Churches Plan for Dialogue, Refugees and Peace

World Council, Quakers, Catholics Seek Solutions, Pledge Aid

The Central Committee of the World Council of Churches has appropriated $20,000 for a consultation between Christians and followers of other faiths next March in Beirut, Lebanon. Two recent conferences, one in the Middle East, the other in the Middle West, have added grist for that mill.

In Nicosia, Cyprus, in October, at a conference of Middle Eastern churchmen co-sponsored by the World Council’s DICARWS (Division of Inter-church Aid, Refugee and World Service) to face up to the needs of the Palestinian refugees, participants insisted that traditional relief, though still essential, is not enough. There must also be awareness of the Palestinian entity, and readiness to redress the wrong done to the Palestinian people when Israel was created in their homeland. Among the follow-up meetings to consider the implications of this challenge, one of the first is slated for the Church Center at the United Nations for all day November 7.

The previous month a two-week meeting of the World Council’s Committee on the Church and the Jewish People concluded in Racine, Wis., after having spent considerable time listening to representatives of American Jewry which outnumbers Israel’s Jews by some 3,000,000. Frank and open exchanges of views characterized the dialogue. Dr. Kurtis F. Naylor of the National Council of Churches posed the Christian dilemma as far as the Middle East is concerned.

“We carry a tremendous burden,” he said. “We are a disappointment to our Arab friends (and there are several million Christians in that group) ... and a real disappointment to our Jewish friends, too ... If you meet the needs of one, you necessarily thwart the elemental needs of the other.”

These judgments gain immediacy from recent major statements expressing Christian concern over (Continued on p. 8)

"THE PILGRIMS' WAY", a Medieval painting of the Holy City, is one of eight Christmas card designs being offered by the Friends of Jerusalem to raise funds for war victims. For details of how to get an order form with color reproductions of this and other designs, see back page article on "JERUSALEM" Christmas Cards.
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aims at maintaining contacts among Americans who believe that friendship with the people of the Middle East is essential to world peace, who would contribute to this goal by spreading understanding of the history, values, religions, culture and economic conditions of the Middle East, and who would — in this context — press for greater fairness, consistency and integrity in U.S. policy toward that area.

It is published by Americans for Middle East Understanding, Inc., whose directors are: John V. Chapple (v.p.), Arabist editor with the Encyclopaedia Britannica, Dr. John H. Davis, past Commissioner General of UNRWA; Dr. Harry G. Dorman, Jr., Executive Director, Middle East & Europe Dept., National Council of Churches; Dr. Henry G. Fischer, Curator of Egyptian Art, Metropolitan Museum of Art, Dr. Helen C. Hilling, (sec.), Professor of Public Administration, N.Y.U.; L. Emmett Holt, Jr., M.D., Beard Chairman of American Middle East Rehabilitation; Sister Blanche Marie of The College of St. Joseph, Mt. St. Joseph, New Jersey (pres.), President of the American Independent Party; President Emeritus Henry P. Van Dusen of Union Theological Seminary, N.Y.; Rev. L. Humphrey Watz (LINC ed.), Chairman of the Near East Sub-Committee of the Presidency; President T. C. Wald and Charles T. White (treas.), past Financial Executive, Near East Foundation and Aid. Program Director: Rev. John Sutton.
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POLITICAL SCIENCE REPORTS

The closing session of the American Political Science Association Convention in New York in September was devoted to "the Palestinians and the Future of Israel." Under the chairmanship of Prof. Malcolm Kerr of U.C.L.A., Prof. Don Peretz stressed the distinctive national character of Palestinians whose Diaspora (dispersal) has developed some of the same aspects of minority consciousness found among the Jews and Armenians. A "Palestine Arab Zionism" has also emerged, Prof. Hisham Sharabi, a Palestinian, commented on the belief of al-Fatah that time is on their side; they refuse—at least now—to contemplate any settlement with the Zionist leadership in Israel. Al-Fatah expects a war of attrition will bring non-Zionists to power in Israel.

Samuel Merlin represented another viewpoint. He questioned the sincerity of Arab demands for a secular Palestinian state in view of recent calls for a Holy War. His presentation was balanced; however: He questioned Israel's belief that the Arabs would come to the peace table if only Russia quit supporting them; he called for the creation of an Arab Palestinian state on both sides of the Jordan which would be linked with Israel and accompanied by a choice for Palestinian refugees of repatriation or compensation; and he urged both sides to reveal their negotiation positions rather than to "play poker." Merlin urged a solution embracing Israeli security needs and satisfaction of the Arabs' sense of justice. He remarked that Israel would rather deal with Nasser than face the issue of the Palestinians' existence and rights, while the Arabs preferred to fight Zionism rather than to consider the fact of Israel's existence.

