THE LINK

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR MIDDLE EAST UNDERSTANDING

Room 538, 475 Riverside Drive, N.Y., N.Y. 10027

Volume IV, Number 6

November/December, 1971

Computer-Age Answers to Middle East Problems?

Computers are being used in the Middle East, as elsewhere, to solve many problems of engineering, marketing and production. But no one, so far as we know, has put computer-related techniques to use in resolving that most complex of Middle Eastern dilemmas, the Arab-Israeli impasse.

This is doubtless partly due to recognition that, as Jeanette Struchen puts it, "soul-searching questions cannot be satisfied with computer-programmed answers." Nonetheless, there *are* ways in which computer-age techniques *can* speed the solving of problems even as complex as those in the Holy Land today.

The possibilities struck me in a completely different context: I was assigned to write a collection of short articles for the October *Synod News* on how computer-wise George Land of the Innotek Corporation had been working with various Presbyterian bodies to meet a whole range of local and statewide problems. This required me to look into how his insights and systems had helped baffled churchmen come to grips constructively with drug abuse in a suburban parish, with attaining Catholic-Protestant agreement on certain phases of 'parochiaid', with recasting an executive job description for rapidly changing circumstances, with reassigning program funds in ways that all recipients would consider fair, and with updating and streamlining administrative practices to permit speedier, fuller participation in decision making by a quarter million laymen.

While these are all admittedly less complex than the Palestine issue, the resources available were also less. Hence, I dare hope that the same approaches can be valuable here. With that in mind, I'll sketch for you some of the basic assumptions and procedures.

'Human' Data

First of all, one must recognize in all these situations that the primary data are 'human.' The problems and the solutions are primarily in the minds, emotions and attitudes of the people directly involved. No outsiders — even experts and 'think tanks'— can, therefore, fully grasp the problems nor determine final solutions, though they may guide significant aspects of the fact-finding and decision-making processes.

On these first-hand sources, then, we must rely for the chief data to be processed — for the causes of Jewish insecurity feelings in and outside the Holy Land, for the factors underlying the frustrations of young Arabs in refugee camps, and ever so much more.

The 'Five-Year-Old Genius' Within

For the discovery of possible solutions, Innotek startles clients by insisting that "you must release the five-year-old creative genius inside you." It seems that at age five 98% of youngsters are fantastically imaginative. But then our culture exposes them to logic, reason and judgment which, by age 20, have suffocated creativity in all but 2%.

"Let your imagination run wild," says Land. "Don't judge. Don't evaluate. Just permit a free flow. You don't turn off the tap because the first water is rusty. You let it run." He then starts your group 'ideating' and writes *every* idea down on poster sheets readable by all.

Then, and only then, is logic called into play. Take some of the 'wild' solutions that might be suggested for the Arab refugees: Send the Giyur Kehalacha rabbis from 350 Fifth Ave., New York, to the refugee camps; by converting the residents to Judaism, they will enable them to go back to their original homes under the Israeli 'Law of the Return'! Or: Have the Palestinian commandos challenge the Jordanian army to attack, flee from it across the Jordan river and surrender to the Israelis! Or: Ask Congress to vote free air fare, instant U.S. citizenship and three years' tax exemption to any Israeli who will leave Israel to permit a Palestinian to return home! Normally, up to fifty more ideas, better and worse, would come up.

Reason Steps in

The logical sifting of such an accumulation of ideas, rejecting some, exploring and refining others, matching them against specific situations and criteria, weighing their feasibility and effectiveness, comparing their value with their cost, and selecting, enlarging on, and testing the plans finally decided upon—these are all done as a process *separate from* the imaginative one.

One need not at this point go into the technicalities of processing such data. When described, the 'tools' by which this is done for a computer — paired-weighting charts, evaluative matrices, feasibility - effectiveness diagrams and value-cost analyses—sound quite mystifying. Actually they simplify matters, breaking down data into components and clarifying relationships. They thus prepare the right 'input' to go into that most complex of computers yet invented —your brain!—for quicker and speedier results.

Housewives as Experts

Incidentally, the people most creative, resourceful and practical in the use of these processes are housewives! Their constant requirements for developing new ways of working amidst changing circumstances make them the world's greatest problem-solvers! Innotek testifies that some of its scientific projects could not get off the ground until housewives were added as consultants. And in the Middle East today it is noteworthy that it is the Palestinian wives and mothers who are pressing hardest for short- and long-range solutions.

One of the most significant things I observed in a recent three-day, 30-hour Innotek workshop was how a sound

solution will naturally "float to the top" without any put-downs, defensiveness, oratory or controversy even on highly controversial subjects in which the participants have large and conflicting stakes.

The varieties of the conflicting stakes in the Middle East are reflected in the mail that greets each issue of the LINK. Some who write in approve of us, but for widely divergent reasons. Some disapprove and denounce us as Arab-lovers, Zionists, Communists, mouthpieces of the oil interests, bigots or imperialists!

An Initial Proposal

It is my belief that all these contrasting opinion holders, gathered in the same room and willing to face real needs in relation to their own capabilities, could make disciplined use of "Innotekniques" to come up with practical answers on individual and joint contributions to justice, peace and prosperity in the Middle East. Observations in other circumstances convince me that they would, in the process, generate mutual respect and appreciation.

"A journey of a thousand miles starts with the first step." Hence the five-year-old creative genius within me ventures a proposal: Call a one-day conference open to all who *want* to move toward peace in the Holy Land, no matter how divergent their viewpoints. Have them list valid "targets" in the Arab-Israeli controversy, determine their comparative importance and explore fund sources to permit three-day workshops on this theme to involve others in strategic areas at home and abroad. Once these have been developed we might send delegations to the Middle East, saying *not* "Here's our solution," but "Have a go at the process we've tested. Then let's see if we can work it together."

Now comes the stage for logic and judgment — yours! Is this suggestion practical? Is it urgent? Have you better ideas? What would you bring to such a conference? What phases are plain citizens best equipped to deal with? What factors can't be handled better by others?

You can get more background by sending a stamped, self-addressed #10 envelope to *Synod News,* 3049 E. Genesee St., Syracuse, N.Y. 13224, and asking for the October issue. And if you're interested in how these systems have been used for participative decision-making by governments, industries and universities you may write to George Land, Chairman, Innotek Corporation, 65 East 55th St., N.Y., N.Y. 10022.

In any case, I'd be glad to receive your reactions and suggestions.

