



Daniel Jeremy Silver Collection Digitization Project

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and
The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

MS-4850: Daniel Jeremy Silver Papers, 1972-1993.

Series III: The Temple Tifereth-Israel, 1946-1993, undated.

Sub-series B: Sermons, 1950-1989, undated.

Reel
50

Box
16

Folder
910

Taking Stock of the Jewish Year, 1969.

Taking Stock of the Jewish Year

Daniel Jeremy Silver

January 5, 1969

With the exception of an editorial postscript, probably by some later hand, the book of Ecclesiastes is a pessimistic essay concerning the futility of the human enterprise. The author assumes that history is cyclical, ever repeating itself, never getting anywhere. There is no such thing as an unfolding of purpose or progress. "That which has been is that which shall be. That which has been done is that which shall be done. There is nothing new under the sun." Every generation is destined to repeat stupidities, follies and the evil of its predecessors. "All things toil unto weariness."

During 1968 I often had this sense of historical familiarity. The Jewish people had been there before. We had been in Poland for a thousand years and in every generation we had seen political figures appeal to the anti-Semitism of the masses to further some faction of their own. The Jew has been the scapegoat of Polish political life. So it has always been and so it is. Poland's university students were fractious. They demanded reform in the eyes of the regime. The Jew was responsible for this unruliness. Writers and artists demanded a larger boundary to their freedom. To the Communist party apparatus the Jew was responsible for these subversive protests. Moczar, the Polish chief of police, inflamed the passion of the mob by his viscious anti-Semitic tirades and unleashed a propaganda barrabe, which still being carried on, on the theme of the perverse and dangerous Jew. The Jew was again the victim of Polish political life, of Moczar's ambitions to supplant Gomulk, professors in the universities from positions in the government, and from the newspapers, the radio and other suddenly sensitive

positions. A generation ago there had been three million Jews in Poland. There are less than 30,000 today. The small number of victims made the tragedy seem less cosmic, but history was repeating itself in the nation where the ovens of Auschwitz had burned, the mass grave of Babi Yar had been filled and the Warsaw ghetto had smoldered. "That which has been is that which shall be, that which has been done is that which shall be done. There is nothing new under the sun."

In 1848 there were stirrings towards freedom and nationality rights in Central Europe. There was a pan-Slav movement in Prague. Louis Kossuth was active in Hungary. Men hoped for political reform and an end to the autocratic rule which had been imposed on Europe by the Congress in Vienna. Jews flocked to the banners of change, but in 1848 the pan-Slav revolt in Prague was put down and in 1849 the forces of Kossuth were defeated. Typically, it was the Jewish community that was the most severely fined. It was the Jewish members of the Reform groups who were most assiduously hunted down. A sizeable Jewish self-exile began. Many of our grandparents came to America in those days and from these lands.

Certainly Prague in 1968 must have been quite like the Prague of 1848. There was the hope of a larger freedom and the right of a small nation to walk in its own way. Soon that hope was dashed by Soviet intervention and the Jew was again both symbol and victim of the rebellion. A Jew, Edmond Goldstuecker, was labeled the arch-villain intellectual. A planned show trial was aborted only by his escape. In the eyes of the Soviet hierarchy it was the Jew and Judaism who were responsible for revisionism, that is for suggesting to the Czechs and Slovaks subversive ideas about freedom and intellectual responsibility. A Jewish

He spoke particularly of Jewish teachers, but he spoke broadly of all Jews whom

minister of state was the first government official to be released from his post. Jews in the television and radio industry lost their jobs. There was another emigration not unlike the emigration of 1848. Twenty percent of Czechoslovakia's small Jewish community of 12,000 left their homeland over these past twelve months. "That which has been is that which shall be. That which has been done is that which shall be done. There is nothing new under the sun."

But, we said, 'America is different.' In America there is no rooted tradition of anti-Semitism with its inevitable side effects of alienation and marginality. We pointed to the rapid movement of the Jew into almost every area of economic opportunity and political advantage. But is America really different? In 1968 we watched as a Jew was nominated to be Chief Justice of our nation. Mr. Fortas' nomination was not consented to by the Senate and though anti-Semitism was not the obvious issue of this rebuke certainly it was an issue. Perhaps even unaware the American people were saying, 'thus far shalt thou come, but no further.' You may come into our research departments, but not into the executive suite. You may join in our community undertakings but not our downtown clubs. You may sit in the lower court but not be the symbol of justice in our land. Thus far shalt thou go, but no further. "That which has been is that which shall be. That which has been done is that which shall be done."