In answer to questions, Peretz felt that younger Arabs on the West Bank were even more hostile to Israelis than were their elders. This bodes ill for reconciliation. There followed a discussion of whether or not liberal Israelis such as Uri Avnery were anywhere near the position of al-Fatah despite the reference by both to "de-Zionization" of Israel. All three speakers agreed that Israel's relations with the Palestinians were more important than relations with Egypt, Jordan and Syria. Palestine is claimed by two peoples: Arab-Israeli peace will most probably have to await Israeli-Palestinian peace.

BOOKS (Continued from page 2)

American with wide Middle East experience discusses various conceptions of Zionism and outlines Christian responsibility under the rubric of "Intra-Semitism." A young French Protestant presents the difficulty for a Westerner, imbued as he is with Western values and practices, in a struggle in solidarity with the Palestinians against Zionism, which he analyzes as the crystallization of Western values and practices. A group of non-Zionist Israeli Jews discusses Zionism and anti-semitism. The WSCP team's theological conclusions after two years in Israel are included. As an appendix, part of the debate about Israel and the Palestinians currently raging among Western Lutheran students is reproduced.—P.J.


Whereas everybody uses the term "Middle East" without an agreed definition, everyone familiar with Southwest Asia knows precisely what the "Gulf" is but cannot agree on a name for it. Nevertheless, whether you call it "Arabian" or "Persian" or whatever, there is general agreement that the Gulf is an extremely important area. Thus it was very timely for Princeton University to choose the Gulf as the topic for its 20th Annual Near East Conference. It drew an unexpectedly large attendance of professionals and specialists from business, government and the universities who found the quality of the presentations and discussion, reproduced in this volume, extraordinarily high. The conference touched on every conceivable aspect of Gulf affairs—strategic, military, political, economic and social. Several speakers commented on the extensive but not widely recognized economic and social progress made in recent years, particularly in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Iran. A consensus emerged that with the impending withdrawal of British forces from the area in 1971 the prospects for peaceful progress depend largely on close harmony between the two major littoral powers—Saudi Arabia and Iran. (Perhaps it was a propitious omen that while the proceedings were under way the conference received advance word of the signing of an agreement between these two governments regulating the offshore boundaries of the Persian Gulf.)

Considerable attention was given to the threat of Communist encroachment. What should American reactions to such encroachment be? It was recognized on all sides that the United States must develop a policy for encouraging useful progress toward stability. As William Breiner of the State Department pointed out, "Significant United States economic and commercial interests with the Gulf will clearly continue in the future." Brewer also dwelt at some length on the development of American private educational and medical contacts going back almost 100 years. In a bit of semantic by-play about the significance of the oil resources of the region to the United States and the Free World, the question came down to whether oil is "vital" or just "highly important." Yet there seemed to be no material dissent from the view of Edward Semand of the First National City Bank, who stated that "by 1980, we estimate that the Middle East will still be accounting for half the world's oil supply." In sum, the conference proceedings provide an excellent introduction to American political, economic, and strategic stakes in the Middle East and the Gulf area in particular. Much credit is due to Princeton for arranging the conference and publishing the proceedings so promptly, at a time when the challenge to American interests is a matter of serious concern.


Professor Field brings thorough scholarship to the story of American interests in the Mediterranean (especially the eastern part) over the first century of our history. While missionaries, traders and others are by no means neglected, this ambitious work is perhaps most original in its exploitation of the U.S. Navy archives. The Sixth Fleet, it appears, has origins with the Founding Fathers: "As far back as 1796 President Washington had urged a permanent protective force for America's Mediterranean commerce; at the end of the Tripolitan War, Jefferson had written that the United States would 'ever' be obliged to keep a squadron in that sea" (p. 104). Such a squadron was formed after the War of 1812, and it was present throughout most of the 19th century. It never fought, but it played a significant role in protecting our traders; helping with the negotiations leading up to the treaty with Turkey of 1830; coming to the assistance of the missionaries and curbing piracy.

While the Navy was constantly in evidence, it operated without any clear or consistent policy mandate from Washington. Much more persistent and pervasive were the purely private American commitments in the Middle East. Here was the heaviest foreign involvement of the American missionary establishment.

