

THE LINK

Volume 8, Number 5, Winter 1975-6

"Zionism"? "Racism"? What do you mean?

by L. Humphrey Walz

The builders of the Tower of Babel, like the founders of the U.N., craved human unity. Their undertaking crumbled, however, when they could "not understand one another's speech."

After the November 10 resolution defining "Zionism" as "a form of racism," it began to look as if a similar fate might be in store for the U.N. Defenders and opponents alike were denouncing each other as hypocritical, self-serving and morally bankrupt. Some, including branches of the U.S. government, were threatening others in ways that boded ill for the world body. Petulant voices were openly advocating 'blackmail' (the current trigger-word for 'economic sanctions') against the U.N. itself.

Few, it soon became evident, had pondered deeply what they meant by either 'racism' or 'Zionism'. Even fewer were bothering to discover how their antagonists were understanding those words. Aristotle's insistence that communication is impossible without definitions of terms was never more in order.

Asked to clarify whose definitions of 'Zionism' and 'racism' he has had in mind when using these terms at the U.N., U.S. Ambassador Daniel Patrick Moynihan has so far declined to answer. Nor has he or his Zionist advisor (and reputed speechwriter), Norman Podhoretz, replied to the question: "Are there indications that some of the proponents of the 'Zionism-racism' resolution have different concepts that are complicating communication?"

Pending official elucidation by more responsive spokesmen from both sides of the fence, the following glossary may serve as a handy checklist for interpreting their terminology.

"RACISM"

What do you mean by 'racism'? The *American Heritage Dictionary* answers simply: "The notion that one's own ethnic stock is superior."

That succinct definition can apply to the convictions of a lot of non-Zionists.

ABOUT THIS ISSUE

This issue of The Link is devoted to an examination of the resolution on Zionism and racism adopted on November 10 by the United Nations General Assembly.

AMEU has received many requests for information on the issue, typified by the letter stating: "We are seeking materials relating to the subject of Zionism, especially as it arose in history and its relationship to anti-Semitism. We plan to supply material for 50 churches in the area on this topic."

AMEU hopes that the following articles will help deepen understanding of a situation constituting one of the world's most difficult problems. The views expressed in the following pages are the authors' alone, not those of AMEU, which hopes that their inclusion here will make a positive contribution to the discussion now taking place.

It also flows over onto any Zionist who affirms with Ben-Gurion: "I believe in our moral and intellectual superiority and our capacity to serve as a model of redemption of the human race." His use of 'race' was all-embracing. His statement, however, illustrates the *American Heritage* understanding of 'racism'. (See Dimont, *The Indestructible Jew*, 1971, p. 438.)

UNESCO's official definition covers a far more disturbing phenomenon. The 'racism' it deplores consists of "anti-social beliefs and acts which are based on the fallacy that discriminatory inter-group relations are justifiable on biological grounds."

Defenders of the U.N.'s "Zionism-racism" equation regard Israel's basic 1950 Law of Return and 1952 Nationality Law as "discriminatory" since both grant to the world's Jews rights which

they withhold from Palestinian and other Gentiles. Among other Israeli practices so cited is the fact that "more than 90% of the inhabited areas of the State of Israel falls under the regulations of the Jewish National Fund, under which non-Jews cannot rent or buy a house or flat, or open a business" (*American Report*, Sep. 16, 1974).

But is that discrimination racial? A 1972 lawsuit in Washington said, "Yes." In challenging the tax-exempt status of the United Jewish Appeal and its chief component, the United Israel Appeal, it charged that "Racial (or 'ethnic') discrimination has been ingrained in the thinking of Zionism since the beginning." On this basis, funds raised for Zionist and Israeli causes would be denied tax exemption under the Civil Rights Act of 1964. (*Cf. N.Y. Times*, Oct. 26, 1972.)

That lawsuit was dropped on procedural grounds before its evidence could be weighed in the U.S. District Court. However, Theodor Herzl, the founder of political Zionism, seemed to be thinking 'racially' when he spoke of Jews not in terms of religious faith but as "Ein Volk" (one race or nationality or peoplehood) for whom he sought distinctive rights.

Golda Meir, an ardent translator of Herzl's thoughts into Israeli action, used the ethnic term 'Arabs' rather than the religious term 'Christians' when on July 23, 1972, she persuaded all but four of her Cabinet to refuse the Catholic villagers of Berem and Iqrit the right to return to their homes. The Israeli army had evacuated them in favor of Jewish immigrants. Their appeal to Prime Minister Meir for redress brought her reported response that it would be "an erosion of Zionist values to allow Arabs to return where Jews had been settled." (*Wright, A Tale of Two Hamlets*, 1973, p. 6.)

This and a multiplicity of other examples are cited by the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) as "discriminatory inter-group practices."

PLO Chairman Yasser Arafat denounces them as a product of what he calls the "racist Zionist movement." He does not see them as in any way an expression of "the noble Jewish religion" which, he asserts, "we consider as part of our heritage and ethos, the same as Islam and Christianity" (*Christian Science Monitor*, Dec. 10, 1975).

The State of Israel has yet to resolve the prolonged, bitter, internal dispute over the question, "What is a Jew?" Is it a "racial" or a religious term, or neither or both? Until an answer comes from the Israeli Knesset, the PLO and its supporters are likely to continue to use 'Jew' with religious, and 'Zionist' with political/ethnic connotations.

Meanwhile, whenever we hear anybody use the term 'racism', we should ask the extent to which it reflects the folk meaning: "Any discrimination by you and your people or by them' and 'their' people against my people and me!" (This would presumably help explain how both the native black Brooklynites and the Polish-immigrant Podhoretzes came to see each other in "racist" terms. Cf. *World Authors: 1950-70*, pp. 1147-8.)

Also, when emotions run high, we need to know the speakers' standards for distinguishing between tolerable and "obscene" racism. Not long ago, for instance, Moynihan felt that aspects of American white discrimination against non-whites could be handled with "benign neglect." However, as Uganda's black President Idi Amin's anti-white policies became increasingly aggressive; "Moynihan's bluster" (a phrase I've taken from the *Capital Times*) denounced him as "racist" with a vehemence not customary in diplomatic circles (See *Christian Century*, Nov. 5, 1975). This has led some non-whites — unfairly, others believe — to place Moynihan himself in a 'racist' category.

Thus 'racism' can be seen to have a wide range of meanings from the bland to the criminal. The sophisticated propagandist may use the word in the *American Heritage* sense while hoping his hearers will understand it in UNESCO's way. Persons concerned for problem-solving communications, however, will indicate their usage whenever they introduce it.

"ZIONISM"

Philip Potter, General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, has declared that "Zionism . . . is subject to many understandings and interpretations" (*Ecumenical Press Service*, Nov. 11, 1975).

We'll be going into some of these in a subsequent section. But first we'll

concentrate on the concept which is at the heart of the Arab-Israeli dispute: *Political Zionism*. This may be defined as "the Jewish nationalist movement, launched by Herzl in 1897, that has sought to create and maintain a Jewish State in Palestine and environs." It has so far developed no uniform agreement on either the meaning of "Jewish" or the extent of territory claimed.

Herzl & Political Zionism

Speaking of this movement, ex-Israeli scholar Michael Selzer — who once believed himself to be a Zionist — stated in 1970 that "Zionism is a complex phenomenon, adequately understood by only a small percentage of its critics and by an even smaller percentage of its supporters." What follows is only the sketchiest introduction to the subject which you can follow up with the help of encyclopaedias (under both "Zionism" and "Herzl") and many available specialized volumes, pro and con.

The underlying assumptions of Herzl and his successors have been fourfold. While expressed in a variety of new forms, they continue to be strongly influential on the hopes, fears, plans and practices of present-day Israel. They are:

1. Jews and Gentiles are inherently (genetically) incapable of living harmoniously in the same society. Anti-Semitism is an incurable Gentile affliction.
2. For self-preservation, all Jews must settle together in the same country. Herzl was willing to accept 6,000 uninhabited square miles of Uganda offered by the British. However, the much more powerful emotional appeal of Palestine made that land the ultimate choice.
3. Non-Jews must either be displaced from the Jewish State or kept apart from the Jewish settlers by legal and psychological walls of separation.
4. Gentile cooperation is needed from two sources: Anti-Semites who will stimulate *Aliyah* (Jewish migration to Palestine), and at least one Great Power whose backing can make up for the relatively scattered smallness of world Jewry. Herzl sought the sponsorship of the Czar, the Kaiser, the King of Italy and the Turkish Sultan. His successors were more successful in enlisting first Great Britain and then (with a brief interlude of Soviet support) the U.S.A.

Herzl's Zionism had limited appeal in its early decades. The 1841 Declaration by Charleston's Jews that "this country (the U.S.A.) is our Palestine, this city our Jerusalem, this house of God our Temple" had become the dominant view of most American Jews, particularly Reform Jews, and had its counterparts elsewhere.

Strictly Orthodox Jews reacted on a different basis. As far back as 1903 the Lubavitcher Hasidim were denouncing political Zionism as "rebellion against the Lord and denial of Torah." To this day, Jerusalem's Neturei Karta Jews call

it blasphemy for preempting God's role in the uniting of all Jewry. (Cf. Caploe, "Zionism: the Dream and the Reality," *Middle East International*, Oct., 1975).

But events, especially the Hitler holocaust, were to conspire to make many people — Jewish and other — regard the Zionist political program in Palestine and environs as the only satisfactory 'final solution of the Jewish problem.' To the resident Palestinians and to Arabs in adjacent countries, however, this spelled inevitable displacement or subjugation.

Israeli General Moshe Dayan has summed up the latter attitude quite candidly: "It is not true that the Arabs hate the Jews for personal, religious, or racial reasons. They consider us — and justly, from their point of view — as Westerners, foreigners, invaders who have seized an Arab country to turn it into a Jewish State" (*Le Monde*, Jul. 9, 1969; cf. Chomsky, *Peace in the Middle East?* p. 530).

Other Concepts of 'Zionism'

Both Dayan and Arafat have in mind the preceding section's definition — complete with the fourfold underlying assumptions — when they speak of 'Zionism.' To the extent that "peace can prosper and freedoms flourish only where words are precisely used and clearly understood," that in itself is a hopeful sign.

Not that *much* more isn't needed to resolve the tensions, claims and counter-claims that keep their peoples apart! But at least the fact that they're focusing on the same realities similarly understood can enable them, if there's enough give and take, to make a start on the long, rocky road to a just and lasting peace. Such a start has been, to say the least, slowed down by the many persons who — however deep their sincerity — have, without feeling the need to say so, used 'Zionism' in quite different senses.

