

WHY WE MUST STOP BEING "JEWS" OR WHY WE MUST BECOME "HEBREWS" ONCE  
AGAIN

An Essay on the Rebuilding of the Third Temple

## OUTLINE

What is a Jew? .....	
The History of the Jews .....	
Judaism and the Jewish Personality .....	
Render unto Caesar what is Caesar's .....	
Why we must stop being Jews .....	
Ashkenazim vs. Sephardim .....	
The Hebrews and Who is a Jew .....	
Old Testament and <i>Talmud</i> .....	
Thou shalt not boil a kid in its mother's milk...	
Thou shalt not commit adultery .....	
Fighting on the Sabbath .....	
Holy War .....	
The Yom Kippur War and Henry Kissinger .....	
The U.N. ....	
The Anti-Zionist Resolution .....	
The Sinai Withdrawal .....	
Israel Social Problems .....	
The Revival of the Priesthood .....	
The Rebuilding of the Temple .....	
The Wailing Wall and the 9th of Ab .....	
The Third Temple .....	
The Mosque of Omar .....	
The Occupied Territories.. ..	
The Old Testament Ideal or Why We Must Become Hebrews once again....	
Rebirth.....	

### 1. What is a Jew?

What is a Jew? Depending on the respondent, this word connotes a variety of meanings. To some, namely the Jews themselves, the term presents few problems. It means simply to belong to a race, a people, a culture, a religion, the history of a group of people that has very few parallels in the world. But to the non-Jew, this term can mean something quite different.

To the enlightened few, it might mean something of that intimated above; but to the vast majority it can mean something hardly even resembling it. True, there might be a connection in terms of cause and effect – that is, the understanding of the vast majority might grow out of some of the effects inherent in situations relating to the above facets of what a Jew understands himself to be. But such connections have long been lost, submerged in the unceasing flow of history.

In any case, they are too complex for the average man – occupied in the daily routine of his existence, particularly in his struggle for survival or at least his urge for well-being – to concern himself with – no less understand. Plus, they have been deliberately distorted, misconstrued, or even falsified for a variety of political, sociological, religious, and spiritual reasons depending on the time and place or the concerns of those directly involved in a given confrontation.

For instance, for the newly created and unified Spaniards of the Period of the Inquisition, the Jews were an alien, unwanted residue of the previous Period, reminding them of and threatening them with

division, their previous impotence and Muslim domination. For the mass of Eastern Europe, the Jews were the middlemen *par excellence*, the people representing the Aristocracy, doing their bidding, acting as their frontmen, sucking up whatever few pennies were left around floating freely among an indentured mass. No thought or concern was ever given to how they managed to get into such a position or where they might have come from or what their problems may have been.

For the Blacks in the Ghettoes in America, there is a similar feeling but, again, no other social forces are even seen or distinguished lurking behind the role of the Jewish shopkeeper or small slum landlord. The Jews are the incarnation of the '*White Devil*' that they experience and that is that. Besides, they have the whole weight of misunderstood Christian Dogma behind them to prove that they are right and the recent history of the Modern World, also imperfectly understood, both in German Europe and the Middle East to prove that what they imagine and experience is correct. No thought is given to why perhaps Nelson Rockefeller is not down in the Black Ghettoes exploiting them or owning property or where the other daemons of White Middle-Class, Bourgeois American Society might be and who they might be exploiting.

For the Nazi Germans, just forty years ago, the Jew was the impure imperfection in their racial stock, the bastardization of their origins: sniveling, pushing-in mass-upon-mass, wave-upon-wave, a bedraggled smelly horde from Eastern Europe, waiting to undermine whatever was newly-thriving in their National Renaissance. He was Semitic, he was sickly, his racial characteristics were usually readily discernible – they were not German. He was unwelcome and he

was unwanted. He had been admitted to German Society against the will of the mass or without even consulting the general public will in a systematic, bureaucratic regularization of the prevailing situation of the previous Century.

Plus, when he was admitted to the general commonweal, he very often excelled in a striking manner – whether in the arts, commerce, or the professions. He was the one blemish on the German National pride and character. He was a Cosmopolitan. He was the thing that was holding the German Nation back from achieving its true, deserved, and well-called-for fruition. He had, therefore, to be removed in whatever manner possible, at whatever cost, before the German People could really achieve their true National Destiny.

True, many Jews too are deceived by these experiences and by the views of the various Worlds they have gained admittance into in the past several hundred years. Also, depending on how aware they are of their identity or what it means to them or how interested or disinterested they are in the total problem generally, they might have varying definitions of what it means to them to be a Jew or what the word, concept, idea, Nationality, *et. al.*, "Jew", might be.

But it is not the intent of this analysis to linger too long on the various shades of Jewish understanding of what being a Jew might mean to Jews themselves. Suffice it to say that, when they are aware of the problem, then they come up with some formulation incorporating aspects of the concepts already enunciated above. It might be a Culture to them, it might be a Religion to them, it might be a Nationality to them, it might mean Peoplehood to them, it might be a Race to them, or they may adhere to some adjectival formulation involving "Jewish",

i.e., Jewish-American, Jewish-English, Jewish-French, or even Jewish-Israeli.

Inversely, depending on which aspect of the compound they emphasize most, they might be Russian Jew, English Jew, French Jew, Israeli Jew, or American Jew. This reverse formulation is particularly a problem with Americans who have not yet found themselves within the various possibilities of American Nationality. In Europe, it is much less a problem and the formulation English Jew, French Jew, Russian Jew comes more readily to the lips. This is because – whether one likes to admit it or not or whether one believes it or not, people think it and that is all that matters, that is what makes it true – there is such a thing as a British Nationality, a French Nationality, even to a certain extent, a Russian Nationality, although less so.

These Nationalities are much more homogeneous in character (though everyone knows their make-up is changing in the Twentieth Century) and the Jews living there are accepted because of administrative decisions made during the recent or less-recent past. They are allowed the British Nationality, the French Nationality, the Dutch Nationality, the German Nationality, the Russian Nationality, as a privilege. They are granted it. They live – in other words – at the leave of the real Russians, the real Frenchmen, the real English.

In America, this problem is very much more complex mainly because It is very difficult to say who the original real Americans are. One has a suspicion but, because of social conventions and the like, one dare not voice it in polite society for fear of being called a racist at worst or a cynic at best. The Black and the Italian, for instance have a very similar problem. Is he an American-black or a black-American?

Is he an Italian American or an American Italian? It is also more difficult because America developed legally in a different manner. It is different. That is all and the wishy-washiness of the formulation American Jew or Jewish American reflects this lack of clarity in direct proportion to the irresolution of the problem. Depending on what an American feels himself to be – either more American and less Jewish or *vice versa* – he defines himself accordingly and this is very often dependent on the amount of time he or his progenitors have been in the country.

Which brings to mind an anecdote which might be illustrative of the problem. Once coming back on a packet boat from India to the European Continent, I happened to chance upon an Indian of the Southern variety – coal black almost as the ace-of-spades. Since he considered himself, rightly or wrongly, or fancied himself an 'Anglo-Indian' as a result of which he seemed to be carrying a British Passport, he told me in no uncertain terms and very proudly that he was "*going home to England*". These were his precise words (a place, by the way, he had apparently never visited). I could imagine what his shock was going to be when he got to England and found that most people there were not really going to consider it his home, nor were they going to view him as being very English.

Now, if he had said this about America or were going home to visit America, one could have imagined there being more truth on his side and perhaps less shock at the initial confrontation (although here too there would, no doubt, be quite a bit). This extreme example is somewhat illustrative of the Jewish problem, and particularly touches upon the crucial difference between European and American Nationhoods

and, therefore, the meaning and value of their derivative nationalities and citizenships.

But to others, the term may have other kinds of meanings – some of them disastrous. For instance, the epithet "Jew" can have the connotation of a curse word similar to "Nigger" and no better than some of the more familiar daily expletives. There is the notorious Oxford English definition that of "Jewing" someone down or to bargain with or out-bargain another person often in a pushy manner. This has come into ordinary English usage and the common vocabulary – so much so that, even upon protest, the editors of *The Oxford English Dictionary* refused to remove it explaining, after all, that it was part of ordinary English usage and that word did have that meaning for the great mass of Englishmen.

That meaning is also widespread in the Western part of the United States and I have often come upon it. Once, when bargaining for a washing machine, I was asked by the other party whether I was trying to "jew" him down. There was nothing offensive meant in the usage or, at least, not as far as I could tell – it was just part of normal English usage as these people knew it.

I did not wish to tell them how right they were, that it really was a "Jew" trying to "jew" them down. Still there is something offensive implied in the usage. It implies certain characteristics of the Jew, caricatured throughout history so as to become grotesque: that the Jew is the business-type, that he is the middleman *par excellence*, that he feeds on and survives on other people's need or other people's misery, that he has no place within the normal framework of society, that he is an outsider – but not simply an outsider as a Black might be – but



an outsider who schemes, who plots, who preys on the good instincts of society, who takes advantage for his own benefit of precisely that element in society that is the most defenseless, that is the weakest, that is the most naive and most innocent.

The Jew does not have the honor of the ordinary mortal. Indeed, the Jew does not even know what honor is. How could he? Did he not, for a case in point, deny the most honorable and most noble human being that ever set foot on this Earth, the most beautiful, the most sensitive, the most golden, the most unblemished – in fact, the Son of God, 'immaculately conceived' out of the womb of Mary? So noble, so spotless, so free of blemishes, like a newborn lamb, was this person that he had to be 'immaculately conceived' and, not simply, for theological reasons. Did he not deny 'our Lord', the epitome of everything good, everything Holy, everything honest, everything gentle, everything fine? How, therefore, could the Jew be anything other than what he is? Who could expect any normal behavior from the Jew?

The Jew is not a normal human being. He is not honest. He does not even know what honesty is. He has no dignity. He does not even know what dignity is. He is a whining, scheming, bleating, crying travesty on what it means to be a human being. He is a "Jew". This is why he tries to "jew" you down. This is what is implied in "jewling" one down. Perhaps the speaker who uses the phrase does not mean to imply all of these characteristics and this caricature (and I, too, living in a Gentile World use the phrase, mockingly it is true, but still use it because it is Understood; it is what my neighbor understands and, coming out of my lips, it is all the more absurd but still I use it);

but this is what is implied in its use, this is what it is based on, this is what comes to mind as the centuries and centuries of human behavior that would be required for such a conception to spring up are focused on.

The Jew lives by other rules. He is not one of us. He is an outsider. The Jew will not hesitate to suck our blood if need be. The Jew is a bloodsucker, a leech, a parasite living on the decency and tolerance of society, and abusing this hospitality, this leave to exist. The Jew is a creeping, crawling, spunging vampire who would not hesitate to drink all of the good, the well-being of the host society if he were allowed, just to satisfy his own and his people's (the clan's insatiable appetite – the secret plot). As long as the Jew is alright, the rest of us can just starve. The Jew cares nothing for any of us. He is just a cancer feeding at the entrails of society. He only cares for himself and his own kind. He does not operate out of the same principles we operate out of. He knows nothing of morality. This is what it means for the typical non-conception of what a Jew is to have sprung up.

Recently a doll craze swept across France and the object of the buying spree was a little doll known as "the Jew Doll". The idea was fantastic but that it should have been so popular shows just how widespread the unconscious acceptance of such an idea, such a suspicion, such a conception really is. The doll was the typical Jewish caricature – the Shylock: the lean, forlorn, plotting creature, the deceiving look almost like that of the typical witch. He had black clothes, a black beard, and wore a black hat – black the color of evil not of light. He had the ever-present hook or aquiline nose drawn out

of all proportions and the lean Semitic features. Let us face it, like it or not, this is the conception—the stereotype of "Jew" for a large proportion of mankind — not everyone but a large proportion.

Granted that most of the meanings enunciated above are what have come to be known as the "stereotype" meaning of what a Jew is, but this this is unimportant. If they are operative, if people think in these ways, then they are effective and it matters little whether they are stereotypes or not. They exist in the real world and, therefore, we must set about to change them or, at least, some of them if we think it is worthwhile to change them.

But how can we change them? What is the basis of the problem? To get at the nature of the problem perhaps it is necessary to go back to the origin of the word itself, to try to understand what the word means and where it came from. The derivation is so obvious that many people have forgotten it or are unaware of it or, worse, have never even stopped to think about it. The Jews have not always been called "Jews".

First, perhaps, they were called "Hebrews", then perhaps "Israelites", then perhaps "Judeans" and, only latterly in the *Diaspora*, "Jews". Even today, many would like to try to get away from this appellation. In Israel, we have many Jews who prefer to call themselves "Israelis" and not Jews and who do not even think of themselves or like to think of themselves as "Jews". In the last Century following the Emancipation and in the wake of its repercussions in the form of vicious anti-Semitism, many Jews enjoyed styling themselves, for example, "Frenchmen of the Mosaic Persuasion" or "of the Hebrew Religion".

In Reform Judaism, particularly, there even arose "temples" instead of "synagogues" to accent this belief in a two-fold manner: one, to show in some way that what was being referred to when speaking of Judaism was older and perhaps more venerable than had been otherwise thought; and two, to emphasize when speaking to other non-Jewish fellow citizens that the idea of a Central Temple in Jerusalem had been given up or abandoned, i.e., we had deleted the notion of a Messianic Return from our prayer books and now we had our "temples" among all the other modern countries of the world. We were good little Frenchmen or Germans or Englishmen or Americans "of the Mosaic Persuasion".

## 2. The History of the Jews

So how did the word "Jew" develop? It is very simply the process of an ever-narrowing differentiation. Let us admit or assume that at the time of Abraham or Joseph the people we now know as "Jews" were called "Hebrews" – as the Bible implies or as scholars tell us, "Hebrews" to outsiders and "Israelites" to themselves.

We have in portions of the Joseph and *Exodus* stories evidence to show that the Children of Israel knew themselves in private as "Israelites" but when speaking to outsiders either referred to themselves or were called "Hebrews". "Children of Israel" or "Israelites" would then seem to be the national name for the people; "Hebrew" the generic. It should be noted, in passing, that "Israelite" represents a narrowing of the denotation "Hebrew" since Israelites are quite simply "the Sons of Jacob" or the so-called "Twelve Tribes". Whereas, if "Hebrew" includes personages like Abraham and Isaac, one wonders why it should not also include people like Ishmael and Esau. Abraham, for that matter, had numerous sons by Keturah, a third wife, and, as the usual reckoning of "Hebrew" in the *Genesis* text seems to include whole households, the extension of the term to Lot, his nephew, is not even beyond the realm of credibility.

The Hebrews themselves in the Old Testament text recognized the close relationship of all these peoples to themselves – the Edomites particularly, the Children of Esau (later on in Roman times Herod, a Judaized Idumaeon – Roman for "Edomite" – from the Maccabean Period, is even reckoned "King of the Jews" and was probably one of the main instruments, if not the main instrument, of Jewish destruction. Even today, numerous Jews worship at walls that he built seeing nothing

anomalous in this – “the Wailing Wall” of the Herodian Temple, for instance, built as a sop for public opinion in his own time, the structure at Machpelah in Hebron, which is of Herodian origin, to name a few), the Ishmaelites (the Children of Ishmael), the Moabites, Ammonites, Midianites, etc.

Muhammad picked up this weakness in the Jewish scheme of things and made it the cornerstone of his budding Islamic Faith, that is, if Abraham was the first Hebrew then the Faith of Abraham could just as easily come down through Ishmael as through Isaac; and, in his scheme of things, it did. It gave the Ishmaelites – or “the Arabs” of his parlance – precedence over or equality with the Jews in claiming “the Religion of Abraham”, the original monotheism.

Paul makes something of the same argument in his Letters in trying to discredit “the Law”, the Jews were fond of making so much of, by showing – no doubt correctly – that Abraham knew very little of such a phenomenon and especially nothing of an Aaronic Priesthood. But let us leave polemics or as it is more respectfully called in some circles, ‘theology’, where they/it belong and get back to our main problem.

“The Sons of Jacob” are, then, the core of what will subsequently come to be known as “the Jewish People”. These coalesce into a rather rough tribal confederacy at the time of the conquest of the Land under Joshua. During the period of the Unified Monarchy under David, around 1000 B.C., these people seem to make up a rough whole. But, whether they were called either “Israelites” or “Judeans”, has always remained something of a mystery to the present writer.

In any event, with the subsequent splitting apart of the Kingdom into the clearly more natural North and South, the South gets to be

called by its tribal name, Judah; the North variously Israel, Ephraim, Joseph, or Samaria. With the carrying away of the North by the Assyrians, the problem is further simplified and, for all intents and purposes, we have only the Judeans left in the South. This is not to say that all people from the North simply disappeared but, the South being the only viable entity left, all people appertaining to that grouping became called by that name. This was the name they were known by during the Babylonian Captivity and this was the name of the entity refounded on their return, "Yahud" – a variation of Yahudah – or "Judah". We are all, therefore, quite simply descendants of this one tribe or, at least, clustered with such descendants out of an originally much wider mass. We are all "Judeans" or, literally, "the People of Yahud". To the Arabs today, we are still "the Yahud". The German "Juden" even seems to retain a sense of this original "h" in its pronunciation. In English, we have simply become "Jews".

But so far this tells us very little. When did the negative characteristics, described at some length at the beginning of this discussion, begin to become associated with the word "Jew". Most clearly and most probably when the people became a "Diaspora" People or, at least, when they can be associated with the *Diaspora*. Of course, this can be reckoned from the Babylonian Captivity and the 6th Century B.C. onwards; but it is more probably connected with the much wider and later *Diaspora* that developed during Hellenistic times (the two of course cannot really be separated out so neatly as one *Diaspora* flowed into and contributed to the other and the "Return", when it took place, was not necessarily the substantial affair it is always reckoned as being in the folk imagination).

Certainly by Roman times the word "Jew" had taken on markedly distinct negative characteristics and this can be discerned in the writings of someone like Tacitus when speaking about the people inhabiting the Holy Land. It can also be detected in the New Testament particularly in the Gospel of John where, though Jews cannot readily be distinguished from Jesus and his band (unless we are to consider that Jesus and his band are distinctly "Galileans" while "Jews" are those people inhabiting the old area of "Yahud" around Jerusalem only, which is quite possible), they are referred to with some marked venom. Most probably this reflects – apart from the basic polemics of the Gospel as a whole – the situation in the *Diaspora* Community of Alexandria itself from where the Gospel of John is thought to have emanated where enmity between the large Jewish population and the other segments of the population, Greek and native, had become quite marked. In other words, in John, we have statements like the Jews did this to Jesus or the Jews did that as if Jesus and his followers were not Jews themselves but some other brand of being.

These negative characteristics increased in the manner familiar to all throughout the whole two thousand years or so of the *Diaspora* and already alluded to in the beginning sections of this discussion. They were negative in a two-fold manner – negative in people's minds in relationship to the Jews and a growing negative influence upon the Jews themselves, leaving certain marked national characteristics as a result of an incessant chain of such treatment as well as a result of the simple physical deterioration of the life the Jew was forced to lead and the characteristics of the later ghettos as being poor, overcrowded, landless, urban, and hardly healthy.



### 3. Judaism and the Jewish Personality

But what of Judaism – what is it and when did it develop? This is clearer to delineate once we delineate the problem of the Jews for Judaism is simply the Religion of the Jews. It is obviously Greek or Hellenistic in origin as the very idea of an "ism", i.e., a belief or idea must be. Otherwise we would not refer to it as "Judaism", meaning a whole set of beliefs, doctrines, and rules appertaining particularly to the Jews.

Certainly it could not have been referred to as "Judaism" in Davidic, i.e., prophetic times, and certainly we can in no way call the Religion of Abraham, Judaism. Muhammad is right on this score. Judaism, as a religion, really developed side-by-side with Christianity and, in this sense, it is a "*Diaspora*" religion – a religion suitable to the needs of a people primarily living in the "*Diaspora*". This is not to say that there were not Jews living in Palestine at that time but, by comparison with the Jews in the diaspora, they were a minority – much as they are today and, after the destruction of the Second Temple, even more so.

When Judaism was a religion endemic to Palestine in the Second and First Centuries B.C., it was a multi-varied thing and could in no way be called "Judaism" since there were so many different aspects to it. It was not linear but multilithic. Judaism, as a phenomenon, can only refer to what must really be called Rabbinic Judaism which in fact did reach the zenith of its development until the centuries subsequent to the destruction of the Second Temple both in Palestine and more importantly in Babylon. In this sense, it really did develop side-by-side with Christianity or, at least, Church Christianity – Greek

Orthodox or Latin Christian. Both had more or less achieved their final form through a series of writings by the Sixth Century A.D. and both in a very real way developed in opposition to each other. Both earlier had been part of the rich spectrum of Jewish life during the Second Temple Period – one perhaps known as Phariseeism; the other perhaps going by names like Essenism, Ebionitism, Jewish Christianity, or Nazarenism. By the latter name it is known in the *Talmud* and in the Hebrew language still today.

It is Impossible to conceive of a religion called "Judaism" existing where there was a Central Temple cult. This could not be "Judaism"; this could not be a "belief" or an "ism" consisting, as it did, of a series of rituals centering around a process of sacrificing. It was not a "belief" in the sense that Christianity is or in the sense that later Rabbinic Judaism came to be – to the extent that you could have Frenchmen, Englishmen, or Americans of the Jewish Belief or of the "Hebraic" Persuasion; that you could have "Jewish Frenchmen" or "Jewish Americans".

It was, quite simply, a Sacrifice Cult centering around a Central Temple and Priesthood. This could be an explanation perhaps for all the dissatisfaction, clearly evident during the Second Temple Period, that gave rise to all the sectarian movements so familiar to us we have been referring to. It was also the reason that, only with the destruction of the Temple Edifice itself and the cult surrounding it, could such a thing as Judaism develop. As this destruction coincided with the destruction of the People as a National Entity we are, for all intents and purposes, entitled to speak about Judaism as a *Diaspora* Religion.

Obviously I am doing polemics here and my arguments certainly can be countered by other perhaps more or less cogent ones, but it is polemics with a point. The point is that the Religion that subsequently developed and which we all now call "Judaism" (a tree out of the root of Phariseeism) has been considered to be co-extensive with the Jewish People and, to a certain extent, this has been or is true. But, with the Emancipation from the Ghettoes in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries, this tree began to disintegrate or at least to fall apart. By the Twentieth Century, this process has been accelerated – whether in the newly created State of Israel or in the remainder of the severely-depleted *Diaspora*, whether in the new concoctions of Reform Judaism or Orthodox, Conservative, or otherwise – they have all been found wanting or, at least, no longer sufficient to fulfill the needs of the vast majority of Jews, Israeli or *Diaspora*.

Another problem with "Judaism" as we have come to know it is that, in being considered coequal or coextensive with the Jewish People (which for a long time in the Middle Ages, before the Modern Period, the Emancipation from the Ghettoes, and the enfranchisement of the Jews, it was); many of the problems already discussed in relation to the term "Jew" are also to be found in relation to the National Religion presently practiced. Since Judaism, as it had come to be known by the Sixth or Seventh Century C.E., was primarily Talmudic Judaism (with the single aberration of Karaism, which did not really count for very much or produce any longterm lasting effect), it was based on many of the precepts, practices, and points-of-view to be found in the *Talmud* – not necessarily the Bible.

The two can in no way be considered coextensive except by the most pious religious zealot. This book was mainly based on a territorialless and landless nature of Jewish existence (though admittedly it contains a full compendium of agricultural datings, festivals, and practices – interesting, to be sure, though not very useful for the Modern Period). By its very nature, it tended to produce and minister to an urban people, a middle or lower-class people, a nation of peddlers and the like, a nation of money-lenders as the world came to see them – pawnbrokers, petty financiers, and later-on financiers and capitalists in the real sense.

The problem was and is that, associated with these professions and life-styles, were many of the characteristics detested by most European Peoples (and, for that matter, the Arabs and other Peoples of the Middle East) – certainly the lower classes and, to a certain extent though less so, the upper classes – who during the Middle Ages and well past the French Revolution felt themselves degraded by coming into contact with such practices and personal traits. The lower classes – the serfs, peasants and other indentured laborers or guildspeople – harbored their antagonisms for their own equally-understandable reasons. Therefore the "Jews", as we have now come to know them, found themselves disliked on the basis of their alien-ness and unwillingness to surrender to local custom and on the basis of their Religion – itself mainly to be found in the *Talmud* and other addenda and compendiums to it.

Could this be the reason for the so frequent burnings of the *Talmud* in the Middle Ages? Most probably. It could not have been simply secret fear, because the surrounding host populations did not know

what the Jews were teaching and studying in it. Of course, it was also contempt and hatred as a rival Religion to Christianity – a rival supplement to the Old Testament and a Religion identified with the very traits which the Christians and all other landed peoples despised.

They did not despise the Old Testament. They could not, not the Christians or the Muslims for that matter. It was considered a holy book just like their own, for the very claims of their various religions were based on it.

No, what they despised was the *Talmud*, the Jewish personality that emerged from it, and the Jewish practices that were based on it. Whatever they might think of the Old Testament or the Old Testament Priesthood or sacrifice ceremonies – whether superseded by Christianity or Islam or not – they could not despise them. They might consider them outdated but not despicable since, these were part of an earlier incarnation of their very Religion itself. Besides, subconsciously, they no doubt recognized these practices as the valid expressions, however primeval, of a Landed People. For the "Jews", unfortunately, though respecting and coveting the Old Testament, the Religion of the Old Testament was no longer their Religion; and, if the numerous addenda and additions to ritual and practice on the basis of *Halacha* (Received Custom), were not enough, then you had the destruction of the Temple, priesthood, and national existence to clinch the case.

But this very same problem in its mirror form is the problem of the Jews today. They find themselves in a position unparalleled in their history, except perhaps in Second Temple Period times. What has, in

effect, happened – with the sudden re-emergence of a National Existence in Palestine, however tenuous, however recent, whatever the problems – is a reversal in the process of their National History.

As this existence grows more substantial – increasing in relation to the *Diaspora* in other words, as the preponderance of the Jewish population in the *Diaspora* relative to the National Home diminishes as it already has (unfortunately at quite a rapid rate) owing to the Hitler debacle and goes on doing so not only because of the natural increase in Palestine and immigration, but because of intermarriage, assimilation, and the obvious erosion of the Jewish Personality in the *Diaspora* – the process will go further and further back into Jewish History approaching more and more the situation as it was in completely Territorial times, i.e., Old Testament times (we are not speaking here of the Patriarchal Period or the Exodus obviously but the Period before the Babylonian Captivity).

However, as already intimated, the Religion they now carry with them in the *Diaspora* and which they brought back to Palestine with them – being largely a post-Palestinian development – is hardly sufficient to meet their present needs. If the truth were told, it cannot really be said to have met their needs – except for a very small minority – for quite some time now despite the almost constant attempts at reaching some reform or synthesis over the last Century and a half.

