new evangelical movement rose quickly on the heels of neo-evangelical leadership by drawing adherents from many conservative Protestant traditions in the United States. Though dispensationalism, speaking in tongues, and baptism, among other issues, remained contentious, organizations such as the NAE cast a wide net for the sake of unity. "Almost by sheer tenacity," observes historian D. G. Hart, "neo-evangelicals created a new religious identity, and *evangelical* was its designation." The EFCA, whose premerger denominations helped found the NAE, saw the new evangelical religious identity as a source of power. For Young, joining the EFCA meant joining a particular expression of the postwar evangelical movement that emphasized cooperation toward shared social and religious goals.[37]

Young and Israel

In 1956, Young took a Holy Land tour to Greece, Turkey, Jordan, and Israel that radicalized his views on Jewish-Christian relations and internationalized his ambitions. He was moved by his visits to Christian and Jewish holy sites. However, he also came away with an impression that tourists were given "biased" information on Middle East politics "inimical to the truth as well as to the best interests of Israel," especially "in view of what . . . the prophetic scriptures had to say about Israel's future." Young saw an opportunity to place an evangelical graduate school in Israel that would serve religious and political purposes. He envisioned a campus at which he could train "the students and young men who will soon be occupying places of influence as pastors of churches in the United States" to rightly understand the significance of the Jewish people and the politics of Israel.[38]

Working throughout 1957, Young negotiated with Israel's Ministry of Religious Affairs for a permit to start the school, relying on Jewish contacts from Minneapolis and Chicago. In correspondence with Saul Colby, an official in the Israeli government, Young elaborated on why a school best served the needs of Israel. "So many American tourists are returning [to the United States] with a lop-sided view," lamented Young, "because they spend, on these pilgrimages, so much time in the Arab countries. . . . It quite amazes me how many of the returning clergymen have been twisted by the propaganda and evidence of never having heard much of the other side of the story." The solution Young offered amounted to creating, through study abroad,

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a counternarrative. "If we can get them [the clergy] to stop off in Israel for a time, or better still, to live with the people for a few months . . . a significant contribution can be made." The Israeli government agreed. In June, Young was given permission to begin the institute in the old offices of the Christian and Missionary Alliance, an evangelical missionary organization whose work among Palestine's Arab population had been decimated by the Arab-Israeli War in 1948–49. The Alliance's local director, M. G. Griebenow, provided a rent-free building on *Rahov Ha-Navim* ("Street of the Prophets") in West Jerusalem.[39]

Young's initial donor list included numerous evangelical businessmen, many of whom donated money to the Billy Graham Evangelical Association, InterVarsity Christian Fellowship, and other evangelical organizations. This funding network bridged theological and regional lines but remained tied to the Midwest for its core support. For years, money remained tight. Much of Young's existing correspondence from the period involves urgent pleas to American donors for advancements or increases in giving.[40] Israel's unpredictable economy, which could experience rapid inflation, further compounded the money issue.

Billed as an "inter-denominational, inter-faith center" with special focus on biblical archeology, the institute sought to spark interfaith dialogue through biblical scholarship. Richard Mitchell, a staff member for the institute's administrative office in Evanston, Illinois, defined its purpose as "establishing a greater understanding between American Christians and citizens of Israel; acquiring a valuable experience in the field of human relations, not only between Christian and Jew, but also between other differing groups in Israel and neighboring countries." Time in Israel exposed evangelical students to the reality "that others could hold to a differing faith and have good reason for it."[41]

The project appealed to the EFCA's president, Arnold T. Olson. He promised Young the EFCA's institutional support and a job at the EFCA's seminary, Trinity Seminary (later renamed Trinity Evangelical Divinity School). Young joined Trinity in 1958 as dean of Old Testament studies with reduced responsibilities so he could focus on building his new institute in Jerusalem. From 1958 to 1963, Young traveled frequently between the United States and Israel. He administered the institute from Trinity and his offices in Evanston, Illinois, maintaining an administrative staff in Israel. As an EFCA-sponsored organization, the institute relied on its denominational affiliation to provide administrative help, students, and funding in its early years. In 1962, Young left Trinity and, the next year, moved permanently to Israel.

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Until Young's permanent residence in Israel, an evangelical presence in the new state had consisted almost solely of missionaries, pursuing a variety of religious, humanitarian, and political goals but always operating under the rubric of missionary work. Southern Baptists, Mennonites, Nazarenes, and various Pentecostal groups established missions as far back as the Mandate period, when British regulations were friendlier to Protestant groups.[42] Most of these groups found more success among Palestine's Arab population. Jewish missions groups such as the American Board of Missions to the Jews and the Hebrew Christian Alliance were also active in the country. Most Israelis paid Protestants no attention, but the country's Orthodox Jews and officials in the Ministry of Religious Affairs continued to worry about conversions.[43] Though most of these missionary groups were pro-Israel in their politics, their primary goal to convert Jews to Christianity severely limited their appeal to the Israeli government.[44] A few evangelicals, such as Jan Willem van der Hoeven, the steward of the Garden Tomb in Jerusalem, were, like Young, passionate Christian Zionists intent on working with the Israeli government. Van der Hoeven, a Dutch Protestant, did not have the same ties to American evangelicalism as Young, though they would eventually work together in the 1970s to form the group International Christians for Israel (a precursor to the International Christian Embassy Jerusalem). Young was unique in the early 1960s for his combination of evangelical beliefs, rejection of missionary work, and Christian Zionism.

The institute benefited from its founder's distinctive vision. The EFCA did not market or fund the Institute as a missionary operation. The Israeli government, after clarifying Young's intentions, did not treat the institute as a missionary organization but as an educational institution. In the institute's own literature, it emphasized "its programs of graduate and undergraduate Biblical study at the very places where events took place" and did not wish to attract too many "tourists" who might have ulterior, missionizing motives. In its internal literature, the focus remained on the institute as "an educational center under American auspices" where, "in a Christian environment," students could "develop and contribute to intercultural understanding through the study of archeology, history, and geography . . . ancient languages and literature . . . and [the land's] culture and peoples both in the present and in ancient times." In the institute's first five years, reports to board members included updates on new crossover programs with the Hebrew University, visiting lecturers, plans for a new "Holy Land Library," expanding facilities, and alumni updates.[45]

Though Young was forced to deal constantly with administrative and financial issues, he preferred to work on the institute's

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

student programs, which embodied his vision of academic and interfaith exchange. The institute's material resources were never abundant, but they amounted to enough to provide room for the fifteen to forty students who attended each semester. Young crafted a curriculum that emphasized Jewish-Christian harmony and the value of Israeli scholarship in biblical studies. The student experience as a whole reflected this focus. Classes were held only three days a week to facilitate "study, visiting, sightseeing, and worship" and to engage with Israeli society. Students were encouraged to visit a synagogue, work on their Modern Hebrew, and explore the diverse neighborhoods surrounding the school, from the ultra-Orthodox neighborhood of *Mea She'arim* to the French and Italian immigrant enclaves. The philosophy, according to Young, was to give "American clergymen, theological professors and students" long enough time "to feel the *tempo* and temper of development there." The students were expected to return to the United States with better qualifications "to help others to see Israel in her true biblical, historical, and political setting in the Middle East and in the world."[46]

Because of limited resources, many institute courses were administered in conjunction with the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. This cooperation in itself could bear political fruit.[47] In the words of one institute employee: "As they attend meetings and classes at the Hebrew University and elsewhere, the students have excellent opportunities for personal contact with the cream of Israel's intellectuals. These Israeli's [*sic*] have the chance to see what a concerned Biblical Christianity is—an opportunity almost completely absent previously." Atop the list of Israeli intellectuals were R. J. Zwi Werblowsky and David Flusser, both professors at the Hebrew University interested in interfaith dialogue and advisors to the Israeli government. Chaim Wardi, the Councilor for Christian Affairs to the Ministry of Religious Affairs, also taught regularly at the institute. Werblowsky taught the history of Christian-Jewish relations. Flusser, an expert on Second Temple Judaism, taught courses on Jewish history, early Christianity, and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Wardi taught the history of Christianity in Palestine and the status of religious communities in Israel. Yonah Malachy of the Ministry of Religious Affairs taught a course on fundamentalism at the Hebrew University. Yahonai Aharoni and Moshe Kochavi, Israeli archeologists, employed institute students at their digs. In addition, students were required to take courses on modern Israeli society and "The History of the Jews in the Diaspora," which were sometimes taught by visiting scholars or, in later years, by Bernard Resnikoff, the American Jewish Committee's representative in Israel.[48]

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The institute also invited prominent evangelicals for extended stays—sometimes up to six months—to teach and collaborate with Israeli academics. Young's selections for these visits, which were numerous and frequent, pointed to his continuing collaboration with the EFCA and other evangelical organizations. Young hosted Jared F. Gerig, a fellow EFCA leader and president of the NAE, who spent six months at the institute in 1964.[49] Quotations by Gerig of his positive experiences adorned institute marketing for years. The institute also featured visiting scholars drawn from evangelical seminaries.[50] American Jewish organizations, including the American Jewish Committee and Hebrew Union College, also contributed visiting lecturers. Young undertook numerous fundraising tours in the United States and Europe and lobbied to distribute institute pamphlets even more widely. These efforts paid off. After only ten years, the institute could count more than forty associated schools from within the evangelical fold, ranging from Dallas Theological Seminary to Gordon College.[51]

These interconnections, which were the bedrock of Young's vision for a growing Jewish-evangelical community, also served to protect the institute from local criticism as a Christian organization. Suspicion of missionary activity always loomed under the surface of Young's early contacts with the state. Chaim Wardi promoted the usefulness of the institute for garnering evangelical support for Israel and bettering Christian-Jewish relations. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs likewise saw the institute as a potentially positive focal point for evangelical cooperation. However, other ministers, including Saul Colby, the minister of church affairs, and Zorach Warhaftig, a deputy minister, both in the Ministry of Religious Affairs, adopted a harder line attitude. The split within the Israeli government meant the institute was forced to negotiate conflicting views of its purpose and presence.

