

QUESTIONS TO

"ISRAEL-PALESTINE. GUIDING THOUGHTS AND EXPLANATORY THESES".

A discussion impulse from the five regional churches of Baden, Hessen and Nassau, Palatinate, Rhineland and Westphalia¹

A statement by the Kairos Palestine Solidarity Network in Germany (January 15, 2022)

The text of the Churches on the Rhine and Ruhr had previously been sent as a draft to various people and groups working in the thematic field of Israel-Palestine - including the Kairos Palestine Solidarity Network. We had sent in our queries. Not one of them was taken into account in the current final version. Therefore, we send them once again, adapted to the final version, to the church leaders as an open letter. This way we present them also to the public.

We recognise that the churches on the Rhine address the reality in Palestine-Israel more clearly than before in some places in the guiding thoughts and theses. Thesis 2.2 states, for example: "We recognise the call of Palestinian Christians, together with the Palestinian people as a whole, for an undiminished right to life and political self-determination. Out of a centuries-old attachment to this land, they demand their right to live in the autonomy of a state." The statement in 3.1 is also important: "In the heated current debate, right up to our political decision-making bodies, we must insist on a differentiation between anti-Semitism on the one hand and a critical view of the respective government policy of the state of Israel on the other. Or in 3.3: "Neither quotations from holy scriptures nor religious traditions can legitimise disenfranchisement and discrimination or justify geopolitical claims to power at the expense of law and justice." Or in 4.3: "We call for an end to continued settlement construction and concrete efforts to end the occupation."

Let us now turn to the "Guiding Thoughts and Theses" which we quote and then comment using italics.

"Preliminary remark:

For us as a church, reflecting on the possibilities of peaceful coexistence between Israel and Palestine from a theological-church perspective is both an ongoing task and an innermost concern. Beyond entrenched attributions and positioning in society as well as in the church, we are looking for a language that is as consensual as possible in the discourse on one of the most difficult areas of conflict, the relationship between Israel and Palestine as well as our relationship to both. The memory of the Shoah motivates our commitment to overcoming anti-Semitism and theological anti-Judaism as well as our advocacy for universal human rights. In the run-up to the WCC World Assembly in Karlsruhe in 2022, we can expect a renewed focus on the Israel-Palestine issue. The host churches would do well to formulate points of departure for the talks with the churches of the ecumenical movement on the basis of the convictions gained in long years of dialogue work".

A variety of motives suggest themselves:

- The conflict between Israelis and Palestinians has not lost its sharpness in recent years. On the one hand, the Israeli settlement policy and checkpoints, the course of the separation wall and the daily burdens of the occupation restrict the lives of Palestinians. On the other

1 Please note, that the following text of the Guiding Thoughts is a translation of Rob van Drimmelen, not an official version of the responsible churches. This is still in preparation. The original German can be found under <https://www.ekiba.de/media/download/integration/400975/gespraechsimpuls.pdf>. Also the comments and queries of the Kairos Palestine Solidarity Network were translated by van Drimmelen.

hand, many in Israel live in fear for the continued existence of their state in the midst of a hostile environment; they see their lives threatened by rocket fire and terrorist attacks. Dialogue and exchange have all but come to a standstill; instead, the political fronts are hardening - also within Israeli society, as the conflicts between Arab and Jewish Israelis in the early summer of 2021 showed.

The first sentence of the motives read in the original draft: "Israeli settlement policy and checkpoints, the course of the separation wall and the daily burdens of the occupation constrict the lives of Palestinians to the point of being unbearable." If the Guiding Thoughts and Theses in its final Version don't want to openly speak about the reality they should at least say: Even many observers who feel committed to Israel understand the practice of occupation, especially the policy of settlements as oppression.

The wording "on the one hand - on the other hand" show that the churches on the Rhine and Ruhr consistently give the impression in this document that it is a "conflict" between equal partners. In any case the rockets of the Hamas must be rejected.² But the Israeli "New Historians" have documented for decades, after the opening of the military archives, that the Zionist forces have forcibly expelled the Palestinians since before the proclamation of the state of Israel with superior military force and supported or at least tolerated by the Western powers and at that time also the Soviet Union, and continue this expulsion every day thereafter as the state of Israel. Today this happens daily with various means. Israel gradually expropriates the land under occupation that is illegal under international law, keeps people including children arbitrarily and sometimes under torture in prisons.³ It destroys houses and commits other human rights violations with impunity. So there is an extreme asymmetry of power.⁴ Why do the churches follow the myth developed to ward off criticism, that Israel's existence is endangered from the outside. Indeed, there are hostile powers in the region like Iran. But Israel is the vastly superior regional military power, the only one in the region to possess nuclear weapons and, moreover, is not only generally supported by the superpower USA, but also receives \$3.8 billion a year in military aid and geopolitical cover for its flanks. Why don't the churches follow the Jewish and Israeli voices that see Israel's existence endangered by the fact that this state betrays Jewish values and builds on violence? Certainly, there have been attempts at peace policies in the past, such as those of former Prime Minister Rabin, but his assassination shows how strong the opposing forces were and still are.

2 For a detailed understanding of this problem cf. BAUMGARTEN, Helga: *Kein Frieden für Palästina. Der lange Krieg gegen Gaza. Besatzung und Widerstand*. Wien: Promedia, 2021.

3 Cf. among others the Amnesty report 2020/21: "Members of the Israeli army and the police, and the secret service ISA keep torturing and mistreat Palestinian prisoners including children without being prosecuted for it. Methods included beatings, slaps, painful restraints, sleep deprivation, remaining in painful positions, and threats that violence would be done to family members. As a punitive measure, detainees were placed in solitary confinement for long periods of time, sometimes for months at a time" (<https://www.amnesty.de/informieren/amnesty-report/israel-2020>).

4 In note 6, the final version refers to the issue of asymmetry, but relativizes it.

In this country, the conflict in the Middle East is reflected in a polarisation of discussions. Defamation, attributions and exclusions dominate the picture instead of listening to each other and exploring possible solutions and compromises in dialogue.