(Continued on page 5)
UNESCO Receives Data on Jerusalem Cultural Property

A report on how well the government of Israel is preserving the cultural property of Jerusalem was submitted in mid-October to the Executive Board of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), for consideration under the Treaty on the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Case of Armed Conflict. (Israel, the United Arab Republic and the Syrian Arab Republic are all parties to the Convention.) The plasses, minuses and deferred judgments on the writers to interpret with balance. Hence

The 30-man UNESCO Executive Board, after listening to the presentation of concern over Jerusalem and asked that UNESCO's Director-General should endeavor to see that the Israeli occupation authorities preserved all the sites, buildings and other cultural properties particularly in the old city. The Convention also states that "in the event of armed conflict, any member state occupying the territory of another state should refrain from carrying out archaeological excavations in the occupied territory." It adds that "In the event of chance finds being made . . . the occupying power should take all possible measures to protect these finds which should be handed over on the termination of hostilities to the competent authorities of the territory previously occupied . . ."

In April, 1969, the Government of Israel agreed to the Director-General's sending to Jerusalem Mr. De Angles D'Ossat, Director of the School of Advanced Studies in the Restoration of Monuments in the Faculty of Architecture of the University of Rome and former Director-General of Antiquities and Fine Arts, in the Italian Ministry of Education. In addition, Dr. H. J. Reinink, Commissioner-General for Cultural Property surveyed the area. Some of their findings include the following:

1. They regretted the demolition of a group of houses known as the Abu Saud houses, abutting on the Western Wall of the Temple Haram-es-Sharif, near the part of the Wall known as the Wailing Wall.

2. Regarding the demolition of old buildings in the South-Western part of the Old City and more especially in the Old Jewish quarter, Mr. D'Ossat reported: "to my mind, the pulling down of a whole district, even if not among the most famous or the most striking, seriously damages the compact appearance of the Old City, which was huddled within its walls, forming a close fabric of small buildings in vivid and delightful contrast with the nearby open spaces and the monumental but untrammelled lines of the Haram. Now, with this dreary and formless artificial space before our eyes, and in the absence of any definite plans for its future lay-out, we can only echo the protestsmade."

3. The transfer of the Dead Sea Scrolls from the Palestine Archeological Museum to the Israel Museum in Jerusalem was, they hoped, only temporary. As to the Palestine Archeological Museum itself, according to Mr. D'Ossat, "only minor measures have been taken and changes carried out there, which may be described as active conservation." The Israelis have, however, provided for the restoration and improved the laboratories and depots for the scrolls.

The report noted that a good many monuments and buildings both secular and religious in character were in need of maintenance and even restoration. "To leave them in their present state would be, sooner or later, to condemn them," the report warned, and noted that Israeli authorities have taken or are taking measures which, in their view, come under the heading of "active conservation".

Anxieties and Aspirations

Paying tribute to measures that the Mayor of Jerusalem has already taken in improving conservation and adopting protective measures to protect the Holy City, the report nevertheless noted with regret that the continued refusal of the Muslim community to cooperate with the Israeli authorities or to accept financial or technical assistance from them for the protection of cultural property was not inuring the preservation of Muslim cultural property as it should be. The disparity between the "enterprising spirit" on the one hand, and "the reserve, not to say passivity" on the other . . . "intensifies the threat that overshadows the equilibrium and harmony of the necessary work of conservation", the report warned.

In addition, the observers noted that buildings were not bearing the emblem which would identify them as cultural property to be protected by the Convention.

The Director-General of UNESCO, Rene Maheu, has offered UNESCO's assistance in two areas: Technical assistance to the two parties to maintain the highest standards of protecting the cultural property, and the provision to the world's public of objective information so that a "great wave of mutual understanding and respect between the cultures which have their historical roots there" could be created. The Executive Board of UNESCO has just authorized the Director-General to take the necessary action.

DID SILENCE MEAN INDIFFERENCE?

While the interfaith conferences of the summer and fall have been varied in content, one common element keeps being reported: the feeling expressed by many Jews that their gentle neighbours are indifferent to their safety. The fact that Christians in particular in May, 1967, were "silent when Israeli was in danger of genocide from the Arabs" is given as special grounds for that feeling.

A fairly wide gentle response is, "We didn't know there was such a danger." Why not? "Well, our informed leaders didn't report it as such." But how about the verbal Arab threats, in print and on the air? Weren't they a clear indication of murderous intent and deadly capability?