This was largely the root of the Zionist Movement in any case, dissatisfaction with the results of emancipation, and equal dissatisfaction for the most part – though no one denies the Religious Sector of the Zionist Movement – with the attempts at Reform and Reconstruction then going on and then in sight. If anyone wants the

proof of this assertion about the inadequacy of the Jewish Religion in its present forms – despite the attempts of such zealously-minded groups as the *Habad*, the Reconstructionists or what is now euphemistically referred to as "Fourth Movement Judaism" to reverse this trend – to meet the needs of the greater part of the Jewish People, whether in the *Diaspora* or in Israel, one only has to look at the present generation of Jewish youth – again whether in the *Diaspora* or in Israel – and see how completely disoriented they are, how completely "un-Jewish" (in a religious sense, though not necessarily in a nationalistic sense) they feel, how prone to intermarriage they are (particularly in Europe and America), and how unconscious they are of the basic problem of their existence – the problem of being Jewish.

If one would like to go back further into the past century or two centuries, one could detect, this very same process at work in the numerous disaffections (Felix Mendelssohn's whole family for a start); the trendy tendencies towards liberalism and socialism (our Marxes, Trotskys, and Luxembourgs to mention the best known – not to mention the other sides of the coin, our Disrealis, Kissingers, and Goldwaters who are comparatively rarer); and of course, the almost total inadequacy of the Jewish people (except perhaps for the political wing of the Zionist movement, and the later "Revisionists") to foresee the earthquake that was coming (Jabotinsky's words, not mine), to take proper cognizance of it, or to deal with it in any effective manner when it had arrived with all of its gruesome and catastrophic consequences.

One is not here impugning the bravery of the Jewish people or their lack of the will to resist the Nazi menace, which is a sensitive topic

of charge and counter-charge in numerous quarters, but just that they were unprepared, unsustained, and therefore unable to mount even the facsimile of a successful resistance effort despite the undoubtedly countless instances of personal heroism and self-sacrifice, most of which by the very nature of things had to have gone unrecorded. The tragedy of these sacrifices is – because of this lack of social, national, and communal unity – they counted for naught in the scheme of things or appear to today's youth to have counted for naught. Why, because they did nothing to impede the progress of these overwhelming waves of destruction.

One has only to compare these sacrifices with the numerous sacrifices that young men are called to make in the Israeli Army over a period of three or four wars,<sup>1</sup> which are really much smaller in scope given the number of casualties sustained or the numbers of people involved in the total endeavor; but, because of the proximity, solidarity, and physical coherence of the National Heartland, the impact of each sacrifice becomes so much more significant, so much less futile and anonymous, and so much more telling on the National survival regardless of how numerically more insignificant the number.

The Jewish Religion in its Rabbinic form does not give us an adequate yardstick or inspiration for behavior now that we have become a Territorial People again. This is not to say that it did not perform its work well at providing for National Survival in the *Diaspora* at least until the end of the Middle Ages (dare one suggest that the Jewish Religion in its Rabbinical form had a vested interest in the survival of the *Diaspora* and, therefore, its prolongation? One dare not suggest this for the moment, but it is a possibility for future



consideration), as it is wont to contend in almost all its history books<sup>2</sup> and, indeed, one might even contend it was created or developed to serve just such a constellation of circumstances.

One assumes that the above statement is self-evident at least as regards the present remnants of the *Diaspora*. One has only to go into the empty synagogues and temples on almost any Friday night or Saturday morning – except for the most important occasions and holidays – for verification of this point. If this proof is considered insubstantial by the reader, further proof is beyond the scope of this discussion and would have to await the collection of different and/or more detailed documentation. As far as Israel is concerned – the territorial focus now of our People – it is also inadequate; but this proof falls within the scope of this paper and will comprise much of the remaining documentation and argumentation.

Rabbinic Judaism, Talmudic Judaism, or *Halachic* Judaism – whatever you would like to call it – is not a Battlefield Religion. Quite the contrary. If ever there was a religion dedicated to the proposition of 'turning the other cheek', it is the religious impetus and embodiment provided by Judaism in its Rabbinic form. The Jewish People have proved this by their behavior over the last two thousand years. They have given the final proof of this in the last half century when they went meekly – 'as lambs' as it is said in the Christian sense, to their slaughter – and the very image of Holocaust/burnt offering in both the Jewish and Christian sense is a very telling metaphor for this incomparable event.<sup>3</sup>

So much of this sort of behavior has become identified with being Jewish and Jewish behavior and Jewishness, at least in the *Diaspora*,

and so much of the Religion of Talmudic Judaism has become identified with the whole of the Jewish People in the *Diaspora* that they are quite literally undifferentiable. The epithet "Jew" in most countries – aside from its pejorative monetary connotations – has almost become a byword for "coward" and this, too, was the image that accrued to "the Jew", whether in supposedly 'Christian' but really warlike, Europe or in those countries dominated by Islam where no pretense was ever made at being un-warlike; as has already been alluded to at the beginning of this discussion: the cringing, deceitful, money-grubbing, cowardly, devious, selfish, ignoble, lacking-in-honour, decency, and self-respect, obsequious Jew.

Even the Nazi butchers or S.S.-Men, who put these Jews to death and who were themselves nominally 'Christian' (though clearly nothing of the sort) did not in many cases by their very own testimony think they were doing anything very wrong, these Supermen, *Übermenschen*; for the Jews – along with the slaves, gypsies, and other racially-suspect peoples, but particularly the Jews – were *Untermenschen* i.e., sub-men. Therefore putting them to death or starving them or putting them through horrendous tortures or dehumanizing experiences was no great disservice to mankind` since they could hardly be considered "men" in any way at all. I think I am accurately characterizing the Nazi mentality as it displayed itself in a large number of instances. It was more like putting a dog out of misery.

That Jew and coward were very often considered synonymous is a very real experience to most people who grew up in an American suburban culture-frame. However, should one doubt this too, one has only to look at the novels of such people as Leon Uris and Norman Mailer or

characterizations of the Ernest Hemingway-type Robert Cohns in *The Sun also Rises* of the Jew out to prove he too has "guts", to convince oneself of this very real problem of most American Jews I have met. It also goes a long way towards explaining the very real enthusiasm of the Jewish man-on-the-street - very often assimilated, very often in a cultural vacuum symptomatic of the American maelstrom, very often irreligious or unreligious - for the experience of the Jewish People in Israel.

There are also numerous wartime stories of Jewish soldiers in the American Army to bear this out. In the smaller, more tightly-organized and compact surviving European Jewish Communities, threatened as they were and still are to a certain extent with extinction; this sympathy for Israel goes unquestioned and is understandable. But in supposedly assimilated America, where every man is free and the equal of his brother, where there are supposedly no religious or sectarian barriers, such a broad and overwhelming sympathy and identification is nothing less than startling.

How often does one hear the expression among older or middle-aged Jews, "The Israelis make me feel like a man again? I can be proud of the fact I am a Jew again. I don't have to make excuses for being Jewish anymore"; and the upsurge of these testimonial encouragements and words-of-praise is particularly evident after successful wars in what has now become understood as a very war-like and still frontier-oriented, shoot-from-the-hip America - such as the Independence War, the Sinai Campaign; and, of course, nothing equalled the unparalleled outpourings after the Six-Day War. How is this to be explained, except in terms of a Walter Mitty-type complex of the average man-on-the-

street American Jew?

This is not to say that all Jews are automatically cowards. We know this is not true and the contrary is more likely, nor that Rabbinic Judaism preached or fostered a religion of cowardice. This certainly is not the case since nothing of the sort was ever mentioned in any Rabbinic document. Only this was the impression the more war-like Europeans (and the Europeans are possibly composed of the most war-like peoples on earth) and their derivative extension in America, as well as the more war-like Muslims, received of the fact and nature of Jewish existence as compounded over the last two thousand years: the kinds of trades Jews operated in, the kinds of business pursuits they were wont to pursue, the kinds of endeavors closed to them (specifically, agriculture, laboring, land-owning, and making war), and their tolerance, forbearance, and even acumen at bearing all this. This, combined with the negative feelings harbored against them as strangers, aliens, religious rivals, economic sorcerers, and the like, was enough to produce the impression here being described.

#### 4. Render unto Caesar what is Caesar's

If any religion embodied the New Testament dictum to the letter and any people in its behavior over a period of centuries to a tee, "render under Caesar what Is Caesar's and unto God what is God's" – attributed to Jesus in the New Testament and, therefore, considered a fundamental doctrine of Christianity – it was the Jewish Religion as developed by the rabbis and the Jewish People in its behavior over the last two thousand years.

Let it here be stated that this dictum was not a dictum of the Zealots of Jewish War renown and during the Period of the Second Temple as it was not a dictum of various other groups of Jews during that very multi-faceted Period. Their dictum might be stated as just the opposite which is perhaps what led them into taking part in what some people might have considered a very disastrous war. That is, "Everything is God's and do not render unto Caesar any of it."

This philosophy might also characterize very well the original Maccabean behavior as portrayed in Books I and XX of the *Maccabees*, for whom we celebrate the *Hannukah* Festival, as it would the celebrated and controversial *Hassidaeans* of that same Period. The Maccabees were not really very popular in the *Talmud* – particularly Judas Maccabee who is hardly referred to at all. Were it not for the Maccabean Books (and the records of Josephus), which were not included in the Rabbinic version of the Old Testament text as collected around the First-Second Centuries C.E., we might know nothing about him.

The present writer would even go so far as to doubt that this 'Rendering' dictum was originally one of the early teachings of the Jewish-Christian Community in Jerusalem either since they, too,

disappeared around the time of the First Jewish Revolt against the Romans in 67-70 C.E., leaving to Paul and his Hellenistic/Asiatic (Asia Minor) Christianity a clear field – but probably one adopted by the his Christians from successful Rabbinic practice in order to ingratiate themselves with the Roman and Greek Peoples generally after the unpopular Jewish Uprisings of 67 and 132-36 C.E.

Paul, after all, admits in Galatians to having originally been a Pharisee, having learned Pharisaic doctrine at the knees of one of its great teachers Gamaliel the 1<sup>st</sup> – a grandson of Hillel. The “Jesus” we know admits to no such thing even in the fairly disjointed reports of the Gospels. As a matter of fact (and perhaps as a matter of polemic), he is always portrayed as being at odds with the Pharisees – the progenitors of *Halachic* or Talmudic Judaism. It should also be noted, if the reports of the observers in the New Testament are correct, that the first place these early Christian itinerants always went to was the local synagogue, where they were more often than not, permitted to speak – certainly the Pharisaic kernel of the hallowed Rabbinic Jewish institution by the same name we know today.

Not only is this practical aspect of Rabbinic Judaism evident in the behavior of Yohanan Ben Zakkai – who was considered to be the last and youngest of Hillel’s students and in the dispute of Hillel vs. Shammai, an Hillelian (though scholars have doubted the tenuous dating of the biographical connection) – in his escape from Jerusalem and his receiving permission from the Romans to set up a Rabbinic Academy and Sanhedrin at Yavneh; this event, too, is generally regarded by all and sundry as the crucial event and keystone of the founding of what we now refer to quite facilely as Judaism, i.e., Talmudic or *Halachic*

Judaism.

Another aspect of Hillel's teaching(perhaps the most revered forefather of early Rabbinic teaching to the extent that almost all Palestinian *Nasis*, i.e., Heads, Ethnarchs, or Patriarchs as recognized by the later Roman and Byzantine Roman Empires, were his direct descendants as well as being descendants of David, since like "Jesus" Hillel was reckoned a descendant of David), the contrapositive of which is commonly acknowledged to have found its way into the New Testament and is among the most renowned teachings of "Jesus", is: "Do not do unto others as you would not have them do unto you"<sup>4</sup> – and perhaps even a third, considered by many to be the most important Commandment of the Bible, but delivered by Hillel in joking fashion while supposedly standing on one foot, "Love thy neighbor as thyself."

These three aspects of Hillelian Theology, incorporated into Rabbinic Judaism at its core (not to mention Early Christianity) are enough to explain the peaceful, almost docile, behavior of the Jewish People thereafter over the centuries – to say nothing of their forbearance and incessant optimism even under the most deleterious circumstances. It is not, however, to say anything about their other traits for which throughout the centuries they were incessantly caricatured and which are a product of aspects of their existence such as commercial dealings and the preposterous circumstances under which they were forced to live in the various countries of the *Diaspora*.

The connection of course between Hillel and Jesus, as he is portrayed in the New Testament,<sup>5</sup> has not first been recognized by this author but is a generally acknowledged fact by a wide circle of scholars. This is perhaps a sufficient analysis of why Jews have often

been portrayed, and nowhere with more poignancy than during the Concentration Camp experiences of the Second World War as displaying typically "Christian" behavior to the core – while Christians, the very people who have persecuted the Jews over all these centuries and were the purveyors of these "Death Camps", very often do not display it.

It is also a reason why Nietzsche and others at the end of the Nineteenth Century<sup>6</sup> came to see Christianity as a pernicious "Jewish" plot to undermine the Western World – particularly the originally "Greek" Pagan Peoples of Europe – which of course it was not. D.H. Lawrence, too, felt something of the same thing and also made something of the same mistake (being an adept of Nietzsche), though he preferred the "Pagan" to the "Greek".

In fact, 'Christianity' was an eclectic Hellenistic amalgam and only "Jewish" in so far as Rabbinic Judaism subsequently became synonymous with Jewishness. These things were not necessarily "Jewish" at the time.<sup>7</sup> As a matter of fact, both Nietzsche and Lawrence demonstrated on numerous occasions their admiration for the writing style and general cultural content of the Old Testament, and could on the whole see nothing wrong with the doctrines evinced therein.



## 5. Why we Must Stop Being Jews

But what has such behavior to tell the Israelis in their present situation of continual warfare with their neighbors – almost verging in some of its ramifications on Holy War? What has it to tell an old-style "Jew" who has himself found himself called upon to fight in several wars and is now a *Haganah* (Jewish Home Guard) Volunteer or who has lost large portions of his family in concentration camps or a single or only son or several sons in the incessant Arab-Israeli Wars?

What has such behavior or the spiritual values identifiable behind such behavior to tell a generation of young Israelis or *Sabras* grown up under the constant threat of war? They themselves might already have fought in three or four wars. At eighteen or nineteen they might have found themselves entrenched at the Suez Canal facing a human wave of fanatic Egyptian invaders or who might have seen one, two, or three of their best friends die beside them. They might have lost a brother or even two or an uncle or a father, or a young Israeli girl, who has lost her fiancée or husband or brother or loved one?

The point is, nothing. Rabbinic or *Halachic* Judaism, no matter how it is interpreted by some of its adherents, is not a Fighting Faith and, even though some of these adherents might derive spiritual sustenance from it, the majority do not. But the spiritual problems of fighting an endless war inside a tank and seeing wave upon wave of one's friends killed, and perhaps knowing one will be killed in the next few moments oneself are not the only problems life in the *Diaspora* and the religious values developed as a concomitant to such life has ill-prepared the Jewish People at the present time to cope with it.

There are other problems. Problems dealing with international behavior, problems dealing with the proper way to treat one's enemies, one's friends – the proper way to deal with conquered territories for instance. There are problems which are associated with losing a given war, or seemingly losing a given war, and then being ready to come back and fight again; and there are problems connected with winning a given war as there were during the Independence War of 1948, the Sinai Campaign of '56, and the greatest Jewish victory of all, the Six-Day War. There are problems of how to behave in moments of triumph, how to treat a fallen enemy, how to deal with prisoners. There are problems of how to behave honorably; and this does not simply mean telling the truth, but learning how to behave with honor, nobility, and with dignity.

All of these are problems we have never had to face in recent times. All of these are problems of a Landed People. All such values must be developed within a society and are usually expressed through that society's culture which, most often, finds its holiest and most sacred expression in its religion – the values and modes of behavior in a given society and group of people which they find most important and hold in the highest esteem.

True we are here mentioning and dealing with problems concerning war or its concomitant effects in international relations and the affects of both of these realms on the internal life in a given society. But the point is that Jewish life of the last two thousand years has no yardstick with which to measure and deal with such problems, the very problems themselves being alien to that life as it was lived for such a long period of time; and Judaism too, the religion of the Jews

during this Period, the yardstick by which they measured their lives – also serving such a configuration of circumstances and springing from the origins just delineated – has very little of a substantial nature (without the tool of interpolation – very often known as exegesis in more contemporary parlance and very often serving the ends of the exegete) from which to draw on to deal with such problems.

There are other problems, too, that come with the founding and ordering of a new state: those of class structure, inequities within the society, the sort of social framework one intends to set up and live in – but these questions we shall leave for the time being outside the scope of this discussion, their being so socially and politically oriented as to cause far more controversy than is the present intent. But whatever most of these problems are, it can be seen that almost all of them relate, at least within the Israel framework, to the problem of having newly become a Landed People, or Territoriality.

Having stated all of these things and raised all these very involved controversies, let us single out a few of them which seem at the moment to be so glaring as to fairly cry out for a solution and for which it seems, to the author, the religion and social values of "the Jews", as he has learned them, provide no solution.

First of all there is the treatment of the Jewish people by the other nations of the world. How does one respond to such treatment? How does the wife of the Prime Minister of a nation respond to a conference where she is a delegate and where more than half of the members of the conference walk out on her before she has a chance to speak? This recently happened at the International Women's Conference

in Mexico City under the auspices of the United Nations to Mrs. Rabin.

Is one obsequious? Does one plead for understanding, does one state one's case in any event, hoping someone will listen, which is what the present Prime Minister's wife did; or does one walk out as well, showing one's contempt for such a body pretending to be debating serious questions of interest to all the women of the world but in reality being nothing more than a rigged political convention? Does one adopt the methods of one's adversaries and shock the other members of the conference by making some statement on its farcical nature and walking out as well? No, good Jews don't behave in such a way. Jews must be nice, Jews must be fair, Jews must be decent. All right, but is being good and decent in a boy-scoutish manner always the most dignified way of behavior? Was the recently murdered King Feisal of Arabia good and decent and yet did anyone doubt his sophistication, his dignity, or for that matter his integrity?

The point is that Landed Peoples do not always express themselves in the way docile people, used to having to please someone else's image of them behave – in the way children behave, used to having to please or do their parent's bidding. This itself is a very relic of the Jewishness we are being forced to shed by the new circumstances of our national existence by becoming once more a landlord, by becoming a fighting people, by becoming once more a Territorial National Entity.

It is a strange new experience for us, a people so long inured to a different kind of life and, even though in Israel anyhow a new generation called *Sabras* by anyone who knows them has emerged and, by being called this, supposedly different; still, they have only shed the external realities of Jewish existence but in their souls a

strange new mushiness and superficiality has emerged. They are baffled by such problems of national honor, of national behavior, of the proper way to behave in an international world. The internal realities of their inner beings are still governed by the modes and mores of the Ghetto and of the Jewish Religion of that Ghetto. They still are very often seeking the external acceptance that internal insufficiency craves, the internal insufficiency of the landless wanderer, the despised outsider.

Does a Charles DeGaulle behave in such a manner, a Fidel Castro, a Harold MacMillan, even a Mao-Tse Tung or an Indira Gandhi? The list is endless and one could go on indefinitely. But the point here is not necessarily to develop a lifestyle completely patterned on other states having enjoyed a longer period of national identity and national harmony and sovereignty. Still, we have the pretense of being a people unto God.

Therefore, the implication is we must go them one better. We must develop a superior pattern of existence. But one has only to go to Israel today and take a peep into any of the numerous public schools or see the behavior of roving Israeli street gangs or watch the rowdy dress and behavior of her hikers to know this effort for the time being is failing dismally. Certainly these are all superficial earmarks to base one's estimation on but then what other straws in the wind is one supposed to observe?

It is clear from the behavior of Israeli youth in almost four different wars that the spiritual material is there, the stuff of manhood, the stuff of bravery without bravado, the stuff of self-sacrifice, but how to galvanize this into a national ethic, how to

make Israeli behavior in peacetime or even in the aftermath of war anything resembling the character it takes on in these moments of crisis?

This is not to say that one must live endlessly at a fever pitch. It is only to say that the development of this new social experiment of the Jewish People after two thousand years – to have returned home after a *Diaspora*, a homeless landless wandering of two thousand years – fairly cries out for the development of behavioral patterns of a higher order than what are presently being witnessed. Nor are we simply speaking of the recent financial scandals that have swept the front pages of Israeli newspapers almost week after week. No one says the newly resurrected Jewish People must be financial saints or angels. How could they be, in any event, after the history we have known?

But how is a champion high jumper booed in almost every approach to the bar at the Asian games in Teheran to behave? How is an Israeli football team, clearly one of the dirtiest teams among the entrants as well the poorest sports at the Asian Games in Singapore, to be regarded? Should one even participate in such games, just for the sake of supposedly showing that we are politically recognized and respectable, where we are not even wanted? Should we force ourselves in where it is hardly worth being and where we are not appreciated anyway just to show that this is our right? Was not this something of our behavior during and after the time of the Emancipation from the Ghettoes of Europe? Is not this, once again, typically "Jewish" behavior? Though with the new healthy bodies of a Landed People, are we not still betraying our "Jewish" backgrounds, our "Jewish"

Heritage, the religious and social values of two thousand years of opportunism and obsequiousness?

It was the Hebrew poet Bialik – who still wrote in the Yiddish vernacular spirit – who was famously said to have said, "When I see the first Jewish thief on the streets of Tel Aviv, then I will know we have really come home." But of course we have seen enough of these with a vengeance and always really did have them in the *Diaspora*. Once again, he was displaying the really "Jewish" quality of his mind by even concerning himself about such matters.

Again, the last Prime Minister, Golda Meir, when confronted with members of the Leadership of the Black Panther Movement (so roundly condemned in the Israeli Press) evinced the opposite side of the coin of such sentiments by having been quoted as saying, "These are not really 'nice Jewish' boys" – not perhaps as she knew them but who wanted them to be? If nothing else, they were valid representatives of the kind of social problems they had been forced to confront.

Chaim Weizmann expressed similar sentiments about Herzl's proposals to get the Jewish People to Palestine or to a National Home at whatever the cost, whatever the price; and Ahad Ha-Am, his mentor, expressed similar sentiments: it was not "Jewish"; the methods they were proposing were just not "Jewish", as if to be "Jewish" had some special sanctity about it. To bumble through, as it seems he and people like Ahad Ha-Am were finally proposing, was perhaps what they felt had that special "Jewish" flavor – that *Diaspora* touch, the feeling of the Ghetto – much the same feeling one still receives when walking into the Jewish Agency today.

Abba Eban, another confidant of Chaim Weizman, himself admits to

being very popular in the *Diaspora*. Recently he was quoted as saying, "The Jews in the *Diaspora* will not tolerate my being out of an Israeli government". Needless to say he is very popular on the Borscht Belt Circuit and his speeches abound with the sanctity of "being Jewish" – as if being "Jewish" has some special sanctity about it, some special holiness, some special flavor all its own, like Golda Meir's famous chicken soup or Levi's Rye Bread or matzoh ball soup.

At the time of the Yom Kippur War, no country ever had the demands laid upon it that Israel had laid upon it. Attacked quite evidently by surprise on the holiest day of its year, the Israelis managed by a sheer act of fortitude to recover against overwhelming odds on all fronts and throw several invading armies out of the country. Just when she was going over to the initiative, just when her forces had congealed and she had driven a wedge between two Egyptian armies at the Suez Canal; the voices predictably rose urging a cease fire, a cessation of hostilities.

Henry Kissinger rushed to Moscow, seeing in this moment the possibilities offered to pull off some more of his diplomatic maneuverings. The Israeli Armies moved on and were on the verge of encircling these two Egyptian armies – to say nothing of the gains of the Syrian front – when the cries for a halt rose to a deafening roar. Not only was she robbed of the fruits of her dearly-paid-for and well-earned victory, she was forced in a humiliating manner to actually resupply the very Arab armies she had cut off and finally to release them and pull back with nothing even resembling a *quid pro quo* agreement.

The rest of the history subsequent to those events from 1973 to 1975



is fairly familiar to anyone who has been following it. Never in the history of human warfare have such conditions been laid upon any conquering army (and we are speaking in superlatives now – if anyone can contradict these statements, let them do so). No people in the history of the world has ever been forced to fight for its existence, its very survival on such humiliating terms – and this just thirty years after coming out of the Concentration Camps after enduring what was probably the greatest inhumanity ever shown by man to man.

After every war, after the 1948 War, the 1956 War, the 1967 War, and the 1973 War, whenever she is on the verge of achieving what would amount to a knock-out victory – what would probably preclude the possibility of another war for probably many years to come and, who knows, even create the conditions that might have made her adversaries more anxious for a viable peace – she is called upon to halt, to stop, and, in many cases as the 1956 Campaign in Sinai and the 1973 crossing of the Suez Canal, even to withdraw.

Only the Jewish People have been forced to undergo such humiliating conditions (and tolerated them). Who can imagine any other nations of the world enduring such humiliating terms: the Russians after World War II when her armies moved after tremendous sacrifice across the whole face of Eastern Europe culminating at Berlin, the Americans in the Pacific, in Europe, and in the steps of her "Manifest Destiny" across the North American Continent? The British, the French, the Japanese, the Turks, even the Hindu Indians in Bangladesh, or the Arabs themselves for that matter? Some people will say the days of nation-building are at an end, that what was possible until well into the Nineteenth Century in Siberia and North America and well into the

Twentieth In Europe and Asia, is no longer possible now. But these conditions only relate to the Jews. They do not relate to the Indians in Goa, Bangladesh, and Sikkim; they do not relate to the Chinese in Tibet; the Vietnamese in Indo-China; the Iraqis and Iranians in Kurdistan, the Pakistanis in Baluchistan and Pashti; the Russians in Central Asia, Manchuria, and North Sakhalin, not to mention the numerous puppet states under their control; and, most recently and perhaps most strikingly because of its very proximity, they do not relate to the Turks on Cyprus.

The Turks perhaps best of all in recent history show what are meant by "facts" – "*faits accomplis*". The Nations of the World will sooner or later acquiesce to the Turkish solution on Cyprus, as they have to numerous other "solutions" elsewhere, because they have to – because the Turks are strong and have proved themselves militarily. Besides they are stubborn and bull-headed (and certainly not "Jewish" in the pejorative connotations of this word) and they are necessary for the defense of the Free World. These facts will ultimately win out as they did in the dislodgement of the Smyrna and other Anatolian Greeks in the 1920's and the utter annihilation of the Armenian heartland and People during the same Period and in the same Era.

But we are Jews. We cannot behave in this way. In the words of many of the more illustrious of our Leaders just quoted: "It is not Jewish. It cannot be done." Very well, then, we must stop being "Jews" – at least in the World's construing of this or these terms and their meanings and implications, if not our own.