The historic Christian use of 'Zion' to mean 'the Church' or 'the Kingdom of God' still survives in such hymns as "O Zion, haste thy mission high fulfilling to . . . publish glad tidings . . . of peace . . . of Jesus, redemption and release." And, interestingly enough, the only subject under the "Zionist" heading in the new *Micropeadia Britannica* is a churchly one. Nonetheless, this once-confusing difference seems not to have added to the recent 'illustrations' at the U.N.

A view held among many 'millennialist' Christians, however, has led to some perplexity. As presented in Hal Lindsey's best-selling 1970 paperback, *The Late, Great Planet Earth*, the divine (Continued on p. 14)

UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



Distr.
LIMITED

A/C.3/L.2159
15 October 1975

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Thirtieth session
THIRD COMMITTEE
Agenda item 68

ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Cuba, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Guinea, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Republic, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates and Yemen Arab Republic: draft resolution

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 1904 (XVIII) of 20 November 1963, proclaiming the United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, and in particular its affirmation that "any doctrine of racial differentiation or superiority is scientifically false, morally condemnable (and) socially unjust and dangerous" and its expression of alarm at "the manifestations of racial discrimination still in evidence in some areas in the world, some of which are imposed by certain Governments by means of legislative, administrative or other measures",

Recalling also that, in its resolution 3151 G (XXVIII) of 14 December 1973, the General Assembly condemned inter alia the unholy alliance between South African racism and zionism,

Taking note of the Declaration of Mexico on the Equality of Women and their Contribution to Development and Peace proclaimed by the World Conference of the International Women's Year, held at Mexico City from 19 June to 2 July 1975, which promulgated the principle that "international co-operation and peace require the achievement of national liberation and independence, the elimination of colonialism and neo-colonialism, foreign occupation, zionism, apartheid, and racial discrimination in all its forms as well as the recognition of the dignity of peoples and their right to self-determination",

Taking note also of resolution 77 (XII) adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity held in Kampala from 28 July to 1 August 1975 which considered "that the racist régime in occupied Palestine and racist régimes in Zimbabwe and South Africa have a common imperialist origin, forming a whole and having the same racist structure and being organically linked in their policy aimed at repression of the dignity and integrity of the human being",

Taking note also of the Political Declaration and Strategy to strengthen International Peace and Security and to intensify Solidarity and Mutual Assistance among Non-Aligned Countries, adopted at the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries held in Lima, Peru, from 25 to 30 August 1975, which most severely condemned zionism as a threat to world peace and security and called upon all countries to oppose this racist and imperialist ideology,

1. Determines that zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination.

THE UN, ZIONISM AND RACISM

by Donald Will

On November 10, the 30th Session of the United Nations General Assembly passed a resolution stating that it "determines that Zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination." The vote was 72 in favor, 35 against, and 32 abstentions. The action has proved to be one of the most controversial taken by the United Nations in recent years. It has precipitated numerous articles, an outpouring of statements and many commentaries within the United States media in particular. Unfortunately, much of the discussion within the United States has taken place in the context of heated indignation that the United Nations could make such a statement. This tone was set by the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, Daniel P. Moynihan, a man whose tendency to "shoot from the hip" has been previously well noted in the United Nations community. The mood in the United States today is, of course, hardly the fault of Mr. Moynihan; he is merely a representation of the "arrogance of power" implicit in much of our country's foreign policy — the fact that he is appointed to the United Nations is a petty exacerbation compared to the policy itself.

What is behind the General Assembly Resolution No. 3379 is far more complex than may appear at first glance. The elements of it are highly controversial and hotly debated. Those who would act as peacemakers must not merely condemn it without exploring its roots. Regardless of whether one considers it timely, bad tactically, or erroneous, dismissing it without examining and explaining it not only contributes nothing to the debate but also adds to a "retreat from knowledge" on this issue which is already far too severe.

In understanding the resolution it is necessary to realize the following points. The Resolution is not:

- An attack against world Jewry by a mass of anti-Semitic people or governments.
- An attempt by communist and Third World nations to take over or wreck the United Nations.
- The result of a vast purchase of votes by oil-rich Arab states.

The Resolution is:

- An expression of resistance to Israeli intransigence in their refusal to deal with the Palestinian people.
- An attempt to isolate Israel in the United Nations for her disregard of numerous United Nations Resolutions and appeals to respect the human rights of Palestinians in the territories occupied in 1967.

- An attempt to isolate Israel for her refusal to withdraw from those territories.
- A criticism of Israel as a Jewish state, i.e., a state founded on principles according to which Jews enjoy privileges not shared by non-Jewish citizens.
- A reaction against policies pursued by Western nations, especially the United States, which ignore the plight of the Palestinian people and attempt to reach a solution to the Middle East problem through exclusion of the Palestine Liberation Organization from negotiations.
- An attempt to show solidarity with the Palestinian struggle subsequent to the Sinai Agreement in regard to which Egypt pursued national, as opposed to regional, interests.

The United Nations and the Palestine Issue

Following World War I the British and the French vied for control of much of the Arab East. In 1922 the Council of the League of Nations designated Britain as the mandatory power for Palestine with the aim that it should be "guided" toward independence. Under the Mandate, Zionist settlement continued despite Arab resistance. United Nations involvement pre-dates the establishment of the state of Israel. On November 29, 1947, the General Assembly adopted a "Plan of Partition with Economic Union" (G.A. Resolution No. 181). The former British Mandate of Palestine was divided into two states — one Arab, one Jewish. Jerusalem was to be an international zone. The two states were relatively equal in size despite the fact that the Arab population in Palestine outnumbered the Jewish population two to one (1,200,000 to 600,000). The Palestinians opposed the plan and took up arms to prevent its enactment. The paramilitary forces of the Zionists which were formed during and in the wake of World War I fought against the Palestinians and the Arab armies. On May 14, 1948, the state of Israel was proclaimed (ahead of the scheduled United Nations plan). When the Armistice Agreements were signed in 1949, Israel maintained control over an area approximately one-third larger than that granted to it under the United Nations partition plan. Egypt occupied the Gaza Strip and Jordan controlled the West Bank of the Jordan River and part of Jerusalem (the other part being under Israeli control). The Palestinian state was never created. On May 11, 1949, Israel was admitted to the United Nations.

A war broke out in 1956 during which Israel occupied part of Egyptian territo-

ry, from which it later withdrew. Again in 1967 war occurred. In the wake of it, Israel controlled the remainder of the former Palestine Mandate as well as the Egyptian Sinai Peninsula and part of the Syrian Golan Heights. Again there was a spate of resolutions in both the General Assembly and the Security Council; most important was Security Council Resolution No. 242 "Stating the Principles of a Just and Lasting Peace in the Middle East." This resolution, among other things, called for the "withdrawal of Israel armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict." Unfortunately the only reference to the Palestinians in this resolution is as a "refugee problem" to be settled; no attention is given to their aspirations to statehood. Since the 1967 War, there have been numerous resolutions in the Security Council condemning Israeli attacks on Lebanon and Jordan. Action in the General Assembly included Resolution No. 2443 "Establishing a Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories." The resolution refers to the territories occupied by Israel in 1967; Israel has, however, denied the investigators access to these areas.

Other resolutions of the General Assembly have called on Israel to permit



Donald Will is Resource Coordinator for the Middle East and Economic Affairs of the United Methodist Office for the United Nations. He is presently working on a Ph.D. in International Studies at the University of Denver.

the return of Palestinian refugees. General Assembly Resolution No. 3236 of November 22, 1974, "Expresses grave concern that the Palestinian people has been prevented from enjoying its inalienable rights, in particular its right to self-determination." Israel's attitude toward these resolutions is typified by the statement of then-Prime Minister Golda Meir in a *Newsweek* interview on July 3, 1967: "If a resolution is passed not to our liking, so what? After all, it is not a tank firing at you."

The Palestinian people are often portrayed in the Western press as "terrorists." This image is a distortion of the reality of what it means to be a Palestinian today. The Palestinians have a centuries-old presence in the region which was disrupted by the creation of the state of Israel. Many continue, after over 25 years, to live in refugee camps. The international community has been particularly unheeding of their plight which it helped to create. Both their armed struggle and the current diplomatic effort at the United Nations are attempts once again to bring about a just solution to their dispossession. This is the context in which the resolution on Zionism came about. Yet it is correct to call Zionism a form of racism and racial discrimination? To answer this, we must examine the terms of the resolution.

On Zionism

Zionism has always meant different things. Conceptions of Zionism include those of spiritual Zionists who feel that the realization of the Kingdom of Zion was meant to come in the spiritual, as opposed to the material, world. Also included were those Zionists who believed in a Jewish presence in Palestine (to act as a center for Jewish religion and culture) but opposed the establishment of a state. An example of such a position is described by Uri Davis, an Israeli dissenter and a council member of the War Resisters International:

One should also bear in mind, that even in Orthodox Jewish terms "the age old yearning for the land of our fathers, the city where David camped" does not in any way necessarily imply that historical rights are a justification for a nation-state. It may be indeed appropriate to cite a concrete example to clearly illustrate this point. The Orthodox community of the Keepers of The Wall (*Netzer Karia*) residing in the Meah Shearim quarter of Jerusalem, indeed acted upon "their age old yearning for the land of our fathers, the city where David camped" and emigrated to Jerusalem from Eastern Europe at the turn of the century. The community, now approximately 7,000 people strong, is the only consistent uncompromising Orthodox opposition to Zionism. Based in Jerusalem and Bnei Berak (in Israel) and linked to affiliated communities in Britain and the U.S.

(many of whom are disciples of Rabbi Joel Teitelbaum of Satmar), they have declared the Israeli day of independence a day of mourning, burn Israeli national flags in public, systematically boycott Israeli taxation and conscription, have, as a matter of fact, attempted to negotiate with the Palestinian-Arab leadership after 1967 for a joint struggle against the Zionist government, refuse to abide by the ruling of the Israeli Rabbinat and, in general, consider Zionism the worst form of apostasy afflicting contemporary Judaism. ("To Be An Arab in Israel," introduction to *Fouzi el-Asmar, To Be An Arab in Israel*, London: Pinter, 1975; reprinted in *Documents from Israel, 1967-1973*, ed. Davis and Mevinsky, London: Ithica, 1975, pp. 223-224.)

