

The JEWISH FRONTIER

SPRING 2003

**Iraq: Was It Good
for the Jews?**

Henry L. Feingold



A LABOR ZIONIST JOURNAL — SINCE 1934

Anti-Semitic Trends in Europe

Jeffry V. Mallow

The French and Their Hollywood Image

Norman Berdichevsky

JEWISH FRONTIER

Spring 2003

Since 1934

Founders

Hayim Greenberg

Marie Syrkin

Editorial Board

Henry L. Feingold, *Chairman*

Saul B. Cohen

Jay Eidelman

Jonathan J. Goldberg

Emanuel S. Goldsmith

Jerry Goodman

Rabbi Mark W. Kiel

Chava Lapin

Judy Loeb

Jeffrey V. Mallow

Daniel Mann

Mordecai Newman

Samuel Norich

Michael S. Perry

Mark Raider

Eduardo Rauch, Z"l

Ezra Spicehandler

Shari Troy

David Twersky

Nahum Guttman, *Publisher*

Ari M. Chester, *Managing Editor*

GB Tran, *Layout/Design*

Note to Subscribers

If you plan to move, please notify our Editorial Office six weeks in advance. Changes of address may be forwarded to

Circulation
Jewish Frontier
275 Seventh Avenue
17th Floor
New York, NY 10001

CONTENTS

LXVIX, No. 1 (644)

International Affairs

IRAQ: WAS IT GOOD FOR THE JEWS? 1 *Prof. Henry L. Feingold*

A DOUBLE STANDARD? 3 *David E. Weisberg*

ISRAEL'S CANARIES 5 *Jan McReynolds*

Anti-Semitism

WHITHER EUROPE? 7 *Jeffrey V. Mallow*

THE CURSE OF INTOLERANCE 9 *Mary Rothschild*

History

DANIEL DE LEON: 11 *Joseph Adler*

A SOCIALIST MAVERICK

OSLO DID NOT FAIL 15 *Harold Ticktin*
BECAUSE OF THE WORDS

Film

THE FRENCH AND THEIR 17 *Norman Berdichevsky*
HOLLYWOOD IMAGE

Fiction

PASSENGERS 19 *Ayelet Ben Ziv Appell*

Obituary 23 *Eduardo Rauch, Z"l*

Letters to the Editor 24

JEWISH FRONTIER (ISSN 0021-6453) is published quarterly by the Labor Zionist Alliance, Inc. The business office is located at 275 7th Avenue, 17th Floor, New York, NY 10001. The editorial office is located at Jewish Frontier, 275 7th Avenue, 17th Floor, New York, NY 10001. Editorial office may be contacted by e-mail only at jewish_frontier@hotmail.com. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to Circulation, Jewish Frontier, 275 7th Avenue, 17th Floor, New York, NY 10001.

Subscription rates for U.S. and possessions, \$20.00 per year for 4 issues; Canadian subscribers add \$2.50 for postage and handling. All foreign subscribers must remit in U.S. dollars drawn on a U.S. bank: \$30.00. Back issues are available for \$10.00 each. Multiyear discounted subscriptions available as well. Advertising, editorial, and subscription information may be found at www.jewishfrontier.org/frontier (information includes ad and notice rates, subscription rates, advertising calendar, editorial calendar, submission guidelines, subscriber list). All contributions, unless otherwise noted, ©2003 Jewish Frontier. Signed articles do not necessarily reflect the official position of the JEWISH FRONTIER.

JEWISH FRONTIER is available on microfilm from University Microfilms, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106.

Iraq: Was It Good for the Jews?

May 31, 2003

There are those who view the collapse of Iraq's Baathist regime as evidence that the power arrangements in the Middle East are more than ever in Israel's favor. It looks like the Neocon strategists advising Bush were as accurate in their predictions as was the remarkable ordinance deployed by the American military. The victory has strengthened the hand of those who proposed the benefits of instrumentalizing war to serve the national interest. But a month after the war it develops that the intelligence which saw the development of weapons of mass destruction and of a link to al-Queda as reasons for war did not match the new military technology in accuracy.

Today it is no longer clear that there is such a thing as the surgical use of power. The new power arrangements taking shape in the area seem much more complex than assumed. The too loudly touted victory of American arms should not come as a surprise. Even before Dessert Storm the inability of the Soviet Union to continue to arm its Middle East client states had radically altered the balance of military power. The Arab states were in a downward spiral in relation to Israel. The possible exception was oil-rich Iraq which, after its eight year war with Iran, possessed perhaps the most seasoned military machine experience and money could buy. Yet it virtually crumbled in the face of American military force, even after Turkey withheld the use of the crucial northern invasion route. Its air force did not

rise to battle and its command structure did not know what to command before it was destroyed. Some experts attribute the weakness of Iraq's response to the vastly superior military technology America could bring to bear. But the outcome would have been much the same if the bombs had been less smart and the missiles less accurate. In truth, since the Soviets abandoned their Arab clients, these states have experienced a sharp decline in military power.

Their Soviet military hardware is obsolete and poorly maintained, and the morale of its military is low. That is a crucial datum because it is precisely their inability to keep up that has accelerated the search for weapons that might overnight magically reinforce their waning power without experiencing the unsettling process of modernization. The rulers of North Korea and Iran who race to develop atomic weapons, or failing that, nurture a "secret" weapon, the suicide bomber, seek to short circuit the process and reestablish a parity of power. An atomic bomb and a means of delivery by missile or suicide bomber is viewed as a great equalizer.

Iraq's pre-war link to the terror network was tenuous. In the days before the outbreak of war Saddam threatened the use of suicide bombers, but the secular Baathist regime was hardly a suitable incubator for the religious fanaticism that is the common denominator of the suicider. Saddam helped reorganize the Abu Nidal organization and at one time hosted the PLF and the May 15th Palestinian group that had a penchant for blowing up aircraft. But mostly its support of terror remained financial and logistical. Bin Laden cooperated with the regimes

HENRY L. FEINGOLD, *noted scholar of American Jewish history, is the director of the Jewish Resource Center at Baruch College. Professor Feingold is also the chairman of the editorial board of the Jewish Frontier and a former president of the LZA.*

struggle against the “Great Satan” but had little use for Saddam and his secular regime. What is so strange is the general acceptance of the Bush administration war rationale that defeat on the field of battle will weaken the forces of terrorism by depriving them of the protective mantle of the rogue state. That reasoning was far more applicable to Syria and Iran than it was to Iraq. But Iraq’s unsuitability to incubate terror may be changing after the control of a totalitarian regime is replaced by a situation where there seem to be few operational controls. The inability to confront overwhelming superior military force directly may stimulate terror which begins by taking the form of warfare by other than direct means. The resort to terror and the budgeting of vast sums of money for the development or purchase of atomic weapons are cut from the same cloth. Governments aware of their weakness seek a way to magically maintain their control. It is not an unreasonable hope. A terror network is relatively inexpensive to organize. It requires only a comparative handful of combatants and a rudimentary network that can be held together by the omnipresent cell phone and E-mail. Arab terrorist organizations like Hamas tout the suicide bomber as the great equalizer which the “infidel” West can never match because it is no longer capable of generating a belief so powerful that it can convince man to surrender life in fulfillment of some holy cause. Like Shintoism during the Pacific war, Islam is particularly good at mobilizing such a religious passion. That it is a weapon that eliminates itself, that to use it is to lose it, does not convince Arab strategists. Such thinking is, after all, further evidence of the kind of corrupt bookkeeping mentality which dominates the world of the West.

What we need to understand is that we are witness to a declining Arab/Islamic power nexus in the Middle East. It is not a given that the inevitable rearrangement of power after Iraq’s defeat will create an opening for peace between Israel and the Palestinians. Rather it is the strength of the former and the weakness of the latter that serves as a paradigm for the idea that at the historical juncture when a defeated and humiliated society feels itself weakest, that such desperate measures as sacrificing their own youth are conceived of and resorted to. That is what Hamas is all about.

The temptation to organize suicide bombers is enhanced by the availability of a pool of religiously motivated recruits which are found in all pre-modern societies. No one knows precisely how many are actually involved in this most extreme form of terror. A guesstimate of 1,000 volunteers and their mentors in the Middle East is probably too high. But that is sufficient not to bring the targeted society down, but to make normal life impossible. The terror nexus does not have to win battles. It just has to prevent those who celebrate life from living it to the fullest.

The truth about terror, especially in the Arab world, is that it is based on a kind of “ideological” capital no longer available in the modern world. The ability to convince young, primarily male believers to surrender their lives is alien to our youth-worshipping secular culture. The strangest images on TV are those which show the piety of the Moslem world. Is there anything more gruesome than Shi’a young men bleeding from self-inflicted wounds? At a given point in ritual prayer even the old and arthritic prostrate themselves so that one sees them in uniform rows of bundled worshippers. They are not like our ultra Orthodox Haredim who *daven*, each at their own pace, as if in a race to finish. In Islam it is collective and that gives us a hint that it will take many years for the religious passion that lies behind terror to dissipate. Unlike Christianity and Judaism, the Abrahamic faith of Islam is still in its command mode. The Moslem remains commanded by his Mullah rather than being self-commanded. His faith is collective and externalized rather than internal and individualized, as is the way of modernity.

The ignominious defeat of the Baathist regime without the promised “mother of battles” is yet another humiliation of Arab arms. That sense of humiliation and cultural inferiority in turn is one of the components of the terrorist mentality. That may be what the sniping and the ambushes and the subsequent trickle of casualties in post-war Iraq is all about. We may have created yet another incubator for terrorism. Meanwhile, the mystery of what this war was all about grows—and with it the uncertainty about whether it was “good for the Jews.”

JE

A Double Standard? Iraq, Israel, and the United Nations

From raucous, chanting antiwar demonstrations to the hushed, almost worshipful solemnity of the UN Security Council, many of those who most vehemently opposed military action against Iraq argued that the United States and its allies resorted to a hypocritical double standard in world affairs. Specifically, Iraq was subject to military force to ensure compliance with Security Council resolutions requiring the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction, but Israel has never faced any similar compulsion regarding Security Council resolutions calling for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the disputed territories. The unfairness of such a double standard, it has been argued, is yet another reason why it was foolish, wrong and even immoral to forcefully disarm Iraq.

This argument, voiced by quite different people, is usually expressed in very similar terms. On the floor of the US House of Representatives, before casting her vote against the resolution authorizing the use of force against Iraq, then-Representative Cynthia McKinney (D. Ga.) said: “Do we give the President the green light to go to war on Iraq because it has refused to comply with UN Security Council weapons inspections resolutions? At the same time Israel refuses to comply with UN resolutions with respect to the occupied territories. Do we have different standards for different countries?” In September of 2002, the Foreign Minister of Syria, Farouk al-Shara, addressed the General Assembly of the United Nations, asked, “Why should the world request Iraq to adhere to Security Council resolutions, while Israel is allowed to be above international law?” An ecumenical working group of various Christian churches in America, “Christians for Middle East Peace,” writes in its newsletter: “[T]here is growing

anger over a perceived double standard in enforcement of U.N. Security Council resolutions. Israel defies the resolutions, yet receives aid and sympathy from Washington; when Iraq is defiant the United States threatens force.” Mr. Robin Cook, who resigned from U.K. Prime Minister Tony Blair’s cabinet in protest over Britain’s military alliance with the United States, complained to the House of Commons that while force was to be used against Iraq, “[i]t is over 30 years since resolution 242 called on Israel to withdraw from the occupied territories.”

The proponents of the “double standard” argument believe that the correctness of their position is virtually self-evident. All one has to do is note that military action has been taken against Iraq to remedy its violation of Security Council resolutions, while no similar action has been taken against Israel, which (it is argued) has also violated Security Council resolutions. Nothing could be clearer: Two countries violate Security Council resolutions, one is subject to military force, the other is not. If this is not an instance of a “double standard,” what is?

The U.N. Charter: Chapter VI and Chapter VII

The technical but nevertheless conclusive response to the “double standard” argument is that the Security Council resolutions which the Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein defied—that is, defied according to the United States and its allies—were issued pursuant to Chapter VII of the UN Charter, while the resolutions that Israel has defied—according to the Palestinians and their allies—were issued pursuant to Chapter VI of the Charter. Chapter VI is headed: “Pacific Settlement of Disputes”; pursuant to this chapter, the Security Council is authorized to “*recommend* appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment” for “any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the

DAVID E. WEISBERG is a NYC attorney and freelance writer.

maintenance of international peace and security” [emphasis added]. Nowhere in Chapter VI is there any reference to the use of military force or sanctions by either the Security Council or constituent member nations of the U.N. Resolutions 242 and 348, the key resolutions regarding the disputed territories, were issued pursuant to Chapter VI.

Conversely, Chapter VII, headed “Action with respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace, and Acts of Aggression,” authorizes the Security Council and members of the UN, among other things, to “take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security.” Resolution 687, which was approved on April 3, 1991 and formalized a cease-fire in the Gulf War, was explicitly adopted pursuant to the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter. In resolution 687, the Security Council was not making a “recommendation” to Iraq as to how its aggression against Kuwait might be ended. It was ordering Iraq to end its aggression in compliance with the terms of the resolution. In adopting resolution 687 under Chapter VII rather than Chapter VI, the Security Council implicitly acknowledged that failure to comply with the resolution might justify, at some point in the future, the use of force against Iraq.

The language of resolution 687 is mandatory, the language of command. With respect to weapons of mass destruction, resolution 687 states that the Security Council has decided “that Iraq shall unconditionally accept the destruction, removal, or rendering harmless, under international supervision” of all of its weapons of mass destruction as specified in the resolution. This resolution is a direct command to Iraq to take certain specified steps. There is a difference between a recommendation and a command, and that difference defeats the premise of the “double standard” argument.

Resolution 1441, which was adopted by the Security Council on November 8, 2002, afforded Iraq with “a final opportunity” to fulfill its disarmament obligations under resolution 687. Like resolution 687, resolution 1441 was explicitly adopted pursuant to Chapter VII of the UN Charter; it says, “[The

Security Council] has repeatedly warned Iraq that it will face serious consequences as a result of its continued violations of its obligations.” As we see, the United States and its supporters understood the term “serious consequences” to justify Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Why Chapter VI, not Chapter VII?