But who said various of these things were not "Jewish" other than certain of our more recent Leaders and their instinctive reactions to

events – like Weizmann or Golda Meir or Ahad Ha-Am, or Abba Eban, or even people like Arye Eliav – though they do not put it in these terms? What they really mean by “It is not Jewish. We shall not do it” is: “It is not Eastern European. It is not *Shtetl* mentality-oriented” – “It is not *Yiddushkeit*”. However, they are saying nothing at all of what it means to be Jewish – especially nothing at all of what it means to be Jewish in the Twentieth Century after four interminable wars with our **neighboring Peoples, the Arabs** and a calamity that they themselves refer to in the most awe-inspiring and gruesome terms as “*The Holocaust*” (Now the Arabs have started taking a variation of this term to even refer to their own predicament – *Ha-Nehba*).

What these present-day Jewish Leaders also mean by the emphasis on this term “Jewish” is that the contrary is “not good”. It is not moralistic in their petty Bourgeois, boy-scoutish conception of what it may mean to be moralistic – a moralism smacking of Sigmund Freud's European, Nineteenth-Century, middle-class, urban-oriented reflection of the peoples' view among whom he was living of what it meant to be moralistic.

This is his conception of the superego, the force within oneself that imposes the standard of conduct on the warring forces within a person's personality reflecting what is desired by that society in which one lives and absorbing almost by a process of osmosis the standards it values most highly. In this sense, no one has a better superego in Europe than the Jews themselves – certainly not the Europeans, who are full of all sorts of repressed violence and numerous other sorts of primeval longings that break out every now and then in a kind of mass hysteria.

Like every colonially-repressed people, we have absorbed the mores of our masters more completely than the original – like the Indians and Africans have to the British and the French almost to the point of caricature. But having been a colonially-repressed People probably much longer than any other and having started with a fairly high standard of intellectual development, we have probably inflicted greater damage on ourselves than any other People. Who can measure these things? Certainly there are myriad psychological investigations that try; but the behavior of the Jewish people in the Concentration Camps when faced with mass extermination – already alluded to as being more “Christian” than the Christians – which has astounded, even baffled, most Peoples of the World and puzzled even ourselves and our own youth ever since, is perhaps the most effective yardstick to measure such mass phenomena.

Who but the Jews would have behaved in such a fashion? Who but the Jews still behave in such a fashion today? Who but the Jews would tolerate the sort of indignities and humiliations laid upon them at the United Nations by the Nations of the World – at international conventions, at international sporting events? Who but the Jews would tolerate such mass acts of terrorism as the bombings at Lod Airport (in this case carried out by three Japanese who seemingly had nothing to do with the problems of Jewish Existence or the Jewish State), the Munich massacre at the Olympics or even the ones at Munich Airport or at Athens, Rome, or Paris? Who would tolerate such massacres as at Ma'a lot, where little children were hurled out of windows, or at Kiryat Shmoneh or Beit Sha'an, . not to mention the Supersol, Mahane Yehudah, Zion Square, or Tel Aviv Bus Station bombings?

But we have become so used to being "Civilized" – in the European sense of the word – we count it as a mark of our superiority that we can bear these things, face up to things – often without exacting similar retribution. We pride ourselves on our "Jewish" behavior, on our "Jewishness" and we mean by this – and this is evident in the connotations of any of the people already-referred to who use the word – our cultural sophistication if not superiority, the superiority of our morality or moral behavior.

But in whose eyes, our own or those of the Peoples of the World? It has often been said of the insane man that the mark of his insanity is that he does not know he is insane. In Plato's image of "the Cave", the blind man in the dark does not know he is in the cave, does not know he is just viewing shadows – an illusory world of what is really outside – does not know there is anything but the cave or that there is light outside.

The caged animal or prisoner in the Ghetto does not know there is a different world outside and so, when he is offered his freedom often prefers or returns to the cage or the Ghetto – indeed, is incapable of living in any different way so deformed and debilitated has he become by his experience over the total course of his life. Imagine ourselves living in the equivalent of a Ghetto situation for two thousand years of our history – in any event, if not always in Ghettos, at least as outsiders. Are we really aware of the true extent of our abnormality? Can we really even measure it accurately – even though we think we can – except when we weigh it against some of the examples already given?

Certainly the young Israeli soldier today appears healthy. Physically and outwardly, he looks like any other free and landed

person – even more proud and more self-assured (of course, this very bluster in so short a time – just twenty-five or thirty years after becoming an independent People – is something of a problem; fortunately much of it has evaporated in the wake of the 1973 reversals). Outwardly and physically, he appears "normal" – to use the language of the psychoanalysts and physicians – but inwardly this is something else. This is something we may never know until after the fact, until after it is too late.

But who said it was "Jewish" to behave in such a tolerant and submissive way? Who said it was "Jewish" to be a do-gooder, to be moralistic in a superficial, petty Bourgeoisie caricature of what perhaps being "really moral" really is? Who said it was "Jewish", as it is often thought in the *Diaspora* (certainly not in Israel) both by Jews and non-Jews alike to be liberalistic, progressive, socialistic, and all the things that Jews are usually identified as being – and with good reason?

The Englishman is supposed to be the harbinger of "fair-play" and we even pride ourselves on such an attribute though, of course, on the sports field – as has already been mentioned – we do a very poor job of it; but the Englishman does not really behave in this superficial caricature of himself so many Nations of the Earth have aped. When it comes down to the truth of *reale politique*, the Englishman in the last few centuries has always been a very stern taskmaster and one of the most insidious political dealers in recent history.

His behavior with regard to the Mandate towards both Arabs and Jews is just one case in point; but there are numerous others wherever the "Englishman" has set his foot – including Scotland and Northern

Ireland today, not to mention the case of the Uganda Asians and certainly not to mention his own caste system on his "tight little island".

But the Englishman, particularly the upper-class Englishman (the average or lower-class Englishman, i.e. the vast majority, knows very little about such things), always has a little twinkle in his eye when he speaks of such things or his tongue just a little ways into his cheek. He knows he is only "fair" up to a point and very often only on the surface – never, or at least formerly never, when it came to damaging his own interests and never when it was a matter of losing the ball game altogether. This was only for the playing fields, the rugby match or game of soccer; this was only the fantasy acted out in the make-believe world of cricket – the polite society. One never had to "play cricket", as it were, when it came to the dirty world of the "Black Hole of Calcutta" or pulling out willy-nilly of one's Colonies and letting the "Natives" have a "bash" at one another. One was not even responsible for such things.

## 6. *Ashkenazim vs. Sephardim*

But the "Jews" go on with their charade of what they think "Western morality" is likely to be or at least what they think will be pleasing to their masters or former masters in the propaganda sweepstakes of the Western Press. Even the young Israeli is deceived by this "shadow show," although most often the *Ashkenazi* (those from Eastern Europe or of European cultural backgrounds generally) – rarely the *Sephardi* (those from more Middle Eastern or North African culture areas). How often does one hear the expression, when speaking to educated groups of young Israelis, what will the Western Nations think of us? This will give us a bad image in the Western Press. Our image in the world is deteriorating.

This was particularly true after the Six-Day War. It has been less true after the resounding shock of the Yom Kippur War. It is almost as if the blow of the Yom Kippur War has awoken the young Israeli out of an opium nightmare of the *Kubla Khan* variety and who can say it has not?

But what does all this mean? It perhaps may mean that young Jews having grown up Israelis, though seemingly outwardly healthy in physical image and even robust, may be suffering from the very same spiritual and psychological psychoses of their elders – particularly those from Europe. And, if this were the case, would it be surprising to anyone? To put it in a different way, though outwardly "*Sabras*" and seemingly quite proud of it, inwardly it is most probable that they have brought their "European Jewish" souls with them – though again one must say that not ostensibly the *Sephardis* (except those who have come very close to Western European culture patterns in France and her



former Colonies in North Africa). Also, too, many are quite proud of this – their "Jewish" souls. As has already been stated, this implies something usually quite superior morally or intellectually, very often quite tender and, no doubt, very sensitive. Certainly, and above all things, "fair" and "very" good. There is even something of this image in the original conception of the *Sabra* – "hard on the outside, soft on the inside" – as the old Palestinians, amalgams of Jewish and British behavior patterns, were fond of putting it.

But, as is emerging from this discussion, this is most generally an Eastern European conception of what it means to be "Jewish", a Diaspora, *Shtetl*-oriented, *Halachic*, Rabbinic-oriented conception that found its way surprisingly easily into the Gas Chambers. Nor is this is some rude or sadistic joke. It is the unfortunate truth. People like Nordau, Herzl, and even Brandeis, who seemed acutely aware of the disastrous situation into which Emancipation had brought a large part of the Jewish People at the end of the Nineteenth Century and the beginning of the Twentieth Century and who wanted to save the Jewish People by whatever means available and at whatever price – only to get the job done and done rapidly – were accused even by their associates of "not being Jewish enough", of being assimilated Western European Jews and coming at things from the standpoint of anti-Semitism and of proposing non-Jewish solutions to things (which indeed Brandeis did), and not understanding the Jewish soul. They were called "Political Zionists" – implying that in some way they were culturally crippled. Indeed this was the favorite rallying cry of their opposition even within the Zionist Movement (to say nothing of the vast majority of Jews outside who knew nothing of these squabbles and were not even

Zionists), which ultimately took over and is still entrenched in Israel today in the Government, the *Histadrut*, and the Jewish Agency; though, since the Yom Kippur War and the rise of the *Sabra* Officer Class, less so.

Once again, it must be pointed out, the *Sephardim* are usually left out of such discussions or conceptions of what it means to be Jewish though they now make up over half of the population of Israel and, indeed, their soul does seem to be made of somewhat different stuff than the *Ashkenazim* – if one can judge such things. Certainly, for anyone who has come in contact with them, their attitude towards the Arabs is of much less-pliable, more-zealous, ruthless nature than the average *Ashkenazi*, which might explain their fondness for parties like *Herut*. Though for the most part members of the working or what is generally considered the lower classes, they are on the whole rarely members of *Mapam* or the Civil Rights Movement, the left side of the Labor Movement, and their lack of enthusiasm for or perhaps just lack of an hospitable reception on the *kibbutzim* has been often noted.

As far as the *Sephardi* attitude towards the Arabs is concerned, even the Arabs themselves are deceived on this point. On travels around the West Bank, one often hears from Arabs about their "Arab-Jewish Brothers" – if only they could deal with what they call "the Arab Jews" and "the European Jews" would go home, then there would be real peace, meaning of course that "the Arab Jews" have always been satisfied to live in relative servitude to them. One even hears something of this attitude in the propaganda strain of the Palestine Liberation Organization in the cry, "Let all the Jews who came (variously) after 1919 to 1948, or what have you, go back home, and

then there would be peace in the Middle East." They do not mean by this the *Sephardi* Jews who would then have to go back to Arab countries in any case.

But, if the Palestinian Arabs on the West Bank and some in the P.L.O. ever ventured out of their convenient intellectual tunnels for a look at the real world, they too would be quite shocked to find that the *Sephardi* Jews in Israel are just those very often proposing the most extremist solutions and harboring the most hostile and viciously vindictive attitude towards their Arab neighbors with whom they always lived in such supposed harmony. This can be proved in behavioral patterns, not only in battlefield-type situations, but even in the rioting in the poorer areas of Jerusalem and Tel Aviv that always goes on after each new terrorist outrage. The *Ashkenazim* are just those likely to be most friendly and, even perhaps in a P.L.O. sense, most enlightened in their attitudes towards Arabs and what the Arabs are demanding, e.g. Abba Eban, Arye Eliav, Uri Avneri, all *Ashkenazim* are cases in point, certainly not the *Sephardim*.

Everyone, of course, knows that in Israel today there is room for a great deal of improvement in the *Ashkenazi* attitude towards the *Sephardis*. How many times has one heard from "Old-Timers" – early settlers who knew Israel when it was still a possession of the British under the Mandate called "Palestine" – an expression for and of the nostalgia for "the Palestinian Boys"? This, of course, is just their way of saying, i.e., the Israelis – mostly settlers from Russia and Eastern Europe before the *Sephardim* arrived after 1948. Or they will say, if only we didn't have these "*Schwartzim*", meaning Darkies or Blacks, things would be different. We would have a healthier, more

respectable society. Sometimes they even begrudgingly admit that the *Sephardim* are part of the State as well, saying, "They proved themselves in the last War. Some of them even fight as well as *our boys*," – meaning the *Ashkenazim*. One hears these sorts of attitudes, too, among new Russian and Roumanian Immigrants to Israel, so it is not simply confined to "Old-Timers" as it were, but seems to be a product of the same cultural bias already noted in referring to everything "Jewish" – meaning everything, that is, *Ashkenzi* Jewish – as being superior.

Of course, the *Sephardis* have developed perhaps as a reverse compensation something of these same sorts of attitudes themselves and, no doubt, what we are describing is a general cultural pattern not endemic only to Israel. For instance the Russians or *Ashkenazim* are referred to as "*Vuzvuzlm*" in a culturally contemptuous manner as from the *Yiddush* expression "*was*" or phonetically "*vas*" or "*vuz*". But this is not to say that either one or the other of the two groups is superior or even completely culturally identifiable in the manner we have laid out – just that they are somewhat different.

In the *Sephardi* case, in any event, very probably the root of this difference is the living in an Arab, Middle Eastern, sometimes Levantine, most often Islamic cultural milieu, also for centuries, without the same European moral and cultural pretensions – except at a much earlier period, certainly not after the coming of the Turks and Mongols and the fall of Spain in the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth centuries. It also probably has a lot to do with not living in the fairly schizophrenic "Christian" World where religious, moral, and ethical pretensions have nothing at all to do with the reality of

ethical or moral behavior on a day-to-day level – probably quite the contrary – and also, of course, of being accused on a day-to-day level of having killed their God or of being a people antithetical to God.

Certainly there is anti-Jewish hostility in the Koran and in the Muslim Religion generally and Muhammad was even responsible for some fairly vicious Jewish massacres to remove various groups of people who earlier opposed him – but nothing of the same order of intensity as in the Christian West. The latter could only increase the psychotic, schizophrenic behavior of having to live for ten or twenty centuries in and adjust to such an environment.

This, too, is probably what is involved in the meaning of the word "Levant", i.e., a cultural bouillabaisse with very few moral pretensions.<sup>8</sup> Once again, too, this is not to say that the *Sephardim* are not Rabbinic or *Halachic* Jews which, of course, they are – though perhaps in a different style than the *Ashkenazim*. For instance, a *Tahanah* of Rabbenu Gershom of Mainz of the Eleventh Century outlawing polygamy for all Jews is not generally considered to apply to them and this produced quite a few intricate legal problems during the Mandate and in the early days of the State.

What one is saying here is that they take their Judaism and their "Jewishness" a little bit differently than those from the West – certainly a little less self-righteously though probably not any less piously or traditionally. Once again, a good part of this can be attributed to the Arab or Muslim influence just as a good part of Western Judaism or "Jewishness" can be attributed to "Christian" or European influence – or at least reaction to feigned or imagined mores in those societies; since, whatever Islam is, it is more like Old

Testament Judaism than Christianity is and the dictum an eye-for-an-eye and a-tooth-for-a-tooth has nowhere been discarded though, depending on the commentator, perhaps softened.<sup>9</sup> Neither has polygamy – though limited to four wives at one time – and a lot of other Old Testament practices are still preserved in perhaps somewhat varying form. There is none of the schizophrenic attitude to sexuality one encounters in the New Testament and the West as a whole, except perhaps in the Twentieth Century where Christianity, at least in Western Europe, has very largely gone by the boards.

The *Sephardim* are for their part still large-family oriented as their Arab neighbors are and as the more bourgeois and urban-oriented *Ashkenazim* are not. This is not to say there are not bourgeois *Sephardim*; there are and very rich ones too – especially those from Saloniki and other places. But still, somehow, it is a different sort of bourgeoisieism than in the West – more Medieval perhaps in the sense of merchant or commercial; not "petty" bourgeoisie, which is a typical Western phenomenon and widespread among *Ashkenazi* urban Jews everyone looking for and holding on to their precious little "dira" or flat.

It is also not to say that there are not unbourgeois *Ashkenazim* like *kibbutzniks* on *kibbutzim*; but even here the transformation always took place through some conscious effort or theological doctrine; and very often the tendency of the richer *kibbutzim* – not the newer or "younger" ones – often verges on petty bourgeoisieism (take. For example, Hazorea of Kinneret in the Galilee). The *Sephardim* also tend to be more emotional or war-like in their responses, as Arabs are, and do not seem to have the Western Jewish 'hang-up' about courage or

being called cowards or proving themselves. This does not seem to enter into their psychological repertoire, though they do have the hang-up about proving themselves or making it in an economic sense.

Still, whatever the implications of all these points, the *Sephardim* in no way dominate Israeli society and are in very few positions of influence or leadership either in the Army, the political structure, the academic establishment, the labor machines, or the kibbutz infrastructure; and the *Ashkenazi* bias, as in most dominant forms of culture patterns, prevails.

It is the *Ashkenazi* version of what it means to be Jewish, of "Jewishness" and Judaism, that governs the thinking of all educated Israeli culture or informational circles; and it is this conception, in the main, that we have been talking about throughout this discussion. This conception also expresses itself in a contempt for general *Sephardi* culture which filters down to the youthful *Sephardi* mass and, in turn, inculcates in them a contempt for their elders and expresses itself in a breakdown in society in Israeli inner city life. For instance, as a concomitant to this, the young thirteen year old prostitute – who very often caters to the tastes and needs of the Arab working man among others – or her twenty year old gigolo is more likely to be *Sephardi*, just as the social worker who deals with them is more likely to be *Ashkenazi*.

## 7. The Hebrews and who is a Jew

But the main point we are trying to get across in this discussion is that these behavioral patterns and intellectual notions which are very often reckoned as being "Jewish" are only Jewish from a given cultural and religious milieu. They are not, for instance, the cultural and behavioral patterns expressed and emphasized in the Old Testament which has always been reckoned by most people to be the basic cultural document of the Jew – most people meaning unsophisticated Jews themselves, who know very little about their own religion, and Gentiles.

They are the cultural and intellectual behavioral patterns of two thousand years of *Diaspora* living, particularly in the West and for the most part under Christianity – but living in the East and under Islam is not excluded completely from this pattern. They are the cultural and intellectual behavioral patterns of the Jewish People as we know them and the Jewish Religion as we know it *today*. They are not the cultural and religious behavioral patterns of the Old Testament, nor the Jewish People as they existed in Second Temple Period times, nor of the Hebrew People – if such can be reckoned as living in Old Testament times.<sup>10</sup>

In any event, for purposes of discussion, let us understand by "Hebrew" those people who were living in Old Testament times before the Babylonian Captivity – both Israelites and Judahites indiscriminately. But it is just in this Old Testament that one will find the behavioral patterns and conceptions of personal honor and nobility necessary to sustain a People living under the trying circumstances in which the Jewish People now finds itself – not only



in Israel but also, to a certain extent, in the *Diaspora* and this latter point will require, to be sure, a somewhat different discussion. But, as everyone who knows anything about the cultural history of the Jews and Christians knows and as I have already intimated in this discussion, the Old Testament Religion is not the Religion of the present-day Jews (even though, of course, many illiterate and unsophisticated Jews still think it is, as do many Christians) any more than it is the Religion of present-day Christians, though both might be considered to claim descent from it.

And this brings us back to the emphasis on territoriality, for the Old Testament is the document, history, religion, and culture of a territorially sovereign People. Indeed, this is one of its main historical emphases and, as such, is more relevant to the demands and concerns and the experience of the Jewish People today – particularly those in Israel.

Whatever else it may be, the *Talmud* and the whole development of *Halachic* Judaism are not – though there is certainly some memory and emphasis on this. On the whole, though, the general thrust of the *Talmud* and the orientation of its chain of development and, therefore, the orientation of Judaism today for which it is the basis is survival *in spite of the lack of territorial sovereignty* – Jewish religious and customary practice outside of and apart from the necessity of a territorial base.

As such, too, it was successful to a certain extent – at least up until the days of the Emancipation (which may be one of the reasons real and truly Orthodox Rabbis were not very enthusiastic about the Emancipation). But, as such, it has very little to tell a people newly

confronting the problems of possessing territory and even conquering new territory – nor a people in the Diaspora newly faced with the political concerns of sustaining such an enterprise and its momentum. If one is saying in this analysis, we must stop being "Jews", then one is also very probably saying we must become "Hebrews" again (not simply Israelis as the modern-day, native-born Israelis are often wont to think), if what is meant by "Hebrews" is the People we were before the Babylonian Captivity.

These are really the problems we are facing today. The problem of the conquest or the re-conquest of a Homeland, the problem of endless warfare with our neighbors, the problem of setting up a viable society in this new Homeland. But these are just the problems dealt with in the Old Testament and so, probably too, *we must become an Old Testament People* again in order to solve them.

But strangely enough, the Old Testament is not as severe a document as its counterpart, the *Talmud*, and the so-called "written law" it contains not nearly as complicated or as involved as its supposed "fleshing out" in legal tradition or *Halachah*. For example, take the problem of "who is a Jew", a problem which has been endlessly debated in Israeli society causing cabinet crises, shufflings and reshufflings in political stances; and this even at a time when the Nation was suffering perhaps its greatest setback in recent times during the *Yom Kippur* War and in its aftereffects. The simplistic notion of God derived from the Old Testament by both Christians and Jews alike was that of an Angry God demanding Justice down to the Fourth Generation – and the characterization of God in this manner probably added to the impression of severity with regard to the law it contained.

But in many matters the compounders of the Old Testament were very easygoing – as any Landed People, confident of itself, usually is – and, on others, at best contradictory. A Jew (or a “Hebrew” in this case) from Abraham's time to Moses' was quite clearly reckoned as anyone who happened to be traveling with the Community or made himself a part of it by observing its customs and carrying out its celebrations. The only prescription laid upon him and the only ritual demanded to confirm it was circumcision – and that was that.<sup>11</sup>

As far as women went, foreign women were quite obviously reckoned among the Hebrews without any ceremonial paraphernalia whatsoever. Isaac's wife is, in effect, a foreigner though a relative – as is Jacob's even though there is no doubt that the prescription laid upon these Ancestors was that a wife from a relative's family was preferred and not one of the Peoples of the Land.

But the references to such a preference are not always consistent, and, in any event, are most likely the moralizing of a later generation as it looked at its situation vis-a-vis the Canaanites, Moabites, Ammonites, Jebusites, etc. Abraham marries a second wife, Keturah – clearly not one of the Hebrews – and there is no problem about the marriage despite what the Rabbis might want to make of offspring such as these nowadays. He has an Egyptian concubine, also, whose son – though reckoned as the father of a foreign, though clearly related people – still seems in many instances to be reckoned as one of the Community; or such evident pains would not have been taken in relating Ishmael's story. Both he and Isaac are said to take care of Abraham's burial, not just Isaac alone.

Joseph has a foreign wife, even the daughter of an Egyptian High

Priest, but no special concerns are evinced over the problem. By this time the People have gotten going and are clearly not concerned over trivialities of this kind. "Whither thou goest, I will go." Whoever reckons himself as one of the Community is one of the Community.

Moses also takes at least one foreign wife – and probably several more. There are problems concerning this reflected in disputes in the desert – many of which sound apocryphal. But the point is he takes these wives – one the daughter even of a Midianite Priest (though related in this way through Ishmael). His offspring are also reckoned part of the Community and only have to go through the ceremony of circumcision as everyone else. David and Solomon take a variety of wives, many of whom are foreign, and no special note is taken of these except perhaps they are portrayed as being a bit lecherous.

We are not discussing what rabbis in Rabbinic or Talmudic Judaism might make of these questions during the Period of the Diaspora or even now. We are not dealing with the final *halachah* on the subject as it developed over perhaps a fifteen hundred year period. We are referring simply to the Old Testament as the original inspiration of the Hebrew people, the Jewish People of today, and showing that quite a complex problem for the latter is easily solved within the reference frame of the former.

For a male, he must observe the customs and festivals of the Community and be circumcised. For a female, and even the story of Ruth bears this out, she must simply show a willingness to be absorbed into the Community – that is that. There is not even any special ceremonial attached such as *mikveh* (ritual bath) and I challenge anyone to find any mention of such a thing on the basis of the Written Law as

contained in the Old Testament only.

But why is this? The reason is simple. The Old Testament – if I have not stressed it often enough – reflects the Religion of a Landed People at ease with itself, not threatened on every side except in a manner it can handle, that is, militarily – much the same as Israel today. It is, therefore, quite easygoing on numerous matters and very often quite un-puritanical though, admittedly, the opposite strain can be found in it too (this writer would argue – the reflection of a later period).

But is not this the very same attitude preferred by the large majority in Israel today and is this not really the general attitude of any People, self-confident and at ease with itself? The *Talmud*, on the other hand, and Halachah generally are quite another matter reflecting, as they do, the concerns of a People surrounded on all sides by danger – spiritual and otherwise – and attempting to survive in a tangle of circumstances – very often simply referred to as “the *Diaspora*” for lack of a better appellation.

8. Old Testament and *Talmud*

Let us give some other examples. Recently a survey was done in Israel about the sorts of dreams young soldiers had on the verge of battlefield situations. The results that surprised the practitioners were that very many young men in battlefield stress-type situations dreamt about "archaeological subjects", as they put it, and strangely enough *Old Testament heroes*.

To this writer, this is not in any way surprising but simply reflects the sorts of yearnings and spiritual necessities I am attempting to draw attention to. The hero or pattern for action for a young man in a life-and-death situation or called upon to make the sorts of sacrifices Israeli young men are being called upon to make generation after generation cannot be a scribal personality like Ezra or a rabbi studying a complicated point of Halachah — they must be a Joshua or Moses or Barak or even a Jeremiah or Isaiah.

One is not speaking here simply of the sorts of things Uri Avneri was trying to suggest in his book *Israel without Zionism* and the simplistic approach therein displayed. The book itself is a very good reflection of the general Israeli spiritual problem where bodily and physical development have outstripped the ability of the spirit and the intellect to cope or come to terms with the dilemma. We are not talking about being Hebrews in contradistinction to being Jews so that we will break Israel's relationship with the *Diaspora* or break a continual train of development lasting quite a long period of time as Avneri was; but, rather, to enrich the Jewish spiritual experience, so new spiritual values can be found to replace the old that will satisfy a people under new circumstances and with different subliminal

yearnings.

We are not speaking, either, of his wholly idealistic idea of a Union of Semitic Peoples – though perhaps one day something of the sort might come into being, though certainly not in the near future – but rather of one Country, in particular Israel, and one People, the Jewish People. We are speaking in terms of their returning to their Hebrew, pre-Exile Heritage because this is by far the richest of any of their numerous heritages, the most inspiring, and the most relevant to the present circumstances of the Jewish People.

In this heritage can be found the answers to many of the problems perplexing the present generation. They cannot be found in a mass of legal rhetoric with no particular relevance to the present day, nor a mass of prayer, important to the single segment of population intent on upholding tradition, but again of no particular inspiration to the average man in a tank, except in so far as linking him with the sufferings and sacrifices of his ancestors.

Something of this notion was already recognized by the very far-sighted Eliezar Ben Yehudah during the early days of the original return to Palestine and, by the example of his single steadfastness, a whole new language was developed and adopted. The Jews who came back to Palestine realized there was something incongruous about their holding on to a language that reflected a different sort of existence and, therefore, finally opted for the Hebrew Tongue.