The Zionists who came to predominate were, however, those political Zionists who took their cue from Theodor Herzl, who in 1896 published the manifesto of the Zionist movement, *The Jewish State*. Herzl conceived of the idea during the Nineteenth Century, an era characterized by extreme nationalism often with all its racist overtones. To his nationalist idea were grafted the concepts of cultural and, for some, religious revitalization. Herzl's own emphasis, however, was on the control by Jews of their own political institutions. He reasoned that this would spare Jews persecution at the hands of governments in whose countries Jews were a minority people. The strength of anti-Semitism in Europe — pogroms and later the Holocaust — led many Jews to share Herzl's conclusion. From this sprang the roots of the present characterization of Zionism as "the liberation movement of the Jewish people." What is anomalous about this is the fact that Zionism had to "liberate" Palestine from its indigenous population. Arguments over aboriginality in the area are inconclusive and lead nowhere. The crucial factor is that the political Zionist movement arose at a time when in order to fulfill its professed aims it had to displace the existing majority population of Palestine. Unlike those movements contemporaneously called liberation movements, it was not a movement of the majority people of the land trying to overthrow an imperialist settler population. In actuality, the Zionists came closer to being such a settler population themselves. The colonial or settler nature of the Zionist movement dates back to Herzl himself. His appeals to Bismarck, Cecil Rhodes, and Joseph Chamberlain were founded on the principle that a colonial venture would be profitable to the power that sponsored it. (This is all explicitly recorded in Herzl's own diaries.) The altruistic intentions of his efforts were negated by the fact that Jewish settlement demanded Palestini-

an displacement.

Some who consider themselves "left-Zionists" or perhaps "non-Zionists" will undoubtedly object that there are other forms the Jewish state might have taken which would not have been colonial. Yet, even the "founder" of left-Zionism, Ber Borochov, once wrote:

The native population of Palestine will be economically and culturally absorbed by those who will bring order to the land and develop its productive forces. The Jewish immigrants will build up Palestine, and the native population will in time be absorbed by the Jews, both economically and culturally. ("Our Platform," in *Jews in Hebrew*, quoted in *The Arab World and Israel*, Kadosh and Loebel, N.Y.: Monthly Review, 1973, p. 119.)

Absorption of another population, its economics and culture, can easily be seen as cultural genocide, and rather explicitly racist. The contradictions of political Zionism run still deeper. Israel Shahak, chairman of the Israeli League for Civil and Human Rights, when asked "If there had been an empty territory in Palestine, would it have been possible then to have had a humane Zionism?" responded:

No, it would have been non-human toward the Jews in the Diaspora. Zionism would have faced the same problem of how to bring Jews into empty territory. It is a contradiction in terms to speak of humane Zionism. I will tell you why, because of two very Jewish reasons. First of all, what is real Zionism? What is its basic assumption? It says two important things about Jews and Gentiles (excuse me for using the word; usually I dislike it). It says first of all that every Jew who does not live in Jewish society is ill, mad. He cannot lead a normal life. Then it says of Gentiles that they are by nature anti-Semitic. A Mongolian in Mongolia is anti-Semitic, and once Jews come to Mongolia, then this anti-Semitic tendency which is dormant will awake. This is nonsense. They do not say Jews can be persecuted like other minorities can be persecuted of necessity. Therefore, all the world is against us. And, therefore, they assume that no Gentile can be critical about any Jewish matter without being anti-Semitic. (Interview in *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol. IV, No. 3, p. 6.)

Many progressive Jews will protest that this is but one form of Zionism. They will also point out that Zionism has brought a new identity to Jews as Black Power did to Blacks. It represents an act of resistance in the face of oppression. This is undoubtedly true; however, such concepts, when pushed to an extreme, embody a discriminatory element. Cultural revival and the expression of identity are healthy phenomena when they do not infringe upon the rights of other groups. If, however, they call for creation or perpetuation of demographic superiority by legal (or coercive or illegal) means, then they are advocating racial discrimination. The question which those who wish to call themselves

Zionists, yet oppose the colonialist and discriminatory aspects of political Zionism, must ask themselves: Do they really represent a separate stream of thought and politics under the rubric of Zionism or are they merely choosing to subscribe to certain positive by-products of exclusivist political Zionism? If the latter is true then they must recognize that they must abandon the appendage in order to successfully struggle against the core of the problem — reform is no option.

The stated aim of the first Zionist Congress in 1897 was the creation of a Jewish national home in Palestine which would be legally recognized by the community of nations. On November 2nd, 1917, British Foreign Minister Arthur J. Balfour wrote a letter to Lord Rothschild which stated: "His Majesty's Government views with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object. It is clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by the Jews in other countries." Thus the Balfour Declaration spoke of a "home" not a "state" as well as demanding protection of the rights of non-Jews. Those advocating a Jewish state remained clearly in the minority. This position came to be the program of the Revisionist Zionists, led by the right-wing Vladimir Jabotinsky. It has been argued by some that a state was the goal of the majority of the movement but was not articulated for tactical reasons. Whatever the case, it cannot be denied that as of 1942 and the adoption of the "Biltmore Program" this became the program of the majority as well. This change did not represent a seizure of power by the Revisionists; it occurred as a result of changing conditions in Europe and in Palestine. The Nazi onslaught, accompanied by the "closed door" policies of many Western nations, led many to feel that a Jewish state was the only way to rescue world Jewry from present and future anti-Semitism. At the same time the Jewish population in Palestine was becoming large enough (roughly one-third of the total population) that such a demand became practicable, both in terms of creating an economically viable state and in terms of resisting Arab and other hostility to such a plan. Certainly not all those who called themselves Zionists supported this platform. It seems logical, though, that an exclusivist state should evolve from certain policies which were pur-

sued: 1) Recruitment on the grounds of escaping anti-Semitism by being in the majority — even though one currently is not; 2) establishment of settlements which, although they may bear traits of utopian socialism, exclude others for being non-Jews; 3) the buying up of land in a fashion that displaces a tenant peasantry (a not too farfetched analogy to inner city tenants who assume the role of squatters in the face of universities or other institutions or businesses buying up their rented homes for other purposes thereby leaving them no place to find similar inexpensive housing in the vicinity).

This is the form of Zionism that the 72 countries who supported the resolution had in mind. Fayeze Sayegh, the delegate speaking for Kuwait, was explicit about this:

... the Zionism that this draft resolution speaks about is a concrete political ideology, articulated by a concrete political organization which launched a concrete political movement at a precise moment in time, which created concrete political institutions, and which manifested itself in concrete practices which had the effect of excluding some people on the basis of their not being Jews — Jewishness being defined officially by Zionism as an ethnic and not strictly a religious definition. (Address before the General Assembly, November 10, 1975.)

His specificity was intentional; he did not wish the resolution to be an attack on Judaism or Jewish people. These countries do not view Zionism as synonymous with Judaism nor anti-Zionism as synonymous with anti-Semitism. The Israeli position, expressed by their ambassador to the U.N., Chaim Herzog, asserts the opposite. He equated this attack on Zionism as an attack on Judaism and said it was "born of a deep, pervading feeling of anti-Semitism." What is essentially behind this equation of anti-Zionism with anti-Semitism is an attempt by the Israeli government to construe the interests of all Jews everywhere as congruent with those of the state of Israel. Many Jews in the Diaspora as well as in Israel itself would take issue with this equation of interest. A few pertinent facts which render the anti-Semitism charge dubious are: 1) many Jews are not Zionists; 2) some Jews who would call themselves Zionists oppose the specific form of political Zionism referred to above by Fayeze Sayegh; 3) not once in the U.N. debate were Judaism or Jews as a people attacked.

"A Form of Racism and Racial Discrimination"

The definition of racial discrimination operative in the United Nations debate on this issue is the one contained in the International Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination

(passed as Resolution No. 2106 A by the 20th Session of the United Nations General Assembly, December 21, 1965). It reads as follows:

In this Convention, the term "racial discrimination" shall mean any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, colour, descent, or national or ethnic origin which has the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise, on an equal footing, of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural or any other field of public life. (International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, General Assembly Resolution No. 2106 A, Part I, Article 1, Paragraph 1.)

This convention does not contain a definition of "racism" *per se*; however, it would seem logical to conclude that a doctrine or ideology the pursuit of which entails racial discrimination (as defined above) is in fact racist or "a form of racism."

Since any concept is always open to alternative definitions of varying breadth or emphasis (especially in the multi-cultural, multi-lingual context of the U.N.), it only makes sense that the General Assembly was using its own definition and not that of Webster's *Third New International Dictionary* which Ambassador Moynihan brought into the discussion.

The problem of the terms of the resolution was rendered particularly complex because each side was using these terms differently. Those who proposed the resolution were specific in their definitions of Zionism and "racism and racial discrimination" both cited above. Those opposed interpreted Zionism to be a movement innate and equatable with Judaism and the Jewish people. The United States deliberately chose a definition of racism which was far narrower than that under discussion in order to strengthen its arguments.

Zionism, Racism and Racial Discrimination

What are the pertinent facts? What in Zionism did these nations see as racism and racial discrimination? As I.F. Stone said in a column in the November 23, 1975 *New York Times*: "The painful point about the United Nations resolution equating Zionism and Racism is that it had an element of truth." To evaluate the accuracy and intentions of the resolution, it is necessary to examine both the theoretical (Zionism as a doctrine or ideology) and the practical aspects of the problem (policies promoted by the Zionist movement and its creation — the state of Israel).

The core of the theoretical aspect is the question of the viability of the concept of the democratic pluralistic secular state. Can a state be democratic

if it is pluralistic and secular? Clearly these are the principles of the United States Constitution. In theory all citizens of the United States share equal rights before the law — discrimination on grounds of religion, race, ethnic origin, or sex is prohibited. Minority groups should be able to preserve aspects of their own cultures as long as those do not infringe upon the rights of others. We are all painfully aware that the U.S. is less than perfect in regard to its treatment of minority peoples. Much of the *de facto* inequality in the United States has to do with a gross imbalance in the distribution of the benefits and the opportunities of this system. Most of us believe that these problems, at least to a certain degree, may be remedied.

The question posed, however, is: Do the failures of the United States and other similarly constituted systems justify abandoning the concept of secular pluralistic democracy in favor of the creation of homogeneous and non-integrative societies? Must each minority group have a state of its own — a state where it constitutes the majority? Is this the only way to prevent discrimination? Clearly a serious effort to pursue such a policy of "Balkanization" on an international level would be folly. The dislocations and resettlements would be manifold. The resultant state would have to be almost totally homogeneous for any minority they might contain would suffer a discrimination harsher than those of the flawed pluralist states. They would be obliged to live by the laws of the dominant majority — take it or leave it. Such societies are also likely to have fewer common interests with neighboring states; this would lend itself to chronic conflagrations in the style of the feuding nationalists of the pre-World War II Europe.

