

THE LINK

PUBLISHED BY AMERICANS FOR MIDDLE EAST UNDERSTANDING

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

Volume V, Number 1

January/February, 1972

Religion Used to Promote Hatred in Israel

"While the whole tendency of the Israeli state-apparatus is to use the Jewish religion for inculcating hatred toward Arabs particularly and all non-Jews generally, and for encouraging expansionistic and chauvinistic tendencies, the Army Rabbinate is the most widely and openly used vehicle."

This charge, leveled by B. Shefi, an Israeli Jew, appears in the December issue of *Middle East International*, the monthly magazine published in London. His article, "Israel: The Jewish Religion Abused," also describes Israeli Jews who actively oppose this debasing of their religion "into an instrument for promoting hatred and aggression."

Prophetic Opposition

In the Sept. 16 issue of *Ha'aretz*, Hanan Reich of Haifa (like Law Dean Amnon Rubinstein of Tel Aviv University on another occasion) deplored the use of the annual "Revival Campaign," to propagate contempt for gentiles. Every Israeli soldier must attend this campaign in preparation for the High Holy Days.

Reich pleads instead for a return to that Hebrew religious sensitivity which responds to God's call to "learn to do good; seek justice, correct oppression; defend the fatherless, plead for the widow" (Isaiah I:17).

In Jerusalem, Dr. Ya'acov Cohen has challenged the distortion of prayer and the Bible to foster military conquest. As an example, Dr. Cohen cites the new prayer book for Independence Day which was approved by Shlomo Goren, then Chief Rabbi of the Israeli Army.

The book's closing "prayer for increasing the borders of the state," asks God "to give us the borders which Thou hast promised to our ancestors, to give to their descendants the land from the River of Egypt to the Great River, the River Euphrates." Goren is now Chief Rabbi of Tel Aviv.

E. A. Simon, retired professor at the School of Education, Hebrew University, has protested in Jerusalem against official publications, designed for internal circulation, which identify the Arabs of today with the Biblical Canaanites. He particularly decries the use of the Bible to forecast the fate of present day Arabs in terms of what was anciently done against the Canaanites and other Palestinians, and also to sanction "helping to fulfill the prediction."

To illustrate the sort of thing that bothers men like Professor Simon, Shefi quotes from an April, 1969 feature article in *Mahanaim*, the Israeli

Army Rabbinate magazine. Entitled, "The Israeli Peace," the article declares that "all the Arabs . . . like Hitler," are solely motivated by the desire "to shed blood for its own sake." How, then, should one deal with them? Simply turn back the clock and handle them as Joshua and David did the Canaanites and Amalekites of old: Exterminate or expel those who can't be assimilated!"

When such practices are actually engaged in, the Israeli government can count on rabbis outside and inside the army to dig up some Biblical warrant for them. Going back with Shefi to 1953, we find Rabbi Shaul Israel, now in the Supreme Rabbinical Council, was asked to justify the massacre of Palestinian families in Qibya. The rabbi 'succeeded' by citing Numbers XXXI:17f., where Moses exhorted his soldiers to slaughter not only the Midianite men, but their wives and little boys as well.

(Continued on back page)

AMEU TO LEAD MORE M.E. TOURS

The announcement that AMEU is prepared to offer its services in arranging transportation, accommodations, and introductions for people interested in pursuing specialized interests in the Middle East, met with surprising response. Those turning to AMEU for help were far more numerous than anticipated and their requests for information were more diverse than expected.

Growing out of this announcement, AMEU has consulted with others who are preparing to lead tours in the Middle East. We are prepared to recommend to those writing to us a 14-day tour scheduled to depart January 27 and a 21-day pilgrimage scheduled to depart April 19.

Two outstanding study seminars can also be recommended. One, to be held April 3 - 22, and the other July 3 - 24. Several very economical charter flights to Lebanon and Turkey have also come to our attention.

AMEU is prepared to offer 15-day tours at Eastertime, at Pentecost, and again in early summer, to those who would travel under our direct auspices. Once again, we will help participants to meet the people of the Middle Eastern world and to understand the problems which they face today.

For further information write to 475 Riverside Drive, Room 538, New York 10027.

Before you travel to the Middle East consult AMEU.

CORRECTION: Cemetery Statement Challenged

A statement in our November/December issue has been challenged by various Americans who have known Jerusalem under British, Jordanian and Israeli rule. It ran: "And Jordan before 1967 had, in the course of road building, partially destroyed a Jewish cemetery on the Mount of Olives." We had heard this allegation so often that we had begun to believe it to be true.

In response to inquiries, however, we must confess that we've been unable to unearth facts to support it, though it continues to be quoted by those who favor a permanent Israeli takeover of Jerusalem. Asked for reliable data on the subject, Professor John C. Trever, whose research on the Dead Sea Scrolls has taken him and his camera repeatedly to that area, answers as follows:

"I have tried to identify what road is being talked about. It was the British who built the road around the Mount of Olives to Bethany, and it

does divide parts of the old Jewish cemetery. See my color photograph of that area in CRADLE OF OUR FAITH, Plate 26:a. I took that picture on March 15, 1948, and the road can be seen almost across the center of the picture. I was in the same place several times in 1958 and saw no appreciable change in the cemetery.