Are the churches on the Rhine and Ruhr aware that this is not only an "illustration" but also a deliberate poisoning by the Israeli government? Since 2009, after the Boycott, Disinvestment and Sanctions (BDS) initiative reached international attention, Israel developed a propaganda programme (Hasbara in Hebrew) in the Ministry of Strategic Affairs. This had an annual budget of 100 million shekels and set up "institutes" such as the Mena Institute in Vienna, recruited people, especially among students at universities, paid journalists, etc. Now it has been abolished and we will see how the propaganda develops further. Anyway, it is important to know this background for some unnecessary polarization.⁵

"Apartheid", "ethnic cleansing", "racism", "colonialism", "genocide" easily become labels that replace differentiated analysis.

It is precisely these concepts that are dealt with in many books and reports with "differentiated analysis". Yes, these are the central terms and facts that are at the forefront of the current international debate, as a recently published scholarly work explicitly states: "Three terms are what determine both the current scholarly discussion and, at least selectively, the political discourse around the nakba: settler colonialism, ethnic cleansing and the apartheid system."⁶

Apartheid: *Are the UN, leading international law scholars, human rights institutes and organisations credible witnesses for a "differentiated analytics"? Do B'tselem and Human Rights Watch count among them?⁷ Already in 2017, the UN Commission on West Asia published the report: Israeli Practices towards the Palestinian People and the Question of Apartheid.⁸ It clarified that apartheid is not limited to the one model of South Africa, but is a legal phenomenon characterised by different features, which constitutes a crime against humanity. Although in 2017 the State of Israel had not yet*

5 There are various reports on this, for example by the respected English newspaper The Guardian: <https://www.theguardian.com/news/2018/aug/14/bds-boycott-divestment-sanctions-movement-transformed-israeli-palestinian-debate>.

6

BAUMGARTEN, Helga: op.cit., p. 32.

7

E.g. https://www.btselem.org/publications/fulltext/202101_this_is_apartheid;
<https://mailchi.mp/a19604d9765e/bip-aktuell-169-human-rights-watch-beschuldigt-israel-der-apartheid?e=ac01a21ac6>

8

<https://web.archive.org/web/20170316054753/https://www.unescwa.org/sites/www.unescwa.org/files/publications/files/israeli-practices-palestinian-people-apartheid-occupation-english.pdf>.

adopted the Nation State Law of 2018, the UN Commission proved even then the clear apartheid character of Israel. How much more is this true now.

The aforementioned Nation-State Law clearly denies equal citizenship rights to an ethnic group comprising 20% of the population and only makes Jewish residents equal citizens. The colonies ("settlements") in the occupied West Bank, which are illegal under international law, are connected to the State of Israel by a network of roads "for Israelis only". Israelis have the right to a civilian justice system, Palestinians are subject to military courts etc. etc.

Ethnic cleansing: *The term was first applied to Israel by the Israeli "New Historians". They worked through the military archives, opened a good three decades ago, e.g. Ilan Pappé in his book "The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine".⁹ This crime was originally processed under the Zionist term "transfer".¹⁰ It is important to understand that the reality of ethnic cleansing continues to this day. The progressive expropriation of Palestinian land, the ongoing construction of colonies, demolition of houses, settler terror against Palestinians, etc. are all methods of progressively cleansing the land of its original Arab inhabitants.*

Racism *is another word that the churches want to avoid. This should indeed be done if the term is understood biologically. However, it is also understood ethnically in science with regard to the Middle East. In this sense one can refer to what was said about apartheid. But in addition, the book by the Israeli scholar Nurit Peled Elhanan "Palestine in Israeli Schoolbooks" should be mentioned, which shows the ethnic prejudices to which Israeli children are already educated in school.¹¹*

Colonialism *is the next taboo. Here, too, scholarship is unequivocal, in two respects: first, with regard to the colonial framework of the founding of the State of Israel, and second, with regard to ongoing settler colonialism. At least since the Balfour Declaration in 1917, British colonial rule has been the framework for Zionist efforts to found a state.¹² Who else but the British Mandate allowed the Zionist military units to expel a quarter of a million Palestinians from Palestine as a first act of ethnic cleansing after the UN decision to partition Palestine in Nov. 1947 until the founding of the State of Israel on 15 May 1948? What does the expropriation of the Palestinians and the expansion of the colonies in the West Bank since 1967, in violation of international*

9 Oxford: Oneworld, 2006.

10 See MASALHA, Nur: *The Expulsion of the Palestinians: The Concept of 'Transfer' in Zionist Political Thought, 1882-1948*. Washington, D.C.: Institute of Palestinian Studies, 1992.

11 London: I.B. Tauris, 2012.

12 Recent research even shows that since the mid-19th century, Christian Zionists from England incited and instrumentalized Jews to Zionism in order to open up the Middle East for the British Empire and to prevent Jews fleeing persecution in Russia and Poland from seeking asylum in England. Cf. RAHEB, Mitri: *The Politics of Persecution: Middle Eastern Christians in an Age of Empire*. Waco, TX, USA: Baylor University Press, 2021, 57ff. with further literature.

*law, mean other than classical settler colonialism, as it has been clearly defined in countless studies also on North America, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand?*¹³

*Finally, **genocide**. Here, the majority of scientists are indeed convinced that this term is inappropriate.*

Nevertheless, the exclusion of the other central facts, which are dismissed as labels, gives the impression that the churches are afraid to speak out about reality and to deal with it argumentatively within the framework of ecumenism.

Likewise, disqualifying legitimate criticism of government policy in Israel as anti-Semitic suggests all-too-fast conclusive judgements. There is an urgent need to clarify the language by means of a perception of what is happening that is as differentiated as possible.

Here it is to be welcomed that the guiding ideas and theses at least do not want to go along with the now common suspicion in Germany of criticism of Israeli policy as "Israel-related anti-Semitism". But has the discussion on this not already moved on? Couldn't the churches have pointed out that here, too, studies have shown that the definition of anti-Semitism by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA), from which this term originates, is one of the main causes for this misuse of the accusation of anti-Semitism.¹⁴ Also missing is a reference to the "Jerusalem Declaration on Anti-Semitism" by international anti-Semitism researchers, which was published months ago and should be interpreted as a necessary correction or better still as a replacement for the IHRA definition.¹⁵ Could the churches perhaps even have the prophetic task here of calling on the German government to part with the IHRA definition and adopt the JDA definition in order to end the poisoning of the atmosphere in the German public through the misuse of the accusation of anti-Semitism?

13 Incidentally, land grabbing is often linked to murder, such as on 5 February 2021, when settlers gunned down an unarmed 34-year-old Palestinian family man when he protested against them confiscating his land to build a "wild settlement" on it (Junge Welt, 6/7 February 2021, 6). There are countless other examples.