Political Zionism rejects the concept of pluralistic democracy; it calls for a Jewish state. It argues that Jews will never enjoy equal rights or be safe from persecution if they are everywhere a minority. Thus the internal contradiction of political Zionism emerges. As Noam Chomsky, Professor of Modern Languages and Linguistics at M.I.T. and author of *Peace in the Middle East?* and numerous other books and articles, puts it:

If Israel is to be both a democratic state and a Jewish state, then non-Jews must be expelled, unless there is an evolution towards democratic secularism for which, at the moment, there are no indications and no substantial support.

If Israel is a Jewish state with non-Jewish citizens, then the respects in which the state a "Jewish" will be respects in which non-Jews are denied equal rights. Thus, democratic principle is violated when a state discriminates between two categories of citizens...

What is meant by a Jewish state? Again this is also a problem steeped in ambiguity. A Jewish state might entail a society in which: a) Judaism enjoys the favor of the state over other religions, b) Jews, as defined by the state, enjoy benefits before the law which are denied to non-Jews, c) citizenship requirements favor Jews over non-Jews, d) legal mechanisms exist deliberately to ensure that the Jewish population of the state will always be the majority. Essentially, if the distinction between Jews and non-Jews exists for any reason beyond simple identification and census purposes, then the state is discriminatory.

The contradictions produced by the establishment of a Jewish state, however, are not merely legal. The ramifications at the sociological and psychological levels are important. Maxime Rodinson, professor of Middle Eastern Ethnology at the Sorbonne, elaborates on this aspect of the problem:

Wanting to create a purely Jewish, or predominantly Jewish, state in an Arab Palestine in the twentieth century, could not help but lead to a colonial-type situation and to the development (completely normal, sociologically speaking) of a racist state of mind, and in the final analysis to a military confrontation between the two ethnic groups. (*Israel: A Colonial-Settler State?* New York: Mond Press, 1973, p. 77.)

And in a footnote on the preceding:

Only a racist or mystical concept of "Jewishness" (with the latter being common among left-wing Europeans) can explain shock that conditions that everywhere else bring about a state with a racist mentality (an ethnic cleavage coinciding with a social cleavage) are also at work in the case of Jews. (*ibid.*, p. 111.)

While Rodinson, at this point, is not actually arguing that "Zionism is racist", he is arguing that political Zionism in Palestine was bound to bring about racism. The distinction is a fine one. Zionist leaders may not have argued that Jews are superior to others; however, they promoted a political program which advocated a state in which Jews, inevitably, were to be in the superior position. The validity of Rodinson's point becomes painfully apparent if one studies the actual effects of the Zionist movement on Palestine.

In examining the practical aspects of the debate about Zionism and racism, it is necessary to scrutinize two areas: the practices of the Zionist movement and the practices of the state of Israel. As previously explained, Zionism can mean many things. Again it is necessary to emphasize that the form of Zionism in question is political Zionism. The settlement in Palestine of many Jews involved, through various means, the dispossession of the Palestinian residents. The immigrants had to live and

on which to settle; thus, so long as the Zionist movement chose a populated region for the Jewish state, this initial wrong was a necessity. As Palestine was settled by Zionists, peasants were forced from the land. Whether the land had been bought from absentee landlords or whether those farming it were merely forced off their own lands, the fact remains that many persons were uprooted even prior to the establishment of the Israeli state. Israeli journalist Yeshayahu Ben-Porat remarks:

One truth is that there is no Zionist settlement, and there is no Jewish State without displacing Arabs and without confiscating lands and fencing them off. A second truth is that in the war against the Arabs, including the terrorists, Israel never committed herself, and cannot commit herself to harm only regular or irregular warriors. And a third truth is that within the framework of the assumptions developed above, Israel has tried in the past and will try in the future to do its best not to kill innocent civilians and not to displace Arab inhabitants by methods not approved of and sanctioned by law and order.

Overt and outrageous talk, and clarification of the Zionist conception of the world upon which the State was founded may indeed expose the government to strong criticism at home and to vicious attacks in the world. In spite of that, open-heartedness, both at home and abroad, will dissipate misunderstandings and tear apart the envelope of hypocrisy which covers many of our actions and failures... ("The Mistake, the Naivety and the Hypocrisy," *Tediot Aharonot*, July 14, 1972, quoted in *Documents from Israel, 1967-1973*, op. cit.)

Does legalizing the displacement of Arab inhabitants or the killing of civilians make the acts less heinous? The influx of settlers into Palestine naturally resulted in tensions between some of the Jewish settlers and the Palestinian Arab residents. Sporadic armed conflict between the two groups was prevalent long prior to Israeli statehood.

While the practices and policies of the state of Israel may not be those of Zionism *per se*, they are undeniably the product of the Zionist movement. Precedent for the current policies of the Israeli state may be found in the writings and practices of some of the pre-1948 political Zionists. Progressives in the Israeli and Diaspora communities may staunchly oppose the policies of the Israeli state, yet, it is unlikely that they will be able to exert an ameliorative influence on the situation without coming to grips with the internal contradiction of Zionism described above by Chomsky.

What are these Israeli practices under attack by the supporters of the resolution? A full categorization of these is beyond the scope of this paper; the paper is restricted to a brief survey of the problem and suggests further readings for those wishing more details. There

are two major varieties — those laws of the state of Israel effective within what is currently considered the state of Israel and those policies pursued within the territories occupied during the 1967 war. In the former area the problem is twofold. There is discrimination in regard to land policy and discrimination in regard to human and civil rights.

Land Policy: Palestinian Arabs have been and still are dispossessed from their land which is then turned over for settlement by Israeli Jews. One of the methods used is to evacuate the Arab population for "security reasons", destroy their homes so there will be no place to which they may return, and then establish new settlers in the area. Much of this Arab displacement has taken place within the context of a deliberate government policy of "Judaization" of certain regions. The acquisition of new land by Arabs is also restricted. The vast majority of land in Israel is controlled by the Jewish National Fund, either directly or through the Land Development Administration. Since the Jewish National Fund was set up to promote the settlement of Jews, the land it controls may neither be sold to nor leased by non-Jews.

Human and Civil Rights: The "Law of Return" which grants citizenship virtually automatically to any Jew seeking to live in Israel, while non-Jews must go through more complicated citizenship requirements. The law applying to Palestinian Arabs who have resided in Palestine their whole life is such that approximately one-fifth of the Palestinians living within the state of Israel today are denied citizenship. Citizenship, however, does not entail equality of benefit or opportunity. Those Palestinians who have become citizens of the state of Israel, i.e., Israeli Arabs, suffer other forms of discrimination such as being denied benefits supporting large families which are provided to Jewish families under the "Discharged Soldiers Law".

The conditions of Palestinians in the territories occupied in 1967 is much worse. The Israeli government uses regulations dating back to 1945, when Palestine was under the British Mandate, to legitimize the practices of administrative detention, expulsion from the country, collective punishment, and the destruction of property. The Special Investigating Committee was set up by the United Nations General Assembly to examine the above charges as well as allegations of ill-treatment of prisoners and the policy of settlement and annexation. Despite the Israeli denial of access to the territories,

the Committee, through use of incidents reported in the Israeli press and through questioning of expelled prisoners, found many of the charges substantiated. The Israeli League for Human and Civil Rights (founded in 1935 to defend the human rights of Jews and Arabs under the British Mandate) has also amassed much evidence of such violations.

Such is the condition of Palestinian Arabs under Israeli rule today. These inequalities are protested by progressive Israelis, who remain, unfortunately, a minority. The question which must be asked, however, is whether such practices can ever be eliminated so long as the state of Israel remains a "Jewish state". So long as non-Jews reside there, they will be discriminated against by the very policies of the state which make it Jewish.

The question which is raised, even by many fully aware of the extent of discrimination in Israel, is: Why single out Israel? What about the oppression of Jews in the Arab countries? No person truly committed to the defense of human rights could say that human rights violations anywhere should be ignored. The United Nations opposes all forms of repression of human rights — it is, however, hamstringing in its ability to deal with such problems. The organization's ability to become involved in internal matters is circumscribed by the member nations' own sovereignties. The reason that Israeli violations are in the spotlight at the United Nations is that Israel is a nation created by the United Nations. Even before the partition plan in 1947 the United Nations had been involved in the Palestine enigma. United Nations personnel have served and died there. The area today constitutes perhaps the greatest single threat to world peace. The United Nations actions have dealt primarily with human rights violations within territories which are regarded as occupied and from which the U.N. has called on Israel to withdraw. The reasons for U.N. involvement thus are commanding — indeed, the U.N. would be irresponsible in its duties were it to neglect these problems. Regarding Jews in the Arab countries, Nabil Sha'ath of the Palestine Liberation Organization Planning Center in Beirut expressed some relevant thoughts in a recent interview:

... we can fight for the rights of Jews in Arab countries; this is where we have the chance to do something about "The Jewish Question". This is important for selfish reasons as well as for moral, idealistic reasons. For selfish reasons, if we show that there is an equal right for the Jew to settle back into his own country, in Arab countries, this might give us a better chance of insisting that this also be done to the Palestinian

wishing to return to his own home and his own country. I'm saying this is a selfish reason because our own struggle at this time is basically destined to free our own people rather than to free the Jews. . . . There is also a futuristic, but equally important reason, and that's really the symbolic reason, of saying to the Jews in Palestine as well as the Jews outside of it, you can believe us when we say we can live together in one big country. And in this case, we cannot really and truly fight for our rights in a democratic Palestine without fighting for the rights of democracy for Jews in Arab countries. (Interview, June, 1975, available through the Fellowship of Reconciliation, Box 271, Nyack, N.Y. (1966).)

It should be evident that a solution of the Palestine/Israel problem would go a long way toward improving the conditions of Jews in Arab countries. They would no longer be regarded as a potential fifth column in the conflict between Israel and their own states.

Conclusion

Offering solutions to the conflict in the Middle East is far beyond the realm of this paper. It can be said, however, that there will be no long-term solution without an end to policies which inevitably lead to discrimination according to race or other factors. The United Nations resolution determining Zionism to be a form of racism and racial discrimination should not be used as an excuse to harden the opposition to peace negotiations. It has passed the General Assembly; questioning its expediency is irrelevant and efforts to rescind it would undoubtedly be in vain and would merely fuel the flames of rhetoric which have already distorted the issue.