It has been argued that the “double standard,” to the benefit of Israel and to the detriment of Iraq, is evident precisely in the fact that resolutions affecting Israel are adopted under Chapter VI of the Charter, while resolutions affecting Iraq are adopted under Chapter VII. Such an argument abandons the seemingly self-evident nature of the first version of the argument; one cannot support this second version simply by demonstrating that Israel, like Iraq, has not always complied with Security Council resolutions. One must demonstrate, in support of the second version, that relevant considerations relating to the conflict between Israel and its Arab neighbors are essentially similar to the considerations relating to Iraq’s armed invasion of Kuwait. Yet this is anything but self-evident.

Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990 and was universally condemned by the international community for initiating an unjustified, illegal war. On the first day of the invasion, August 2, 1990, the Security Council issued resolution 660, which “condemns the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait” and “demands that Iraq withdraw immediately and unconditionally all its forces” from Kuwaiti territory. On November 29, 1990, the Security Council issued resolution 678, which authorized member states of the United Nations “to use all necessary means to uphold and implement resolution 660 (1990) and all subsequent relevant resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area.” The phrase “all necessary means” is a formulation traditionally understood in diplomatic discourse to authorize the use of military force. Resolution 687 sets forth the demands the Security Council decided to impose on Iraq before there could be a formal cease-fire ending hostilities between Iraq and the coalition forces led by the United States.

Continued on page 28

Israel's Canaries

The question of whether a given war is or was morally justified is never a settled question. What today appears clearly established has a nasty habit of later becoming transformed into its opposite. Today's "just" cause becomes tomorrow's archetype of unfettered imperialism, colonialism, or racism, as the wealth of particular atrocities emerges into the light of day. Here lies the fundamental basis of the arguments now raised by a group of military reservists in Israel, popularly known as refuseniks, who have mounted a campaign called "Courage to Resist." Nearly all are officers in the Israeli Defense Forces yet they refuse to serve in the Occupied Territories, a role which they have come to regard as "dominating, expelling, starving and humiliating an entire people."¹

To be considered "just," a war must be demonstrably just—not merely, as in the case of beauty "in the eye of the beholder," a standard recognized as hopelessly subjective and upon which we neither require nor expect to find general agreement. Yet who, at a minimum, must perceive the war to be just? It seems axiomatic that above all others, those who must see its justness include the people who are being asked to risk their own lives, or ordered to extinguish the lives of the 'other': The military personnel being sent as agents to carry out the war. If you are unable to convince your own soldiers that the war is just, it seems unconscionable in a democracy to send them into battle.

The U.S. government explicitly recognizes that some citizens who would otherwise be subject to military draft, were it to be invoked again, should be exempted from military service as "conscientious objectors." The government of Israel makes no statutory provision for "conscientious objection" among men, but its Minister of Defense does exempt large

numbers of people, including yeshiva students as well as large numbers of people determined to be "unfit" for military service. Israeli women do have a right to claim CO status, contained in a different section of the statute, a concession made to Orthodox groups. Neither government recognizes the right of its citizens—even less the right of its military personnel—to invoke what has been termed "selective conscientious objection," the right to pick and choose among wars and fight only those which the citizen or soldier regards as "just." But is the refusal to recognize selective conscientious objection (SCO) ethically justified?

The Columbia Encyclopedia describes a conscientious objector as a person who, on the grounds of conscience, resists the authority of the state to compel military service, adding that:

Such resistance, emerging in time of war, may be based on membership in a pacifistic religious sect, such as the Society of Friends (Quakers)... or on personal religious or humanitarian convictions. Political opposition to the particular aim of conscription, such as that maintained by... large numbers during the Vietnam War, is usually considered in a separate category. The problem of conscientious objectors, although present in different forms since the beginning of the Christian era, became acute in World Wars I and II because of the urgent demands for manpower of the warring governments.

At first glance, the concern over running out of manpower may seem to be merely a practical issue. What makes this a moral concern is that running short of manpower might mean other citizens have to serve longer terms, thereby creating an unequal burden. The U.S. government would have a difficult time demonstrating that either CO or SCO would negatively impact its ability to pursue its military policies, inasmuch as the U.S. currently relies upon a

JAN MCREYNOLDS is a writer and web designer from Chicago.

volunteer army—to the great relief, indeed, of top military personnel who remember all too well the impact of the anti-war movement during the Vietnam War. Tens of thousands of men found ways to escape service in the U.S. military, legally or otherwise, without bringing the campaign to a halt. From this the administration concluded that they would be better off with an all-volunteer army. President Nixon stated his intent to work toward this goal, and the Gates Commission report supported its feasibility.

In Israel, military service is still mandatory, not voluntary, yet the government's need for soldiers nonetheless fails to demonstrate a case for excluding either CO or SCO. As human rights expert Joanne Mariner indicates:

There are many ways to escape military service in Israel, some of them dishonest, others sanctioned by the government. Thousands of Israeli men are exempted from military service because they study in religious academies. Religious young women are granted the possibility of performing civilian duties in a school or hospital. Secular Israelis with moral and political objections to military action enjoy no such options.²

Massive opposition to a war, whether expressed through draft resistance or desertions, amounts to a vote of no-confidence. Hence, a “shortage of manpower” should serve as a barometer of the extent to which the government has persuaded its citizens that the war is, in fact, just and deserving of their support, rather than as an excuse to impose even greater burdens. Selective conscientious objection is not the cause of the problem, but rather the result.

It has been argued that allowing soldiers to object to selected wars would undermine the discipline of the army, which must be able to rely upon its troops obeying orders. This argument was succinctly stated in a recent analysis by Adam Kushner:

If soldiers question their orders in times of peril and disagreement (the Vietnam War, the reoccupation), they greatly endanger their army's ability to carry out a war. When life and death rest on split-second decisions and complex

intelligence, there is no room for deliberation. In Israel, where national and personal security have been compromised for more than two years, nothing could be more treacherous.³

True enough, but this turns out to be an argument in favor of SCO, not against it. The government has a responsibility to protect the troops that are sent into harm's way, and allowing for SCO greatly reduces the possibility that those troops will be endangered by “friendly fire” or “fragging” by any of their own comrades who do not support the war.

It should be noted that relying on a volunteer army may minimize concerns of this nature, but it does not eliminate them, as evidenced in the highly publicized “fragging” incident that occurred shortly after beginning of the U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003. Furthermore, people often “volunteer” to serve in the army for economic reasons, and even those who enlist for political reasons may change their views after a war actually commences. During the Vietnam era, opposition to the war was evidenced not only through widespread draft avoidance but by notoriously common incidents of both “fragging” and desertion.

Moreover, in light of both the Uniform Code of Military Justice and international standards flowing out of the 1945-47 Nuremberg trials, military personnel, especially those in leadership positions, must be enabled to disobey an unlawful order.⁴ The refuseniks are almost exclusively officers in the IDF. If military personnel truly believe that the orders they are being given are unlawful, they have both a moral and a legal responsibility to disobey those orders. Putting people in the position of carrying out such orders runs the risk of engendering outright mutiny.

One of the more interesting arguments against tolerating selective conscientious objection is that it would undermine democracy because the citizen or soldier would simply be weighing the same factors that the government already weighed. In a highly abbreviated form, this is the position argued by the U.S. government and accepted by the Supreme Court in a case decided at the height of the Vietnam War.⁵ The problem with this position is that it assumes what

Continued on page 29

Whither Europe?

Hardly a day passes without some news from Europe that's bad for the Jews:

- Parisian anti-Iraq war protesters beat Hashomer Hatzair members with metal bars.
- British and Norwegian university professors and scientific researchers refuse to share research information with Israel's academics and physicians.
- Belgian legislators and jurists spare no effort in finding a way to bring Ariel Sharon and other Israelis into the "crimes against humanity" dock, while ignoring the cases brought against Yaser Arafat.
- "I need Zimeray's investigative committee like a hole in the head," says European Parliament External Affairs Commissioner Chris Patten in response to French-Jewish member Francois Zimeray's petition for a judicial inquiry into the Palestinian Authority's use of EU funds to support terrorism.

Can Europe be saved from itself? Or has it finally decided to embrace anti-Semitism once again and for always? Let us first dispense with the absurdity that what we are seeing is not anti-Semitism, but merely "legitimate opposition to the Israeli occupation." Anti-Semitism is not simply "a feeling of hatred toward Jews." Who cares about feelings? It is actions that matter. And on that basis, modern anti-Semitism is an objective and easily measured phenomenon—selective morality. That it manifests itself against the world's only Jewish state is inevitable. Just as inevitable is the spillover into traditional anti-Semitic acts against Jews everywhere. Israel as the target is perfect. The Europeans can at one and the same time claim to be anti-racist, and in that context call for demonstrations and boycotts against Israel, even calling for its destruction, all in the name of a higher humanity. But a simple comparison of Europe's behaviors toward other countries gives the lie to their claims. Here's the

clearest example: China has occupied Tibet for over half a century, 50% longer than Israel's occupation of the West Bank and Gaza. And Tibet never attacked China. China has systematically driven Tibetans out of their towns and villages and settled Chinese there. Estimates are that the Chinese have killed over a million Tibetans. Modern maps don't even list Tibet, but show it as part of China. Yet one would be hard put to find European demonstrations against China. And boycotts? Nothing is easier than buying Chinese goods in those same Oslo stores that refuse to stock Jaffa oranges.

The watershed was Europe's response to Arafat's refusal to negotiate with Barak. Actually, its non-response, as Europe suffers from mass amnesia about this initiative. And there were surely no demonstrations against Arafat at the time. Nor were there cartoons of him eating Jewish babies, as there are (most recently in England) of Ariel Sharon devouring Palestinian babies.

Is the situation today getting better or worse? The good news is that right wing anti-Semitism is becoming a fringe phenomenon. The bad news is that left wing anti-Semitism is endemic, and may become epidemic. And the cautiously hopeful news is that true European liberals are adopting a policy of counterattack, both vis-a-vis acts of violence against Jewish property and persons, and against the anti-Semitism which masquerades as opposition to Israeli policies. Here are some examples of how this struggle is playing itself out.

France: After close to two years of violence against Jews, mostly by the offspring of North African Muslim immigrants, the recently elected center-right government has cracked down. Not because President Chirac is either a lover of Israel or a philo-Semite, but because the French people are embarrassed that their country, which they view as the cradle of modern democracy and tolerance, has witnessed close to a thousand assaults on Jews and

JEFFRY V. MALLOW is the president of the Labor Zionist Alliance. He is also chair of the physics department at Loyola University, Chicago.

Jewish institutions. The French Left has either dismissed these as random acts of juveniles, or rationalized them as legitimate expressions of opposition to Israel's policies or to purported class differences between Jews and Muslims. French working class Gentiles, on the other hand—themselves often victims of violence from the same quarter with their plight ignored by the Left—have now shifted voting patterns. Thus the surprise protest victory of the Fascist Le Pen over the Socialist Jospin in the first round of voting. In the runoff, those votes went almost entirely to Chirac's Union for the Presidential Majority Party. (The banner of one wag said, "Vote for the crook, not the Fascist!") French Jews, who have frequently voted Socialist in large numbers, have also shifted to the center-right, not least because of the leaked internal memo of the Socialist Party calling for a more anti-Israel stance to attract Muslim voters. And Israel's declaring French Jews entitled to the special aliyah benefits for endangered communities also stung the French conscience. For all these reasons, the center-right government has done an abrupt about-face. Interior Minister Nicolas Sarkozy has clamped completely down on violence, arresting perpetrators and acknowledging when the violence is anti-Semitic. (Paradoxically, this has produced the illusion of an increase in anti-Semitism, since the previous government concealed the anti-Jewish nature of many of the attacks.) Education Minister Luc Ferry is demanding that the authorities in all French public schools, even those which are predominantly Muslim, enact a zero-tolerance policy for verbal and physical assaults against Jewish pupils, and an education campaign against anti-Semitism. French TV, according to philosopher Alain Finkelkraut, is now showing more acts of Palestinian violence against Israelis, as it has always shown Israeli troops shooting at Palestinians. (Although my French mother-in-law, a non-Jew and a courier in the Resistance from 1943-1945, claims that there is even yet hardly a balanced portrayal.) French police have become assiduous in the protection of Jewish sites. Anti-Semitic violence is sharply down, and is quickly delat with when it occurs, despite reports to the contrary.

Belgium: The continual efforts to put Ariel Sharon and other Israelis in the dock as war criminals, no

matter how much Belgian law itself is perverted, stands in sharp contrast to Belgium's apathy in the cases brought by Israelis against Yaser Arafat. Indeed, one wonders why the Belgians do not ask the Palestinian accusers of Sharon et al. why they have not also called for trials against the actual Lebanese Arab perpetrators of the Sabra-Shatilla massacre. Belgium is content to maintain the charade. And, coincidentally (or so we are to believe), Belgium has also just banned kosher slaughtering. Now that is a reasonable case to make: Sweden banned shkhithah years ago, on the grounds that quicker and more painless methods now exist. But Sweden wasn't seeking to put Israeli leaders on trial at the same time. And Sweden, while it does have an anti-Semitic past, doesn't come close to matching Belgium's history of violence against Jews or its record of complicity with the Nazis in the murder of its Jewish population. Belgium continues to embrace anti-Semitism, all in the name of a higher justice.

Denmark: A center-right government has not repeated the anti-Israel rhetoric of its center-left predecessor, at least not to the same degree. Nevertheless, the left wing press continues to use the cover of "legitimate political criticism of Israel" to rationalize its biased reportage and editorializing of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. This bias spills over into what Danish Jews dub "the little anti-Semitism." Thus, for example, the laudable Danish opposition to female clitoral mutilation in African immigrants suddenly morphs into an attack on male circumcision. The left wing daily *Politikken*, notable for its relentless criticism of Israel, publishes an anti-circumcision op-ed in which the writer opines that the Holocaust has given the Jews too much "elbow room" for their arguments. Fed up with this final scandalous example of bias, seven hundred Danes (Jews, Gentiles, and a couple of Americans), publish an ad, "Now It's Enough," calling *Politikken* to account for its systematic selective morality. *Politikken* responds with a tone of outraged virtue, accusing the signatories of pro-Sharon politics and warning us that anti-Semitism might well come to Denmark, so we'd better not cry wolf. (I wrote back that this is good advice, but not coming from the wolf.) The Danish newspaper *Jyllands-Posten* sees fit to publish an op-ed calling

Continued on page 30

The Curse of Intolerance

"There are three ways to mourn: Through tears, through silence, and by turning sorrow into song."
A Hassidic Proverb

My mother "survived" Auschwitz and Stuthoff. She was liberated during a death march by the Russian Army in January 1945. Six decades have taught me that time does not heal all wounds and there is no organizing principle for having the equivalent of an atomic bomb explode inside you and take away your soul. For most human beings there is a loved one who, when torn from one's life, their absence leaves an eternal bleeding wound. For my mother, that was her mother. Minutes after they arrived in Auschwitz, my mother watched her mother march to the gas chamber looking back with tears in her eyes. That image is permanently seared in her heart. After that, nothing more happened to my mother.