In the face of lingering suspicions, the institute justified itself to Israelis in academic and political terms, which often bled into each other. In 1963, the institute began an *ulpan* for American scholars, an intensive language course in Modern Hebrew usually reserved for new immigrants to Israel. The program, promoted jointly by the Hebrew University in order to gain exposure for Hebrew-language scholarship on biblical archeology, exposed American evangelicals to the "language of Israel and this land" with obvious political consequences. The institute's *ulpan*, one internal memo excitedly remarked, "is the place where the Lord is training these people [evangelical scholars from around the world] who will reach out to the whole world in time." At the same time, Young was busy promoting the school as a destination for "Christian pilgrims . . . college graduates

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and specialists who will be leaders in the Christian community of tomorrow." These types of Christian visitors to Israel, Young remarked to an Israeli tourism manager in 1964, were to be distinguished from "tourists" who visited Israel for evangelism or sightseeing. The "pilgrim" leaders trained at the institute "will have new ideas, new points of view replacing older stereotypes, with a consequent betterment of relations between our communities and nations." The political rationale for the institute's academic programs helped shield it from scrutiny by Israeli officials and, at the same time, appeal to American evangelicals.[52]

A final aspect of Young's vision for the institute was more individual: to become a personal spokesman for the "evangelical" view of Israeli politics and the Middle East. When events or controversy hit the headlines, the voices of trusted figures could carry weight in shaping how evangelicals understood the news. Young's growing connections among evangelicals and his continuous travels around North America ensured his views could be found in evangelical publications such as the *Evangelical Beacon* and less evangelical outlets such as *Christian Century* and *Christian News from Israel*.[53]

To the outside world, Young's views resembled other pro-Israel positions in Western media. Writing in 1962 for the *Christian Century* (a liberal Protestant magazine), Young articulated a pro-Israel position on the Arab-Israeli conflict on nonreligious grounds. He defended Israel's demand for recognition from Arab states before a comprehensive peace plan could be settled. "Negotiation for settlement of disputes," lamented Young, "can be carried on only in a context of coexistence." The Arab refusal to acknowledge the right of Israel to exist overshadowed the "technical issues" of water rights, borders, and refugees, though Young acknowledged each of these constituted a definite problem. They could, however, be conceivably fixed, while the "main issue" of coexistence was more intractable. Comparing Arab-Israeli talks unfavorably to Washington-Moscow relations, which had recently been rattled by the Cuban Missile Crisis, Young chastised "the Arabs," who "consistently refused in the past to sit down with the Israelis—before 1948 in London, after 1948 in Lausanne; and any suggestion of a meeting in Tel Aviv or Cairo today would seem to the Arab leaders like a joke in poor taste."[54] This type of pro-Israel commentary could easily be divorced from any single religious perspective. Young did not use any words or concepts specific to evangelicalism. Capable geopolitical analysis, already in short supply among evangelicals, broadened Young's appeal to the Israeli government and, increasingly, to American observers as well.

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Amid the institute's growth in the 1960s, Israeli officials started to pay attention to Young's interfaith vision. Especially in the wake of the Arab-Israeli War in June 1967, Young's belief in Israel's centrality to Jewish-Christian relations and his unwavering pro-Israel stance distinguished him from many of the Christian organizations with which Israel had hitherto been dealing. Large international bodies, including the World Council of Churches, began to qualify support for Israel and turn attention to the Palestinian refugee crisis. American Jewish leaders, galvanized by the fear of Israel's defeat in the month leading up to the war, started demanding Israel take center stage in Jewish-Christian relations.[55] Yonah Malachy noted one "positive aspect" of the fighting was that it led "more and more Christian theologians and clergymen to reappraise the central tenets of Judaism and their relation to the land of Israel and to Jerusalem. . . . The recognition of ties between the Jewish people and their country must become the central theme of any future dialogue between Christianity and Jewry." Meanwhile, in the United States, Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum, the American Jewish Committee's director for interreligious affairs, warned, "There will be no future Jewish-Christian dialogue unless Jews insist that Christians face and accept the profound historical, religious, cultural, and liturgical meaning of the land of Israel and of Jerusalem to the Jewish people."[56] Young's consistent pro-Israel position proved prodigious, and Young himself sought to seize the opportunity, as Jewish organizers searched for theologically favorable Christian supporters.

After the June 1967 War, Israeli policymakers struggled to understand the rapidly shifting landscape of Christian support for Israel. They turned to experts such as R. J. Zwi Werblowsky, a scholar of comparative religion at the Hebrew University and an unofficial advisor to the Foreign Ministry since the early 1950s.[57] Werblowsky insisted that any progress in Israel's relationship with the Christian world depended on progress in Jewish-Christian relations. The future of Jewish-Christian dialogue, warned Werblowsky, hinged on Christians reconciling their theology with Zionism. He bluntly concluded in 1974 that it was "sheer hypocrisy" to "invite Jews to live as Jews and to be faithful to 'Judaism' without fulfilling their existence" in the land of Palestine. Werblowsky was not satisfied with a Christian worldview that "for centuries has tried to theologize the Jews out of existence."[58] Instead, Christians needed to develop a theology that acknowledged the permanency of a Jewish state in Palestine.

Evangelicals such as Young already possessed such a theology. And the growing relationship between Young and the Foreign Ministry in the late 1960s led to further evangelicals working with the

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Israeli government. Young helped introduce the Ministry to Arnold T. Olson, still president of the EFCA but also serving as president of the National Association for Evangelicals from 1968 to 1970. In coordination with the Ministry of Tourism, Young hosted Olson in Israel in 1967 and 1969 and added Olson to the institute's board of directors. Olson's trip was recounted in *Inside Jerusalem: City of Destiny* (1968), which painted a positive portrait of Israeli society. Young proudly relayed to the Ministry in 1969 that he had "furthered his [Olson's] education" on Israel, explaining that Olson held a "good understanding and attitude" about the Arab-Israeli conflict. Encouraged by Young's work, Olson similarly adopted an overtly political tone in his pro-Israel public statements. He mirrored Young's efforts in the United States, working closely with American Jewish leaders. Throughout the 1970s, Olson was a vocal supporter of Israel and a constant presence on the evangelical and interfaith conference circuit.[59]

To Israelis, Young's ability to evangelize to the evangelicals made him one of the most valuable Christians in Israel in the late 1960s. Pinchas Lapide, a veteran Israeli diplomat to the Vatican, highlighted the institute in his 1968 *Christian Century* article on "Ecumenism in Jerusalem." On his trip to Israel in 1969, Olson relayed to institute supporters that the head of the Ministry of Religious Affairs, Zerach Warhaftig, "told me that the Israelis will never forget the faith that G. Douglas Young and his board members showed not only in God but in the future of Israel when they chose to move to Mount Zion within sight of and range of Jordanian guns [in March 1967]. . . . He felt that Dr. Young has done one of the most outstanding jobs in the 20 year history of the new nation." Other Israeli officials praised Young, as well. One told Olson that "evangelicals must get behind G. Douglas Young since he is doing the most effective work on Christian-Jewish relations that is done by anyone in the state of Israel. . . . The evangelicals have in him and in the Institute a work which supercedes anything that is being done by the liberal element." The example of Young and the institute stood in contrast to "the complete moral collapse" of the World Council of Churches, Olson noted. Citing a private conversation with R. J. Zwi Werblowsky, Olson agreed with the Jewish scholar that "the breakdown between Christians and Jews is so complete that it may be broken down for a long time to come. . . . It is in this complete breakdown of confidence in the liberal community that Dr. Young and the Institute are being looked upon with new interest."[60]

Young was also the first evangelical to participate in Israel's fledgling interfaith dialogue scene, which brought with it political implications. In early 1968, he eagerly accepted the invitation to join

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the Jerusalem Rainbow Group, a monthly gathering of Jewish and Christian leaders in Jerusalem to discuss religious and scholarly questions. He was the group's first evangelical member and served as a temporary secretary for the group beginning in May of that year. Young also joined the Ecumenical Theological Research Fraternity and, in 1971, offered to house the organization's offices at his institute's new campus. He soon joined numerous committees in Israel that promoted interfaith exchange, including the Israel Pilgrimage Committee, the Christian Tourism Committee of the American Jewish Committee (AJC), and the advisory board for the Israel Interfaith Committee. Young also joined liberal Protestant Franklin Littell's new pro-Israel group, Christians Concerned for Israel.[61] The institute continued to feature notable American Jewish and Israeli leaders, and the school cosponsored with the AJC the first evangelical-Jewish interfaith conference in the United States in 1975.[62]

After the war, Young also expanded his role as an expert on Middle East issues. He toured American and Canadian evangelical churches, at points speaking more than two hundred times a month on the Arab-Israeli conflict with funding and organization by the Ministry of Tourism.[63] His efforts also included publishing op-eds in the *Jerusalem Post* and in American evangelical magazines such as *Eternity* and *Christianity Today*. The archival record indicates that Young also advised the Foreign Ministry on the views of specific evangelical leaders following the war.[65] In these efforts, Young took a prominent role in American evangelicalism's new and remarkable "interest in military and foreign policy issues" in the early 1970s. However, while many U.S.-based commentators were interested because of "their almost obsessive fascination with the question of how and when the last great war—the war to end all wars—would come about," Young's motivation remained rooted in interfaith dialogue and in discussing "workable solutions" to "Arab-Israeli relations" and the contemporary "political, cultural, and logistic" problems of Israeli society.[66]

As the new pro-Israel network grew around Young in the late 1960s, it also attracted the attention of American Jewish organizations, which often worked in tandem with the Foreign Ministry on interfaith issues. The American Jewish Committee, as a prime example, began to dedicate resources to evangelical outreach after the war.[67] Rabbi Marc Tanenbaum, the AJC's director of interreligious affairs, emerged as the most important Jewish figure promoting interfaith dialogue with evangelicals, with Young as a central partner. Tanenbaum encouraged all Christians to develop a "'theology of Israel,' a theology of the Jewish people in the context of a theology of the people of God"

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and to "fac[e] up to the historical amnesia" of church-sponsored anti-Semitism. Even so, he believed evangelicals were more predisposed than others to emphasize these themes. Speaking in 1970, he observed, "Before the six–day war, about 85 percent of the American Jewish Committee's interfaith efforts had been directed to Catholics, and most of the remainder to Protestants. About 40 percent of the committee's efforts this year [are] going to evangelical Protestants."[68] As the new focus for both Israeli and American Jewish outreach to the Christian world, evangelicals, and Young in particular, were soon searching for ways to express, in definite terms, the evangelical perspective on Israel.