The prevailing mood in the U.S. has been to condemn the resolution in its entirety. This is facile — it neither adds to knowledge of the issue nor demands knowledge of it. Such responses merely play into the hands of the Israeli government, whose policies many of those condemning the resolution oppose. In the U.S. in particular this is an easy trap into which to fall. As one Israeli anti-Zionist has put it:

... Western civilization accepted the Zionist state as its "conscience." Under these circumstances the reluctance of public opinion in the West to criticize, expose or denounce Zionism is understandable, but those who placidly go along with this state of affairs ought at least to be aware that they accept, tacitly, the basic assumptions of racism (N. Israeli, "Zionism and Anti-Semitism," *The Other Israel*, Garden City, New York: Anchor, 1972, p. 175).

What are called for are attempts to go beyond the simplistic treatment by the United States press, beyond the confusions introduced into the debate by some delegations at the United Nations. The first step in doing this is to examine

what was meant by Zionism by those who voted to term it racist. That has been attempted above. Favez Sayegh, speaking for Kuwait but himself a Palestinian, made one point clear:

We are against Zionism as a form of racism. We are against anti-Semitism, and we reject the equation of anti-Zionism with anti-Semitism. We revere the Jewish faith. We in the Arab world showed hospitality to Jews who came fleeing from persecution in Europe when anti-Semitism was driving them into our arms; we permitted them to come and share our lives and share our limited resources and have as much freedom as we ourselves had, because we were receiving them as human beings. It was only when the Zionists came, and instead of the Jews saying, "I should like to live with you", the Zionists came, saying, "I want to live in your place." It was only when the Zionists came that our hospitality to the Jew turned into hostility to the Zionist, but we reject the contention the hostility to the Zionist indicates any lessening of the hospitality to the Jew, the human

being, who is not animated by the racism and exclusionism of Zionism. (Address to the General Assembly, November 10, 1975.)

Why then should the Israeli delegate, Chaim Herzog, attribute the resolution to anti-Semitism and term it an attack on Judaism? He may indeed consider political Zionism to be an integral part of Judaism, but this is a highly controversial position rejected by many within the world Jewish community. Another reason for him to claim this, however, is that (as the Israeli government knows well) the best defense for Israeli policies is to link them with the interests of Jews in the Diaspora or to assert that they are part of Judaism. Conduct that is beyond the pale is thus brought within it. This allows otherwise legitimate criticism to be smeared as anti-Semitic.

The task that falls to those sincerely

interested in an end to this conflict in the Middle East is to come to grips with the essential contradiction between political Zionism and democratic pluralism. Rather than covering already hard-pressed flanks by falling in line and condemning this resolution, these peace-seekers should explicitly disassociate themselves from the exclusivist form of Zionism castigated in this resolution and increase their efforts to explain the differences between political Zionism, Israeli policy and the interests of world Jewry and Judaism. Since the sponsors of the resolution were specific about what they were attacking under the rubric of Zionism, the task is not difficult in terms of analysis. It is, however, a political crucible which with the prevailing mood in the United States takes no small amount of courage to endure.

Use this CONVENIENT ORDER FORM for books, etc.

- W.F. Aboubishi, **THE ANGRY ARABS**, 285 pp., \$8.95. Westminster Press. With a view to satisfying the awakening interest of the American public in the Arab world and with a desire to contribute toward an honorable and workable peace between Arabs and Israelis, the author clearly presents the Arabs' values, customs, goals, traditions, etc. Our price \$5.75.
- Ibrahim Abu-Lughod, editor, **THE TRANSFORMATION OF PALESTINE**, 522 pp., \$15.00. Northwestern University. Distinguished scholars reexamine the history and development of Palestine during the mandate period and the issues underlying the Arab-Israeli conflict. Our price \$9.00.
- Margaret Arakic, **THE BROKEN SWORD OF JUSTICE: ISRAEL, AND THE PALESTINE TRAGEDY**, 195 pp., \$1.50 (paperback). Quartet Books. The author out of her vast experience with various U.N. agencies traces the development of U.S. foreign policy in relation to Israel and of pro-Israeli pressures on the White House and Congress. Our price \$3.45.
- Robert B. Betts, **CHRISTIANS IN THE ARAB EAST**, 293 pp., Lycabettus Press, Greece. A comprehensive study of the Arabic-speaking Christians and the role they have played in the Middle East from the time of the Islamic conquest up to present day developments. Valuable demographic statistics included. A comprehensive bibliography in the appendix. Our price \$10.00.
- Ray Cleveland, **MIDDLE EAST AND SOUTH ASIA**, 91 pp., \$2.25 (paperback). Stryker-Post Publications. The author gives a short historical background of the early empires in these areas, followed by a treatment of each of the present countries. This treatment consists of a set of statistics, a short history, description of the culture, outline of economy and finally an analysis of the future prospects. Maps included. An excellent study book. Our price \$2.00.
- Alistair Duncan, **THE NOBLE SANCTUARY**, 80 pp., £2.00. Longman Group, Ltd. A collection of beautiful color pictures of Jerusalem, the Dome of the Rock and details of Arab design, accompanied by an appreciative text giving the history and the various phases of construction and restoration of "The Noble Sanctuary." Our price, \$3.00.

- Fouzi El-Asmar, **TO BE AN ARAB IN ISRAEL**, 215 pp., £1.95 (paperback). Frances Pinter, Ltd., London. Tells of the impact of the Arab-Israeli War on both Arab and Jew. In this biographical presentation the author gives a picture of the Israeli way of life and expresses his faith in the possibility of a bi-national secular state in the land of Palestine. Our price, \$1.50.
- E.M. Fisher and M.C. Bassiouni, **STORM OVER THE ARAB WORLD**, 429 pp., \$8.95. Follett Publishing. A chronicle of 20th Century developments in the Arab world, including a particularly revealing outline of the Zionist conquest of Palestine and the June 1967 war. Our price \$1.25.
- A.C. Forrest, **THE UNHOLY LAND**, 178 pp., \$3.95 (paperback). Devin-Adair Co. The author's personal, informed and uncompromising stand against what he considers to be imbalanced and distorted news coverage of the human tragedy brought about by the Arab-Israeli conflict in the Middle East. Our price \$2.50.
- Maxim Gilhan, **HOW ISRAEL LOST ITS SOUL**, 290 pp., \$2.50 (paperback). Penguin Books, Ltd. Shows events leading up to the birth of the State of Israel in 1948. Illustrates the complexities in separating the international Jewish question from the Middle East question. He considers the possibilities of a multiracial secular state made up of all Middle East countries, but blames Israeli policy for destroying immediate hopes of peace. Our price \$1.60.
- Norman A. Horner, **REDISCOVERING CHRISTIANITY WHERE IT BEGAN**, 110 pp., \$5. Lebanese pounds (paperback). Heidelberg Press, Lebanon. The churches in the Middle East are presented from two standpoints — their historical origins and their present status. Appendixes give valuable information statistically and list ecumenical agencies at work in the area today. Our price \$1.00.
- Malcolm H. Kerr, ed., **THE ELUSIVE PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST**, 347 pp., plus maps, \$6.95 (paperback). State University of New York. Widely diverging views of six knowledgeable writers — a Syrian, an Israeli, a Canadian and three Americans. Each presents aspects of the Middle East conflict as he sees them. The one point of agreement is that the conflict has reached a dangerously explosive point and that some solution is imperative. Our price, \$4.50.
- D. Magretti & M.A. Sigler, **AN INTRODUCTION TO THE NEAR EAST**, 280 pp., \$3.95 (paperback). Our Sunday Visitor, Inc. A very readable short general history of the Near East from ancient times to 1967, followed by a factual study of each Near Eastern country and a study of Judaism, Christianity and Islam. Includes a comprehensive annotated bibliography. Our price \$2.25.
- Abdallah Schleifer, **THE FALL OF JERUSALEM**, 247 pp., \$3.45. Monthly Review Press. An extraordinary account of the fall of Jerusalem, some of it observed through the windows of the author's own home. Forceful and informative. Our price \$2.50.
- Ray Vicker, **THE KINGDOM OF OIL**, 264 pp., \$7.95. Chas. Scribner's Sons. The author traces the shift of power from Western to Arab hands in the politics of oil and offers some suggestions for the future as far as energy is concerned. Contains a study of the history, politics, religions and social customs of the Middle East and its emergence into modern history via oil. Our price \$5.00.

- Contribution to AMEU, tax deductible.
- Book as noted on p. 16.
- Free Pamphlet Collection.

A check or money order for \$_____ is enclosed, payable to AMEU.

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

ZIP _____

The Racist Nature of Zionism and of the Zionist State of Israel

by Professor Israel Shahak*1

Zionism is Racism

It is my considered opinion that the State of Israel is a racist state in the full meaning of this term: In this state people are discriminated against, in the most permanent and legal way and in the most important areas of life, only because of their origin. This racist discrimination began in Zionism and is carried out today mainly in cooperation with the institutions of the Zionist movement. [I will prove this opinion of mine by quoting facts, laws and regulations which have force in Israel (and which are known really to anybody) and are enforced by the government. I will therefore ignore the racism of the individuals in this article and also the declared or undeclared explanations by which this racism is "justified" sometimes.]

Restrictive Covenants

In the State of Israel, one who is not a Jew is discriminated against, only because he is not a Jew, in these areas of life:

1) **The right to live or to dwell or to open a business in the place of his choice.** Most of the land in Israel belongs to or is administered by the Jewish National Fund — JNF — which is an institution of the Zionist organization, and operates an admitted racist policy: It forbids non-Jews to dwell on its lands or to open a business and sometimes even to work, only because they are not Jews! Such policy not only enjoys here perfect legality (in contrast to a similar discrimination against the Jews which is illegal in most countries of the world) but is supported by all the instruments of the Israeli rule. In such a manner many whole towns were created in Israel, which are as the phrase goes "clean of Arabs" and this legality, or as we should say rather, "clean of Gentiles (goyim)." In other towns, like Upper-Nazareth, only one special quarter is "devoted" to the dwelling of Arabs. Any attempt of an Arab to buy or to rent a flat from a Jew is opposed openly and legally by all the branches of the government (the Ministry of Housing, municipality, etc.) and also by the illegal opposition of the Jewish inhabitants which is nevertheless supported by the Israeli police. I can only remind you that nobody opposes an operation of the sale or the rental of a flat in Nazareth, if the buyer or the lessee is a Jew; which means according to the racist definition of this

word employed legally in Israel, a human being who can prove that his mother, his grandmother, his great-grandmother and his grandmother of his grandmother were Jewesses. If he can prove this, such an operation becomes all right all of a sudden and nobody opposes it, neither the government nor the inhabitants. There is an opposition only if the mother of the buyer is not a Jewess ... [Another example in the same area can be given if we remember the case of Mr. Muhammad Ma'aruf, an Israeli citizen from the village of Dir-El-Assad, who wanted to open a factory in the town of Carmiel. This was officially prohibited to him because of the official reason that Carmiel is "out of bounds" to non-Jews, and surely enough, at the end, he had to build his factory outside of the "pure" boundaries of Carmiel. I want again to emphasize, that there is no limitation whatsoever on any Jew to open a business or to dwell in any place in Israel and therefore those limitations which operate on the great majority of the Israeli lands constitute a grave racial discrimination. I can dwell or open a business in any place of my choice (of course if I come to an agreement with the previous owner) but only because my mother was a Jewess. An Israeli citizen whose mother was not a Jewess can not enjoy this right. He encounters racist discrimination from which he suffers any day of his life.