And here is the best kept secret of my generation: People who survived Nazi concentration camps were so brutally traumatized that their psychology and biochemistry seems to have been altered and their stress hormones passed on to their children. Yael Danieli and Rachel Yehuda discuss the biology of intergenerational trauma in *The International Handbook of Multigenerational Legacies of Trauma*:

We have found that massive trauma has an amorphous presence not defined by place or time, lacking a beginning, middle or end, and that it shapes the internal representation of reality of several generations, becoming an organizing principle passed on by parents and internalized by their children (Danieli & Yehuda, 1998, p.22)

Primo Levi, the most lyrical of Holocaust bards, expressed this in his book, *The Drowned and the*

MARY ROTHSCHILD, a psychologist, frequently lectures and writes about the horrors of war and its impact on subsequent generations.

Saved: "The injury cannot be healed; it extends through time and the Furies, in whose existence we are forced to believe... perpetuate the tormentor's work by denying peace to the tormented" (Levi, 1988).

I was born with a disorder resulting in continuous jet lag-type fatigue. I have struggled with cancer, and no matter what my circumstances, I don't feel safe in the world. It seems a mother who has survived unspeakable horrors bestows on her first born a life spent in "the valley of the shadow of death." Growing up, many of my nights were filled with my mother's nightmares and many of my hours with images of concentration camps: Eyes filled with shock or emptied of life, walking corpses, the cornucopia of hell that the Third Reich created for European Jewry. I carry the name of my murdered grandmother. In the words of singer and songwriter Rosalie Gerut in *We Are Here*:

We bear the names of those,
Whose cries,
Went up like smoke in the sky.

The fire that has murdered my mother's parents and branded her with trauma has become my own, to burn through my life and beyond it. No matter how fast I run, I cannot escape it. Most of my adult life I have searched for healing from something which remains unnamable.

A few years ago I formed friendships with second-generation Germans because I sensed that they might hold the key to something essential I needed. My encounters with second generation Germans culminated during the fall of 1998 when I participated in a dialogue with descendants of the Third Reich. There were seven second generation Holocaust survivors and seven descendants of the Third Reich, as well as four facilitators who shared our history, two from each side. Together, we sat in a room overlooking Wansee Lake, one mile away from the

Wansee conference house. We told our lives' stories to each other, eight hours a day, for five days. The experience changed my relationship to my history, to the descendants of the Nazi regime, and to my life. It remains one of the most profoundly healing times of my life. If I were to name the single most transforming element of my week spent in dialogue, it would be hearing several Germans say "I am so sorry for what my people did to your people."

It is only now, almost five years later, that I can begin to appreciate the full measure of their generosity—going against a whole culture, family and friends, a legacy of silence and suppression, to unveil and talk about a horrible and shameful legacy. They listened to our stories no matter how difficult it became, they cried with us and brought us the truth about their past. I will be eternally grateful to my friends in Germany who have restored my faith in human goodness. I have learned the value of acknowledgement and contrition from that experience. I recommend it highly and equally to victims and perpetrators. Unfortunately, I have also learned the painful way that those people were only the exception who stand in sharp contrast to the rule.

The Holocaust is too vast, too pernicious and powerful, to be mastered by reading books and watching movies; certainly not for those of us who were suckled at its breast, on either side of the equation. In order to achieve some measure of healing we must find our personal connection to that history; we must know what happened to our parents. Sounds simple? It isn't. On the Jewish side, the personal aspects of this history can bring on unbearable pain and rage; on the German side, uncontainable shame and guilt, as well as rage at the people who trigger such feelings, the first and second-generation Holocaust survivors. The alternative is to not know, yet this is barely an alternative when you consider the anxiety of living in the dark. It seems you are "damned either way." However, if condemned to spend your life housing landmines in the most intimate confines of your being, it is probably better that you know the details.

I learned this the hard way. A few years ago I had several friendships with second generation Germans

who live in my hometown. Most of those friendships are gone because one after another, most of my German friends lashed out at me. Of the many attacks I experienced, two stand as a metaphor for the rest. I approached one man, whose father was in the SS and who, despite being a celebrity, responded because of our shared sense of history. For six years we met and spent many hours talking. There were times when this man, who considers himself civilized and cultured, ranted and railed at "The Jews." I allowed it because I counted on his knowing the difference between feeling and acting. I was wrong.

He crossed the line the day I sent him an article where I expressed my feelings about the Germans who murdered my grandparents and destroyed my mother's life. In response I received an e-mail in which he wrote: "You, like so many other Jews and non Germans, are ever so ready to so glibly and conveniently talk about the 'German Perpetrators,' as if the 'Germans' were asked in a democratic and public survey if they wanted to eliminate six million Jews." He then writes, "The Jews were more successfully assimilated in pre-Hitler Germany than anywhere else in the world." (In her book *A Season for Healing*, Anne Roiphe reminds us about Aharon Appelfeld's warnings about "assimilation, about trusting, about cultures that appear benign, about the genteel masks murderers wear.") The e-mail ends with the crassest of denials, seeking to justify Germany's mass murders by invoking the cosmopolitan aspect of the Holocaust: "You and the Goldhagens of the world, however, like to hold on to that image of 'The Germans' because its very convenient and it spares you the pain of fully remembering that there was an enormous collaboration on the part of occupied Europe to assist in that horror."

Shocked, I forwarded this e-mail to my friend Bruce Einhorn, an immigration judge and former prosecutor of Nazi war criminals for OSI. Bruce reminded me that my friend was in denial and "does not want to be reminded of the Shoah's singularity because of what it means for German history." After his written attack, I approached my German "friend" with a request to discuss this, but never heard from him

Continued on page 32

Daniel De Leon: A Socialist Maverick

The Socialist Movement in the United States may be said to have begun with the arrival of revolutionaries from Germany following the uprisings of 1830 and 1848. Various workingmen's political organizations were formed in the 1860s, and in 1877 the Socialist Labor Party was born. One of its most charismatic, dynamic, and controversial leaders was Daniel De Leon (1852-1914). He was born on the Caribbean island of Curacao (Netherlands Antilles), the scion of a Dutch-Sephardic military surgeon. For his heroic efforts in treating the sailors of a typhus infested ship and protecting the island's population from the ravages of the dreadful disease, Daniel's father was made a Knight of Danneborg by the grateful Dutch government. He died when his son was twelve years old, and was the first person in the long established Jewish community of Curacao to be buried in the island's new Jewish cemetery.

A precocious child, Daniel De Leon was acutely aware of the social injustices surrounding him; indeed, slavery was the main source of Curacao's income until the institution's abolishment in 1863, and even De Leon's family owned slaves. When news came that one of them had escaped, the De Leon family—with the exception of Daniel—reacted with shock at the runaway slave's ingratitude. Daniel, on the other hand, asked "did anyone offer to give him his liberty?" Following his father's death, Daniel was sent to Europe to continue his education. He studied in Germany and Holland, receiving a Bachelor of Philosophy from the University of Leyden. In 1872, he came to the United States to study law at Columbia University. A brilliant student, he was awarded prizes for constitutional law and international law. After

graduation, De Leon went to Texas where he set up a legal practice. Eventually he returned to New York to take up a lectureship in international law at Columbia University.

In New York, De Leon was drawn to politics as a supporter of the Single Tax advocate, Henry George, who was running for the office of Mayor of New York City. Up to this point De Leon's activities constituted a far more 'American' kind of experience than that of most activists of his day. However, this halcyon interlude would soon give way to a more turbulent state. While still teaching at Columbia, De Leon became interested in the labor movement. In 1888, during a period of intense labor strife, he joined the Knights of Labor, soon emerging as a forceful speaker for the union. De Leon was slowly drifting toward Socialism, but would not become a Socialist until after he had taken part in another utterly American phenomenon, the Bellamyite Nationalist Club of New York. The latter entity had been formed under the inspiration of Edward Bellamy's utopian novel *Looking Backward*, for the purpose of discussing the prospects for creating the better world envisioned by the book. The club became a focal point for the generating of socialist ideas, which were beginning to gain currency at the time among Americans of radical leanings. Eventually the Bellamyite Nationalist Club converted itself into a branch of the Socialist Labor Party.

De Leon's active involvement in the labor movement was not looked upon favorably by the Columbia University administration. After not being appointed to a promised professorship, De Leon abandoned both law and teaching to devote himself full-time to the labor movement. In 1890 he joined the Socialist Labor Party and was soon recognized as an

JOSEPH ADLER PhD., is the author of *The Herzl Paradox and numerous articles on Jewish personalities and historic eras.*

outstanding speaker and leader. The following year, De Leon was chosen to be the party's candidate for the office of Governor of New York State. For the next two decades he would dominate the Socialist Labor Party in his various capacities as a nationwide public speaker, editor of the party's weekly *The People*, and leader of the party.

Despite mild beginnings as a Socialist, De Leon soon evolved into one of the leading critics of American capitalism. Accepting without reservations the doctrines of Karl Marx, he outlined in numerous pamphlets and speeches his concept of Socialism and his notions how it could be achieved. De Leon, in particular, took a militant stand against traditional trade unions whose leaders he denounced as "labor fakers." He urged all workers to join in an independent political movement dedicated to winning control of the government and establishing a Socialist commonwealth in which the instruments of production would be made the property of the whole people.

With the customary zeal of a revolutionary Marxist, De Leon exhibited complete intolerance of all rivals to the Socialist Labor Party and to his leadership. He advocated an all-out war against both the Knights of Labor and the American Federation of Labor, and considered any effective disruptive tactic to be legitimate. Thus, in an attempt to strengthen the position of his party within the labor movement, De Leon developed a unique strategy known as "dual unionism." Cultivating delegates at the American Federation of Labor convention of 1894, he succeeded in having Samuel Gompers defeated for the presidency that year for the first time since the Federation had been founded. However, the following year Gompers regained the office, and would hold it continuously for the rest of his life. De Leon's plan to infiltrate the AFL having failed, he retreated and turned his attack on the moribund Knights of Labor. Here too he failed to gain control. De Leon's response to these setbacks was the creation in December of 1895 of a new entity—the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance to rival Gompers' organization as a national labor federation. De Leon was determined to see the Alliance reach out and challenge every "AFL"-dominated shop in the

country. The policy of "dual unionism" with the creation of the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance now became De Leon's major weapon for gaining control of the labor movement.

It would, however, lead to a bitter clash with some of the leaders of the Jewish labor movement who had been among his earliest supporters. Many of the Jewish immigrants who supported Socialism had arrived in the United States at the apogee of unrestrained American capitalism. Early efforts to unionize almost invariably failed. Among Jewish immigrant workers, these initial unionizing ventures proved more difficult than for other non-Jewish laborers. Most Jews worked in sweatshops in tenement quarters that were too small to foster a collective unionist outlook. However, as early as 1885, some ten thousand Jewish workers (cloak and shirt-makers) participated in a brief, spontaneous walkout. After achieving some minor concessions they drifted away, allowing their union to die. The improvements they had won were gradually rescinded. Three years later in 1888, a nineteen year old shirt-maker named Bernard Weinstein, along with Morris Hillquit (a former Bundist leader from Riga) and several other Lower East Side Jews, founded the United Hebrew Trades (UHT). The goal of the UHT was to foster union organization within the garment industry and other "Jewish trades." Eminently practical, its leadership agitated for a shorter work day, paid vacations, and for the abolition of sweatshops and child labor. Within a few years the UHT succeeded in establishing numerous unions and could boast an ever-growing membership. Among the many new associations were a typographers union, a shirt-makers union, a knee-pants union, a cap-maker's union, a baker's union, and even a Yiddish actor's union.

Hillquit, the first secretary of the UHT, conducted all his correspondence in Yiddish in order to build up membership that appealed to both Socialist and Jewish loyalties. It was therefore not unusual of UHT rallies and demonstrations to see banners emblazoned with Biblical or Talmudic quotations. Early on, close ties were established with Daniel De Leon's Socialist Labor Party. In 1890, at De Leon's request, the UHT participated in a May Day Parade. Ostensibly a

demonstration for the eight-hour work day, the event signified more to the 9,000 marching Jews: The beginning of a great revolution which would lead to a new society based on the foundation of genuine liberty, equality, and fraternity.

At first De Leon had little difficulty in winning the loyalty of the UHT leadership. For almost two years they followed him blindly into strike after strike. Responding to his direction, their picketing was often clamorous, occasionally even violent. It soon became apparent that De Leon was little interested in the practical improvement of working conditions, and was far more obsessed with the notion of communizing American society. His strikes effectively demoralized the needle trades, but there were few tangible results for the workers. Nor was it possible to persuade De Leon to modify his tactics. His arrogance, insufferable egotism and explosive temper made him virtually unapproachable. The result was an ideological crisis for the UHT leadership who were confronted with making a decision whether to remain an instrument of the Socialist Labor Party under whose auspices they were federated, or devote themselves to the needs of the rank and file of the UHT. The most prominent leaders chose the latter course. By the end of the 1890s, however, De Leon's tactics had taken their toll on the UHT and its unions had declined to barely three. By then most of the Jewish workers had learned their lesson, and no longer had any faith in De Leon's policies. The UHT was left with little choice except to allow its remaining unions a certain tentative identification with Samuel Gompers' American Federation of Labor.

De Leon's authoritarianism and abrasive personality alienated all but a small coterie of his most loyal followers among the Jewish and non-Jewish rank-and-file of the Socialist Labor Party. Seeing no way to address their misgivings over De Leon's radicalism, a number of Jewish Socialist leaders left the party. In 1899, Morris Hillquit and his colleagues in the UHT also withdrew their support of De Leon. Among the most vocal of De Leon's critics was Abraham Cahan (1860-1951), later the editor of the famous Yiddish newspaper *The Jewish Daily Forward*. Cahan's dislike of De Leon's character and methods stemmed

back to the days of the Henry George campaign. An avid supporter of the Single Tax candidate, De Leon had shown little regard or respect for other points of view. Cahan's distrust was reinforced in 1890 by De Leon's first public lecture as a Socialist. During the question period following the lecture, one of De Leon's assertions was contested by a man named Goldenstick; the audience was startled to hear the lecturer reply by addressing his challenger as "Mr. Golden Stink." Believing that De Leon had simply made a mistake, one of the listeners corrected him. De Leon laughed and then deliberately proceeded to mispronounce the name again, "Mr. Golden Stink."