They had and have not yet realized that there is something equally incongruous about holding on to the expression of a religious sentiment developed and adopted for a completely different set of spiritual circumstances and providing little or no sustenance to the

average citizen on the street.

Of course, many people *have* realized this but, instead of turning to the documents of their history and culture where such sustenance is still available – because such a turn has been blocked by the staunch pigheadedness of the traditionalists and their one-sided interpretation of what Jewish experience has to mean; they have turned in the direction of outright secularism – very often what is often bragged about as agnosticism or outright atheism which people like Uri Aveneri, however well-intentioned, trumpet for their own benighted reasons.

The adoption of the Hebrew Language was one of the first steps in the return to Palestine. The adoption of the spiritual expression of the Hebrews – and one is not here talking about that concoction of Hellenistic and Babylonian Judaism known as the *Mishnah* but the proud poetical expression of a people in full control of its intellectual faculties – will be the second. Eliezer Ben Yehudah himself was very fond of the Prophets and the Old Testament generally and rarely if ever, when he could help it, referred to anything out of the *Talmud*.

The Prophets, too, are another expression and aspect of this fundamental problem for they did not express themselves in the sterile legalism of their Rabbinic Successors – whatever the pretense of *Halachic* Judaism to be but a succession to the Prophets and their Spiritual Heirs. If anything, the Prophets were completely un-legalistic and certainly – to a large extent – not very enamored of ritual generally. They themselves went a long way towards softening many of the seemingly stern legal prescriptions contained in the First Five Books of the Old Testament.



Their message, as almost everyone who has read them knows, was something like – Behave Righteously, Do Justice, and all else will follow. Nor did they simply limit themselves to expressions of *Halachic* hair-splitting. They took a deep interest in the society around them, such as the tendency of the upper classes to trample on the rights of the lower, their wallowing in material luxury while large masses of the population suffered, the falsification of weights and measures, the extreme duress of widows and orphans, etc.

Certainly these concerns are also, to some extent, echoed in the tradition of Talmudic literature as they must be, but they are so surrounded by an artificial knot of legalism – the Talmudic 'Building a Fence around the *Torah*' – so as to make them almost inaccessible and indecipherable to the average man.

This is why the Jewish People now require Rabbis – really legal specialists who, in effect, spend their whole lives studying *Torah* and *Talmud* in order to interpret their meanings to the average man on the street. Such would be the training required for the average man himself to get at the legal puzzles so playfully tossed around by Talmudic students. No wonder we have so many lawyers in Israel – no wonder we make such good lawyers.

But to the man on the street this maze of legal rhetoric means nothing – nor does his Religion since in about eighty per cent of the cases, I have encountered, he does not even know what it is. It is for this reason he needs a legal specialist – the classical rabbi or scholar or teacher – to interpret it. Only latterly in imitation of Christianity has the Rabbi taken on any more formal or ceremonial functions as the Priest of old. What kind of spiritual sustenance,

therefore, can be derived from a Religion, about which the average man knows next to nothing and the majority of whose documents are utterly inaccessible to him?

This is something of the predicament the average man is in relative to contemporary secular law. In many cases he does not even know what it is – certainly in most civil or commercial suits – so in what sense is it of any use to him unless he has a good lawyer (who after all costs money) to interpret it for him?

But the Old Testament, for the most part, is not such a document, though there are certainly aspects of this in *Exodus*, *Leviticus*, and *Deuteronomy*, upon which the *Halachic* Tradition concentrates and draws and back to which, through the pretense of another Oral Sinaitic Revelation, it develops its respectability.

The Prophets, in particular, are not such sorts of people but very definitely speak to the average man on the street giving him all sorts of advice – particularly very definite political advice. For instance, in *Isaiah* and *Jeremiah*: Do not deal with the Egyptians, Do not treat with your neighbors, Do not give in to the Assyrians, Do not pay tribute to the Assyrians, Do not become a vassal state, Do not pay tribute to Nebuchadnezzar, Do not go down into Egypt – along with countless others which could very easily be documented.

This is the sort of political information Israel needs and expects from its spiritual sustainers today in relation to the UN, in relation to the Russians, in relation to the mission of Henry Kissinger, in relation to its Arab neighbors, in relation to the economic corruption gripping the country, in relation to withdrawal from the Occupied Territories, in relation to whether they should or should not have

crossed over to the East Bank of the Suez and stayed there, in relation to whether to give up the strategic passes in Sinai for a meaningless promise of non-belligerency, in relation to whether to deal with the Palestinians or King Hussein.

Indeed, some Rabbis even attempt to give such advice but they are defeated by the very anomaly of their role, the very insufficiency of the framework upon which they must draw and its uselessness in coping in any real spiritual manner with the problems of the present generation.

The Prophets, in particular, spoke in the language of the mass and to the mass. They spoke in heightened emotional prose – almost free verse. They presupposed almost little or no prior religious or spiritual knowledge and their pretense was to speak directly from God with no intermediaries. They do not require any legal ritual or purification, any ceremony of any sort. They even cry out: "Yahweh hates your sacrifices; He hates your ceremonies; He requires but one thing, the Justice and self-respect of really spiritually free men." In this way they went a long way towards softening many of the seemingly more stringent and intolerable prescriptions of the *Torah*.

There are no stonings in the Prophets. People are not pulled out of bed for sleeping with a woman during her menstrual bleeding and theoretically butchered. There is not even any mention of witches or witchcraft, nor would there be any stonings according to their attitude for such crimes relating to impurity. The Prophets' retinue of crimes and injustices are very few and primarily they are almost all social – a very good lesson for Israel today. They would certainly not have worried about the sorts of things our present-day Rabbis

worry about in wondering whether a person has gone through the proper *Halachic* rituals in order to determine whether he is a Jew or not (or whether his mother or grandmother did so before him or whether he is a bastard).

There would be no sitting down and making agreements about these matters. There would certainly not be any face-saving tricks or legal compromises as there are in *pilpul* (the science of Talmudic gymnastics), for there would not need to be any. But this is why the Prophets are not really very popular in Rabbinic Literature, nor is the excellence of their spiritual utterances or poetry generally recognized. They are only read in passing, i.e., in *Haftorah* – what is rather glibly referred to as “After-Torah”; because, when looked at in any serious way, there can be very little doubt that they are changing the letter of the *Torah* per se.

In this sense the Christians, though perhaps for the wrong reasons, value the Prophets even more than Rabbinic Jews do. One can never spend even a moment with a Fundamentalist-type Christian without being inundated with quotes from the Prophets – albeit to prove a given theological point – but, very often too, because they are simply intoxicated by the music of their voices, the joy of the spiritual uplift received, the sound of their songs – as perhaps the Jews should be instead of indulging in the self-pity of some of our self-centered prayers.

There is no doubt the Christians value the Prophets even over the Law and, in this sense, style themselves the true successors to the Prophets. In this, too, they are probably correct for there is very little of the prophetic spirit left in Judaism, i.e., “the Religion

of the Jews", that is, "the People of the *Diaspora*", rather than "the Hebrews" – "the People of the Land", except for confused and very often ambiguous conceptions of the "the Messiah" or "Messianic Mission" of the Jews, as it is often redefined by latter-day Reformists, or "the Messianic age," a conception it shares with Christianity but with a different exegesis; and, of course, the idea of "the Return," meaning a return to Palestine, a yearning which to a large extent was responsible for modern Zionism – this, along with Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Nationalism though, as most observers recognize, one would not have been possible without the driving force of the other.

But even the idea of a "Return" was quite properly recognized by the propagators of Reform Judaism in the Nineteenth Century as being a remnant of pre-*Diaspora* Judaism or even, to a certain extent, pre-Exilic Biblical Prophecy – thus, the very concentrated efforts they exerted to remove any mention of it from their prayer books and the struggle over this notion that took place in the last one hundred and fifty years in the *Diaspora* – only to be resolved in our own time for all branches of Judaism with the successful emergence of a new Jewish State in Palestine, a State which could defend itself. Nothing better supports the ancient adage, "nothing succeeds like success".

It was because they saw in such a notion just these vestiges of Territoriality that would inhibit their successful integration into real *Diaspora* life, their acceptance as equal "citizens", and their successful assimilation to the life-styles of the Countries in which they lived, that temporizing Jews were so eager to do away with the hope for "a Return to Zion" in prayer service.

They realized that such a notion had nothing inherently to do with

the basic ideas of "Judaism" itself and therefore could be re-interpreted. They could then be good little Jewish Englishmen or Jewish Americans or Jewish Germans or Frenchmen of "the Mosaic" or "Hebrew Persuasion". There was even an extended attempt on the part of Reformers and Orthodox alike to reinterpret what was meant by "the Jewish Messianic Mission" in the World and give it a more modern cast - more in keeping with the sensibilities of their Nineteenth Century, newly "Emancipated" practitioners.

But the further back one goes into Old Testament Literature and particularly the earlier one goes into Prophecy, the fuzzier such notions - at least of a "messiah" or a "messianic age" - become. This goes along with the writer's notion that, as we sift for viable religious ideals out of our cultural heritage, we have to go further and further back in time to arrive at a situation more and more synonymous with the present-day and ideas more and more viable as a Religious Faith for our own era.

It is clear that these "Messianic" notions reached their full fruition and widest circulation in the Second and First Centuries B.C. after the Exile to Babylonia and return, after the demise of the Davidic King Line, after the Maccabean Uprising and Restoration and, in particular, during the disastrous imposition of the alien Herodian King line by the Roman Overlordship. One sees this quite clearly, not only from the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphic Literature of this Period (i.e., The Maccabbee books, Enoch, The Twelve Patriarchs, etc.), but also from the recently-uncovered Dead Sea Scroll material as well as the obvious ramifications and expressions of it in Christian and Rabbinic material - also having their source and root in this Period.

From the Jewish point-of-view, it is not even clear how many "Messiah"s were expected. One hears talk in the Dead Sea Scrolls of a "Messiah of Aaron and Israel", a reflection of which is developed in the Gospel of *Luke* in its presentation of the parentage of John the Baptist and Jesus. There are also murmurings in subsequent literature of a "Messiah of Israel" and a "Messiah of Judah" and this two-"Messiah" theory is widespread throughout the Middle Ages, even popping up in the schemes of such celebrated Rabbinic spokesmen as Saadya Gaon.

One does not even begin to give credence to more latter-day notions of what it might mean for there to be a Messiah either in terms of Reform, Conservative or Orthodox Judaism. The Christians, as everyone knows, have their own interpretations of these notions and events. But the peculiarity of their exegesis and particularly that of Paul in his letters – upon which almost all of later Christian Doctrine is based – cannot even be credited by any Jew or by any serious scholar for that matter who looks into the context and nature of Seventh through Fifth Century B.C. Jewish Prophecy. Christian exegesis, as has been implied, is more in keeping with the thinking and notions of Second through First Century B.C. Palestine and the literal 'broth' of religious notions that were then in currency and being flung about at that time.

But the importance of the Prophets and particularly the earlier ones (not in any way to be associated with Apocalyptic Literature of a later period) for the present period of our return to Palestine and their importance too as an inspiration for spiritual behavior once that return has been accomplished, as it seems to have been now – however tenuously – cannot be underestimated.

Yehudah Halevi, the great Jewish poet of the Middle Ages – and some say 'rabbi' (but in what way he was a Rabbinic Jew, except superficially, is hard for the casual observer to determine) – and certainly the first of the real ardent modern Zionists, expressed some of these notions himself and had the same deep affection for the Prophets. So moved was he in this direction that he felt it incumbent upon himself to return in the Eleventh Century regardless of the unsettled conditions in Palestine of the time and regardless of his age – dying or, at least, disappearing in the attempt.

So taken was he by these notions that he felt that there was some mystical significance about the Holy Land. Just as in some strange manner she was "the Heart of the Earth: so, too, the Hebrew People or the Jews were "the Heart of the Nations"; and that when the two would be reunited, when "the Return" so-to-speak would have been accomplished, then the miracle of Prophecy would return. And who can say whether he was completely wrong?

He recognized that, when the Jewish people returned to their Homeland, a new religion would have to emerge to correspond to their new living conditions and express the regeneration of their spirit. He recognized that to a large extent this religion would have to rest on the ecstatic and exalted utterings of the Prophets and probably not on the sterile legalism of most of our latter-day scholar/priests – our rabbis. Just like Ben Yehudah, who grasped the cruciality of the revival of the Hebrew language in everyday usage for the revival of a new Hebrew spirit among the People and the shedding of their *Diaspora* soul, to say nothing of their skin; so too Halevi, who himself wrote poetry in Hebrew (though his prose is in Arabic), recognized that one



important cornerstone of this Hebraic Religion would have to reappear – that of Prophecy – and by necessity would reappear once reunion of the Jewish People with the Land of Palestine was accomplished.

But the implications of such a spirit for the modern situation of the Jewish People both within and without of Palestine are quite startling for, if the Prophets were anything, they were certainly anti-formalistic and against empty motions practiced simply for their ritualistic desirability. It is not surprising that Ben Yehudah, perhaps the next great Zionist in the flesh after Halevi in terms of actually practicing himself what he preached, also was such an ardent admirer of the Prophets. We are referring here to the earlier ones, in particular, for they were the ones particularly concerned about social problems, the trampling of the rights of the poor by the affluent or the elite, the ensuring that Justice would be done within the framework of society, the corruptibility of judges, priests, rulers, and commerce and industry leaders – concerns very relevant to present-day problems of the renewed Jewish State.

### 9. Thou shalt not Boil a Kid in its Mother's Milk

But, if the Wellhausen critical School's line-of-thought is followed with regard to the Bible – and to follow the line of thought does not mean that we have to accept every point of it – then much of the expression of the Prophets, though grouped later in the Bible, was of earlier import than that of some of the Law. Once again, to say much of or some of is not to say all. There are certainly parts of the Law that go back very far and even the Prophets speak of the Law, though they mention very little of it and perhaps do not mean quite the same things as present-day Rabbis do.

In order to find which parts of the Law were older than the utterances of the Prophets or *vice versa*, one would have to go into quite a good deal of Biblical criticism which is beyond the scope of our present discussion. But suffice it to say that the consensus of opinion is that, at least, some and perhaps much of the material in the Prophets is older than the final expression of the Law as it seemed to coalesce in Ezra's time – expressing Exilic as well as pre-Exilic concerns.

Take something like the Laws of Cleanliness and *Kashrut* which the Prophets rarely, if ever, refer to – almost as if they were totally unaware of the later interpretations that developed with regard to these.

Take the favorite injunction, "thou shalt not boil a kid in its mother's milk"<sup>12</sup>, the basis of almost all of our latter-day contortions regarding "*milchig*" and "*fleischig*", our separate plates and silverware and one of the disabilities Modern Jews have suffered under with regard to dining with other people – nominally considered to be

members of "Civilized" Nations of the world – not to mention the stumbling block it has presented to generations of Jewish youth.

That such an important bit of Judaica is not even mentioned, no less conceived of, in the literary works of the Prophets is surprising to say the least. The invalidation of the pretense of Mosaic authorship and, therefore, the unquestioned sanctity of much of this convoluted legal rhetoric would certainly be a great blow to the practitioners of present-day Judaism; but it would hardly disturb the bulk of the Jewish People, whether in the *Diaspora* or in Israel, a jot since it is not practiced by the majority of the Jews.

Here the mass of Jews have shown themselves instinctively wiser than their supposed teachers and, if we were to adopt the Muslim precept that what is right for any given age (again practiced in the breach by them as well) is what the consensus of Muslims think is right; then clearly in today's world, though not necessarily in yesterday's, much of this legalistic paraphernalia would go by the boards. But then, of course, much of this is really nothing but "fences" or artificial constructions to protect the Law – now lately having rather become impediments.

We are not here speaking of the Ten Commandments of Moses which, by style and content, have been recognized by scholars as being doubtlessly primordially old.

## 10. Thou shalt not Commit Adultery

However, take just one of these Commandments which has caused problems in any age and, in this regard, for Christians *and* Jews alike. Take the Commandment, "Thou shalt not commit adultery" – whatever is precisely meant by the term "adultery" in the ancient context, whether sleeping with a neighbor's wife out of marriage or in marriage or before marriage (but then marriage did not have the same significance then as now judging from the examples of both Abraham's and Jacob's numerous wives and concubines and the relative ease with which, it would seem, they could be gained or shed. This, not to mention Moses' various escapades).

Such a Commandment is clearly not very much in harmony with the general practice of most young people today – to say nothing of others, if they were but to admit it – at least in relation to their activities before the state of marriage. It is not too much out of spirit with what most people might regard as desirable after marriage and this ties up with the problem of what is clearly meant by adultery in the Bible.

But it is not the Commandment of not committing adultery which is upsetting to most people. It is the punishment for it, variously given as stoning or other less severe variations in the threshing out of the Law presented in Leviticus and Deuteronomy. Clearly, the tenure of the general commandment as a moral precept is not disturbing to most people, but the severity of the punishment is.

But then let us see how the Bible presents our noble ancestors as behaving in such matters. Abraham in some episodes in the Bible is portrayed as passively standing aside while his wife Sarah, "*Immenu*

*Sarah*", the mother of the Hebrew People, is calmly let out for Pharaoh's or Abimelech's pleasure – depending on which version is followed<sup>13</sup> – as is Isaac in another version of what is clearly the same story. All questions of how far the supposed trespass went are clearly irrelevant since the text is corrupt and has obviously been tampered with.

Judah comes upon his own daughter-in-law, Tamar, disguised as a harlot and sleeps with her. The Bible is strangely laconic in its moral assessment of these infractions. Reuben even sleeps with his father's concubine (i.e., "uncovers his father's nakedness"), but little is done concerning this infraction except to cast him and his descendants in a sometimes dubious light. Certainly he is not stoned, as the authors of Leviticus and Deuteronomy would have it at times in their zealousness.

David sleeps with a variety of women, including sending one man out to his death to enable him to seduce his wife – taking another man's wife whose death he has caused. These acts are not looked upon with much approval by the Bible but he is not brought to trial for them or even stoned.

What are we to make of these things? On the whole the Old Testament Religion and Religious Practices were of a much more free-wheeling nature and far more flexible than they were later interpreted to be. No one is suggesting here that the average Jew immediately go out and kill his neighbor or sleep with his neighbor's wife, but one is simply stating that the interpretation of and retribution for these crimes was not as severe as portrayed in the later law and, later still, in Rabbinic Literature. Either these laws were completely unknown at the

time of the Patriarchs, the Exodus, and in the days of the Early Monarchies – and that is the opinion of the present writer – or they were observed in the breach.

The general approach of the Old Testament to these matters is one of disapproval and repugnance, but never is there any indication that any of the main characters in the stories or history knew that they were supposed to be stoned for such crimes. Such severe punishments in Leviticus and elsewhere would seem to be the additions of a later, more Puritanical age.

Even the Early Prophets (Amos, Hosea, and Micah) speak in some detail about Temple prostitution in the North and people lolling around every threshing floor and by every altar and both father and son resorting to the same young woman – this is a law they do know, not necessarily the one regarding adultery as we presently understand it – but nowhere is there any more than disapproval expressed of these violations of ritual purity and immoralities. There is never the slightest mention of such practices as stoning or the like as portrayed in Leviticus or Deuteronomy, and indeed such punishments would have been totally out of the spirit of the general social morality of Amos and Hosea (and the part of Isaiah known by scholars as Isaiah I). They are either totally ignorant of them or they disapprove of them – in the opinion of this writer, both probably are or would be the case.

The general ethos then of the Hebrew Religion, for it is this the present writer is identifying with Early Old Testament Religion, is one of expressed disapproval for such acts, but nothing really more than this – a general moral prescription, much the same as the one on

killing yet there is killing going on all the time in the Old Testament and, for that matter, today too in spite of our own disapproval of it. If it were anything else, we should very likely have to have Reuben, Judah, David and various others stoned or, at least, have had the possibility considered – but it is not.

But once again, this is entirely in accord with our own general attitude towards the problem. We disapprove of such practices to a some extent in wedlock, though we recognize extenuating circumstances, and our attitude towards them out of wedlock is not at all clear. The Puritanism of the Law – both the strict interpretation of the later Old Testament and of Rabbinic Judaism – is not the general practice of a self-confident People at ease in its own Land as it is not, for that matter, the present general morality of the older Countries of Europe, as opposed to the newer (until recently) more Puritanical American tendencies.

What is clearly known – and this very early – is the injunction on both father and son resorting to the same woman or, in other words (as wed just saw), 'uncovering one's father's nakedness'; and reference is made to it on numerous occasion in Genesis and in the Prophets. But, once again, even here there is no drastic penalty mentioned concerning it – just a general disapproval of such practices as on the whole being unclean. For most practices regarding uncleanness, a simple Temple contribution or sacrifice would have sufficed to restore the offender to his former cleanliness or the recommendation is to expel such people from the Community whose general ritual purity has been tainted by such an act – but this is much softer than stoning.

Only in the case of Achan in Judges do we have a very old instance

of stoning but here the crime is clearly one with social implications and concerns ritual notions about Holy War, i.e., illegally concealing booty which belonged either to the Community as a whole, or to God, or to the King. One can well imagine a later age, concerned about the Communal Treasury, being very upset by such infractions.

That these practices are clearly considered contemptible is beyond question but that anything more was involved is very questionable. On the whole, they are used as the butt of jokes or for purposes of jibing at enemies by telling foul stories about them – for instance, with regard to Canaan and Noah in order to cast aspersions on the lowly origins of the Moabites and the Ammonites. Even the material concerning Judah is very likely to cast aspersions on his progeny or on the region of Judah as a whole – as, on the other hand, is the negative material portraying Reuben, the oldest of the Israelite sons, representing either the People of Gilead or the People of Israel and one of the numerous spiteful ways current in the Old Testament text of getting at the People of the North as a whole.

Since such stories are used for the purposes of telling distasteful stories or making bad jokes about someone in particular disfavor – for instance, regarding David and Bathsheba, to derogate the circumstances of Solomon's birth – it is clear that there was hardly any current practice as severe as stoning to punish the infractions therein portrayed.

But even in the text of Leviticus itself, this is a problem. Take the instance of 'sleeping with a woman at the time of her monthly bleeding'. This, from my own knowledge, is still a concern of most men today, if not also for many women. How should they deal with the



problem? There is obviously something disagreeable in the matter. Even the American Indians recognized this, and dealt with the problem in a similar manner to the Hebrews.

What to do? The text of Leviticus is contradictory. At one point it says this is simply a problem of impurity and easily dealt with by the sacrifice of a pigeon (a very meager fine for a minor offense at that); at another point it is listed under the list of sexual crimes deserving of death.<sup>14</sup> Again, it is the contention of the writer that the early Hebrew Religion is fairly easygoing and hardly ever as puritanical as it later became or was interpreted to be either in the fleshed-out form of the *Torah* or later Rabbinic interpretation.

For instance, Jacob knows nothing about the later ban on resorting to two sisters while both are still living and the later Rabbinic upholding of this proscription. If he did, why would he have resorted to both Rachel and Leah at the same time without seeming reproach. Of course, one might say this was before the Law was revealed on Sinai. Very well, then, give us back the Religion as it was before the Law was revealed on Sinai. But, in all seriousness, no one takes the legal proscriptions of the Sinaitic Revelation – as has already been noted in our mention of the Wellhausen school – as necessarily having priority over other material in the Bible, whether presented in an earlier or later framework.

### 11. Fighting on the Sabbath

Take another problem – that of fighting on the Sabbath. By the time of the writing of the Maccabee Books in the Second Century B.C., this has very definitely become a problem – so much so, that Judah is pictured as having to solve it, after several reverses and massacres suffered as a direct result of it, by making a legal decision to allow fighting on the Sabbath in self-defense, i.e., when life and limb were threatened.

To a certain extent, this is the Rabbinic position today and was certainly the position enunciated by Rabbi Akiba during his Revolt in the 130's. When human life is endangered or threatened, certain things become permissible that would not otherwise be permissible. Clearly this, too, was a precept Modern Israel was forced to follow in responding to the launching of an attack on her by her enemies on the Holiest of her Sacred Days, *Yom Kippur*.

Jesus in the New Testament is forced to come to terms with the problem as well and, in an episode concerning the gleaning of sheaves from the fields on the Sabbath, he is pictured as turning the Rabbinic tables on his interlocutors. Was it not true they had already decided that, when a man's life was endangered, it was permissible to fight? Well his men's lives were endangered through hunger. Was it not then permissible to glean? The dictum is then enunciated, "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath."

But whichever approach to this problem one might prefer, the fact of the matter is that it was not a problem in classical times. No mention is made of such a troublesome issue in Joshua's campaign of conquest in Palestine or during the reverses suffered during the days of the

Judges. There is not the slightest mention of the problem in all of David's campaigning or in the whole Period of the Kings.

How can we account for such an anomaly? If Israel's enemies were taking advantage of such a reluctance to fight on the Sabbath in the Second Century B.C. and, to a certain extent, even taking advantage of Israel's Religious Holidays today – to the extent that it had become common knowledge that to attack Jews on the Sabbath was a relatively safe endeavor – why was it not a problem earlier on in even more war-like times?

The answer is obvious. The answer is because nothing was ever known of such a proscription in earlier times. Whatever the Sabbath was, it was not taken as seriously as it was later interpreted to have been. Clearly a war-like nation, such as Israel was and had to be from the Period of Moses onwards, was not concerned with such a minor anomaly as *fighting on the Sabbath*. It was only after the Captivity, after a later generation had returned with a more zealous interpretation of the Law, that was never even known or cared but at an earlier time, that such things became a problem. It was only in the Maccabean Period and beyond, the Period of the origins of Rabbinic Judaism, the *Tannai'im*, as well as of Christianity and some other varieties of Judaism that such problems emerged.

They emerged, as we have consistently been showing in regard to previous problems, because the Law – as it was called – and the interpretation of the Law had now solidified and grown to such an extent that it permeated the whole life and practice of the Jewish Nation after it returned from its First Exile. In any event, only a fraction returned at this time, but the Law returned – as has rightly

been pointed out by Wellhausen and other scholars – with Ezra and his successors.

The brand of Judaism being practiced in the Second Century B.C. onwards, down to the present day, was a much more zealous brand of Judaism – as the term “Zealot” indeed implies – than that practiced in a much more Territorially self-confident age – that from the Judges to Kings. Joshua and David do not concern themselves with such problems, as fighting on the Sabbath, which would have had to be a problem for any army in whatever period, because it had not a problem to them. They simply did not know about any such notion and, therefore, were not worried about it.

Such concerns only emerge among a generation grown up in Captivity, taking the Holy Writ as its Written Word and knowing nothing about fighting – as they knew nothing about seduction – in a word, among a *Diaspora* Elite returning to impose a new, more stringent set of standards upon a chaotic countryside very much the same as the Return of *Diaspora* Jewry to Palestine in our own age where many of the educated classes bring with them the intellectual baggage of their previous situation and position. A peasant population, secure in its own Land, knows nothing about such preoccupations just as the present day *Kibbutz* Population in Israel – despite the clear intellectual preoccupations of many of their fathers – knows very little about such idealistic conceptions today.