14 Cf. https://www.rosalux.de/fileadmin/rls_uploads/pdfs/rls_papers/Papers_2-2019_Antisemitismus.pdf and <https://www.progressiveisraelnetwork.org/progressive-israel-network-groups-oppose-codification-of-ihra-working-definition-of-antisemitism-citing-strong-potential-for-misuse/>. In addition, when the German government adopted the IHRA's definition of anti-Semitism in September 2017, it tacitly expanded the core definition to include the first sentence of the transitional paragraph on examples: "Manifestations of anti-Semitism can also be directed against the state of Israel, which is thereby understood as a Jewish collective". However, the second sentence in the IHRA text was deliberately omitted: "However, criticism of Israel that is comparable to that of other countries cannot be considered anti-Semitic." This means that in Germany the manipulated IHRA definition is once again manipulated in order to immediately portray any criticism of Israel as illegitimate.

15 See <https://jerusalemdeclaration.org/>.

The controversy surrounding the Bundestag resolution of 17 May 2019 on the connection between the BDS movement and anti-Semitism continues to fuel the polarised debate.

Does this wording imply a hidden criticism of the Bundestag's decision? If so, this should have been clearly stated. After all, the European Court of Human Rights has condemned the French government, which had also violated the fundamental right of freedom of expression and called BDS anti-Semitic and acted accordingly. All German courts have also condemned cities and institutions that acted on the basis of the Bundestag resolution and, for example, cancelled premises for BDS events. Why don't the churches clearly stand up for fundamental rights like the large number of German cultural institutions in their initiative GG 5.3 Weltoffenheit (openness to the world)?¹⁶

The Kairos Palestine Document of December 2009, which was received with great attention and controversially discussed at the time, calls for a re-examination of the topic after 10 years since its publication.

This recommendation is very welcome. But why have the churches on the Rhine not explicitly included here the continuation of the Kairos-Palestine Document? Although all church leaders were personally handed the "Cry for Hope: Call to Decision and Action" by Kairos Palestine and Global Kairos for Justice at vigils on 27 June 2020, this document is not even mentioned.¹⁷ But it is expected to play a central role in the debates of the WCC Assembly 2022 in Karlsruhe. For it has raised the conversation on this issue to a new theological level. Following Bonhoeffer, it calls for the recognition that the persistent negation of the rights of a people group and the pseudo-theological justification for it affect the faith, the credibility of the Gospel and the very being of the church itself (in Bonhoeffer's language: constitute a status confessionis).¹⁸ This puts the denial of Palestinian rights and the justification of this injustice through the misuse of the Bible on the same level as apartheid and the pseudo-theological justification of the apartheid system in the former South Africa (cf. the declaration of the Lutheran World Federation on apartheid as a status confessionis in 1977 and the condemnation of apartheid as heresy by the World Alliance of Reformed Churches in 1982).

This basic question is linked in the Cry for Hope with 7 demands for action, the first of which is that the churches should organise processes of clarification at all levels in order to then come to a common decision. In the meantime, several churches from the USA and the UK have responded to this, partly in confessional form.¹⁹ These decisions were known to the authors.

16 See https://www.humboldtforum.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/201210_PlaedoyerFuerWeltoffenheit.pdf.

17 See <https://cryforhope.org/>.

18 See BONHOEFFER, Dietrich: Die Kirche vor der Judenfrage (1933). *DBW 12*. München : Kaiser, 1997, pp. 349-58.

19 See below p.16f.

The worried view of the Middle East is overshadowed by the unabated, even blatantly demonstrated hostility towards Jews in this country and worldwide. It must be perceived with the utmost sensitivity where old and new forms of flaring anti-Semitism on the one hand and the critical view of the Israeli-Palestinian relationship on the other intertwine in an inadmissible way.

This is a very legitimate concern. The Jerusalem Declaration on Anti-Semitism in particular warns that falsely labelling criticism of the State of Israel as anti-Semitism weakens the fight against real anti-Semitism.

This paper aims to provide impulses for further discourse. It is intended as a position paper which has been prepared in the specialist departments of the five regional churches in Baden, Hessen-Nassau, the Palatinate, the Rhineland and Westphalia, and which has been endorsed by the church leaderships concerned as a basis for further discussion.

GUIDING PRINCIPLE 1 - WHERE WE COME FROM

From their origins, the churches remain in the history of the promise of God's first chosen people Israel as well as in the ecumenical fellowship of all Christendom.

THESIS 1/1

Connection with Judaism

The Church of Jesus Christ is inseparably connected with Judaism. Jesus himself was a Jew, the "early church" around Peter lived in a Jewish self-understanding and regarded Jesus as the Messiah promised in Judaism. Paul describes the relationship of the Church to Judaism with the image of grafted branches on the trunk of the olive tree. In Jesus Christ, Christians are included in the history of God's promise to his people, which begins with Abraham and ends in the completion of the kingdom of God.

THESIS 1/2

Interconnectedness of worldwide Christianity

Christians are connected to the various Christian denominations worldwide as members of one body. From the one original church around the disciples of Jesus, various currents of Christianity have already formed through the journeys of Paul, which have manifested themselves in the course of the next centuries in a multitude of different cultural expressions. Ecumenical Christianity in all its various members finds its unity in referring back to the common ground in Jesus Christ. In our understanding, this implies the essential reference of the Church to Judaism.

There is consensus in this general form of expression. At most, one could have mentioned that according to Paul, it is precisely the antagonism of Jews and peoples that is overcome in the Messiah Jesus (Gal 3:26-28).

GUIDING PRINCIPLE 2 - WHAT WE HOLD FAST TO

We recognise the inseparable relationship of the Jewish people to the land of promise with Jerusalem at its centre. For Christians, too, this land - and Jerusalem - is of special dignity as a place of divine self-disclosure and the motherland of the Christian faith. We respect the deep connection also of the Palestinian churches with the land of the Bible.²⁰

20 (In the original note 2) In the discourse, one is reminded of the formulation of the Regional Church in the Palatinate (1995), which stands paradigmatically for many others in the Evangelical Church in Germany: "Through its Lord Jesus Christ, it (sc. the Regional Church) knows that it is taken

THESIS 2/1

Jewish self-understanding

The Christian Church recognises Jewish self-understanding. According to this, four fundamental aspects are given in the term "Israel": Religion, people, land and, by derivation, state. These four dimensions cannot be separated from each other, but they must also be carefully distinguished. "When Christians stand up for the right of the Jewish people to live in the land of the fathers, they respect that the connection between people and land is indispensable for Judaism. Insofar as the State of Israel has an indispensable safeguarding function for this, Christians affirm this state. However, insofar as the State of Israel is a secular state in the community of nations, it is subject to the same criteria as all other states with regard to its borders and its policy towards non-Jewish parts of the population". (EKD study Christians and Jews II, 1991, page 57) We struggle to find a way between a complete profanation and a religious-fundamentalist exaltation of Israel's history.