De Leon's unwillingness to tolerate other opinions or to modify his political agenda was again made clear to Cahan in an incident in 1894. Mayor Gilroy of New York City summoned to his office a group of labor leaders (including Gompers, De Leon, and Cahan) to discuss ways of dealing with the city's severe unemployment crisis. Instead of concentrating on a solution to the problem, De Leon harangued the mayor with his radical views on the role of labor in society. The mayor responded very politely that this was not the time to become involved in questions of political economy, and that it was essential that something practical be accomplished here and now. After the meeting Cahan tried to little avail to convince De Leon that Mayor Gilroy was right in seeking practical ways to alleviate the unemployment problem that was creating hardships for all workers and threatening the health of the city's economy.

A short time after the mayor's meeting, the propensity of De Leon to aim barbs at individuals whom for one reason or another he believed opposed him came to the foreground again. This time his target was a British born writer and journalist named Charles Southern. A highly respected member of the Socialist Labor Party, Southern had edited a brochure about the SLP and inadvertently neglected to mention De Leon's name. Whether this was the source of his hostility or not, the fact remains that De Leon, while delivering a lecture, denounced a biography that Southern had written about Horace Greeley. The great journalist, he claimed, was an ardent anti-Socialist. De Leon then proceeded to attack Southern in a severe manner. Using his position as editor of the

party's newspaper, De Leon subsequently published an article roundly condemning the author of the Greeley biography without directly mentioning Southern's name. Cahan and others came to the defense of Southern, and a meeting was called to discuss the ethics involved in De Leon's use of the pages of *The People* to denounce a high ranking party member. The issue caused a great commotion, but was not resolved. The controversy over De Leon's behavior subsided and he continued to badger Southern, eventually causing the frustrated journalist to quit the Socialist Labor Party.

However, it was not until the winter of 1893-94 that Abraham Cahan, Louis Miller and other Jewish leaders emerged as major opponents to the policy of "dual unionism" favored by De Leon. The issue came to a head at the Seventh Congress of the Yiddish speaking branches of the SLP (New York, December 31, 1895). The Congress became the scene of a public confrontation between De Leon's staunchest supporters, known as "the clique," and their opponents. The latter demanded reforms that would give a greater voice to those who opposed De Leon. They also wholeheartedly vented their disapproval of the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance.

De Leon's "clique" did not have the strength to crush the rebellion, but they managed to divert it into a compromise. The Congress adjourned with an agreement to establish a Board of Arbitration which would examine the disputed issues and make recommendations. The board that was created was made up entirely of non-Yiddish speaking leaders of the Socialist Labor Party. The result was that De Leon continued to rule the party in an arbitrary fashion and to push for the implementation of his radical revolutionary agenda. Accordingly, many of the dissidents left the SLP, and reorganized their ranks under the banner of the Social Democratic Party that had been created around the figure of Eugene V. Debs (1855-1926). A second wave of disaffected SLP members were derisively nicknamed the "kangaroos" by the De Leon faithful for their apparent ability to hop from one party to another.

In January of 1905, representatives of the Western Federation of Miners attended a secret conference in

Chicago called by radical labor leaders and journalists. At this meeting, plans were laid for a convention to organize "one great industrial union embracing all industries... founded on the class struggle... and established as the economic organization of the working class, without affiliation with any political party." The convention, which met on June 27, 1905, was attended by two hundred radicals representing approximately forty different trades and occupations. The delegates, led by Eugene V. Debs, William ("Big Bill") Haywood, and Daniel De Leon, named the new organization the Industrial Workers of the World (I.W.W.). Provision was made by the convention for the organization of workers into thirteen all-inclusive departments. Numerous speakers arose to attack employers in general, and the AFL in particular with equal vehemence.

During the first three years of its existence the I.W.W. was torn by factional strife. At the 1906 convention an all-out struggle quickly developed between the so-called "radicals" and "conservatives" who thought that the creation of an effective organization should take precedence over the revolutionary demands of their opponents. The radicals, led by De Leon and supported by the rank-and-file of the poorer unions, easily routed the conservatives, who in almost any other labor organization would have been considered extreme left-wingers. Following the defeat of the conservatives, the Western Federation of Miners withdrew from the I.W.W., and a new conflict arose between the more doctrinaire De Leonites and the representatives of the western migratory and unskilled workers, who favored direct action rather than De Leon's theoretical approach. In the 1908 convention, De Leon and his followers were defeated and forced out of the I.W.W. The "Wobblies," as the members of the I.W.W. were called, were now firmly in control of the movement.

Refusing to take his defeat lightly, De Leon tried to form a rival group to the I.W.W., which never flourished. Undismayed by his many disappointments, he continued until his death to tirelessly insist on the eventual triumph of Socialism, and the ultimate vindication of his methods and ideology. In retrospect, his inflexibility and

Continued on page 33

Oslo Did Not Fail Because of the Words

In the roseate days following the signing of the Oslo Accords in 1993, I was asked to give a talk to a Labor Zionist conference. As a dutiful American lawyer, I read the protocols quite carefully and reported to the assembled delegates that were I the lawyer for the Palestinian Authority (PA) I would advise my client not to sign the agreement! If that statement came as a surprise to my fellow Zionists, then what should we be thinking now when the conventional wisdom is that Israel never should have signed on to such a disaster-on-the-way? The short answer is contained in the homely wisdom of an old friend who has always held that “the only good contract is one that doesn’t have to be consulted.” Stated otherwise, the words are meaningless; it is the determination to agree that brings compliance. When that is absent, no words will change the outcome. The lines of a T. S. Eliot poem apply: “...words that strain, crack and sometimes break under the burden,” a sentiment thoroughly applicable to Oslo.

An excellent example of why I would have advised my fictional client not to sign is contained in Art. VIII 9 (b):

Where Israeli authorities exercise their security function, and in their immediate vicinities, the Israeli authorities may carry out engagement steps in cases where an act or an incident requires such action. In such cases, the Israeli authorities will take any measure necessary to bring to an end such an act or incident.

HAROLD TICKTIN, *attorney and long time member of the LZA, has written extensively on subjects of Jewish interest.*

A bit further on Oslo provided that “Israelis, and tourists to Israel, who have passed through any of the above crossing points into the Gaza Strip shall not be required to undergo any inspection,” and with reference to Gaza and Jericho, “Any event involving injury to Israelis, at any location within the Gaza Strip or the Jericho Area, shall be immediately reported to Israel through the relevant DCO.” Throughout, the document reads like a meticulously written protocol, attentive to every possible precaution in favor of Israeli security. Of course, it must be noted that far from the handshakes on the White House lawn, the PLO was floundering in the backwash of one of its inevitable mistakes, namely, backing Iraq in the Gulf War, which almost succeeded in making Arafat a pariah even among the Arabs. That fateful failure is the only possible explanation for the PA to agree that “Israelis shall under no circumstances be apprehended, arrested or placed in custody or prison by the Palestinian authorities.”

The PA was to be under the constant surveillance of Israel and its most basic functions, legislation for one. Israel had the right to question any proposed legislation if it believed the proposal exceeded the PA’s grant of authority, which meant only what Oslo granted and no more, specifically forbidding the notion that a Palestinian state was being created. A flat prohibition against foreign relations is mentioned more than once. Stamps were to include only “the Authority, price and subject matter.”

Domestically, there is not a hint in Oslo of any diminution of the settlements, a point now made to seem as if settlements were somehow to disappear. I

am no devotee of unrestricted settlements, but the language is clear in Art. V3 (a):

Israel has authority over the Settlements, the Military Installation Area, Israelis, external security, internal security, and public order of settlements, the Military Installation Area and Israel and those agreed powers and responsibilities specified in this Agreement.

Indeed, the Palestinian Authority was obliged to supply electricity to Kfar Darom and Gush Katif! (Art. 5-24 c). If there was stringency on land, then at sea Israel was quite literally to rule the waves, a point of no small importance when the attempt to smuggle arms from Iran on the Karine A was made last year. The relevant maritime provision could hardly be broader, seen here:

As part of Israel's responsibilities for safety and security within the three Maritime Activity Zones, Israel Navy vessels may sail throughout these zones, as necessary and without limitations, and may take any measures necessary and against vessels suspected of being used for terrorist activities or for smuggling arms, ammunition, drugs, goods, or for any other illegal activity. The Palestinian Police will be notified of such actions, and the ensuing procedures will be coordinated through the Maritime Coordination and Cooperation Center.

Quite the same applied in the air. Art. XII 4 (b) made clear that "The exercise of authority with regard to the

electromagnetic sphere and airspace shall be in accordance with the provisions of this Agreement."

None of the provisions laid out here touch on limitations of arms, personnel, or heavy weapons. They were the more publicized features of Oslo. All that aside, I certainly seemed an innocent when I suggested to a Zionist audience that I would not have advised the Palestinian Authority to sign. My statement presumed in that short halcyon time that both parties were equally committed to the provisions of Oslo. Like my Zionist audience and the majority of the Jewish world, I was pleased that the PLO had signed on. After the death of Rabin, the failure of Camp David, the mendacity of the Palestinian "partner," it is quite obvious why they signed at the time. It had nothing to do with the document itself. It had only to do with the fragility of words against what Moshe Dayan used to call "facts on the ground."

There was a play in New York recently called *Imaginary Friends* (an excellent phrase for Oslo) which recounts the ferocious clash between Mary McCarthy and Lillian Hellman. In this play, McCarthy claims that every word spoken by Hellman is a lie, including "the," "and," and "it." Whatever the merits of that dispute—the idea that even conjunctions and nouns can be lies—it certainly pertains to the failure of Oslo, which made clear that Israel and the Palestinian Authority were indeed no more than imaginary friends. This imagined bond was subverted by one side's determination that literally every word would be sapped of any meaning whatsoever.

JF

Subscribe to the Jewish Frontier—

Name:		
Address:		
Address-2:		
City:	State:	Zip:
Phone:	E-mail:	

4 issues/one year --- only \$20
8 issues/two years -- only \$35

☐ check enclosed ☐ bill me

Return to: Circulation, Jewish Frontier, 275 Seventh Avenue, 17th Fl, New York, NY 10001-6708

The French and Their Hollywood Image

Six major Hollywood films contrast the respective roles of France and the United States in both world wars and in fighting international crime. They come to mind immediately in the wake of the recent tensions between the United States and France. Three of them employed similar plots revolving around heroic individuals—American outsiders or expatriates in Europe and their confrontation with the regime of Fascist Vichy France. They even employed the same cast of characters, starring Humphrey Bogart supported by Claude Rains, Peter Lorre and Sydney Greenstreet. These films include the mega-success *Casablanca*, set in Morocco, and the two “also-rans,” *To Have and Have Not* (also starring Lauren Bacall in her famous debut and unforgettable line – “just whistle”) and *Passage to Marseilles*, both of which take place in the French Caribbean possession of Martinique and the French Penal Colony on Devil’s Island (where Dreyfus was imprisoned).

In these three films, the French are portrayed as a nation betrayed by its own leaders and opportunistic officials all too willing to collaborate with the Nazis. There is a small band of “Free French” who are presented as brave but also inept, disorganized, and devoid of leadership. In the end, these Frenchmen are finally inspired to fight by the heroic Humphrey

Bogart. In *Passage to Marseilles*, Bogart, a French reporter, speaks out against appeasement and is framed by the authorities as a “trouble-maker” likely to offend Nazi Germany. He is sent to Devil’s Island for fifteen years after a street mob wrecks the printing presses of his newspaper that criticized French betrayal of the Czechs at Munich. The police simply stand by and let the mob do its work.

After escaping from Devil’s Island, Bogart finds refuge on a ship bound for Marseilles. He tells Claude Rains that “The France you and I loved is dead, Colonel. She’s been dying for a long time. I saw her die in the Rhineland and at Munich. Now, her death is complete. I can stop lying and tell the truth.” In very similar dialogue in the other two films, Bogart tells other Frenchmen in exile, who are full of doubt and indecision, that they must take a stand and fight the Nazis to redeem France’s honor. His words so shame the doubters that they kiss him on the cheek with the exclamation that “We are so glad you are on our side” (*To Have and Have Not*) and “toss a bottle of Vichy water into the trash can” (*Casablanca*). Since these events take place before Pearl Harbor, Bogart’s action is his own free choice and not the formal obligation of an “ally.” He helps because “it’s the right thing to do,” something which the Frenchmen seem to have difficulty understanding. In all three films, one hears the repeated subliminal melody of the Marseillaise. In Rick’s *Casablanca* bar, it is sung openly in a brief act of defiance and Rick (Bogart) takes the blame.

NORMAN BERDICHEVSKY PHD., *most recently has authored* “The Danish-German Border Dispute” (2002) and “Nations in Search of a National Language” (2003).

Casablanca is rated as the third most popular film in history by the American Film Institute in a 1977 and the “best ever” by the British Film Institute in 1983. It has become a cult with its own following. Few films match so well its elements of drama, romance, intrigue, and adventure. Rick has a sentimental memory of the time he spent in Paris with his love Ilsa (Ingrid Bergman) before the war. The French surrender and ensuing confusion results in him losing Ingrid Bergman, only to regain her later and give her up so she can accompany a resistance leader into exile and carry on the fight.

Claude Rains plays the Vichy French police official “Captain Louis Renault” who provides protection for Rick’s café in return for a share of the illegal gambling profits. This character at first typifies the cynical, corrupt and totally pragmatic of all those Frenchmen who chose some form of collaboration with the Germans in order to survive. His devotion to “duty” is immortalized in the lines “I am making out the report now. We haven’t quite decided if he committed suicide or died trying to escape”; his feigned sense of shock in having to close down the Café, “I’m shocked—shocked—to find gambling is going on in here,” only to be told by the croupier “Your winnings, sir”; his immortal reply to Rick who is holding a gun pointed at his heart, “That is my least vulnerable spot”; and his frank admission “I have no conviction, if that’s what you mean. I blow with the wind, and the prevailing wind happens to be from Vichy.” In the end, Louis has to make a choice and flees with Rick to Free French Territory, prompting the last line of the film, “Louis, this could be the beginning of a beautiful friendship.”

The fourth, lesser known film, *The Cross of Lorraine* (1943), takes place in a prisoner of war camp where French soldiers are interned. Peter Lorre plays a sadistic and corrupt German prison guard. Hume Cronyn plays a French prisoner more than ready to

work for the Germans in order to win extra rations of food and other favors. The other stars, Jean-Pierre Aumont and Gene Kelly, are two close friends who differ in their view of the necessity of fighting. They are depressed to hear the prisoners relate that their countrymen at home, especially the “wise ones,” are collaborating. The muffled strains of the Marseillaise are continually repeated in this film until the very end. Sir Cedric Hardwicke, voicing dissent, plays a French



Photo courtesy of Warner Bros.

priest who admonishes the prisoners that to resist and die fighting is better than to serve the Germans and thereby repudiate their “divine origin.”