We raised this last question with Howard Koch, Jr., who is briefly in New York preparing the final details of a study on Arab-Israeli tensions for the Hoover Institution on War and Peace. Out of his research files Dr. Koch dug some interesting documentation:

From Walter Laqueur he quoted General Haim Herzog as having assured his fellow Israelis on June 1, 1967, that, "Knowing the facts, I can say that if I had a choice between sitting in an Egyptian aircraft sent to bomb Tel Aviv and sitting in a house in Tel Aviv, then I would prefer for the good of my health to sit in Tel Aviv."

According to Kimche and Bawly, General Earle Wheeler, Chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, reported on May 25 that "he had no information of any Egyptian intention to attack; . . . if anything, it was the Israeli
army that was pressing to begin hos-<ref>
ilities. And he repeated that in the <ref>
Pentagon’s view Israel had nothing to <ref>
fear. Her army was in their estima-<ref>
tion, far superior to that of Egypt.” In <ref>
fact, CIA head Richard Helms then be-<ref>
lieved that an Israeli initiative in the <ref>
air against the Arabs would result in Is-<ref>
raeli victory in three or four days. <ref>
Israeli General Rabin later con-<ref>
ceded: “I do not believe that Nasser <ref>
wanted war. The two divisions he sent <ref>
to Sinai on May 14 would not have been <ref>
enough to unleash an offensive against <ref>
Israel. He knew it and we knew it.”

THE PEOPLE’S RIGHT TO KNOW?

A mimeographed letter from The <ref>
Citizens Committee to Tell It Like It <ref>
is, Inc., Box 2276, Baltimore, Md. <ref>
21203, reached us with the statement <ref>
that: “We have reason to believe that the <ref>
(Gene) Burns show on WCBD <ref>
radio, and the one scheduled in August <ref>
on WMET-TV, were abruptly termi-<ref>
nated by the money pressures applied by <ref>
a small, but financially strong, segment <ref>
of the advertising and commercial com-<ref>
munities.”

Our inquiries elicited the following <ref>
claims: The Gene Burns daily, 3-hour <ref>
talk-and-phone-in show, on WCBD, <ref>
was rated as Baltimore’s most popular <ref>
radio program by all three major cating systems. Last January, <ref>
after calls concerning the Israeli raid <ref>
on the Beirut Airport, one sponsor sug-<ref>
gested a Burns trip to Israel for first-<ref>
hand observations. The trip was ar-<ref>
ranged by WCBD and Metromedia <ref>
management for February, but also <ref>
called for Burns’ visit to adjacent coun-<ref>
tries. His observations, as reported on <ref>
his return, were contrary to what had <ref>
been expected by the sponsor. After an <ref>
on-the-air blow-up between Burns and the <ref>
sponsor, pressures on the sta-<ref>
tion, direct at first and then through its <ref>
advertising income, resulted in his <ref>
departure from the Baltimore airwaves in <ref>
March. Similar pressures apparently <ref>
forced last minute cancellation of his <ref>
WMET-TV premiere in August and <ref>
seem to be preventing his employment <ref>
with other outlets.

A member of the Citizens Commit-<ref>
tee asked us whether this was a nu-<ref>
tional, or merely a local, phenomenon. If <ref>
you have any clear evidence, pro or con, <ref>
please contact the Citizens Com-<ref>
mite direct.
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which eventually developed into an equally heavy educational and philanthropic investment. By 1895 there were 435 schools and some 20,000 students, with hundreds of Americans actively involved. “The educational system created in these years forms a remarkable monument to American disinterested benevo-<ref>
ence . . . Much of this work was lasting . . . With all allowance for the human tendency to rationalization and self-deception, this seems a magnificent record, and one for which any historical parallel is difficult to discover.” (p. 358).

In spelling out the continuity of American interests in the Middle East, Professor Field provides much more: the brisk trade in American arms, for example. He reminds us of the millenialists who attempted to colonize Palestine at mid-century; the lively export trade in kerosene as early as 1868; the American-made rolling stock on the original Jaffa-Jerusalem railroad; the former Con-<ref>
federate and Union officers who took charge of the Egyptian army at the <ref>
Khedive’s request in the 1870’s; and the laundry set up by the Rev. Cyrus Hamlin at the Bosphorus to serve grateful British troops during the Crimean War, with the proceeds devoted to the education of the Armenian minority in Constantinople.

