

# Israel's Threat to Judaism

IN PALESTINE :  
ZIONISM v. JUDAISM, CHRISTIANITY, ISLAM

By  
RABBI ELMER BERGER

*A speech delivered to the Irish Arab Society, Dublin,  
5th February, 1970*



### The 'Three I Tour'

I am very grateful to the Irish Arab Society for inviting me tonight; and I, an American Jew, am grateful for a reason so quixotic it must be Irish. In my home city of New York it is generally conceded that anyone who wishes to be someone politically must eventually take what is called the 'Three I Tour'. That is to say, part of his credentials for serving Americans—in the utter illogic of political campaigning—must be a visit, at some time in life, to Italy, Ireland and Israel. Tonight I have finally reached my third 'I'. I dare say that may be the last word you will hear tonight which would fit into a manual for teaching aspiring politicians how to be elected anything from dog-catcher to governor in the state of New York.

For I have not come all these miles and made my first visit to this legendary country of yours at what is one of its least inviting seasons to play the diminishingly respectable rôle of politician. Contemporary politics, in my judgment, is no longer even the art of the possible. It seems to me, rather, to be the artlessness of avoiding the possible in the interests of evasions, cynicism, de-humanization. In America this is called 'pragmatism'. No one really knows what the term means—unless it is understood by that newly discovered bonanza of the computerized politician, 'the silent majority'.

Well, if I know anything of Irish history, this silence business in politics sits as little with you as it does with me. People from this country have supplied America with a fair quota of political leaders. I do not say that they were better or worse—as politicians. Perhaps it is just because most of them served before the computer provided one of the great de-humanizing factors in man's relations to man. Whatever the reason, Americans of Irish descent left to America a tradition of pleasant flamboyancy, what was called 'style' in the person of John Kennedy. It made our political life palatable. It was said of the dubious public morality of Chicago's famous Mayor Kelley that at least he was corrupt with a flair. And even in these days of American sadness and torment, there is still enough left of the mixture of humanism and humour to prefer a Jesse James to the sombre sanctimonious pomposities who so often sit today in high places to make low-level deals.

In my own tradition, as a Jew, there is also a golden thread of humanization. It was born several thousand years ago with a small group of men we all know as the Old Testament prophets. It transcended the power-structure of a primitive nation in early Israel and Judea. It had an articulate exponent in Jesus of Nazareth. We know too little of the intimate lives of these men from Amos to Jesus to know whether or not they had that mixture of sentimentality and humour so characteristic of the

legendary Irishman and so reflective of his humanity. The humanity of Judaism's prophets—including Jesus—may have been of sterner stuff. But we who are free are no less indebted to them, for it was they who put men above the machine. They saw the development and evolution of the individual as the purpose and meaning of life. They formulated the moralities which lifted the human soul above the power structure of both state and church, or, in the context of their lives, the Jerusalem temple or even the synagogue. The best of which man is capable they believed to be a reflection of God; and God they knew was not some punch-card solution arrived at by a prescribed mixture of material sacrifice, psalm-singing and tribalistic ceremonialism. The pipe-line between God and man was righteous conduct and human justice. That pipe-line was available to all men and the God at the other end was the same for all the world and all humans in it.

### **Zionism—A De-Humanizer**

It is in this spirit that I, as a Jew, come to talk to this Irish audience tonight about one of the great and tragic—and also one of the dangerous—problems in our contemporary world. For the problem in Palestine is—above all—a problem which the politicians, the power-structure automatons, the bureaucrats, the computers have created by de-humanizing a large segment of mankind. In the Middle East today, this de-humanizing process has produced a geo-political threat to the peace of far greater and more frightening portent than in Vietnam. That threat has escalated for more than fifty years because the politicians who run our lives have preferred neat and de-humanizing formulas to the irrepressible spirit of man.

It may be said that it all began some seventy years ago. A newspaperman from Vienna—Theodor Herzl by name—witnessed the trial of Captain Alfred Dreyfus in Paris. Herzl decided that if such anti-Semitism could continue a century after the great liberal revolutions in America and Western Europe then anti-Semitism was an incurable illness. Jews, according to Herzl, were really unassimilable. Some incompatible alien-ness inevitably existed between Jews and others which prevented national assimilation even in those new societies where such assimilation was a right—and even a responsibility—of each individual citizen, regardless of race, faith or national derivation. That is to say, in Herzl's conception it was impossible for those who were not Jews to accept those who were on any basis of full equality of national rights and obligations. The reason for this, again according to Herzl, is because Jews are 'a people—one people'. And all 'the nations in which Jews live are either covertly or openly anti-Semitic.'<sup>1</sup>

And so the first submergence of the human spirit to a pragmatic political formula took shape in the Palestine tragedy. But at least it can be said of Herzl that he was no hypocrite about it: 'However much I may worship personality,' he said, 'I do not regret its disappearance. Whoever can, will and must perish, let him perish. But the distinctive nationality of Jews neither can, will nor must be destroyed.'

Herzl expanded his ideas into a book called *The Jewish State*. It has been the classic textbook of Zionism ever since its publication in 1896. I am always shocked by the number of people—Jews and Christians—who express sympathy with and even support of Zionism but who have never heard of, let alone read, this bible of the movement.

Herzl, however, did not stop at a philosophical analysis of doom and the inevitability of evil. The only answer to this demonstration of eternal inhumanity, Herzl declared, was for the world to confess its dedication to hatred, to declare—in international law—the existence of the Jews as a nation and to give the members of this unassimilable nationality 'a home in Palestine secured by public law.'<sup>2</sup>

In 1897, in Basle, Switzerland, Herzl convened the first congress of what he called—and what has been called ever since—the World Zionist Organization. It declared its purpose to be the establishment of a 'home' for 'the Jewish people'; and it formulated a programme for mobilizing political support for the objective by 'strengthening and fostering Jewish national sentiment and consciousness.' There were 220 Jews at this first congress.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, it claimed the right to speak for what has ever since, in Zionist jargon, been called 'the Jewish people'. The World Zionist Organization was a political structure, and Herzl, the first president, set out to negotiate with the politicians of the world, hoping to obtain what he called a 'charter' which would establish the 'rights' of this 'Jewish people' to Palestine as the site of its 'national home'.