## 12. Holy War

But how does this original Old Testament Religion of a confident Landed People, we are attempting to describe, solve many of the problems and preoccupations of the Israeli and *Diaspora* Jewish Population today? We have already given an example: the problem of "who is a Jew" – a problem now surrounded with the xenophobic Schizophrenia of almost twenty-five hundred years of off-and-on Exile – solved in the simplest of manners when using the Old Testament text itself as the guide.

Let us take some others. How would the Religion, we are delineating as "Hebrew" (in contradistinction to Judaism), have responded to the problem of the Return to Palestine and the constant warfare and sacrifice thereby engendered? How would a "People of Hebrews" or "Israelis" – and not one saddled with the baggage of today's "Jews" or the recipients of "Jewish Civilization" (and "Jew" or "Hebrew", it matters not. It is a character-type one in referring to and a manner of thinking one is calling into question. We can continue being "Jews" if only we will upgrade our characters and our spirituality as we have, to a certain extent, our bodies. I have only used the term "Hebrew" for purposes of pinpointing this) – have responded to the same problem?

First of all, the warfare and the sacrifice they have undergone would have been expected from the outset – as, indeed, it was in Moses' and Joshua's time. There would have been none of the Utopian euphoric schemes of our idealistic Founding Fathers. "Idealism" and "Idealistic" are words one often associates with the "Modern Jewish" soul rather than the ancient "Hebrew" one.

Whatever the Ancient Hebrews were, they were down-to-earth and, to a certain extent, realists. They were concerned with Justice and certainly with the notion of Good – even of Honor – but Idealism is hardly the quantity one feels one should associate with an Abraham, a Jacob, a Moses, a Joseph, a Joshua, or a David. It is a quantity very much associated with today's Jews world-wide and certainly one always hears about "Idealistic" Jewish Intellectuals. It is a quantity many young Israelis feel very close to.

Unfortunately, where there is Idealism, there can also be disillusion and this is the danger of being over-Idealistic in terms of the long struggle for survival thrust upon the Jews by their neighboring Arab Cousins. One should have gone back to Palestine expecting a fight, expecting a long drawn-out struggle; and, therefore, there would have been no basis for the disillusionment and acrimony one often encounters in Israel today – that "The only thing wrong with the Founding Fathers was that they forgot there were Arabs in the Land".

The writer has heard of stories – and he knows he will be contradicted on these – of young Israelis unwilling to get in their airplanes in the face of the terrible losses of The *Yom Kippur* War or Officers running into battle only to find there was no one behind them. Even if these instances are exaggerated, as they very often are, who could blame such young people – some of whom have three or four wars behind them with the prospect of more to come – for not wanting any longer to go into battle.

At the conclusion of the last war, perhaps in the wake of the bitterness at the high casualties suffered, numerous stories were

current — particularly among young people, many of whom bore the brunt of the fighting — asking what was it all for? Was it worth it? Was coming back worth this price? We have had enough. Let us go back and live in the *Diaspora* like normal people.

At the time, many, many stories like this were circulating though now, after the original shock has worn off, less so. But still, what has Rabbinic Judaism to offer such young people? How can it stiffen their backs and pick up their courage, rouse their spirits? With all due respect to its achievements over the last two thousand years — and they are many — these are situations it just did not have to face or cope with.

The Old Testament as a document has and does. It is not possible that a People could go back to a land it has not inhabited for almost two thousand years without a long struggle. Twenty-five years or thirty years is comparatively speaking nothing — no price at all to pay for the reconstruction of a Land abandoned so many centuries before.

This is the long view, though admittedly not the short one of bereaved parents or wives or children. Neither is it not only not possible to build a Nation at this point in the Twentieth Century without bloodshed, it was never possible. The Books of Joshua and Judges — and the later Books too of the Old Testament — tell us of almost two hundred years of uninterrupted warfare, and then some, at the time of the original conquest of the Land. The Land was not conquered in one fell swoop; it was gradually taken over.

This is the thrust of the general picture of Joshua and Judges regardless of the idealized, general lightning-like version of

Joshua's conquest. A People nowadays likewise should not expect the lightning-like conquest of twenty-five years to build a State, but rather two hundred years or so would be more like the true reckoning it should take for such a process and the scope of the conflict to be expected.

This would be the real message of the Old Testament to the Jewish People: the struggle has only just begun. The struggle is going to go on. The struggle is not going to be simple; the struggle is not going to be an easy one. Armed with such a version of history, Israeli youth, coming out of the secondary schools and high schools, would not be so vulnerable to the ups-and-downs in morale as they have previously been subject to. They would perhaps have a deeper conception and understanding of the struggle they are involved in and the sacrifice they are being called upon to make. For the current Period of Israel, there will be no end in sight for them. They should know this and rejoice in it. They are not living in Europe. They are not living in America. They are not living the easy life. Unfortunately, they are being called upon to make sacrifices – but this has its rewards as well.

Which raises the controversial and connected question of Holy War, which has real significance for today's struggle. What is really going on in the Middle East today is a Holy War. The Arabs have few illusions about this and even proclaim it as such. Whatever the casual observer might think about the validity of such a notion, it still has a powerful affect upon the participant in it – at least over the short haul.

The Arab-Muslims have proclaimed their Holy War/*Jihad* on numerous



occasions. The late King Feisal of Saudi Arabia – perhaps the foremost proponent of such a conception, a conservative Muslim of the classical variety and the real power and driving force behind the recent *Yom Kippur* War – saw the struggle in such terms, so why should not the Jews? It is not as if one must adopt the conceptions of one's neighbors but, in effect, what is going on in the Middle East today in its simplest terms is the struggle of two Peoples – actually two Religions – for the same piece of territory.

This has come home even more strongly in the wake of the recent events in Lebanon. The struggle going on is not simply a National War between the Israelis and the Palestinians – (if there were two such Peoples). It is a Religious War between certain of the conceptions of Islam and certain of the conceptions of Judaism (not to mention Christianity) – particularly as regards the status of a Land called Palestine, Jerusalem, the Temple Mount, the Dome of the Rock, etc.

But the Israelis do not see it as such – at least most of the Israelis do not see it as such. The sort of the late Chief Rabbi of Israel, *Ha-Rav* Kook, an influential figure in Orthodox Circles, made precisely such an announcement in the aftermath of the recent War; but, on the whole, Israelis pride themselves on being or rather appearing modern. More's the pity. In doing so, they want no truck with such old-fashioned conceptions such as Holy War and yet this is precisely what they are involved in.

Either they wake up to this fact and acknowledge it for what it is or the ups-and-downs that have plagued their civilian morale will go on. It is not that there is precisely such a conception, formalized in the Muslim way, in the Old Testament; but the kind of war Moses is

fighting in the Wilderness, the kind of war Joshua embarks on in Palestine, and the kind of war described over and over again in Judges – with expressions like “Yahweh has given this Land into your hand”, “Yahweh has given the Philistines into your hand”, “Yahweh has pronounced a ban upon it – let not a single inhabitant live”, and such like – have all the earmarks of a Holy War. Plus, the very expressions themselves, “Yahweh Sabaoth” “Yahweh Lord of Armies”, “Yahweh Lord of Hosts”, and the fact that it is so often announced that Yahweh of the Armies/Yahweh of the Hosts would be fighting for them on their side and win such battles for them, as the Sea of Reeds, Jericho, or those with the Amalekites, has something of this conception implied.

But it is probably just this conception of a Holy War that will give them the sustaining power to survive in the face of overwhelming odds, in the face of a struggle that may turn out to go on for a couple of hundred years. If the concept of war is elevated to a spiritual concept: as, for instance, in Cromwell’s England or in the American Civil War to cite two more recent examples – not to mention the Russian “People’s struggles” against Napoleon, against the “Whites” and the Allies, and more recently against Hitler and the similar North Vietnamese struggle in South Vietnam against the United States which, though Communist, still had all the earmarks of a Holy War (in their parlance “a People’s War”) – then one does not have to give a reason for the supposed sacrifices asked.

The reason is there enough for all to see and all to take part. There can be no complaining except in the odd case – there can be no questioning why. It is a Holy duty. It is for Mother Russia, it is for the People, it is for God (as in the Cromwell case). The outcome of

these wars are on the whole, especially when fought for a just cause and not just out of the figment of some fanatic's imagination, rather successful.

But for most of Modern Israelis, such a conception is too embarrassing; once again it is their Jewishness that is speaking, their servility, their desire to please, their desire to be accommodating, their desire to be accepted and not seem "outside the Pale" or too grotesque, emerging from the Ghettoes and the *Shtetl* desirous of seeming "normal" or likable to their peers in the other Nations. They claim to want to be accepted, to want to be liked, to want to be a Nation that seems just like any other Nation when, in fact, they do not. They are not.

But they cannot have it both ways, and these are the horns of the dilemma. Once again, it is the *Sephardis* who have less difficulty in not being liked, and not wishing to be liked, than the *Ashkenazis*. The desire to appease, to placate, to be accommodating is almost totally lacking from their personality; and one might thank fifteen hundred years of living in the Arab World, perhaps, for that. But for the average modern Israeli the idea of a Holy War is too outlandish to be appealing: let it be a war of survival, let them remember the gas chambers, let them have their *Yad va-Shems* (Holocaust Memorials), but let it not be a Holy War. What would the other nations think of them?

Once again it is always this. They see themselves as if reflected in a prism. The prism is their conception of what other nations might be thinking of them when, in fact, it might turn out those other nations are not thinking that at all. It is their own nightmarish dilemma, like being inside a hall of mirrors – the mirrors are their own

personalities not, in reality, what other nations think of them – for whatever other nations might think, they do not consider the Turks outlandish for holding on to their gains in Cyprus. They may not like them for it, but it is not outlandish.

The cries of the Arab Peoples for *jihad* may sound a trifle fanatic to Western ears, but it is part of the Arab personality; and, as such, adds to and does not detract from their strange charm. They are not, thank God, little carbon copies of Westerners, as one feels the Japanese sometimes to be with their cameras and little achievement drives. Let them be anything but let them not be like that.

However, it is this Old Testament conception of war which will in the end have to provide the Israelis with the fortitude and staying-power they so vitally need. It is not to be found in Rabbinic Judaism, however tenacious Rabbinic Judaism was in the *Diaspora*. It was just that, tenacious in the *Diaspora*. It cannot fulfill two functions. The other function has to be fulfilled by the Hebrew Religion – by the Old Hebrew/Israelite/Jewish (from "*Judean*") Prophets – if the Israelis, and the Jewish People as a whole in support of them, are going to reach back into their own cultural roots for the wellsprings of such staying power.

If they are not, then it will have to be provided to them by some muddled modern conception of Socialistic Nationalism – as Zionism originally considered itself to be. But this cannot survive, this cannot be – for, on the basis of this notion, the Arabs have as much right to the Holy Land or Palestine. The only title deed the Israelis possess is the very Document of the Old Testament itself; and, truly, it is this that fed the wellsprings of Zionism in the wake of the

Holocaust when the complementary sources of Modern Nationalism seemed to have run dry.

It is this Chaim Weizmann was talking about when he spoke of Herzl's defeat on the Uganda Issue. Zionism is not a purely modern conception. If it is, it cannot survive. Only, when it goes back to its religious roots, draws on the religious heritage of Old Testament Prophecy and history, can it derive the necessary sustenance to survive as a spiritual notion. Only this will provide the new Israeli People of Palestine with the staying power to go on – with the fighting power to sustain a military struggle that is liable to go on for generations. Only, too, if the staying power is there will it not go on for generations – will the other side realize the futility of such a struggle.

As long as the other side even senses that there is some possibility that the Zionists and their support in the *Diaspora* might relent, might let up and go home – as there indication of their doing in the late Fifties and again more recently – as long as the struggle is only political and not also religious, will it go on indefinitely.

Only when the other side realizes that there are two sides to the religious struggle, two sides to the Holy War – their side and the Israeli side – will the struggle subside and wind down; for, to the Arabs, the idea of "Palestine" is not of such primary religious importance as it is to the Jews. It is really quite a secondary, even a third-rate matter when seen in the long run of their religious interests. When it comes to the endless sacrifices in blood and materials they will be called upon to make for such a conception, they will finally turn their energies elsewhere.

On the other hand, to the Israelis the idea of a Holy Struggle is paramount. It is the very core of their title deed to Palestinian Territory. It is the core of the Nation's desire to return – not simply its modern recasting as a National Liberation Struggle as many contemporary theoreticians have tried to do. In this light, all the sacrifices become worthwhile; in this light all the deaths, all the drain in men and material, all the heartbreak become comprehensible. Only in this light can the struggle be sustained indefinitely – which it must be – not in the light of the fires of Auschwitz or of national extinction.

There must be a positive propelling driving force – this is the Jewish or Hebrew conception *Yahweh Sabaoth/of Yahweh Lord of Hosts* – of Holy War. It is no wonder that young Israelis on the verge of battle or under the sway of battle field-type situations have been found to dream of archaeological situations or of Old Testament characters. Is there any wonder in this? Who else are they to identify themselves with; and all men, however brave, need some subconscious identification with heroism. Is it to be Rabbi Yohanan ben Zakkai or Joshua? Is it to be Rabbi Abba Jose or Isaiah? The comparisons may seem juvenile or emotional but, unfortunately, it is just that simple; and, besides, one is dealing once again with a mass of real living beings not idealistic intellectual specimens.

This then is the Fighting Faith needed by a real Fighting People. This then is the self-confident, but flexible, Righteousness which is the expression of a Territorial People – not the self-conscious legalism of a people living in fear for its very existence, in fear of every alien and external incursion. A People, newly arrived in a new

Homeland, needs a new expression of its Territoriality and pride in this new possession.

I think the arguments I am presenting show the direction one should go in order to find it. The direction is backwards, very far backwards, to a time when the newly emerging Hebrew People also felt similar emotions and were experiencing a similar experience. They expressed this confrontation with these new emotions, their emergence from slavery in Egypt – our ghettos in Europe and *shtetls* of Asia – in a high and exalted prose and poetry, by the wonderful expression of an all-powerful God, *Yahweh Sabaoth*, who fought by their side, nay fought even their very battles for them.

They expressed this new self-confidence through the ecstatic expression of their Religious Prophets who spoke in the name of this fighting, but Just, all-Righteous, Deity – not through the sterile legalism of scribes or priestly rituals, though these also were a part of this cultural development. And they expressed their political feelings and emotions, the rightness or wrongness of a decision wisely or unwisely taken, also through the mouths of these ecstatic and Righteously-indignant Spokesmen.

13. The *Yom Kippur* War and Henry Kissinger

Let us take another example: how would these Prophets of old, these spokesmen for the Old Testament Religion in its prime – this attested to, not only by one of our greatest Medieval Poets, but also by one of our greatest modern revivalists – how would they have reacted to some of the events implicit in the disaster of the *Yom Kippur* War (a better name for this particular War could not have been found)?

To phrase the question in a different way, what has the mythical Hebrew religion, we are hypothesizing, to tell us about how we should have behaved at the Suez Canal at the climax of the last war, how we should have reacted to Russian and American threats, how a proud People – even at the risk of being at the brink of destruction – should have behaved when World pressure was brought to bear in what was clearly a dishonorable manner?

The enemy in The *Yom Kippur* War had nothing to fear; they knew that as long as they were winning they would be permitted to do so. They also knew that the moment they started losing, World pressure would be brought to bear on Israel and she would be forced to withdraw. This is exactly what transpired and is still transpiring! This is exactly what was implicit in Henry Kissinger's hurried trip to Moscow after the Israelis had achieved at high cost a successful crossing of the Suez Canal – driving a wedge between the two Egyptian Armies, demoralizing them.

What would the Hebrew Religion have told us about such a military and political situation where almost all Jewish Leaders seemed to have dissolved into docility and senility – those great pillars of the heretofore redoubtable Israeli Government, Moshe Dayan and Golda Meir



and even the linguistic gymnast, Abba Eban – all left speechless before the conformation of powers that confronted them.

The Prophets, however, would have risen to such a situation, not collapsed. There would be no doubt in the way they would have approached it. One can literally hear their great voices booming out down the corridors of History: "Yahweh Sabaoth has spoken it." "You shall not go down into Egypt. You shall not deal with the Egyptians". "Do not go into Nebuchadnezzar's Camp. Do not pay any tribute. Do not deal with the Babylonians."

These are the words of a proud People, sure of their destiny and proud of the heritage for which they were born to serve. Translated into modern language, which is perhaps a futile exercise but still instructive, they would read: "Do not listen to the Russians. Do not bargain with the Americans. I have placed the Egyptians into your hands. I have given the Syrians over to you. Do not bow to the voices of the Nations of the Earth. I the Lord of Hosts has spoken it." This would be the political and spiritual advice that our Prophets of Old, the Jewish Religion in its Hebrew Incarnation, would have cried out to our Leaders and our People at such a crucial juncture in our history.

What would the Rabbinic Faith have had to say in such an extremity, accustomed as it was to survival in the *Diaspora*? Perhaps I am being unkind to it but I doubt if very much – very little I would suppose. If the Christian dictum, "Render unto Caesar what is Caesar's and unto God what is God's," can safely be said to be any indication of the general tenor of their approach; then, no doubt, the "Jews" among us – those followers of the outmoded garment we still call "Judaism" including most of our Leaders, though very few of the general populace

who, once again, seem wiser than their Leaders – would advise caution. “Be careful. Let us think about it” and, in thinking about it, be debilitated – which is precisely what happened. The Jewish People were robbed of the fruits of one of their greatest victories of all times – a victory achieved at tremendous cost in lives, in material, and in economic dislocation.

The cost of this robbery will be felt for a generation to come. They were robbed without even a shot being fired. They were robbed in the manner so customary in the *Diaspora*: by subtle pressure, hints of disaster, threats of annihilation and deprivation, and, finally and most of all, by appealing to their self-conscious Jewish embarrassment about being conquerors, about being military men, about achieving military victories – even though these victories are necessary for their survival, even though the opposite of any one of these victories would result in their total annihilation.

They were bilked out of it by the clever and subtle manipulation of these pressures by one of their own, Henry Kissinger, who being subject to such frailties himself (a puppet for the oil lobby and cartel of industrial business forces that govern America, a puppet of Rockefeller, Nixon, and Ford, the winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, also a dubious honor given the present nature and state of the world – not very impressive credentials), would know better how to apply them to others. This was the usual Jew-baiting in reverse form. The Jew-baiting of Russia turned around into the subtle form of anti-Semitism that has replaced it in America – and the not so subtle in Europe. The Russians were praying for it. The Americans kept their fingers crossed, and the Israelis fell for it.

How did this happen? How was it possible? Many of my Israeli friends, some even in Foreign Ministry Circles, give me the usual line – how could we have done any differently? They were threatening to cut off our military supplies. What could we do? The Russians might have come in. We could not take the chance – the words of a Hebrew People, self-confident, assured, placing their faith in the Mighty One of Israel or the words of their *Diaspora* soul, not yet discarded covered, by a Sabra skin? I believe the latter. Yet this was the policy the Israeli Government and its ineffectual organs of Democratic input opted for.

Is it right to blame the Israelis placed in such an untenable position? Yes, it is right to blame them and, if one does not, one is delinquent. The Russians would not have come in. How can one say this with any authority, I am asked? How can one be sure?

They would not have come in because they have never come in and, even if they had, it would not have mattered. The Russians love the game of bluff but it is common knowledge that they have never since the Second World War committed their armies to a foreign war, except perhaps in Czechoslovakia and Hungary closer to home. They know better than most of the Nations of the World what war is. They had a good taste of it from 1940-44.

Even if they had come in, then the Israelis would have been forced back by overwhelming odds and what shame would there have been in that – what loss? The sympathy of the World would have been on the Israeli side and the West would have been in a state of panic. To let the Russians really come into the Middle East in a fighting manner? Inconceivable. The Middle East is a vital area for both the Europeans

and the Americans, as the Israelis saw in the days of the oil embargo following The *Yom Kippur* War much to their dismay. The Russians never would have been allowed to make such a move whatever the provocation without some appropriate response, whatever the impression left by Kissinger with the Israelis. A clever card player never reveals all the trump cards he has in his hand – just what he wants his opponents to know he has.

But the Americans would have cut off all our military and economic aid, Israelis are heard to say. They would not have – not then. This was Kissinger's bluff. He did not and could not control Congress then, especially not in the midst of the Watergate Crisis. He does more so now with a new puppet President in power, Gerald Ford. At the time of The *Yom Kippur* War, Congress' sympathies were mainly on the side of the Israelis – more so than they had been for some time. Whatever Kissinger said, or thought he could do at that time, he would not have been able to do. He could not afford to alienate Congress any more than he had already done – any more than Nixon had done – not in the middle of the Watergate Crisis.

It took over two years for the Administration to chip away at Israel's support, the Pre-Israeli Lobby, as it is called now in Government Circles. Both in Congress and with public opinion in the United State. This was helped by an Oil Embargo in 1974, the post-mortem blame for which pro-Administration, subtle force tried to pin on Israeli stubbornness through constant and subtle sniping in the Nation's press – particularly since Gerald Ford's coming to power and the sponsorship of the Rockefeller Oil Lobby close behind him.

But at the actual time of the confrontation, all these factors did

not matter. Whatever supplies the Americans were going to give the Israelis at that moment had already been given. As far as the casual observer could see, Israel had already been re-armed at the time of the Crisis Airlift that had bailed them out of an armaments shortage during the height of The *Yom Kippur* War. Besides, whatever else they would have needed in the short haul; they could have captured from their enemies by the successful pushing of the war through to its logical conclusion in a manner' which would have left her enemies bruised and battered not only in materials – but also in spirit – for a long time to come.

The outcome of the War as it finally turned out did nothing of the kind but, on the contrary, left the Arabs with the new sensation that what seemed like a defeat had actually been a victory – that they had really won The *Yom Kippur* War – that a no-win for Israel was really a victory for them. As the pressures of the Oil Embargo mounted in 1974, this feeling of jubilation mounted. They had shown Israel was vulnerable, militarily, economically and, most of all, politically.

They were beside themselves with exultation and, with it, their extravagant demands came more and more to the fore. As their self-confidence mounted so, too, their extravagant demands mounted until Israel has her back almost to the wall, both economically and militarily, and nobody knows when the list of demands will come to an end. Israel has tried to draw the line. Rabin has tried to put some backbone into the Israeli foreign policy and, because of it, the first Kissinger Shuttle Peace Mission ended in failure at the beginning of 1975 – but this just resulted in a further mounting of pressures and more demands.

What were the Israelis frightened of? If the Americans were going to cut off aid or use the aid as a weapon for blackmail in 1973 in the midst of The *Yom Kippur* War, then certainly they would do so thereafter as they have now to a certain extent proved they would. Some will say this is hindsight. But it is not hindsight. It was already obvious then at the time of the crisis during The *Yom Kippur* War and anyone with any vision could see that once the Israelis gave in to international pressure and Arab blackmail at that crucial moment, then there would be no end to the demands laid upon them subsequently. This is precisely what has happened since and there have been no end of disengagement talks and pullbacks, one pullback agreement following another.

So, if the Israelis did not have to dig in their heels in 1973 in the midst of The *Yom Kippur* War, they will certainly have to do so sometime in the future, as they are already showing signs of realizing – as long as the present Administration is in power in Washington. But the turning point in the present state of their fortunes has already been past. Whatever anyone might think, whatever anyone might say, "All the World loves a winner". Demands that are put on the loser or the dubious winner are never quite the same as those put on the clear winner.

The chorus of demands after the successful conclusion of the 1967 War, despite Israel's public opinion image abroad, were never as great as those following the 1973 War – once again, despite the improvement of Israel's public opinion image abroad because of the restraint she displayed. The World now feels or realizes, perhaps rightly or wrongly, that Israel is no longer invincible. Therefore, the natural

economic forces set in motion by oil needs leads it to think that Israel can be brought to terms – perhaps even removed from existence – anything to placate the mounting demands of the Arab Oil Cartel and the mounting dependence of the Western block upon it.

The Arabs, too, have received an uplift in spirit by the events of 1973 followed by the Oil Embargo equivalent to little else in their history – as they themselves are the first to boast – except the Period of early expansion under the Abbasids and Umayyads and perhaps the successful "Revolt in the Desert", inspired by T.E. Lawrence. Such a spirit will be hard to counterbalance and whatever short-term effects Israel thought she was gaining in 1973 by caving in under Western and Russian pressure and not moving on to inflict a crushing defeat on her attackers, these effects in the long run must now seem inconsequential. Only a sound defeat of the Arabs could have further solidified Israel's position as a viable Nation and erased all doubts as to the substantiality of her future. Only a sound defeat could have brought the Arabs to a state-of-mind where further such adventures might have seemed foolhardy. As it is, having once tasted Israeli blood, the appetite is whetted not abated – having once seen Israel's vulnerability, the dogs (no insult intended), though patient, feel they can close in for the kill. As the Arabs say, we waited two hundred years for the Crusaders to collapse but they did collapse. The same will happen to the Israelis.

As if to underscore this process, the incidents of Arab terrorism since the 1973 Mar have been nothing like those preceding it since The Six Day War. Their scope has been wider, their effects more deadly. Even more so, the display of Arab daring and determination has

increased. No longer do they use Japanese terrorists to carry out their suicide missions for them as in the Lod Airport bombing and machine gunning, but now Arab terrorist bands take over whole buildings in Israeli border settlements and in the middle of Tel Aviv. Children are thrown out of windows. Whole roomfuls of hostages are hand-grenaded and murdered. Could any wrath be more gruesome and terrifying coming as it does on the heels of the disaster and poignant losses of The *Yom Kippur* War? It is doubtful.

How could the Old Testament Religion, we have been describing – the Religion of the Hebrews, Judaism without its *Halachic* Traditions – have altered this situation or affected it? As has quite straightforwardly been presented, by providing those fundamental behavioral patterns necessary to any Landed People that wishes to act with honor and self-respect – qualities that are on the whole totally lacking from the Talmudic conception of Religion and, as a result, on the whole totally lacking from the Jewish Personality as it is perceived or as it has emerged in the *Diaspora*.

We have already discussed the problem of what the World thinks of the Jews at quite some length at the beginning of this analysis. This is not to say that the Jewish People do not have the fundamental qualities of courage, nobility, honor, and honesty that all the World admires – whatever the culture – though, admittedly, practices rather infrequently. These qualities are lurking in everyone's heart – albeit somewhat beneath the surface – which is why there is such universal agreement no matter what the culture framework concerning what they are. The problem is that the Jewish Cultural and Religious Environment of the last two thousand years has not been very encouraging or



stimulating to such qualities. Other qualities were needed to survive.