The Jerusalem Conference on Biblical Prophecy

In the spring of 1970, Young approached the Israeli government with the idea for a large conference in Israel to "strengthen the ties between Israel and evangelicals around the world as well as serve as an inspiration [*sic*] rallying point for Christians from the west."[69] Planning soon began for the Jerusalem Conference on Biblical Prophecy, a gathering expected to attract between fifteen hundred and two thousand evangelicals. For Israel, organizing this unprecedented "huge operation" required coordination among multiple government agencies. No other evangelical had proposed such an ambitious event to the government. Consuls in the United States, who were crucial in organizing marketing and travel plans for American evangelicals, were advised: "The important thing is, of course, to give the conference a desirable character and to plan for that outcome. This kind of operation requires much more thought." For Young, the conference was integral to his ministry, "the Lord's cause, which we are trying to develop here [in Israel]."[70]

From June 15 to June 18, 1971, almost fifteen hundred evangelicals gathered in Jerusalem for what one of its organizers, the neo-evangelical leader Carl F. H. Henry, claimed was "the largest Christian gathering in the Holy Land since the state of Israel was founded in 1948." The Jerusalem Conference on Biblical Prophecy hosted attendees from more than thirty countries, though most came from the United States and Western Europe. Magazine advertisements announced "the world's first convocation of Christian thinkers at Jerusalem" gathered "to restudy the Bible's pertinent prophecies and to proclaim their message for our time." The invitation extended "to all who are 'looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.'" The Israeli government expected "Protestants of many varieties" from the "Bible Belt

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of America."[71] For four days, evangelicals would swarm Jerusalem's Christian holy sites, stimulate Israel's burgeoning tourism industry, and draw international attention as a new constituency interested in Israel's geopolitics.

Though a spectacle, the Jerusalem Conference on Biblical Prophecy frustrated Young and stunted his vision for a movement of interfaith-oriented evangelicals who would take leadership of Christian Zionism. The conference, focused on prophecy, promised an opportunity for unity, if only evangelicals could rally around a common understanding of Israel. To Young's disappointment, no such consensus emerged and was, in retrospect, doomed from the start. The conference's planning was contested, its execution muddled, and its legacy divisive. Though it was a climactic moment in Young's assent in Israel and among American evangelicals, the conference revealed the challenges to evangelical Christian Zionism in 1971. Without broad institutional support, theological agreement, or grassroots organization, evangelicals could not find the common ground on which to base political support for the state of Israel. Even so, the attention the conference garnered provided an outstanding window into the divisions among evangelicals and the place of Christian Zionism in American evangelicalism in the early 1970s.

Conference planning began in April 1970 and was structured around two committees. The Israeli committee headed by Young included other evangelicals in Israel and Israeli government officials to carry out the practical tasks of organization.[72] The American committee was tasked with galvanizing enthusiasm for the conference by attracting popular evangelical speakers and theologians, as well as advertising the conference in evangelical news outlets and churches. Carl Henry, in 1970 one of the most prominent evangelical theologians in the United States and a professor at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, led the American committee. Though they agreed on the importance of prophecy and holding the large conference in Jerusalem, Young and Henry soon butted heads on almost every fundamental issue, beginning with the intended outcome of the gathering. While Young hoped the conference would spark mass Christian Zionist interest among the evangelical laity, Henry was concerned about reducing the role of Israel in evangelical thinking. This stark contrast, stemming from theological and political differences, was a microcosm of evangelicalism more broadly in the early 1970s.

The evangelical social practice of organizing large conferences had long historical roots. Since the nineteenth century, evangelicals and fundamentalists had hosted numerous prophecy conferences to seek agreement on biblical interpretation. In 1971, the

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

allure of this time-honored tradition increased with the prospect of Jerusalem as its setting. So excited was Wilbur Smith, one of the slated speakers, that he held out hope its impact would be the most significant "since the great conference at Moody Bible Institute, in the spring of 1914"—an event Smith attended as a twenty-year-old and which featured many of the most prominent leaders of the nascent fundamentalist movement gathered on the eve of World War I.[73]

The Jerusalem Conference on Biblical Prophecy was similarly conceived as a setting to state in unison the evangelical understanding of Israel. In early 1970, Gaylord Briley, an evangelical marketer and tourism promoter, approached Young with the idea of a conference to boost evangelical interest in Israel and to rally "premillennialist support for Israel," by which Briley meant specifically dispensationalist support.[74] Young and Briley saw eye-to-eye on the potential for such a conference. Ideally, it would combine financial and ideological interests and serve as a turning point when evangelicals would begin to show, in material ways, their love for Israel. Furthermore, tourism was an important step toward politicizing evangelicals, and the conference served as an attractive rally-point for ministers and their congregations to visit Israel to see its new, expansive post–1967 borders.

But neither Briley nor Young held enough gravitas to organize an event on the scale they wanted. Briley, the consummate entrepreneur, sought carefully to "seat the placement for [the conference] into competent, better known hands." In short order, he found Carl F. H. Henry, whom Briley contacted after managing to convince W. A. Criswell, then president of the Southern Baptist Convention, and Harold Ockenga, a close associate of Henry's, to lend their names to the calling committee. Briley, who remained more interested in the publicity and tourism aspects of the conference, did not seem to grasp the problems of splitting responsibility between Young, an ideologically driven activist, and Henry, a theologically driven intellectual. Yet Henry's willingness to sign on was hard to pass up. His name recognition, close ties to Billy Graham, and wide appeal in evangelical circles bolstered the prospects that the conference could be "the biggest in Israel's history to date."[75]

Most crucially, Young and Henry disagreed over their basic approach to Israel and prophecy. Henry, as we have seen, was theologically a premillennialist but not a dispensationalist.[76] He did not believe the state of Israel or the Jewish people had a unique role to play in history aside from mass conversion to Christianity in the future. In the present, Henry opposed political arguments to support Israel based on prophecy or on Young's favorite notion that Christians owed Jews a historical debt for past injustices. Fundamentally,

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Henry wanted evangelical energy poured into other projects. He disliked the tendency of dispensationalists to focus on the end times at the expense of evangelical unity, missions, and social engagement.[77]

Ironically, Henry agreed to help organize the conference out of fear instead of enthusiasm. He had grave doubts about a conference organized by an entrepreneur such as Briley and a political activist such as Young, writing privately that Briley represented "a group of eager-beaver evangelical promoters of tour travel" who, on their own, would likely organize a conference "tragic for the evangelical witness, for the Church in the modern world, and for Christian-Jewish relations, no less than for Christian-Arab relations." The content of the conference, he lamented, would amount to "a parochial eschatological sideshow reflective of one narrow segment" of theology, by which he meant dispensationalism. A fellow evangelical theologian, Bernard Ramm, wrote Henry lamenting the effect the conference would have on "Moslem missions" and predicting the event would devolve into "a glorious propaganda meeting for American Protestants with all its eschatological flag-waving." Writing to Wilbur Smith, Henry worried that all of evangelicalism would be perceived through the lens of "a parochial intramural Biola mood," a not-so-subtle jab at the prophecy-centric evangelicalism represented by the conservative and largely dispensationalist Biola College.[78] Now that he was involved, Henry believed he could steer a potential disaster of a gathering into more productive straits.[79]

Almost immediately, though, practical concerns set Young and Henry against each other. Henry sought an apolitical conference as a "public forum for examination of the biblical view of last things," a program skewed toward theological explication and exchange. As a prominent theologian, Henry sought to attract some of the most respected evangelical leaders, many of whom, like himself, had distanced themselves from dispensationalism since the 1940s. He envisioned worldwide evangelical representation, including speakers from North America, Europe, Asia, Africa, and the Arab world. However, a string of speaker rejections in the summer of 1970, due mostly to scheduling conflicts or reticence about the prophetic theme of the conference, circumscribed this grandiose vision. The final list of presenters was scaled back especially in terms of European and Arab representation, but Henry could still confidently write that he had constructed "a top-flight program . . . with nationally and internationally known participants."[80] He managed to sign on numerous speakers from the entire spectrum of evangelicalism—ranging from British theologian John Stott to the African American street evangelist Tom Skinner. He included a few dispensationalist theologians in the spirit

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of an open "public forum," but invited more than a dozen fellow neo-evangelicals and non-Americans as speakers. For Henry, this guaranteed theological diversity and respectability. Yet Young, who applauded the lineup because of its star power, hoped the full weight of evangelicalism, if unified in support of Israel, would spark mass political engagement.