In this film there are no American characters but the news alone that the Americans have landed in French North Africa and are fighting there with the Free French under “The Cross of Lorraine” (General de Gaulle’s forces) is enough to bring elation to all the villagers where the two men have found refuge after escaping from prison. When spending the night at the home of an ordinary family, they realize how all the simple joys of life will be eliminated in the Nazi New Order and exult in the knowledge that they must fight to make that possible.

Jean-Pierre Aumont’s character is also plagued by the realization that before the war he had preferred the

Continued on page 34

Passengers

Of four sons the Torah speaks: One is wise, one is wicked, one is simple, and one knows not how to ask. (Passover Haggadah)

Late morning. A railroad carriage comes to a stop at a station in Manhattan and the doors open to let passengers on and off. Its metal gray interior all scuffed and kept together with iron nails, its plastic seats orange and black, its dotted floor witness to the crowds that have passed through it. It is covered with advertisements for Club Med; the sun is shining, tropical drinks with a cherry on top and paper sunshades, women with white smiles and men with powerful bodies rushing between the waves. One of the passengers, protesting the white smile of the woman in the advertisement, drew a moustache over it with a black ink marker. The rush hour, when the carriage carries thousands of people to work, is over. At the end of the carriage, close to the next one, there are two sleepy rows of seats staring at one another occupied by a few passengers.

Seated are three teenage girls holding plastic bags from which they take out cheap jewelry purchased in the street. They are pleased with themselves, a little noisy, a cheeky look on their faces, their hair plaited, swept back in a pony tail sparkling with colored pins. Rosita, a little chubby, whispers to Lina, who looks much younger than her fourteen years. She consults Gladys, with chafed elbows, and the three of them start chuckling noisily, and so it goes on between them.

AYELET BEN ZIV APPEL, an Israeli writer, is pursuing her doctorate in Instructional Technology and Media at Columbia University.

Opposite them sits Enrico, a philosophy student, tall and very thin, almost haggard, with fair, unkempt hair and torn trousers. He is thinking about what his mentor, Professor Altman, would say about a hypothesis that he had developed on relative morality. Enrico's attention is diverted, however, when the reflection of the woman sitting to his right appears in the window opposite. Her face beautiful and calm, her hair swept back in a bun, headphones on her ears, listening to music. She is sitting one seat away from him, tall, wearing a miniskirt, long legs that she does not bother to cross. Her thighs touching each other, but the soles of her feet placed comfortably on the floor. In the reflection in the window one could discern the darkness under her skirt in between her legs, and even her panties; pinkish, perhaps? She looks like a picture out of the advertisement on the walls, definitely a model. Enrico's dreamy brain imagines a small moustache disfiguring her face like that of the blond woman appearing in the placard on the wall. He wonders whether the mystic qualities attributed to beautiful women are solely in the eye of the beholder, or whether they have a reality of their own? Opposite him, obstructing his view of the wonderful reflection, sits Kyle, a stolid guy with a cold face, wearing a gray suit, white shirt, and blue tie. Kyle is reading a book.

Kyle, hidden behind his book, avoids the tiresome eye competition that often takes place in a carriage. Who will take a look at whom? Who will keep his or her good manners and not look? Who will look too late and get caught? Kyle is not reading. The movements of the carriage are making his headache worse. Behind his book he's thinking of the girl he picked up yesterday at the bar, what he had said to her, how she

had complimented him on his muscular body, what she did to him, and how they had laughed. Despite his throbbing temples he tried to decipher what had happened: Late at night everything becomes hazy, he gets up in the morning—and she’s gone. He rushed to check the pockets of his trousers to see if his wallet was missing. She hadn’t taken anything. His stomach juices are rising, causing heartburn. How could he possibly manage to make his presentation in an hour in such a state?

Karen, whom Enrico had been surreptitiously observing, arranges her skirt and crosses her long legs. “I am more than a pretty face inside a train,” the music can be heard from her headphones and she turns it off. She turns her attention to check the tape and while her hands are busy, she remembers the exercise that Frank, the drama teacher, had asked them to practice—to choose an inanimate object and identify with it. She glances at her watch and decides to give it a try. “Now I am a subway carriage,” she decides with her eyes closed. My noise is loud and wonderful. I cross the island straight under the streets, under the buildings. Rumbling, shaking, hurrying, opening, closing, loading, unloading, speeding through the tunnels, burning up the tracks, shocking the passengers, stopping to let other trains pass, or speedily overtaking other trains. Now we are opposite each other, myself and the other train, screaming with pleasure. The walls of the tunnel are disappearing into my window, reflecting men and women, passengers in my twin. Their shadows are drawn out by the speed, extended behind them like chewing gum. Yo ho. How good it feels! That’s it; finished. The twin train has passed and the tunnel walls are back in place. The engine accelerates, hurrying to meet yet another train. Trembling with the effort of following the curves of the track. A crack in the lines. The engine is careening back and forth, then continues on one side only, and red sparks flash upwards. The first carriage overturns, followed by the second and the third, the passengers are thrown about like coffee beans in a grinder, up and down, and from side to side. Karen’s hands seize the metal rod next to her. She opens her eyes. Shit. Who says that an active imagination is a good thing? Again she has crashed in the exercise. Frank had said not to be afraid of losing control in exercises, go with it all

the way. Not now, later perhaps. With troubled movements she puts the headphones on again. The singer in the tape continues “up, up, and above away from me... looking for the special things inside of me...” Karen closes her eyes and immerses herself in the music.

The carriage comes to a halt at a station and a woman with a newspaper folded under her arm gets on and sits down next to Kyle. A careful glance would show anyone interested that she is dark-skinned, a little broad, of average height, her hair brushed back and her face of the kind that leaves no impression. She spreads out the newspaper for comfortable reading and quietly buries herself behind it. The doors close. The clacking of the wheels starts again until the next station.

“La-la-la.” The woman who just got on suddenly bursts into song and hides herself behind her newspaper. Her voice is high and clear as if on an opera stage. It penetrates the space of the carriage, rising high, spinning down, with a sharpness that covers all the background noise. Then all at once it stops, as suddenly as it had begun.

The passengers lower their eyes humbly, glancing discreetly at their neighbors. Enrico is excited, here’s something to recount at the seminar! Did this really happen or did it not? Out of the corner of his eye he checks the other passengers, but their looks move in different directions. Silence reigns in the carriage, even Lina is quiet, but Rosita is nudging her with her elbow. A moment of discomfort and then the conversation is renewed. Perhaps the unfortunate incident never occurred.

“La-la-la-la...” More singing is heard from behind the newspaper, the same unknown melody. Now it is clear that it had happened after all and is still continuing. A strange melody comes out of the mouth of the woman behind the newspaper. A beggars’ song, for instance, would have been accepted with understanding, even if not welcomed as routine. But this singing is different: disjointed, uncontrollable, with no beginning and no end. Broken passages of harmony escaping from her lips in a clear, loud voice

like the last song of the nightingale. “La-la-la...” The singing continues, varying, attacking, bursting forth like a ghost and turning... to where?

Rosita and Lina emit nervous chuckles. Gladys nudges her with her elbow, covers her mouth with her hands and requests in Spanish, “Quiet! My mother told me not to have anything to do with people like that, she says they are a cul-de-sac and to be careful not to enter their alleys.” Lina ignores the singing lady and the whisperings of Gladys, and in a courageous voice proposes her own explanation “they are like a box—no, actually a chest—that is forbidden to open because snakes and all sorts of evil creatures will emerge and seize anyone who looks at them. It even has a name but I don’t remember what it is. In any case, my brother beat up an old woman in our street who was always taking her clothes off and who offered me candies if I agreed to go with her.” Rosita gets excited, “Mama Maria, an old woman who actually gets undressed?” Lina suggests, “Come and see for yourself, she is disgusting.”

Gladys covers her mouth again glancing from one of her friends to the other, “see that woman opposite, perhaps she speaks Spanish too, we have to be careful!” “The woman opposite, she doesn’t understand a thing!” says Lina reassuring her. Since explanations have already been given, they try very hard to ignore the incident. Very quickly they renew their interest in the plastic bags containing their private treasures. Every now and then chuckles can be heard, not connected to the incident, but Gladys is quieter than usual.

“La-la-la...” Kyle’s head seems about to burst. He could hardly suffer the monotonous background noises and the chuckling next to him, and now, this! The woman’s opera singing, penetrating the remains of the alcoholic fog, grates on his exposed nerves, and spreads to every corner of his body. His headache is getting worse and threatens to affect more parts of his body. His chance of being able to function normally when he gets to the office is slipping away. He closes the book with a click, clutches his head and stressed face, and stands up right above the woman who had disappeared behind her newspaper. What should he

do? When they reach a curve in the tracks he raises his hands above the woman and clutches the plastic strap hanging from the ceiling. And as if to annoy, “la-la-la...” Kyle strengthens his grip on the plastic strap. Every additional note coming from her lips sends a current of burning pain through his body from his ears downward, and from the opposite direction, a burning sensation rises upwards. She must be silenced, immediately!

“Shut up, bitch!” The words come out from between his teeth like an attack. No reaction from behind the newspaper.

Lina nudges Rosita with her elbow. Despite the pain Rosita does not complain. The relationship between them is more than just words. The code of silence between strangers on the subway has been violated; and by a curse! Not even one nervous chuckle was heard. Enrico feels a cold draught and shrinks. Up to now he had enjoyed this little scene and had actually made an effort to hide a smile that threatened to break out on his face. He thought that despite the fact that people are so predictable, in Manhattan they are still able to surprise you. Actually, one exhibitionist woman succeeded in raising the level of tension to new heights and put everyone on the defensive. However, now the situation was no longer enjoyable. The limits of the violence that had exploded had still not been reached. Enrico’s legs were pressed one against the other, his stomach was pulled in, his hands crossed, his fingers clasped round his elbows, his look directed at his worn shoes, and whatever was happening opposite him was beyond the pale. His world, which, only a moment ago, had been small but calm, shrunk to a point and froze. Astounding, he ponders, how in the end it is these nerds with the suits and ties that prove to be the most dangerous. When they explode there is no way of knowing how it will end up.

“La-la-la...” Kyle’s hands let go of the plastic strap and stretch above the singer’s head. He clutches his head, walks decisively toward the carriage door, ignores the sign clearly requesting passengers “not to pass from carriage to carriage while the train is in motion,” struggles with the handle and finally opens

the door and passes on to the area joining the two carriages, and disappears into the tunnel. The door slams behind him.

“He was about to hit her,” whispered Gladys with a sense of relief, “What a wicked man!” Lina disagrees, her pony tail shaking from side to side: “My brother also gets angry like that at times, and rightly so! This old witch should be careful, she herself is wicked to sing like that in a subway! She should learn! And besides what did the man really do? Nothing actually happened.”



“What do you mean nothing happened? You are so simple! Did you see how he shouted?” asked Rosita, the tone of her voice raising the drama to new heights. “Who is the simple? You are the simple one. I am a tough and sophisticated woman” answers Lina cheekily, and the three of them burst out laughing.

“La-la-la...” Enrico envies Kyle because he left the carriage. He is the one who likes to observe from the sidelines and actually finds it difficult to get up and leave the carriage as well. He is stuck, nailed to his seat, sharing with the other passengers in the nearby seats the same polite assumption that nothing happened or is happening. Now, the two rows of seats include Enrico, the singing woman behind the newspaper, the teenagers, and “the model,” her face as beautiful as the Madonna herself, her eyes closed,

serene in a world of her own, her private music in her ears, impenetrable to the background noise. Does she realize that something is happening outside her world? It is doubtful she would even try to ask and find out. The girls are busy chuckling and chattering. What is so funny all the time and how much noise they are making, what a lack of manners, a fool’s paradise.

Now Enrico is angry. People are so aggressive. They do not respect the space and freedom of others. They annoy you, bother you, push you around and break into your world by force, leaving you defenseless. What else can a person do but put on a good face, shut himself off, and pray that they will not break in, and if they do, that they may pass without touching you.

“La-la-la...” The train arrives at another station. The singing lady folds her newspaper and leaves the carriage. End of incident. A new atmosphere pervades the carriage, The girls are making signs on their foreheads with their hands, voicing doubts about the mental health of the singer.

Karen, with her eyes closed, is keeping to herself. The clacking of the carriage can now be heard without any interference. Enrico glances at the passengers sitting near him, passes his hand through his hair, and would very much like to analyze what has happened. The word “evil” that he understood from the chattering of the girls in Spanish strikes a chord in him. An interesting choice to describe all that has happened. In early religious thought and philosophies, the word is used to describe heresy or denial of the divine laws. However, it is also used outside the religious context in discussing human nature. In any case, Enrico reflects, there are those who claim that everyone has a grain of evil in him and the choice is in his hands to overcome it or succumb to it. But how can one put this rule to use in such a trivial situation, and who are

Continued on page 34

Eduardo Rauch, Z"l

We mourn the death at age 61 of Dr. Eduardo Rauch, the first editor of *Melton Gleanings* [and member of the Jewish Frontier Editorial Board], who died in New York on June 21st, 2002, after a short illness. Edy Rauch spent twenty-four years on the faculty of the Jewish Theological Seminary, teaching in the department of Jewish education and serving for twelve years as Co-director of the Melton Research Center.

Born in Santiago, Chile to survivors of the Holocaust, Dr. Rauch was educated as a biochemist. He came to Israel in the wake of the Six-day War and spent three years working and studying in Israel. He was elected secretary-general of the World Union of Jewish Students (WUJS) and moved to London with his wife in 1970. During that time WUJS began organizing various initiatives in North America including the North American Jewish Students' Network out of which CAJE was eventually born.

Edy entered the doctoral program at the Harvard Graduate School of Education after finishing his term at WUJS and came to the Melton Center in 1978 upon completion of his degree. He spent the rest of his career at JTS. At Melton he helped developed a wide range of educational projects including the Melton Teacher Retreat Program, the Melton Graded curriculum for afternoon schools, and many teacher education initiatives and publications. Aside from his work on *Gleanings*, in recent years Edy worked on curriculum projects for the National Ramah Camps and edited publications for the Rabbinical Assembly.