"In 1962 I was on the Mount of Olives talking with one of the men in charge of the building of the Intercontinental Hotel, and he told me that a road was to be built down to the Jericho road. In 1966 I expected to find that road completed but learned that it had not been built, because the Amman Government stopped it from going through the Jewish cemetery! Nor was there any road there in 1969 when I was last there. Therefore, I would like to know what road is being referred to. Most of the damage that was done to that cemetery was the result of the '48 war I am convinced and very little change followed."

From Jerusalem, we received a flier circulated by the anti-establishment Israeli Socialistic Organization on the

Hebrew University campus. The communication challenges not our statement so much as the logic which usually accompanies it:

"You protested when you heard about the desecration of Jewish cemeteries in various places.

"But why not protest when you hear that Agron Street in Jerusalem and the Hotel Hilton in Tel Aviv are standing on Muslim cemeteries?"

A final quotation, from an archaeologist's report of a visit to Israeli digs:

"We were proudly shown the 13 squares (opened in 1969) at Gezer near the acropolis (site 6). There we could see very clearly in the baulks skeletons cut right through, for the whole area was a Muslim cemetery. I was told by a Jewish student who worked in 1970 at the Beersheba dig that the same thing was done there."

Several readers have also reminded us that, long before 1967, the Israelis had bulldozed the Mamilla Cemetery to make the park near the American Consulate in West Jerusalem.

Link Asks 'What is Pro-Israel Stance'?

The Quakers, the Vatican and others who have sought to cope with Arab-Israeli realities continue to be attacked as 'anti-semitic' because they refuse to endorse an all-out "pro-Israel stance." Are such charges warranted?

We raised this question with Dr. Edwin M. Wright, who recently retired from a long career of Mideast-related U.S. government service dating back to the British Mandate in Palestine. By way of answer, he gives us information with which to reformulate our question more specifically.

"To discover what it is to be pro-Israeli and pro-Zionist," he writes, "it is essential to examine the pertinent documents issued by the Zionist State of Israel and specifically the charter it granted to the World Zionist Organization in 1953-54. This Covenant states that the central purpose of the establishment of the State of Israel is the 'Return of the Exiles' (or the liquidation of the Diaspora) to their homeland, Eretz Israel. Thus, to be pro-Israeli or pro-Zionist is to agree with, and give support to, this goal.

"The first part of this goal is clear: Most of the world's more than 12 million Jews live in 'exile' (i.e. outside Israel), almost half of them in the

U.S.A. The purpose of the State of Israel and Zionism is to 'ingather the exiles' (including American Jews) into 'their homeland, Eretz Israel.'

"That phrase, 'Eretz Israel,' however, is a mystery. What are its presumed boundaries? Officially, Israel has only stated negative propositions—that it will never return to the pre-June 1967 frontiers. But its spokesmen's constant repetition of Biblical references to justify State policies infers that the annexation of still more territory is envisioned.

"When, in 1947, President Truman stated he would support the U.N. Partition Plan assigning only part of Palestine to Zionist control, Rabbi Meyer Berlin telegraphed him a rebuke which quoted the Bible to 'prove' that the Jewish Nation was unique in that its laws and borders were established by Divine Revelation and could not be modified by any human institution or agency.

"Since then, Israel's Chief Rabbi Nissim has frequently pronounced the judgment that present-day Israel's proper boundaries are those specified in the Torah. In the aftermath of the June 1967 war, he issued a formal ruling known as a *psak halacha* which is the Jewish equivalent of a Papal Encyclical. In it he enjoined *all* individual Jews (including those in the

U.S.A.) as well as the Israeli government to refrain from 'even contemplating' the return of any territory that was included in God's promise to His people.

"It is essential, therefore, to enquire what the 'God-ordained' boundaries of Eretz Israel are supposed to be. By lumping together select portions of Holy Scriptures from various periods of ancient Israel's history (e.g. Numbers 34; Joshua 13, 2-6; I Kings 8, 65; II Kings 14, 25-28) you can come up with claims to 'all Lebanon', to all of inhabitable Jordan as it now is, to portions of Egypt and to Hamath, Damascus and beyond."

In the light of all this, we now replace our original broad query with two more limited questions: Quite apart from the resultant displacement of Palestinians, is it anti-semitic to suggest that we don't want our Jewish neighbors to answer Israel's appeal to leave us? And is it anti-semitic to suggest that politicizing the Bible in behalf of Israel's indefinite expansion must ultimately undermine the security of the Jews it would ingather?

Many, many Jews in and out of Israel answer 'No' on both counts.

—LHW

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.

Msr. 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.;

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

John M. Sutton, Executive Director;
Gene Attal, Associate Editor.

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

GROUP IN BOSTON NOW ORGANIZING

A new group interested in "a peaceful settlement of the Middle East situation" is organizing in the Boston area.

Tentatively called "Search for Justice and Equality in Palestine," the group is soliciting the support of Jewish, Muslim, and Christian individuals who believe a peaceful settlement of the struggle of Palestinians and Jews over the same homeland is possible and desirable, and that the Palestinians, like any other victimized national religious or ethnic group, cannot be expected to eschew violence forever if no peaceful alternatives exist."