"Security"

I want to continue with this subject in order to show that:]

A) There is no connection between this and what is called among us by the name of "security": This limitation is enforced in a racist way against *all non-Jews*, including those among them who served in the Israeli Army, or even distinguished themselves in it, or were wounded during their service; or if they are too old but whose sons or other relatives serve in the army. Mr. Ma'aruf is a Druse, and therefore all his family is obliged to serve a compulsory service in the IDF just as Jews are, but he has not the right, given to every Jew, to dwell in Carmiel! A Jewish thief or robber or murderer, who has completed his sentence, has the right to dwell in Carmiel. A "goy" (Gentile), a Druse, a Circassian or a Bedouin or a Christian who has let us say served in the army, was wounded in his service and is now

an invalid — that man has no right to dwell in Carmiel only because he happened to be born to the "incorrect" mother.

B) This racist discrimination is not connected with anything described as "left" and "right" or "hawks" and "doves", inside the Zionist movement. On the contrary. The two most racist blocks in Israel are the Zionist "socialists" and the "National Religious", and the unholy alliance between them is based on their common support of racism. For example: When the Sebastia "settlement" (demonstration) was carried out (by the right wingers) the activities of "MOKED"² made a demonstration of their own before the farm belonging to the general (reserve), Arik Sharon, protesting the fact that he employs Arabs there! I am a strong opponent of the policy and the deeds of General Sharon, but I consider that (the writer) Amos Oz who had specially "distinguished" himself in the employment of that accusation, is in this case the more dangerous racist, and that it is the full right of Sharon to hire workers for his farm without any distinction of race, religion or nationality.

The Kibbutzim

C) The worst racists in Israel in this respect are the kibbutzim members, and the most despicable in their racism among them are the members of the "Hashomer Hatzair" kibbutzim, for they are adding a great deal of hypocrisy to their racism.³ An Israeli citizen who is not a Jew cannot be accepted as a member in any kibbutz, even in cases where a daughter of a kibbutz falls in love with one of its hired non-Jewish workers.

D) Any discriminations of that kind, if they are inflicted on Jews in other countries, encounter — and rightly so — the shout of "Anti-Semitism"! But what is the difference? What is the difference between the prohibition inflicted on a Jew to dwell in Saudi Arabia because he is a Jew and the prohibition inflicted on a non-Jew to dwell in Carmiel because he is a non-Jew? What is the difference

*1 The article was written by invitation of the editors, in the framework of the debate on Zionism. Some parts of the original article were cut. Those are included in the English version and indicated by square brackets. I. Shahak.

² A Zionist-"socialist" party supposedly left of the Alignment. I. Shahak.

³ Those kibbutzim belong to the MAPAM party, and are loud in their declarations of "socialism", "care for Arabs", etc. I. Shahak.

between the continuous struggle to open clubs or neighbourhoods in the USA, which refuse to accept Jews, and the continuous struggle to prevent non-Jews to enter whole cities in Israel, for the purpose of dwelling there, or even for the purpose of merely opening a business? The difference is that the Zionists here in Israel and the anti-Semites there are really fighting on the same side of the barricade. The Zionist State of Israel does here exactly the same thing that the anti-Semites attempt — usually without success — to do in other countries.

Save the Land

[I shall now describe more briefly some of the other forms of discrimination.]

2) The "Salvation of the Land", that concept which is pushed into the brains of all the Jewish pupils in Israel from the kindergarten on. What is this? The meaning of this term is that according to the teaching of the Israeli Ministry of Education, a land which was "saved" — was transferred to a Jewish ownership. A land which has not yet been "saved" belongs as yet to human beings who were born of non-Jewish mothers, and one has to "save" it. Messengers of the JNF, who enjoy the most forceful support of the Israeli government and especially of its "security arms", are employed continually in "saving" land both in Israel and in the conquered territories, and in changing it into an additional area of racism.

The best and the newest example is Rafiah Approaches. I do not want to discuss here the problems of the "fair" or "unfair" compensations for the Arabs who were expelled from that area, or the problem of "Jewish work" or "Arab work" in that area. (The debate on those questions I leave to hypocrites of MAPAM and MOKED.) I want only to ask a simple human question: Do the people who lived in that area until a few years ago enjoy the right to dwell in the new racist town of Yamit?⁴⁴ Has an Israeli Arab the right to settle in Yamit? The open and the official Israeli answer is: No! Only Jews enjoy the right to live in the new racist town of Yamit, and in the other settlements established near it. The reasons for that step do not interest me. Maybe the Tsars of Russia had a good reason when they prohibited Jews from dwelling outside the area of the "Pale" only because they were Jews. But this was racism! Similarly what is done now in Rafiah Approaches and similar acts of "salvation of land" in any other area, in Israel or in the conquered

territories constitute a similar act of racism.

I want to emphasize that this is a racism which tends to infinity so far as the Zionists are concerned: To the "salvation" of all the lands in the Land of Israel, and therefore to the expulsion of all non-Jews from the land which was "saved" by such manner.

[In that respect, Zionism is worse than the apartheid regime of South Africa. That regime has "divided" the country and has forbidden the whites to buy land in a "black" area (the Bantustans) and the blacks to buy land in a "white" area. Zionism wants to "save" as much land as it can without any limit at all, in all areas of the "Land of Israel", and it turns the land that it "saves" into one big apartheid area, in which human beings who were born from non-Jewish mothers have no right to live. I see no difference whether the apartheid-area was created by confiscation or by purchase. The most important fact is that it exists. Again the "moderate" Zionists were and are the worst in this respect. The testimony of the historian Walter Laqueur (a Zionist himself. Tr.) in his book "The History of Zionism" (Shoken, 1974, in Hebrew) is correct: "A.D. Gordon⁴⁵ opposed violence on principle and justified self-defence only under the most extreme conditions, but he and his comrades desired that every single tree or plant in the Jewish Fatherland will be planted only by (Jewish) pioneers" (*Ibid.*, p. 178). This means that he desired an absolute apartheid and a complete expulsion of "non-Jews" from the "Jewish Fatherland", but without a loss of blood. I, on the contrary, do not oppose violence always, but I oppose apartheid on principle and I do not care how it was created.]

"Jewish" Labor

3) The right to work. I will begin here from two quotations. Under the title of "The Israeli settlement authorities are taking action against the leasing of lands to Arabs," *Ma'ariv* (3.7.75) tells the following racist story: "The Ministry of Agriculture and the Settlement Department of the Jewish Agency have recently launched a vehement campaign to eradicate the plague of land-leasing and orchard-leasing to *Bedouins* and *Arab farmers* in the Western Galilee. The Director of the Galilee area for the Jewish Agency, Mr. Aharon Nahmani, said that his office sent a circular notice to all settlements, in which they are warned that the leasing of national lands for cultivation by Arab sharecroppers,

as well as renting of the orchards for picking and marketing by *Arabs* contradicts the law and the regulations of the settlement authorities and the settlement movements. The management of the Galilee area enjoins the settlements to abstain from this practice, and stresses that last year already, the department pressed legal charges against settlements which did not abstain." (All emphases mine.)

Pay attention please: Because I am a Jew, I am allowed to lease orchards for picking or marketing, but an *Arab*, only because he is an Arab, is forbidden this! The Ministry of Agriculture of the State of Israel together with the (Zionist) Settlement Authorities will persecute and prosecute the *Jewish settlements*, for doing actions which are completely legal when done between *Jews* and *Jews* and become a grave offence when done between *Jews* and *Arabs*! And truly enough the settlements were punished. But since in this country "the settlements" are a sacred cow, because they are racist, a special privilege was granted to those offenders who "broke the law", something not granted to Yehoshua Peretz⁴⁶: They were not brought to court, on the accusation of this most horrible "crime" of absence of racism, but made "a deal" and bought themselves off by giving "donations" to a mysterious fund! And so tells us *Al-Hamishmar* (21.7.75) the end of this story: "The Ministry of Agriculture mentions a number of agricultural settlements which were "caught" breaking the law and leasing their lands for cultivation, or for the picking of their crop. Since they committed that offence for the first time they were not fined but were obliged to give donations in money to a special fund which stands to be established in the near future, and the aims of which have not yet been defined." The sum of the "donations" — 750,000 IL! And the paper tells us further that "if a settlement is caught once again leasing lands, all form of state support will be interrupted. That settlement will not receive water-allocations, will not obtain credit, and will not enjoy development loans." (*Ibid.*)

Even so the Israeli Ministry of Agriculture takes care that the racism will be observed! And not in vain this racist struggle against the human right of Arabs (Israeli citizens, by the way) to

⁴⁴ Situated in that area. I. Shahak.

⁴⁵ One of the founders of the Zionist "socialism". Supposedly a moderate, in reality an anti-Arab racist. I. Shahak.

⁴⁶ A worker leader from Ashdod. A Jew from Morocco. I. Shahak.

must develop. (Yediot Aharonot 10.10.75. Article by Shulamit Aloni, M.K.).

The housing and the health in Israel are not of course the only examples. In almost every area of life in the State of Israel there exists a similar racist separation between "Jews" and "non-Jews", a separation that necessarily causes discrimination. I am quite prepared to bring further examples if other opportunities will be given me.] Here I want to finish with two chief conclusions:

Not in their Stars

A) I do not wish to debate any justifications for that racist policy. The most important fact is that it exists. Therefore the first step consists in admitting the truth: The State of Israel is a racist state, and its racism is a necessary consequence of the racism of the Zionist movement. Facts are facts. After this we can debate, if we wish to do

so, why such a racism is "forbidden" against the Jews and becomes a good deed when it is carried out by the Jews.