These and many others laid the basis for America’s present interests in the Mid-<ref>
dle East. With a lack of official interest in Washington, these Americans did their duty as they saw it, avoided quarrsels, tried to do business for a fair return, pro-<ref>
claimed their ideals and principles, came to the relief of the oppressed, and brought a vision of the New World to many who had known it only by hearsay. And the rewards were significant. The combination of private concern and official disinterest enhanced the reputation of our country in an extraordinary way. “There is scarcely a native,” wrote an American from Egypt in 1882, “but knows from his Arabic paper that the United States are their friend, that we are not here to plunder and oppress but to aid and encourage.” (p. 425). If any Cairo paper is reflecting this sort of sentiment today, I don’t know about it. “Our ancestors,” Field points out, “knew more about, and were more concerned with, the merchant marine, the peace-time employment of the Navy, and the missionary effort than we” (p. 456). Surely the continuity of our interests in the Middle East over almost two centuries, and the solid relationships that have grown up with the people of the area over that time, deserve to be more widely known today, when relations appear so tenuous. Professor Field’s work is thus both timely and welcome.—(Condensed, with permission, from The Middle East Journal).


Ethical monotheism — recognition of one God, righteous and compassionate — was born in the Middle East. Its three major expressions — Judaism, Christi-<ref>
anity and Islam — are still inescapable parts of its conditioning. Professor Ar-<ref>
berry and his competent, readable essayists have, therefore, rendered a valuable service to mutual understanding by showing similarities that can be stressed, differences that must be appreciated and interplay that can be fruitful.

Among the differences that must be grasped, for instance, are Islam’s centuries of practice of inseparability of religion and government, with the consequent diffi-<ref>
culties of adjustment to Western secularism. Then there’s the Jewish emphasis on the actual — and the Christian stress on the universal, ideal — Jerusalem. Yet, even where there are conflicting interpretations of, for instance, Palestine as a Holy Land, the producers of this set of volumes have shown how, historically and ideologically, a harmonious living together may be developed.

They don’t present this as a simple matter. They show the ramifications of the subdivisions of each group. Nor do they minimize the complications stem-<ref>
ing from the identification of much modern Judaism and Christianity with the West. Yet they find enough in common to encourage greater mutual trust, respec-<ref>
tive dialogue and fruitful cooperation. Hence, in pressing on through these encyclopedic pages, one feels that one is not merely engaged in a study but sharing in a pilgrimage. — L.H.W.


This account by the former New York Times correspondent is not just another book about the Suez crisis. It is a source of insight into many facets of the Middle East today.

Suez, Love says, is not only an “intricate drama of great men, bold action, pride, prejudice and guilt,” but also clearly demonstrates that “democratic leaders can be as dangerously wrong as dictators when they act in secret upon secret (or inadequate) information.” This thesis Love illustrates with carefully selected quotations drawn from interviews, published works or original documents. Often (Continued on page 6)
this takes the form of a well chosen and memorable anecdote which reveals motives, background of decision or details generally unknown. For example: In Love's description of Hussein's dismissal of General Ghubb, he describes how this event was misinterpreted by Nasser as a British move. Nasser, in conversation with Selwyn Lloyd, thus appeared sarcastic and sympathetic to British feelings. Eden, on the other hand, believed the dismissal to be evidence of an Egyptian plot and reacts in anger. The account of his telephone conversation with Nutting, in which Eden shouts: "I want him destroyed, don't you understand!" is shown to set the scene for the mounting crisis which led to war.

Those who look to a well informed and alert public to redress the balance will take little comfort in the account in which Love tells how news is managed, suppressed or actually misinterpreted. He relates how Nasser, in an interview with him, made bold, conciliatory statements to improve Egyptian relations with the West. This interview, duly cabled to New York, went unprinted. When at last excerpts from it finally got into print, it was edited in such a way as to falsify Nasser's true intent—making it appear that, while Israel wanted peace, Nasser threatened war. Thus, Love says, was lost one of the last opportunities for real peace.

The book contains a revealing treatment of other events which no serious student will want to overlook. It is enhanced by numerous maps and charts and an index prepared by Roberta Blacke. Copious notes and bibliography will add to its value as a resource for advanced study. — J.S.


This selective guide to some 400 volumes, with a thumbnail review of each, will enable the student of the area quickly to select those books which bear most directly on his special interests. The listing comprises 24 categories, from the geographical, historical, religious, artistic, economic, social and cultural to classifications by country. For the student who wishes to dig even deeper, Dr. Howard has included sections of other "Useful Bibliographies," "General Surveys" and "Convenient Documentary Collections." His supplementary "The Middle East in Paperback" appeared in last Summer's issue of The Middle East Journal published at the above address.