In 1968 we had evidence that the Jew as Jew was expected to be less insistent on his self-respect than other Americans. New York University appointed the first head of its Afro-American Center dedicated in the name of Martin Luther King, Jr. The man chosen had a record of excessive language bordering on libel. He spoke particularly of Jewish teachers, but he spoke broadly of all Jews whom

he accused of "cultural genocide" and of having "poisoned the minds of black students in their ghettos. When the Jews of New York brought these attitudes to the attention of the largely white Christian administration the largely white Christian Board of the university they responded: 'you are over-excited, you are thin-skinned. Hatchett really doesn't mean what he is saying. This is simply rhetoric. Be forgiving.' We were patient. Mr. Hatchett continued to make these statements and they did much to polarize the black and the Jewish communities during that city's school crisis. Further protests were made, but we were told: 'he has a right to say what he is saying' or 'he is not saying what you think he is saying.' Then one day in a flight of ugly oratory Hatchett included among his catalog "racist bastards" not only Albert Shanker, the Jewish President of the New York Teachers' Union, but Mr. Nixon and Mr. Humphrey. The next day he was dismissed. We Jews must excuse and forgive, but when the non-Jewish political establishment is smeared with the same labels as those hurled at us then the attacker has crossed the bounds of acceptable behavior. "That which has been is that which shall be."

In 1968, the first time in many years, anti-Semitism became legitimate political language in the United States. This practice is only incipient, but it needs to be marked. The voices which were heard were heard not in the traditional places on the far right among poor white trash or the Klu Klux Klan, but among the northern and urban black militants. Poets, like Leroi Jones, were reading to their people their lyric effusions on Jews:

"selling fried potatoes and people,
little arty bastards
talking arithmetic they sucked from the Arab's head,
Suck you - the best is yet to come.

Oh how we beat you and killed you

and tied you up and marked this specimen -

dangerous germ culture will put you back in a cold box. "

Such flagrant anti-Semitism was not legitimate even in extreme circles, but anti-Zionism was. A strange misalliance between some black militant groups and the Arab league developed during 1968. In August Stokely Carmichael, founder of SNCC and a Black Panther, went before the Organization of Arab Students and told them that: "anyone who wants to join our cause must join your cause, " and "Black America is prepared to die for the Arab cause against Israel. " Somewhere there is a disjunct in history. For 1200 years the Arabs have been the slave traders of the world. They have gone into dark Africa and brought out black slaves and sold them to their own people and across the face of Asia and Europe. Arab literature is among the most racist in the world. Even now the Arabs of the Soudan are conducting a genocidal war against the black tribes of that nation. But the embassies of the Arab states have money and are willing to spend that money on militant groups who will add the cause of the Arab world to their catalog of challenge. Whatever the explanation for some black groups anti-Zionism became a plank so their domestic struggle against American racism and their attitude has spilled over to other groups. At the New Politics Convention in Chicago the white delegates had to accept sight unseen the platform of the black caucus which included a number of mendacious planks having to do with Israel and the legitimacy of her survival. We had been there before, watching heartsick as rootless young Jews who worship a restless political ideology were forced to prove their ideological purity by cosigning attacks upon their families and people. So it had been in Eastern Europe when many young Jews sought to follow the party line of the

Communist Party, sold their souls only to find that the far left is as prejudiced as the far right and that they had to belong to a Jewish Communist Party and a Jewish Social League, the Bund, for they were not welcome in the "stadt" fraternity.

Many of us were reminded of the events in Germany in the 1920's when the conservative Junker upper class made common cause with the mob, covertly passing money and political support, in order to buy some measure of peace. These groups had only one common : to scapegoat the Jew and blame the Jew for the inflation and the unrest and the other problems that beset Germany. There is no exact parallel between Germany in the 1920's and the United States in the 1960's; but we do see the possible outline of a manipulative political relationship between the Establishment and black militancy. The blacks want rights. The establishment wants some measure of peace in the community. If the Jew happens to be caught in the middle of their arrangements that's his problem. During 1968 some of the Foundations in New York and even the mayor of New York seemed surprised that Jewish teachers would stand up and say: you can't bargain my rights away to solve your problem. "That which has been is that which shall be. That which has been done is that which shall be done. There is nothing new under the sun."

But many of us said Israel is different. In Israel the Jew is not marginal and does anguish over not belonging. In Israel a Jew is his own master, a whole man. But Israel is a part of the world and is one small state among many. Who of us here is prepared to say that the heavy-handed, snappish, bearishness which has characterized Soviet policy towards Israel these past months is only a calculated geo-political policy, not in part the traditional pleasure of the muzhik in baiting the Zid.