Young opposed, however, Henry's other motive for such wide representation: making sure the conference remained apolitical. The optics of the conference especially worried Henry. Sharing his views with a colleague, he explained that, even if Jewish migration to Palestine fulfilled prophecy, it was not "tied to the existence of Israel as a national entity, far less with the nation in its present political and geographic commitments." His worries compounded when Billy Graham refused to attend. The public relations risk of appearing at a prophecy conference seems to have been too much for Graham. Briley, who also pursued Graham, complained that "[Graham's] staff has thrown a protective cordon around him and is trying to deflect him from participating."[81] Henry also continued to hear rumors that Graham believed the conference was a money grab, but Graham insisted that his schedule was simply too full with an evangelical crusade in the Chicago area.[82] Henry initially changed the dates of the conference to conform to Graham's schedule, but to no avail. A series of frustrated letters from the pens of both Henry and Young, with guarded and diplomatic responses from Graham's assistants and finally from Graham himself, squashed the possibility of his involvement and, thus, the promise of evangelicalism's most prominent spokesman keynoting the conference. Henry suspected that the politics of the conference were simply too much for many potential speakers, including Graham.[83]

Henry was right to worry about the conference's political tone. At the same time Graham declined, Young's committee in Israel was working hard to arrange for a prominent Israeli statesperson to address the conference. When Young excitedly wrote to Henry that he believed David Ben-Gurion, Israel's first prime minister, would be available, Henry responded coolly. When Henry later found out the plans included introducing Ben-Gurion with a rousing rendition of Israel's national anthem, he worried that "it makes a one-and-one identification between the prophecy conference and the identity of Israel as a nation that it seems we aren't called to make." Young could hardly understand this position. He believed the lack of a "prominent government figure" would be "a very grave public relations and social blunder." He urged Henry to "stop this business of being fearful of the political relationships between the two sides of the city [of

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Jerusalem]," a reference to a concern, as Henry wrote in his memoirs, that the conference would be perceived as a statement of evangelical support for a unified Jerusalem that "would be offensive to some and so to be avoided at all cost."[84] In the end, Young won out and Ben-Gurion gave an opening night speech.

Young was deeply connected to the American scene as well and knew how to appeal to evangelicals on American terms. In a letter to donors, he argued the years immediately following the war in 1967 were the most important for Jewish-Christian relations. Evangelicals had an important role to play: "Jews and evangelical Christians (Biblically oriented) are beginning to recognize how much more we have in common with each other than some Christians."[85] Young wanted a Jewish-evangelical relationship based on reverence for the Bible and Jewish history, shared Jewish-Christian hopes for a future millennium of peace and prosperity for Israel, and concern for the present security of Israel. In both religious and political terms, Young leveraged his location at the fringes of American evangelicalism in Israel into promoting Christian Zionism. The institute's role as official "host" of the conference was a boon to Young's popularity and an opportunity to reach more American evangelicals.

The conference's schedule was also contested. Young organized a mass meeting at Yad Vashem Memorial to show solidarity with the survivors of the Holocaust, an evangelical parade up the Mount of Olives, a visit to the institute's campus, and Israeli participation in the conference. Disagreement arose when Young cautioned against Henry's suggestion to pair Jewish and Christian speakers on panels to enrich the exchange of ideas. Young feared that, by putting Jewish and Christian speakers in direct dialogue with each other, the conference would evoke a "missionising tendency." Instead, Young urged that some panels feature only Jewish speakers. The sight of an evangelical trying to convince a Jew on an issue of Christian theology struck Young as highly explosive. Young conveyed to the American committee the "very, very strong feeling on the part of our committee that it would be a public relations disaster" to feature panels with both Jews and Christians. Henry worried that panels featuring only Jewish speakers would "bequeath Israelis an opportunity, if they wish it, to simply tell Christians what attitude they ought to hold politically re[garding] the state of Israel and its problems."[86] Henry won this argument, which stifled the willingness of Israeli speakers to attend the conference.

When the conference finally began, it featured a wide array of evangelical views on Israel. The various evangelical groupings came with separate, often competing, theological and political agendas.

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Dallas Theological Seminary president John F. Walvoord and Talbot Theological Seminary president Charles Feinberg represented the scholastically inclined dispensationalist tradition that revered Israel but largely eschewed political programs. Conservative Reformed theologians, represented by Edmund Clowney, the president of Westminster Theological Seminary, and Herman Ridderbos, a Dutch Reformed New Testament scholar from the Netherlands, stood on the opposite end of the eschatological spectrum (as staunch amillennialists) and, while not rejecting Christian political engagement, believed support for Israel was counterproductive to evangelism. Young, Arnold T. Olson, and the Reverend Alexander Wastchel, a Jewish-born Christian in Israel, believed political support for Israel was most important. Hebrew University's R. J. Zwi Werblowsky, the lone Jewish speaker, supported Young's project, though he was most concerned to convey the centrality of the Holy Land to the Jewish people. And Henry led the group of neo-evangelicals who mostly feared the conference would descend into nothing more than a pro-Israel rally.[87]

There were, of course, many other evangelical leaders rounding out the twenty-one speakers. Nearly a third came from international and Pentecostal traditions, ranging from Scottish theologian James M. Houston to Im-Chaba Bandang Wati, a prominent Burmese evangelical and president of the World Evangelical Fellowship. The conference's political spectrum was similarly broad, ranging from Fuller Seminary professor Wilbur Smith's rail against the "epidemic of lawlessness" of student riots across the globe in 1968, to the thunderous denunciations of the "Christianity of our parents" by Tom Skinner, an African American ex-gang member and youth evangelist, who called on attendees to remember that "[God] does not wear the American flag around His shoulders."[88] In contrast to conferences that took place less than a decade later, including Young's next major conference in 1978, the diversity in both theological and political views was truly unique.

Much in line with Henry's wishes, the panel format was structured to discourage uniform opinions emerging from the conference. Three speakers with different viewpoints presented opposing arguments on a thematic topic, leaving conclusions up to the audience. Under this system, debate often spiraled into theological minutia and laid bare deep theological divisions within the broader evangelical community. Panels debated the proper interpretations of specific verses and the overall function of prophecy in the Bible. Yet the major dividing lines were drawn over disagreements of whether the state of Israel, in fact, signaled a fulfillment of biblical prophecy and deserved political support. For someone such as Young, who based his activism on these issues, the stakes could not be higher.

Speakers debated Israel's theological significance in panels on the future of the Jewish temple, biblical hermeneutics, the future of the Jewish people, and the practical application of prophecy interpretation.

Henry and Young let their longstanding differences air out in public in their own presentations, which they delivered on their own panel with Werblowsky. Henry once again publicly refused to see any political significance in the conference and worried about placing the "official" evangelical position as "pro-Israel." Though apparently crowded out of his speaking slot by Young and the "unexpectedly introduced . . . surprise speaker Professor Zwi Werblowsky," Henry pleaded in his written remarks for evangelicals to channel their excitement for prophecy into evangelism—the "awesome global mandate . . . [to] witness to the risen One 'in Jerusalem . . . and unto the uttermost parts.'" The efforts of the church—"a moral beachhead in history"—to evangelize to unbelievers mattered even more crucially because "the coming judgment of our race is at hand." To those theologians who poured their energies into deciphering prophecies, Henry sought to turn their attentions to bigger issues. To those activists who regarded moral and material support for Israel as an extension of their faith, Henry urged that those efforts go instead into promoting Christ and the gospel.[89]

Young rejected the narrow mission of evangelization and focused instead on the historical injustices Christians had committed against the Jewish people. He railed against the church's continued "anti-Semitic attitudes to our day. . . . The long historic record of the church and the Gentile world has not helped us here in Israel." For Young, the overriding insight of the 1967 War was the error of the historical church in teaching that it had superseded the Jews in the eyes of God. This belief had historically forced Jews in every European country to choose "one of the three options": conversion, flight, or death. Under Christian kings and the Catholic church, Jews took a courageous stand, "for two thousand years—two awful, bloody thousand years—[the Jews] never forsook their Bible and never came to believe that the word Israel in their Bible meant the church." Raising a pluralistic banner that called for Christians to rethink their view of Judaism, Young proclaimed, "I am saying that since Jews are Jews and not Christians they can hardly be expected to sublimate [biblical] passages in such a way that they refer to an Israel that is not Israel but is in reality the church." More explicitly, Young wondered if "perhaps the Jewish understanding is right and Israel *is* Israel, and not the church." Furthermore, the Jewish state in Palestine did not so much set up the end times as it revealed that "God himself began to take a hand" in Jewish history again.[90]

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

R. J. Zwi Werblowsky's speech supported the thrust of Young's message, which is probably why Young considered it "a highlight of the conference." Werblowsky articulated the Foreign Ministry's strategy of rallying evangelicals around a simple theology of the Jewish claim to the land of Israel. Speaking on the Jewish understanding of prophecy, Werblowsky urged evangelicals to support a sovereign Jewish state in Palestine with Jerusalem as its capital. He acknowledged the importance of prophecy to Jews, both secular and religious, but clarified that "to experience reality with a biblical resonance is not quite the same as reading events in terms of the literal fulfillment of texts." The Jewish people took away a more existential meaning; the text "illuminates our past as well as our future in the sense of imbuing us with very specific historical awareness, a sense of destiny and vocation, and the certainty of a future beyond all suffering and tragedy of which Jewish history has been so full even in the present generation." The prophetic claim to the land was not "legal . . . to be recognized by courts of law" but expressed an "unshakable conviction that this bond . . . was the deepest reality of [Jewish] history." The crux for evangelicals was to integrate, both theologically and politically, the Jewish insistence that "the State of Israel, that is, the life of the Jewish people as a body politic in the land which it had never ceased to consider its own, is not a vain thing newly invented but a fulfillment that constitutes a further link in a unique historical chain." Only from this basis could the "millennial hopes" of Christian and Jew alike be realized.[91]