Just the manly virtues of pride, strength, courage, nobility, honor, et. al. were likely to be the qualities that led to someone's stepping out-of-line or not recognizing his place – in short, causing the Community troubles it did not need or was not seeking. Therefore, just those qualities that stimulated the universal admiration of men were the ones suppressed in Jewish Religious Expression, as it was incorporated in the Talmudic/*Mishnaic* tradition, and it was just their opposites which emerged – just the ones most likely to fuel the fires of the universal detestation. So much so that, as we know, the word, "Jew" has not only become a religious curse word among Christians, meaning those who killed Christ; it has also become a social epithet of disgust for one universally recognized as pariah.

How quickly this situation can be turned around and was turned around once the Jews became a Landed People again is evident in the Israeli experience and the clear admiration the young Israeli evokes worldwide – even among his enemies. What has he been admired for? Why just those qualities so evident in the Old Testament – his forthrightness, his fighting Spirit, his fortitude, his pride, and his courage – not for the qualities, it should be noted, usually associated with being Jews, not for the qualities for instance that Albert Einstein, Sigmund Freud, Leon Trotsky, or Karl Marx have been admired or, as the case may be, detested for. These latter, intellectual acumen and verbal ability, are also those closely identified with the Rabbinic Tradition or just those so universally acknowledged as hitherto being "Jewish" in the *Diaspora*.

But what the Israelis are or presently have become is not enough.

Clearly if they want to be the "Special People", so always talked about in the Old Testament – a People unto God, "the Chosen People", etc. – if they want to think of themselves as being different and they do subconsciously in spite of themselves, then they must exhibit just these qualities of Justice, honor, and nobility even more than other Nations presently do. They must exemplify the qualities of courage and spiritual strength even more than they presently do.

Some good cases in point are the present thorough disarray of their youth and their general disorientation at the time of The *Yom Kippur* War as well as what to do under the pressures that were then brought to bear on them. An Old Testament Faith could have provided the answers – a more modern or compromising one could not have.

Once again, the answers were clear or evident in the Prophets for all or anyone to see. This answer was be stubborn, be pig-headed, have "a *Masada Complex*" and universal amazement and admiration would have followed. As it was, the Israelis vacillated showing the incompleteness of their spiritual development and so, if not universal contempt – at least a universal pity almost bordering on contempt – followed. What to do with the poor Israelis? How can we have this burden on ourselves? How can we shoulder the responsibilities of keeping a viable Israeli State alive – of defending the Israelis? Something almost akin to the universal dismay and the ostracization always greeting the beggar, the cripple, or the deadbeat is beginning to emerge instead of the former profound admiration based on the assurance that the Israelis could take care of themselves.

The answer of the Prophets was clear. "Do not negotiate with Egypt." "Do not bargain with the Syrians." Do not go to the UN, do not honor

the Missions of the World's Henry Kissingers. Do not give in to the blackmail of the World's dishonorable Nations when you know you are in the right – just so long as you do know you are in the right and, if the Israelis and Jewish People know nothing else, they certainly know this – and all else would have followed.

What else would have followed? Why a Stunning victory in the 1973 War, a raising of the spirits of all Israel's Youth and that of the Jews around the World, a more viable negotiating position – from strength rather than from weakness – and a completely different situation in the World and at Home than Israel presently finds herself in, a situation resembling more the one that followed the lightning-fast, successful 1967 War than the present one, a situation which the Israelis themselves frittered away by their glibness, superficiality, monetary unscrupulousness, and social corruption in the years following The Six-Day War. Perhaps the situation now after the reversals, defeats, and lessons of The *Yom Kippur* War will be different. There are already indications with the new "*Sabra*" Administration that it will be – though not completely.

## 14. The U.N.

What are the further lessons of a proud, self-confident Old Testament Religion for an Israeli People and the Jews of the World behind them mired in self-doubt and indecisiveness? Let us take several examples: take the example of Israel's treatment at the U.N. No one says that Israel necessarily has to pull out of that World Organization that has so thoroughly discredited itself by the plainly political orientation of its debates and the shabbiness of its conduct towards Israel as only one of numerous cases in point.

But the Israelis themselves need not act like "Jews" on these matters. They need not sit by and let themselves be needlessly insulted by Arab or other International Delegates. If the Russians can walk out on the Americans, if the Arabs and others can walk out on the Israelis in whatever the arena or forum connected with UN activities — and this includes not simply the General Assembly, then the Israelis can very well walk out on them as well when she is being insulted — as, indeed, she has done on several occasions. Even more so, however, when she is treated in this manner, she need not continue to participate in a given enterprise or further debate on a given subject.

When the Prime Minister's wife, Leah Rabin, is walked out on and insulted in a meeting of the Women's Equal Rights Conference — as was done recently in Mexico City — she need not continue her speech, however valiant, and plead for understanding in the World and mutual reconciliation. She need not continue to show Israel's moderateness — not in the face of such provocation — for it is debilitating to Israel's spirit not only at home, but also abroad. She, too, can quite

simply cease participating in the sham of such a Conference and, in the process, take the occasion to deliver the relevant denunciation of the dishonorable procedures and humiliating tactics employed by Israel's detractors.

The same goes for International Sporting Events. Israel need not beg to participate in these – whatever supposed advantage she might see in them. Where her participants are insulted and harassed beyond any conscionable degree, she can simply pull out. She is not obligated to ingratiate herself to the Countries of the World. She is not obliged to be obsequious and bear their indignities. This does not win the popularity contest and, even if it did, she is not in a popularity contest.

If the Turks would not do it, why should she; and, lest any of the Nations of the World doubt it, the Turks would not bear such indignities. Clear proof of this was demonstrated during the recent Cyprus Crisis and their reaction to the American Congress' arms embargo and the opium-growing dispute. The Turks go their own way. No one might like them for it but certainly no one disrespects them, which is even more important.

This is the fundamental behavior of a self-confident Landed People. This is the behavior that strikes awe and respect in the eyes of one's enemies and friends alike. This is the political and international behavior Israel must learn. She has already learnt it on the battlefield and not for naught is it said, "Israel fritters away in peacetime and at the conference table what she has gained in war." This process cannot go on indefinitely without serious consequences, not only politically but, also, by way of undermining the basic morale

and spiritual underpinning of the People. This underpinning has been in a state of erosion since The *Yom Kippur* War. It must not be allowed to continue to erode.

As has already been pointed out, no Country in the World has been treated the way the Jews have in their present guise of the Israeli People. What country, attacked on the holiest day of its year, would have been so docile when victory was at hand or been so quick to give up the fruits of that victory under International pressure? Would the Russians have done it? Would the Turks, would the Americans, would the British, would even the Germans have done it? Not very likely. Then why should the Israelis?

There is a double standard for behavior in the World – one for the Israelis and one for all others. The Israelis, however, bring it upon themselves by the indecisiveness of their behavior at crucial junctures and their misreading of world public opinion.

## 15. The Anti-Zionist Resolution

Take, for example, the recent passage of The Anti-Zionist Resolution at the U.N. "Zionism" is just another name for the Jewish National Movement. To say that the Jewish National Movement is "Racist", while all other latter-day National Movements are not, is just pure and unadulterated Racism itself and smacks of the worst days of Hitler. But the Russians and others of their kind have learned that nothing goes over as well as "The Big Lie". "The Big Lie" is even more palatable, very often, than the simplest Truth.

It is difficult to understand this strange aversion human nature has when it comes to Truth. What is the reason for this? Probably because Truth is much too complex a phenomenon to come to terms with whereas "The Big Lie" presents everything in a relatively simple light. In the limited span any human being has to spend on this earth – a span that can be interrupted in an unforeseen way at any instant – it is probably much more convenient to go the comparatively unsophisticated and fairly simplistic way of "The Lie" than to try to unravel the actual Truth of a given problem.

The very finiteness of any given human being himself is probably reason enough for being drawn to the half-Truth and the Lie rather than the whole Truth, for Truth is so precious a commodity as to rank it almost on the level of the infinite. Finite beings rarely can comprehend that which is beyond them, i. e., infinities. Once again, their very finiteness draws them inevitably to a simpler, more distorted version of Reality than the Reality itself.

What should the Jews – or in this case the Israelis – have done in, connection with this resolution? They did boycott any sessions in

which it was discussed or voted on but this, in itself, seemed too small a protest to make with regard to a resolution that, in effect, sought to contradict the very assumption of their existence itself. Probably they should not have been in the U.N. any longer in any case.

Perhaps, even, they should have taken this opportunity to point up the moral bankruptcy of that Organization. It had long become apparent to the Nations of the World – at least those ordinarily thought of as being "Western" – that the U.N. had degenerated into something morally bankrupt. Perhaps it was time for the Jewish People to point this out in a more-or-less spectacular way, i.e., instead of waiting to be thrown out – which will perhaps be the next step in the World-wide campaign to discredit them and declare them once more "outside the Pale," much as in the days of the old Nazism – they probably should have walked out for good, taking the opportunity to deliver a stinging denunciation of the bankruptcy of that body and declare its obituary in the Prophetic manner of their Ancestors since there is very little doubt that that Organization is probably doomed in the long run and its present lingering existence is probably little more than a case of *post-mortem* effects.

Many would, of course, say in relation to the advisability of such an act that we would not be able to present Israel's case to the World any longer if we did not have the forum of the U.N. to speak in. How would we be able to prevent that body from doing and deciding on even worse things in our absence? That is a chance one will or should perhaps have to take, but it cannot be said that Israel's present presence or attempts to dissuade the U.N. from taking any particular course of action – much the same as Leah Rabin's attempts at the



International Women's Congress in Mexico — do very much good.

Finally it is Nations like the United States and others who, by their vetoes in the Security Council and willingness to stand up to the ire of the Developing Nations, save Israel ultimately from any more serious consequences than she is already subjected to. If these nations were to decide tomorrow it was no longer worthwhile to cast their votes in opposition to such forces, then very little could save Israel in any case — whether inside the U.N. or out of it.

It cannot be denied that it was Israel's presence in the U.N. during the last crisis that made it possible, once more, for these Nations hostile to her to humiliate her in the eyes of the World. It is very difficult to humiliate a member that does not recognize your very right to humiliate her or declares in advance your legitimacy to be illegitimate. It is like trying to condemn as guilty a defendant who does not recognize the Constitutionality of a given Court or does not appear on the dock and has to be condemned in *abstentia*.

There are those who will say, however, that it was the U.N. that gave Israel her legitimacy in the first place and to turn one's back on the U.N. would be to turn one's back on the Instrument that underlies the Legality of the existence of the Country. But it was not really the U.N. that gave Israel its legitimacy. Israel survived in spite of the U.N. At any given military juncture, it was always the U.N. that stood in the way of and, to a certain extent, against the future survival of Israel. Israel has survived because of the excellence of her Armed Forces and the willingness of her young men to make the necessary sorts of sacrifices; whereas, on the other hand, the U.N. has made her continued harassment and humiliation possible.

Contrariwise, there also can be little doubt that, were Israel to have left the U.N. in Righteous indignation and with a denunciation delivered concerning its Dishonorableness either during the recent debates or years ago, she doubtlessly would have won for herself the silent approval and secret admiration of large segments of the World's Population that do not altogether go along with their individual Governments' artificial policies of support for the U.N. and in their own hearts have doubtlessly long harbored contempt for the spineless, amoral vacillation of that Organization – an Organization which has no intrinsic power but that of propagandistic and self-interested voting.

Many, no doubt, would have admired by her steadfastness and, as a consequence, the steadfastness of a Jewish People who were willing to stand up to such a charade and live by the principles supposedly therein espoused. Israel and the Jewish people would have been seen by many as the harbingers of those principles of Honor and Decency supposedly represented by the U.N. The gain in her own self-respect and in the morale of her People would have been likewise immeasurable.

Now, however, on the contrary we must still live day-by-day confronted by such taunts and abuse – waiting until we are thrown out on the streets like dogs and beggars. But we have had ample warnings and the honorable course of action still stares us in the face beckoning.

## 16. The Sinai Withdrawal

Let us give another example. There was probably no more disheartening and vulgar behavior pattern than that exhibited by the Israelis in pictures of their boisterous troops rowdily celebrating the pullback from the Egyptian side of the Suez Canal after the Sinai Accords were signed in 1974. In the World's press, on the newsreels, loutish Israeli Troops were shown in a pseudo-celebration that fairly reeked of callowness.

They poured "Champagne" - one can imagine the sort of cheap Israeli wine they used - over themselves, drenching each other, their tanks, their vehicles. They were pulling back, shouting loudly to newsmen, waving as if this was a moment of triumph or as they had thought one was supposed to do in such moments. Who were they fooling but themselves; and who was the charade for - the Israeli Press, the World Press, or their own ruffled feelings. And why would an Army - supposedly tough, supposedly self-confident, supposedly proud - allow such loathsome behavior to go on at such an unfortunate moment? If not unfortunate, then certainly, solemn.

Nothing, in the writer's view, gives a better picture of the gap between the spiritual development of the Israeli People and their physical development than these repugnant scenes. Their men were dressed in every sort of shabby attire. Their hair hung down over their faces or in various modish manners of dishevelment (clothing and appearance regulations have since, it would seem, been upgraded in the Israeli Army probably on the basis of the dictum, not altogether untrue, that sloppiness of dress and appearance very often reflects sloppiness of character and soul).

Here they were being humiliated, once again, by the World, being humbled and forced to withdraw after having made the sorts of sacrifices certain of their units made and they were loudly singing as if on a Feast Day. It was not the sort of spectacle likely to impress their Arab neighbors. Were these the vaunted Israelis? If they could so easily be made to withdraw and even celebrate it, what other inanities could they be made to swallow?

It was also not the sort of spectacle that could be relied upon to impress World public opinion. They looked like a bunch of street people with no sense of dignity, no sense of honor – not even admirable when it came to military retreats or setbacks or even when it was simply a matter of discipline. In face, even the emotion they attempted to evince did not ring true and was clearly feigned. They really could not be happy under the ridiculous circumstances of such a debacle and yet, if they really were, what did it presage for Israel's future? Certainly not anything very promising.

Given that these are just the sorts of emotions usually felt by armies being told that they would be going home soon, what was wrong with seeing them displayed by the Israelis? First – and this can only be a subjective judgment – they seemed artificial. Second, they revealed a People who yet knew nothing about Dignity or Honor. Though they had the bodies of the Israeli People, they still had the souls of a *Diaspora* one. They inhabited the souls of a servile People as they often do in public – not an honorable one. They still had no conception of what Honor was all about or what it could even be.

So you ask, what have we to do with Honor? We, the Jews, who have not fought for almost two thousand years – what have we to do with

these grandiose European notions of Chivalry, if you like, or Pride? We are just Jews. Why should you expect anything more of us? We haven't learned such delicate mores but that is just the point. To repeat, we are still nothing but "Jews" – we have not learned such delicate mannerisms or behavior patterns. But to really earn the respect of the World's Peoples – and not just superficially, not by plotting about public relations campaigns or figuring out where an added or subtracted little bit of emphasis might be placed – we must learn them. This is the universally understood language around the World. It is not just the behavioral patterns or grandiose European conceptions – though this is how we as Jews came in contact with them through our experience of the European Cultural milieu and elite.

This language is understood by the Japanese as well as the Chinese. It is understood by the Muslim Peoples, whether *Pathan* Tribesmen, Mongols, Turks, or Arabs, Beduins or city imitations of Beduins. It is understood by almost all the European Peoples from the Russians all the way across to the English Channel.

It is even understood by the Germans in their own curious way and everyone who has fought them or dealt with them will attest to this. It was understood in the old American West on the Plains between Indians and real fighting men – not necessarily the colonists or settlers who followed in their wake. It is a language of Honor and Dignity bred of respect for courage and self-sacrifice that has been understood by almost all Peoples at or in all times. It is understood, too, by Israelis in their hours of Destiny as anyone who would like to read the Honor Citations given out after The *Yom Kippur* War can readily attest.

However, if it is not understood by the Society as a whole, if it is only understood in moments of crisis and not as a general behavioral pattern or what is perhaps more *a propos*, if the Jewish Soul has not yet developed a series of behavioral patterns to encompass, respect, admire, and thereby foster such behavior (though in its more unselfish moments the Jewish body has); how are we ever to become a People held in respect and admiration and treated by the same standards other Nations are treated by – the likes of whom as we claim to want to become?

The Old Testament is just the Document that will allow us, once more, to become such a People because it presents such behavioral patterns as a matter of course as the norm – not as the ideal or exception to the rule. Cain kills Abel. He is detested for it. Abraham magnanimously gives up the more fertile and promising portion of the Land to his nephew Lot – though, by right, he should have first claim to it. Esau behaves with utter magnanimity, generosity, and forgiveness towards his scheming younger brother Jacob and his conduct is clearly portrayed with approbation by the Old Testament – though not necessarily in Talmudic Literature where he is looked upon as something of a marshmallow-head (since he was not a "Jew") or dunce. Aaron and Miriam get the sort of recompense their behavior merits in rebelling against Moses. Jonathan is the paradigm of Chivalrous Behavior – and the cast goes on.

The Old Testament is one of the original Documents of and, quite literally, one of the fountains of Medieval Chivalry (certainly this phenomenon does not come completely from the New Testament which is much too pacifistic to actually be its sole source). Judas Maccabeus –

an apocryphal character by Jewish standards, though miracle of miracles included in the Catholic Canon (how would the Jews know *Hanukkah* otherwise?)— has many of the virtues of the Medieval King Arthur around whom so many of famous romances centered.

Not surprisingly, the Rabbis did not altogether approve of such a noble self-sacrificing hero such as Judas, for who knows where such conduct might have ended us up in the *Diaspora* (probably with a proper Country of our own and a viable Civilization for that Country)? The Old Testament knows what a conception of Honor is all about — albeit from whatever Civilization it might arise: Japanese, Beduin, American Indian, Scots-Irish. It knows what is meant by such concomitant virtues as generosity, hospitality, pride, courage, nobility, magnanimity, steadfastness, and mercy. Anyone who doubts this has only to look at the retinue of stories contained therein to document these various recommended forms of behavior.

The Talmudic or *Mishnaic* Tradition of Literature on the whole hardly seems to have any notion of what such conceptions are about at all. The emphasis there is on survival and Communal Solidarity (to say nothing of *pilpul*) — survival at all costs. I know this is a controversial statement and can only be proved by subjective measurement yardsticks but, still, these emotions just seemed to be beyond the scope of the general *Halachic*, intellectual, legalistic, and often fantastic (if not irrelevant) subject matter of such later books. Once again, they were not the emotions of importance to a People deprived of Territorial Existence for such a long period of time.

Emotions such as these are only of interest to a Territorial People

– the modes of behavior and personality patterns developed by a People at ease in a Landed Existence and at ease with itself to the extent that it can afford to be generous, proud, self-sacrificing. What are the importance of such emotions and behavioral patterns to the Jewish People nowadays? Nothing perhaps – only that without them, we can never expect to become a Normal People at ease in its own Homeland, free to develop its own individual Culture again – which we claim to want to be and become. The Old Testament contains the patterns for just such behavior. It is where we must begin when we go back to wanting to be a Territorial People again, when we go back to wanting to be Hebrews once again. It is the Cultural Document of the Hebrew People at least, though it does not necessarily contain the whole of the Culture of the Jewish People – if the reader can understand the fine distinction being made here.

What is wrong, then, with the behavioral patterns evinced by a retreating Jewish Army rowdily dousing itself and its vehicles with Champagne or whatnot? Nothing – only that it is false. The emotions are false and the behavioral patterns were forced. Again, this is a matter of subjective evaluation, but the proper behavioral patterns for a brave and courageous People in such a situation called for solemnity – even if they were happy to be going home.

It was a solemn moment and, if the Soldiers could not see the solemnity of what was transpiring, then they were no doubt going to be in for more such solemn moments in the future. If the retreat was as necessary as it was portrayed as being – and evidently the Israeli Leaders would not have agreed to it otherwise – then it should have been carried out with order and Dignity.



If the men, stuck for months in the Desert away from their families, did not feel it this way, then discipline should have been enforced – as it can be well imagined a Joshua or a Barak would have enforced it – enforcing the sort of conduct patterns on their Army that the situation merited and not letting the Army run amok according to the behavior the individual soldier might have thought appropriate.

Even a certain surliness in retreat – a certain repressed quiet anger would not have been out of character or uncalled for. One could imagine just such behavior being displayed by the Russians, the Turks, the French, or even the Arabs themselves in such a situation. If nothing else, at least such behavior would have sent a chilling reminder into the soul of their enemies that such a retreat was not agreed to willingly, *i.e., it was not agreed to out of weakness.*

To celebrate such a reversal in public in such a childish, undignified manner makes it unclear what impression this could have had upon one's enemies. Whatever else they might have thought, fear would not have been one of the emotions generated – except perhaps fear of getting hit or drenched by an unruly wine bottle.

## 17. Israel Social Problems

These older, more self-confident, classical behavioral styles too would go a long way towards solving many of Israel's incipient social problems as well as the woes of the Jewish People as a whole. There would be far less materialism, far less of crass displaying of the trappings of middle-class prosperity: the car, the trip to Europe, the vacation, the latest styles, or new stereo ("the *televizia*" – just wait till the latest color tv's are available in Israel).

There would be far less misbehavior on the part of public officials, businessmen, and bureaucrats in Israel – far less graft. There would be far less of the culture patterns learned from Eastern Europe and the *Diaspora*. You would not necessarily have the same "*pakid*" (bureaucrat) sitting under mountains of paper doing nothing but sipping coffee and gossiping with his friends. There might also be far more magnanimity between rich and poor – far less of a social gap than already exists in Israel.

For a Country that has only been in existence a mere thirty years for such fissures in the fabric of social life already to have appeared bodes no one any good. As back as far as 1970 it was estimated that there was the equivalent of some 500 millionaires in Israel. There are doubtless far more now with the recent inflation. This is altogether unconscionable in a Country with the social problems of Israel – a Country with the deep gaps between rich and poor that Israel has, a Country once again only in existence barely a quarter of a Century.

Of course it has been said – and with some justice – that the Jews had no one to steal from, now that they had returned from the

*Diaspora*, so they had to start stealing from each other; and anyone who has spent any time in Israel will understand the purport of this statement. It is a cruel statement to make but one of the points of this analysis is to show that behavioral patterns – the product of centuries of dehumanized living – once learned, are not so easily unlearned.

It is not so easy to unlearn how to survive when the only measure and modicum of that survival was money and the use of bribery – without a supreme effort of national and spiritual will. This is just what is called for in setting up a new National and Autonomous Spiritual Existence. In the *Diaspora*, once again, Rabbinic Judaism would have seen nothing wrong with such cultural values because the victims of them were usually "Gentile" (the "*Goyim*" of vulgar Jewish parlance) and Rabbinic Law only extended to members of the Jewish Community. In the *Diaspora* too, owing to circumstances and *force majeure*, the Jewish Community usually stuck together; but, once again, such behavioral patterns, once learned, are not so easily discarded.

Now that the Jews have returned to their own Land, an impartial observer might say that they are literally tearing themselves apart. Anyone who has been in Israel for any length of time – and not simply on the sophomoric "return to the roots" tour – could not avoid being upset by the almost vicious way one citizen treats another in public life at least in the cities – the arguments, the plethora of legal suits (but then again we are a legal people), the rudeness. It begins with the taxi drivers arguing over passengers at the airport (even the Customs Officials are usually surly. They should try some of their surliness out on the U.N. or Henry Kissinger rather than each other),

continues in the shops, restaurants, Government Offices, buses, hotels, and does not let up till one has quite literally left the Country. It has been estimated, and the writer does not doubt it, that person-for-person there are more legal suits in Israel than any Country in the World. Ask any local lawyer and he will tell you this. You might say this is because there is such a concern for Justice there, but this is hardly the case, since most of the suits involve suing people for nickels and dimes, uncollected bill real or imagined.

From my own experience of living five years in Israel, I can attest that it is hardly possible to enter into any commercial transaction of any kind without some difficulty emerging in connection with it – from the simplest of garage repairs to the arguing about a phone with the telephone company. It is this, no doubt, more than anything else that has discouraged many immigrants from remaining in Israel – the sheer torture of this dally commercial intercourse – and this is not simply a product of the strained economic circumstances of the Country. It is also a product of the economic personality of the People and how they treat each other.

What is the point of such a state of affairs? There can be no joy attached to it. One rarely sees any real joy in the faces of the people on the street, only a certain grimness engendered by this struggle for survival on a day-to-day basis – this struggle for existence. The struggle is not with the Arabs, but with each other. The writer has often contended that perhaps the main reason the Arabs cannot win the present periodic military confrontations with Israel is their almost complete ignorance regarding the realities of Israeli life and their total unpreparedness to face a People as doggedly

determined – as a result of these realities – as the Jewish People are in Israel.

But there is nothing redeeming in this struggle for daily existence – the unpleasantness within the social fabric of Israeli life. Its basis is simply greed. Nothing else – the graspingness of a middle-class mentality. It is doubtful if one could ever expect much better behavior from a Nation of shopkeepers, small businessmen, and petty salesmen. At least, however, from the Government Officials one should or could expect a higher order and standard of behavior, more Dignity and more Honor, and certainly within the ranks of the Army. One must not only expect it there, one must demand it.

To a certain extent, the character transformation we are suggesting has already occurred on some *Kibbutzim* where a more agricultural life-style has been engaged in. This perhaps might be the reason why the *Kibbutzim* are well known to take more than their proportional share of casualties in any Israeli War. But the economic crassness and schemingness is also present on the *Kibbutzim*. One has only to go there to convince oneself of that – one cannot avoid it.

Certainly, too, for the schools and the young people, these new standards of behavioral and cultural values would be a tremendous uplift. If these new standards of behavior, based on a Religion that inculcated Honor, Justice, Mercy, and Pride, rather than a Religion which inculcated useless norms of legalistic formalities – a Religion based on the informality of the Prophets rather than the formalism of the Rabbis – were taught in the schools from earliest childhood; then it would not be long before a new spirit and new attitude would begin to permeate the Society regardless of the attitudes already learned by

the adults and already partially discarded. Many of the problems of today's schools in Israel would vanish almost overnight.

No one who has seen the behavior norms of the Israeli young person in a schoolyard setting can be very impressed with the present instruction or sanguine about the future. First of all, there is almost no discipline – there is vulgarity, rudeness, boisterousness, and hardly any understanding of what might be meant by what the rest of the world calls "Honor" except, perhaps, a kind of rude, callow self-confidence.

One is not only speaking here of the rampant cheating that goes on in the classroom when one speaks of the behavioral patterns associated with a concept of Honor. The general attitude of the Israeli classroom and the average young Israeli is to a certain extent that of the rude undisciplined savage. The teaching of the principles hinted at above, backed up by the story context in which they are found not as a Religious Exercise in *pilpul* or formal Religious Practice, but rather as the Cultural Heritage of one's People and the virtues and values most highly prized by its Ancient Heritage, would go a long way towards clearing up the present animal farm-type atmosphere of the average Israeli classroom and the resultant loutish personality produced.

The reason of course for the negative aspects of the Israeli young person noted above is the hodge-podge of values he is subjected to: Western, Traditional, and Jewish, none of which seem entirely suited to the new situation he alone will have to face. Therefore, his contempt for his elders and the values of his elders – perhaps not altogether misplaced – is displayed in his vulgar, superficial

behavior, particularly in the city.