—L. Humphrey Walz

THE unHOLY LAND ENTERS 4th PRINTING

On the market for only a fraction of a year, Dr. A. C. Forrest's *The unHoly Land* has already entered its fourth printing in Canada. It early reached the "10 National Bestsellers" list on its own merits (see the accompanying review) and was advanced from 10th to 4th place amidst attempts to suppress it and defame the author.

Attack and Support

As long ago as mid-April its burgeoning success became the springboard for a wholesale attack by Aba Gefen, Consul-General of Israel at Toronto, in an address to Beth Tzedec Synagogue. This prompted the Toronto *Globe and Mail's* April 24 editorial against Dr. Gefen's charges and innuendoes:

> ". . . that there is a massive conspiracy to annihilate the people of his country and that an unstated number of readily-identifiable Canadians are participating in it.
>
> "He accuses this group of joining forces with the Soviet Union in a campaign aimed at fanning the flames of war. He says these Canadians are unhappy that Jewish boys are not being slaughtered today. He implies they are disseminating the Hitler line, they are peddling the propaganda of genocide in the name of a large Canadian religious institution.
>
> "These are flagrantly abusive statements in themselves but they arouse special concern because they have been uttered by a man who has been sent to Toronto by the Israeli Government and, therefore must be assumed to be speaking for the Israeli Government.
>
> "In light of Dr. Gefen's official position, External Affairs Minister Mitchell Sharp should ask the Ambassador from Israel if these charges can be substantiated or explained. If the Government of Israel believes that there is a significant number of Canadians working in an unholy alliance against Israel then he should document his case. Identified advocates of genocide would not be popular in Canada and we find it difficult to believe that the United Church would give them a platform."

(Forrest is editor of the United Church *Observer.*)

'Banning' Attempt

Perhaps the biggest publicity the book has received, however, was the announcement by Coles Bookstores that they were removing it from their 29 outlets across Canada as "an absolute non-seller." This made the headlines almost coincidentally with the announcement of its reaching the best-seller list!

This action, noted the Toronto *Star,* "lends color to Mr. Forrest's claim that there is a pattern in Canada of 'suppressing criticism' of Israel." Three- to six-column headlines proclaimed, "Book critical of Israel disappears from Coles," "Israel book ban 'smells' " and "Book criticizing Israel still sold by most shops." Buckley's bookstore advertised, "We do not suppress books however truthful they may be," and offered a dollar discount on *The unHoly Land* "to all who believed that book banning died with Hitler." Even reviewers who disagreed with Forrest deplored the 'ban'.

Jewish Backing

Amidst these attacks and defenses, Forrest declared, "It's hard to get a book published and sold on this topic. The most heartening thing since the book appeared is the number of Jewish people who've backed me up publicly." He noted also that younger Jews, especially in universities, are open to his position. "There is some hope," he added, "in young Israelis and young Arabs, many of whom share the same view that the Palestinians have been wronged, and that the great hope of the future is for Israel to acknowledge the wrong and correct it."

The Calgary *Herald* stated: "Dr. Forrest thinks a lot of Jews have been embarrassed by the attacks on the book from some Zionists and the action of Coles. He says a group of Jewish book stores in Toronto have ordered an extra supply of the book and they want him to autograph some at a promotion party."

Attempts to find a U.S. publisher have so far been unsuccessful. One publisher—whose candor deserves anonymity—told us, "I agree in general with its thesis but I couldn't deal with the problems it would create for me." This seems to imply that freedom of dissent is much more hazardous in the USA than in Canada. Could that possibly be true?

UnHOLY LAND NOW AVAILABLE IN STATES

Because of difficulties encountered by Americans in securing copies of A. C. Forrest's Canadian bestseller, *The unHoly Land,* we've made a wholesale purchase from the publishers, McClelland & Stewart. We are passing along our savings to LINK readers to whom we offer this $6.95 volume at $4.50 postpaid (checks payable to AMEU). The following review by Marc Raboy, which appeared in hte Montreal *Star,"* may help you decide whether or not to place an order.

The governments of the United States and Israel are in the process of making the Middle East "the next Vietnam," according to one of Canada's leading critics of Zionism, Rev. A. C. Forrest.

Israel is being held up as the new Western bulwark against Communism by Zionists trying to exploit the anti-Communism feelings of North Americans. The results will be dis-

astrous, the editor of the 400,000 circulation United Church Observer said in an interview yesterday.

"Anyone who doesn't see the Middle East against the background of Southeast Asia doesn't see it at all," said Dr. Forrest, who has lived and travelled extensively in Israel and the Arab countries.

The veteran journalist - churchman feels Canadians are being systematically misinformed about the Middle East, preventing them from pressuring for a just peace.

In an effort to help "get the truth about the Middle East out to the world," Dr. Forrest has just completed a book based on his first-hand observations, "The Unholy Land."

His documented conclusions are a strong indictment of Israeli policies and Western collaboration;

—The partition of Palestine was a "grave injustice" to the Palestinian Arabs, which must be redressed before there will be peace;

—Many of the Palestinian refugees were "ruthlessly driven out" in the processing of building a Jewish state, and did not simply flee in panic;

—The Palestinians are not being kept as "political pawns" by the Arab states, but are determined to resist assimilation and return home;

—Arabs who remain in Israel are exploited and repressed by a "racist and aggressive state."

Dr. Forrest submits to his readers that any objective student of the Middle East would reach the same conclusions by studying United Nations documents, visiting the area for a length of time, and talking to experts and common people on both sides.

"Admittedly, this is an adventure beyond the reach of the average citizen, but the institutions whose responsibility to provide such information — the media — have abdicated," Dr. Forrest said.

"When I first became interested in the subject," he wrote in the introduction to "The Unholy Land," "I suppose I was mildly anti-Arab. Certainly, like almost everyone else, I was pro-Israeli . . . I suppose I was rather typical of reasonably intelligent, fairly well-informed, well - intentioned, church - going, newspaper-reading Westerners."

Ten months living in Beirut with junkets to Jordan, Syria, Egypt and four side trips to Israel, changed his position, and he returned to Canada as a critic of Zionism.

As a result, "the roof fell in on me. This was something a Christian minister just did not do."

Dr. Forrest was "startled and depressed" to be vilified as an anti-Semite.

"In Canada, I'm considered very pro-Arab and very anti-Israel, but in the Arab community they are critical of me because I say there has to be a compromise," he said.