A measure of evangelical camaraderie showed itself in the less polarizing moments of the conference. A concert by Anita Bryant, a night of joint Arab-Jewish folk dancing, and an ecumenical communion service on the Mount of Olives helped alleviate tensions. But, in the end, conference attendees left Jerusalem as divided as when they had come. In a desperate attempt to salvage the event's political significance, Young tried a final end run around Henry. In the conference's last day, Young, Olson, and four other evangelical leaders released a statement in support of the Israeli annexation of East Jerusalem, which had occurred only four years earlier. The statement was ostensibly separate from the conference. It asserted that "the unity of Jerusalem [under Israeli control] must be preserved at all costs" and praised Israel for its stewardship of Christian holy sites. Israel's Foreign Ministry cabled consulates in the United States to "immediately make all effort to distribute [the statement] text to U.S. media." To Young's benefit, the conference and the statement were linked in the American press, including in the *New York Times* and *Washington Post*.[92]

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This minor salvage operation did not save the conference in the eyes of its organizers. Henry offered a stale recounting in his memoirs devoid of feeling or interest. Young was ambivalent due to the difficult planning stage, the lack of consensus, and the minimal Israeli and Jewish representation. Arnold T. Olson judged privately, "The conference seemed to have more low spots than high spots." In a cable to its New York consulate, Israel's Foreign Ministry judged, "Though [there] have been problems, [the] conference [is] likely to be positive," though this evaluation paled in comparison to the potential the Ministry had envisioned months earlier.[93] Indeed, the evangelical declaration on Jerusalem, in so much as it would not have materialized had the conference not taken place, seems to have been the chief legacy for the Foreign Ministry and American Jews. Marc Tanenbaum, writing for the American Jewish Committee, used the proclamation as an example of the "growing number of prestigious and representative Christian leaders" opposed to Jerusalem's internationalization.[94]

Conclusion

The failure of the Jerusalem Conference on Biblical Prophecy, in so much as it lacked an ideologically coherent statement, did not stop Young from organizing evangelical support for Israel. Young had hoped an evangelical pro-Israel organization would emerge from the conference; it took five more years, until 1976, for Young to launch Bridges for Peace, a Christian Zionist organization that continues to publish literature, lobby governments, and support new Jewish immigrants on Israel's behalf.[95]

When the opportunity to host a conference in Israel appeared again in 1977, Young modified his strategy, using both his acquired wisdom and new changes in the landscape of American evangelical and Israeli politics. On November 1, 1977, Young and fourteen other evangelical leaders published a full-page ad in the *New York Times* expressing "Evangelicals' Concern for Israel."[96] The ad criticized the Carter administration for the "erosion of American governmental support for Israel" but spent most of its space articulating a distinctly evangelical understanding of the relationship of the Jewish people to "the land." "The time has come," it concluded, "for Evangelical Christians to affirm their belief in biblical prophecy and Israel's Divine Right to the Land by speaking out now." Six of the fifteen signatories had ties to the EFCA or the American Institute of Holy Land Studies in Jerusalem; Young's influence on the document was unmistakable. Other cosigners, including singer Pat Boone, Baptist pastor W. A. Criswell, and *Christianity Today* editor Harold Lindsell, were emerging in 1977 as

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

leading members not only of conservative evangelicals but also of the religious right.

The International Congress for the Peace of Jerusalem, held January 31–February 2, 1978, continued in the same vein as the advertisement. As the organizer, Young avoided evangelical speakers who were not certain to bring unqualified support for Israel. Six Jewish speakers, including Prime Minister Menachem Begin, also spoke at the event. The conference's final session, held at the summit of Masada, featured a panel of speakers under a massive sign that read, "Masada Shall Not Fall Again." The congress affirmed a statement with wording borrowed from the earlier *New York Times* ad and concluded the conference by founding a new body, International Christians for Israel. With Protestant representatives from Norway, South Africa, the United States, and Israel, this new group (which would eventually help form the International Christian Embassy Jerusalem, one of the most influential Christian Zionist organizations in the world) embodied what Young had hoped would emerge out of the Jerusalem Conference seven years earlier.[97]

On May 21, 1980, Young suffered a fatal heart attack. He died in his home in Jerusalem and was buried on Mt. Zion. His funeral service was attended by Israeli officials including Teddy Kollek, the mayor of Jerusalem.[98] The biography of G. Douglas Young elucidates at least two important aspects of Christian Zionism in the 1970s. First, as an activist, Young embodied a new expression of Christian Zionism that was informed by the context of the 1950s and 1960s and by the location of the American Institute of Holy Land Studies in Israel. As an American evangelical close to the center of power in Israel, Young developed ideas and political affiliations that diverged from the predominant ones in the United States. He drew much of his influence and many of his ideas from the interfaith movement and framed his institute as a major center for Jewish-Christian dialogue. Second, the trajectory of Young's activism, from activist dispensationalism to building a network of evangelicals and ultimately to sparking grassroots activism, provides historians with an alternative narrative to the growth of evangelical Christian Zionism in the mid-twentieth century. Viewed from the Middle East, American evangelicals needed consistent reminders of the need to support Israel "materially and physically," in the words of Young. Furthermore, the increasingly international makeup of Christian Zionism, with massive followings in countries such as Brazil, Nigeria, and South Korea, are inexplicable without referencing Young's pragmatic ideology or paying close attention to Israel as a scene of Christian Zionist activism.[99] Assessing the place of Christian Zionism in American evangelicalism is, thus, an

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

international and transnational question—one that, while including the factors of dispensationalism and prophecy belief, must also grapple with larger contours of theology, pluralism, and interfaith relations in the twentieth century.

Notes

Special thanks for assistance on earlier drafts go to Jon Beltz, Sean Bloch, Athan Biss, Skye Doney, George Quarles, Terry Peterson, Jennifer Ratner-Rosenhagen, Jeremi Suri, and the writing seminar in Fall 2013 at the University of Wisconsin-Madison led by Lee Palmer Wandell.

1. G. Douglas Young, *The Bride and the Wife: Is There a Future for Israel?* (Minneapolis: Free Church Publications, 1960), 12. Young did not leave a collection of personal papers; his correspondence and institutional records are available only piecemeal with the most important deposits at the Jerusalem University College in Jerusalem, Israel (hereafter referred to as JUC), the Billy Graham Center Archives in Wheaton, Illinois (hereafter referred to as BGCA), and the Archer Archives at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Illinois (hereafter referred to as AA). I draw on further archival research from the Israel State Archives (hereafter referred to as ISA). Young is either only mentioned in passing or briefly quoted in Timothy P. Weber, *On the Road to Armageddon: How Evangelicals Became Israel's Best Friend* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 225; Angela M. Lahr, *Millennial Dreams and Apocalyptic Nightmares: The Cold War Origins of Political Evangelicalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 91, 156, 164; Caitlin Carenen, *The Fervent Embrace: Liberal Protestants, Evangelicals, and Israel* (New York: New York University Press, 2012), 145, 158; and Stephen Spector, *Evangelicals and Israel: The Story of American Christian Zionism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 2.

2. G. Douglas Young to J. Herbert Taylor, October 6, 1967, box 24, folder 5, collection 20, Papers of Herbert J. Taylor, BGCA; David A. Rausch and Carl Hermann Voss, "American Christians and Israel, 1948–1988," *American Jewish Archives* 40 (April 1988): 64; Calvin B. Hanson, *A Gentile . . . with the Heart of a Jew: G. Douglas Young* (Nyack, N.Y.: Parson Publishing, 1979), 155–66.

3. For the best summary of dispensationalist beliefs in the United States, see Weber, *On the Road to Armageddon*, 19–44. Of course, dispensationalism, like any set of ideas, has changed over time. For a critical historical approach to twentieth-century dispensationalism, see Herbert W. Bateman IV, "Dispensationalism Yesterday and Today," in *Dispensationalism Today, Yesterday, and Tomorrow*, ed. Curtis I. Crenshaw and Grover Gunn (Spring, Tex.: Footstool Publications, 1994).

4. Young, *The Bride and the Wife*, 87. The school has had numerous names throughout the years: Israel-American Institute of Biblical Studies, American Institute of Holy Land Studies, Institute of Holy Land Studies, and, today, Jerusalem University College.

5. See Yaakov Ariel, *An Unusual Relationship: Evangelical Christians and Jews* (New York: New York University Press, 2013), 86–90. For the history of Protestant fascination with Jews, see Robert O. Smith, *More Desired than Our Owne Salvation: The Roots of Christian Zionism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013); and Victoria Clark, *Allies for Armageddon: The Rise of Christian Zionism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 27–147. Other historians have focused on the nineteenth-century roots of Christian Zionism. See Donald M. Lewis, *The Origins of Christian Zionism: Lord Shaftesbury and Evangelical Support for a Jewish Homeland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); Shalom Goldman, *Zeal for Zion: Christians, Jews, and the Idea of the Promised Land* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009); and Yaakov Ariel, *On Behalf of Israel: American Fundamentalist Attitudes toward Jews, Judaism, and Zionism, 1865–1945* (Brooklyn, N.Y.: Carlson, 1991). The evangelical presence in Israel is less studied than is Christian Zionism in general. See Amnon Ramon, "Christians and Christianity in the Jewish State: Israeli Policy towards the Churches and the Christian Communities (1948–2010)" (Jerusalem: Jerusalem Institute for Israel Studies, 2012).