He was known for his wide-ranging and eclectic intellectual interests, his profound and charismatic teaching, and his deep moral commitments. He founded and was managing editor of *The Melton Journal*, considered the liveliest and most inventive journal in the field of Jewish education in the 1980s, and wrote innumerable articles and reviews on many different subjects. His book on the history of American Jewish education in the early part of the 20th Century will be published next year by Tel Aviv University Press.

Edy was one of the great dreamers of contemporary Jewish education. He was always inventing new ideas; his remarkable mind always making new connections: spirituality, Jewish ecological education, teacher education, the arts in Jewish education. He led the way in many of those areas.

We will miss his great smile, his prophetic zeal and uncompromising moral sensibility, his profound love for all of God's creatures and his unwavering belief, as he liked to put it, that "teaching can change the world."

May his memory be a blessing.

Barry Holtz

Jewish Theological Seminary

<http://www.jtsa.edu/research/melton/gleanings/v5n1/edr.shtml>

We mourn the passing of SOL BRANDZEL, distinguished Labor lawyer and communal leader, and extend condolences to his beloved partner, our old friend and mentor, Esther Zackler.

We extend our condolences to Ben Cohen on the passing of his brother, JULIUS COGEN, a veteran professional leader of the Israel Histadrut Campaign in Cleveland and many other communities.

Daniel and Elaine Mann, Bethesda, MD

Re: "Herostratus Syndrome: An Analysis of the Suicide Bomber," Winter 2003

To the Editor:

We become disorganized and unsure when confronted with a frightening and inexplicable behavior that threatens the orderliness of our society and our personal security. A great anxiety accompanies the uncertainty of not knowing. Patients living with the uncertainty as to whether they have cancer or not are relieved when this uncertainty is resolved either positively or negatively. The presence of uncertainty evokes in us a search for explanation.

The unsettling impact of the assault on the Twin Towers on 9/11 disrupted the certainty of our world. It called to our attention in a compelling manner that there were people who were willing to die in order to kill Americans, to kill people just like us and in a random manner. The "suicide bombers" were no longer over there, they were here and uncertainty and fear mounted. What sort of people would destroy themselves to destroy us?

In his article "The Herostratus Syndrome: An Analysis of the Suicide Bomber" (*Jewish Frontier*, Winter 2003), Dr. Myslobodsky undertakes to explain "what makes one ready to inflict death on others..." His answer is given as an expression of what he believes, namely, "...that some sort of depression is the major factor that is shared by all those who choose to terminate their life. Bereavement-provoked hatred

and the experience of wrath demanding retribution can complicate a lingering personal unhappiness and provide it with meaning."

The difficulty with the explanation that Dr. M. provides as a serious scientific medical explanation is that it is based on speculation and conjecture. He acknowledges that "not all examples of wickedness are psychopathology." However, he follows this disclaimer with the comment "...we shall be somewhat out of touch pretending that there is nothing wrong with the psyche of terrorists trying to cremate people alive." We have lived through the tragic error of pathologizing those who are found abhorrent, in Nazi Germany, in Communist Russia, and in the People's Republic of China. American psychiatrists were taken to task, by their own organization, for questioning the sanity of a Republican candidate for President, the late Barry Goldwater, because they had never examined him to establish such a claim. Political disagreement did not justify psychiatric diagnosing without examination.

Dr. M. posits that holding onto life is a core human behavior, which may well be the case in general but exceptions abound. For the elderly or devastatingly ill who terminate their lives either with or without assistance, we have carefully documented evidence that they are not depressed, psychotic, or suffering from a personality disorders or brain tumor; etc. We have examples of groups who chose to die in defense of a cause, the defenders at Massada, the participants in the Warsaw Ghetto uprising, and the Japanese Kamikaze pilots in World War Two who hoped to take the enemy with them in death. Dr. M. wonders about a culture that would sacrifice its children for political ends. The Viet Cong are a case in point, but they were Marxists. The youthfulness of many in Washington's Revolutionary Army and on both sides in our Civil War—and in all wars—are other examples.

Avoiding complexity when possible is admirable, but Dr. M. worries that complexity in explaining terrorism will detract from the "neuropsychiatric profiling of the fraction of individuals who are

The Jewish Frontier invites responses from our readers.

Please send all correspondence to:

Editor, Jewish Frontier
275 Seventh Avenue
17th Floor
New York, NY 10001

jewish_frontier@hotmail.com

capable of dying by suicide." Thus we must see "heroic death" as camouflage for the "struggle for self-esteem at its least disguised." There is little recognition that the late teens and twenties are a time of great idealism. When a 25 year old woman would-be bomber gave as her rationale for jihad, "to create a just and equal, non-corrupt and non-criminal society by the spread and unification of Islam," it is seen by Dr. M. as "the cry of a lonely and unhappy woman..."

Dr. M. apparently seems to favor conjecture and speculation over complexity. He recognizes the limits of our psychological understanding of these "suicide bombers" as the studies, psychological autopsies, are done on "proxies of the deceased." Yet he subsequently engages in conjecture based on what he thinks is conceivable based on the hypothesized mental illness of the young terrorists. He then offers the idea that as sexual abuse in Palestinian society is significant the victims of such abuse "must show signs of psychoticism... paranoid ideation, depression... and psychological distress." The relationship of abuse and mental illness is statistical, far from inevitable, and undemonstrated in the young "suicide bombers." Speculations on sexual guilt and descriptions of the terrorists as "backward and irrational" are not supported by examination of the people being described.

Name calling in the guise of science delays understanding rather than facilitates it. We may all label the "suicide bomber" as evil within our moral system. Unfortunately, without adequate evidence, we may have to continue to tolerate considerable anxiety and uncertainty if we seek a psychological explanation.

Milton Kramer, M. D.
New York, NY

.....

Re: "Labor's Platform and the Imperative of Palestinian Statehood," Winter 2003

Dear Mr. Chester:

Your article in the Winter '03 issue of Jewish Frontier was utterly cogent. I have only one caveat. It is

important to make the case that Ariel Sharon, as compared to the Likud in general, can be considered moderate, or semi-moderate. At the same time, an extremely good case can and has been made that Sharon is part of a duo—Sharon on one side and Hamas and Islamic Jihad on the other—where each wants no genuine compromise and will do all within their power to sabotage the chances for such a compromise. As you say, the compromise necessary to solve the Israeli/Palestine conflict must be based on Israel ending the Occupation and the establishment of a viable Palestinian state. Hamas and Islamic Jihad will not settle for the existence of any Jewish state of Israel.

Granted, there is an enormous qualitative difference between accepting a non-viable Palestinian state and a wish to wipe out the existence of the Jewish state. However, both perspectives—that of Sharon as well as that of Hamas—spell disaster. In that sense it is, I believe, insufficient to point out that Sharon, as compared to Likudniks in general, comes out not as the "infamous tyrant depicted by his opponents." Rather, it is necessary to persist in pointing out his role in playing "tit for tat" with Hamas, and, indeed, his extreme skill in playing that game so provocatively.

Sincerely,

Irving Weinstein
Far Rockaway, NY

.....

An Open Letter to the American Jewish Community

From: "The Third Watch," Concerned Jewish Students at Wesleyan

We are writing this letter as concerned American Jewish college students and members of the greater Jewish community. We are committed Jews, raised in Jewish families, and taught in Jewish institutions of learning. We have also been raised to love Israel. It is with this background, with this voice, that we address you.

The Jewish ethic of social justice compels us to speak out for a new American Jewish discourse concerning Israel. We reject the notion that criticizing Israel or its policies makes one a traitor or a self-hating Jew. Instead, we insist that the American Jewish community recognize that we can criticize Israel from a position of love. Moreover, we reject the simplistic and divisive labeling of pro-Israel and pro-Palestine. In its place, we seek a third path, one founded upon the pursuit of peace, justice, and reconciliation for both peoples.

The current discourse on the Israeli/Palestinian conflict is one marred by fear, distrust, and hatred. It is imperative that we create an environment of empathy, understanding, and open peaceful dialogue on our campuses if we ever hope to move forward in this seemingly intractable conflict. Over the last two years the situation on college campuses has become tumultuous and even frightening. In many cases students have refused to acknowledge the history of pain and suffering felt by both peoples. This hostile environment has led to verbal and even physical violence on campuses. It is our goal to transform our colleges and universities into places where all students take on the responsibility of tikkun olam, of rebuilding the world, reaching new levels of understanding and beginning the arduous task of restoring hope in these dark times.

We are frustrated and disheartened by the American Jewish community's limited response to critiques of Israeli policies. The current mind-set led the American Jewish Committee to publish a letter declaring the necessity of creating a safe space for Jewish/Zionist students on college campuses, a place where they will not be harassed and can freely voice their ideas. While many feel that Israel has been unfairly singled out for criticism, this conviction does not relieve us of our responsibility as Jews to work towards peace and justice in the Middle East. We recognize that there are Jews and Zionists on campuses whose voices have been silenced. We would also emphasize the plight of Arab and Muslim students who have been harassed for their views. We call for the American Jewish community to work towards constructive, respectful dialogue instead of its current narrow and unproductive discourse.

Out of concern for American Jewish students, organizations such as campuswatch.org have been created to report on what it considers to be anti-Israel attitudes amongst professors. Instead of contributing to dialogue, understanding, and the promotion of peace, the only end of such blacklisting is the intimidation of those with opposing views. We American Jewish students are better served with open, challenging and constructive discourse than with protection from diverse opinions.

Every day, we see the horrifying results of hatred and misunderstanding in this conflict. Our college campuses must become places of open learning and respect if we are ever to achieve peace and justice for both our people and the Palestinians. It is not anti-Semitic to criticize the Israeli government's policy of settlement building. We can see suicide bombings as abhorrent while at the same time support the human rights of the Palestinian people. Our community must recognize the complexity of this conflict and advocate for just policies on all sides. Our voices have been stifled for too long and now we implore the Jewish community and our university communities to help us create both campuses and a world, based on empathy, justice, and compassion.

Third Path

222 Church St., Box 4729

Middletown, CT 06459

(Contact: Dan Geltuch, dgeltuch@wesleyan.edu)

.....

Re: "Amol iz Geven"

It's hard to imagine that there were Yiddish secular schools in cities such as Shreveport LA, Macon GA, South Bend IN, and Rock Island IL, to name but a few of the 140 communities where such educational facilities existed? There were also at least 36 Yiddish educational summer camps for children and adults with names like Hemsheykh, Nit Gedayget, Gan Eden, Yungvelt, Kindervelt, Mehia, Kinder Ring, Boiberik, Naivelt, Kinderland, etc.

There were literally hundreds of schools and camps all over Canada and the U.S., teaching language,

literature, holidays, history, customs and the arts, all in Yiddish, and depending on the ideology of the sponsoring organizations, Hebrew and Zionism. The heyday of these institutions began in 1912 and carried through to the 1960's. A number of these schools still exist, in Canada as day schools, and in the US as part-time supplementary schools. The sponsoring organizations of these various schools, camps and parent activities included the Arbeiter Ring (Workmen's Circle), the Farband (Labor Zionist Order), The Sholem Aleichem Institute, the Borochoy Schools, the IWO/UJPO (International Workers' Order/United Jewish People's Order) and the Non-Partisan Jewish Workers' Children's Schools.

A book is being written about this fascinating phenomenon in North American Jewish history that included many thousands of students and parents, and that had a tremendous impact on their lives and their Jewish identity. Currently, research is underway to gather as much information as possible about each school and camp. Documentation about such institutions in smaller communities is particularly difficult to locate. National, state and provincial archives, both Jewish and secular, do not have much material, if any, about a number of cities where such facilities existed. Records have disappeared or were never kept, and the generation of founders, movers and shakers, and even their children, is fast becoming unavailable for memories and oral histories.

But such an important story should not remain untold and undocumented! If you have personal knowledge of such a school or camp in your current location or city of origin, or if you have access to a local Jewish community history that might describe such an institution, please get in touch with Fradle Freidenreich at 9 Harzfeld Street, Herzlia Pituach, 46661 Israel or fradlef@aol.com. Names of staff, dates of operation, addresses of schools, information about curriculum and specific programs, and memorabilia – all will be of great help in putting together this story. Material will be returned upon request, and acknowledgement will be made. Networking suggestions will be gratefully received.

Fradle Freidenreich

On Sunday, June 8th, 2003

*The Labor Zionist
Alliance of Chicago*

Honored



Chaikey Greenberg

*in recognition of her many
years of devoted service and
commitment to the ideals and
activities of Labor Zionism*

A Double Standard?

Iraq, Israel, and the United Nations

Resolution 242, adopted in response to the Arab/Israeli war of 1967, is different in purpose and in tone. Though historical interpretations vary, the 1967 war was, from Israel's perspective, a defensive action. The international community never characterized the 1967 war as an "invasion" by Israel of the territory of any other sovereign nation. Indeed, in 1967 when Israel conquered the Gaza Strip, the West Bank and East Jerusalem, those areas were not recognized by the international community as the sovereign territory of any state. From the perspective of rectifying a perceived wrong, it is relatively easy to understand how naked force could be effective in forcing Iraq to turn over whatever banned weapons it might possess. Yet it is difficult to imagine how force could be effective in establishing the stated goal of Resolution 242, "the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East." Interestingly, the Palestinian Liberation Organization has itself published an analytical piece entitled "UN Double Standards: Israel, Iraq and Chapter VII of the UN Charter." The piece half-heartedly advances what I have called the "second version" of the "double standard" argument, but even the PLO refrains from asserting that resolutions 242 and 338 should have been adopted pursuant to Chapter VII. Indeed, the piece is completely silent regarding resolutions 242 and 338, asserting only that other more recent, less comprehensive resolutions relating to the Middle East should have been issued under Chapter VII.

Iraq Made a Bargain; Israel Did Not

There is an additional difference between Resolution 687 and the resolutions concerning Israel and its Arab neighbors. Iraq agreed in writing, on more than one occasion, to comply with the terms of resolution 687, including its requirement that Iraq's weapons of mass destruction be eliminated, yet there has been no similar written agreement from Israel, or from any of Israel's Arab neighbors, to comply with 242 or 338.

On April 6, 1991, in order to finalize the cease-fire in the Gulf War, the government of Iraq agreed in writing to comply with all the provisions of 687. Iraq's acquiescence forestalled the complete destruction of its military forces by coalition forces. Additionally, on February 23, 1998, when the Iraqi government and the first UN arms inspection agency (UNSCOM) were at loggerheads, the Iraqi government entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with the United Nations. That Memorandum of Understanding begins with Iraq's reconfirmation of "its acceptance of all relevant resolutions of the Security Council, including resolutions 687 (1991) and 715 (1991)." No state—neither Israel nor any of its Arab neighbors—was requested to agree in writing to the provisions of resolutions 242 and 338. Nor did any state in fact so agree.