Not only would these values go a long way towards clearing up the morass of the average Israeli classroom and the behavior patterns displayed therein, they would also provide a basis to the young person for the sort of life he might come to expect. Some of this has already occurred on *Kibbutzim*, as we have suggested, and is already trickling into the mainstream of Israeli life since The *Yom Kippur* War – but not in any orderly fashion.

He would, then, not be armed with the sorts of illusions he was heretofore inculcated with when he goes out of the classroom to face war after war after war – to see his compatriots crippled and dying, to see his best friends fall beside him on the battlefield. The immediate reaction might not be, "Why me, why us?" But, rather, "This is just what I expected. I was told about it from the time I was a little boy. I was prepared for it." Then, of course, if he does not have to face these things when the time comes or during the course of his life all the better but, at least, he will have the spiritual and intellectual apparatus to cope with them on a personal basis.

If Honor, Nobility, Dignity, Self-Sacrifice, Righteousness are stressed from birth rather than the present, generally-muddled acquisitiveness of Israeli Society, then he will not perhaps be so surprised when he comes into young manhood and young womanhood and sees the sorts of sacrifices he will be called upon to make and will be called upon to make in the future along with his friends.

There has always been a real camaraderie among Israeli Youth, and this may well be just a rebellion against the sorts of things already discussed that he will be forced to face in the actuality of his life

later on or it may be based on somewhat sterner stuff. If the only concern of the average Israeli teenager or young adult is where he is going to get the money to afford to buy a flat and sometime settle down – not within the confines of his miniscule family flat but within the confines of a flat of his own – then how can you expect him to react to and behave with regard to the unfortunate interruption in his life that the Blood Conflict and Holy War with the Arabs represents.

The Israeli Government, as it is presently organized, bears a large degree of the responsibility for this degrading state of affairs by letting the acquisitiveness of Israeli Society in the name of the so-called virtue of "free enterprise" run away with itself to the extent of being out of all proportion to the circumstances of Israeli Life. This was mainly a result of the unnatural security felt by all strata of Israelis after the events of The Six-Day War – a sense of well-being which was very rudely shattered by the events of the Yom Kippur War.

Of course there may be some relief from the all-pervading economic concerns of everyday Israeli life and the peer pressure of acquisitiveness that exists especially in the cities by the prospect that going into the Army represents. Many men, both young and old, married and unmarried, have said something of the like with regard to their military service both in the reserves, which is also a not altogether unwelcome activity, and in the real crisis of battle. Once again, it is only the classical Old Testament values encompassed in the heroic stories of their Ancestors that are going to give the Young Israeli the staying power and the sort of Spiritual Uprightness necessary to resist the overwhelming forces surrounding him and make



the sacrifices necessary to ensure the survival of the National Existence.

It will not come, at least on a mass scale, by bowing and scraping before or kissing Stones or Scrolls or through the endless repetition and recitation of certain formalized prayers – though these might help.

## 18. The Revival of the Priesthood

The objection might now legitimately be raised, what are you suggesting? Are you suggesting a revival of the Priesthood instead of the Rabbinate? Are you envisioning a return to Old Testament sacrifice and all the rituals associated with that? Are you envisioning even rebuilding the Temple?

No, perhaps not any of these particularly, but each probably must be investigated in their turn to determine their relative merits or demerits. Once again, Rabbinic Judaism was operating on the for them fortuitous situation that they did not have to worry about the revival of the Temple Cult – at least not for the foreseeable future. Therefore, they could go along their merry way, envisioning it as an ideal to be reached perhaps at “the End of Days”; but in the meantime practicing a wholly different form of Religious Expression.

We are no longer living under such circumstances, so the ideas proposed above are not necessarily so far-fetched. I have even had students inquire about them in seminars and lectures – and this, with the utmost seriousness.

Let us take the Priesthood. First of all, it is not at all clear that the Priesthood was necessarily one of the most important or even one of the most intrinsic practices of early Judaism or the Hebrew Religion, as we are calling it. To determine such a problem we would, once again, have to enter into the framework of Biblical Criticism or exegesis and see just how much of the material concerning the Priesthood is authentic or how much of it was insinuated into the text to cover the practices or meet the needs of a Later Age.

To begin with, there can be little doubt that most of the material

in the Law and elsewhere concerning the practices of the Aaronic Priesthood reflects the situation as it existed during the Period of David or Solomon, or even later, and has nothing whatever to do with the practices discussed in the early parts of the Bible. I am not the first one to have used these arguments or to have pointed out these problems – though perhaps one of the first to applied them in quite this way.

Paul in his letters, though clearly doing polemics (as we are to a large extent), used the very same arguments in attempting to invalidate and discredit the Jerusalem Priesthood by showing that this Priesthood was not necessarily one ordained by God but, simply, a much later addition to Israelite History. He asked the question, "What Priesthood did Abraham know" or, for that matter, "What Law"? The answer, of course, according to Jewish History itself was, "None".

He then goes on to say that he is now appointing – or "Jesus Christ" appointed before him – a "New Priesthood of the Order of Melchizedek", the Righteous or Gentile Priest pictured as meeting with Abraham in Genesis and acknowledging the Holiness of the Hebrew Nation, to take the place of the one now discredited (either because it was corrupt or it was going to be or had already been destroyed) in Jerusalem. Of course, this "Priesthood of Paul's" is still with us today in the Greek Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches – to say nothing of some Protestant ones.

Muhammad picked up Paul's arguments at this point but used them for slightly different polemical ends, that is, to show that the Arab People had as clear a title to what he called "the Religion of Abraham" – through the real or imagined link of Abraham's oldest son

Ishmael – as the Jews (through Isaac and Jacob). In fact, he claims that the latter had even *falsified Scripture*. What he, Muhammad, was actually doing was going back to “the Original Religion of Abraham” and, in effect, *Islam was really the Original Monotheism of Abraham without all the later corruptions*.

There is no doubt that in this discussion we are using some of these very same arguments though, again, towards different ends – for these men in their early attempts at Biblical Criticism and Exegesis did pick up on some very crucial and significant points.

Throughout the books of Genesis, Joshua, Judges, and most of Samuel I, there is no Central Sanctuary with Central Formalized Priesthood and Paraphernalia or anything else (Eli in early Samuel is a very shadowy character at best and, at least, in Samuel, it is not even clear that he is a member of the Priesthood of Aaron). Rather, there are a myriad of stones and shrines set up very often two, three times each by several of the most important heroes – namely Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joshua, and Samuel who all have Sanctuaries ascribed to their names as well as standing stones and a baffling number of various poles, shrubs and trees. Then, too, there is the embarrassing problem of the conflict between Aaronite and Levitical Priesthoods, the latter being generally portrayed as a lower groups than the former. But, at least in Judges and early Samuel, there does not seem to be much of an Aaronite Priesthood present.

Whatever one wants to make of all these problems – and there is very much to be made of them (one thing is that the Aaronites very probably replaced the widespread and more informal Levites – the Clan of Moses – in connection with the setting up of a

Central Dynasty both North or South and a Centralized Pattern of Temple Worship), the Prophets who lived very much later are to a large extent almost to a man – at least the Pre-Exilic ones – anti-Priestly.

Though clearly Nationalistic and very much oriented towards the Southern Davidic Monarchy in Jerusalem – so much so that people like Isaiah and Jeremiah even seem to have Official Court Functions, probably as an Official kind of Oracle, Seer, or Soothsayer – they are hardly interested in the Priesthood at all (even though Jeremiah, for example, is of the Priest Class himself). As a matter of fact, more often than not, they roundly condemn it as leading the People astray and perverting them to immoral Baalistic and other idolatrous practices.

So whatever *Halachah* may have to say about the Priesthood – and *Halachah* is always rigid and literal – it is highly doubtful that such a dubious Institution as “the Priesthood”, at least as far as it is presented in the Old Testament, must necessarily be resurrected in its entirety in order to return to the general teachings and spirit of Pre-Exilic Judaism.

Although no one could say that a Priesthood would necessarily be or do anything worse than the Rabbinate which has generally usurped its functions in any case, particularly in the *Diaspora*, does. In Reform Judaism, the Rabbi has such Ceremonial Functions as to almost verge on being a Priest anyhow – but more of a Christian Priest than a Jewish one. It might even be better – for, at least, we might have a little Ceremony and Pomp and Circumstance to nurture a People’s natural longing for spectacle

instead of the present drab show, we all must witness, that is, all of us who are not participants and do not take it very seriously which. from my own personal experience, amounts to quite a large proportion of the Jewish People.

There are even hints of this anti-Priestly, at least anti-Aaronic attitude, in perhaps the most "Priestly" of all the Books of the *Torah*, Exodus. Here Aaron is deliberately indicted for leading the people astray and giving in to their demands to construct a Golden Calf or Bull Idol, the generally-prevalent Mediterranean Deity from Spain to India (to some extent, even to this day).

The implied criticism is much the same as that made by the Prophets in general – leading the People into Idolatry. Plus the shifts back and forth in emphasis between Aaron and Moses, the fantastic, almost gymnastic, movements of that fabled "Rod" – sometimes "Moses' Staff" and at other times "Aaron's Rod" – as well as the various appearances of the Deliverer Joshua – sometimes at Moses' side, sometimes in his tent, sometimes on the Mountain of Horeb in place of Aaron – attest to the political squabbling and confusion going on at the time of the final rendering of this very interesting Document or presentation.

The problem of the Priesthood, therefore, will have to be left to future exegetes and "the Consensus of the People" – as Islam often does – who may or may not feel they require one. Since there are no Prophets around at the moment to express such a "Consensus", other ways will have to be found to give it utterance – perhaps the Democratic Vote, for instance. Whatever the

resolution of such a problem would come out to be, it should be remembered that the Prophets themselves were not very enthusiastic about the Institution – at least those of them who have left us their undeniable and indelible written record to peruse.

## 19. The Rebuilding of the Temple

This brings us to the next question – what of the Temple?

Before answering this, perhaps it would be better to answer the associated question – what of the Sacrifice Cult?

There was nothing intrinsically wrong with the Sacrifice Cult as such however distasteful it would appear to most of us today. If anything, it bred in man a higher respect for the taking of an animal's life than he might ordinarily have had. When a beast was offered up as a sacrifice, this process was at least seen as something *Holy unto God* or *Religious*.

The other aspect of sacrifice, which does not escape most people's attention because of the use of it made in Christian Doctrine, was that it was in reality a ritual meal – parts of which were offered in total to God, parts of which were taken by the Priesthood (doubtlessly providing them with a livelihood while at the same time no doubt offering manifold opportunities for corruption), and parts of which were consumed by the person offering it himself.

But what was really involved in the process was a procedure for purification from very real or imagined ills, either sins, transgressions, periodic menstrual cycles, contact with the dead, sexual intercourse, etc. The greater the purification desired, the more serious the sin, the more able a given person was to afford a certain sacrifice, on the whole the more costly the given sacrifice demanded.

But whatever one might think of these somewhat dubious practices today, they are certainly no worse than the average



slaughter-house one might visit in our own time where animal life is taken brutally and degradingly largely in private and behind the scenes.

The Arabs still retain aspects of this sacrificial cult in their ceremonies surrounding the *Hajj*, as do the Samaritans for their Passover Festivities in slaughtering "the Paschal Lamb". Anyone who is familiar with Arab life today knows how enthusiastic they are on any ceremonial occasion about slaughtering a given animal they have bought for the assembled family and guests – and this practice can still be found over a wide area of the Mediterranean.

Still, it is Purification and the desire to obtain it that must concern us relative to a Temple and really represent the central theme of the Ceremonial aspects of the Sacrifice Cult. This desire for Purification is now fulfilled by various Religions in numerous ways. In Christianity, there is confession and consuming the body and blood of "their Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" in a ritual way (a spin-off of the older sacrifice ceremonies, "Jesus" self-sacrifice for all sin – the participating in his "body and blood through Communion" being the participation in this ultimate sacrifice).

In Islam, there are various forms of cleansing similar to those of Judaism; and in Judaism, for women anyway, there is still for those who observe it – the ritual bath, a variation of which runs into the ceremony of baptism for Christians.

However, since most of these practices are practiced in any event in the breach by most modern people, what is the answer

to this basic drive, this basic need – that is, to achieve Purity, ritual or otherwise? The need itself seems to be a basic drive of mankind and almost all human cultures record some version of it. Even the man who has just come in from a hot day in the desert knows the relief he feels when taking a fresh shower. Everyone knows the marvelous feeling involved in “becoming clean” or “being cleansed”.

For those who feel particularly aggrieved, owing to sin or injustices or trespasses against neighbor or family they may feel themselves to have committed, there is no doubt that the feeling of obtaining Purification from these sins – however it may have been achieved – is a relieving one. It is doubtful that the single *Yom Kippur* Fast – formerly a National Day of Penance, now substituted in Judaism almost across the board for the general Purification practices of the Old Testament relating to remission of sins – is particularly satisfying in itself to anyone.

Though now completely distasteful to us and to myself, one has to admit that fortunate were they who could participate in the process of sacrifice in a meaningful way and felt that such a process relieved them of the weight of their real or imagined sins and impurities. If we could do so today, we would probably be a good deal better off and would not then need psychiatrists, social workers, *gurus*, and the like to work our spiritual frustrations off for us. If we cannot, that is our own problem.

In any event, this too, like the problem of the Priesthood, would have to be resolved by a “*Consensus of the General Public*” (actually, to some extent, just as in theoretical Islam – though

there it was "the Scholars"). If we were dealing simply with a Middle Eastern Public like the Arabs, it is not at all clear what the "General Consensus" would be. As already indicated, there is nothing more pleasing than the smell of fat roasting on the fire – as the *Yahweh* of Genesis would perhaps be the first to testify. There is no more pleasing occasion than a family or communal roast, now termed by most moderns, barbecues – a practice still reserved for honored guests in the desert at Beduin encampments.

But, as we are supposedly trying to be modern Jews and Israelis with all the conceits and pretensions that implies, it is doubtful that such a practice would sit very well with the general public or can and should not be widely resurrected. In a Ceremonial manner, however, or for Ceremonial Occasions – much like the Arabs on the *Hajj* or the Samaritans at Passover – there might be some scope for a variation it.

In fact, it might be an altogether more wholesome practice for some of our Rabbis to get involved in than some of the daily chores they routinely presently perform, some of the picayune problems they very often concern themselves with, and some of the awful sermons one is forced to sit through in both Reform and Conservative Ceremonies (I am not aware of Orthodox Sermonizing as a ritual performance *per se*). At least, it would get them closer down to the ground – down to the reality of human existence and physical work – which might not be such a bad thing, given the new physical circumstances of the Jewish People. But certainly not in a general manner and the general distastefulness of and for the whole idea or process completely

mitigates against it in the modern Era – we must discover something new!

As for the necessity of Ceremony – and this is where the resurrection of the Temple and a purely Ceremonial aspect of the sacrifice cult along with the Priesthood might come into play – much like Queen Elizabeth's Beefeaters at the Tower of London or the Royal Scots Guards with their pipes and drums, or the Pope's Swiss Guards in their Michelangelo-designed uniforms. One could perhaps conceive of something resembling the British House of Lords, i.e., an Honorary Role granted to people on the basis of their achievements or contributions to the Society. But what they would do and how they would function, and for what length of term or whether if even for life, are certainly beyond the abilities of the present writer either to foresee or even to suggest.

Still, as already indicated, there is certainly a need for something of a National Celebration of some kind – just as is done for Israel Independence Day – as people just demand it, but what relative to the Priesthood and its functions would in the end, as just indicated, probably have to be determined by “*A Consensus of the People.*”

An Ancient and Traditional People needs Ceremony and Ceremony feeds the Cultural and National life of the People. Too much Ceremony, of course, can get out of hand. Still, as already indicated, there is certainly a need for some National Celebration of some kind – just as is done for Israel Independence Day – as people just demand it; but, when kept in normal bounds, it is a good avenue for the normal expression of

emotion by the People whom, as we just remarked, have a need for and cherish such displays. But what, relative to the Priesthood and its functions, would in the end, as just suggested, probably have to be determined by "*A Consensus of the People.*"

Certainly the idea of rebuilding the Temple of God on the Temple Mount in Jerusalem, which I have often heard suggested in the years since the Six-Day War by numerous people, is not such a very bad idea at all when it comes to this need. I will not deal for the moment with the problem of what to do with the Mosque of Omar, which many think presently stands in its purported place, but to rebuild the Third Temple as an expression of the new National and Spiritual life of a People – newly returned to their Land after two thousand years of Exile – cannot be completely ignored.

Certainly it does not have to be in the same architectural style as the original, if such could be recreated (and anyone who has seen some of the models of these things scattered around Jerusalem knows how ghastly many of them look). Nor does it have to be in the Herodian style – though these stones are certainly impressive which was, no doubt, his/Herod's purpose – but I would certainly oppose it, knowing the purposes for which and the reasons why he built it. To repeat: I, for one, would certainly oppose rebuilding or restoring anything he built or was responsible for because for me – more than anyone else or any single cause – he (not even originally being a Jew himself despite the 'popular' view, but more about this later) was responsible for the total annihilation and corruption of the

Jewish People from his time forward.

20. The Wailing Wall and the 9<sup>th</sup> of Ab

Which brings us to another point concerning the rebuilding of the old Temple, i.e., that of the Wailing Wall. Nothing is perhaps a more humiliating reminder of what the Jewish Religion and the Jewish People are today than the practice of 'Wailing' at 'the Wailing Wall'. These people continue their 'Wailing' (or 'praying', as they may call it or the case may be) even though the Jewish People has nothing to 'Wail' about anymore – but rather *to Celebrate*.

This would be understandable if the purpose of their praying at these ruins of the last Great Temple were to have them restored to their original state. But nothing could be further from the Religious practices and intent of the Majority of the People praying there. They have grown so accustomed to their chains, as the expression goes, they enjoy the ruins. They prefer it like that. Indeed, the most Orthodox of Jews forbid their practitioners from setting foot on the Temple Mount (another instance of adopting a humiliating decree of your Conquerors and making it a stricture of your own Religious Practice).

Is it any wonder that Jews of this kind went to their deaths so docilely during the Hitler Holocaust – the Third Great Reich – the pretended continuation of these early Roman Conquerors? They regard it as being under ban, as did their Roman Overlords, until the days of the Messiah should arrive – which is to say, Never!

Whatever else "the Messianic Concept" may be, it is certainly a way of putting desirable things off into the far-distant future so that they will never come about. They even refuse to consider

its reconstruction, claiming this can be the domain of no less a one than "the Messiah" himself, which again is to say no one. Not only do they adopt the regulations of their Conquerors as a Religious Obligation, they do worse than that. However beautiful these stones were and however marvelous this structure might have been, it cannot be forgotten that this was the work and the construction of Herod – perhaps the one man most singly responsible as just remarked for the downfall of the Jewish People – and these ruins of his were not built for any reasons of Great Piety but as public works projects to appease the sentiment of the generally hostile Jewish mass.

Not only did he do more than any man in history, as just indicated, to bring about the ruin of the Jewish people; he destroyed the heroic, by-then Royal Family of the Maccabees and grafted his own family by force onto theirs instead. Whatever one's opinion of the Maccabees might be – and by the time of Herod the Pharisees, the progenitors of modern Judaism, did not have a very great affection for or high opinion of them – they were still a Jewish Royal House, a family which had done more than any other to secure the Jews their Independence and set up a second National Existence, however brief.

Herod, as we have been emphasizing, was a monster – a monstrosity acknowledged even by the arch-rivals to the Pharisees for evangelical conversion, the early Christians, in the episode of his wishing to kill all the Jewish Children – an episode meant to elevate "Jesus'" stature to the level of Moses' by telling a comparable story to Pharaoh's wishing to kill all



the Jewish Children at the time of Moses' birth, albeit for different reasons.

Herod rooted out the Maccabees root and stalk killing not only his own wife Miriamme – the last Maccabean Princess – but also his own children by her fearing that the people out of hatred for him would have set them up as kings in his place, which they would have. These are only a few of the long list of Herodian brutalities which rival in imagination, if not in scope, those of Hitler – another arch-enemy of the Jewish People (to say nothing of Nero).

Whereas Herod probably did more than any other single individual to destroy the National Existence of the Jewish People, Hitler in his own demented way *destroyed us* while at the same time forcing us to come to our senses and recognize the anomaly of our position – thereby bringing about our National Resurrection though admittedly at a terrible cost. Let us hope the sacrifice during his time has not been in vain.

Not only was Herod a vicious tyrant, but he was also brought in – or rather was set up by – Roman Overlordship and was their willing vassal in all things they wished to undertake. He cooperated with them towards all their aims over and against the Jewish People. Moreover, his family after him were always the willing intermediaries between the Romans and the Jews. The reader, who wishes a more detailed description of the rise of Herod and all the activities of his family, should read Josephus' *Jewish War* and his *Antiquities*.

The Pharisees, however, are reported to have spoken warmly of

Herod or, at least, cooperated with him; and, when the Maccabean Sanhedrin that preceded him upon his assumption of power was slaughtered almost to the man, they seem to have benefited more than any other Party. Hillel and Shammai, the most important Pharisaic Pair, came into prominence during his tenure and Herod seems to have held them in high regard and spoken warmly about them on numerous occasions. We do not know if they repaid the compliments but certainly they preferred him to the Maccabean Royal House and the Sadducees generally and, for that matter, certainly to the Zealots (or Nationalists).

This is not too surprising in view of what we have come to know of *Halachic* Judaism and Judaism in the *Diaspora* generally and, as a matter of fact, seems to set the keynote for Jewish survival in the *Diaspora*. That the Pharisees were not particularly antagonistic to Roman Rule – at least in this Period – is well documented and it is clear that they, more than any other party (except the later Christians, who thrived under it for similar reasons), thrived under Roman Overlordship after the Temple was destroyed and the new Pharisaic or Rabbinic Sanhedrin was set up at Yavneh under Rabbi Yohanan ben Zacchai, the hero of Rabbinic Jewish History who had himself – if legend can be believed – smuggled out of Jerusalem during the siege in a coffin, a fitting image for the course of Jewish History to come.

Only in the single instance of Rabbi Akiba's Revolt fifty years later – felt even by some Rabbinic commentators to have been an aberration – was there any disapproval evinced of the Roman Regime. This rapidly disappeared in the Second Century C.E. to

the time of the Roman Patriarchate of "Judah the Prince" – a descendant of Hillel, the compiler of the First Book of the *Talmud* (the *Mishnah*), and a willing instrument of Roman Power in Palestine (now renamed by the Roman Conquerors after "the Philistines").

How then can it be a surprise that these very same Rabbinic Jews – the descendants of these early, politically astute Pharisees – should have adopted the very practices of their Roman Masters as a Religious Obligation: that is, that the ban on setting foot on the Temple Mount since its destruction till the time the Messiah should arrive (a time the Romans could safely feel was far away in the infinite future – as could anyone else with any intelligence) should have become part of the Religious Law, *Halachah*?

Not only this, but they adopted as a Religious Festival the one day a year the Romans allowed the Jews to return to Jerusalem and pray (or rather "wail") at the ruins of the Wailing Wall, the last standing monument of this Herodian Temple, i.e., the Ninth of Ab. From this, "the Wailing Wall" derived its quaint name and this is the origin of the charming practice still continued today. Furthermore the fiction was adopted, which may or may not be true, that this was also the date of the Babylonian destruction of the First Temple – an amazing historical coincidence which no one has ever found any record of in the Old Testament. No record of a Festival called "the 9th of Ab" can be found there either and it is an obvious accretion of Rabbinic practice.

Are we then to ascribe the origin of this Holiday, too, to Moses on Sinai as we do the whole of their Oral Law? Moses must have been a far-sighted seer indeed. Is the old proverb, 'the prisoner is never far from his chains', so incorrect? And is it any wonder, too, they the Pharisees feel a special affection for these 'Herodian' Stones (how often have we seen the abominable practice of Jewish lips touching these stones as, in fact, we see them touching the *Torah* Scrolls in most synagogues – charming, it is true, but nevertheless an abomination?)

For, if the historical reports are true – and the writer sees no reason to doubt them given the political constellation as it was at that time – their Leaders the *Tannaim*, the spiritual progenitors of our present-day Rabbis, would have a special affection for this Structure built, as it was, by the man who seemed to show them special favor or at least with whom they seem to have had some special connection. Is it any wonder that all these practices and all these processes have since been hallowed by "Jewish" Tradition and enshrined until they have become accepted as part of the very core of what Judaism has come to be? Is it any wonder, too, that the writer views many of these disreputable events and humiliating historical effects as part of what has come to make the "Jewish Religion" and "Jewish" character what it is today – in a certain way and to a certain extent the symbol of our National downfall itself rather than the remnant of any special sacred Religious Practices?

Whatever anyone may think of all these arguments and approaches, it still cannot be denied by any Nationalistic Jew,

proud of his heritage and wishing to be proud of his People, that before anyone should kiss a stone on a Temple Wall constructed or reconstructed by Herod – and the writer admits these stones are very beautiful – or 'wail' or 'pray' at a Wall, again, constructed by him who was the bane if not the outrage of the Jewish People, sooner should his tongue cling to the roof of his mouth to avoid such blasphemy.

That this Herod was a monster cannot be denied by anyone. That he was intrinsically involved in the events leading to the downfall of the Maccabean House and the destruction of the Jewish People in the Land of Israel/Palestine also cannot be denied by anyone. That anyone should worship or even 'wail' at a Wall partially constructed by him as a public works project to gain the affection of the People is a disgrace to the whole of the Jewish Nation – not only now, but also throughout history – and yet this is precisely the practice that we have become most quaintly known for around the world. This is the charming little anomaly that the tourists come and click their tourist cameras over outside today's "Wailing Wall".

Has ever there been such a cruel irony of history and, as we have already shown, the Jewish People of today have quite a few of these stored up in the intricate schizophrenia and xenophobia of their subconscious? Also, that anyone should consecrate the Roman practice concerning this "Wall" and the enforced Exile and ban on access of the Jewish People from the Holy City and to the Temple Mount as a hallowed Religious Tradition is also perhaps an even crueller historical mockery on the Jewish people. Again, it

is not surprising in view of the "Jewish" Personality Complex, we have been attempting to delineate, that has developed over the last two thousand years. Far be it for the writer even to claim to begin to unravel it, but perhaps a start has been made.

So much for the practice of 'Wailing' at "The Wailing Wall" and kissing its stones and the concomitant Rabbinic ban on setting foot upon the Temple Mount till the days of the Messiah shall have arrived.

## 21. The Third Temple

Now let us move on to the question of rebuilding the Temple – let us hope not this time the Herodian Structure but an earlier version of it. We shall have to do some very extensive preliminary archeological surveying, of course, to determine the architectural truth of the Temple Mount setting anyhow.