Interested persons may contact the group through Edmund R. Hanauer, P.O. Box 53, Waverley, Mass. 02179. (Phone 617-489-0765)

"FOR THE WAR RECORD"

There are, regrettably, certain sadists who enjoy inflicting upon Jews a sense of perpetual unwantedness and upon Christians a feeling of vicarious guilt. We believe the following editorial, "For The War Record," from the United Church of Canada *Observer* should do much to help heal the resultant wounds:

"At meetings of the Associated Church Press in Philadelphia some time ago, we heard two speakers making reference to the failure of Christians of the West in dealing with the Hitler regime in Germany.

"One speaker, a professor of some eminence, said, 'No one did anything.' The other speaker expressed the same sentiment in similar words.

"We hear this slander repeatedly, especially from Christian Zionists who emphasize that the church did so badly by the Jewish people in times past it must now throw all its support behind Israel. This is pretty faulty reasoning but that seems to be the way it goes. Just for the record it should be remembered that in order to stop Hitler, a good many hundreds of thousands of western soldiers, sailors and airmen died.

Millions Died

"In eastern Europe uncounted millions of Czechs, Poles, Ukrainians, and others—Jews and Christians—were slaughtered before Russia brought Hitler's armies to a halt. Twenty million Russians died.

"Within Germany itself, thousands of German Christians died in their futile attempt to resist Hitler. For example, 2,771 priests and an unestimated number of Protestant clergymen, including Martin Niemöller, were imprisoned in the infamous camp at Dachau. About 1000 of them died in that camp of hunger, ill-treatment or disease.

"That great German theologian, Karl Barth, wrote after VE Day in 1945, 'In proportion to its task, the Church has sufficient reason to be ashamed that it did not do more. Yet in comparison with those other groups and institutions, it has no reason to be ashamed; it had accomplished far more than all the rest.'

Einstein Quoted

"Whenever we hear a western clergyman, forgetting his church history, say of the Hitler era, 'No one did anything', we are reminded of the famous statement by Jewish professor, Albert Einstein, who said:

"'Being a lover of freedom, when the (Nazi) revolution came, I looked to the universities to defend it, knowing that they had always boasted of their devotion to the cause of truth; but no, the universities were immediately silenced. Then I looked to the great editors of the newspapers, whose flaming editorials in days gone by had proclaimed their love of freedom; but they, like the universities, were silenced in weeks.

"'Only the Church stood squarely across the path of Hitler's campaign for suppressing the truth. I never had any special interest in the Church before, but now I feel a great affection and admiration for it because the Church alone has had the courage and persistence to stand for intellectual and moral freedom. I am forced to confess that what I once despised I now praise unreservedly.'

STAFF CHANGES IN OFFICE, LINK

It is with regret that we must announce the resignation of Mrs. D. Siddall, administrative assistant, for reasons of health. We express our gratitude for her excellent help during the two years she has served in this capacity.

The Rev. L. Humphrey Walz, who has served as *The Link* editor from the very beginning, has temporarily increased his responsibility in the New York Synod of the United Presbyterian Church, USA, and during this interval will not be able to continue to serve AMEU in this capacity.

Gene Attal, a graduate student in the Columbia University School of Journalism, will act as associate editor in Mr. Walz's absence.

All of us at AMEU hope that Humphrey will be able to return to his work with us, for his contributions to the progress of AMEU and *The Link* are invaluable.

NEW COPTIC LEADER ENTHRONED NOV. 14

The heads of three Orthodox churches and representatives of several others joined a Roman Catholic cardinal and the general secretary of the World Council of Churches in paying tribute to the new Patriarch of the Coptic Orthodox Church upon his enthronement in Cairo November 14.

Bishop Shenuda, 48, a graduate of Cairo University who has been in charge of religious education for the church, was enthroned as the 117th successor to St. Mark as Patriarch of the Coptic Orthodox Church and Pope of Alexandria. He succeeds Pope Kyrillos VI who, as noted in the *Link* at the time, died last March.

Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, general secretary of the World Council, spoke on the unity of the Church at a dinner meeting following the enthronement. Present were the following visiting Orthodox dignitaries: Moran Mar Ignatius Yacub III, Syrian Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch; Khoran I, Catholicos of the Armenian Church of Cilicia; a representative of Abuna Theophilos, Patriarch of the Ethiopian Church; and others.

A.U.N. SUGGESTS NATIONAL MEETING

Americans for United Nations Responsibility in the Middle East, Inc., a private non-partisan, non-profit organization of concerned Americans, has proposed that a national meeting be called to influence American foreign policy in the direction outlined in the following resolution:

Whereas, Washington's warning that "a passionate attachment of one nation for another . . . betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter without adequate inducement or justification," is still valid today;

Whereas, in a democracy foreign policy should be in the interest of the whole community rather than for the real or apparent benefit of any special group;

Whereas, although neither the Jews nor the Arabs are the original inhabitants of Palestine, the claims to the land of each have some merit;

Whereas Russian influence in the area has increased as the result of favoritism to one of the parties;

Be it herefore resolved that the United States support the concept of a settlement based on moral principles as opposed to force, through the United Nations.

Be it further resolved that the United States desist making any pledges regarding the political independence or territorial integrity of Israel or any Arab state.

