

The Zionist State of Israel: A Political Construct, Not Biblical Israel

Introduction

From the title as given above, this post will expand on and address the **definition and meaning of the Zionist State of Israel**, incorporating a critique of the term "*Jewish descent*," and supplying **historical, theological, and scriptural commentary**, along with quotations from **historians** and **biblical scholars** to reinforce the distinction between the **modern political state of Israel** and **biblical Israel** as defined in scripture.

The modern state of Israel, established in 1948, is often perceived—particularly by Christian Zionists and many Western governments—as the prophetic fulfillment of God’s promise to the descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. However, a closer examination of the **origins of the Zionist movement**, the **ethnic composition of modern Jews**, and the **biblical definition of Israel** reveals significant discrepancies. The entity known today as the *Zionist state of Israel* is not the **Israel of the Bible**, but rather a **modern political construct** shaped by secular ideologies and defined not by adherence to divine covenant, but by **ethnic nationalism and geopolitical considerations**. □

Truman's Theological and Political Role in the Creation of Modern Israel

The following statement by Harry S. Truman—"I am Cyrus. I am Cyrus."—is highly significant, both politically and theologically. It reveals the depth of how Truman viewed his role in the establishment of the modern state of Israel, and it reflects how Zionist aspirations were often framed in biblical terms to garner support from Christian leaders and nations.

I. Historical and Theological Implications Behind Truman's Comment

A. Historical Context: Truman's Role in the Creation of Israel

1. Truman was the first world leader to officially recognize the new State of Israel—only **11 minutes** after it declared independence on May 14, 1948. This quick recognition was pivotal, giving legitimacy to Israel on the global stage.
2. Eddie Jacobson, Truman's Jewish friend, played a key role in persuading him to meet with **Chaim Weizmann**, who later became Israel's first president. That meeting helped solidify Truman's support.
3. Truman went against significant pressure from within his own administration—especially from **Secretary of State George C. Marshall**, who believed recognition would destabilize U.S. interests in the Middle East.

B. "I Am Cyrus" – Biblical Allusion

By saying, "I am Cyrus," Truman was likening himself to **Cyrus the Great**, the Persian king who allowed the Jews to return from Babylonian captivity and rebuild the temple in Jerusalem (see *Ezra 1:1–4*, *Isaiah 44:28*, and *Isaiah 45:1*).

1. In *Isaiah 45:1* (KJV), the Lord refers to Cyrus as "his anointed" (Hebrew: *messiah*), which is a rare designation for a Gentile. Cyrus is depicted as a deliverer for Israel: "*Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him...*" (*Isaiah 45:1*)
2. This comparison reveals that Truman understood his recognition of Israel not merely as political, but as prophetic—a continuation of biblical history.

C. Zionist and Evangelical Influence

Truman's statement also exposes the deep religious overtones behind the political Zionist project:

1. Many **Christian Zionists** believed the reestablishment of Israel was a fulfillment of prophecy.
2. Truman, raised in a **Baptist home** and familiar with Scripture, was susceptible to this theological framework. It's possible he genuinely saw himself as playing a divine role.
3. This belief was fueled by a narrative common among both Jews and Christians: that the Jews' return to the land of Israel would usher in **prophetic fulfillment**.

D. The Problem with the Cyrus Analogy

While many Zionists and evangelicals see the Cyrus-Truman connection as noble or even divinely appointed, it deserves serious scrutiny:

1. Cyrus allowed a **remnant** of Israelites to return to their ancestral land *after judgment and repentance*. It was **God's doing—not a political negotiation**.
2. The 1948 return was not a spiritual return to **covenant faithfulness**, but rather a **secular nationalist movement**, often led by those who did not even believe in the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.
3. Unlike Cyrus, Truman was not acting in obedience to a **direct command from God**, but under pressure from **lobbyists, political concerns, and personal relationships**.

Furthermore, this statement helps illustrate why many today confuse political Israel with biblical Israel—Truman himself was presented as a modern instrument of prophetic fulfillment, perpetuating the myth that the modern state is a continuation of God's covenantal plan, which in **New Testament theology** is centered on Christ and His church:

“Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ.” (Galatians 3:16, KJV)

“And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.” (Galatians 3:29, KJV)

E. Theological Implication

Truman's assertion suggests a **dangerous precedent**—political leaders assuming prophetic roles. While God did use pagan kings in the past, to self-identify as a type of **Cyrus** is to ascribe divine purpose to a political act **without the clear command or covenant approval of God**. The comparison is more symbolic than scriptural.

Conclusion

Truman's words, "*I am Cyrus*," highlight the deep intertwining of politics and prophetic expectations in the founding of modern Israel. It reflects how **biblical imagery has been used—sometimes manipulatively—to frame geopolitical events as divine fulfillment**. Yet when examined in light of **covenantal theology**, the comparison falters. The true fulfillment of the promises to Israel is found in **Christ**, and not in any modern political nation-state.