The theological question of the relationship of the churches to the State of Israel plays a central role in this consensus paper. The answers are ambiguous. It is to be acknowledged that the paper honestly admits the reason for this: "We are struggling to find a way between a complete profanation and a religious-fundamentalist exaltation of Israel's history".

On the one hand, we read in note 2 (here note 20): "Every insistence on a particular claim to the land fails if the universal horizon - that 'salvation for all people' - is lost from view. This land, which is inscribed in the basic narrative of Jewish identity, is also the motherland of ecumenical Christianity; furthermore, Jerusalem is also regarded in Islam as a place where heaven and earth touch. The particularity in the land reference has with it, from the biblical beginnings, another dimension, the universal opening of the land to the community of all peoples." This is clearly a basic biblical view, starting with the promise to Abraham in Gen. 12, which explicitly aims at all peoples being blessed in him.²¹

*However, this progress is undone in Thesis 2/1. And here lies the basic problem of the Guiding Thoughts and the Theses: They claim that **the Jewish self-understanding exists and that they have the right to define it. But are they not in fact limiting Judaism to Zionism, and even more so to a single form of it, namely the violent one, without justifying this? Until the Holocaust, the vast majority of Jews were hostile to Zionism, even seeing it as a disaster for Judaism. And increasingly, voices in Judaism are gaining***

into God's history of promise with his chosen people Israel - for salvation for all people. In other words, any insistence on a particular claim to the land will fail if the universal horizon - that "salvation for all people" - is lost from view. This land, which is inscribed in the basic narrative of Jewish identity, is also the motherland of ecumenical Christianity; furthermore, Jerusalem is also regarded in Islam as a place where heaven and earth touch. From its biblical beginnings, the particularity of the land has a further dimension with it, the universal opening of the land to the community of all peoples. The Palestinian churches, as it were, assert this universal horizon of reference to the land on behalf of Christianity.

21 See ISAAC, Munther: From land to lands, from Eden to the renewed earth: a Christ-centred biblical theology of the promised land. Carlisle/UK: Langham Monographs, 2015, and id.: *The Other Side of the Wall. A Palestinian Christian Narrative of Lament and Hope*. Downers Grove, IL., USA: InterVarsity Press, 2020.

weight that only see a way out of the impasse of current politics if the State of Israel is de-Zionised ("unlearning Zionism") and becomes a democratic state with equal rights for all. The Jewish historian Yakov M. Rabkin has presented a wealth of sources for this, analysed them and brought them into conversation with political developments: "A Threat From Within: A Century of Jewish Opposition to Zionism."²² Here, in brief, are his findings:

Zionism emerged as a negation of traditional Judaism. Central to this was a change in behaviour towards violence. Russian Jews in particular saw their hopes of integration into Russian society dashed by pogroms. Theodor Herzl suffered a similar fate in Western Europe, especially as a result of the Dreyfus trial. Out of injured dignity and the feeling of shame, the image of the "new Jew" emerged, who "like the other peoples" focuses on honour, pride, nation and power. This is why militaristic Zionism increasingly gained the upper hand and was later conceptualised by Vladimir Jabotinsky and put into practice since David Ben Gurion, the first Prime Minister of the State of Israel.

There had been an attempt to implement another form of Zionism. The pious Jews, who had lived in peace with the Arabs in Palestine for centuries, were strongly opposed to Zionism. Together with Arab leaders, they drew up a document in 1924 in which the Arabs agreed to mass Jewish immigration on the condition that it would not establish nationalist structures - a notion roughly equivalent to the Zionism of a Martin Buber. When the Dutchman Jacob de Haan was commissioned to have this agreement ratified by the British Mandate government in London, he was assassinated by an agent of the Zionist paramilitary organisation Haganah shortly before he left for London. That was the end of the attempts to put peaceful Zionism into practice. Count Bernadotte suffered a similar fate when he was supposed to implement the UN decisions in Israel in 1947/48. He too was murdered. This violent Zionism has been the guiding principle of the State of Israel through the Nakba of 1947/48, the occupation since 1967, the provocation of the second Intifada by Ariel Sharon, the architect of the separation wall, up to Netanyahu and the religious Zionist-led new government. After all, as mentioned above, there was also pragmatic Zionism, open to peace - but again ended with murder. In this regard, Rabkin writes: "For his role in the Middle East peace process, Rabin was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1994, together with Yasser Arafat and Shimon Peres; in 1995 he was assassinated by the right-wing extremist Yigal Amir" (424).

Increasingly, Israeli Jews and Jews from other countries are taking up such critical reconsiderations from a Torah perspective.²³ Especially in the USA and in Israel itself, a strong movement in the Jewish community away from the ruling government policies

22 London and New York: Zed Books, 2006.

23 See e.g. MARX, Rabbi Dalia: *Durch das jüdische Jahr*. Leipzig: Hentrich & Hentrich, 2021, 41ff., who, referring to the Feast of Tabernacles, warns against "aggressive use of power" and recalls Lev 19:23-24. In Chicago a Jewish congregation declared itself as "anti.zionist": https://mondoweiss.net/2022/01/why-anti-zionism-is-core-value-of-congregation-tzedekchicago/?utm_source=mailpoet&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=daily-email-mailpoet

is visible - also among Zionists. Many recent publications prove this.²⁴ In Germany, Rolf Verleger stands for this with his book "Hundred Years of Homeland? Judaism and Israel between Love of the Neighbour and Nationalism".²⁵ The initiatives "Jewish Voice for Justice in the Middle East" and "European Jews for a Just Peace" also work in this direction. Their aim is to ensure that justice is finally done for the Palestinians, but at the same time that the State of Israel does not destroy itself and continue to cause great damage to Jews and Judaism worldwide. One of the latest testimonies of this awareness among Jewish people is the Open Letter of 60 18-year-old Israeli conscripts. It says: "In reality, the goal of the Israeli military is not to defend itself from hostile militaries, but to exercise control over a civilian population....the Zionist policy of brutal violence towards and expulsion of Palestinians from their homes and lands began in 1948 and has not stopped since. The occupation is also poisoning Israeli society-it is violent, militaristic, oppressive, and chauvinistic. It is our duty to oppose this destructive reality by uniting our struggles and refusing to serve these violent systems-chief among them the military. Our refusal to enlist to the military is not an act of turning our backs on Israeli society. On the contrary, our refusal is an act of taking responsibility over our actions and their repercussions."²⁶