Dr. Forrest supports the UN's resolution of Nov. 22, 1967, calling for Israeli withdrawal from the territories occupied after the six-day war, without regulating the Palestinian crisis springing from the hostilities of 1948.

IDOC ON U N IN MIDEAST

The September 13 issue of *IDOC* devotes 69 of its pages to an analysis of "Arabs, Israelis and the United Nations." It gives "background," "the Arab case," "the Israeli case" and "evaluation" for each of several crucial matters that have come before the UN. These include the 1947 Palestine Partition Plan, Jerusalem, the Palestinian Arab Refugees, conciliation attempts, the Suez Canal and the June 1967 war. It concludes with a brief essay on "Is Peace Possible?", appendices and a bibliography.

This study, by Casimir Yost (son of the former American ambassador to the U.N. and an international scholar in his own right), was originally prepared for Americans for Middle East Understanding (AMEU) to use as a yardstick against which to check the balance and objectivity of our own publications. We circulated it, in bulky mimeographed form, to our board members and a few friends. The editors of *IDOC* saw a copy, felt that nothing like it had appeared so briefly and clearly, and secured our permission to share it with their readership.

IDOC is a semimonthly publication devoted to *I*nternational *DOC*umentation supplied by over 300 specialists and by groups and centers in 32 countries. A paperback book in form, it is subscribed to like a magazine at $24.95 per year ($26.95 in Canada, $28.95 elsewhere). Though individual copies are $1.95, LINK readers who identify themselves as such may secure the September 13 issue (which also includes documentation on Latin America and Church & State) for just $1.00 from *IDOC,* 637 West 125th Street, New York, N.Y. 10027. The publishers have printed enough extra to fill prompt orders. For late orders they reserve the right to send another sample issue which will be just as interesting but on other themes.

U.S. SANCTUARY FOR SOVIET JEWS?

It was an American Jewish poetess, Emma Lazarus, whose sonnet, "The New Colossus," was selected as the most appropriate inscription for the Statue of Liberty when it was dedicated in 1886. It includes these words, addressed to totalitarians overseas:

> Give me your tired, your poor,
> Your huddled masses yearning to
> breathe free,
> The wretched refuse of your
> teeming shore,
> Send them, the homeless, tempest-tost
> to me.
> I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

It may at first, therefore, seem a little strange to read the recent Jewish Telegraphic Agency report that President Herman L. Weisman of the Zionist Organization of America vigorously opposes U.S. Senate Bill 1872. That bill, introduced last May but still not voted on, would set aside any law standing in the way of admitting 30,000 "residents of the USSR who are listed on their Soviet internal passport as citizenship Soviet, nationality Jewish, and who are seeking admission to the United States to avoid religious persecution." Weisman has urged that Congress drop the proposed legislation because it "can only divert attention from their (the Soviet Jews') primary demand to be permitted to go to Israel."

Refugees as Political Pawns

Sharply critical of Weisman's stance is Rabbi Moshe Sherer of Agudath Israel of America. "The ZOA leader's stand," he comments, "recalls bitter memories of post-war politics by certain Zionist representatives who harassed any rescue efforts for Jewish refugees which brought them to any other land than Israel."

His reference could well be to the mission on which Franklin D. Roosevelt sent the prominent American Jew, Morris Ernst, abroad during World War II. "I went over to England," wrote Ernst, "on Roosevelt's hunch that I should speak to the British, the officials, to see if they would agree to take 100,000 or 200,000 of the people pushed around by the Nazis." It was Roosevelt's belief that, if beleaguered little Britain could set the example, the USA and other countries would follow suit. Ernst's mission was successful. But then there was pressure, and the whole idea was called off. Pressure from whom? Ernst answers in Roosevelt's own words:

FDR on Zionist Fund-Raising

"The Zionist movement knows that Palestine is, and will be for some time, a remittance society. They know that they can raise vast sums for Palestine by saying to donors that there is no other place this poor Jew can go. But, if there's a World Political Asylum for all people irrespective of race, creed or color, they can't raise their money. Because the people who don't want to give the money will have an excuse and say, 'What do you mean there's no place they can go but Palestine? They are the preferred wards of the world.' "

Similar Zionist pressures to close doors against Jewish immigration to any other haven than Palestine were reported from England by Rabbi Solomon Schonfeld and from Western Australia and Holland by the Free-land League. Harold Ickes' proposals for Alaska as a sanctuary ran into kindred obstacles. And Richard Crossman in his Washington Diary for 1946 wrote, "The Zionists'. . . main preoccupation is not to save Jews alive out of Europe but to get Jews into Palestine."

In May, 1959, when the issue of rescue of Jews from alleged anti-Semitism in Rumania was pressing, the New York Yiddish monthly *Undzer Tsayt* revealed (and took issue with) a secret meeting of February 25. At that meeting the Foreign Minister of Israel and the chair-

man of the Jewish Agency had pressed American Jewish leaders not to back Rumanian Jewish emigration except to Palestine. The revealing article asks a question:

"Upon what ground and with what authorization do Dr. Goldmann and Golda Meir make statements which create the impression that Rumanian Jews wish to migrate only to Israel? Even Jews now living in Israel want to go to the United States, and would emigrate here *en masse* if they only had the opportunity. It is certain that if it were in the hands of the Rumanian Jews, they would prefer to go to various countries and, not last of all, to America."

One still timely disclosure in that connection was that Maurice Bisgyer, Executive Vice - President of B'nai B'rith, and a Mr. Emil Baar had made efforts to persuade Senator Jacob Javits to abandon his plan for a bill to admit Rumanian Jews to the United States. So Weisman's resistance to an American haven for the victims of Soviet anti-Semitism has its precedents. So does Rabbi Sherer's protest that "playing politics with Jewish lives, even when motivated by a lofty ideal, is reprehensible to Judaism."

Other Reactions

Although the mass media have been strangely quiet about Senate Bill 1872, some Palestinians have learned about it and have expressed approval. They feel that the issues of Jerusalem and the adjacent Occupied Territories would be less complex if Soviet and other Jewish emigrants went elsewhere.

The bill has, however, been opposed on other grounds than Weisman's. Americans, both Jewish and gentile, have expressed readiness to accept the 30,000 Jews proposed in the bill but consider it a bad precedent to put religious or racial limits on legislation for immigration. There are, they note, others in the Soviet Union who need freedom. In his *Faith on Trial in Russia,* published October 6 by Harper & Row, Father Michael Bourdeaux tells of how the Russian Baptists "keep their faith under incredibly trying circumstances" as they "fight for religious freedom in the Soviet Union."