### **Zionism v. the 'Rights of Man'**

It is probably not surprising, given the reactionary, despairing and divisive fundamental proposition of Zionism, that most of Herzl's diplomatic contacts were with those who—in either Eastern or Western Europe—had most successfully and skillfully resisted the emancipating forces of the great eighteenth-century revolutions for the 'rights of man'. There is even suspicion—if not explicit admission—in *pro-Zionist sources* that anti-Semitic policies accounted for the willingness of some to consider negotiations with the father of modern Zionism.<sup>4</sup> Certainly that suspicion—if not admitted fact—applied to the

German kaiser and to the Russian von Plehve. And something more than political convenience or great humanistic passion must account for the historical friendship between South Africa and Zionism, beginning with the South African patriarch Jan Smuts. Apartheid as a societal principle is no less ignoble and humanly degrading when accepted as a working principle between Jews and others than when it is applied between whites and blacks. And South Africa has always been a Mecca for Zionists, from the days of Herzl through Ben Gurion up to and including the transplant from Milwaukee to the present office of Israeli prime minister. All such alliances were natural.

The reactionary anti-democratic statesmen with whom Theodor Herzl negotiated for a legal charter giving Palestine to the Jews were among the most active exponents of political and social structures committed to the medieval, pre-democratic concept of men as fixtures in separate social castes. Jews had been such a caste, and Zionism offered an answer to this problem: make a virtue of taking Jews out of these societies to a piece of land to which the 'nation' of Jews, created by ostracism, would have title. In return Zionism promised to aid in the deportation of people from whose ranks had come some of the most effective revolutionaries in the social-democratic movements.<sup>5</sup>

Some years after Herzl, a great American liberal philosopher—and a Jew—commented upon the reactionary character of Zionism in an American context. In 1920, Morris Raphael Cohen wrote:

Though most of the leaders of Zionism in America are sincerely and profoundly convinced of the compatibility of Zionism and Americanism, they are none the less profoundly mistaken. . . . The fact, however, is that the American ideal of freedom is just what the Zionists most fear. At bottom they have no confidence that with complete toleration and full freedom Judaism can hold its own in the open field.<sup>6</sup>

The alliance of anti-Semitism with the anti-democratic ideology of Zionism played a notable rôle in the motivations which produced the Balfour Declaration. In 1918, less than a year after he had transmitted the declaration to the British Zionists in a letter to Lord Rothschild, Arthur James Balfour wrote of Zionism:

For as I read its meaning it is, among other things, a serious endeavour to mitigate the age-long miseries created for Western civilization by the presence in its midst of a Body which it too long regarded as alien and even hostile, but which it was equally unable to expel or to absorb. Surely, for this if for no other reason, it should receive our support.<sup>7</sup> [Emphasis supplied.]

Zionism then is a political-national movement, resembling the ethnic and even religiously oriented nationalities of seveneenth- and eighteenth-century Middle Europe more than the

egalitarian democracies of the West. It is predicated upon despair that the egalitarian ideals can ever prevail, at least for those identified as Jews. It accepted—with resignation—the anti-Semitic canards of history's most stubbornly reactionary societies. Jews and Christians represent two intrinsically conflicting collectivities. The 'alien' character of Jews is affirmed as a virtue and extrapolated. It provides the rationale for withdrawal from what are called 'non-Jewish' societies into a political sovereignty characterized by a *guaranteed* Jewish majority.

It is this permanent, guaranteed Jewish majority which is the crux of the Palestine problem today. The maintenance of this majority of Jews is—today—the declared policy of the Israeli government. It was so stated by Moshe Dayan who, in 1967, said Israel could take back the refugees created by the 1967 war but would not do so, because then Israel would become 'either a binational or poly Arab/Jewish state and we want to have a Jewish state. We can absorb them,' Dayan concluded, 'but then it won't be the same country.'<sup>8</sup> And that policy was repeated by Israel's prime minister, Mrs. Meir, in a debate in the Israeli parliament on 25th June, 1969: 'I want a Jewish state with a decisive Jewish majority,' she said, 'which cannot change overnight.' Then she added, 'I always believed [this] was plain Zionism.'<sup>9</sup>

Mrs. Meir, of course, knows whereof she speaks when Zionism is the subject. To create a majority of Jews in Palestine—by hook or by crook—was always a fundamental Zionist objective. That majority could not be established at the time when politically the state of Israel was launched on the world stage. The majority had to be created by massive influxes of Jews and massive expulsions of Christians and Moslems, who were Arab.<sup>10</sup> And this same Zionist nationality commitment is, today, the principal obstacle to any possible repatriation of any significant numbers of Palestinians. And it is the uprootedness of the Palestinians which is the principal obstacle to peace.

### **'The Jewish People'**

But it is not only the application of such apartheid-like concepts to the people of Palestine which must raise serious questions about Zionism in any liberal minds. It is not only a kind of Rhodesia, affecting Rhodesians. Zionism considers all Jews—no matter what their citizenship and nationality—to be part of the Israeli nationality base. Israeli courts, in opinions designed to influence international law, have formally designated Israel as 'the sovereign State of the Jewish people.'<sup>11</sup>