Be it further resolved that the United States desist supplying arms to Israel, Lebanon, Jordan, or any other Arab state.

The members of the group urge the formation of a coalition to work for adoption by the major political parties at their state and national conventions in 1972 of the components of this Middle East Resolution.

American involvement in a Mideast war can best be prevented it is felt by a policy of "no pledges; no arms." The group also is working to strengthen the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations and to enlarge the role of the International Court of Justice.

Interested groups or individuals may write to: A.U.N.M.E., P.O. Box 15424, Wedgwood Station, Seattle, Washington, 98115.

PETITION

ACJME Chapter Seeks Signatures

The current session of the United Nations General Assembly serves as a backdrop for a private American initiative to focus attention on the plight of the displaced Arab people of Palestine.

The Melbourne, Florida, branch of the American Committee for Justice in the Middle East (ACJME) has prepared a petition appealing for justice on behalf of these Palestinian Arabs.

The first 2,300 names collected were presented by an interfaith delegation at a meeting Dec. 16 in the United States Mission to the United Nations.

The delegation consisted of Dr. John H. Davis, former UNRWA Commissioner-General; Rev. John Sutton, executive director of Americans for Middle East Understanding; Dr. Norton Mezvinsky, professor of history, Connecticut State College (New Britain); Mrs. Margaret Pennar, Association of Arab-American University Graduates; and John P. Richardson, executive vice president, American Near East Refugee Aid.

A spokesman for the group said the petition effort, which only began recently, will continue into 1972 with a goal of 25,000 names.

American Near East Refugee Aid (ANERA) has offered its services in helping to enlist the active support of groups and individuals across the country.

Persons wishing to sign the petition may do so by filling in the space below.

The petition reads:

Dear Ambassador Bush:

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations states, in Article 13 (2): "Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country". Too little attention has been given to the denial by Israel of the right of the displaced Arab people of Palestine to return to their homeland, despite repeated efforts by the United Nations in support of this right.

The record of the United Nations in this regard speaks for itself:

1) General Assembly Resolution 194 (III) (1948) stated the principal of repatriation and/or compensation for the Palestinians. This Resolution, supported by the United States, has been reaffirmed consistently since 1948.

2) Security Council Resolution 237 (1967) called upon the government of Israel to facilitate the return of Palestinians who left areas which fell under Israeli occupation following fighting in June, 1967.

3) General Assembly Resolutions 2252 (1967) and 2452 (1968) called for Israel to take "immediate and effective steps — without delay" for the return of the Palestinians to their homes.

4) General Assembly Resolution 2672 (1970) stated that "full respect for the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine is an indispensable element in the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East."

The continued exile of the Christian and Moslem Arabs of Palestine from their homeland is a blot on the conscience of all mankind. In this "statement of conscience" we urge that the United States use its influence to assure that the Palestinian people be granted their rights. The United Nations has spoken clearly. The United States, which is pledged to support the United Nations Charter, must act now.

With esteem and best wishes.

Name

Address

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Please clip this out and return it to: ACJME, Melbourne Branch, PO Box 1856, Melbourne, Florida 32901.

On Holy City's Future:

Responding to the request from the House Sub-Committee on The Near East for a statement on the future of Jerusalem, the United Church of Christ submitted its official declaration on the subject along with explanatory notes. Although this is shortly to be published along with other statements in a Congressional booklet, we feel our readers will appreciate an advance viewing of it, especially as it supplements our earlier materials from Roman Catholic sources:

STATEMENT ON THE FUTURE STATUS OF JERUSALEM

The United Church of Christ Board for World Ministries is heavily involved in the struggles of the people of the world for justice and in the efforts of Christians to bring about reconciliation among all men. The Board is especially active throughout the Middle East where since the 1820's its representatives have been engaged in church, educational, publication, medical and relief work. As do all Christians, the members of the corporation, the executive staff and all the field missionaries of the Board look upon Jerusalem as a Holy City. They also are deeply conscious of and sympathetic to the religious significance of Jerusalem to Jews and Muslims.

Therefore, the Board is greatly concerned about the future of Jerusalem. It is imperative that Jerusalem be protected from conflict and disorder, so it may continue to fulfill its historic function as the serene and holy center for scholarship, reflection and worship for the Christians, Jews and Muslims of the world.

The Board calls the attention of the Congress and the people of the United States to a Statement on the Middle East, adopted in June, 1971 when the General Synod of the United Church of Christ, the central deliberative body of the denomination, set Peace and United States Power: Middle East

"Goal. To have members of the United Church of Christ understand the needs and aspirations of the Israeli and Arab, particularly Palestinian, peoples and the issues that divide them, to be sympathetic to all sides and to assist in the achievement of a negotiated peace.

Objective 1. To establish procedures throughout the United Church to help understand the history of the Middle East and the causes and forces that dominate the area; and to develop public support for United Nations and United States Government action that will safeguard the aspirations and interest of the people deeply affected by the Middle East conflict.

Objective 2. To continue present support for programs of relief and rehabilitation for Arab refugees in cooperation with sister churches in the Middle East and to respond to the call of those churches for a program of

information and interpretation concerning the cause of the refugee problem.