Some Baptists and all Uniate Catholics and Pentecostals are officially suppressed in Russia and Muslims and Buddhists are having very hard times. These are reported in a magazine-style book, *Religious Minorities in the Soviet Union, 1969-70,* available at $1.50 postpaid from the Centre for the Study of Religion and Communism, 13 Red Hill, Chislehurst, Kent, BR7-6DB, England. The magazine *Religion in Communist Dominated Areas* ($10.00 a year, 475 Riverside Drive, N.Y., N.Y. 10027) publishes related material monthly.

American Jewish efforts in behalf of Soviet Jewry have been valuable in demonstrating that publicity does help, rather than hurt, people in trouble in the USSR. Jews seem, at the moment, to be among the most secure minorities in the Soviet orbit. More publicity for the others — plus inclusion of them in the hospitality of Senate Bill 1872 — would seem to many to be in order.

RYAN TO LECTURE IN U.S.

Rev. Joseph L. Ryan, S.J. is now in Lebanon on a research program at St. Joseph's University (P.O. Box 293, Beirut). He plans to return annually to the U.S. for a lecture tour of six to eight weeks to give Americans a more balanced view of the Middle East, including the perspectives of Oriental Christians and Muslims. His 1972 tour will make him available February 14-21 in New England, February 22-29 in New York, March 1-8 in Detroit and Chicago, March 9-16 in California, March 17-22 in New York again and March 23-31 back in New England.

His subjects include: "Anti-Zionism and Anti-Semitism," "The Arab-Israeli Conflict," "Christian - Muslim - Jewish Relations," "Jerusalem," "Our Right to Know About the Middle East," and "Vatican II and Muslims." To take advantage of his availability in your area, write him c/o Lecture Tour Bureau, 314 Dartmouth Street, Boston, Mass. 02115, or phone (617) 536-7224.

Father Ryan served Al-Hikma University in Baghdad as Dean 1956-66 and Vice President 1966-68. From 1969 until this past September he was Visiting Fellow at the Cambridge Center for Social Studies in Massachusetts. His researches there focused on the impact of the Arab-Israeli conflict on Jewish-Christian-Muslim relations. He has participated in many interfaith seminars and panels on related subjects and testified last July 28 before the Sub-Committee on the Near East of the U.S. House Committee on Foreign Affairs. His articles have appeared in the *Boston Globe,* the *National Catholic Reporter, The Pilot, Worldmission* and the *Homiletic and Pastoral Review.*

David G. Nes, who retired from service with the State Department in 1968, after many years in the Middle East, Vietnam, Europe, and who is widely known to our readers for his very knowledgeable brochures and lectures on the situation in the Middle East today, has indicated to AMEU his availability as a speaker on the Palestine conflict during the Fall and Winter months. Arrangements can be made by writing to: Mr. David G. Nes, Crestline Court, Owings Mills, Md. 21117.

HOLY LAND TOURS OF UNDERSTANDING

Inaugural Tour

Seventeen people departed from Kennedy Airport on September 20th on AMEU's pilot tour to the Middle East. They visited Greece, Lebanon, Cyprus, The Holy Land, and Italy, in 15 activity-packed days. A full program of visits to tourist sites was combined with seven structured meetings with various religious leaders, Arabs and Israelis.

Each member of the inaugural tour group travelled in the understanding that this trip was being used to test AMEU's arrangements. We are grateful to them. Their comments and insights have proved invaluable and will help us to guarantee that our offering in the field of travel will meet the high standards which AMEU continually sets for itself.

Random Impressions

"Beauty around us . . . fascination unending . . . people? friendly, often passionate, unguarded . . . generous hospitality — delicious food . . . ancient customs in modern dress . . . old and new side by side . . . air pollution over Haifa — looks like Germany . . . sub-standard housing occupied by Arab or Oriental Jew? . . . 30,000 Arabs rotting in prison . . . highrise apartments ringing Jerusalem — even the hills are changing . . . where is Emmaus? . . . justice? . . . deep-seated resentment . . . painful memories . . .what hope? No easy solutions!" –JMS

Limitations

AMEU's tours are designed to help its participants meet the people of the Middle Eastern world and to understand the problems which they face today. But one can only expect to receive overall impressions or to perhaps authenticate knowledge gained by research. The pilot tour revealed quite clearly that conducted tours do not lend themselves easily to the pursuit of individual study or developing interests in depth.

To those people who are interested in pursuing specialized interests in the Middle East, AMEU is prepared to offer its services in arranging transportation, accommodations, introductions, and otherwise plan with them to achieve their goals.

Next Tour

Why not spend Christmas in Bethlehem? Reservations are now being received for the December/Christmas Tour. For full details of this tour and other offerings of AMEU, please write to our office immediately.

Before you travel to the Middle East consult AMEU. ■

RULLI REPORTS ON PRESENT-DAY JERUSALEM

(The U.N. is again at an impasse over Jerusalem. What precipitated the crisis? What attitudes and plans can resolve it? In our struggle for answers we have found Rulli's painstaking studies particularly enlightening as they interweave familiar facts with other data just as pertinent but less well known. Their background is this:

Last March 22 *L'Osservatore Romano* editorialized on Israeli plans for forcibly 'Judaizing' Jerusalem to the detriment of Muslims and Christians to whom it is also a Holy City. The preceding week the Pope had expressed a related concern for the Holy Land. "We, too, have a grave right and duty," he said, "not only on our own behalf, but also in the name of Christianity as a whole, to obtain recognition for the special requirements of the holy places in Palestine, of the continued residence of Christians in that troubled country and of the status of Jerusalem."

Reactions to these statements have been fairly voluminous ever since. Some of the attacks have been so contradictory that Father John Rulli, S.J., determined to study the situation at first hand. His report has been published by the fortnightly *La Civilta Cattolica* as three feature articles: "Old and New Problems in The Holy Land," "New Walls Around Jerusalem" and "Proposals for The Holy Places."

The translation fills 37 single-spaced typewritten pages which we're ready to xerox for you for $3.50. We hope, however, to be able to announce in our next issue that an English version will be available in print at less cost. Meanwhile, we are sharing with you the following summary which, in so condensed a form, cannot do justice to the thorough research, sensitive spirit, compassion and fairmindedness of the author. Still, we hope that what we have culled will give fuller insight into a highly controversial situation.)