That state has enacted legislation which puts this anti-democratic political proposition into the realm of international law.<sup>12</sup> By virtue of such legislation I—a Jew, with no nationality relationship to Israel whatever, since I reject the 'Jewish people' nationality—have more obligations to the state of Israel than those who, by any criteria of accepted jurisprudence, are legitimate nationals of Palestine. By any generally accepted political norms, therefore, the state of Israel is an exclusivist state, sustained in its present character by discriminatory nationality legislation. To use the language of George Orwell, this state makes Jews more equal than others and, correspondingly, discriminates against others. It is a kind of anti-Semitism in reverse. This exclusivist, discriminatory Zionist nationality concept and the state it has erected in the Middle East, with the active help or acquiescence of the great powers of the world, hardly qualifies as either a model of democratic virtue or as an exemplar of man's positive, hopeful, spiritual values. A Christian civilization which has certainly committed its share of crimes against people who have been identified as Jews may wish—with Balfour, Lloyd George and others—to try to redeem its soul by 'giving Palestine to the Jews', to use Zionist terminology. But having said this, that Christian world has no right to be smug and cynical, rationalizing this act by investing it with any of the commonly recognized virtues either of our political systems of the West or of our morality. To do this is to fall into the Zionist trap of sanctifying evils. As a calculated—or thoughtless—political act, the glorification of Zionism and the recognition of its discriminatory national state may be little different from hundreds of other calculated or thoughtless political acts which our governments commit all the time and about which most of us are too complacent until, with evil compounded, the world faces another catastrophe. But it is the essentiality of Judeo-Christian tradition that in its perhaps too-infrequent periods of introspection its devotees recognize their sins and atone. We have, I believe, reached that point in the Palestine problem where we must decide if, indeed, we will atone, or whether we will try to continue yet a while longer to stand stubbornly in the rôle of accomplice, to face the continuously escalating eruptions of violence which are always the surface symptoms of deep and cancerous misconceptions and even injustice.

### **Judaism Is Different**

Now, it should be reasonably clear how and why Judaism is different from this political-national programme of Zionism; and why—in many respects—Judaism must not only reject but



must also condemn the political and military strategies and tactics this basically discriminatory nationalism must employ to advance its national and international politics.

Judaism, in the first place, is a religious discipline. Historically it has had profound influence upon your faith, whether it be Catholic or Protestant; and the new spirit of ecumenism recognizes both this historical relationship and the wisdom, perhaps even the necessity, for dialogue and understanding to mobilize the *spiritual* resources of the world. And while I am on the subject, let it be said here loudly and clearly, that Judaism—and Christianity—are *both* recorded ingredients of Islam. Your prophets—and mine—are inscribed in the Koran, the holy book of what may well be the most ecumenical of all the great faiths of mankind. We are all—Jew, Christian and Moslem—'People of the Book'.

It must be said first of all, therefore, that the war in the Middle East is not a religious war. The conflict over the city of Jerusalem borders on religious sensitivities. But the issue over Jerusalem is not really the recognized interests of all three religions in the Holy City. It is rather what political and territorial arrangement will really satisfy the people who comprise the citizenry of the city while, at the same time, insuring the religious rights of Christians, Moslems and Jews all over the world.

### **Not a Religious War**

I cannot emphasize too strongly the *political* character of the Arab/Israeli/Zionist controversy, nor urge you too strongly to challenge any who attempt to confuse the problem by dressing it in the vestments and rhetoric of a religious quarrel. The knowledge that Judaism is a religion—not a nationality—is the fundamental proposition from which this clarification follows. To state the problem as one of Arab versus Jew is, in fact, to fly in the face of demographic reality. There are, for any who have the desire to see, Arab Jews, as there are Arab Christians, both living in the majority world of Arab Moslems.

Zionism has selected the people of one of these religious faiths and, by political fiat, attempted to politicalize them within a segregating political-national ideology. Zionism insists that all who worship as Jews are invested with rights in whatever of Palestine the state of Israel claims, and Zionism says those rights are superior to the rights of even Palestinians who are either Moslem or Christian. Zionism is *deliberately* responsible for the misleading idea that objective disapproval of Israel, or Zionism, is an invasion of the religious freedom of Jews. Any Judaism worthy of its heritage must condemn this

de-humanizing of people who are not Jews just as it would condemn racism or theocracy in any place in the world. There is no room here for moral compromise. What is going on in Israel—or more correctly in Palestine—in this aspect of the problem cannot in any conceivable theology I know be rationalized with Judaism.

I know some have been taught to believe—or have been indoctrinated to accept as theological dogma—that the state of Israel is the unfolding of the Divine Will and a fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy. Not by any Judaism I know and not by the moral standards of any of the great prophets I have ever studied!

Consider, for a moment, what those stormers of heaven considered to be the conditions for the redemption of Zion.<sup>13</sup> Hear, for example, Isaiah:

Zion shall be redeemed with justice  
And they who return to her with righteousness.<sup>14</sup>

And I ask you, how did the Zionists come to Palestine? I have already said it was through the assistance of men guilt-ridden with their own anti-Semitism, making political deals with others who believed the human depravity called anti-Semitism was an ineradicable blemish in the human animal.

Listen to Mr. Balfour instructing his cabinet in 1919, two years after his promise to give the Zionists a political title to land which was never British property to give.

Whatever be the future of Palestine it is not now an 'independent nation', nor is it yet on the way to become one. Whatever deference should be paid to the views of those who live there, the Powers in their selection of a mandatory do not propose, as I understand the matter, to consult them. In short, so far as Palestine is concerned, the Powers have made no statement of fact which is not admittedly wrong, and no declaration of policy which, at least in the letter, they have not always intended to violate.<sup>15</sup>

Now I can understand why, in Zionist/Israeli politics, this cynical man and the document named after him are glorified on Balfour Declaration day. But, please! let no one suggest that this kind of confessed de-humanizing of people who are Arabs or such dishonouring of national promises is to find a place of respect, much less reverence, in any religious creed in which genuinely moral men are expected to put faith.

No, little that has happened under Zionist control in Palestine for all of these six decades since 1917 can qualify as Judaism. On the contrary, most of what Zionism has done has deserved the unreserved condemnation of my religious faith and, if I may be so audacious as to say so, of yours also. For if I am critical of Jews who are Zionists or who, by silence, have given assent, I am no less critical of Christians who are

also Zionists or who, by silence, have given assent. Our spirituality is indivisible, however differently we perform in church, cathedral or synagogue. And Christianity is as much on trial in the Middle East today as is Judaism, because of our common moral derelictions in the Palestine problem. Nor are the secularist exponents of western democracy in better repute, for it has been the great democracies—particularly my own and the one across the Irish Sea—that have aided, abetted and subsidized a state which by policies serving its exclusivist character has attempted to obliterate a people and keep them victimized in camps, in the rootless and dependent rôle of refugees.