*Should the churches on the Rhine and Ruhr also begin a Christian-Jewish conversation with these Jewish brothers and sisters who are committed to justice and non-violence, or do they want to take the side of violent Zionism one-sidedly by not even raising this question and speaking of **the** Jewish-Israeli position?*

THESIS 2/2

Palestinian Christian self-understanding

We recognise the call of Palestinian Christians, together with the entire Palestinian people, for an undiminished right to life and political self-determination. Out of a centuries-old bond with this land, they demand their right to live in state autonomy. United in the one body of Christ, we share in the continuing affliction of our Christian brothers and sisters and suffer with them, for "where one member suffers, all the members suffer with it" (1 Cor 12:26).⁴

What deeds follow these words?

THESIS 2/3

State sovereignty

As Christians, we know ourselves to be closely connected with the State of Israel, which is the refuge and home of most Jews all over the world. At the same time, we support and strengthen the Palestinians' striving for a sovereign state: spiritually, morally, materially and politically. The perspective for coexistence under the formula of the two-state solution in mutual respect and

²⁴ Cf. BEINHART, Peter: *The Crisis of Zionism*. New York: Times Books, 2012; BOEHM, Omri: *A future for Israel : beyond the two-state solution*. New York City: New York Review Books, 2020; HALPER, Jeff: *Decolonizing Israel, Liberating Palestine. Zionism, Settler Colonialism, and the Case for One Democratic State*. London: Pluto Press, 2021.

²⁵ *Hundert Jahre Heimatland? Judentum und Israel zwischen Nächstenliebe und Nationalismus*. Frankfurt/Main: Westend, 2017.

²⁶ <https://mondoweiss.net/2021/01/israeli-high-school-students-refuse-to-join-the-israeli-military-citing-the-continuing-nakba/>

recognition seems to have receded into the distant future. No matter what political models are developed by the parties to the conflict, there will be no sustainable solution to the conflict without the widely agreed path in the international community of states via "the recognition of Palestinian statehood as well" (EKiR Synodal Resolution 2016). "There can only be peace in Israel and Palestine if Israel's right to exist is recognised in the same way as the Palestinian people's right to their own state." (From the resolution of the Synod of the EKvW, 11/2017 on "Israel and Palestine") In all this, we hear the admonition from the biblical word that the gift of the land for all who dwell in it is linked to the demand for justice and mutual respect.

The first question is: what does the statement "As Christians, we know ourselves to be closely connected with the State of Israel, which is the refuge and home of most Jews all over the world" mean? Firstly, many Jews would reject this statement. After all, not even half of them live in the State of Israel. Secondly, does the sentence mean that it is a question of faith ("as Christians") to be committed to the State of Israel? How can it be a matter of faith to be associated with a state? Moreover, anti- and non-Zionist Jews say that because the State of Israel relies solely on violence, it is the most dangerous place in the world for Jews.

It is to be welcomed that the churches on the Rhine and Ruhr also want to represent the rights of the Palestinians in an advocacy-political way. But doesn't this require a clear political analysis? At least since Likud has ruled in Israel, a real two-state solution was never intended. And Netanyahu has since said publicly that there never will be. What does it mean that the West, and with it the churches on the Rhine and Ruhr, still claim to be in favour of a two-state solution? Can it not only mean that they do not want to take any measures to persuade Israel to find a solution, but that they want to continue to tolerate with rhetorical formulations that Israel continues to expropriate piece after piece of Palestinian land?

An economic and political analysis would show that Israel is only able to maintain and, above all, finance the illegal and systematic oppression of the Palestinian people because the USA and the EU - especially Germany - give their support unconditionally without tying it to compliance with human rights and international law.²⁷ Shouldn't the churches, if they were serious about their advocacy, approach the German government and demand that all further economic, financial and military support and cooperation be tied to compliance with the UN resolutions under international law and the Charter of Human Rights?

GUIDING PRINCIPLE 3 - WHAT WE SEE CRITICALLY

In view of the dwindling willingness to compromise, the fronts are hardening in this country as well, the threads of dialogue are breaking, the possibilities for understanding are dwindling, and positions are diverging to the point of becoming irreconcilable. The discourse on Israel-Palestine is increasingly becoming a verbal battleground in which contextualisation and differentiation no longer have a place.

THESIS 3/1

²⁷ See LE MORE, Anne: Killing with kindness: funding the demise of a Palestinian state. *In: International Affairs* 81 (5.10. 2005) Nr. 5, pp. 981–999.

Yes to an open, differentiated discourse.

We expressly stand for a discourse without prohibitions of thought and speech according to the standards of a free, democratic society. In the heated current debate, right up to our political decision-making bodies, we must insist on a differentiation between anti-Semitism on the one hand and a critical view of the respective government policy of the State of Israel on the other. Where such criticism uses anti-Semitic forms of expression, it meets with our vigorous resistance. Open discourse also includes a critical view of the policies of the Palestinian ruling elites. We are aware of the longing of the people in Palestine for freedom, fundamental rights, the rule of law and democracy. We recall sentences from the Baden and Hessen-Nassau response letters to the Kairos document: "Wherever international law is clearly disregarded by actions of Israeli or Palestinian state authorities, this must be called by its name without reservation. (EKiBa) "Unjust structures that fundamentally restrict human rights ... contradict the message of God's merciful love towards all people and cannot be accepted." (EKHN)

Once again, the differentiation between anti-Semitism and criticism of the state of Israel is to be welcomed. But what does it mean if, at the same time, the policies of the Palestinian leadership elites are again criticised in a balanced way, as if it were a matter of symmetrical violations of international law and human rights? Would it not then be necessary to examine more closely how the regrettable split in the Palestinian leadership came about and how it was centrally caused by the West and Israel?²⁸ In 2006, supervised and absolutely democratic elections took place in Palestine. Because the West and Israel, which call themselves democracies, considered their interests more important than democracy, they did not recognise the election because Hamas won. This resulted in the final split of the Palestinian leadership. Not that it does not have to be criticised like any other government, but does one not have to include in the analysis that it is acting under military dictatorial conditions and has to constantly decide how to implement the right of resistance guaranteed under international law?