Old and New Problems in the Holy Land

Jerusalem is a 'holy' city to Muslim, Jewish and Christian 'children of Abraham.' Here God has, in a unique accumulation of events, and through the voices of prophets and the life, death and resurrection of His Son, challenged the consciences and fortified the hopes of mankind.

Violation of Human Rights

Yet one cannot stay there long without anxiety for the future and sadness over the present. The land which first heard the angelic song of "Peace on earth to men of good will" is the setting for a subtle war that, amidst seeming outward tranquility, warps the mind and shatters any promptings toward comradeship. If you disagree in the slightest with most Israeli Jews or Palestinian Arabs in regard to this war, they look on you as an enemy or, at best, brainwashed.

Central to this conflict are charges of Israel's frequent violations of international conventions and human rights in the areas occupied since June 1967. To clarify the facts, the UN established on September 12, 1969, a committee of investigation. Israel challenged the committee's constitutionality, branded its members (Ceylon, Somalia and Yugoslavia) as hostile and refused to admit them. Witnesses therefore had to be met in adjacent countries and New York, London and Geneva. There were also depositions from the Israel League for Human and Civil Rights which, fortified by clippings from the Israeli press, gave substance to the accusation that Israel had inflicted collective punishment, deported peaceful citizens, mistreated prisoners, confiscated property, leveled buildings, and plundered homes. Among other items, the League reported the demolition of 7,554 Arab homes, 342 of them in the old city of Jerusalem, between June 11, 1967 and November 15, 1969, not counting 17 villages in the Golan Heights reportedly destroyed in the first ten months of occupation.

Emergency Laws Still Applied

These actions are sometimes justified as simply applying the "Defense Emergency Regulation 1945" whereby the British Mandate for Palestine had authorized extreme measures to quell the terrorism of that period, whether by Palestinians or Zionists. At that time, however, M. J. Shapiro (now Israel's Minister of Justice) was less than enthusiastic. On February 16, 1946, he commented to an assembly of Jewish jurists: "Not even in Germany did laws exist like these. . . . They try to reassure us by saying that such ordinances apply to criminals and not to all citizens. That was precisely the claim of the Nazi governor of Oslo who said that no trouble would befall any citizen who minded his own business."

In addition, Israel has been rebuked at the U.N. for disregarding the Geneva Convention for the protection of the civil population, their property, rights and freedoms, in wartime.

The Privilege of Jews

Israel has protested that the U.N. has made no comparable report on violations of human rights, including mistreatment of Jews, elsewhere in the Middle East. 9 of the 16 Iraqis executed as spies in Baghdad, January 27, 1969, for instance, were Jewish. And Jordan before 1967, had, in the course of road building, partially destroyed a Jewish cemetery on the Mount of Olives. And there have been the widely reported Arab ambushes, sabotage, hijackings and other acts of terrorism against the Jews of Israel.

It is sad to hear each side amplify such accusations against the other by the hour. One would hope particularly that the Jews, who, in this situation are dominant, would be sensitized by memories of their own suffering and persecution. Privileged as the people chosen to lead all men to faith in one transcendent God, may they also strive to include their gentile neighbors — Muslims and Christian — in a universalistic embrace.

The Arab Exodus

In round figures, 1,500,000 Palestinian refugees, their numbers amplified in 1967, are without hope of a dignified and secure solution to their miseries. Despite evidence cited to the contrary, Israelis have exerted pressure—psychological, political, social, economic and administrative — to encourage the departure of such Arabs as had not fled. This exodus is neither new to the Middle East nor limited to areas controlled by Israel, but the trend has received momentum from Israeli expansionism and military occupation. If some statistics seem to deny this, one must remember the *Jerusalem Post's* January 27, 1970 revelation that "understandable pride" has been known to lead the Israeli government to publish figures that are as much as 100% off.

Meaningful statistics are hard to come by in any case, and, once secured, difficult to interpret. Still, reliable statisticians indicate that there were about 200,000 Christians in the Holy Land in 1948, with slightly less than half that number there now. The Pope would seem to have grounds for concern that further exodus would reduce the Christian presence there to a matter of beautiful temples without a live community.

Hope for a New Order

"The reconciliation of Jews, Christians and Muslims in our day," said Chouraqui (Jewish former vice-mayor of Jerusalem) in dialogue with Cardinal Danielou, "is necessary for . . . the concentration of forces, spiritual, moral, political and social . . . to prevent atomic war, famine, ignorance. The union of

Arab homes were demolished to create a plaza at Jerusalem's Wailing Wall.

these three religious forces could contribute to help, and perhaps save, the human race . . ." In their common Holy Land, the first step toward this reconciliation lies in respecting the fundamental rights of each by the other without discrimination or attempts, open or disguised, at exclusive domination. ■

NEW WALLS AROUND JERUSALEM

On June 27, 1967, the Knesset (Israeli parliament) placed the Arab sector of Jerusalem under the City Council of the Jewish sector. Since then the Israeli government has spared no expense in restoring shrines and places of worship damaged by neglect or war. During the conquest of the Arab sector earlier that month, Israeli troops had reportedly been instructed to spare the sacred buildings of all religions, even at the risk of their own lives. Mayor Kollek cut red tape in behalf of both Christians and Muslims. And the City Council was quick to permit construction of an ecumenical center at Tantur off the road to Bethlehem.

A Problem More Religious Than Political

At the same time there is a strong Israeli thrust toward making all of Jerusalem completely Jewish, with the Holy Places to remain simply as small Christian or Muslim islands. Immediately after the occupation of the Old City, the government leveled Arab homes in the Jewish quarter and in the then densely populated area near the Wailing Wall. Arab buildings and grounds were confiscated for government offices, synagogues and other Jewish purposes. Despite the Geneva and Hague conventions on conquered territory, and repeated interventions at the U.N., this process of 'Judaization' has continued since June 13, 1967.

U Thant sent Ambassador Ernesto Thalmann for an on-the-spot investigation from August 21 to September 3 of that year. Among the religious leaders there, Thalmann found real concern lest the Holy Places become dependent on a single State whose political objectives are related to only one of the three religions involved. Internationalization was strongly preferred.

The Thalmann report received little publicity and the Israeli government proceeded with the expropriation of gentile property for Jewish purposes. On July 3, 1968, the U.N. Security Council strongly censured its "acquisition of territory by military conquest" and asked it to "revoke immediately the measures taken and to refrain from adopting new ones."