70 raids and of the six lives and of the school children. There was no mention of the earlier remonstrances by Israel to the United Nations about these incessant attacks.

During 1968 Israel celebrated her 20th anniversary. There was much to celebrate; 20 years of freedom, 20 years of growth, 20 years during which Israel had emerged as a modern, humane and prosperous state. By rights Israel should have enjoyed its accomplishments, but relaxed with a well-deserved celebration when her Independence Day came Israel sought to do that which is most natural for any state, to march a patriotic pageant through its national capitol, this parade somehow became an international incident. The world seemed to choke a bit on the evidence of Israel's stability. For Israel 1968 was a year of nightly incursion and murder. During 20 years of Israel's existence 2500 Israelis had been murdered by the El Fateh, the Fedayeen and other desperados. Imagine what our reaction would be if during the last 20 years a quarter of a million Americans had been murdered by terrorist groups operating from Canada, and that is the exact population equivalent. Would there not have been retaliatory raids into Canada and reprisals and jet planes and worse? But Israel is told you must be patient. You must turn the other cheek. You must forgive. The Arabs are a hysterical people, given to this kind of activity. Learn to die with it!

Between February 14 and March 18, 1968 over 70 terrorist attacks are known to have been launched from Jordan. Those attacks cost Israel six lives and 25 men and women seriously wounded. On March 18, a mine planted by terrorists exploded under a school bus. Two adults were killed and 28 children were seriously wounded. On March 19 the army of Israel launched a reprisal raid against Karameh, the main command post of the El Fateh in Jordan. On March 21 the Security Council of the United Nations rebuked Israel for this raid. There was no specific mention of the 70 raids and of the six lives and of the school children. There was no mention of the earlier remonstrances by Israel to the United Nations about these incessant attacks.

I am not ^{much} impressed by the "hot angels" of the Security Council. Five of the fifteen nations on the Council refuse to maintain diplomatic relations with the State of Israel - India, Pakistan, Algeria, Hungary and the Soviet Union. One of these, Algeria, is actually at war with Israel. With some glee the Soviet Union has openly announced that she will not permit any specific condemnation of any specific Arab state for any specific act of terrorism. To the Soviet terrorism against Israel is legitimate and Israeli retaliation is a crime against humanity. During the year great nation states meet and exchange their pieties and found reason to rebuke the small state, the victim. Somehow they have yet to find occasion to read into the record, the ugly record of murder, sabotage and of bombing which Israel has endured. The assailant dangled bribes - markets, o. k. , ports - before the police and the victim was charged for defending her honor. The nation-states chose to overlook it.

Let me say a word about the nonsense that has been written in our public press these last ten days about neutral Lebanon, about the surprise of this innocent little state that she should suddenly be the victim of reprisals. Let us look at the record. The Popular Front for the liberation of Palestine has its headquarters in Beirut. It has operated quite openly in Beirut for a number of years. The Front has had difficulty in securing arms or in crossing and recrossing Lebanon's border with Israel, frequently has been praised in the Beirut press for its sacrificial dedication to the common Arab cause. Its commandoes are not seen as desperados but as liberators. Premier Yafi of Lebanon has inspected the sabotage camps. Their location and mission is not unknown to him. This is the group which has claimed responsibility for 70 acts of war against Israel. Last summer the Front pirated an El Al commercial aircraft to Algeria, set the bomb in the

Makane Yehudah marketplace which last month claimed a dozen lives and sent two blackguards to Athens two weeks ago with rifle and machine gun to destroy an Israeli aircraft. Only a miracle kept the loss of life to only one. The Popular Front has operated openly. The Lebanese government knows of it and has cooperated with it and encouraged its activities. . Such is the innocence of "neutral" Lebanon now so seriously aggrieved.

What other recourse does Israel have? If the nations of the world had taken action according to their responsibility and imposed military and economic sanctions on those nations which allow the Palestine Liberation Front and the El Fateh and all the commando groups to operate on their soil the Middle East would not have arrived at this impasse. But the nations have chosen to overlook and to close their eyes to the guerillas. The Arabs can infiltrate and murder. Israel can react. The other nations can use the cease-fire as a cloak for any act of war hastily. Israel must stay on its side of the cease-fire lines.

How would we react if Cleveland had been besieged these last 18 months, if every night there were marauders on the streets? Every time you went to a theater you were afraid that a bomb would explode? If every time you went to the rapid stop or the bus station you were afraid for your life? If you could not send your child off in the morning without worrying that his bus might strike a mine or his school be bombed? If every night some of your friends who farm in the outlying counties were murdered in their sleep? How would you react if every approach you made to the world body or the great powers to condemn and proscribe against such activity was met with cold silence? What would you do? I think you

would do just as Israel has done, assume full responsibility for your own safety, that of your family and that of your neighbors.