When the original version of this book was published, in 1965, the Intermountain Jewish News castigated the author in these terms: "The Jews have a word for it, Meshmouthed, one who abandons his Jewish faith to proselytize against his own people." My reaction is quite opposite. Moshe Menuhin's devotion to Jewish faith and his pride in Jewish contributions to civilization are the driving force behind his indictment, not of his people, but of a political program—Zionism. Can Zionism and Judaism be separated? Menuhin insists that they must be, if Judaism is to retain its spiritual value; otherwise it becomes an anarchistic fusion of religion and politics in which God is replaced by man, and individual conscience is subordinated to nationalism. "It is," he says, "the immoral spirit of duallless moral independence that we revere in the prophets, not the old political independence fought over endlessly, sometimes in self-defense, and sometimes in offensive wars to carve out more territory, to rule over more slaves, to be richer at the expense of neighbors."

And Menuhin is by no means alone in proclaiming this message. He cites, for example, Ahad Ha-Am (Asher Ginzberg), who saw in the "return to Zion" a revival of spiritual values, but said of the First Zionist Congress in 1897: "Who knows whether this was not the last sign of a dying people?" Ahad Ha-Am warned in 1891 that the Jewish settlers must meet the native Arab population with friendliness and respect: "Yet what do our brethren do in Palestine? Just the very opposite! ... They treat the Arabs with hostility and cruelty, deprive them of their rights, offend them without cause, and even boast of these deeds, and nobody among us opposes this despicable and dangerous inclination." He quotes Judah Magnes, who abandoned secular nationalism soon after he emigrated to Palestine in 1922 and later declared, "Will the Jews here in their efforts to create a political organism become devotees of brute force and militarism?"

We seem to have thought of everything except the Arabs." He cites Einstein, who in 1938 spoke against the creation of a Jewish State because he feared "the inner damage Judaism will sustain." And he cites Martin Buber, who in 1958 said: "I believed that this nationalism [Zionism] would not go the way of..."
and author Ania Francos of Paris as panelists. Mr. Tarig Ali of London will sound the keynote. Mr. Claudio Maksoud, Lebanese expert on the Third World, will be the banquet speaker. For further details of the organization, its history, objectives and contributions, see the February issue of Middle East Forum.
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all the others—beginning with a great hope and then deteriorating, decaying, becoming collective egoism even daring, like Mussolini, to call itself a sacro egoismo, as if a collective egoism could be more sacred than the egoism of any individual! . . . The majority of the Jewish people preferred to learn from Hitler rather than from us . . . Hitler showed that history does not go way of the spirit, but the way of power . . .

It must not be thought, however, that this book is a series of jeremiads. Part I is an orderly and informative history of Palestine in terms of the ancient Jewish kingdoms, the development of Zionism, the evolution of Israel, and the Arab-Israeli confrontation. Part II deals equally methodically with the history of the Diaspora, the role of Jews in the Near East, Europe and America, and the impact of Zionism on their life and ideals. Part III is a 90-page addition to the original edition, which covers developments since 1965, including the Six Day War, the retreat of the American Council for Judaism, and the formation of Rabbi Berger’s new group, Jewish Alternatives to Zionism. All three sections contain a wealth of information, much of which is not available in other surveys of the current Middle East impasse. Moshe Menuhin speaks with authority, for he has lived through the period and was witnesses to the demise of his Founding Father, Dr. Herzl. In 1913, refusing the scholarships offered by the Gymnasium, he came to America to support himself “and be independent.”

Informative as it is, the special value of the book derives from the spirit that pervades it, a nuova indagine worthy of Dean Swift. Like Swift, Menuhin evidently believes that “religion, being the best of things, its corruptions are likely to be the worst,” His religion is based on the precepts of Hillel: “What is hateful to thyself do not to your fellow men. This is the whole ‘law,’ all else is exposition . . . Judge not thy neighbor until thou art in his place.” Although he does not explicitly compare these words with Luke 6:31, 37, he does assume that Jesus heard Hillel preach, and recommends that “as the whole world rises above the bestiality of the past dark ages [of persecution in the name of Jesus], we Jews are bound to enroll Joshua of Nazareth in the Hall of Fame of our great prophets . . .” At a time when so much that is written about the Holy Land is nationalistic and divisive, Menuhin reaffirms a faith that is truly ecumenical, — H.G.F.

TRUTH IN ADVERTISING?