Objective 3. To support those policies of the United States Government which decrease the element of great power rivalry or conflict in the Middle East, recognizing at the same time that all the great powers consider that they have legitimate national interests in the area stemming from a variety of factors: geographic, strategic, and economic."

Underlying Assumptions

Although the General Synod did not make specific mention of Jerusalem in its action, there are underlying assumptions which speak to the nature of the Middle East conflict and pertain as well to Jerusalem. One of these relates to both Israeli and Palestinian Arab aspirations and the need to recognize these in any settlement. Another is the experience of several elements in the conflict including among others Great Power (US-USSR-China) rivalry, Arab-Israeli confrontation, inter-Arab disputes, and the Palestinian Arab-Israeli struggle. It is difficult to separate any one of these elements from any other.

Jerusalem: A Microcosm

The question of the status of Jerusalem is a case in point. We would see the Jerusalem question as a microcosm of the basic Palestine problem and inseparable from it. Here we would make a distinction between the basic Palestine problem, i.e. the conflict between Israelis and Palestinian Arabs over rights to the land of Palestine, now Israel, and the wider conflict between Israel and the Arab States. Just as the basic Palestine problem will be solved only by accommodation between Israeli Jews and Palestinian Arabs and a sharing of the land of Palestine, so too the question of the future status of Jerusalem is inextricably tied to these same people, be they Jewish, Muslim or Christian.

Interest in Jerusalem

Apart from our view of Jerusalem as a vital part of our Christian spiritual heritage, we have a primary interest in the city as a living, developing community of men, women and children. In this respect, Jerusalem has the same significance as any other city in the world. Speaking out of our concern for those anywhere who find themselves a minority, voiceless, and powerless, we feel a responsibility to call attention to the Palestinian Arabs who, in the present situation in Jerusalem and elsewhere in the Middle East, find themselves in this lonely position. At the same time, we recognize that they are not alone as an oppressed minority in the Middle East today. Others, including Jews living in some Arab countries, suffer the same fate. We call attention to the Palestinian Arabs since we see a just resolution of their situation as essential to an overall peace in the area. This, in turn, would relieve the plight of other minorities. Our concern for Palestinian Arabs does not give them precedence over Israeli Jews, who too have known the fears and persecution of minority status. However, we see our task as providing a voice to the voiceless and

empowerment to those who otherwise are powerless and who, as Palestinian Arabs, cannot under present conditions engage in discussion or negotiation of their own future, be it in Jerusalem or in Palestine, now Israel.

Jerusalem: A City of Peace

In order that Jerusalem may once again become a City of Peace, as its name suggests, it must be a city in which all inhabitants, Jewish, Christian, or Muslim, feel at home in a milieu of cultural, religious and ethnic pluralism. The political structure of the city must provide for a maximum of participation by all those who live there, regardless of their religious or ethnic identification.

Any arrangement for the future status of Jerusalem must have the acceptance of the people living there as well as of those who regard it as their home. We see not only the Israelis, therefore, as having a key role in determining the future of the City, but also the Palestinian Arabs, be they of Jordanian or whatever nationality at present. Consequently, it is the Palestinian Arabs, rather than existing Arab governments, who must be brought into discussion of the future status of Jerusalem.

We view the present situation in Jerusalem as one which denies to Palestinian Arabs and other non-Jewish minorities these basic rights and one in which cultural pluralism is being seriously threatened. If a single political entity is to control the City, it must be organized to provide full rights to all residents presently living there. In addition, opportunity must be given to those Palestinians, former residents now living elsewhere, who wish to return and participate in the peaceful development of the City to do so. A large-scale return of Palestinian Arabs to Jerusalem and the restoration of their rights would symbolize an important step toward the kind of situation in the City which we would support.

Future Status of Jerusalem

We do not feel it is our prerogative to determine the future form of the political structure of Jerusalem. The international community, and American religious and secular groups as part of that community, working to the greatest extent possible through the United Nations, have a responsibility to help create an environment and incentive which encourage those directly involved in Jerusalem to move toward a just solution of their differences, recognizing the interests of all who regard the City as their home. The role of the international community, including ourselves, is to insist upon the observance of internationally recognized human rights for all the people of Jerusalem, including a right of self-determination and full participation in the administration of the City.

We do not regard promises of a guarantee of a special status to Christian Holy Places in Jerusalem as meaningful, however important the Holy Places are to a significant portion of the Christian community. Such guarantees would not secure the rights of the resident worshipping communities of the City, whatever their faith. Nor do we see the various proposals for internationalization of the City as solutions having long-term validity. How-

(Continued on page 7)

Book Reviews

THE ISRAELIS: FOUNDERS AND SONS, by Amos Elon, 357 pp. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.

As the title of this popular Book of the Month Club selection suggests, Amos Elon compares the point of view of younger Israelis with the goals and attitudes of the successive waves of Zionist settlement.

He emphasizes the dominant role that is still played by the East European pioneer component of Israeli society which is circumscribed not only ideologically, but geographically: "a circle drawn on a map of Russia at a distance of 500 miles from Minsk would probably include the birthplaces of at least two thirds of the present *mandarins*". It is coevally circumscribed as well; during the first two decades of the Israeli parliament the average age of the delegates rose by exactly twenty years, from 43 to 63. Since the vicissitudes of old age will inevitably alter this situation to some degree within the very near future, Elon's comparison of attitudes is of some importance as an indication of future policies.