"For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly... But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly..." (Romans 2:28–29, KJV)

II. The Origins of Zionism

Zionism emerged in the **late 19th century** as a **secular nationalist movement**, not as a religious revival. Founded by **Theodor Herzl**, a secular Jewish journalist, Zionism was a response to **European anti-Semitism** and sought to establish a national homeland for Jews, preferably in Palestine, based on the belief that Jews constituted a nation rather than merely a religious group.□

Israeli historian **Shlomo Sand** critiques this transformation, stating:□

"Zionism, from its inception, was an ethnocentric nationalist movement that firmly enclosed the historical people of its own invention, and barred any voluntary civil entry into the nation its platform began to design."

– Shlomo Sand, *The Invention of the Jewish People*
[Goodreads+1The New Yorker+1](#)

Similarly, **Ilan Pappé**, another Israeli historian, characterizes Zionism as a colonial endeavor:□

“Zionism is a settler colonial project, similar to those in South Africa, the Americas, and Australia.”

– *Ilan Pappé, Ten Myths About Israel* □[SoBrief](#)

These perspectives highlight that Zionism was influenced more by European nationalist ideologies than by religious tradition.□

III. Ethnic-Based Citizenship and the Misuse of the Term “Jewish Descent”

A cornerstone of the Zionist state is the **Law of Return (1950)**, granting automatic citizenship to individuals of so-called **“Jewish descent.”** However, this term is both **theologically and historically problematic.**□

A. Misdefining “Jew”

In Scripture, the term *Jew* originally referred to someone from the tribe or kingdom of **Judah**. Over time, especially during the Persian period and into the Second Temple era, the term expanded to include anyone living in the province of Judea or practicing Judaism. However, in **modern Zionism**, “Jew” is treated as an **ethnic marker**, and many claiming “Jewish descent” are **not ethnically descended from Jacob (Israel).**□

Arthur Koestler, in his book *The Thirteenth Tribe*, argues that many Eastern European Jews are descendants of the **Khazars**, a Turkic people who converted to Judaism in the 8th century:□

“The story of the Khazar Empire, as it slowly emerges from

the past, begins to look like the most cruel hoax which history has ever perpetrated.”

– Arthur Koestler, *The Thirteenth Tribe* [\[A-Z Quotes\]](#)

This challenges the notion that modern Jews are direct descendants of the ancient Israelites.□

B. Theological Implications

The application of “Jewish descent” in Israeli immigration law is misleading. One cannot claim descent from Judah while being genetically, culturally, and religiously disconnected from him. The modern state of Israel has crafted an ethno-national identity around a name that biblically belongs only to those truly of the covenant line through Jacob.□

This misapplication is addressed in the Book of Revelation:□

“I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan.”

– Revelation 2:9, KJV□

IV. Zionism and the Rejection of the Messiah

Zionism is not merely a secular nationalism; it also represents a **rejection of biblical covenant theology**. In the New Testament, the **true Israel** is no longer defined by **fleshly descent**, but by **faith in Christ**, who fulfills the law and embodies the true seed of Abraham.□

The Apostle Paul writes:□

“For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel... That is, they which are the children of the flesh, these are not the

children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed.”

– Romans 9:6,8, KJV

Therefore, a political state that **rejects Christ** cannot be considered God’s Israel.

“Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God...”

– 2 John 1:9, KJV

Modern Zionist Israel continues to reject Jesus as the Messiah and follows **Talmudic Judaism**, which arose largely from Babylonian traditions, not the Torah given to Moses.

V. The Contradiction of Zionist Israel

Modern Zionist Israel contradicts the term “Israel” in several key ways:

1. **Biblical Israel** was defined by covenant with God, not by nationalism or race.
 2. **Modern Israel** is a secular state, while biblical Israel was a theocratic society governed by God’s law.
 3. The term “Jew” has been ethnically distorted, applied to people with no bloodline connection to the patriarchs.
-

VI. God's True Israel Today

Scripture makes it abundantly clear: **those who are in Christ are the true heirs of the promise.** The new covenant does not operate on the basis of ethnicity, bloodline, or geography, but on faith in the Messiah, Jesus Christ.

“And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.”

– Galatians 3:29, KJV

“There is neither Jew nor Greek... for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.”

– Galatians 3:28, KJV

This means that **true Israel** is defined **not by the flesh**, but by the **Spirit**. It is **not a geopolitical state**, but a **spiritual body** composed of those who believe in the Messiah—whether Jew or Gentile.

VII. The Christian Zionist Foundation Preceding Herzl

Long before Theodor Herzl published *Der Judenstaat* in 1896 and convened the **First Zionist Congress** in 1897, a **Christian Zionist foundation had already been laid**—particularly in **Britain and the United States**—by evangelical Protestants who interpreted biblical prophecy to mean that the Jews must be **restored to Palestine** as a necessary precursor to the Second Coming of Christ.

This theological premise is rooted in a **literalist, futurist interpretation** of Scripture, heavily influenced by

Dispensationalism, a system popularized by **John Nelson Darby** in the early 1800s. This system posits that God's plan for history is divided into distinct dispensations and that **national Israel has an unfulfilled prophetic destiny**, separate from the Church.