THESIS 3/2

No to a comprehensive boycott of Israel

We hear the call of the Palestinians who ask us for means to oppose the illegally built settlements on the territory occupied by Israel. We recognise boycott measures as a legitimate non-violent form of political resistance against actions that violate international law worldwide. For example, the current EU legislation, according to which goods from the occupied territories are in principle subject to compulsory labelling, enables corresponding decisions to be taken. At the same time, we reject a total boycott of Israel as demanded by the BDS movement (cf. statements by the EKD of 29 February and the EKIR of 6 March 2020), because it indiscriminately affects an entire collective and excludes any cooperation with Israelis, which weakens precisely those forces that are working for justice and peace in Israel itself. For us as German churches, this rejection is also justified by the disastrous history of boycotts against Jews in Germany.

Once again, BDS is rejected with questionable arguments. No one has to approve of every part of BDS. Many are limiting the boycott to goods from the occupied territories, that is, companies that profit from the occupation. The EU officially requires the labelling of these goods. So it is not at all reprehensible to enable consumers not to buy such goods and to call for this. With regard to BDS in general, it should be recognized as a basis for judgment: BDS demands nothing other than compliance with UN resolutions, i.e. international law and human rights:

28 See. Baumgarten, Op. cit.

1. ending the occupation and colonisation of all Arab lands occupied in 1967 and tearing down the wall.
2. recognition of the fundamental rights of Arab Palestinian citizens of Israel to full equality.
3. respect, uphold and support the right of Palestinian refugees, as stipulated in UN Resolution 194, to return to their homes and to be compensated for loss or damage to their property or for compensation in the event that they do not wish to return?

*In our opinion, it is also a misrepresentation to claim that the BDS boycott "indiscriminately affects an entire collective and excludes any cooperation with Israelis". The official version is: "BOYCOTTS involve withdrawing support from Israel's apartheid regime, **complicit** Israeli sporting, cultural and academic institutions, and from all Israeli and international companies engaged in violations of Palestinian human rights." So it is only about those sporting, cultural and academic institutions that directly represent the state or are directly or indirectly linked to it. Even if individuals in the BDS movement, which is not a tightly run organization, may see it differently, the majority of BDS supporters do not boycott, for example, Israeli academics, journalists, artists etc. who work in critical independence.²⁹ Moreover, the fact that the Theses again make reference to the Nazi boycott puts non-violent Gandhi methods with regard to the enforcement of international law in the State of Israel on the same level as Hitler's crimes against the Jewish people.*

THESIS 3/3

No to the instrumentalisation of religion for political power claims

Neither quotations from holy scriptures nor religious traditions can legitimise disenfranchisement and discrimination or justify geopolitical claims to power at the expense of law and justice. This applies both to a biblically based claim to ownership of the land, as found among "Christian Zionists" or Israeli settlers, as well as to the claim of an exclusively Islamic land, e.g. by Hamas. We reject such positions as hostile to dialogue and aggravating the conflict.

These are welcome statements. Precisely for this reason, the following queries: Why do the churches not say directly that the ruling classes in Israel are doing exactly what is rejected in the first sentence, namely using biblical quotations to "legitimise disenfranchisement and discrimination or justify geopolitical claims to power at the expense of law and justice". Meanwhile, the government officially refers to the West Bank as Judea and Samaria, justifying its systematic ongoing land grab. Why don't the churches call a spade a spade on this as a political misuse of the Bible, as does the Cry for Hope, which calls on churches to reject this, along with the systematic disenfranchisement of Palestinians, as an issue of confession?

The rejection of Christian Zionism is also to be welcomed. It is to be welcomed that the churches thus implicitly depart from the synod resolution of the Rhenish Church of 1980, which stated: "The insight that the continued existence of the Jewish people, its return to the land of promise and also the establishment of the state of Israel are signs of God's faithfulness to his people". As late as 2020, the Rhenish Church invoked that 1980 resolution to justify its rejection of Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) on the basis of God's faithfulness. Mind you, this is not about God's faithfulness to his first-chosen people, but about God's alleged faithfulness to the State of Israel. Since

²⁹ Cf. <https://bdsmovement.net/what-is-bds>.

this is asserted as a general insight, and not as an opinion or statement of faith, it means that all people must then realise that the ethnic cleansing of three quarters of a million Palestinians and their existence as refugees since then, including the massacres and destruction of 530 villages and several towns during the Nakba, as well as the ongoing theft of land, arbitrary arrests and torture even of children, are all signs of God's faithfulness. What would be the biblical basis for such "insights"? What is the meaning here of Jesus' word that the meek will inherit the land? And what do such Jews say to these claims who are not among the violent Zionists? Are the churches prepared not only to address these questions implicitly, as they have done here, but to pose them openly and in a theologically fundamental way to the Rhenish Church and to themselves?

GUIDING PRINCIPLE 4 - WHAT WE STAND FOR

We rally around the vision of an unchallenged and recognised State of Israel living side by side with a free and sovereign State of Palestine in the midst of a pacified Middle East. Those who strive non-violently to achieve this goal have our undivided support.

These sentences are surprising in view of the fact that they say the opposite of what these Guiding Thoughts and Theses represent: the rejection of non-violent resistance against injustice and oppression and the justification in principle of a state which, on the one hand, exercises violence like any state, but in this particular case has been based on partly terrorist violence since its foundation and does not recognise international law and human rights, although it owes its existence to them. What do the churches say to these obvious questions?

THESIS 4/1

Shalom over Israel

The well-being of Israel is close to our hearts. We reaffirm our solidarity with Israel and unreservedly affirm the right of the State of Israel to exist. We express our hope and pray for a reconciled coexistence of Jewish and Palestinian people in the Holy Land in a just and fair peace for all. Believing in the changeability of entrenched conditions, we rely on the support and promotion of all forces and initiatives that enable encounters and serve peace. This applies especially to groups, institutions and schools that are committed to promoting humanity, solidarity and social acceptance.