Himself a member of the younger generation—45 years being little indeed by present patriarchal standards—the author can speak with some authority. His experience in Washington, Bonn and Paris, as foreign correspondent for the Israeli newspaper *Haaretz* has doubtless contributed to his ability to explain some of the most galling problems of Israeli society in terms that cannot fail to elicit the sympathy of an outsider. Even so, I am told that his book has been criticized in Israel because it deals with "family matters" in a language other than Hebrew, and did not even make its first appearance in that language.

Informative as it is, however, Elon's book offers little hope of any constructive change in Israeli policy toward the Arabs. While the sufferings of the Palestinians are not only recognized, but regarded with sympathy, there is nonetheless a tendency to cancel out the wrongs of the past step by step, much as the borders of the Jewish State have successively expunged the old lines of demarcation. By 1935 "the rescue of the refugees already figured more prominently than the need for finding a compromise with the Arabs"; in 1968 "for most Israelis the almost century-old debate over the rightness or wrongness of Zionism reduced itself to a purely academic matter"; and today, Elon concludes,

The Arabs bore no responsibility for the breakdown of civilization in Europe. Yet their opposition to Zionism grew so ferocious, their insensitivity to Jewish sentiments so great, their refusal of all compromise so absolute, the violence so indiscriminate and the policies, finally, so genocidal — that the original imbalance between right and wrong was lost. In time it was almost entirely superseded by fresh concerns, by a new balance of rights and wrongs within the framework of an entirely new *existential* situation (pp. 323-324).

Elon does not doubt the Six-Day War of 1967 "saved Israel from extinction" and does not explicitly question the assumption that "the newly-won strategic strongholds" must be retained in the absence of "direct negotiations which would lead up to a fully fledged peace pact." He recognizes that the absorption of a large additional Arab minority will make for problems. He also recognizes that "peace is never absolute" and "can never be both immediate and complete," and that: "The Israeli call for [a] formal, final peace settlement assumes the attainability in the Near East of conditions which now prevail only in the Scandinavian or Benelux countries". He believes that "Peace with the Arabs, even some kind of semi-permanent border settlement, could alter [Israeli] attitudes beyond present recognition." But he does not propose to reverse this sequence of possibilities.

That is not to say that Elon is uncritical of Israeli attitudes, including some that decidedly contribute to the present unyielding policies. In particular he criticizes the power of the theocrats, which, he says, has been enhanced in recent years by an atavistic, sentimental religiosity that "probably reflects the deep psychological crisis of an aging power elite, and in some cases borders on chauvinism and racism". In addition to the ruling against the evacuation of occupied areas that was issued by the Sephardic Chief Rabbi of Israel, Yitzchak Nissin, in 1967, one might, in this connection, also quote the Ashkenazi Chief Rabbi who, addressing Jewish settlers in the occupied Upper Jordan on October 6, 1970, hoped that the border might be moved still farther eastward "to include our Gilead," adding that "we have not finished conquering what is our own and what was promised to our fathers."

Elon concludes that "if Zionism was destined ultimately to merely bring

about the establishment of another national theocracy, containing medieval orthodoxy with modern chauvinism, both Jews and Arabs will have paid too high a price for it." With this exception — admittedly a most important one — he avoids any recommendations that concern the Arab-Israeli conflict. To a considerable degree his own point of view seems imbued with the doctrine of *ain brera*, "there is no choice," which, he says, might serve as the motto of contemporary Israel (p. 224).

While the section that deals with the earlier settlers is presented in historical sequence, the rest of the book is far less orderly, less consistent, and less reliable. The uninformed reader will not only remain uninformed about many of the principal situations and events of the last 25 years, but will, in many cases, be misinformed. Since readers of *The Link* have the means to repair such shortcomings for themselves, I shall only cite one example. It is stated that "if left to themselves, a *modus vivendi* might have developed between the two sides" and that it was the invasion of the neighboring Arab states that eliminated this possibility at the end of the British mandate on May 15, 1948. The fact is that, in the wake of a gradual British withdrawal during the five preceding months, the Haganah and other Jewish military units had taken over one Arab area after another with such success that, as Yigal Allon has stated, the whole of Palestine would have been seized had it not been for the intervention of the Arab armies. And within the conquered area the bulk of the Arab population had been put to flight.

In his concluding chapter Elon states, "We have seen that what men thought was true was often more important than the truth itself". As he approaches recent history, he finds it increasingly difficult to make that distinction.

GIFT TO CONTRIBUTORS

A memorial gift honoring the memory of Dr. Elias J. Sawabini and Victor E. Sawabini makes it possible for us to send a copy of WHO KNOWS BEST MUST SAY SO by Rabbi Elmer Berger, to each person who sends a special contribution to AMEU during January and February. The gifts are tax-deductible. Contributions are necessary to continue the work of AMEU.

PEACE IN THE HOLY LAND,

by Sir John Bagot Glubb

published by Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., St. Paul's House, London E. C. 4, 1971.

Peace in the Holy Land is the latest in a distinguished series about the Arab world, its history, and its current problems by Sir John Bagot Glubb. Expressing his surprise at "the number of books written about the Palestine problem which commence in 1917 or 1920," the author begins his account with the early town dwellers in Palestine about 7000 B.C., and brings it down to our present day.