Measures for 'Judaizing' Jerusalem

Nonetheless, early in 1970, the "new plan for Jerusalem" was published. This, according to Minister Shimon Peres, involved gathering over 200,000 more Jews into the city. The bulk of new immigrants were to be settled there. "This is a plan with a Jewish goal," said Minister of Buildings Zeev Sharef. "This is a Zionist exposition."

It included confiscating 2,964 more acres to build a "wall" of apartment houses for the new settlers. The confiscation has been justified as an "unproductive", "abandoned" or "enemy" land. These definitions have been challenged but, in any case, the lands still have legal owners and their expropriation violates the Geneva Convention.

The speed with which the plan went forward was, according to the *Jerusalem Post* of December 18, 1970, to get the job done before the Rogers peace initiative could prevent "establishing, by means of accomplished facts, the indisputable sovereignty of Israel over the whole city of Jerusalem." The *Post* added that "further projects have been set in motion to bring, in time, the number of dwellings to 25,000. The study and preparation of these plans have been carried out under the most rigorous secrecy." Speed eliminated esthetic factors, "and thus the plan that has emerged is a monstrous one: like a collection of matchboxes placed in endless rows along the hills of Jerusalem!"

Some 30 architects and engineers who visited Jerusalem to judge the plan expressed disillusionment. Samuel Moses of the American Institute of Urbanization could not find in it "a single expression of the distinctive character of the city . . . that is so holy for all of us." Yosef Tamir of Gahal deplored its poverty of "spiritual ideals." But its chief fault lies in its aggravation of antagonisms between Arab and Jew.

Youth Demands: Experts Protest

Actually, more Jews than most Arabs realize are among those who are troubled over the violation of human rights involved. At the March, 1970, Zionist Council Meeting, Raanan Weitz, head of the Committee for the Installation of the Jewish Agency, remarked: "Israel ought to put into operation a plan also for the repatriation of the Arab refugees. In creating a Zionist reality and demanding justice for ourselves, we have created a situation which is unjust for the others. . . . It is also our duty . . . to try to give justice to those who have been victims of injustice in this region: this is a Zionist need of the first rank."

The World Union of Jewish Students was more explicit. Meeting in Jerusalem in July, 1970, its 130 delegates voted 69 to 13 (the rest abstaining) that Zionism as "a movement of national and social liberation and emancipation of the Jewish people" can "be fulfilled only on the condition that the national rights of Palestinian Arabs be taken into consideration." They then appealed for the realization in Israel "of a democratic society, just, egalitarian, a fosterer of peace, one that recognizes the right of self-determination of all the people." With only one negative vote, it followed through with seven hard-hitting resolutions. The most pertinent of these were that the Congress "invites the youth and the people of Israel to back up those who oppose the annexation of territories, defending at the same time the right of the Israeli people to live in peace and security, . . . (and) . . . deplores the policy of the *fait accompli* adopted by the Israeli government by the founding of Jewish civil colonies in the occupied territories . . ."

To the chorus of protests were added the voices of U Thant, the U.S. State Dept., the *New York Times* and the *Jerusalem Post*. But the 'dozers kept 'bulling', Arab homes continue to vanish, the wall of high-rises is approaching completion with American/Jewish donations, and the cause of peace has taken a further step backward in the 'city of peace.' ■

PROPOSALS FOR THE HOLY PLACES

Many observers feel that the Israeli government is playing a card game for Jerusalem which is risky for the city and possibly for the whole country. Its high-speed procedures have ignored considerations of justice, equity, and, perhaps, humanity. Its rough-shod riding over explicit international arrangements and U.N. resolutions has defied world opinion.

Israeli Government Suggestions

The Israelis have made their intentions clear. Foreign Minister Abba Eban, in response to U Thant's note of October 15, 1969, declared that Jerusalem "has always been the fulcrum of the faith and of the nationalism of the Jews for 3,000 years, and the center of government of the State of Israel over the last 20 years" and would remain so. But "peace, when it shall be definitely established, will have to include an agreement with Christian and Muslim authorities, to guarantee the expression of the universal religious interests in question." International guarantees, especially from the U.N., are out.

In an interview with *Corriere della*

Sera (Milan, March 3, 1971) Eban justified his position by citing the relationship of the Vatican to Rome. This comparison is misleading, however, for, unlike the situation in Jerusalem, the people and government of Rome are overwhelmingly of the same religious faith as the Vatican. Furthermore, the question of Vatican City status in Rome was settled by common accord and international treaty between the two parties.

Eban's opposition to internationalization is nonetheless fortified in the mind of the Israeli general public by deep-rooted fears: of injury to Israel's sovereignty by international organizations, of new gentile oppressions, of the Arabs who outnumber them, and of Soviet influence if Jerusalem is internationalized. These emotions are understandable but not fully founded in objective reality. The *real* grounds for fear, as young Jews and intellectuals are coming to realize, can begin to be eliminated by establishing equal rights for *all* of Jerusalem's citizens.

UN Resolutions and the Holy See

The same UN resolution which in 1947 proposed the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine insisted that Jerusalem and environs be a separate entity, internationally administered. Twice in 1949, Pope Pius XII declared this to be the most satisfactory arrangement permitted by circumstances. He expressed the hope that, within this framework, justice, peace, veneration of the Holy Places and the rights of "so many children of the Church" would flourish.

At the U.N., however, the whole question slid into the limbo of good intentions without action. Then, in June, 1967, abrupt annexation of Arab Jerusalem by Israelis and their prompt proclamation of that city as their national capital, one and indivisible, brought the matter to the fore again, but with new complications. These include making over the entire city on an exclusivist and nationalistic basis, replacing U.N. resolutions with *faits accomplis*. Confronted with this situation, Pope Paul VI, on December 22, 1967, stressed once again the importance of an international administration for Jerusalem, both to safeguard the Holy Places of all three faiths and to guarantee the civil and religious rights of all citizens.

Minority Rights

L'Osservatore Romano of March 22, 1971, reasserted these concepts. It emphasized that peace depends on the "reciprocal sympathetic understanding" of the parties involved and on "the sense of justice of their official representatives" who should "inspire respect for the rights of the minority communities which today feel threatened in their existence and development by a policy which seems to be aiming at slow suffocation."