### 'Dual Nationality'

But it is not only at the level of spiritual ethics and morality where those of us who reject Zionism—and the Zionist identification of 'the Jewish people' with the state of Israel—differ from the proponents of that political ideology. Most of the governments of the world have recognized the state of Israel, although many of them have stipulated reservations about Israel's ultimate boundaries, its Jerusalem policy and its unfulfilled obligations to the Palestinian refugees. But virtually none of these governments has expressed clearly—or put into operative international law—reservations about Israeli nationality claims which affect their own citizens who are Jews and which are inconsistent with most democratic nationality concepts. An excellent illustration of my point developed in the recent situation in which it became known that some small but unspecified number of American Jews were serving in the Israeli armed forces. The core of this problem was whether or not these people had forfeited their American citizenship. The legalities involved are enormously complicated, but my own concern as an American Jew derives from a part of the explanation offered by our Department of State. The official spokesman for the department tried first to deny that in the confusing—and probably confused—interpretation of American nationality legislation, the state of Israel was any 'special case.'<sup>16</sup> But a moment later, in the same prepared statement, the same spokesman said,

Because of the *automatic* extension of Israeli nationality to Jews entering Israel with an immigrant visa (unless the immigrant positively renounces the grant of Israeli citizenship at the time of entry) a class of *dual American and Israeli nationals* has grown up. [My emphasis.]

Now what is irregular—even illegal—in American law, is that this peculiar dual nationality extends only to Jews. The imposition is admitted to be 'automatic', involuntary. It is extended to citizens of other countries who have never been to

Israel and whose only relationship to that state is the Israeli presumption—written into its nationality legislation—which claims as a national anyone identified as a Jew. The United States government—and I dare say your own—is acquiescing in this religiously discriminatory presumption, if not actually defending it.

The indulgence of my own government in this discriminatory legislation is contrary to the constitution of the United States. And in 1964, after a long negotiation and discussion, the same Department of State agreed that Zionism/Israel's 'Jewish people' nationality is not a valid 'concept of international law'.<sup>17</sup> But as with so much declared policy in massive, bureaucratic governments, this policy declaration rejecting Israel's discriminatory 'Jewish' nationality has failed to affect specific operation of the United States government.

That is one reason why those of us who believe we have a constitutional *right* to be Jews without any invasion or alteration of our nationality status, publicly in organized fashion, repudiate Zionism. Our religion is separate and apart from any political-nationality, and we believe our government is constitutionally obligated to prevent any foreign political sovereignty from infringing this freedom. That choice, it seems to me, confronts Jews in every country where fundamentally the same democratic principles obtain; and the theocratic conception of Israeli nationality, enacted into law with international ramifications, is a dilemma confronting the government of every such democratic state. I submit that before the Palestine problem is resolved it will be incumbent upon Jews who do not want, automatically, to have a dual nationality because of their religion to join in repudiation of Zionism; and it will be equally essential for any government of a democratic state, concerned with the integrity of its own democracy as well as with peace in the Middle East, to reject the Zionist basis of the present Israeli state.

### **Charity or Taxation ?**

But this rather esoteric—but vitally important—question of nationality integrity is not the only reason why the Israeli operation of its Zionist apparatus should cause concern in other states. There is no problem following the activities of Zionist fund-raising and political activities in the United States. Here, as I understand the situation, the Zionist effort is more or less integrated with those in England. It was not possible for me, therefore, with the sources at my disposal, to come as I would have liked to do with precise statistics for your country. I did, however, ascertain that you are hosting—or were in 1967, which is the latest year for which statistics are readily avail-

able—four so-called 'emissaries' from the World Zionist Organization.<sup>18</sup> They are here, in Irish institutions, ostensibly teaching harmless sounding subjects which have a relevancy to Judaism. Actually they are, of course, indoctrinating your children of Jewish faith—and incidentally any of the rest of you who are exposed—with commitment to Israeli national interests. I also could ascertain that from 1964 to 1967, approximately 12½ million dollars<sup>19</sup> were sent from Britain (presumably including Ireland) to Israel in only one of the many financial channels which must exist here as they do in the United States. I am sure these fragments of information only scratch the surface. But they demonstrate that your country, your people and your money are all involved; and therefore what I am about to say has political, human and financial relevancy to you.

Now I must make it absolutely clear that I believe free citizens in a free country should exercise the right of political petition. It is a form of what the younger generation is calling 'participatory democracy'. We oldsters may have failed to exercise this freedom sufficiently, leaving the precious business of governing our lives to the politicians least qualified to do so. But it is crucially important that such protest and petition be the voluntary action of citizens of Ireland or of the United States. There is no amenity of which I know between sovereign states which licenses one state to run lobbies and to organize votes within another sovereignty. Any such licence would create international anarchy.

Similarly, moral men, freely governing themselves, consider the giving of honest and needed charity a laudable virtue, eloquently sanctified in all the great religious traditions of man. But again, in a world organized into sovereign states the giving of money by citizens of one country to the governmental structure — and for governmental purposes — of another country is not generally regarded as proper charity. Certainly neither political protest nor petition nor financial contribution is proper if either, or both, are organized, manipulated and controlled by the established agency of a foreign government and in support of the national interests of that foreign government.

Now it is a matter of recorded fact and public law that Zionist organizations—here and elsewhere—are linked in Israeli/Zionist law to the Israeli government. In fact, some of us who have studied this problem in depth believe that the Israeli government and the World Zionist Organization—of which local Zionist groups are constituent and disciplined parts—are one and the same sovereignty. The World Zionist Organization has been a 'public body'—or a quasi-government

—ever since the establishment of the British mandate for Palestine in 1922. That in itself is neither surprising nor a crime. But what is surprising—and certainly improper—is that its constituent branches all over the world have been allowed to operate within other sovereignties as if they were indigenous, voluntary associations of local citizens. Finally, in 1964, the Senate of the United States investigated part of this operation in America. And the investigation, among other things, revealed that the World Zionist Organization was operating an extensive lobby in a manner resembling a foreign agent, although it was passing itself off as a complex of voluntary associations. Moreover, its activities were found to be 'inimical to the interests of the United States. . . .'<sup>20</sup>

The Israeli government enacts legislation and collects taxes for the part of Zionism's 'Jewish people' nationality living in the state of Israel, and the World Zionist Organization enacts legislation and collects philanthropy—but as if philanthropy were taxation—from the part of 'the Jewish people' nationality living in other states.<sup>21</sup> For example, the *New York Times* for 19th May, 1969, ran a full-page advertisement to stimulate contributions to the principal collection agency for Zionist funds in the United States. The advertisement stated that because of Israel's large expenditures for defence—which today means the occupation of territory of other states—there would be 'practically . . . nothing . . . for social services', projected to cost \$365 million. The advertisement then stated—unequivocally—that

It is the *responsibility* of United States Jewry to meet the major share of the cost of these social services. . . . [Emphasis supplied.]