The book is available in the United States from Lawrence Verry Inc., River Road, Mystic, Connecticut 06355.

KUWAIT JOURNEY,

by A. John Daniels, Asst. Director of Finance, Government of Abu Dhabi.

published by White Crescent Press, Ltd., Luton, England, 1971.

KUWAIT JOURNEY is story of a people with strong tradition who moved their land at the head of the Arabian Gulf from isolation to world affluence during the relatively short period—15 years—the author lived there. John Daniels is eminently qualified to tell this story, pointing out in detail, the natural advantages given, the character inherited, the problems faced internally and the perils externally—in learning how to manage the quickening pace of their national and international affairs in a responsible, efficient and progressive way. He writes of the total scene, covering each aspect of government responsibility.

The chronological portion of KUWAIT JOURNEY points out the background and follows in proper perspective the growth of Kuwait as a nation unto itself and as leader in the development of the Arab world—economic, social and political. This story does not just relate statistics that justifiably point to Kuwait's phenomenal growth, nor does it glamorize or simplify the progress achieved. Telling of Kuwaiti customs, he shows their character, adaptation to change, and confrontation with challenge. Telling of Kuwait's history, he shows a heritage that has enabled a people and government to rise from protection through independence to influential power; to surmount the many and complex problems thrust on a new small State with sudden enormous wealth. Pointing to the future, perhaps this potential will constructively guide Kuwait's neighbours on the Arabian Gulf. John Daniels hopes so. He has

Weapons for the Middle East?

We believe our readers would be interested in the following "letter-to-the editor" which appeared Dec. 3 in a New York newspaper:

To the Editor:

In light of the two letters dealing with the Mideast in your Nov. 20 column and with the visit of Israeli Premier Meir to Washington in search of weapons and diplomatic support, the American public should be aware of the potential ramifications for our nation in both the explicit and implied commitments we have in that region.

The special status accorded Israel through the Jackson amendment to our own national military procurement bill last year was repeated again in the Senate vote on Nov. 23. Thus, Israel is treated as an integral part of the U.S. and/or those areas where our armed forces are stationed or actively involved, as in Southeast Asia or Europe. What is implied in this unique action authorizing \$500 million in military credits?

The weapons sought by Israel are either directly or indirectly offensive. Prior to the 1970 Suez ceasefire arranged by Secretary Rogers, the deep penetration bombing of Egypt with a high civilian casualty toll was carried out by American-made Phantoms. Both the Phantom F-4 and the Skyhawks are described as first-line attack aircraft. Undiminished Israeli air superiority, i.e., the military imbalance in Israel's favor, insures continued occupation of Arab territory taken in 1967.

As for the Lancer surface-to-surface missiles, they could be classified as primarily

defensive only if deployed within the pre-June 5, 1967 Israeli borders. If placed in Arab Jerusalem, Jordan's West Bank area, the Golan Heights, Gaza or Sinai, such missiles could be viewed only as offensive by enabling Israel to continue its occupation. The implied U.S. policy, should Washington make such weapon deliveries, would be that of tacit support for Israeli occupation, settlement and annexation of Arab land.

Americans have a right to ask that our commitment to Israel be defined. The lack of guidelines certainly aided in the gradual creeping escalation of U.S. involvement in Vietnam. Each new Congressional poll [Congressional Record, July 7, Aug. 3, Sept. 16, Sept. 23, among others] indicates an ever increasing majority of our citizens want no deep unilateral commitment to Israel but a multinational approach to the problem as well as decreasing support for military aid to Israel.

It seems clear Americans may be willing to undertake a commitment to uphold the existence of Israel proper (pre-June 5, 1967 borders) but not an unlimited understanding to support Israeli expansionism. It is time we finally face the international position premised upon the admissibility of territorial expansion through force embodied in the Nov. 22, 1967 United Nations resolution for which the U.S. voted. It is time our Government defined its Middle East commitment and brought our stated and implied policies into alignment. DAVID L. HENDRY

Chairman, American Committee for Justice in the Middle East
Boulder, Colo., Nov. 26, 1971

HOLY CITY

(Continued from page 5)

ever, it may be that in lieu of other proposals or developments guaranteeing the rights of all the people of Jerusalem, both present residents and those former residents now refugees elsewhere, consideration of some form of internationalization may be the only recourse open to the world community.

United States Policy

Present United States policy on Jerusalem maintains official recognition of the 1947 proposal for the internationalization of Jerusalem. The recent vote of the United States in the United Nations Security Council condemning the actions of the Israeli Government in altering the status of the City is further evidence of this policy. While maintenance of this policy has little *de facto* relevance, it may be of importance as a *de jure* position until there is a transformation of the situation more consonant with the inter-

written KUWAIT JOURNEY as a balanced message about a people, part of the land that became a State, which is part of a nation. He writes as an Englishman with close personal ties to, and an intimate knowledge of, his subject, in part as an historian, economist, and political scientist, but most of all in a most readable way, as a first-hand storyteller.

ests of all people concerned.