Israel's existence is based on the UN decisions of 1947 and therefore on international law. Therefore, it is only endangered by the disregard of international law. Shouldn't the existence of the Palestinian people also be called to mind at this point? For according to human judgement, it is this that is in danger, not that of the State of Israel. It is gratifying to hear that the churches "support the promotion of all forces and initiatives that enable encounters and serve peace". Does this also mean the non-Zionist organisations, such as in Germany the "Jewish Voice for Just Peace in the Middle East" or the "Alliance for Justice between Israelis and Palestinians" (BIP)?

THESIS 4/2

Cooperation with the Palestinian churches

The welfare of the Palestinians is equally close to our hearts. In consensus with the member churches of the Evangelical Church in Germany, the Protestant Regional Churches on the Rhine and Ruhr reaffirm their solidarity with their Palestinian brothers and sisters, and hold with all intensity to

the cooperation in the civil-social-diaconal sphere which has grown over many years and decades. We appreciate the impulses from Palestinian theology and seek a fraternal exchange with the Palestinian churches about the contextuality of theology, here and there. We pay particular attention to where our respective theologies run the risk of perpetuating old patterns of replacement and substitution of God's people under new auspices. As churches of the Word, we seek guidance primarily from the biblical Word in each specific context.

Why doesn't the headline say, by analogy with the previous paragraph, "Shalom on the Palestinian churches"? By such small stylistic subtleties one reveals very much. The "equally" is thus immediately denied. Nevertheless, the cooperations mentioned here are to be welcomed, even if the political level is excluded. But again, Palestinian theology is accused of replacement theology. This accusation is simply based on the fact that, like many Jews, it does not read the Bible in a Zionist way, but in a way that is oriented towards the Torah, the prophets and Jesus. Therefore, the question to the churches on the Rhine and Ruhr is: Do they take into account the difference between a Zionist and a non-Zionist reading of the Bible and are they also prepared to read the Bible with non-Zionist Jews and Christians and, if convincing arguments are found, to change their Zionist reading? If the German churches and especially their leaders are interested in knowing what a Palestinian patriarch and representatives of world Christianity have to say about this, watching the film "The People's Patriarch" and listening to the statements on it is recommended.³⁰

THESIS 4/3

Call for justice and peace for Israel and Palestine

We want to contribute to the growth of justice and peace in Israel and Palestine: We reaffirm the commitment to promote and strengthen actors and initiatives in the region that are ready for dialogue and reconciliation. We believe that God's directive is, at its core, for justice and peace for all people.

How is it then that the churches on the Rhine and Ruhr do not propose a single concrete political or economic measure that could help to implement justice for all people in Palestine/Israel?

We expect from the responsible politicians on both sides readiness for negotiations and openness to compromise solutions.(6) We call for an end to the continued construction of settlements and concrete efforts to end the occupation.

What concrete means of pressure do the churches want to use to achieve this, since it is obvious that Israel wants to annex the entire West Bank step by step - except perhaps a few reserves?

We reaffirm the statement of the Evangelical Middle East Commission of 28.5.2020: Any unilateral annexation cements injustice and fuels violence.

What actions do the churches propose to take against this?

30 See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-CkiiAlToos>.

We call for clear steps towards political autonomy for Palestine as well as a renunciation of terror and violence of any kind. We urge all parties in the region to respect human rights and the international law of the international community.

What actions follow these words?

GUIDING PRINCIPLE 5 - WHAT WE EXPECT

"... that justice and peace kiss each other" (Psalm 85:11). Biblically based hope is directed towards justice and peace. In this hope we support political steps that come closer to conflict resolution.

THESIS 5/1

High time for justice and peace

The letter of response from Baden to the authors of the Kairos document from 2010 closes with words which, from the point of view of our churches, have lost none of their topicality. However, we relate them even more self-critically to us as Western churches with all our entanglements in the global power structures - these words are for us both a greeting to our brothers and sisters and a plea to God: "It is time for peace in Israel and Palestine. It is time for a "no" without any "yes" to all acts of violence and bending of the law on all sides of the conflict.

Why are the concrete entanglements of the Western churches, especially in Germany, not mentioned here? Once again: only through the unconditional political support and financing of Israel by the West can this state implement the oppression of the Palestinians. Therefore, the churches in these countries are directly co-responsible and complicit by their silence on this fact.

THESIS 5/2

Steps of reconciliation

Christians hear from the biblical word: Christ's love moves the world towards reconciliation and unity. The motto of the 2022 World Assembly is biblically nourished hope. "Reconciliation" means change, exchange; reconciliation will only be possible through mutual sharing and giving of each other's perspectives and narratives. On this path, "unity" will also be attainable. Reconciliation begins with the willingness to engage with the feelings, the stories of loss and suffering, but also with the stories of hope of the other. For this, we as a church can and should create forums of conversation and exchange. We want to strengthen such initiatives and movements open to dialogue in the conflict between Israel and Palestine - between Israel and Palestine, between Jews, Christians and Muslims. This is what we pray for, what we campaign for and what we work for.

Hasn't South Africa shown that reconciliation is not possible via the exclusive path of exchange? Does not reconciliation have to be linked to justice and truth? Only when justice and freedom for the oppressed was achieved through resistance and non-violent resistance, including boycotts and sanctions, was reconciliation then also possible with the help of a Truth commission.

Behind the manoeuvring of this entire text, a basic problem becomes clear: The majority of Germans - not only in the churches - are not at all aware that we have a double (history of) guilt. We have concentrated on the obvious guilt of the genocide of the Jews. Preoccupied with this, we have overlooked the fact that this genocide of the Jews also contributed to the Nakba, the catastrophe for the Palestinian people. It has

already been said that until the German genocide of the Jews, Zionism was rejected by a majority of Jewish people. Only with this crime against humanity and its consequences did this understandably change step by step, because the fact of a state offered the possibility of emigrating there to escape anti-Semitism and persecution. At the same time, the West's feelings of guilt made it close its eyes to the methods by which this state came into being. No one cared when Israel began to expel the Palestinians under the eyes of the British, to carry out massacres and to raze Palestinian villages to the ground even before the state was founded. In other words, Germany is essentially complicit in the catastrophe (nakba) of the Palestinians. By unconditionally criticising the status quo only rhetorically, together with the USA and the EU, and by supporting Israel politically and financially on a large scale, even cooperating with it militarily, it makes occupation and daily human rights violations possible and thus becomes guilty twice.