Iraq's obligation to destroy its weapons of mass destruction is, therefore, not merely an obligation that was imposed on Iraq by some foreign, external body. Rather, Iraq's obligation is part of an agreement—a bargain, if you will—into which Iraq itself entered, certainly not with great satisfaction, but nevertheless with a view towards gaining specific, concrete advantages in exchange for its promise to rid itself of the specified weapons. Preserving the surviving remnants of its military forces was, indeed, a compelling incentive to agree to the provisions of 687. By enforcing Iraq's obligation to rid itself of weapons of mass destruction, the Security Council (or those nations acting on its behalf) enforces not only resolution 687 and 1441, it also enforces Iraq's own written agreement. This is a unique circumstance, with no analogy to resolutions 242 and 338.

The "Double Standard" and the Arab Nations

Those who complain most bitterly about the "double standard" never seem to acknowledge that the resolutions which refer to Israeli withdrawal from occupied territories also refer to reciprocal steps that Israel's Arab neighbors are supposed to take. Resolution 242, adopted on November 22, 1967, states that the Security Council desires:

“[T]he establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East which should include the application of both the following principles: Withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict; Termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force[.]”

Resolution 338, adopted at the end of the 1973 war, incorporates by reference resolution 242. In addition to recommending withdrawal of Israeli forces, resolution 242 equally recommends the “acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area.” Except for Egypt and Jordan, which have signed peace treaties with Israel, none of the Arab states have ever acknowledged “the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence” of the State of Israel, and its “right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries.” Indeed, Syria and Lebanon consider themselves to be in a technical state of war with Israel, or the “Zionist entity” as they prefer to say. If Israel has failed to comply with resolution 242 by failing to withdraw from occupied territories, the great majority of Arab states have likewise failed to comply by refusing to grant full diplomatic recognition to Israel and by failing to end their hostile belligerency towards Israel. The duties and obligations imposed under resolutions 242 and 338 are mutual and reciprocal in nature. It is particularly brazen that Syria, a terrorist-harboring nation which considers itself to be at war with Israel and has never recognized Israel’s legitimacy, not only protests Israel’s failure to comply with 242, but cites that failure, in the context of military action against Iraq, as proof that Israel is the beneficiary of a double standard.

Reasonable minds can differ as to the wisdom and morality of having used military force against Iraq to ensure the elimination of its weapons of mass destruction and to depose the regime of Saddam Hussein. Reasonable minds cannot, however,

seriously entertain the notion that, because military force has been used against Iraq, it follows that Israel is the beneficiary of a double standard. The international community, speaking through the Security Council, ordered Iraq to disarm and, in traditionally opaque diplomatic language, reserved the right to use force if Iraq failed to comply. Moreover, Iraq agreed in writing to disarm. No analogous order has ever been issued to Israel, and Israel has entered into no analogous agreement. Different cases demand different standards. **JF**

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS *Continued from page 6*

Israel’s Canaries

must first be proved: That the government is right simply because it is the government, a notion negated by the long, sorry necessity of a Civil Rights Movement in the U.S. to eliminate legalized segregation in the South, as well as by the very necessity of a Universal Declaration of Human Rights to specify the rights of citizens against their own governments.

Allowing people who are required to register for the draft to register as SCOs might give the public a less tension-filled barometer than massive draft resistance gave to the American public during the Vietnam War for judging whether the government’s position regarding “jus ad bellum” is correct. It might also help to ensure that the government gives sufficient weight to the arguments against engaging in any particular war. Similarly, recognizing the right of citizens who are already members of the military to decline serving in a particular conflict might give the public some measure of confidence that the government’s position regarding “jus in bello” continues to be correct—thus helping to ensure that the tactics employed in the execution of a war have not transformed a just war into its opposite. Hence, enabling these two functions of SCO as safety valves could enhance democracy, not minimize it.

The most recent argument against SCO is that it would fragment society. “The people’s army might turn into an army of peoples, made up of different units, each having its own spheres in which it can act

conscientiously, and others in which it cannot.” So says the Supreme Court of Israel in a controversial decision on December 30, 2002 ruling against five of the reservists who sought recognition of their right to refuse service in the Occupied Territories. The Court went on to add: “In a society as pluralistic as ours, the recognition of selective conscientious objection might loosen the links that hold us together as a people.”⁶

Commenting on this decision, Adam Kushner writes: “This is patently wrong. Israel's greatest asset, like any democracy, is the wide field of debate that guides public policy. Israelis should foster conscientious objection and dissent, and even showcase those divisions—except when held by soldiers—to the Palestinians as their most imitable qualities... The court is wrong to fear the recognition of selective conscientious objection, as long as it recognizes the objections in society, not in the army.” While Kushner sees open discussion of disagreements as fundamental to a healthy democracy, he does not extend this democratic principle to members of the military whose role is, arguably, to defend that democracy. I disagree, and not only for the reasons already spelled out above. We in the U.S. know all too well the inequity of sending people into battle to defend a democracy that does not extend to themselves. African Americans have been subjected to this treatment repeatedly, as those who served in World War II and Korea and Vietnam have related time and time again.

It is not selective conscientious objection that fragments a society. It is war itself. Even more so, it is being called to serve—or to have one's brothers and sisters and friends and children serve—in a war that the public does not support that creates deep fissures in a society. Adam Kushner knows this. He concludes his analysis by pointing to the unanswered question raised by the Israeli reservists: “Even more injudiciously, the court declined to consider one of the soldiers' central arguments: That the occupation itself is illegal. There are good arguments that Israel violates United Nations resolutions and perpetrates human-rights abuses as the reoccupation continues. By refusing to address this important question, the court prevented a sincere consideration of the petition.”⁶ What he does not seem to grasp is that

preventing “a sincere consideration of the petition” is precisely why governments, whether Israel or the U.S., do not recognize the right of either citizens or soldiers to selective conscientious objection.

Opposition to the Vietnam War often is misrepresented, or perhaps only mis-remembered, as though it stemmed only from the sheer volume of American casualties, but it was far broader in scope. Americans were forced by the depth and breadth of the anti-war movement to ask themselves and their government how we came to believe that anything could possibly justify carpet bombing of villages and the seemingly indiscriminate use of napalm. The growing body of draft resisters and deserters seemed to many Americans to be like thousands of “canaries in a coal mine,” a clear and persistent sign that this particular war was toxic to the polity.

Today the “refuseniks” are Israel's canaries. As Joanne Mariner indicated a few days before the Israeli Supreme Court's ruling: “Their refusal to serve... directly implicates Israeli policy in a way that a blanket rejection of military service could never do... Indeed, they present themselves as guardians of the military's legitimate functioning, claiming that ‘the price of Occupation is the loss of [the Israeli Defense Force's] human character.’” No democracy can afford to demand that its government demonstrate that its military engagements are just, and then refuse to recognize the concept of selective conscientious objection. Indeed, in the words of Arthur Holmes, selective conscientious objection is “an unavoidable corollary” to the theory of just war. Canaries in the coal mine are the messengers we most need to hear.

1. “Court rejects Israeli reservists' plea” by James Bennet, *The New York Times*, Tuesday, December 31, 2002.
2. Joanne Mariner, 2002, “Refusing to Fight in Israel,” *CounterPunch*, 26 December.
3. Kushner, Adam, 2003. “Justices dismiss selective objectors,” *The Miami Herald*, 6 January.
4. See Mosqueda, Lawrence, 2003. “A duty to disobey all unlawful orders, *International Law*, 9 March; and Popple, James, 1989: “The right to protection from retroactive criminal law: *The Nuremberg trials*,” *The Australian National University, ANU Online*.
5. Mariner, 2002.
6. Kushner, 2003.

JF

Whither Europe

into question the 'Danishness' of the ad's signatories, since a disproportionate number of the names sound Jewish. That ignites another firestorm of protest. My friend Albert, who immigrated to Denmark from Poland thirty years ago when they started counting Jewish names, asks if he has to look for yet another country. His wife Kirsten, an 'ethnic Dane,' notes that on issues of real estate, homeowners are disproportionately the ones who write in protest; on issues of childcare, it's parents and teachers, and so what? Is anyone tallying them? Albert, Kirsten, my wife Ann, and I are accosted on the street by a Palestinian who tells us we look like Jews and Americans, and he hates them both. (I reply in American sign language.) He feels emboldened to articulate these sentiments because the Danish Left has produced an atmosphere conducive to them. Whither Denmark? It's hard to say. Multicultural naivete is competing with resentment of Muslim violence, and knee-jerk left-wing anti-Israel bias with a long tradition of philo-Semitism. But at least the Danish authorities appear to have put an end to the beatings and stabbings of Jews in the streets of Copenhagen.

Norway: The most anti-Semitic of the Scandinavian countries, Norway banned Jews from even living there legally until well into the 19th century. Half of its Jewish population was murdered by the Nazis, with the complicity of the Quisling government. The survivors only recently received some compensation, and that only after much Norwegian opposition. Norwegians lead the anti-Israel boycotts, and their Nobel Committee's response to the violence following the failure of Camp David was to propose that the Peace Prize be rescinded from Shimon Peres. They were the venue for the Oslo accords, but they lay the blame for its demise almost entirely on Israel. Their most prominent Middle-East intermediary, Terje Roed Larsen, veers between support for Palestinian democratic reform and anti-Israel blood libel (the Jenin 'massacre'). Norway ranks down there with Belgium in hubris and bias.

Other nations run the gamut of behaviors. Germany generally, but not always, has the good grace to keep its mouth shut. The Italian press is not above anti-Semitic cartoons, yet its most prominent leftist, the redoubtable Oriana Fallaci, has condemned Italian anti-Semitism and placed the blame for the Middle East violence squarely on the shoulders of Yaser Arafat. Jewish children are assaulted in Dutch schools, while Gretta Duisenberg, wife of the European Central Bank President, extends her pro-Palestinian sympathies to jokes about the 'six million.' Finland hasn't been much heard from since 2001, when Foreign Minister Erkki Tuomioja compared Israeli occupation policies to Nazism. (That from a Nazi ally and USSR quasi-colony which watched the persecution of Soviet Jews with nary a protest.) Sweden is, as usual, neutral.

The recently liberated East European states evince rather less bias, in part because they admire Israel's ally America for its role in their liberation. (Although Albert, in his first return to Poland last year, found plenty of the traditional anti-Semitism.) The EU and the European Parliament, on the other hand, are hardly places where Israel gets a fair hearing. The degrading stewardship of Chris Patten, referred to at the beginning of this article, is only one example among many. Is this anti-Semitic? Not necessarily, if the criterion is trivially a "feeling of hatred for Jews." But if it is double morality for the Jews and for the world's only Jewish state, then there is no doubt whatsoever.

So can Europe be saved from itself? I think the jury is still out. There is a strong vestige of Marxism, with its hostility for Jewish self-determination and its anti-Americanism, coupled with a desire to prove the Jews just as bad, if not worse, than the Gentiles, thus providing a pernicious sort of self-absolution for European complicity in the Holocaust. Hence the penchant for calling Israelis "Nazis." But there is also now a reaction among ordinary people against the excesses of the chattering classes, and against some of the negative consequences of large scale Muslim immigration. Ordinary Danes and Norwegians, for example, do not respond well to arguments justifying

Muslim men gang raping Scandinavian women on the grounds that scanty dress is insensitive to Muslim norms, and in any case they weren't virgins. (Yes, these arguments are made, and not just by Muslims, but by the supposedly pro-feminist left-wing press.) The racist element of anti-Muslim resentment is certainly not to be endorsed. But the part which demands that immigrants to a democratic country become good citizens, and that good citizenship does not include attacks on Jewish fellow citizens, is to be welcomed.

Will Europe respond appropriately to a serious Israeli initiative for peace? Given its treatment of Barak, I am not hopeful. That is why I am glad that the proposed "road map" makes the U. S., not the Europeans, the arbiters of Palestinian and Israeli compliance. Maybe the Europeans will find their way back to a semblance of morality and fairness. Maybe not. In any case, it is a relief that the centers of Jewish population are no longer there. **IF**

ANTI-SEMITISM *Continued from page 10*

The Curse of Intolerance

again and when we met in the street recently, he avoided me. There we go again, I thought, but for the grace of time... The German and the Jew... Somehow, I assumed that our sacrilegious, binding history, granted us a sacred covenant that no German will hurt a Jew again. Yet for Germans who have not dealt with their history, personal and collective, people like me are a thorn in their side, constantly reminding them of horrors they prefer to forget. Perhaps even holding on to the illusion that killing the messenger will erase the message...

My second experience was with my next door neighbor, an American of German origin. I befriended him contrary to my instinct. One day, as we were walking together, he put his arm around me and said: "You Jews should not tell the world that the Germans made soap out of Jewish fat because it isn't true." Of course he knew that, because somehow he had access to all that ever happened in all concentration camps for the duration of the war. In *A Season for Healing* Anne Roiphe analyzes these issues with stark clarity:

As cowardly, self-serving, conscience-relieving, pride-enhancing a maneuver as this might be, it is nevertheless a solution to an obviously intolerable burden of guilt. To deny or distort the reality of the Holocaust provides balm for the still open wounds of collective national pride.

Today, Holocaust deniers are in no short supply. At first I didn't recognize it as such, because denying a piece of the Holocaust is more pernicious than the whole. When I came to, and asked my neighbor to never discuss the Holocaust with me again, he laughed.... then he became abusive, threatened me, and has not spoken to me since. I ran to another neighbor the day of the abuse and told him everything. Later on, I learned the two had become friends. The experience reminded me that I find bystanders no less offensive than perpetrators.

Does unexamined history repeats itself as yet another generation of Germans lashes out at another generation of Jews? Is it easier to strike out than to bear the burdens of shame and guilt? "A man will do anything to avoid looking at his own soul," said Carl Jung. Albert Camus mirrors this in his play, *The Fall*: "The way back home passes through that one place—that one hell—we want most to avoid." An ancient myth reminds us that to look into Medusa's monstrous face without the protection of a shield, is to turn into stone. Paradoxically, for those bound to our history, it is the suppression and avoidance that seems to have that effect.