In March of 1968 Minister Tekoah told the United Nations that Israel was prepared to accept the Security Council resolution of November 1967 as a basis for negotiation. This resolution is somewhat vague, but it says in effect: There shall be a withdrawal of troops, an end to the state of belligerency, a guarantee of borders and free passage through the Suez and the Straits of Teheran and some resolution to the human problem involved. Israel accepted this package as an agenda for direct negotiations with the Arab world. The Arab world has accepted only one element in this package - the withdrawal of Israel. The Arab world and its most active partner, the Soviet Union, have insisted right along that the necessary prerequisite for peace in the Middle East must be a unilateral withdrawal of Israel. The Arab states obviously have in mind their amazing success eleven years ago when the world forced Israel out of the Sinai on the promise that the nations would guarantee the borders and freedom of the waterways. Israel withdrew. And Egypt returned and the nations were nowhere to be found when it came to making good on their promises. Quite understandably Israel is unprepared to withdraw until peace is secured. Thus the Soviet Union is not prepared and the Arab states do not even consider it. But, interestingly, Israel, having welcomed negotiations on outstanding issues, now becomes by some peculiar word logic which applies only to the Jew the recalcitrant one.

taken retaliatory measures against the Arab states. But our words go unheard and do not represent official U.N. policy. The Soviet Union is not evenhanded and has assured the Arab states against any specific condemnation or rebuke. So, because of our evenhandedness, the record is unbalanced. If one were to read

Now the bleeding hearts in the foreign ministries and the state departments of the world, whose eyes have dollar signs for pupils, say to Israel: You must make the first compromise. You must break the logjam. They don't say to Israel: make the first move and we will guarantee borders and your security. Oh, no. You be Christian, with a small "c," and we will be hard-headed. You lose and we win and what are you complaining about. "That which has been is that which shall be."

The new public relation term is a need for a more "evenhanded" policy in the Middle East. All sounds proper, judicious and reasonable. But how shall a policeman be evenhanded between an assailant and the one he is trying to rape? The United States has sent into the Arab world 25 times the value of the arms that she has sent to Israel. American made guns in Jordanian army hands which shelled the Neharvah in 1967, American-made guns in Iraqi army hands which shelled the Belsan Valley last month - if evenhandedness is a code term - for a policy which will deny the Phantom jets and arms to Israel, and while supplying new arms to the Arab states, this is deliberate deceit, a total capitulation to Arab demands and an Arab policy which has only one goal, the liquidation of Israel. If you want to see "evenhandedness" in action read the sad record of the Security Council over the last 18 months. The United States has been evenhanded in the Security Council just as the State Department would wish it to be. Our statements have been judicious; we have condemned the Arab countries when they infiltrated Israel, and we have joined in the official condemnation of Israel when she has taken retaliatory measures against the Arab states. But our words go unheard and do not represent official U.N. policy. The Soviet Union is not evenhanded and has assured the Arab states against any specific condemnation or rebuke. So, because of our evenhandedness, the record is unbalanced. If one were to read

only the official decisions of the United Nations one would believe that every once in a while a militaristic Israel launches a sudden thunderbolt against the peaceful peoples of the Arab world, and that is exactly the picture which is painted in any number of tracts which are circulating in schools and in churches with the seeming imprimatur of the United Nations. Such is the result of evenhandedness. You can't be evenhanded in a world in which Russia is pursuing her own ambitions, and make no mistake about it. Russia is not interested in Israel. Russia is not interested in justice in the Middle East. Russia is interested only in Russia and Russian ambitions now coincide with those of the more belligerent Arab states.

The official policy of the United States has recognized the implausibility of such evenhandedness. In June of 1967 President Johnson listed five points as the basis of American foreign policy towards the Middle East and they are points on which all men of good will could agree. But in the dying days of this administration we have seen the little foxes of the State Department come out of the wall and seek again to weaken America's policy of friendship toward Israel. So there have been in the last months bi-lateral conversations between Dean Rusk and members of the Soviet delegation in which they explored how far America could come towards the Soviet position. When these discussions were leaked to the press they were denied, but they have taken place. In the last six months the State Department has published a brochure intended for mass distribution which purports to give the background of the six-day war and ^{it} is the most creative background. Doubt is raised as to the legitimacy of the State of Israel despite the vote of the United Nations. The Arab attack on the Yishuv in 1947 is pictured as a civil war between Arab and Jew. The war of 1967 is traced to Russia, Soviet meddling and to Syria, but most especially to Israeli belligerency. There is no record here of the battle