On June 24, the Pope stressed the urgency of bringing the conflicting parties together harmoniously. "It is to the Middle East," he noted, "where the Holy Land finds itself in the center of a conflict that we are forced to turn with passionate interest, and to express the wish, with almost prophetic instinct, for peace, for true peace. Everyone knows that this can never be the fruit of military victory and that no facile formula can be found for it. It is the very complexity of the situation which makes it extremely delicate and difficult. . . . Jerusalem, that city of unique and mysterious destinies, should be protected by a special status, guaranteed by a juridical international presidium, so that, instead of being the object of implacable controversies and endless strife, it may become a center of concord, peace and faith. To this end let us perform, in friendship, the task of persuasion."

The Plans of Rogers, Caradon and Others

On December 9, 1969, U.S. Secretary of State Wm. Rogers said: "The future status of Jerusalem . . . can be determined only through the agreement of the parties concerned. . . . Arrangements for the administration of the unified city should take into account the interests of all its inhabitants and of the Jewish, Islamic and Christian communities. And there should be roles for both Israel and Jordan in the civic, economic and religious life of the city."

On July 12, 1970, Lord Caradon, former British ambassador to the U.N., was more detailed: The city should be united, with one sector subject to Israel, the other to an Arab country, both answerable to a U.N. High Commissioner charged with maintaining unity, equality and liberty.

Religious leaders, including Catholic Bishop Collin of Digne, have had similar feelings. In June, 1971, Anglican Archbishop George Appleton of Jerusalem, impressed by evidences of sober realism among Israeli and Palestinian youth, proposed that a Jerusalem common council, half appointed by the heads of Jordan and Israel, and half elected by the citizens of the Old City, could work. To help facilitate this or any other solution, he proposed that leaders of the three religions involved meet to explore the possible contributions of each to the prospects of peace.

Years ago Martin Buber insisted that the growing Jewish presence in Palestine must be "comprehensively respectful toward those whose rights conflict with ours, and must seek to reconcile both sets of rights . . . in faith and love . . . ," placing human values above political considerations, cooperation and service above domination. Thus the Holy Land could become, as the prophets dreamed it should, "a light for the nations."

Buber, like Hammarskjold later, trusted in the power of faith, truth, love and understanding. These are the foundation on which alone peace can be built anywhere—including Jerusalem. ■

(Quotations in the above are translations of Italian translations. The words may, therefore, differ from the originals. The meaning should, however, be unaltered. L.H.W.)

FOOTNOTES TO RULLI

Rabbi Jacob Neusner of Brown University recently stated that "Jews . . . know that it is not the place, but the quality of life in it, that truly matters. No city is holy, not even Jerusalem," unless people "want to sanctify life in it." And, in the spirit of the Hebrew prophets Isaiah and Micah, he declared: "But if no city is holy, at least Jerusalem may be made into a paradigm of sanctity."

'Love in Reality'

Father Rulli would unquestionably support these views. However, both he and Dr. Neusner would doubtless also agree with Dostoyevsky that "love in reality is a harsh and difficult thing compared to love in dreams." And the same would apply to holiness.

The harsh and difficult realities in Jerusalem include deep-seated Israeli fears of what C. J. Eustace calls "hostile regional encirclement." And there are other Jewish anxieties, too. Rulli has dealt with these, but only in passing. Apparently he believes that Israel's efficient communications systems can keep the world posted on them. He thus limits himself largely to being a voice for the voiceless.

Most of the attacks being leveled against him center around the words 'Judaization' and 'suffocation'. This is partly, at least, a matter of vocabulary, as is shown by Neusner's puzzlement (in a different context) over "what the ambiguous adjective *Jewish* is supposed to mean when the noun *Judaism* has been abandoned."

If Martin Buber were still alive, he'd be among those who want to use the term 'Judaization' to stand for the deepening of every I-thou relationship by applying the Torah, Prophets, Wisdom Scripture and portions of the Apocrypha and Talmud to it. Jerusalem, Israel the State, Israel the Church (as in your hymnal) and all the world are in need of being so 'Judaized'. However, the increasingly ethnic (rather than religious) use of 'Jew' by Anti-Semites, Zionists and the whole alphabet between gives the word 'Judaization' overtones which suggest, instead, domination or displacement by ethnic Jews.

Suffocation?

It is at least this interpretation that gives Palestinian Arabs within the areas now controlled by Israel a premonition of ultimate "suffocation" when they hear or read certain statements from seemingly official sources. The April, 1969, publication of the Israeli Army Rabbinate did not console them when it said: "The Arabs, who are elements foreign to the essence and destiny of this country, must be considered from every point of view like the ancient foreign elements. Our war

with them was just as inevitable as were our wars with the nations who ruled the country during our ancient colonization. To live here with the Arabs is impossible, because the Arab turns to Mecca to say his prayers whereas we turn toward Jerusalem."

And from civilian life comes this quotation attributed to Golda Meir's advisor on Arab Affairs by the Histadruth (Israeli labor) journal, Sept., 1967: "Between ourselves, it must be clear that there is no room in this country for two nations. . . . No Arab must stay here."

Those Arabs who do stay must be subservient. Or such, at least, is the view reported with some alarm by Dr. Israel Shahak, president of the Israeli League for Human and Civil Rights (P.O. Box 14192, Tel Aviv). In an interview in the August 13, 1970, *Témoignage Chrétien* (from which the two previous quotes are also translated) he indicated: The Israelis "have resuscitated a book in Spanish dating from the 14th Century which is used as a manual of religious instruction in secondary schools. It explains why non-Jews ought to be the slaves of Jews 'because Jews are the élite of the human race and were especially created to give homage to the Creator. Because of this they deserve to have slaves, and these must be non-Jews, because a Jewish slave could not devote himself entirely to God . . .' "

Displacement by Immigrants?

But, for the Palestinian gentile, even servile jobs are insecure. The *Washington Post,* August 19, 1970, quotes Israel's Caretaker Absorption Minister Shimon Peres as declaring "that jobs now held by Arabs from occupied territories such as the Gaza Strip and the west bank of Jordan will have to go to Israelis, causing economic and political disruption in the territories. Although they could have serious consequences, Peres believes it is more important to encourage immigration while finding solutions to the problems it engenders. . . . The government will . . . help them (immigrants) to find housing and to obtain loans and mortgages on better terms than those available to other Israelis. The new immigrants are also exempt from income taxes, which are extremely high in Israel, for three years. . . . They will be eligible for a mortgage of just under $12,000 anywhere in the country and just over $13,000 if they decide to settle in Jerusalem. . . . Americans . . . now make up the largest group of foreign immigrants."