B) I do know the fact that the State of Israel is not the *only* racist state, and similarly the Zionist organization is not the *only* racist organization. I know for example that the paragraph six of the 1968 Palestinian Covenant can be considered also as a racist declaration and I have said so many times to Palestinian-Arab audiences in neutral countries. Usually I encounter a great understanding. But justice begins at home. The primary duty of all citizens of Israel, and also of all those Jews in the Diaspora who define themselves as the "supporters of Israel", is to struggle against the racism and the discrimination which Zionism has established in the State of Israel, and which is directed against all the non-Jews who live in it. Such a struggle, which necessarily begins with the explanation of the racist character of Zionism and the State of Israel and the condemnation of their racism is neither anti-Jewish nor anti-

Semitic, just as in the similar condemnation of the racism of the Tsarist-Russia, there was no hate of Russians. Only a state which will abolish inside itself all the forms of racism, beginning with those that it enforces itself, can, afterwards, operate a policy which will bring all of us to a stable peace. Such peace can only be one in which people will not be discriminated against for reason of their origin, neither in their right to dwell nor in their right to work nor in any other area of their lives, but whatever government that will exist, will treat everyone in a manner in which human beings deserve to be treated.

A fuller perspective on the author's views may be obtained by asking your Congressman for a verbatim of Dr. Shahak's testimony before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements. It appears on pages 33-46 of the April 4, 1974, House Committee on Foreign Affairs report headed "Problems of Protecting Civilians Under International Law in The Middle East Conflict."

Rabbi to an Arab Ambassador

of International Law, edited by Marjorie M. Whiteman, Assistant Legal Adviser to the Department of State, Volume 8, September, 1967, U.S. Government Printing Office, pp. 34-35. It is contained in a letter, dated April 20, 1964, from the then-Assistant Secretary of State, Phillips Talbot, and addressed to me.

The letter states, *inter alia*, that the Department of State "does not recognize a legal-political relationship based upon religious identification of American citizens. It does not in any way discriminate among American citizens upon the basis of religion. Accordingly, it should be clear that the Department of State does not regard the "Jewish people" concept as a concept of international law."

The broad context in which this fundamental, legal principle was handed down and inscribed in this official United States codification of international law is the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. But the more precise context, clear on the face of Mr. Talbot's letter, is exactly the discrimination and exclusivism of Zionism's "Jewish people" nationality claims, based upon either religious belief or racial descent from a Jewish mother. And since Zionism is an international movement and since much Israeli Zionist legislation has had — and

has — international legal and political implications it is regrettable that neither the United States delegation to the General Assembly nor the President of the United States took the initiative to look at their own official "Bible" of international law. For the *principle* which Mr. Talbot was constitutionally required to apply to Zionism in rejecting its "Jewish people" nationality claims is certainly applicable to the impact which Zionist "Jewish people" legislation, enacted by the Israeli Knesset, has had on Palestine's non-"Jewish people" nationals and the Palestine problem as a whole.

ZIONIST/ISRAEL'S "CENTRAL TASK": There is, first of all, the commitment of high principle in the Declaration of the Establishment of the State of Israel — a kind of Declaration of Independence proclaiming the emergence of the state in 1948. That solemn document declares that the state "will be open for Jewish immigration and for the Ingathering of Exiles." (Emphasis added.)

This declaration of high purpose was implemented in three specific legislative acts of the Knesset. "The Law of Return" is Israel's basic immigration law. Every Jew, regardless of present citizenship, has the right to immigrate to Israel. The state is prohibited, except in individual and exceptional circum-

stances, from preventing Jewish immigration. The "Law of Nationality" grants citizenship automatically (unless it is rejected) to any Jew immigrating under the "Law of Return." Neither the right to immigrate nor the automatic acquisition of citizenship is the prerogative of any but Jews.

Perhaps even more prejudicial, however, to non-"Jewish people" Palestinians — and even to non-"Jewish people" citizens of the Zionist state — is the "central" commitment of the state to "The Ingathering of the Exiles." In 1952 the Knesset enacted "The World Zionist Organization/Jewish Agency Status Law." The "Status" law grants the Zionist organization a special status in Israel for "immigration," "absorption," and "settlement" projects.

Paragraph 5, consistent with the Declaration of Establishment, states "the mission of gathering in the exiles is the central task of the State of Israel and the Zionist Movement in our days and requires constant efforts by the Jewish people in the Diaspora..." (ALL emphases added) "Exiles" and Diaspora" are Zionist terms describing Jews who live outside the State of Israel. In 1954 this Knesset legislation was made operative when the Executive of the World Zionist Organization and the Israeli government signed a "Covenant" embodying the substance of the 1952

law. The Covenant provides for the establishment of a "Coordination Board." This body, composed of members of the Zionist organization and the government, allocates what would be functions of a normal state between the various departments of the Zionist movement and the counterpart departments of the government. The division of responsibilities is consistent with the conception of Israel as a Zionist state, or as the highest courts of the state described it in the *Judgment* handed down in the trial of Adolph Eichmann, "the sovereign state of the Jewish people."

"MORE EQUAL THAN OTHERS": It is clear, therefore, that the process of building a state for "the Jewish people" — identified either by religion or maternal descent — continues within this "democracy." Since "Ingathering the Exiles" — recruiting Jews for immigration — is defined by law as the "central task" of the state it is not surprising that privileging Jews governs most Israeli policy. This affects the structuring of the economy, educational opportunities, rights of political organization, public subsidies for activities such as agriculture, provisions of public services such as roads, utilities and housing, among others. Old Zionist prohibitions against non-"Jewish people" Palestinians, long ante-dating the present configurations of the Arab/Israeli conflict, still obtain. For example, only Jews may be employed on Jewish National Fund lands. The lands belong in perpetuity to "the Jewish people" and the Jewish National Fund is a major instrument for present Israeli occupation policies.

Israel is a state, therefore, in which if apartheid is not as blatant or as territorially visible as South Africa, "Jews" are nevertheless "more equal than others."

BEYOND SEMANTICS: All of this is public law. The application of these Zionist laws makes discrimination a matter of national politics and of



Rabbi Elmer Berger is the leading Jewish anti-Zionist spokesman in the United States. He was a founder of the American Council for Judaism and served as executive vice-president of that organization from 1955 until 1968. In January 1969 he and a number of members of The Council organized "American Jewish Alternatives to Zionism, Inc.", and elected Dr. Berger president, a position which he still holds.

demographic fact. This being so, it is an abandonment of democratic principle to accuse those who oppose these public policies of malevolent or "obscene" motivations. To Americans, the effort to do so is reminiscent of the effort to label opponents of the Vietnam war as "traitors."

I am unsure of what "racism" may mean to all those who participated in the debate or have been witness to it or some of the side-shows. But if "racism" is a form of government or a structure of society in which national rights and responsibilities are officially legislated upon the basis of creed, color or ethnic derivation, then the Zionist character of much "Basic" Israeli law qualifies.

ANTI-ZIONISM UNINTIMIDATED: Because the facts — and the relevant law — speak for themselves, many of us have long been anti-Zionists. Articulating our anti-Zionism as opposition to these Zionist practices, we believe we are articulating our deepest commitment to humanistic, liberal, democratic values. The inequities which Zionism has inflicted on Palestine and Palestinians and the violence Zionism does to the moral and ethical values of Judaism (and Christianity) continue. We anti-Zionists will therefore continue our opposition to Zionism. We are neither confused by the orchestrated hysteria nor stampeded. We will hope that now — since Zionism has been vividly called to the attention of a world which has, for too long, accepted it with uninformed innocence — the authentic character of its national/political substance will become clear. In the process of civil and disciplined discussion, no legitimate religious sensibilities will be bruised and the State of Israel need not be "destroyed." In fact, there are increasing numbers of Israelis who advocate either de-Zionizing the state or, at least, containing its Zionist character to the pre-1967 "borders" and agreeing to the establishment of a Palestinian state precisely for those non-"Jewish people" Palestinian nationals, who, because of Zionism's discriminatory and exclusivist policies, cannot now find satisfaction for their legitimate rights in the Zionist state.

I hope that as the debate continues you and your associates will help the American people — and others — first to see and examine and then to make responsible value judgments of Zionism as it operated in Palestine. If you will do this it is my conviction you will perform an appreciated and needed service which will contribute eventually to a just and enduring peace in the Middle East.

Very sincerely yours,

Elmer Berger
President

(Continued from p. 2)

schedule of events paving the way for Christ's Second Coming includes "the rebirth of Israel, an increase in natural catastrophes, the threat of war in Egypt and the revival of Satanism." Since these are seen as inseparable from the ultimate conversion of the Jews, they are hardly in keeping with the aims of Herzlian Zionism, even though they hail the establishment of a Jewish state.

Three other concepts — none of which would necessarily find Herzl's

underlying assumptions palatable — have been dominant among many outspoken liberals. First of all, there are those Europeans and Americans who, since 1948, have slipped increasingly into the habit of using 'Zionist' and 'Jewish' as interchangeable adjectives. In this context, those Western Christians who have enjoyed bold, generous Jewish cooperation in combating racism at home see the 'Zionist-racist' label as libel, an offense demanding an immediate, energetic counteroffensive.

Again, there are those who regard Zionism as a "Jewish Liberation Movement" which, by guaranteeing a politically assured territorial haven for victims of pogroms, holocausts and other anti-Semitic manifestations, is — in its purpose and function — anti-racist.

Lastly, there are those who seem to think that Martin Buber's dream of a Zionism "friendly to the Arabs ... and opposed to all European imperialistic tendencies" is at stake in the current

controversy. But the 1931 Zionist Congress slapped Buber down. And the 1956 British/French/Israeli Sinai-Suez incursion revealed how completely his ideals had been eliminated in Zionist practice. (See under "Buber" in the *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia* and *Macropaedia Britannica*.)

Any definitions of Zionism you want to use are permissible. But whatever usage you employ that is at odds with the Herzlian Jewish nationalism at the heart of the current commotion ought to be labeled. Otherwise you'll be adding to the confusion which so urgently needs clearing up.

As an example of how one person has done this with commendable clarity, I cite the following paragraph from an article on "Zionism and Racism" by David G. Gil in the Nov. 25, 1975, Brandeis University in-house periodical. Deploring the sloganeering at the U.N. and associating 'Zion' with Jewish pursuit of all that makes for universal peace, Prof. Gil states:

"The Jewish people must overcome the racist elements of political Zionism and of the State of Israel which are a blatant contradiction of the true meaning of Zion and which threaten Jewish physical and cultural survival. To overcome these elements Jews need to recommit themselves to the original meaning of Zion, peace through justice and equality for all people including the Palestinians. In political terms this means affirming the equal rights of Jews and Palestinians to return to their common homeland and to live in a multi-ethnic commonwealth of self-directing, cooperating communities throughout the land of Zion-Palestine, with neither people dominating and exploiting the other."