plan developed by General Nasser for his attack against Israel and only passing mention of his proclamation of the war of liberation. No quotation is made of any of the belligerent statements of the Arab leaders. We have seen in these past six weeks a mounting program in the public press designed to convince the American people that somehow America has been too friendly to Israel, and that it is important now to disengage America of that friendship. We heard such phrases from the mouth of Mr. Nixon's envoy, Mr. Scranton, who went to Cairo and Amman and came back talking of "evenhandedness." We read such words in Charles Yost's writings, the diplomat recently appointed by Mr. Nixon to be the head of our United Nations delegation. A year ago in Foreign Affairs Mr. Yost published a rather interesting article explaining the origin of the Six-Day War. He wrote of Russian meddling and Syrian irresponsibility and what he called Israeli militancy; but General Nasser was hardly mentioned and Nasser, by sending his troops into Sinai and closing Tiran, is made to appear almost as an innocent victim of the forces of history. No one yet knows the position that the new administration will take. The disappointments may not presage major shifts but these will occur in any case unless the administration reasserts its control over some of the Near Eastern people in the State Department to whom Israel represents an unfortunate subject of conversation whenever they are just settling down to tea with their Arab counterparts.

If we can take campaign statements as the position of a man's then Mr. Nixon recognizes the facts of history and America's responsibilities and will exert himself not to be evenhanded in the sense of giving in to the Arabs, but at

being evenhanded in the sense of seeing to it that Israel has security, all the while working inventively towards political solutions. In April of 1968 Mr. Nixon wrote as follows:

Confronted with a diplomatic military policy of expansionism and adventurism on the part of the Soviets the American response has been halting and lame and ineffectual. Indeed, there seems to be no American policy at all in the region of the world where a single chance spark could ignite a local conflict that could bring the great powers hurtling together in a major confrontation.

What should American policy be in this area now that we have paid so dearly in the absence of effective past policy: First, the first urgency is for America not to allow the balance of power to shift in favor of the militant Arab states bent on a new war. To this end the United States must see to it that Israel's military strength is never at the level vis a vis. the Arab militants that will invite a war of revenge, the consequences of which we could not possibly foresee and which at all costs we must avoid. Second, the United must deal directly with the Soviets and impress upon them both the urgency of keeping their client states in check and the dangers inherent to the peace in any renewal of the kind of wholesale Soviet irresponsibility evident just before the recent conflict; third, the United States must take the diplomatic lead in forging an acceptable settlement. Included in the terms of that settlement should be solid guarantees of the currently occupied territories that they will never again be used as bases for aggression, as sanctuaries for terrorism, access for the ships of all nations through the reopened Suez canal and straits of Tiran must be guaranteed to include recognition of Israel's sovereignty, its right to exist in peace and to end the state of belligerency.

The new administration will soon come into power. Its policy is still unclear. If Mr. Nixon follows this campaign statement he will reassert the policies of Presidents Johnson, Kennedy, Eisenhower and Truman. We pray that he will. But in any case Israel is different. Ultimately whatever the great powers do Israel's destiny rests with her. As long as she is willing to gamble her life the initiative remains hers. Today Israel understands why the editors of the Bible added a postscript to the book of Ecclesiastes - to the pessimistic effusions which we have taken as our frame of thought. The postscript reads: "The end of the matter, all having been said, fear the Lord, keep His commandments for that is the whole man." We have never had a guarantee of survival and the dawn has never loomed that bright on the near horizon, but fearing the Lord, keeping His commandments, keeping our heads, our strength and our will, we have survived. We will survive. So let us face dangers, those dangers which lie ahead without flinching just as Israel is steady. American life has been good to us, good beyond our fondest dreams. If there is now some danger in our lives the answer is not to wring our hands and shed tears, but to continue on our way, keeping our self-respect, obeying God's law, our inner light: "Fear the Lord and keep His commandments for that is the whole man."

of
ations urged
Hatchett: "To
rant groups,
not merely
but in fact
ductive in-
tadition to
intellectual
a practi-
ght to fore-
own" in the
and black
were among

me students
ced to a dis-
Hillel director
is anti-Negro
is directness
udicals, with
Mark Rudd,
the quarry. If
ut of intoler-
en spared the
erance." And
pus harmony
econdary con-
nthusiasts for
sire to placate
ost charitable
at action. But
the suspicion
gh children of
raust, are less
than by anti-
is a good pos-
le civil rights
us would, like
prepared to ab-
to sympathize
dignant young
emotion."

roversy, who
as to the na-
emotion, was
eg his letter,
ouched, made
to the enor-

mous relief of NYU and to "alleviate rather than acerbate tensions," Mr. Goldberg recommended the confirmation of the appointment. With all parties aiming for peace and quiet as the paramount good, the solution was bound to favor those prepared to make disturbances. Since none of those opposing the Hatchett appointment were likely to indulge in violent demonstrations, the victory, with Justice Goldberg's sanction, went to expediency.