Since last May the situation apparently has worsened. Mr. Louis Pincus, chairman of the Jewish Agency, advised American Jews in December that Israel's 'defence costs absorbed 80% of Israel's current annual tax revenue. The foreign currency reserve,' he added, 'is down to the breaking point . . . \$58 million below the \$500 million figure which all economists agree is dangerously low.'<sup>22</sup>

This condition was not reported to the government of the United States in the context of some government-to-government financial arrangement which might serve mutual national interests. These Israeli financial facts were reported at the banquet opening the United Jewish Appeal campaign, to a group of private citizens who are Jews and who contribute money to what is held out to be a philanthropic agency. And I submit there is all the difference in the world.

Moreover, Mr. Pincus left no doubt about what Israel expected of these private American citizens, just because they



are Jews. 'Remember,' he told them, 'we will not survive alone. . . . We will not survive if we do not have you standing with us. . . . You stand firm, we'll stand firm.'<sup>23</sup>

These ideas were embellished by the super-eloquent Mr. Eban whose foreign affairs business seems to include regular trips to raise money from Jews who are citizens of other countries. Mr. Eban candidly admitted,

With overseas Jewry bearing the burden of Israel's humanitarian requirements, Israelis can hold the line everywhere else.<sup>24</sup>

And no less an authority—and official voice—than Madame Prime Minister herself joined the chorus for handouts on 26th November. Moreover, she was speaking to the Knesset and this is what she said :

The largest Jewish community in the world lives in the U.S. Thanks to the U.S. Administration, American Jewry can demonstrate its ties with Israel through actions, through words and through immigration. . . . As long as we are in the midst of a war, there is no disgrace whatsoever in our asking for dollars from Jews. We have done so in the past, and we may do so for a long time ahead.<sup>25</sup>

In plain English this all means that if 'overseas Jewry' supplies manpower and the normal costs of Israeli governmental services to that country's poor, its badly housed and badly fed, Israel can continue to defy the world in the lands it occupies by force.

### **Immigration or Mobilization**

Now I must make one more fact unmistakably clear before asking you to agree with me in a conclusion about this philanthropy-become-taxation-become-a-subsidy to military occupation of the homes and lands of another people. For there may be some who will argue that, on top of all its other troubles, Israel deserves generous financial help which is 'humanitarian' because it is taking in tens of thousands of uprooted Jews each year.

Well, let us see ! The official reports of the World Zionist Organization tell us that between 1965 and 1967 immigration declined roughly 80%; 50,000 odd immigrants against 11,000 odd immigrants. But Jewish Agency expenditures declined something less than 10% in the same time period. This sober report does not even attempt any apology to those who contributed under the impression they were paying for distress immigration. The report says, quite brutally—and in sharp contrast to merchandizing campaign sentimentality—

The above figures show that there was no apparent connection between the dimension of immigration and expenditures of the Jewish Agency. . . . Indeed there had never been an immediate link between these two sets of figures in previous years.<sup>26</sup>

But even if these funds collected as charity really subsidized immigration in any direct sense, the character and purpose of immigration to Israel in recent years is not at all what the innocent contributors believe. They are still motivated by the vestigial emotionalisms of twenty years ago. Every nose thumbed at Israel is merchandized to these uncritical givers as 'genocide'. But these same official reports tell us that of immigrants with professional skills 'the proportion . . . coming from *affluent* countries exceeded by far those coming from the countries of distress. . . .'<sup>27</sup> [Emphasis supplied.] And in terms of the total immigration to Israel of all kinds of people, we are again informed that in 1967/68 the immigration from what are called 'affluent countries' was more than 40% of the total immigration.<sup>28</sup>

Those who have never been confused about Zionism will not be surprised at these facts. Israeli legislation with the authoritative status of constitutional law declares that the 'central task' of the state of Israel is 'the ingathering of the exiles'.<sup>29</sup> No matter how much Zionist apologists deny it, neither the state nor its Zionist handmaiden has ever really abandoned Herzl's fundamental proposition. The only security for Jews—and the only cure to the Christian disease of anti-Semitism—is to 'ingather' all Jews to the so-called 'Jewish' state. That is why the state exists. That is why it will not restore the rights of Palestinians who are not Jews. That is why all Jews are expected to support the state, with money, political lobbying and—ultimately—with their own lives. That is why the state—as presently conceived—and Zionism are both contradictions of every liberal, humanistic dream of free men. Zionist immigration was always motivated by these considerations. The famous case of Rudolph Kastner who did business with Adolf Eichmann by trading the lives of old Jews in concentration camps for young Jews to immigrate to Israel is an extreme, but not wholly out of context.<sup>30</sup>

The basis of a nation is its people. By definition Zionism precluded Arabs from the base of its 'Jewish' nation. Israel, the Zionist state, had therefore to import Jews. Today there is not only a manpower shortage because of the military occupation, but there is a steady process of establishing 'new settlements' in the occupied territories, financed by 'philanthropic' dollars and—insofar as possible—populated by recruited immigration.

Mr. Eshkol was explicit about this soon after the 1967 war. In October of that year he told 'a largely American audience . . .'

That Israel's bargaining position over the disposition of the occupied lands would be improved with a larger Jewish population needing land for new development. . . . He called on B'nai B'rith to encourage immigration to Israel through its Hillel organizations on American campuses. . . .<sup>31</sup>



In April of 1968, Mr. Allon, who may still be Mrs. Meir's preference as a successor but who was then minister of labour, said :

Our obligation now to settle 'Greater Israel' is not less important than the settlement of the Jordan and Beisan valley during Mandate days. Those doubting the truth of this put the whole Zionist concept into question.<sup>32</sup>

By October of last year Israel had established twenty-five new settlements in occupied lands since the 1967 war,<sup>33</sup> and for these, people are needed.