6. Young, *The Bride and the Wife*, 88, 91, 91, 26, 26.

7. See, for example, the case of Vern Asleson, a student at the institute in 1962 who desired to stay in Israel past his student visa expiration in order to teach English at the Jerusalem YMCA. Young, fearing Asleson would also engage in missions work, pressed him to leave the country. The Ministry of Religious Affairs compromised and allowed Asleson to obtain a new six-month visa in Cyprus and remain in Israel. See G. Douglas Young to Vern Asleson, July 7, 1962, box 5820, folder 15, Ministry of Religious Affairs files, ISA; and Saul Colby to Young, July 19, 1962, box 5820, folder 15, Ministry of Religious Affairs files, ISA. On Jewish missions, see Yaakov Ariel, *Evangelizing the Chosen People: Missions to the Jews in America, 1880–2000* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000). See also Yaakov Ariel, "Evangelists in a Strange Land: American Missionaries in Israel, 1948–1967," *Studies in Contemporary Jewry* 14 (1998): 195–213.

8. Yonah Malachy et al., *Discussing Jerusalem: From the Proceedings of the Seminar for Visiting Academics Held at the Van-Leer Jerusalem Foundation, Jerusalem, 1972* (Jerusalem: Israel Academic Committee on the Middle East, 1972), 38.

9. For discussions of the contemporary (post–1980) Christian Zionist movement, see especially Yaakov Ariel, "An Unexpected Alliance: Christian Zionism and Its Historical Significance," *Modern Judaism* 26 (February 1, 2006): 74–100; Clark, *Allies for Armageddon*; and Spector, *Evangelicals and Israel*.

10. Hanson, *A Gentile . . . with the Heart of a Jew*, 25.

11. On the founding of Faith Seminary, see Barry Hankins, *Francis Schaeffer and the Shaping of Evangelical America* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 13–14; and Hanson, *A Gentile . . . with the Heart of a Jew*, 32–39.

12. Sometimes called "interdenominational evangelicals." See William R. Glass, *Strangers in Zion: Fundamentalists in the South, 1900–1950* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 2001), 81–133; and Brendan Pietsch, "Dispensational Modernism" (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 2011), 24–29.

13. Oswald T. Allis, *Prophecy and the Church* (Phillipsburg, N.J.: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing, 1945), vii.

14. Joel A. Carpenter, *Revive Us Again: The Reawakening of American Fundamentalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 33–88. Divisions were especially acute among Southern Presbyterians. See Glass, *Strangers in Zion*, 134–84; and B. Dwain Waldrep, "Lewis Sperry Chafer and the Roots of Nondenominational Fundamentalism in the South," *Journal of Southern History* 73 (November 2007): 807–36. On the broad ranging debates between dispensationalists and other conservative Protestants, see R. Todd Mangum, *The Dispensational-Covenantal Rift: The Fissuring of American Evangelical Theology from 1936 to 1944* (Eugene, Ore.: Wipf and Stock, 2007); and Daniel P. Fuller, *Gospel and Law: Contrast or Continuum—The Hermeneutics of Dispensationalism and Covenant Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 1–20.

15. On Darby, see Max S. Weremchuk, *John Nelson Darby: A Biography* (New York: Loizeaux Brothers, 1993). Darby's writings are accessible online at http://www.stempublishing.com/authors/darby/. I borrow the term "anthropological dualism" from Darrell L. Bock and Craig A. Blaising, *Progressive Dispensationalism* (Wheaton, Ill.: BridgePoint Academic, 1993), 23. Bock and Blaising write from within the dispensationalist tradition, but with a critical eye to its past. The "remnant" or "believing Church" stands in contrast to "Christendom," which dispensationalists insisted contained many, if not a majority, of nominal Christians.

16. See, for example, Isaiah 9, Jeremiah 23, and Daniel 2, which dispensationalists interpret as describing a millennial government

governed by Jesus. For a longer discourse from a dispensationalist perspective, see John F. Walvoord, *The Millennial Kingdom: A Basic Text in Pre-Millennial Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1959).

17. For a discussion of supersessionism in postwar Protestantism, see Caitlin Carenen, *The Fervent Embrace: Liberal Protestants, Evangelicals, and Israel* (New York: New York University Press, 2012), 59–92. For a summary of supersessionism in Jewish-Christian relations, see Michael Wyschogrod, "Israel, the Church, and Election," in *Abraham's Promise: Judaism and Jewish-Christian Relations*, ed. R. Kendall Soulen (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 179–87.

18. Charles Ryrie, *The Basis of the Premillennial Faith* (New York: Loizeaux Brothers, 1953), 6; Mangum, *The Dispensational-Covenantal Rift*, 175–211. For a sympathetic but well researched history of the *Scofield Bible* and its reception, see R. Todd Mangum and Mark S. Sweetnam, *The Scofield Bible: Its History and Impact on the Evangelical Church* (Colorado Springs, Colo.: Paternoster, 2012).

19. George Marsden attributes at least a part of the "great reversal" in evangelical social engagement to dispensationalism. See George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture*, 2d ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 85–93.

20. Carl F. H. Henry, *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1947), xv–xvi.

21. Owen Daniel Strachan, "Reenchanting the Evangelical Mind: Park Street Church's Harold Ockenga, the Boston Scholars, and the Mid-century Intellectual Surge" (Ph.D. diss., Trinity International University, 2011), 3. For a classic study of the new (neo-) evangelicalism, see George M. Marsden, *Reforming Fundamentalism: Fuller Seminary and the New Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987).

22. Two of these men were also leaders in the EFCA. Olson was president of the EFCA from 1951 to 1976, and Kantzer was academic dean at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School from 1960 to 1978. Gerig was president of Fort Wayne Bible College and associated with the Missionary Church Association, an Anabaptist denomination based in Indiana.

23. See Russell Dwayne Moore, "Kingdom Theology and the American Evangelical Consensus: Emerging Implications for Sociopolitical Engagement" (Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2002), 40–137.

24. Henry, *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism*, 46–48.

25. Donald Dayton argues, "The issue of dispensationalism was at the core of what was going on during the rise of neo-evangelicalism. It is probably not too strong to suggest that this was the crucial issue between the continuing fundamentalists and the emerging 'neo-evangelicals.'" See Donald Dayton, "The Search for Historical Evangelicalism: George Marsden's History of Fuller Seminary as a Case Study," *Christian Scholars Review* 23 (September 1993): 30–31. Joel Carpenter moderates this claim, pointing out that Fuller Seminary, the flagship neo-evangelical institution, started with "about equal numbers of dispensationalists and nondispensationalists on its faculty . . . the new evangelicalism . . . could accommodate dispensationalism in some of its less starkly sectarian forms." This tolerance dwindled as time wore on. As we will see in the differences between G. Douglas Young and Carl F. H. Henry in the early 1970s, dispensationalism would be characterized as "parochial," among other pejoratives. Carpenter concludes, "Hanging onto or jettisoning dispensationalism was a key sign of whether one merely wished to reform fundamentalism or substantially change it." See Carpenter, *Revive Us Again*, 310.

26. George Eldon Ladd, "Israel and the Church," *Evangelical Quarterly* 36 (October 1964): 210–11.

27. Young, *The Bride and the Wife*, 91. Young was not, of course, the only evangelical to try to combine dispensationalism and political activism in the 1950s. For another example, see the anticommunist efforts of J. Vernon McGee in Darren Dochuk, *From Bible Belt to Sunbelt: Plain-Folk Religion, Grassroots Politics, and the Rise of Evangelical Conservatism* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2010), 153–67.

28. Young, *The Bride and the Wife*, 9; Young quoted in Hanson, *A Gentile . . . with the Heart of a Jew*, 434. Young's views on the Holocaust are discussed on 45–48.

29. See Paul Boyer, *When Time Shall Be No More: Prophecy Belief in Modern American Culture* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1992), esp. 115–290.

30. Young quoted in Hanson, *A Gentile . . . with the Heart of a Jew*, 322; Young, *The Bride and the Wife*, 19.

31. See especially the efforts of Franklin Littell and A. Roy Eckardt, both mainline Protestant clergy active in the Jewish-Christian interfaith movement and supporters of Israel. See Carenen, *The Fervent Embrace*, 155–60.

32. Young, *The Bride and the Wife*, 90.

33. Ibid., 65–66.

34. William Vance Trollinger, *God's Empire: William Bell Riley and Midwestern Fundamentalism* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990), esp. 65–70. "Human Relations" was a popular approach among American Jewish organizations during this period. See Marianne Rachel Sanua, *Let Us Prove Strong: The American Jewish Committee, 1945–2006* (Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University Press, 2007), 67–98. The seminar was geared toward the city's Jewish and African American communities.

35. Hanson, *A Gentile . . . with the Heart of a Jew*, 66.

36. Arnold T. Olson, *The Search for Identity* (Minneapolis: Free Church Press, 1980), 151, 152. By west, Halleen meant North America, seen from his homeland of Norway.

37. D. G. Hart, *Deconstructing Evangelicalism: Conservative Protestantism in the Age of Billy Graham* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 24. *United Evangelical Action* was the title of the NAE's magazine. For the NAE's understanding of historical evangelicalism and its claim to be the rightful successor to the name, see James Deforest Murch, *Cooperation without Compromise: A History of the National Association of Evangelicals* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956), esp. 3–15. The EFCA, more than many denominations, imbibed an ideal of cooperation and "silence" on secondary issues, such as baptism and predestination. See, for example, Arnold T. Olson, *"The Significance of Silence": The Evangelical Free Church of America* (Minneapolis: Free Church Press, 1981).