"To recruit immigrants, the Jewish Agency maintains 100 missions throughout the world, 23 of them in the U.S.", says the *Wall Street Journal's* Tel Aviv correspondent (page 1, June 5, 1970). These immigrants, or at least some of them, are, with their advantageous mortgages and tax exemptions, settled in Arab properties. The Jewish Telegraphic Agency (quoted in the Anglo-Jewish press for April 9, 1971) reports: "Israel is proceeding with the first stage of a controversial housing development that will establish 2,600 Jewish housing units in the former Arab sector of East Jerusalem, Housing Minister Zeev Sharef told the Knesset. . . . The project has been criticized in Israel for aesthetic reasons and denounced abroad on the grounds that it violated United Nations Security Council injunctions prohibiting Israel from unilaterally altering the status of Jerusalem."

A *New York Times* Feb. 16, 1971, report from Jerusalem quoted Sharef as saying that a new 35,000-unit housing program in Jerusalem (unacceptable to the U.S. State Dept. as changing the status of the city), designed to accommodate 122,000 new residents, has as its aim to keep Jerusalem a Jewish city. In the light of what the *Christian Science Monitor* calls "Ben-Gurion's time-proven axiom that an area settled is an area unlikely to be handed back for whatever reason" (Mar. 17, 1971), we can understand why Palestinians are apprehensive about "suffocating" prospects.

Displacement or subjugation of Palestinians apparently has 'religious' sanction. A Halachic ruling by Chief Rabbi Nissim declared "Jerusalem and the land of Israel are holy to us. The land was promised to us by the Almighty and all the prophets foretold its return to us. Therefore it is forbidden for any Jew even to consider returning any part whatsoever of the land of our forefathers." (*Jerusalem Post,* Oct. 29, 1967.)

Cheap One-Way Tickets

Displacements will go as smoothly as possible. House demolition does continue (e.g. JCNS, pub. Apr. 9, 1971), but other methods are preferred. The Histadruth article already quoted says: "We shall find the money to do it (displace Western Palestine Arabs towards the neighboring countries), a great deal of money, and only if we succeed shall we be able to absorb the millions of our brothers (who are still in other lands). . . . There is no other way." One such costly program is reported in Uri Avnery's *Ha'Olam Hazeh*: "The Petra tourist agency, subsidized by the Israeli Government, gives away almost free one-way tickets to Brazil to stimulate Arab emigration."

It is hard to give a fully balanced summation of facts. In trying to analyze the basis for Palestinian anxieties, however, the above information has had to be lumped together. There are other quotations, however, that are more comforting. JCNS (pub. July 30, 1971) states: "Moshe Dayan, the Israeli defense minister, said this week that he was prepared to consider suggesting to the government that West Bank Arabs who had left before the 1967 Six-Day War and wanted to come back should be allowed to do so."

That such statements should be interpreted by some as opportunistic and more for public consumption than as government policy is inescapable. An Arab has provided the following quotations to explain his lack of credence. Eshkol, he says, told the Knesset (Isreali parliament) on May 22, 1967, just before the June conquests, that his attitude toward the adjacent Arab states was "neither to violate either their security, or their territory." On June 29, moreover, while the dust of occupation was still settling, Eban denied to the press that Israel was annexing East Jerusalem and suggested that regulations recently passed there were purely "administrative." Yet, by July 24, the same Eban was telling a press conference that the unification of Jerusalem under Israel was "permanent." This was after Yigal Allon, Israeli Minister of Labor, had declared (July 5) that "the world must reconcile itself to the fact that the city has at last returned to the nation that founded it and that turned it into a holy city."

Healing a Wound

Georges Khodr, Arab Bishop of the Eastern Orthodox Diocese of Mt. Lebanon, has said of the Palestine tragedy, "I no longer identify myself in relation to a dogma but in relationship to a wound." A similar therapeutic spirit has been manifested by three Israeli professors whom Solly Sachs (London *Times,* March 2, 1971) quoted at length as seeking peace with the Arabs, not through territorial aggrandisement and military superiority so much as through justice leading to reconciliation.

Can you send us further conciliatory statements from various people involved in one aspect or another of this tragic conflict? Wouldn't it be great if we could fill an entire issue of LINK with them? They could help put Dostoievsky's kind of love effectively to work amidst the realities Rulli describes.—L.H.W.

THE LINK

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 the U.S. policy toward that area.

It is published by A.M.E.U. (Americans for Middle East Understanding, Inc.) whose directors are:

John V. Chapple, former CARE director, Gaza Strip project;

Bertram C. Cooper, Editor and freelance writer;

John H. Davis, Former Commissioner General UNRWA; International Consultant;

Dr. Harry G. Dorman, Jr. (sec.) former Director, Middle East and Europe Department, National Council of Churches;

Dr. Henry G. Fischer, Curator in Egyptology, Metropolitan Museum of Art. (V.P.)

Dr. Helen C. Hilling, Professor of Public Administration, N.Y.U.—(treas.)

L. Emmett Holt, Jr., M.D., Emeritus;

Dr. Carl Max Kortepeter, Assoc. Prof. Middle East History, NYU.

Msgr. John G. Nolan, National Secretary, Catholic Near East Welfare Association;

David C. Quinn, former Asst. Attorney General, N.Y. State.

Rev. Joseph L. Ryan, S.J., Cambridge Center for Social Studies;

Jack B. Sunderland, President of American Independent Oil Company—(pres.)

President Emeritus Henry P. Van Dusen of Union Theological Seminary, New York ;

Rev. L. Humphrey Walz, Near East Chairman, Presbytery of N.Y.C.; LINK editor.

Charles T. White, Former Financial Executive, Near East Foundation and AID;

John M. Sutton, Executive Director;
Mrs. D. Siddall, Administrative Assistant.

All correspondence should be addressed to Room 538, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, New York 10027.

HELP WANTED

The programs and services of AMEU (Americans for Middle East Understanding), including The LINK, depend entirely on voluntary contributions. Your gift, which is needed and will be appreciated, is tax-deductible.

INTERFAITH AD

Folded in with most mailed copies of this LINK are reprints of a full-page advertisement on "Everyone's Jerusalem" from The Washington Post. **If you wish to help defray its cost and make follow-up ads possible, send your check to the Interfaith Committee for Jerusalem, P.O. Box 428, New Canaan, Conn. 06840.**