MR. HATCHETT, however, proved to be unwilling to compromise. Though his "frank talk" with Justice Goldberg led the latter to assume that a change of heart had taken place, the Justice was apparently misled. In the previously mentioned interview in *The Village Voice* Hatchett proceeded to re-expound his original doctrine with no sign of recantation. To his interviewer's suggestion that since Negroes were being miseducated in localities where there were no Jewish teachers, the explanation might not lie in the ethnic composition of the instructors, Mr. Hatchett replied: "If I were going to attack the Sanitation Department for poor performance in the ghetto, one of the first things I would point out is that it is 85% Italian."

Though Mr. Hatchett's supporters would view racial generalizations on the basis of the behavior or achievement of Negroes as intolerable, his latest statement has gone unchallenged at NYU. Together with Mr. Hatchett's sturdy re-affirmation of his right to "criticize" in the vein of his article without being branded an anti-Semite (anti-Jewishness should not be confounded with anti-Semitism since the Arabs are Semites, a friend of Hatchett present at *The Village Voice* interview explained), where does that leave the situation at NYU?

The principles to which Mr. Hat-

chett was asked to subscribe as a condition of the confirmation of his appointment were two. Justice Goldberg formulated them as follows:

1. The University is dedicated to being an open academic community in which persons of all races and religions are treated equally. Therefore, any member of the administrative staff must clearly demonstrate that he is free of any racial or religious prejudice.
2. A major purpose of the Martin Luther King Jr. Afro-American Student Center is to develop relations among all groups in accordance with the principles for which Dr. King stood.

Mr. Hatchett affirmed his dedication to these ideas presumably in good faith. He merely interprets them in his fashion and with considerable latitude. Under the broad umbrella of "criticism" any nastiness can take cover. Let me speculate on a not-too-hypothetical case. Supposing LeRoi Jones were invited to a poetry reading at the Center, and he declaimed his lyric on the Jews (*Evergreen Review*, December, 1967) whose final lines read:

Selling fried potatoes
and people, the little arty bastards
talking arithmetic they sucked from the
arab's head.
Suck you . . . The best is yet to come.
On how we beat you
and killed you
and tied you up
And marked this specimen
"Dangerous Germ
Culture." And put you back
in a cold box.

What would happen if a thin-skinned Jew on the campus, or hopefully a non-Jew on the faculty, were to resent this invocation to massacre despite its poetic merits? A defense of freedom of expression would be that Mr. Jones had made a factual reference: the Jews

Richard M. Nixon

Former Vice-President Richard M. Nixon made the following statement available to the American Israel Public Affairs Committee and the NEAR EAST REPORT, on Apr. 22.

The Soviet Thrust

"The Middle East today stands closer to the threshold of armed conflict than at any period since the June war. Outside of the cauldron of the Middle East itself, this new danger to regional and global peace can be traced directly to Soviet policy in the area—and indirectly to the absence of an effective American counter-policy.

"There is no question but that the Soviets were the losers in the six-day conflict itself. The belligerent Arab states to which they were allied suffered a stunning defeat; a Soviet-trained and -equipped army was humiliated on the field of battle and a multi-billion dollar investment in arms and equipment had to be written off.

"But if the Soviets were the losers in the six-day conflict, they are the principal beneficiaries of the uneasy post-war truce; and United States interests have suffered to the same extensive degree that Soviet interests have advanced.

"Their naval manpower in the Mediterranean has been augmented five-fold since the war. Their client states have been rearmed and equipped with some of the most modern of weaponry in the Soviet inventory. Their influence has grown in the entire Arab and Near Eastern world—from Morocco to Iran—as they have stiffened the spine of the militants with encouragement and arms, established naval bases on the south shore of the Mediterranean, and assumed the leadership of the anti-Israel league in the United Nations. For the first time in history they are in the Mediterranean in power, and solidly entrenched on the World Bridge.

The Halting U.S. Response

"Confronted with this diplomatic and military policy of expansionism and adventurism on the part of the Soviets, the American response has been halting and lame and ineffectual. Indeed, there seems to be no American policy at all in a region of the world where a single chance spark could ignite a local conflict that could bring the great powers hurtling together in a major confrontation.

"What should American policy be in the area, now that we have paid so dearly for the absence of an effective past policy?