What has been passed off as charity—or even some spiritual longing to return to Zion—is integrally a part of Zionist/Israeli national-political policy. In the present context, moreover, this policy involves money and manpower to reinforce continued aggression against the Arab states. It is neither legitimate defence nor humanitarian nor religious. It is a policy in flagrant defiance of and conflict with American and world interests.

I do not know the precise position of your country with respect to Israeli occupation, to Zionist expansionism or to the collection of funds to finance the expansionist policies of a foreign state under the misnomer of charity. In my country it is political cowardice and the threat of Zionist blackmail which permits these actions, even while my governmental officials intone policies which are in conflict with those of Israel.

### **No End to the Matter ?**

I began by saying that I am no politician. I believe the powerful forces of national interests will *eventually* lead to open conflict with these Zionist/Israeli policies which mislead so many well-intentioned but uninformed people. But before any solution predicated upon the human decencies can be formulated, it is necessary to cut through the mists of propaganda to the facts. And it is this which I have considered to be my primary purpose here tonight. And so I do not apologize for spending most of my time—and yours—tonight in this critical analysis.

But even with the facts, answers to problems created by fifty years of obfuscation and human injustice are not so easy. Israel's answer is clear. No two-power and no four-power interference. For Israel has, presently, a balance of power in its hands. This may be the Zionist state's last chance to establish sovereignty in most of what was mandated Palestine. This may be its final fling in history to defy the limitations which the Balfour Declaration established for 'a national home . . . in Palestine'. Israel does not want international intervention because Israel's posture is in defiance of the international community. It insists upon direct confrontation with the Arabs—not for peace—but to impose the historic aspirations of a conqueror.

The Arab answer is less precise, but it is nonetheless reasonably clear. In their military defeat and humiliation they are not about to surrender unconditionally. They may have lost a long series of diplomatic engagements and three military wars, but they will not concede defeat. To those who do not know them this appears as sheer stubbornness. But to them, the very fundamentals of human dignity are involved; the right of self-determination of people, the respect for ownership of home and land, the right to live with honour in the lands which all the legal documents about Palestine say clearly are a part of their patrimony.

Fortunately, you did not ask me to resolve this dilemma tonight. And yet I am not so much a part of the younger generation that I can comfortably leave a problem without, at least, some suggestions of how an answer may be pursued. I barely understand abstractions in art or the new music or the modern drama, all of which—perhaps with greater insight than I possess—too often fail to lead to a meaning because of the growing feeling life is, in its entirety, without meaning. And so perhaps you will forgive the classicist in me for wanting to bring this to a conclusion with some affirmations reflecting the value-system on which I was nurtured. Fortunately, there are 'still small voices' among the parties to the conflict which—under the din of the war-cries and the bombers—have been urging some world attention to the fundamental, human problems involved.

### **Israel's 'Original Sin'**

I take first the statement of a young Israeli, a student at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. His name is Uri Davis. To an international conference last summer he reverted to history to find the root causes of the present conflict between people who had lived peacefully together for centuries. The source of the problem, he said, was the fallacious idea of the early 'Zionist dreamers' that Palestine was an empty land. Eventually—and inevitably—they learned there was a sizeable population of Arabs who, although the subjects of imperial rule for centuries, had clung to their Arab consciousness and sustained their Arab culture and civilization. Then, Davis said, these early Zionist dreamers 'faced the most difficult dilemma that can face a human being'. They could have abandoned their dream or they could pursue a programme that meant 'Palestinian expropriation'. They elected the second alternative. This the young Israeli called Israel's 'original sin'. Then with the moral passion of the prophets, he added :

The Palestinians' struggle against Israel today is not motivated by the mere historical fact that Israel was initiated in sin, but because Israel has done nothing to expiate and atone for her sin. Not only did Israel refuse to admit her sinful birth and atone for it in concrete practice, but this refusal has, as so often happens, led her to repeat it twice. Both after the 1956 war and after the 1967 war Israel annexed Arab territory. It is this, and not Israel's original sin that has brought this Middle East conflict to such monstrous escalation.<sup>34</sup>

Then this young man urged his fellow-Israelis to recognize the legitimacy of the rights of the Palestinians. Zionism, he said, can be defined today as the 'ideology' which finds it impossible to recognize Israel's original sin. Last June in London, Mrs. Meir demonstrated the validity of Davis's definition of contemporary Zionism. 'There was,' she said, 'no such thing as Palestinians. . . . They did not exist.'<sup>35</sup>

Mr. Davis reasons quite correctly, therefore, that for Israel now to recognize the rights of the Palestinians and to atone for the 'original sin' means 'de-Zionization of Israel'. The alternative, he argues, is the 'chauvinism' of occupation. And then he adds these words of pregnant warning :

South African apartheid can never maintain itself and simultaneously atone for its original sin. Once it does atone for it, it is de-apartheidized. Since it does not, it will turn into more and more impossible fascism.

That is the warning, by analogy, of this brilliant young Israeli to his own countrymen. His is still a minority voice, but he is not alone. There are others who share similar views in Israel, and in their behalf—and in behalf of the peace of the Middle East and the world—I implore you to listen to them.

### **Resistance Democracy**

And what of any hopeful echoes from the Arab side ? Fortunately they exist and, interestingly, they come from the resistance. The leader of Fatah, Yassir Arafat (or Abu Amar, whichever you choose to call him), was recently asked a loaded question, phrased as follows :

The Zionists claim that Al Fatah and the Arabs are waging a war of extermination against the Jews, and in the event of their defeat they will be 'thrown into the sea'. How do you respond to this ?