While seeking to maintain a balance of power with the Soviet Union in the Middle East, the United States appears to have been forced into supporting a *status quo* which does not take into account all the dynamics of the changes occurring in the area. In particular, the importance of the Palestinian Arabs in the resolution of the Middle East conflict has received little attention from U. S. policy makers. In fact, there is a suggestion that the policy of the U. S. would see a solution which might prejudice the future of the Palestinian Arabs, not only in favor of Israel but also of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

It is difficult to see how the United States can fulfill its role of helping to create the environment and incentives for peace in the area until it comes to grips with the Palestinian element in the Middle East conflict. We feel that it is at this point that the American religious community has a responsibility to relate to the Palestinian community and its still-evolving sense of identity. We should press its leaders to define their goals more clearly, and also urge the United States government to demonstrate more understanding toward the Palestinian Arab community than has been the case in the past. In this way we as American Christians and members of the United Church of Christ may fulfill our responsibility for justice and reconciliation in the Middle East and in particular in relation to the Israeli and Palestinian Arab peoples.

Religion Used to Promote Hatred in Israel

(Continued from page 1)

More recently, Rabbi Obadia Hadaya, also of the Supreme Rabbinical Council, endorsed Israel's 1967 conquests as "liberation" of the Holy Land from Satan.

No Rights for Gazans?

And, just last September (as reported in *Yedioth*), a group of rabbis visited Gaza not to "seek justice, correct oppression, defend the fatherless (or) plead for the widows" but, to reassure General Yitzhack Pudak and his Chief Rabbi Moshe Zeltzberg that (in Rabbi Ya'acov Shtiglitz's words): "Arabs in the Gaza Strip have no rights of ownership on their land." After all, Biblical Professor Yehuda Elitzur promptly pointed out, Gaza is Jewish and Israeli, because the tribe of Judah once had captured it from the Canaanites!

That was thousands of years ago and the conquerors soon lost it. But that ancient loss, according to Elitzur, was due to the "sin" of not having "utterly driven away the inhabitants." Now, at last, however, as Shtiglitz sees it, its conquest by the Israeli Army, "which was done by the force of religion and its laws," has sanctified the Gaza Strip by "Holy War" for permanent Israeli annexation!

Shefi is bothered by the fact that complaints about such twisting of a great religious heritage receive "absolutely no response from official circles." Instead, the Israeli political establishment rewards subservient rabbis by giving them the authority "to require the majority of the Jewish inhabitants of Israel—who are not religious—to obey religious laws in which they don't believe" and which create hardships,

unparalleled in other countries, for certain categories of Jews.

The Plight of Jewish 'Bastards'

For instance, all descendants of 'adulterous marriages' are classified as 'bastards' whose rights in Israel are strictly curtailed. "Let us suppose," says Shefi, "that a Jewish woman in London in 1870 married a Jew, was divorced in an English court and married again—a Jew. Since the non-Jewish divorce is not recognized, the second marriage is considered 'adulterous', and all the children born of it, and their . . . descendants . . . will be considered 'bastards' and will be written down in a special book (popularly known as the 'black book')" maintained by the Israeli Rabbinate.

Women converts to Judaism are also restricted by rabbinical laws—those applying to prostitutes—for, "as the current *Talmudic Encyclopaedia* (Vol. 7, p.23, 1953) puts it: 'Every female born a gentile has the name of a prostitute even if she did not have sexual relations.'"

Then there's the Jew who suddenly discovers that a grandmother, great-grandmother or great-great-grandmother was not Jewish or was converted to Judaism by the 'wrong' kind of rabbi. This break in the female line makes him officially 'non-Jewish,' automatically nullifies his marriage in Israel and, among other things, disqualifies him as a blood donor to the Red Mogen David (Israeli equivalent of the Red Cross).

Israeli rabbis complain that French and British officials don't cooperate in tracking down such defects of ancestry. The West Germans do, however, possibly through fear that otherwise "they would be accused of Anti-Semi-

tism." Hence, Israeli Jews of German origin are among the most insecure in the face of the constant genealogical investigations by the rabbinate. (Mrs. Shulamit Aloni of the Israeli Labor Party writes further on this theme in her 1970 book *Hashesder* ("The Deal").)

The 'Smell' of Race

Even top judges accommodate to the ethnic ethics of the establishment rabbis. President Agranat of the Israeli Supreme Court, for instance, chimes in with racial arguments to support the rabbis' prohibition of marriage with gentiles.

"The most important Jewish opinion, is after all the holiness of the Jewish race . . ." Agranat said. "It is difficult to speak about race today . . . because the Nazis have made the word 'race' smell bad. But let us not allow the Nazis to turn our minds from the true significance of this quality . . . which consists of the feelings of people who see themselves as having common blood." This common blood, the Supreme Court's former vice-president Moshe Zilberg joins in asserting, accompanies character superior to the gentiles'.

These and other interlockings of rabbinical dicta with political practices are less well known than they might be—partly because in Israel the rabbis still do much of their writing in an unfamiliar medieval Hebrew dialect. Also many people just don't consider the subject important. In Shefi's eyes, this is regrettable because, "without understanding this, none of the so-called 'real problems', like secure borders, Arab-Jewish relations, etc., can be properly understood at all."

—LHW



Americans for
Middle East Understanding, Inc.
Room 538, 475 Riverside Drive
New York, N.Y. 10027