Israel's Military Strength

"The first urgency is for America not to allow the balance of power to shift in favor of the militant Arab states bent on a new war. To this end, the United States must see to it that Israel's military strength is never at a level vis-a-vis the Arab militants that will invite a war of revenge, the consequences of which we could not possibly foresee and which at all costs we must avoid.

"Second, the United States must deal directly with the Soviets and impress upon them both the urgency of keeping their client states in check, and the dangers in-

herent to the peace in any renewal of the kind of wholesale Soviet irresponsibility evident just prior to the recent conflict.

Guarantees Against Aggression, Terrorism, Blockade

"Third, the United States must take the diplomatic lead in forging an acceptable settlement. Included in the terms of that settlement should be solid guarantees that the currently occupied territories will never again be used as bases of aggression or sanctuaries for terrorism. Access for the ships of all nations through the re-opened Suez Canal and the Straits of Tiran should be guaranteed. It should include recognition of Israeli sovereignty, its right to exist in peace, and an end to the state of belligerency.

"With regard to the occupied territories, it is not realistic to expect Israel to surrender these vital bargaining counters in the absence of a genuine peace and effective guarantee. However, it is also my view that for Israel to take formal and final possession of these occupied areas would be a grave mistake.

"It is my belief from my own visits to Israel and my own talks with her leaders that the one thing that Israel values more highly than the peace she desperately seeks is her freedom and national independence.

U.S. Friends in the Arab World

"If the United States is to help secure this for the future, then we must strengthen our ties with America's friends in the Arab world. The channels of communication that have broken down must be repaired and the United States must re-establish its position on the side of all of those, Arab and Jew, who are appalled at the prospect of wasting their precious resources on another war.

"To find a just peace in an area of the world that has known only armed truces and three major and bitter wars in a generation is not an easy task. But the United States is not without diplomatic and economic resources, and its private and public men are not without cogent ideas to get directly at the underlying problems of refugees and water. And I think that we cannot wait longer to make the effort."

PAST PROPOSALS AND ACTION

In his campaign for the presidency in 1960, Nixon stressed that the preservation of Israel is one of the essential goals of U.S. foreign policy.

He then called for efforts to establish freedom of passage through the Suez Canal, to end discriminatory practices, to raise living standards in the Arab world, to promote resettlement of Arab refugees and to increase support for Israel. Israel, he said, had demonstrated the effectiveness of free institutions and the democratic way by her technical assistance in Africa and Asia.

11/11/2020 10:00 AM

but I cannot see anything better than the present.

~~W R H S~~


Read from a new & revised
~~revisions~~
~~pages~~ new ~~pages~~ in the ~~revisions~~ ~~pages~~, The table of ~~the~~

Mikrocyclus MAE2AR - The main and central unit
Zentral - road free - need no more roads and support
 globally - need transit - need transit - need "to go"
 needed from & beyond "as the same under the name of the country"

[illegible]

There is nothing more to be said.
1848 was a year of unrest - called Europe. There were
some movements for freedom, including up to the large, some
led into the land camp - forced into the land reluctant
people of Russia at Warsaw, Prussia - in defeat the
June movements were not successful, consequently
they were forced to leave, the people no longer free to choose for
the future needed independence entirely under, European
by the people, many of the causes of the war were
of the suppression of these hopes. How different is it to be

the number in case we get asked what we
have done in the past.



Calling them an evidence of a double standard &
 judgment in NYU's handling of the assault & the
appearance Rebecca Carter! But clearly it was! Double
standard my defense middle was just with not

January 1968 La Rive June 1968 ^{no date indicated}

"SELLING FALSE PIPES
AND PEOPLE, THE LITTLE ARTY LASTARDS
TALKING ARITHMETIC THEY SUCKED FROM THE
ARAB'S HEAD.

SUCK YOU ... THE BEST IS YET TO COME

ON HOW WE BEAT YOU

AND KILLED YOU

AND TIPPED YOU UP

AND MARKED THE SPELLEWH

"DANGEROUS GERM

CULTURE" AND PUT YOU

IN A CAGE WRHS

and blood money. ^{AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES} appeared before
the Congress and I called them. I ~~passed~~ ^{passed} on the

"people were not our subjects and must be treated

Zionists, but "black people are ready to give

their lives for us and were against Israel."