38. G. Douglas Young, "The Israel-American Institute of Biblical Studies," *Christian News from Israel* 10 (December 1959): 32, 31.

39. G. Douglas Young to Saul Colby, July 1958, box 5820, folder 15, Ministry of Religious Affairs files, ISA; Hanson, *A Gentile . . . with the Heart of a Jew*, 82–88. See also Young, *The Bride and the Wife*, 88–89.

40. See, for example, Young's correspondence with Herbert J. Taylor, an evangelical businessman and owner of Club Aluminum Products Corporation. Taylor was a key supporter of the institute and Young. Their remaining correspondence is stored in the Billy Graham Center Archives, collection 20.

41. Quoted in Hanson, *A Gentile . . . with the Heart of a Jew*, 118.

42. Ariel, "Evangelists in a Strange Land," 195–213; Per Østerbye, *The Church in Israel: A Report on the Work and Position of the Christian Churches in Israel, with Special Reference to the Protestant Churches and Communities* (Lund, Sweden: Gleerup, 1970), 192–97.

43. Antimissionary activism was undertaken mostly by Orthodox Jews who feared for Israeli youth. Organizations such as Keren Yeladenu ("A Foundation for Our Children") and Acheizer promoted Jewish youth activities and lobbied the Israeli government to curtail missionary activity. See Ariel, *Evangelizing the Chosen People*, 149–50.

44. One exception is the example of William Hull, the founder of Zion Apostolic Mission and a Pentecostal missionary. Hull had warm relations with many Israeli officials and spoke on Israel's behalf in the United States and his native Canada. He famously served as the religious councilor for Adolph Eichmann during the latter's trial in Israel in 1961–62. Even so, Hull's political reach was limited by his missions work and apparent disinterest in organizing North American evangelicals into a Christian Zionist political movement. For a brief biography, see Ariel, *Evangelizing the Chosen People*, 156–59.

45. Hanson, *A Gentile . . . with the Heart of a Jew*, 111; Saul Colby to Chaim Wardi, February 22, 1959, box 5667, folder 2, Ministry of Religious Affairs files, ISA; Brochure for the American Institute of Holy Land Studies, 1968, box 24, folder 12, collection 20, Papers of Herbert J. Taylor, BGCA; memorandum by G. Douglas Young, July 29, 1963, Institutional Records for the American Institute of Holy Land Studies, JUC.

46. Young, "The Israel-American Institute of Biblical Studies," 34.

47. The institute's activities in this regard paralleled those of many postwar American institutions engaging in cultural diplomacy. As Justin Hart writes of American policymakers, culture played an increasing role in advancing U.S. objectives abroad. Young, a naturalized American, was employing the same thinking advancing Israeli interests abroad in the United States. See Justin Hart, *Empire of Ideas: The Origins of Public Diplomacy and the Transformation of U.S. Foreign Policy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), esp. 25.

48. Marlene Olsen, "A New School with a New View in the Holy Land," memorandum, 1961, Papers of G. Douglas Young, JUC; on organizing the lecturers, see G. Douglas Young to Anson Rainey, July 24, 1962, Papers of G. Douglas Young, JUC; Rainey to Young, December 11, 1965, Papers of G. Douglas Young, JUC; Young to David Flusser, December 8, 1964, Papers of G. Douglas Young, JUC.

49. "International News Bulletin of the AIHLS," August 21, 1964, Papers of G. Douglas Young, JUC.

50. These included well-known evangelicals such as theologian Dwight Pentecost from Dallas, Old Testament scholar William La Sor from Fuller, Christian apologist Edwin Yamauchi and, out of the evangelical mold, archaeologist George Ernest Wright from Harvard Divinity School, and past president of Augsburg College (and theologian) Bernhard M. Christensen.

51. Associated schools would circulate institute brochures and recommend students to study in Jerusalem. For a list of associated schools, see the letterhead on Young's newsletter in 1976 in the JUC files.

52. Memorandum, July 29, 1963, Institutional Records for the American Institute of Holy Land Studies, JUC; Young to Mr. Yeager, May 13, 1964, Papers of G. Douglas Young, JUC.

53. See Young's long-running series in the *Evangelical Beacon*, "The Bible in the Space Age," which ran from November 1958 to April 1959; G. Douglas Young, "Toward Arab-Israeli Coexistence," *Christian Century* 79 (December 12, 1962): 1508–09; Young, "The Israel-American Institute of Biblical Studies," 31–34.

54. Young, "Toward Arab-Israeli Coexistence," 1508, 1509.

55. For a summary of the American Jewish response to the war, see Joshua Zeitz, "'If I Am Not for Myself . . . ': The American Jewish Establishment in the Aftermath of the Six Day War," *American Jewish History* 88 (June 2000): 253–86.

56. Yonah Malachy, "The Christian Churches and the Six-Day War," *Weiner Library Bulletin* 23 (1969): 24.

57. Werblowsky's role as advisor to the Foreign Ministry is discussed in Uri Bialer, *Cross on the Star of David: The Christian World in Israel's Foreign Policy, 1948–1967* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005), 74–76.

58. R. J. Zwi Werblowsky, "The People and the Land," in *Speaking of God Today: Jews and Lutherans in Conversation*, ed. Paul D. Opsahl (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), 80, 82.

59. Arnold T. Olson, *Inside Jerusalem: City of Destiny* (New York: Regal Books, 1968); Young to Yitzhak Lair, June 4, 1970, box 4548, folder 11, Ministry of Foreign Affairs files, ISA; Arnold T. Olson, *Give Me This Mountain* (Minneapolis: Arnold T. Olson, 1987), 177–94.

60. Pinchas Lapide, "Ecumenism in Jerusalem," *Christian Century* 85 (June 26, 1968): 839–42; Arnold Olson to Arthur Miller, November 19, 1969, box 4548, folder 11, Ministry of Foreign Affairs files, ISA.

61. Peter E. Janssen, *Adventures in Dialogue: Impressions of 45 Years of Jewish-Christian Dialogue in the Rainbow Group of Jerusalem, Israel* (Jerusalem: Lee Achim Sefarim, 2013), 194; Carenen, *The Fervent Embrace*, 158.

62. The conference took place in New York City, December 8–10, 1975, and was cosponsored by the American Jewish Committee's Department for Interreligious Affairs and the institute. The papers were published as *Evangelicals and Jews in Conversation on Scripture, Theology, and History*, ed. Marvin R. Wilson, Marc H. Tanenbaum, and Arnold James Rudin (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1978).

63. American Institute of Holy Land Studies to Chicago area donors, newsletter, February 1, 1969, box 24, folder 5, collection 20, BGCA. See also Young to mailing list, report, May 22, 1972, Institutional Records for the American Institute of Holy Land Studies, JUC. For an example of Israel sponsoring Young's talks, see "Report on Dr. G. Douglas Young's Lecturing Tour in the Western States," February 11, 1969, box 145, folder 2, Ministry of Foreign Affairs files, ISA.

64. G. Douglas Young, "Lessons We Can Learn from Judaism," *Eternity*, August 1967; G. Douglas Young, "At Peace in Jerusalem," *Jerusalem Post*, December 9, 1968; G. Douglas Young, "Israel: The Unbroken Line," *Christianity Today*, October 6, 1978. Young often contributed letters to the editor for the *Jerusalem Post*. Some of them include: "Al Aksa—A Christian Accuses the Churches," August 27, 1969; "Misconceptions about the Refugee Problem," September 22, 1970; "Murdering of Jews," May 17, 1974; "Arab Riots," June 6, 1976.

65. See Chicago Consulate to Pragai, January 6, 1970, box 4548, folder 11, Ministry of Foreign Affairs files, ISI; Chicago Consulate to Pragai, May 6, 1970, box 4548, folder 11, Ministry of Foreign Affairs files, ISA.

66. Melani McAlister, *Epic Encounters: Culture, Media, and U.S. Interests in the Middle East, 1945–2000* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 178. Young's speaking topics may be found in "Current Subjects," promotional flyer, n.d., Institutional Records for the American Institute of Holy Land Studies, JUC. This flyer, which summarized Young's speaking engagements in "25 states and 4 countries," was likely produced in 1970.

67. On the AJC's approach to Billy Graham, see Marc Tanenbaum to Bernard Gold, memorandum, June 26, 1970, box 4548, folder 11, Ministry of Foreign Affairs files, ISA. For the AJC's broader strategic approach to evangelicals, see "Program Prospectus: Evangelical

Christians," memorandum, January 9, 1975, AJC online archives, http://www.ajcarchives.org/ajcarchive/FileViewer.aspx? id=13695. For an overview of American Jewish responses to evangelical support for Israel, see Lawrence Grossman, "The Organized Jewish Community and Evangelical America: A Brief History," in *Uneasy Allies? Evangelical and Jewish Relations*, ed. Alan Mittleman, Byron Johnson, and Nancy Isserman (Lanham, Md.: Lexington Books, 2007), 49–72.

68. Marc Tanenbaum, "Jewish-Christian Relations: Issues and Prospects," in *A Prophet for Our Time: An Anthology of the Writings of Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum*, ed. Judith Herschcopf Banki and Eugene Joseph Fisher (New York: Fordham University Press, 2002), 148; quoted in Paul L. Montgomery, "A Dialogue of Faiths at Seton Hall," *New York Times*, October 29, 1970, 45.