We frequently see ads, allegedly signed by respectable Americans, dealing in partisian fashion with Middle East affairs. How truly do they reflect the real views of the presumed signers? Though the correspondence below, just brought to our attention by a new Lark reader, took place last summer, the doubts it raises will remain with us for some time. In response to an ad which appeared in various newspapers, a disturbed voter wrote his Congressman:

Your letter to me of 1 May under your signature suggested “that our own best interests are not served” by a strong stance in favor of either side in the Middle East dispute. You spoke favorably of the four-power consultations on the Middle-East. Accordingly, I was shocked to see your name among the many Representatives supporting the bill to commemorate the 21st anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel in the New York Times of 11 March 1969. That declaration looks with disfavor upon the four-power talks and is about the most strongly biased statement in favor of the State of Israel I have ever seen anywhere.

Do you realize that your signature to that statement flies in the face of one of the basic principles of U. S. policy, a principle that from my perspective it would be immoral to violate? That principle is perhaps best stated in the Charter of the Organization of American States:

“The territory of a State is inviolable: it may not be the object, even temporarily, of military occupation or of other measures of force taken by another State, directly or indirectly, on any grounds whatever. Its territorial acquisitions or special advantages obtained either by force or by other means of coercion, become inalienable.”

This same principle is recognized in the United Nations charter and in other U.S. obligations. Yet you insist the State of Israel has the right to sit on occupied territory, opposing “all pressures upon Israel to withdraw prematurely and unconditionally from any of the territories which Israel now administers.”

His Congressman replied:

I received and read with careful interest your recent letter. I can understand your amazement.

If memory serves me right a member of my staff told me I had been phoned and invited to join in a birthday greeting to the State of Israel. I said I would be glad to and forgot the matter.

I did not agree to be part of any policy statement. I did not agree to any newspaper ad. I remain entirely convinced of my earlier statement that “our own best interests are not served by taking a strong stance in favor of either side in the Middle East dispute.” To do so is asking for trouble and we have enough of that already.