Can the German churches perhaps learn from sister churches like the US and English churches to call on the government and the public to tie cooperation with Israel to the observance of international law and human rights? Then they would live up to their double historical responsibility - not only for the sake of the people in Palestine, but especially for the sake of those in Israel.

To at least hint at this, let us conclude with a brief look at the churches' responses to the "Cry for Hope" so far. The most comprehensive decision was taken by the United Church of Christ in the USA (UCC). We therefore choose it as an example. In the introduction, the statement ties in with the resolutions of the church since Israel's occupation of Palestine for over 50 years. It recalls the biblical message that the land has a universal mandate, tied to justice, and rejects the accumulation of land in the hands of a few (Is 5:8). She then clearly enumerates the facts of 70 years of dispossession of the Palestinian people with all kinds of violence, names the refugees, the illegal occupation since 1967, the negative role of the governments of the USA and compares the treatment of Palestinians with the oppression of black people at home and the settler colonialism in North America, Australia and South Africa with that of the Israeli colonists on land that does not belong to them. It names the military force with which the land is de facto annexed in violation of international law.

Next, the statement agrees with the Cry for Hope that "the very being of the church, the integrity of the Christian faith, and the credibility of the Gospel is at stake. We declare that support for the oppression of the Palestinian people, whether passive or active, through silence, word or deed, is a sin. We assert that Christian support for Zionism as a theology and an ideology that legitimize the right of one people to deny the human rights of another is incompatible with the Christian faith and a grave misuse of the Bible".

The declaration that follows then borrows from the structure of the Barmer Theological Declaration (1934) against National Socialism and German Christians and the Accra Confession against Imperial Capitalism (2004) with six articles: "We affirm (affirm)....We reject". The six points are:

- 1) *The oppression of the Palestinian people is against the prophets and the Gospel and is a sin; silence about it is a denial of the Gospel; therefore the view that the occupation of Palestine is a purely political problem is rejected.*
- 2) *The creation of the earth and the calling of Israel aim at blessing all peoples. Therefore, ideologies such as Christian Zionism, substitutionism, anti-Semitism, anti-Islamic bias are to be rejected.*
- 3) *All people living in Palestine and Israel are created in the image of God and have equal dignity. Therefore, all discriminatory laws against any segment of the population, including those in apartheid Israel, must be rejected.*
- 4) *All peoples have a right to self-determination and sovereignty, therefore equal citizenship rights, fair and equitable sharing of land and resources in accordance with international law must be addressed. Therefore, Israel's abuse of the Holy Scriptures to justify the annexation of Palestinian land by military might and with the support of the USA must be rejected.*
- 5) *According to UN Resolution 194, the refugees have the right to return or compensation. To be rejected is the denial or manipulation of this right.*
- 6) *According to the constitution, freedom of speech and assembly apply - also with regard to criticism of Israel and BDS. Therefore, the criminalisation of such criticism and actions as anti-Semitic must be rejected.*

The following actions then follow from this basic confession:

- a. *Listen to the Palestinian brothers and sisters;*
- b. *Outreach to Palestinian children;*
- c. *Critically examining our use of Scripture;*
- d. *Advocating for freedom of speech;*
- e. *"Advocating for the cessation of U.S. military aid to Israel until such time that Palestinian human rights, civil rights, and self-determination are fully realized and protected in compliance with international law, US laws on foreign military assistance, and the principles of human rights.."*
- f. *Support the full resumption of US payments to the 'United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees'.*
- g. *Advocate for the implementation of UN Resolution 194, i.e. return of refugees or compensation.*

Finally, the consistency of the Church's financial policy with these resolutions is urged, which refers to withdrawing investments from companies that profit from the illegal occupation.

In the meantime, several churches in England have followed the UCC's example in the same direction: the Methodist Church, the United Reformed Church/URC and the Carlisle Synod of the Anglican Church. The General Synod of the Church of Sweden has called on the church leadership to investigate the implementation of international law with regard to apartheid in Israel. Last year, the Norwegian Bishops' Conference had already rejected Christian Zionism. A Berlin ecumenical group led by Almuth Berger, Heino Falcke, Elisabeth and Konrad Raiser and Gerhard Rein have written to all church leaders in Germany to listen to the responses of the above-mentioned churches to the

"Cry", because the issues dealt with there will have a bearing on the upcoming Assembly in Karlsruhe.³¹

Finally, it should be pointed out once again that the efforts of critical Jews, Palestinians and these churches point in the same direction, namely to enable a future for both peoples in peace and justice. This is in line with the "logic of love" of the Kairos Palestine document of the Palestinian churches, which states, among other things,³² "It is God's land, and therefore it must be a land of reconciliation, peace and love. And that is also possible. God has placed us here as two peoples, and God also gives us, if we only sincerely want it, the power to live together and to create justice and peace, to truly transform the land into God's land....today, we bear the strength of love rather than that of revenge, a culture of life rather than a culture of death.....Christian love invites us to resist it [occupation]. However, love puts an end to evil by walking in the ways of justice.... It is thus a creative resistance for it must find human ways that engage the humanity of the enemy. Seeing the image of God in the face of the enemy means taking up positions in the light of this vision of active resistance to stop the injustice and oblige the perpetrator to end his aggression and thus achieve the desired goal, which is getting back the land, freedom, dignity and independence.....Our message to the Jews tells them: Even though we have fought one another in the recent past and still struggle today, we are able to love and live together. We can organize our political life, with all its complexity, according to the logic of this love and its power, after ending the occupation and establishing justice."

This perspective is supported by a letter that Archbishop Tutu wrote to the German Protestant Kirchentag and the Council of the EKD in 2015: "Neutrality must not be an option, for it always favours the oppressors. Always....Please join the ecumenical Kairos movement and publicly and in solidarity demand freedom for Palestine so that Israel can also be free."³³

31 This text as well as all mentioned church responses to the Cry for Hope are printed in the brochure: KAIROS Palästina-Solidaritätsnetz (ed. U. Duchrow): *Der palästinensische Schrei nach Hoffnung und die Antwort der Kirchen – Auf dem Weg zur ÖRK-Vollversammlung*. Krummhörn-Uttum: 2021.

32 <https://www.oikoumene.org/de/resources/documents/kairos-palestine-document>.

33 Cf. https://kairoseuropa.de/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/Tutu_Brief_Palaestina_30.04.2015_deutsch-21.pdf