69. Hanson, *A Gentile . . . with the Heart of a Jew*, 315. Historians have portrayed the conference uniformly as a successful event. Shalom Goldman asserts the conference was a "great success" (Goldman, *Zeal for Zion,* 293). Melani McAlister likewise judges the conference "a stunning success . . . a remarkable gathering of evangelicals" that "consolidated the newly politicized interpretations of prophecy" (McAlister, *Epic Encounters*, 170–71). Timothy Weber agrees, calling the conference an "important sign" of the way Israelis and evangelicals "started building their special relationship shortly after the Six Day War" in 1967 (Weber, *On the Road to Armageddon,* 213–14). See also Spector, *Evangelicals and Israel*, 145–46; and Boyer, *When Time Shall Be No More,* 188.

70. Michael Pragai to Chicago Consulate, July 26, 1970, box 4457, folder 19, Ministry of Foreign Affairs files, ISA; Young to Herbert Taylor, December 12, 1970, box 25, folder 5, collection 20, BGCA.

71. Carl F. H. Henry, *Confessions of a Theologian: An Autobiography* (Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1986), 335; "Ockenga, Criswell Announce Historic First: Jerusalem Prophecy Conference," full-page ad, *Christianity Today*, November 20, 1970, 171; Michael Pragai to Saul Ramati, July 26, 1970, collection 4457, box 19, Ministry of Foreign Affairs files, ISA.

72. Other members of the Israeli committee included officials from the Foreign, Tourism, and Religious ministries, Robert Lindsey (Southern Baptist), Canon Peter Schneider (Anglican), and Rabbi Jack Cohen.

73. On the beginning of the Bible conference movement, see Timothy P. Weber, *Living in the Shadow of the Second Coming: American Premillennialism, 1875–1925* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987),

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

26–28. For the 1914 conference papers, see *The Coming and Kingdom of Christ: A Stenographic Report of the Prophetic Bible Conference Held at the Moody Bible Institute of Chicago, February 24–27, 1914* (Chicago: Moody Bible Institute, 1914).

74. Gaylord Briley to G. Douglas Young, May 16, 1970, box 1, folder 12, Papers of Wilbur M. Smith, AA.

75. Gaylord Briley to Wilbur Smith, June 2, 1970, box 1, folder 12, Papers of Wilbur M. Smith, AA; Young to Carl F. H. Henry, October 13, 1970, box 5, folder 4, Papers of Carl F. H. Henry, AA.

76. This position, usually termed "historic premillennialism," was popular among neo-evangelicals. For a study of its most prominent theologian, see John A. D'Elia, *A Place at the Table: George Eldon Ladd and the Rehabilitation of Evangelical Scholarship in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008).

77. Henry, *The Uneasy Conscience of Modern Fundamentalism*, 46.

78. Henry to John Winston, June 12, 1970, box 5, folder 5, Papers of Carl F. H. Henry, AA; Bernard Ramm to Henry, July 12, 1970, box 5, folder 5, Papers of Carl F. H. Henry, AA; Henry to Wilbur Smith, May 30, 1970, box 5, folder 7, Papers of Carl F. H. Henry, AA.

79. Henry displayed a similar reluctance with his participation in the Chicago Declaration on Social Concern in 1973. In that case, Henry worried about the leftward drift of the Chicago gathering. His hapless attempts to hold a collapsing center are well articulated in his own memoirs. See Henry, *Confessions of a Theologian*, 348. Thanks to Tim Padgett, a Ph.D. candidate at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, for this lead.

80. "Ockenga, Criswell Announce Historic First: Jerusalem Prophecy Conference," full-page ad, *Christianity Today*, November 20, 1970, 171; Henry to Young, October 4, 1970, box 4, folder 5, Papers of Carl F. H. Henry, AA.

81. Henry to Robert Walker, October 11, 1970, box 5, folder 4, Papers of Carl F. H. Henry, AA; Gaylord Briley to Wilbur Smith, July 30, 1970, box 1, folder 12, Papers of Wilbur Smith, AA.

82. See Henry to Billy Graham, July 24, 1970, box 5, folder 5, Papers of Carl F. H. Henry, AA; Young to Herbert Taylor, December 24, 1970, box 24, folder 5, collection 20, BGCA; T. W. Smyth to Henry, December 25, 1970, box 5, folder 4, Papers of Carl F. H. Henry AA.

83. Henry to Bernard Ramm, July 27, 1970, box 5, folder 5, Papers of Carl F. H. Henry, AA.

84. Henry to Robert Walker, October 11, 1970, box 5, folder 3, Papers of Carl F. H. Henry, AA; Young to Henry, October 13, 1970, box 5, folder 4, Papers of Carl F. H. Henry, AA; Henry, *Confessions of a Theologian*, 335.

85. Young to Herbert Taylor, December 1, 1969, box 24, folder 5, collection 20, BGCA.

86. Young to Gaylord Briley, October 7, 1970, box 4457, folder 18, ISA; Young to Henry, October 13, 1970, box 5, folder 4, Papers of Carl F. H. Henry, AA; Henry to John F. Walvoord, October 26, 1970, box 5, folder 5, Papers of Carl F. H. Henry, AA.

87. Other neo-evangelical speakers included Harold Ockenga (pastor of Park Street Church, Boston), Merrill Tenney (professor and dean at Wheaton College), and A. Skevington Wood (tutor at Cliff College, Derbyshire, England).

88. Wilbur Smith, "Signs of the Second Advent of Christ," in *Prophecy in the Making: Messages Prepared for Jerusalem Conference on Biblical Prophecy*, ed. Carl F. H. Henry (Carol Stream, Ill.: Creation House, 1971), 185; Tom Skinner, "Modern Youth in Biblical Perspective," in ibid., 271. Smith injured his arm days before the conference and was unable to attend. His paper was delivered by General William K. Harrison, the president of the Officers' Christian Fellowship.

89. Carl F. H. Henry, "Jesus Christ and the Last Days," in Henry, *Prophecy in the Making*, 169; Henry, *Confessions of a Theologian*, 335.

90. G. Douglas Young, "Christian and Jewish Understanding of the Word 'Israel,'" in Henry, *Prophecy in the Making*, 161, 165–66.

91. R. J. Zwi Werblowsky, "Prophecy, the Land, and the People," in Henry, *Prophecy in the Making*, 345–47.

92. "Declaration on Jerusalem by Ad Hoc Group of Evangelical Christians," June 17, 1971, box 4548, folder 13, Ministry of Foreign Affairs files, ISA. The signers included Young, Arnold T. Olson, Harold J. Fickett, Jr., John F. Walvoord, Myron F. Boyd, and John Warwick Montgomery; Michael Pragai to New York Consulate, telegram, June 17, 1971, box 4457, folder 20, Ministry of Foreign Affairs files, ISA; "Evangelists Meet in the Holy Land," *New York Times*, June 20, 1971, 10; Yuval Elizur, "Evangelical Christians End 3-Day Meeting in Jerusalem," *Washington Post*, June 19, 1971, 11.

93. Henry, *Confessions of a Theologian*, 334–35; Hanson, *A Gentile . . . with the Heart of a Jew*, 328; Arnold T. Olson to Wilbur

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

M. Smith, August 17, 1971, box 1, folder 50, Papers of Wilbur M. Smith, AA; Michael Pragai to New York Consulate, telegram, June 17, 1971, box 4457, folder 20, ISA.

94. Tanenbaum relied on an article from the *Evangelical Beacon*, the EFCA's official mouthpiece, for the declaration's wording, which may explain the sole credit given to Olson in the report. See *Christians Support Unified Jerusalem* (New York: American Jewish Committee, 1971), 1, 13–15.

95. Hanson, *A Gentile . . . with the Heart of a Jew*, 378–84. Bridges for Peace's homepage is http://www.bridgesforpeace.com/il/.

96. "Evangelicals' Concern for Israel," *New York Times*, November 1, 1977, 12.

97. For a description of the congress, see Hanson, *A Gentile . . . with the Heart of a Jew*, 343–54.

98. "Zionism Loses a Staunch Evangelical Supporter," *Christianity Today*, June 27, 1980, 51.

99. The International Christian Embassy Jerusalem's homepage is http://int.icej.org/.

ABSTRACT G. Douglas Young, the founder of the American Institute of Holy Land Studies (now Jerusalem University College), is a largely forgotten figure in the history of Christian Zionism. Born into a fundamentalist household, Young developed an intense identification with Jews and support for the state of Israel from an early age. By 1957, when he founded his Institute, Young developed a worldview that merged numerous strands of evangelical thinking—dispensationalism, neo-evangelicalism, and his own ideas about Jewish-Christian relations—into a distinctive understanding of Israel. Young's influence in American evangelicalism reached a climax in the years 1967–1971. This period, and Young's activism therein, represents a distinct phase in the evolution of Jewish-evangelical relations and evangelical Christian Zionism. Young's engagement with the Israeli state prefigured the Christian Zionists of the 1980s.

This article examines Young's distinctive theology and politics and situates them in intellectual and international contexts. It argues that Young sought to place Christian Zionism at the center of American evangelicalism after 1967 and that his effort was only partially successful. While Young spoke to thousands of evangelicals, trained hundreds of students, and sat on boards and committees to broaden the appeal of Christian Zionism, he also met stiff resistance by some members of the

https://doi.org/10.1525/rac.2015.25.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

American evangelical establishment. The Jerusalem Conference on Biblical Prophecy, which saw Young collide with Carl F. H. Henry, a leading American evangelical, illustrates the limits of Young's efforts. Ultimately, a look at Young reframes the rise of Christian Zionism among American evangelicals and situates activism in Israel as central to the development of Jewish-evangelical relations in the twentieth century.

Keywords: G. Douglas Young, American Institute of Holy Land Studies, Christian Zionism, evangelicalism, Jewish-Christian relations, Israel