Much has been made of the fact that second generation Jews and Germans share similar issues; anger at carrying a history we have not created, torn between so many abysmal, conflicting feelings. There is, however, a great and painful difference between our inheritance and it has permitted many on the German side to fare better in life than many on the Jewish side, as William James wrote: "Those who live on one side of the threshold of pain cannot possibly understand the psychology of those who live on the other side of the threshold of pain." The difference between the outcome of Jewish and German lives is an even starker contrast in the first generation. My mother's life, a slower gassing, was spent haunted by the demons of what she had seen

and experienced. By contrast, very few Nazis suffered any kind of retribution for their crimes, and most lived out their lives ranging from high political positions to quiet, protected lives with comfortable government pensions. Judge Einhorn, who has sat across the table from many a Nazi war criminal, told me that not one showed any remorse for their actions. If they were sorry for anything, it was for losing the war.

The two encounters I described raise a deeper question. William Grim talks about it in an article titled *The Eternal Nazi: Watching Polanski's 'The Pianist' in Germany*, which starts with the old joke that "Inside every German there is a Nazi waiting to get out." He describes his horror when an audience of upper middle class Germans in Munich, at the end of 2002, laughed repeatedly at scenes where Nazis were tormenting or killing innocent Jews. He goes on to say "You hear a lot about how Germans are so ashamed today of the behavior of their countrymen during the Nazi period and about how much they have done to atone for their past sins. Don't buy that bill of goods. If the audience of the screening I attended is any indication of German attitudes in general it doesn't augur well for the future." Later in the article he concludes: "And then it became clear as a bell. German shame for World War II does not result from a moral awareness of the innumerable crimes and atrocities committed by Germans. No, the Germans are ashamed because they got their rear ends handed back to them by a bunch of Yanks, Russkies and Brits who they considered—and still consider—to be members of inferior races."

So if Germany has not been changed by the Nuremberg trials or else their own conscience, and if "a man convinced against his will, is of the same opinion still," then the madness that unleashed mankind's worst calamity has gone underground to possibly be acted out later or in some other fashion. Here is another chilling thought: Perhaps the last six decades have sent the signal, after all, that they can persecute Jews and get away with it. The Wansee Conference House witnessed an encounter where Germans formulated the "Final Solution" to the "Jewish problem." Jan Blonski, the literary critic, elegantly offers what seems to be the Jewish solution

to the eternal German problem of avoiding accountability by lashing out. "To clean Cain's field, we must remember Abel. He lived in our house, on our soil, his blood has sunk into the soil, whether we want it or not. It has penetrated our memory and ourselves. Thus we must purify ourselves by seeing ourselves truly. Without that, the houses, the soil and ourselves shall remain branded."

As for a deeper, age-old dilemma of how to achieve and maintain our humanity, I am reminded of Judge Einhorn's comments when asked about the lessons he learned prosecuting Nazi war criminals: "I have seen and heard of people soaring to the heights of angels with acts of heroism and decency that can only be imagined by most of us. And at the same time I have seen and heard of human behavior so vile and base that you can only imagine it from the darkest fiction. In the end, the greatest lesson is that I don't think we will ever live in a world where everyone will love everyone else. But I would like to live in a world where everyone tolerates everyone else." **JF**

HISTORY *Continued from page 14*

Daniel De Leon: A Socialist Maverick

intolerance of other points of view served only to fragment the labor movement. The assumptions upon which he based his doctrines were not shared by the majority of workers. Thus, he was unable either to destroy "Gomperism" in the American Federation of Labor or to build an effective socialist organization outside of the established trade unions.

Daniel De Leon's failure stands in contrast to the relative success of other Socialists in formulating an anti-capitalist creed that had its roots in America rather than Europe. In 1897, Victor L. Berger and Eugene V. Debs, who had been converted to Socialism during the prison term he received for contempt of court as leader in the notorious Pullman strike, formed the Social Democratic Party. Two years later they were joined by a splinter group from De Leon's forces, and in 1901 they formed the Socialist Party of America. Although the Socialist Party shared De Leon's distaste for Gomper's labor philosophy, its leaders were gradualists who believed that American

economic society could be changed piecemeal by the democratic process. De Leon's personality and doctrinaire Marxism, on the other hand, inclined him to advocate revolution rather than evolution, leaving him blind to the possibilities inherent in the approach of Debs.

Sources

1. Beard, Mary. *A Short History of the American Labor Movement* (1920).
2. Brooks, J.G. *American Syndicalism. The I.W.W.* (1913).
3. Cahan, Abraham. *Bletter fun Mein Leben. 5vols.* (1926-1931).
4. Coleman, S. *Daniel De Leon* (1990).
5. Commons, J.R. and others. *History of Labour in the United States. 4 vols.* (1918-1935).
6. Epstein, Melech. *Jewish Labor in the United States. 2 vols.* (1950).
- 7 - ----- *Profiles of Eleven* (1965).
8. Gompers, Samuel. *Seventy Years of Life and Labor* (1925).
9. Hillquit, Morris. *History of Socialism in the United States* (1903).
10. Joseph, Samuel. *Jewish Immigration to the United States From 1881 to 1910* (1914).
11. Laidler, Harry W. *A History of Socialist Thought* (1927).
12. Peterson, A. *Daniel De Leon. 2 vols.* (1941-1953).
13. Reeve, C. *The Life and Times of Daniel De Leon* (1972).
14. Reed, L.S. *The Labor Philosophy of Samuel Compers* (1930).
15. Sachar, Howard H. *A History of Jews in America* (1992).
16. Wigoder, Geoffrey. "De Leon, Daniel" *Dictionary of Jewish Biography* (1991), pp.115-116.
17. Yellowitz, Irwin. "De Leon, Daniel." *Encyclopaedia Judaica. vol.5* (1971), p.1472.

JE

FILM *Continued from page 18*

The French and Their Hollywood Image

policies of appeasement and, therefore, he owes a debt to his friend Victor and those like him who saw the dangers of not fighting then. "They wanted to fight and we didn't. We got all the Victors into this." Even the character played by Gene Kelly—a traumatized man, broken by Nazi torture, who vows never to risk his life or even comfort for anything—is shamed by a teenage boy in the Resistance. The two friends and boy exult that "It's war again! It's to bring happiness again to millions of homes that we fight." At the end, the entire village population fights with rocks and bare fists against the Germans, burning their own homes in a Russian-like scorched-earth policy rather than submit. The film ends with the Cross of Lorraine fluttering across the screen to the exultant strains of the Marseillaise. Rarely has the cinema portrayed such an out-of-character event for a nation.

For all its faults, Hollywood, more often than its critics dare admit, hits the nail on the head in reducing complex issues and relationships to startling truths, sometimes even creating eternal myths. The motivation of the film studio in presenting the same theme in several films was the rescue of France's sullied, defeatist reputation in American eyes as part of wartime propaganda. Following Pearl Harbor, Hollywood clearly believed that the American war effort would be aided by the creation of a myth that France, the most powerful continental European power and democracy, had not really been defeated but "betrayed" and that the Free French were worthy allies and still the bearers of *liberté, égalité, fraternité*.

This was an important goal because the Vichy regime had alienated American opinion both before and after American entry into the war. In July of 1940, the powerful French fleet based at Oran in Algeria refused the British offer to sail for British ports and had to be sunk or interned. Vichy leader, Marshall Petain, called upon the French people to cooperate with Germany. Together with his Foreign Minister Pierre Laval, he encouraged French volunteers to work in Germany, called for the death penalty as

Rosh Hashanah 5764

To our Friends and Advertisers:

To place a Rosh Hashanah greeting in our summer 2003 Issue, please call (212) 366-1194 for rates & ad information.

punishment for French soldiers serving in “foreign armies” with the British, publicly expressed wishes for a German victory, introduced anti-Semitic legislation, participated in the deportation of foreign and French Jews to concentration camps, allowed Germany the use of French military and naval bases, permitted French “volunteer” pilots to join the Luftwaffe, arrested pre-war French politicians, and ordered military forces in Syria and North Africa to resist an Allied occupation. In the battle for Syria, “French forces” fighting with the British were arrayed against other French units loyal to Vichy. Finally, the Vichy government severed relations with the United States on August 11, 1942 to protest the “invasion” of French territory in North Africa. For much of the American public, “France” had become identified with the enemy.

In the fifth film, *Sergeant York* starring Gary Cooper, the action is set in the trenches of World War I on the Western Front. The greatest American hero of the war originally refused to bear arms as a devout “born-again Christian” hillbilly from the Appalachian mountains. His change of mind is brought on by a crisis of conscience that is only resolved by a random glance at the Bible and the injunction of Jesus to “render unto Caesar what is Caesar’s and unto God what is God’s.” These words enable him to use his marksmanship and courage to save his comrades in arms who are being gunned down by German machine-gunners. Nothing better indicates the American source of true heroism than the desire to save lives. When being awarded the highest French military honor, Gary Cooper is also kissed on the cheek to his great embarrassment by the French General Foch.

What is perhaps most fascinating about these films is that they exploited a theme that the American public found easy to relate to then and certainly today as well—an inept France, led by corrupt politicians, which is twice rescued by American guts, heroism, and initiative. In these films, the American hero is uncomfortable with the French fondness for glory, finesse, fashion, genteel style, exaggerated formalities, elaborate uniforms, and the epicurean delights of fine cuisine.

This last contrast of the cultural divide between France and America is a major theme of the sixth and highly successful film *The French Connection*. Who can forget the scene of Popeye on a stakeout on a New York sidewalk during a pouring rain, munching on a cold soppy hamburger and pathetic coffee while observing the two French drug dealers dining on the exclusive food of Manhattan’s most elite and expensive French restaurant? The essential difference is not the style but the substance of how to solve the problem and stop the drug-ring. Only the gutsy courage of the brash and “uncouth” American police detective “Popeye” succeeds in eliminating the drug dealers to the chagrin and embarrassment of the French police.

In all the war films, there is a heroic struggle often between an apathetic and defeatist French majority willing to compromise to achieve “peace” at any price, and those who are aware that such a view diminishes and defames all that they believed in as France’s “honor” and “mission.” Indeed, the dialogue of the dilemma—whether it is better to stand up early and risk war, or try to appease a dictator who will never be satisfied with another compromise—is an eerie reminder of events preceding the recent conflict in Iraq. Today, in the light of these American-French tensions, these films can be viewed again with added appreciation. Time has only reinforced their message. JE

Sergeant York, 1941, Gary Cooper, Walter Brennan, Joan Leslie

Casablanca, 1942, Humphrey Bogart, Ingrid Bergman

The Cross of Lorraine, 1943, Jean-Pierre Aumont, Peter Lorre, Cedric Hardwicke

Passage to Marseilles, 1944, Humphrey Bogart, Claude Rains

To Have and To Have Not, 1944, Humphrey Bogart, Lauren Bacall

The French Connection, 1971, Gene Hackman

FICTION *Continued from page 22*

Passengers

the evil ones under these circumstances? Enrico takes a well-worn notebook and a chewed up pencil from his khaki-colored canvas bag and drafts important questions to ask Professor Altman, regarding evil and relative morality and other qualities such as good faith or non-involvement. In an attempt to sort out the problem, he draws squares and arrows and flow charts. When his station arrives he rushes into the sliding doors, all excited. The teenagers in the carriage point at him imitate his walk, somewhat floating, somewhat lofty. But Enrico is not aware of them.

Karen also gets up to alight from the train at the same station, remembering at the last minute just before the doors shut, that she has to change trains. She takes off the headphones and walks around watching from the outside as the sleepy carriage disappears into the distance. She must speak to Frank and ask him why she always gets to the same point in the exercises. What is she missing? What should she do? Over the yellow line that marks the edge of the platform she watches the train become a small point of light in the tunnel and disappear. Opposite it is dark. She remembers the rumor that spread among the subway travelers a couple of months ago, that someone was pushing people standing near the edge of the platform under the wheels of a train. Karen carefully checks the people around her and glances into the tunnel impatiently waiting for the lights of the oncoming train about to arrive and once again carry her to another place. When the train is slow in coming she unravels a knot in the thin wires of her tape and puts on her headphones.

JE



Congratulations to Stephane Acel and Mara Hier Green on their marriage. June 15th, 2003.

*We mourn the passing of
our dear brother,*

JULIUS R. COGEN

*in Florida on
February 16, 2003*

*He was a lifelong member of our
movement and a career executive of the
Israel Histadrut Campaign in San Francisco,
Minneapolis, Cleveland, and Chicago.*

Ben Cohen and family

**Serving the Jewish community with dignity
and compassion for over a century.**

WIEN & WIEN Inc.

Memorial Chapels
Barry Wien, Mgr. N.J. Lic. No. 2885
Frank Wien, Mgr. N.J. Lic. No. 3005

1-800-322-0533

402 Park Street, Hackensack, NJ 07601

129 Engle Street, Englewood, NJ 07631

Serving all of Florida

www.guttermanmusicantwien.com

GUTTERMAN-MUSICANT

Funeral Directors
Arthur R. Musicant, Mgr. N.J. Lic. No. 2544
Alan L. Musicant, N.J. Lic. No. 2890

1-800-522-0588

To advertise in the Jewish Frontier, please call (212) 366-1194.



Simchat in the Kramer family! Karen Ehrlich, b-day on May 5th; Joshua Kramer, b-day on May 15th; Judy Mogul and Dan Kramer, anniversary on June 10th; Yael and Nadav Ostrin, b-day on June 16th; Max Kramer, b-day on July 25th; Judy Mogul, b-day on July 26th...

Ezra Weinberg

Mazel Tov on receiving your Master's Degree in Conflict Transformation in May from the School for International Training, Brattleboro, VT. Mazel Tov as well on your acceptance to the Reconstructionist Rabbinical College in Philadelphia where you will enter the rabbinate in September. May integrating your modern and progressive Habonim-Labor Zionist values with traditional Judaism's eternal values help you to accomplish the Tikkun Olam that is so critical to who you are.

Love, Abba and Ima

Steve and Dorna Weinberg

Reminder: renew your subscription!

To continue receiving the Jewish Frontier, please renew your subscription for 2003. Return this page, with any corrections below.

_____ \$20.00
_____ \$30.00

USA-Domestic 2003 Subscription
International 2003 Subscription

Name:		
Address:		
Address-2:		
City:	State:	Zip:
Phone:	E-mail:	

Note: LZA members outside of NYC and Life Members of Na'amat USA receive the Jewish Frontier as a benefit of membership. All others must subscribe!

Return to: Circulation, Jewish Frontier, 275 Seventh Avenue, 17th Floor, New York, NY, 10001-6708

NONPROFIT
ORGANIZATION
US POSTAGE
PAID
NEW YORK, NY
PERMIT #4124

The JEWISH
FRONTIER

SPRING 2003