How many other Congressmen, one asks, were similarly misrepresented in that ad? How reliable are kindred ads bearing the names of clergymen, college professors and others?
Churches Plan (Continued from page 1) the Mideast crisis and suggesting im-
mediately practical action to reduce the level of violence.
Quakers Ask Buffer, Arms Ban
Just before the opening of the cur-
rent session of the U.N. General As-
sembly early in September, Quakers in the United States, Canada and Brit-
tain delivered a brief appeal to Secre-
tary-General U Thant and to the U.N. Ambassadors from the U.S., France, Russia and Britain, urging that U.N. emergency peace-keeping forces be as-
signed to hold suitable demilitarized buffer zones between Arabs and Is-
raelis under U.N. supervision, and that the Big Four initiate an arms em-
bargo in the area to prevent further escalation of the conflict.
WCC Stresses Rights and Needs of All
Late in August, the Central Com-
mittee of the World Council of Churches, meeting in Canterbury, Eng-
land, affirmed its support of the posi-
tion taken by that body in August 1967, recognizing the responsibility of the Great Powers to create a political climate and external circumstances conducive to peace negotiations based on the U.N. Security Council Resolu-
tion of November 22, 1967.
The Canterbury statement further called for effective international guaran-
tees of political independence and territorial integrity of all nations in the area; the obligation of the Great Pow-
ers to help redress any injustices to Palestinians resulting from the creation of the State of Israel; the responsibility of the W.C.C. to continue serving the needs of the nearly 2,000,000 Arab and one-half million Jewish refugees in the Mideast; and concern that basic human rights of all people in the area be ob-
served. It also recommended the initi-
ation of appropriately sponsored dis-
cussions among Christians, Jews and Moslems as to the guardianship of holy places and the status of Jerusalem and its population.
Catholics Delineate Roots of Tension
In a more detailed statement, re-
leased on September 4th, the Depart-
ment of International Affairs of the U.S. (Roman) Catholic Conference noted that intrusion of the major pow-
ners into the Middle East has been one of the most "pervasive" factors con-
tributing to the increase of tensions between Arabs and Israelis. In the spirit of the Quaker appeal, it called for the major powers, notably the U.S. and U.S.S.R., to "consider the implications" of their presence in the region and seek arms reduction agreements. It suggested, however, that a distinction be made between policies of foreign governments that contribute to devel-
opment, peace and stability, and those which tend to prolong or extend the ex-
isiting animosities.
The Conference indicated that it considers the source of Mideast ten-
sions to be less religious than political in nature. Conflicting claims of Israeli and Arab nationalism, rivalry between revolutionary and monarchical govern-
ments, tensions between secular mod-
ernizing forces and traditional religious attitudes, conflict between military and civilian elements in some countries, the economic gulf between "haves" and "have-nots", the attraction of abundant oil reserves within the Middle East, and the presence of both U.S. and Soviet naval forces in the Medi-
terranean, have all tended to heighten and prolong the antagonism between Israelis and Arabs.
Relief and Development
The Catholic Committee's statement specifically urged generous financial support of UNRWA, establishment of a U.N. Resettlement Fund to assist refugees, and increased participation by the U.S. in programs for economic and social development throughout the Middle East.
All three church groups have been actively engaged for many years in re-
 lief programs for refugees and in other projects to benefit the people of the area. They work effectively with other voluntary agencies in the region in support of UNRWA's work for the Palestinian refugees, and speak from a background of long experience in and familiarity with the history and problems of the Middle East.
CHURCH PROPAGANDA?
' A frequently constructive and concili-
atory Jewish body is creating a cred-
bility gap for itself by publishing, and widely publicizing, a statement on Propaganda in The Church. "In this campaign," it declares, "the Arabs and their supporters employ . . . religious anti-Semitism—from sophistication the-
ological arguments to Nazi slurs and mediaeval superstitions like the blood libel. Substantial headway has been made, especially among Protestant leaders . . . Clergymen, mostly Protestant, have set up national and local or-
ganizations to lobby before Congress and to sway public opinion through film showings, pamphlets and letters-to-the-editor campaigns. Perhaps the best-
known such group is Americans for Middle East Understanding (New York) — a citizens organization headed by a Presbyterian minister . . ."
Actually, a M.E.U. U., which was 100% lay-established, is headed by a Catholic layman! It has never lobbied before Congress, shown films, published pamphlets or conducted letter-to-the-
editor campaigns! Knowing how error-
filled those charges against A.M.E.U.
are, we may say that this viewpoint on "rel-
gious anti-Semitism", whether theo-
 logical, Nazi or mediaeval, is equally remote from reality. In any case, A.M.E.U. dissociates itself from any attempts to spread hatred, unrest or prej-
duce against any Semites, including Arabs, Armenians, Assyrians, Baby-
lonians, Chaldeans, Jews, Phoenicians or whatever other peoples your dic-
tionary may list as Semitic.
"JERUSALEM" Christmas Cards
The Friends of Jerusalem Society in Beirut has again prepared some most attractive Christmas cards to help sup-
port its work for victims of the 1967 June War. Provided with choice of Arabic, English or French text, the cards cater to almost every taste. Eight designs, all from the Arab world, in-
clude stained glass, an icon, classical manuscript illuminations, calligraphy, modern art and a very touching crayon drawing by a child for refugee camp. In past years these greetings had to be ordered for air mail shipment from Beirut. This year is easier. The follow-
ing people have generous supplies in the U.S. and Canada. Write them the nearest you for an order form comp-
plete with full-color reproductions of each card:

American Aid for Arab Refugees, Inc. P.O. Box
67, Fort Hamilton Station, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11209
American Arab Association, (ANARA) P.O. Box
18217, Boston, Mass. 02118: American Near East
Refugee Aid, Inc. (ANERA), 900 Woodward Build-
ing, 733 15th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.
20005: ANERA—Seattle Chapter, P.O. Box 15401,
Northwood Station, Seattle, Wash. 98115: Mrs.
Katherina Bayoud, 7729 Meadow Park Dr., Dallas, Texas 75220: The Holy Land Center, Inc., 225
East 49th St., New York, N.Y. 10017: Dr. A. A.
Kuri, 250 S. Chestnut Street, Ravenna, Ohio
44266: Mr. & Mrs. Mamou Sakkar, Louisiana State
University, Baton Rouge, La. 70803: United American Arab Appeal, 575 Ridge
Road, Whirarton, Mass. 01059: U. S. OMEN,
708 Ellis Street, San Francisco, Cal. 94109: Mr. Spear
Sayegh, U.S. OMEN, 2035 Vista, Sierra Madre,
Cal. 91024: Mr. Isma Qubah, U.S. OMEN, 105-B
Avenue E, Redondo Beach, Cal. 90277: Dr. & Mrs.
J. Malcolm McCullum, 406 Lakewood Dr., Enid
Okl. 73701: Canadian Arab Federation, P.O. Box
415, Station K, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
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