The most prominent figure in the Palestinian resistance replied for the record :

Our aim is to bring an end to the concept of a Jewish Zionist state, a racist expansionist state. Our aim is to destroy this state, this concept—but not its people. We want a democratic Palestinian state. We will not force anyone out who is willing to live under the banner of this state as a loyal Palestinian. It does not matter whether he is Christian, Moslem, or Jew.<sup>36</sup>

Or if you prefer a statement of resistance goals by a somewhat broader based authority than Mr. Arafat, let me refer

you to the policy-declaration of the official spokesman for the Palestine Liberation Organization itself, made to the Special Political Committee of the United Nations during the recent General Assembly. If Mr. Arafat is essentially a military leader, the PLO is surely the over-all body of the resistance. Its official representative formally summarized its political goals:

The Palestinian revolution is humanitarian in its goals. It seeks the establishment of a just and democratic society that guarantees to all its citizens, irrespective of their faith, the same rights and responsibilities and the same duties. It seeks the establishment of a society free from racism and bigotry, free from repugnant concepts of supremacy and racial purity, free from economic exploitation and social ills. It seeks the establishment of a State and not a beachhead for perpetual waves of invasion by followers of one faith or another. It seeks the establishment of a democratic secular state—a pluralistic state—for all its people.<sup>37</sup>

### And—'Political Legitimacy'

And finally, so that you should not think I am romanced by Irish elves or Jewish idealists or Arab eccentrics, let me call to the witness stand one of the important wielders of power in the world. He sits in what is known as the 'situation room' in the basement of the White House in Washington. More than any other single man he probably advises the president of the United States what to do about world problems in the context of America's global strategy. For Mr. Nixon this post is occupied by Henry Kissinger. In *Life* magazine for 5th September, 1969, Kissinger reportedly formulated the Israeli dilemma, to an Israeli, in these words:

The question before Israel is whether it can trade some of its physical superiority for some political legitimacy.<sup>38</sup>

The key words are 'some political legitimacy'. Kissinger acknowledged Israel's *de facto* existence, but also indicated that it is different from a politically legitimate existence. And this is simply different semantics for epitomizing what has been the essence of the Palestine problem for more than half-a-century. It is the reason why the Arabs refuse full diplomatic recognition, and it is the reason why Israel grows ever more infuriated that its unquestioned technological advantages and superior military force seem only to increase Arab resistance instead of bringing Arabs to their knees. For, in the main, Kissinger appears to have recognized that what Israel claims today has all been established by 'physical superiority' against the very people who, above all, hold the key to its political legitimacy and, therefore, to peace.

Israel can never transform its *de facto* existence into political legitimacy without first of all acknowledging and honouring its human and moral obligations to the Palestinians. It can never know peaceful borders until it renounces its annexation of

East Jerusalem and enters into firm *international* political and territorial agreements which guarantee the interests of all of the three great religions in the Holy City.

These geo-political requirements of political legitimacy all have legal, moral and humanistic bases. To all of them Zionism is opposed. Rarely in such international disputes are the moralities and the politics of peace so closely identified. Rarely has it been so essential for men of good will, everywhere, to know the facts which have been kept from them, in order properly and prudently to bring their moral persuasion to bear on a problem which can affect us all. For it is entirely possible—perhaps even probable—that the principal belligerents are now incapable of coming together on their own initiative. Yet as Uri Davis, Yassir Arafat and Henry Kissinger all testify, there are men of good will in high places, embroiled in the passions and violence of the existing tragedy. We—you and I—can help find, even if we cannot directly dictate, a constructive resolution. We can search out those who see the fundamentals of the half-century quarrel. We can lend them our encouragement. And out of the conscience of the world, of concerned men, disciplined by the tradition of the spiritual giants of prophecy who gave us Christianity, Islam and Judaism, we can cut through the racism and discrimination of Zionism and the fanaticism found in segments of the Arab world as well. And then, in that enduring unity of genuine morality and ethics which all of our religions enjoin us to search out and live by, we may help bring to the historic Zion that justice which exalts the dignity of men, no matter what their creed or race and so witness to the day when

They shall not hurt nor destroy  
In all My holy mountain  
Saith the Lord.<sup>39</sup>

#### NOTES

- 1) All the identified quotations are taken from Herzl's classic textbook of Zionism, *The Jewish State*, which exists in many editions. The one used here is published by the American Zionist Emergency Council (New York 1946).
- 2) This language is from the 'Basle Programme' adopted at the first congress of the World Zionist Organization in Basle, Switzerland, in 1897. It remained the basic statement of Zionist objectives until the establishment of the state of Israel in 1948.
- 3) Nahum Sokolow, *History of Zionism, 1600-1918* (Longmans, Green & Co.: London 1919), II, 122.
- 4) See Herzl's *Diaries*; also *Palestine: A Study of Jewish, Arab, and British Policies* (Esco Foundation: New Haven, Conn., 1943), I, 43 ff.
- 5) Herzl was often explicit about this bargain in his *Diaries*.
- 6) Morris Raphael Cohen, *Zionism, Tribalism or Liberalism* (American Council for Judaism: New York 1946, reprint), pp. 7 ff.
- 7) Sokolow, *History of Zionism*, I, xxxiv. The introduction was written by Arthur James Balfour. For further references to the anti-Semitic predilections of many of the Christian supporters of Zionism see Leonard Stein, *The Balfour Declaration* (Valentine-Mitchell: London 1961), pp. 143, 162, 502.
- 8) Quoted by I. F. Stone in 'For a New Approach to the Israeli-Arab Conflict', *New York Review of Books*, 3rd August, 1967, p. 3.