A. Lord Shaftesbury: Forerunner of British Christian Zionism

Anthony Ashley-Cooper, the **7th Earl of Shaftesbury** (1801–1885), was a **devout evangelical** and one of the earliest and most influential voices in **Christian Zionism**. Decades before Herzl's activism, Shaftesbury was urging the **British Foreign Office** to support Jewish restoration to Palestine—motivated not by politics, but by biblical prophecy.

He believed the Jews' return was foretold in Scripture and would usher in God's final redemptive plan.

“There is a country without a nation; and God now in His wisdom and mercy, directs us to a nation without a country.”
– Lord Shaftesbury, cited in Donald M. Lewis, *The Origins of Christian Zionism* (2010), p. 209

Shaftesbury's efforts led to increasing political attention being paid to the “Jewish Question” and paved the way for Britain's **Balfour Declaration** (1917), which would later support the Zionist cause.

“Restore the Jews to their land, and you will have secured England's destiny in the East.”
– Lord Shaftesbury, c. 1840s

B. William E. Blackstone: The American Counterpart

In the United States, the most prominent early advocate of Christian Zionism was **William Eugene Blackstone** (1841–1935), a successful businessman, evangelist, and author of the widely

read book **Jesus Is Coming** (1878), which sold over one million copies.

Blackstone's theology, like Darby's, anticipated a **literal return of the Jews to Palestine**. In 1891, five years before Herzl published *Der Judenstaat*, Blackstone organized the **Blackstone Memorial**, a petition signed by more than **400 prominent Americans**, including industrialists like **J.P. Morgan, John D. Rockefeller**, and future president **William McKinley**. It urged President **Benjamin Harrison** to support the return of Jews to their ancient homeland in Palestine.

"Why shall not the powers which under the treaty of Berlin, in 1878, gave Bulgaria to the Bulgarians and Serbia to the Serbians now give Palestine back to the Jews?"

– William E. Blackstone, Blackstone Memorial, 1891

This initiative reveals that American Christian support for Zionism was **active and organized well before Herzl's secular movement** took form. Blackstone has rightly been called "**the father of American Christian Zionism.**"

C. A Theological Lens: Restorationism and Prophetic Misapplication

The theological drive behind these early Christian Zionists was the belief in a **literal fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies**, such as:

"And I will bring again the captivity of my people of Israel... and they shall no more be pulled up out of their land which I have given them."

– Amos 9:14–15, KJV

However, these interpretations **ignored the New Testament's redefinition** of Israel—not as a geopolitical entity—but as a **spiritual body of believers in Christ**, both Jew and Gentile.

“For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel.”

– Romans 9:6, KJV

“And if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.”

– Galatians 3:29, KJV

These early Christian Zionists, though sincere, **confused the typological nature of Old Testament Israel with future geopolitical realities**, thereby supporting the establishment of a **man-made political nation** in the name of fulfilling God’s promises—**outside the context of the new covenant in Christ**.

D. The Lasting Impact

The theological influence of men like Shaftesbury and Blackstone laid the groundwork for widespread **evangelical support for the modern state of Israel**, especially in the 20th and 21st centuries. Their efforts primed Christian communities—particularly in **America**—to see **modern political Zionism** not as a human invention, but as a divine fulfillment.

Yet biblically speaking, **God’s covenant people are no longer defined by race or geography**, but by **faith in Jesus Christ**.

Conclusion

The **Zionist state of Israel** is a modern political project, not a divine restoration. It was birthed through **European colonialism**, shaped by **racial nationalism**, and populated largely by people who—while practicing a religion called Judaism—have **no covenantal or genealogical claim to biblical Israel**. Worse yet, the state itself continues to **reject Jesus Christ**, the promised Messiah, and thus remains **outside the scope of God’s covenantal blessings**.

“Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven... Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name?... And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity.”

– Matthew 7:21-23, KJV

In light of this, **Christians must be discerning**. To conflate the **secular state of Israel** with the **biblical people of God** is not only a theological error—it is a **misrepresentation of the gospel itself**. As the Apostle Paul warns in Romans 11, the olive tree is **Christ**, and only those who abide in Him—whether Jew or Gentile—are truly part of **God’s Israel**.

The real Israel is not determined by borders or bloodlines, but by the **new birth**.

“For we are the circumcision, which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh.”

– Philippians 3:3, KJV

Thus, the Zionist state—though powerful politically—is a **man-made counterfeit**, and not the Israel of God.

A Word on Speaking the Truth: Galatians 4:16

“Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?”

– Galatians 4:16, KJV

This verse speaks directly to the experience of many who proclaim **biblical truth that challenges widely held assumptions**. Whether addressing false doctrines, misunderstood prophecy, or nationalistic distortions of Scripture, those who uphold truth are often **met with resistance**—even hostility.

But the truth is **not ours**—it is **God's Word**. It does not change to fit political trends or denominational traditions. As Christ said:

“Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth.”

– John 17:17, KJV

If we speak in humility and sincerity, out of love for the truth and for those we engage, we must not be discouraged when some **turn away** or **disbelieve**. We are not called to **convince all**, but to **be faithful witnesses** to what God has said.