2. money to keep - just now alleged Canada

officially must be helped - but money passed to public

support. In Canada, the manipulation agreements on

not yet long enough - but it is the possibility - a

financial parallel - as in Canadian aid - 7 years

imposed 200 million dollars on the Canadian people

Monday 28: Donned in Lifford. Donned in mid the Dunrobin. The
day of celebration 'Anticipation' does not appear to be. Was needed to
hurry. The Donned in at home - the house - but in London and of
the large reception. Was in presence of the Reverend Canon
huddings of David Green and possibly in mid house in mid house
at least of young wife in 2nd in the scientific proposition
benefit of house - note beneficial proposition



WRHS

On Feb 9th 2 small pieces of ~~the same~~ the same ~~material~~

Parliament Feb 11, 1919 - when there were 37 members

for the day against 44 votes 6 members 44

2000 members, The S.C. was about

on March 18th - 1000 members of the S.C. were about

2 weeks were held, 2 weeks were held

2000 members, The S.C. was about

on March 20th - 1000 members of the S.C. were about

El Tico - 1000 members of the S.C. were about

2000 members, The S.C. was about

1000 members of the S.C. were about

5000 members of the S.C. were about

1000 members of the S.C. were about

1000 members of the S.C. were about

1000 members of the S.C. were about

1000 members of the S.C. were about

1000 members of the S.C. were about

1000 members of the S.C. were about

1000 members of the S.C. were about

1000 members of the S.C. were about

1000 members of the S.C. were about

1000 members of the S.C. were about

1000 members of the S.C. were about

1000 members of the S.C. were about

1000 members of the S.C. were about

But we have now eliminated a disputed mean for it seems
have become preliminary to any case based on the document part -
delivered with conclusion - Not an specific - No goal
given under any circumstances based on the document
needs must be met after

There may be some recognition of Israel's position of the
attitude of these people with regard to the document concerning Israel's
concerns - The document presented to the United Nations -
which was the first document presented to the United Nations -
has been the first document presented to the United Nations -
with the aim of the document presented to the United Nations -
Israel must be able to present its case to the United Nations -
present ing UN in 1957 of the document presented to the United Nations -
To present the document presented to the United Nations -
Israel's position with regard to the document presented to the United Nations -
document presented to the United Nations -

Review - all cases
Israel's position 1957

for Israel must be able to present its case to the United Nations -
document presented to the United Nations -
Israel must be able to present its case to the United Nations -
document presented to the United Nations -

The document presented to the United Nations -
... ..

In every need my Washington letter to the - 2 by an agent
to cover people have indicated - LRT and others in June 4
1967 when he found someone really with NO ^{about} on ^{regarding}
grounded in the, and of illegality, suddenly refugee
policy - This policy will stand - but recently ^{again}
level to ^{in context} 100 million - 20000 per - State Dept will be

along Jewish people with to some was reluctant to take in the past year

~~2nd State Department memorandum dated July 1967~~
~~1) On Nov Dec Bush advised that the State Dept~~
should have no interest in the to have any
directly to the people - and lot of problems

On present the State Dept is at State
2) On Nov 10, 1967, the State Dept is a popular leader
of the 100 million per State Dept will be
small, copy to the State Dept will be
clearly, The 1947 State Dept will be in the past year
has been "a small number of people in the past year"

On the full knowledge of the "past year"
and the State Dept will be in the past year
address the State Dept will be in the past year
a small number of people in the past year

Populists of the State Dept will be in the past year
of the State Dept will be in the past year

have the State Dept will be in the past year

have the State Dept will be in the past year

unrelated & irrelevant?

Answer: in order to achieve more uniform results -
industrial, day, low, standard, adjustment, in June '67 & January
1968, long-term need by groups, studies conducted in
November of this year - to see whether there is any change
now due to growth?

In order to understand more thoroughly the growth -
Risk advice is given - which is the major point -
Russia very close to the U.S.

Before we accept any idea as being a balance
judgment and in order to understand the growth
at the low level of the growth of the growth of the growth -
from which level of the growth of the growth of the growth -
growth and very close to the U.S.

What are the main points of the growth of the growth of the growth -
in the low level of the growth of the growth of the growth -
the growth of the growth of the growth of the growth -
and very close to the U.S.

What are the main points of the growth of the growth of the growth -
all points of the growth of the growth of the growth -
has been indicated by the growth of the growth of the growth -
and very close to the U.S.

No. 1 member - John J. "Uncle Sam" Cohen after the
 1960s were also in 1960s before - to Charles East
 appeared on caravan to U.S. also George Aronson
 while you are in foreign affairs and there
 effect to succession of 1967.

Displaced new members past - new use
sales from business admission - had - to see a
existing past - these day not see to see to see
to buy first? names new of the new new
long to keep

The new to see



new
to see new - new new
new new new

- new new new

new - 1967 new new new new
new new new new new new new new
new new new new new new new new

new new new new