OTHER CONFUSING WORD-USAGES

In the course of the reactions to the November 10 U.N. resolution, other words have come up indicating that differences in "understanding one another's speech" aren't limited to the two controversial terms focused on above. "Democracy," "religion" and "anti-Semitism," so fuzzily used in other areas, contribute to the confusion by their imprecise use here.

"Democracy"

Take "democracy" first: Castigating "Third World Rhetoric at the U.N.," the *Christian Century* (Nov. 5, 1975), characterized Israel as a "democracy... which has a religious, not a racial, base" and "cannot afford the luxury of debate over Zionism." With a contrasting usage, Israeli Zvi Yaron wrote in the *Jerusalem Post* (Sept. 4, 1975) that "if we shall have full democracy, it obviously will not be a Jewish state." He clearly claims the democratic right of debate to affirm that a Zionism which discriminates on either a religious or racial basis is undemocratic. (The other side of this coin is the conviction of some of his fellow-



The Rev. I. Humpfrey Walz, a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries (Scotland), concentrated on Eastern Mediterranean cultures in his college days and in four years of graduate study, including two at Oxford University. He is Communications Consultant to the United Presbyterian Synod of the Northeast in which he served until recently as Middle East Studies Chairman. In pastoral, governmental, ecumenical and denominational posts he has rendered significant service to refugees from Nazism, Communism and Palestine.

Israelis that the "secular, democratic state in Palestine" plumped for by the PLO would be "the death of Israel.")

"Religion"

"Religion" is another of those words which, in general use, are more colored by emotions than clear to the mind. It can apply to a high spiritual-moral-ethical devotion. It also is used of exclusive and prejudicial convictions and behavior due to rigid creed or institutional, even "ethnic," loyalties. To gain perspective, let's concentrate on usages outside the "Zionism=racism" controversy.

Are the tragic wars in Ireland and Lebanon "religious" or "irreligious"? Was the July, 1999, holocaust by "Christian" Crusaders in Jerusalem "religious"? Were the Israelites' genocidal forays into Jericho (sparing only the family of a cooperative prostitute) and other Palestinian cities "on a religious, not a racial, base"? (See Josh. 6:21f, 8:2, 9:12; cf. Deut. 7:2, 20:13, 1 Sam. 15:3.) Was Moses being "religious" or "ethnic" when he selected members of just one tribe, Levi, to slaughter some 3000 Hebrews for worshipping a false god (Exod. 32:25-29)? And what did David Borean mean when he called the 1944 Zionist assassination of Lord Moyne, British Minister of State in the Middle East, "a religious duty"? (*Jewish Press*, Aug. 8, 1975).

On the current scene, let's take just one example to balance the assertion above that Israel "has a religious base": In the *Christian Century's* neighbor publication, the *Chicago Tribune* (Nov.

25, 1975), Mike LaVelle viewed Zionism and Israel as "not a religion". The extent to which these usages may seem to contradict each other reflects in no way on either writer. It can, however, cause confusion.

(A minor added reason for being extra careful in one's use of 'religion' in a controversy over "racism" lies in the fact that hymns like the Jewish "Rock of Ages" and the Protestant "All hail the power of Jesus' name" sing of the religious community as a "race".)

"Anti-Semitism"

Another vague and ambiguous word was introduced into the confusion of November 11, 1975, when the U.S. Congressional joint resolution declared that the previous day's U.N. action "encourages anti-Semitism." So many have been the uses of that noun, some vicious, some remedial, that a whole Centennial Volume could well be produced in recognition of its first known use in print — by Wilhelm Marr in 1879.

In an article entitled "Anti-Semitism Redeveloped" in *Ma'ariv* (Sep. 5, 1975), Ephraim Kishon revived the suggestion that prejudice against any Semites, including Arabs, should be so branded. Herzl maintained in a different vein, that — once the Jewish State was founded — any of the then 14,000,000 Jews who refused to migrate there should be classed as "anti-Semitic" (Herzl, *The Jewish State*, tr. Lipsky, 1947, p. 81).

Among the other definitions and redefinitions, the one being most vigorously promulgated today is "any talk of substance that is critical of Israel or Zionism." Pres. Nahum Goldmann of the World Zionist Congress rejects this usage, but Fenster and Epstein's *The New Anti-Semitism*, 1973, fosters it by imposing that label/libel on the Quakers, Episcopalian Dean Francis B. Sayre, Senator Fulbright, Evans & Novak and the *Christian Science Monitor's* Ahah in denouncing Elijah (1 Kings 18:17) and Amariah in expelling the critical Amos (Am. 7:10-13) could have made handy use of such an epithet!

The persons whom this revised usage can downgrade are legion: There's Harry Truman, for instance, when he wrote to Eleanor Roosevelt: "The action of some of our Zionists... will eventually prejudice what they are trying to get done. I very much fear the Jews are like all other undertogs. When they get on top, they are just as intolerant and as cruel as the people were to them when they were underneath." There's also Nahum Goldmann at whose 1970 article in *Foreign Affairs* Golda Meir snerled. "It's the most anti-Zionist statement I've ever seen," (Wright, *The Great Zionist Cover-up*, 1975, pp. 10, 35). And, more recently, there's Joe Abop's devastating "Open Letter to an Israeli Friend" (*N.Y. Times Magazine*, Dec. 14, 1975).

The trouble with this latter-day campaign so to redefine "anti-Semitism" is that it undercuts its important use to ferret out, expose and destroy the scourge clearly described by the *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*. That source uses the term... to denote the movement to degrade Jews to an inferior position in all branches of life in the countries in which they live. Generally, it is applied to individual and group incitation and action aiming to circumscribe the civil, religious and political rights of the Jews; also to hinder normal relations between Jews and non-Jews."

Just which anti-Semitism did the Congress have in mind on November 11, 1975? It would help to know.

BOOK REVIEW

"My Servant ... Shall Not Be Loud and Noisy" Is. 42:1-2

Zion Reconsidered, Jakob J. Petuchowski, Twayne Publishers, N.Y. 1966

Dr. Petuchowski is a distinguished member of the faculty of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion. His special disciplines are the fields of rabbinic literature and theology.

Dr. Petuchowski argues in this book that all Jews (including those Zionists who are now "at home" in the State of Israel) and probably all Christians and Moslems, too, are in "exile" from "Zion".

This paradoxical statement may be the quickest way to dramatize that this book rejects, on both historical and theological grounds, any equating of Judaism with the secular, nationalistic Zionism which established the State of Israel. "Zion", Petuchowski argues, is "messianic redemption", but not for only one state or for one people. In Judaism, "it had to be salvation for all mankind." And we are all a long way from this "Zion."

Petuchowski has lived and taught in Israel. He finds its people, like all people, to include "extreme kindness and base chicanery, gracious hospitality and unpleasant arrogance."

But the book is not a critique (or criticism) of these people. It is rather a searching examination of the very pretensions of the Zionist ideology (and some of the Zionist ideologues) of the state which have been all too-widely accepted at face value and which have contributed to the totally erroneous populism which would make Zionism and Judaism the same. Petuchowski's orderly process of examination enlists ethnic, political as well as religious consideration to reach his conclusions.

The book is ten years old. But the recent debate about Zionism, stimulated by the United Nations resolution labelling it as "a form of racism" may make the book more immediately relevant than it appeared to be when it was written. For if Israel is not "Zion" and Zionism is not Judaism, then all Jews are not Zionists. And it follows inexorably that honorable and knowledgeable opponents of the pretensions of Zionism which is not Judaism cannot be "anti-Semites" by fiat despite Mr. Moynihan's employment of false dilemma as a technique to make them appear so.

In fairness it must be said that in the decade which has passed since Petuchowski wrote this book his *political* evaluations of the State of Israel and of its international relations may have changed. I happened to be in his Cincinnati home on one of the earliest days of the 1967 war. We disagreed about the responsibility for starting the

war and about the possible consequences of victory for either side, even though at the time we did not know who would be the victor. I have not seen or been in contact with him since. And we might again disagree — this time about the possibilities of peace and the responsibilities of all parties in undertaking the steps which might produce a peace.

But these are all precisely military/political questions. They may be exalted by the generals and politicians to the status of "high policy." But I have seen no evidence suggesting that Petuchowski has consented to identify even such "high policy" with the supremacy of the human spirit, the stringent and absolutist ethics, the prophetic universalism which, in this book, are the ingredients he identifies as "Zion" and which distinguish Judaism from the nationalistic ideology which has structured so much of the State of Israel's statehood.

Elmer Berger

This book will be handled in a very limited quantity by AMEU. Orders will be filled on a first-come-first-served basis. Publisher's price is \$9.75; AMEU will sell it for \$5.00.

NOTE:

AMEU has made new arrangements for the handling of our computerized mailing list. We expect that all future additions, deletions and changes will be processed quickly and accurately.

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, religion, culture and economic conditions of the Middle East, and who would—in this context—peak for greater fairness, consistency and integrity in U.S. policy toward that area.

It is published by AMEU, Americans for Middle East Understanding, Inc., whose directors are: John V. Chappie, former CARE director, Gaza Strip Project; John H. Davis, former Commissioner General of UNRWA, International Consultant; Harry G. Dorman, Jr., former Director, Middle East and Europe Department, National Council of Churches; Henry G. Fischer, Curator in Egyptology, Metropolitan Museum of Art; J. P. I. Helen C. Irving, Professor of U. of Fla.; Carl Max Kopelman, Assoc. Prof. Middle East History, NYU; J. L. John G. Nolan, National Secretary, Catholic Near East Welfare Association; Joseph L. Ryan, S.J., St. Joseph's University, Beirut; Jack B. Sunderland, President of American Independent Oil Company (Int'l.); L. Humphrey Waiz, Associate Synod Executive, U.S. United Presbyterian Synod of the Northeast; Charles T. White, former Financial Executive, Near East Foundation and AID (Israel).

John M. Burton, Executive Director; Mrs. E. Kelly, Administrative Assistant; Miss H. Casule, Distribution & Travel.

All correspondence should be addressed to Room 771, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, New York 10027.



Americans for Middle East Understanding, Inc.

Room 771, 475 Riverside Drive
New York, N.Y. 10027