- 9) *Jerusalem Post*, 26th June, 1969, p. 8.
- 10) See Menachem Begin, *The Revolt* (Henry Schuman : New York 1951).
- 11) This is the language used in the 'Eichmann Case', Criminal Case No. 40/61, District Court of Jerusalem, *Judgment*, sect. 34.
- 12) The 'Law of the Return', the 'Nationality Law' and the 'World Zionist Organization/Jewish Agency for Israel (Status) Law' are the most significant.
- 13) For a complete analysis of the relationship between prophecy and the state of Israel, see Elmer Berger, *Prophecy, Zionism and the State of Israel* (American Council for Judaism : New York 1968).
- 14) Isaiah 1 : 27.
- 15) E. L. Woodward and Rohan Butler, eds., *Documents on British Foreign Policy, 1919-1939* (H.M. Stationery Office : London 1952), p. 345.
- 16) This quotation and those immediately following are from 'Statement on Foreign Military Service of U.S. Citizens' by Mr. McCloskey, 18th October, 1969.
- 17) For a full exposition of the legal issues involved and the full text of the letter stating the policy decision, see W. T. Mallison, Jr., 'The Zionist-Israel Juridical Claims to Constitute "the Jewish People" Nationality Entity and to Confer Membership in It: Appraised in Public International Law', *George Washington Law Review*, XXXII (June 1964), 983-1075. The State Department policy declaration is to be found on p. 1075.
- 18) *Reports Submitted to the Twenty-Seventh Zionist Congress*, Jerusalem, June 1968 (Jewish Agency : Jerusalem, May 1968), p. 210.
- 19) *Ibid.*, p. 249.
- 20) *Foreign Agents Registration Act Amendments*, Report to accompany S. 2136, 88th congress, 2nd sess., cal. 851, rep. 875, 21st February, 1965 (U.S. Government Printing Office : Washington), p. 5. For the complete record and evidence produced in the investigation, see *Hearing, Activities of Non-Diplomatic Representatives of Foreign Principals in the United States*, pts. 9 and 12, 23rd May and 1st August, 1963 (U.S.G.P.O. : Washington 1963).
- 21) For a full legal analysis, see W. T. Mallinson, Jr., 'The Legal Problems Concerning the Juridical Status and Political Activities of the Zionist Organization/Jewish Agency : A Study in International and United States Law', *William and Mary Law Review*, IX (Spring 1968), 556-629.
- 22) Jewish Telegraphic Agency report published in the Newark, N.J., *Jewish News*, 19th December, 1969, p. 28.
- 23) *Ibid.*, p. 1.
- 24) *Ibid.*, p. 28.
- 25) *Jerusalem Post*, 27th November, 1969, pp. 1, 2.
- 26) *Reports Submitted to the Twenty-Seventh Zionist Congress*, p. 266. The report attempts to justify the sustained high level of expenditure on the grounds that even if immigration in any one year is low, there is an 'absorption backlog'. That is to say, Israel is allegedly still 'absorbing' immigrants received in years of higher influx. But the term 'absorption' must be examined with great care. It is impossible here to provide such a detailed examination, but in general it may be said that—again—it includes many functions ordinarily funded by normal governments in efforts to improve overall economic and social conditions. I believe, therefore, that the fundamental argument is correct. UJA (Jewish Agency) funds are a subsidy to the general Israeli economy. In no small degree they account for the differences in the average standard of living between the Arab states and Israel.
- 27) *Ibid.*, p. 95.
- 28) *Ibid.*, p. 87.
- 29) 'World Zionist Organization/Jewish Agency (Status) Law, 5713-1952', in *Fundamental Laws of the State of Israel*, ed. Joseph Budi (Twayne : New York 1961), p. 285, particularly pars. 4-6.
- 30) Moshe Menuhin, *The Decadence of Judaism in Our Time* (Exposition Press : New York 1965), p. 481.
- 31) *New York Times*, 29th October, 1967.
- 32) *Jerusalem Post*, 18th April, 1968, p. 8.
- 33) *Jewish Observer and Middle East Review* (London), 3rd October, 1965, pp. 14 ff.
- 34) Uri Davis, 'The Middle East Paper,' prepared for the War Resisters International Conference, Haverford, Pennsylvania, August 1969.
- 35) Interview with Frank Giles, *Sunday Times* (London), 15th June, 1969.
- 36) Edmund Ghareet, 'An Interview with Abu Amar', in *The Arab World* (Arab Information Centre : New York, May 1969), p. 27.
- 37) Statement by M. Saadat Hasan, U.N. General Assembly, A/SPC/PV. 671, 24th November, 1969, pp. 12-13.
- 38) David Nevin, 'Autocrat in the Action Arena', *Life*, 5th September, 1969, p. 50B.
- 39) Isaiah 65 : 25.

*Rabbi Elmer Berger was ordained in 1932 after graduation from Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio, and the University of Cincinnati, where he was Phi Beta Kappa. He served congregations in Pontiac and Flint, Michigan, before helping to found the American Council for Judaism in 1943. From that time to the present, he has specialized in issues related to the Zionist controversy and the preservation of Judaism as a religion of universal values. He has become the leading Jewish anti-Zionist spokesman in the United States.*

*At the current time, Rabbi Berger is president of the Washington-based organization Jewish Alternatives to Zionism (JAZ) which was founded in January, 1969. JAZ conducts a programme of education which applies Judaism's historic commitment to justice and truth to the Arab/Zionist/Israeli conflict in an effort to advance the cause of peace. The organization rejects the claim that the 'Jewish people' have a national-rights-and-obligations relationship to the state of Israel.*

*Rabbi Berger believes that it is impossible to profess dedication to the universal moralities and prophetic spirit of Judaism while, at the same time, supporting or giving silent approval to Israel's flaunting of the recognized rights of Palestinian Arabs. His approach to the complex issues that plague the Middle East is well-informed (he has travelled extensively in Israel and the Arab countries).*

*Apart from his work with JAZ, Rabbi Berger is also a director of the American Friends of the Middle East and the Holy Land Centre. He has written scores of articles, appeared on radio and television in both Europe and America, and authored several books: The Jewish Dilemma, A Partisan History of Judaism, Judaism or Jewish Nationalism, and Who Knows Better Must Say So, a book of letters from the Middle East that has run through five editions since its publication in 1956.*





## IRISH ARAB SOCIETY

*To promote friendship and understanding between the  
Irish and Arab peoples*

*President* DEREK COOPER, M.C., O.B.E.

*Vice-President* DR. AKHRAM M. DAJANI, F.R.C.S. (Glas.)

*Secretary* SEAN T. RYAN

*Treasurer* ATIF MATOUK

*Patrons* LORD BOYD

H.E. NADIM DIMECHKIE

ETHEL MANNIN

HON. ANTHONY NUTTING

ENQUIRIES TO THE SECRETARY, 86 MARIAN CRESCENT, DUBLIN 14