There is, of course, nothing intrinsically wrong with the project of rebuilding the Temple as long as this is done with sufficient architectural imagination and on a sufficiently grand scale to make it a Monument worthy of its predecessors and also a symbol of the Historical Resurgence of the Jewish People and their Renaissance. That is to say, it cannot be done in the pseudo-classical, paltry style of the current attempts at reconstructing the Old Jewish Quarter of Jerusalem or on the level of architectural craftsmanship and concept presently current in the country of Israel. Fortunately, the former is a second or third-rate project and does not merit more than a mention in passing in our discussion.

It does not necessarily have to be modern either. But it must reflect sufficient architectural sweep and sufficient stylistic imagination to make it a Monument akin in Beauty and Significance and of sufficient Architectural Grandeur to St. Peter's in Rome, the Taj Mahal in India, the Parliament Buildings in England, the Arc de Triomphe and Champs Elysees in France, the Kremlin in Moscow, the City of Peking in China, the Umayyad Mosque in Damascus, and even the Dome of the Rock. If it cannot be done on this level, then it should not be done.

This the writer sees as the principal impediment to such a project, that is, finding a scheme that will incorporate the general Religious Purposes of the Original with a design that will satisfy the tastes of an urbane and thoroughly-sophisticated Modern Population. Given the present level of taste and construction in Israel, it would appear to be a project beyond the scope of this Generation. But this situation could change rapidly if the Reforms and New Spiritual Uplift, already advocated in this discussion, took root and began to transform the Religious, Social, and Spiritual Life of the People. There are no other impediments, religious, political, or otherwise. The supposed Religious Proscriptions of Orthodox Judaism, already mentioned above, are invalid for the reasons so stated (and no doubt numerous other ones).

The Temple can and probably should be rebuilt. It is only a political and social decision when and how. No doubt the spiritual energies and cooperative efforts released in such an all-towering Communal undertaking would mean an uplift in National Morale and a boost in Spiritual Fervor inestimable in present circumstances. Plus, the successful bringing to fruition of such a project in the manner outlined above would provide a Spiritual and Cultural Heritage to future generations also of inestimable proportions.

One generation, to be sure, would have to have the courage and foresight to commence, i.e., to set down their heels and say, here the Exile ends, here Rabbinic Judaism (which cannot abide the reconstruction of the Temple) ceases to be, here the *Diaspora*



spirit is no more. It is just as likely that this should happen in our time as in some other; – it is only a question of spiritual will. From that time forth. in the words of the present Government, it becomes an established "fact".

The objection of course will be what of the Orders of Temple Priesthood, what of the orders of Gate-Keepers and the like, of Psalmists? These are, indeed, very intricate National questions (I repeat – the word "National" not "Spiritual"), which will have to be solved by some "Consensus of the Community", as I have stated, as to just what they want their New Structure to be – other than that they want it to do Honor to God – but just how they want it to do Honor to Him I have already addressed myself to this question to a certain extent above.

There is nothing wrong with Orders of Gate-Keepers and the like (and, of course, these could even be raised to the Order of a National Knighthood or Honorary Fraternal Order as they are in United Kingdom with the Queen's Lists to honor outstanding Public Servants and Cultural Achievement (as we have stated to a certain degree above), as the Arabs have something of the kind even today concerning the Temple Mount. Certainly Orders of Singers and Musicians also could be associated with the rebuilt Temple Structure and it could be looked upon as a center for National Culture and for the National Expression of the People. Let us hope, however, there will be no playing of Bach or Beethoven – that we will keep this thing strictly National and Culturally National to stimulate the New and Reborn Culture of the People, a National Renaissance – and there will be none of those

omnipresent organs and Gentile Choirs because they cannot get enough Jews to sing in them we see in most Modern Reform Jewish "Temples" today.

But the main problem to be faced in all of this is whether the People wants the new expression of the National Consciousness and the New Monument to their National Revival to be simply that, a Grand Monument with occasional Ceremonial Practices or a National Sacrifice on selected Feast Days (already discussed above in discussing the Priesthood), or whether they want an actual revival of the total Temple Cult (the basis for which, as we have already said, in Religious Writ is at best dubious) with all its attendant Paraphernalia and Priesthood. But this will have to be a question for the Consensus of the National Consciousness to evolve in the course of time and in their own way; and, since there are no acknowledged Prophets yet to guide us, we shall have to take our time — stumbling along cautiously.

I have already given my opinion of this as being untenable in the Modern World and in the Modern Consciousness but, for a start, there can certainly be no objection to reviving the Temple as a Structure worthy of the National Renaissance, as a National Monument — and most people at the present stage in our development would probably rather have it like this. It is impossible, of course, to foresee what a future generation might require or wish and one should not try. This would perhaps be the very minimum we could achieve at this stage, that is, the revival of the Temple as a National Monument and National Shrine; but what the procedures could or would be associated with it, the

management of the various Orders I have already given my opinion of this as being on the whole untenable to the Modern Mind. This would have to be left to time and to "Consensus" to work out. This would be the true easy-going Spirit of the Hebrew People at work – not the tortured strictures of a legalistic *Halachah*.

What is being envisioned here for a start is the building of a Structure of the National Consensus as an expression of the National Cultural and Spiritual Life, just as in former days, not necessarily a Religious Expression. Even in the days of Solomon, few people would have agreed on the Institution of a Centralized Temple. This is clear from the contemporary accounts of the Period and the competing shrines and national monuments that abound in the Literature of the time.

It is also clear in the fact that the North hardly recognized (even until Maccabean days) the Southern Centralized Davidic Shrine at all, having their own Monuments of National Expression at Bethel, Shechem, and elsewhere; and this continued on even after the days of the Return when the Samaritans objected to the rebuilding of Jerusalem's walls by Ezra and Nehemiah and their followers. Even they finally built their own rival Samaritan Shrine on Mount Gerizim in the present-day city of Nablus ("Neopolis" – "New City" – "The New City" built upon the ruins of the Ancient City of Shechem) and a Tradition which is carried on by the Samaritans of that City in their *Paschal* Celebrations to this day.

Certainly, too, on a National Level – though not perhaps a Religious – there could be no objection at least at the

beginning, as I have already proposed, that the Offices associated with the building of the Temple be filled from Respected and Honored Persons among us in much the same way, as we have also already suggested, that the Queen's Birthday List awards recognition for National and Cultural Achievement, since we no longer have anything even remotely resembling what one would be able to or even want to consider a Priesthood.

I, for one, would be unwilling even to recognize the pretensions of the Cohens or the Levis to a claim to the Aaronic Priest-Line and, therefore, a concomitant claim to a part in the Resurrection of any National Sanctuary. Having known enough Cohens and Levis myself (having even some of them on my own Family Tree), I see no special spiritual or moral excellence associated with these families that qualify them for special distinction or single them out for renewed participation in a revived Temple Cult.

But, once again, these statements may express the sentiments and Consensus of the Present Age, but have nothing whatsoever to do with the sentiments some Future Age might develop. Perhaps, with the revival of the National Sanctuary, the Cohens and the Levis – if they could really prove their biological connections which is doubtful – would really develop the Spiritual and Moral qualifications necessary to carry out the Exalted Functions hallowed for them in our National History. Anything is possible, any miracle, when the new National Consciousness begins to become operational and thrive, but this is one I personally doubt.

In any event, the pretense of the Aaronites – the supposed

Fathers of our present-day Cohens – is another fiction of our Rabbinic Heritage that has been hallowed by Time and National Practice rather than by any convincing innate proof of it in Scripture. There is nothing wrong with the acceptance of the *status quo* as Hallowed Religious Revelation and Procedure, of course, as good National Custom and Worship of the Ancestors always produces, just as long as this *status quo* was worth preserving anyhow.

In the case of the Aaronite priest line (though I am not at all sure of the Levitical – at least the Maccabees were Levitical, one of their problems and one of the impediments which led to their downfall), it is doubtful that such was the case either in very early times and certainly not in the times when we have any historical record of, the Second Temple Period.

Even the prophets were anti-Priestly to a large extent, as has already been remarked, and the pro-Joshua supporters behind the Exodus Text and probably the supporters of the Family of Moses – the Levites – were also to a certain extent anti-Priestly or at the very least anti-Aaronic. Nothing less could be read into the episode of the Golden Calf in the Old Testament and its link-up with the Prophetical Strictures in Amos and Hosea. There is no doubt too that the Monarchy, as embodied by the Houses of Saul and David, was certainly hostile to the Eli Priest Line – probably a Northern Priest Line anyhow – since the Sanctuary being tended to was at Shiloh.

Then, too, we have no end of testimonies regarding the corruption of the Priest Class leading up to the Hellenization

during the Maccabean Period, not only in Josephus, but also in the very bitter denunciations expressed by the Outcast Priests in the Dead Sea Scroll material – whatever else one might want one might want to make of this.

The Priesthood, too, in the Herodian Period and the Roman Period seems to have been at the disposal of the highest bidder so, without a very thorough revamping of that Ancient Practice, it is dubious if it would be viable for the Modern Period. We have only the example of the Catholic Church, another such Priest Line though founded on somewhat more Democratic Principles, to give us pause before embarking on such a project. Here, I would side with the arguments of Paul – on most other things an outrageous scoundrel – that the Jerusalem Priesthood of the Aaronic Strain had discredited itself and it was time for a “New Line of the Order of Melchizedek” – what he obviously is proposing as an Earlier Line in his very parochial exegesis.

But, besides all these things, the Priesthood as we know it and as we have it, is clearly an invention of and development of the Davidic Centralized Monarchy, lasting in its pure form only for that very short period of its Reign and, as such, clearly probably out-of-step with the Modern Requirements for such an Institution.

Therefore, we would be completely justified in starting from scratch along perhaps the lines already outlined above. However, if the People in the infinity of their Wisdom in the course of time arrived at a “Consensus” that it would be better to return to an Aaronic or Levitical Line and the present embodiments of these

families were upgraded to a certain extent, then one could abide such a resolution of the problem.

Once again, this would have to be for the exigencies of Jewish History to work out. We are only talking about a start, a rebuilding of the National Shrine along acceptable architectural lines and with sufficient grandeur of scope as to impress itself upon the minds of the People and, for that matter, those of the Peoples of the World.

## 22. The Mosque of Omar

All right, you say to me, deal with the problem of the Mosque of Omar. Since you insist, I shall. In the first place the Mosque of Omar is a completely illegitimate building and one does not say this for the purposes of polemics only; it happens to be the truth. This is, of course, to say nothing about its beauty for certainly it is one of the most striking examples of early Arab Islamic architecture from the Umayyad Period of the Eighth Century.

In this sense it is completely legitimate, not only in style and ornamentation (aside from the pretty gold leaf and blue glaze, etc., King Hussein had tacked on to its roof and external parts for embellishment), but also as one of the most successful examples of art and architecture from the Period it represents.

It was founded, however, for purposefully political purposes. When the Umayyads in Syria were having difficulties with the more conservative Muslim Authorities of the Arabian Peninsula in the two cities of the Prophet, Mecca and Medina, it was for a time thought possible to divert attention and influence from one source of power in the Arabian Peninsula, the Pilgrimage (or *Hajj*) both to Mecca and Medina, principally Mecca.

It was, therefore, decided because of the Insurgent Movements then current in the Arabian Peninsula centering on the Prophet's own Family and objecting to the illegal seizure of power by the Umayyad Elite — the former Meccan Aristocracy — to set up a rival Pilgrimage site closer to Damascus. Damascus the Capital of the Umayyad Kingdom (or 'Caliphate') and, therefore, more manageable;



and the closest available site with any Religious Prestige was Jerusalem which was, therefore, chosen.

A Pilgrimage was organized to that site, dominated by the Umayyad Family in, competition with the Meccan one. For it, the Mosque of Omar ("The Dome of the Rock") was built but it rapidly fizzled out, particularly with the coming of the Prophet's own Family to power (at least his uncle) under the 'Abbasid Caliphate in Baghdad around the year 750. The building, however, still remains as a magnificent example of early Islamic Architecture and soon came to be considered the Third Most Holy Site in Islam after Mecca and Medina.

Of course, too, there is another reason for its supposed Sanctity and that was the reason the Umayyads were seeking to capitalize on in building it in the first place, that is, that it is located on the site of the former Jewish Temple in Jerusalem – which causes all the contemporary problems. It is precisely because the place was a Jewish Holy Site that the Muslims – claiming to be the legitimate successors of the Hebrew Prophets and particularly the Patriarch Abraham (though for awhile Moses gets quite a good deal of attention in the Koran) – built the Shrine there in the first place.

The Shrine is just that, a Shrine. It is not considered a mosque at all, as no praying really goes on there, but it is rather a Monument built on the supposed precise spot of the Altar of Sacrifice of the original Temple in Jerusalem. The actual stone formation – which is the supposed base of the original Sacrificial Altar – is even on view in the subterranean vault.

The praying that takes place on the Temple Mount really goes on at another Mosque, al-Aksa, across the way at one corner of the compound of the Temple Mount. This was the Mosque one Michael Rohan of Australia (he said his name was "Nahor" – the brother or uncle of Abraham – spelled backwards) attempted to burn down with inconsequential results several years ago. It is also a model of architectural style for its Period though somewhat later than the Mosque of Omar. Rohan did manage to destroy some priceless internal furnishings of the Mosque – mainly the wooden *Anba'* – the steps leading the way to the Speaker's Platform or Pulpit of the Mosque, which were also of high antiquity.

What Muslims claim to be the basis for the Sanctity of the Mosque of Omar is that it purportedly commemorates the spot from which Muhammad commenced his celebrated "Night Journey to Heaven" or "*Miraj*", in the course of which he claimed to be taken up in a dream, deposited on the Temple Mount in Jerusalem, and taken up to Heaven for a brief visit. These last particulars do not actually appear in the *Koran* itself but are contained in later Commentary and Elaboration of these mysterious Koranic verses – which were equally puzzling to believing Muslims. Muhammad's "*Midnight Journey*". of course, has fascinated commentators ever since and, in fact, also forms the basis to a certain extent of Dante's celebrated similar, though more deliberately-paced journey.

The story itself can be traced back to an Apocryphal Gospel of the New Testament of the Nazoraeans (i.e. the "Jewish Christians" or "Ebionites"), in which Jesus was said to have been picked up

by the Angel Gabriel (not surprisingly, a favorite Angel of Muhammad's as well and whom he claimed originally dictated the *Koran* to him) and also deposited on the Temple Mount, from whence he too undertook a Journey to Heaven – only he did not start from Mecca or Medina, but rather the Galilee.

Whatever the origin of all these stories or hallucinations, the point is that the only reason for the Sanctity of the place is because there was once a Hebrew or Jewish Temple either attributable to David (a Saint in Islam too), Solomon, or some other at that spot. That is the reason for the original Sanctity of the place and the significance of such a Night Journey from such a location or even a "Pilgrimage" to such a locale as even Muslims themselves readily admit.

As such, regardless of the beauty or antiquity of the Mosque of Omar, it is a completely illegitimate building; for only the Jews themselves, from whom the traditions originally emanated, can say what is to be considered Holy and what is not to be considered Holy when related to such a spot and they were never really consulted on the project in the first place – nor the Dogma on which it is based. It is like trying to imagine the Christians in Rome or the Hindus in Benares attempting to build their Sacred Sanctuary on the Jewish Temple Mount. It is inconceivable; and, though probably not meant as an insult at its inception (the Jews were hardly worth considering at such a time), only a People as relatively young to the World Scene as the Arabs and the Muslims (the Muslims are, after all, the youngest of the World's great Religions) and as callow, could have maintained it as being

anything else.

Even the Romans, though they tried a similar project – with perhaps more provocation – never really carried through on such a course with any success. They only bulldozed the Temple Area into ruins and a good part of the Jewish City of Jerusalem as well, attempting to erect there a Roman City and Sanctuary to the Capitoline Zeus instead.

So, what are the Jews or, if you prefer, our rejuvenated "Hebrews" to do with such a building now that they have – should we say "by the Grace" of God" (why not, after all it is a dictum of theirs that God repays His faithful Servant and have they not been faithful in their own way)? – been returned to Sovereignty over it and its precincts. Of course, if the Jews were the Muslims or the Arabs – or even the Romans for that matter – there would be no doubt what they would do with it. They would bulldoze it under as an insult and an affront to their Religion and that would be the end of it.

But the Jews are "Jews", as we have just done explaining at some length, much to their own dismay. They like to think they are different than these other Peoples – or at least behave differently – and so they do. Besides, many of them being intellectuals and priding themselves at having control over their passions, see the Building as being something beautiful – which it is – and abhor the idea that anything untoward should happen to a "work of art" or the relic of another Faith, however inconveniently located.

Once again, they display the bondservant's mirror image of what

he thinks his master expects him to be, not what his master really would be himself or ever would expect him to be, i.e., more perfect than his master – more European than the European, more civilized than the civilized. Are these other Peoples not really also civilized – the Arabs, for instance, the Europeans – and how, for instance, would the Russians behave towards a German relic left behind on their Territory regardless of the right or wrong of who presently possesses that Territory? For the Russians, as for most of the other Peoples of Europe and America, 'Might makes Right' and that is an end to it. In Stalin's words, "How many Divisions does the Pope have?"

Such noble and artistic sentiments are even expressed by the Delegates of "the Jews" over and over again to the Peoples of the World at the United Nations – who, of course, care nothing about "the Jews" and even speak, more often than not, of expelling them – in the forms of guarantees on the Sanctity of and access to the Holy Places.

But the Jews are "Jews" and like to think that they are different from other Peoples. Is there a note of superiority in their stubborn adherence to such a conception? One can even hear Golda Meir saying, "It is not Jewish. It cannot be done" – or Chaim Weizmann or Ahad Ha-Am, for that matter – as if being "Jewish" had some mystical quality of Sanctity about it or "Judaism" some undeniable purity.<sup>17</sup>

"This is not the 'Jewish' way," they would have said to the Politicals like Theodore Herzl, Max Nordau, Louis Brandeis, or Ze'ev Jabotinsky (i.e., "the Political Zionists" as opposed to

the Cultural" ones). "It is not 'Jewish'. It cannot be done" and so we ended up in the Concentration Camps. Or Golda's reference to the Black Panthers (the Black Panthers of that Period in Israel were *Sephardi* Youth Gangs not their American prototypes), throwing molotov cocktails at the police who were firing water canons at them: "These are not 'nice' Jewish boys. Jewish boys don't behave in this manner." She could just as well have been talking about the Stern Gang and *Irgun* in the Forties but, then, this is just how her own Party would have referred to them.

But never mind, what does it matter? We are back to the problem of this Building. It is in such an embarrassing spot. How are we to rid ourselves of the inconvenience of it? But once again, the "Jews" are expected to be some abnormal sort of people, some kind of cretin, some kind of throwback to a previous age or should we say throw-forward to a future one? While they are protecting these very same Muslim Holy Places and being pilloried for it in the United Nations as Bandits, Predators, Gestapo Torturers; they are attacked on the Holiest Day of their Religious Year, *Yom Kippur*, and then expected to behave perfectly normally and in a civilized manner in spite of it.

Nobody else has ever heard of such a Civilization. It comes out of the weird fantasy world of their own distorted imaginations. But what is more, they do and did. Is this not the behavior of the condemned man going to his death on the gallows or in the Concentration camps without a whimper or sign of protest or the Communist Party member who, during the Stalin Purges, admitted his very elimination was for the good of the Communist Party

Movement?

What country in the world would behave in such a so-called "civilized" manner while the flower of its young blood was dying on the battlefield? One could imagine what would happen in Northern Ireland if a Shrine of their antagonists was located in their Territory. One could envision the looting and burning that would go on in Istanbul or the mad mobs that would sweep through Berlin, Bangkok, Cairo, Peking, or Tokyo if this happened to be the case.

One sees what is happening in Lebanon today. But for whom are the Jews acting out this role? The World does not really expect them to act in such a way. As a matter of fact, when they do, they are blamed for supposedly behaving in just the opposite manner, e.g., in the matter of the Occupied Territories and the alleged mistreatment of Arab prisoners. They themselves do not even wish to behave in such a way. Like the child freeing itself of its halter, they would like to throw off the restraints of their previous existences and behave as any other People – as men do. Yet they dare not. Who might they be offending? Only the exalted image they have constructed for themselves in the solitariness of their two thousand years confinement – nothing else. Yet they persist.

Even when they are bombed in every kind of brutal and insane manner, when their children are thrown out of upper-story windows, their teenagers bazooka'ed in rooms, when whole families are machine-gunned in apartment flats, or airport lounges peppered with flying glass and bomb fragments, hotels blown up in

suicide missions in the centers of their biggest cities, and their busiest thoroughfares turned into lethal death-traps; they persist in behaving in their "correct" manner. Humanely and most civilizedly, mobs are turned back from the Arab Quarter of Jerusalem – and should they not be, but what then to do with this building?

First of all, if one were going to rebuild the Holy Temple of Jerusalem, one could build a building of such imposing size and stature that it would literally surround and cover the offending building. But this would not really be a very satisfying structure, particularly since the Mosque of Omar itself purportedly covers the spot where the former sacrificial altar was located. We could check the precise locations, which we shall have to do anyhow, and see. Maybe it will turn out that the Mosque of Omar is not really standing on a very significant location – not a very likely outcome.

Why not build the Temple right alongside it or at another end of the Compound? Again, hardly a very satisfying exercise or procedure though it would satisfy the "Jewish" urge for being "fair" (or "good") – fair in a Western, hardly an Old Testament, sense.

What then to do with it? Perhaps we could get those very talented architects of Abu Simbel – those same ingenious U.N. technicians who saved the Nile Temples from the artificial Lake Aswan – to come and jack up the pavilion *en masse* and move it to another part of the Compound. Ah ha, an ideal solution. Maybe they could even move it further away – perhaps to the Mt. of



Olives or beyond. Then the Israelis could still benefit from the busloads of tourists coming to see this very old original piece of Muslim Architecture though we could hardly be claiming to be "protecting Muslim Holy Sites". Not a very likely solution.

What then to do with the Building? Perhaps it is too bad that Michael Rohan set about burning the wrong building and, even then, succeeded only partially owing to the zealous efforts of both Muslim and Jewish Fire Brigades. Would that Hitler's agents at the time of the Reichstag fire would have been so zealous. There is little doubt that, in the depths of their breasts, this is the majority opinion in Israel today. Then why not act on it? The question has already been answered: "We are Jews and do not act in this way."

Let us then consult Yahweh Lord of Hosts, Yahweh Sabaoth, and see what He would say. If Yahweh Sabaoth were alive today, i.e., if people cared anything about Him or if He had Prophets at least to represent His words, I think He would put them something like this:

"You Sadat and you Nasser, you Feisal and you Syrians. You want My People to withdraw from the Sinai Desert, want My People to give up what I the Lord have given them? Here is what Yahweh Sabaoth says to you: 'Come and take away your Sanctuary from Jerusalem. Come and take it and put it in some other place — you who are the richest Nations on the Earth, you have had more gold in your treasuries than all the rest of the Nations combined, you who are blessed with rivers of molten oil — Come! Come up to the Mountain Of Jerusalem. I, the Lord of Hosts, the Lord God of

Israel, have spoken it. Come up. Come and take your Sanctuary out of the laps of My people and do not harass them anymore'!"

He would then perhaps give them a reasonable time limit – say four or five years in which to get the engineering or architectural work done – and, if the time limit ran out, give them this ultimatum:

"You who harass and oppress My People, you who cause them to bleed in the desert, you who cause their young men to be burned in tank hulls, you who cause their young women to mourn fallen husbands, mothers to weep over lost young ones never again recreateable in the streams of time, you who come upon My People with interminable demands – who never cease from harassing them at every step – Come up. Take away your building and be gone or Yahweh, Lord of Hosts, will destroy it."

That is what the Oracle of Yahweh, if He were alive today, would most likely say to His people, or something very much like it. And who can say it is such a bad idea other than that in any normal "Nationalist Country," the Mosque of Omar would already have been destroyed long ago regardless of its artistic merit. The Russians, the French, the Germans – perhaps not the British who pretend to be too "civilized" – would have destroyed it long ago.

One can just picture it being blown up and collapsing in ruins, much the same as what happened in South Vietnam when the North Vietnamese entered and threw down the Memorials to the South Vietnamese Fighting Men, threw down the Memorials to all the former South Vietnamese Rulers regardless of their artistic

merit; much the same as the Turks are, no doubt, doing at this very moment in Northern Cyprus to anything of a patriotic Greek nature; much the same as what happened to the Fascist Memorials in Germany when the Russians came and to the Russian memorials in Czechoslovakia and Hungary during the temporary Uprisings there.

And who blames them? Does anyone blame them? No, no one. This is how any normal "Newly" Independent Country would have behaved in the frenzy of joy at its new Independence back in 1948 and 1967. This is how the Palestinians would behave if they ever return and yet there already has been unending provocation for it.

There already has been enough provocation for such a frenzy of destruction on the part of the bereaved families: parents, cousins, or loved ones of the dead of the Israeli People, that it is only a wonder that it has not happened already. Only in a "Jewish" Country would it not have happened already and only by "Jewish" standards is it not likely to happen.

The writer makes no recommendation whether it should or should not happen in the future. This is up to the Jewish People as a whole in the deepest recesses of their souls to determine and only by so determining as "a Consensus" will we know what sort of souls they have come now to possess.

### 23. The Occupied Territories

Several years ago there was quite a good deal of talk about what to do about the Occupied Territories. This was at a time perhaps midway between the 1967 and 1973 Wars when quite a lot of pressure was being brought to bear on Israel to bring about a solution. This is not to say that a lot of pressure is not being brought to bear now – it is only that the nature of the problem has come to be seen as different.

Then, retention Territories was looked upon as an example of Israel intransigence and expansionistic tendencies. Now, since The *Yom Kippur* War, the problem has been viewed more within the framework of a security one where it belongs; and, though the pressure is not any less – probably more – Israel's public relations' image with regard to it is not as bad as it once was and her arguments are at least being listened to. For their part, the Arabs are not being seen as quite the underdogs they once were before The *Yom Kippur* War.

Let us take the Old Testament and see if it would be any help in solving this problem. First of all, if one were to adopt the extreme of Old Testament practices, the answer would have been: expel all the inhabitants of the land. The Land has been put under ban – you must either put all the inhabitants to the sword or expel them. Muhammad did this to the Jews of Arabia in his day, which is why Arabia is so homogeneous population-wise today. In those days, there, were quite substantial Jewish and Christian Populations. The elimination of these was quite simply public policy. Nothing more, nothing less.

The Old Testament is not a very ambiguous or vacillating Document. On this question, particularly, the answer given is perhaps too simple or too straightforward: "Slaughter all the inhabitants." Of course, this was never carried out in actual practice.

When it comes to slaughtering inhabitants, there is always too much temptation to take bondservants out of them or to take their wives or to keep their livestock and possessions. The answer enunciated above was an Old Testament ideal put forth by later authors – it was not the actual practice of the Period in question. In fact, it would seem that the Hebrews or Jews or Israelites butchered or expelled very few people – no more than they themselves were butchered.

As the books of Joshua and Judges tell us, the Conquest of the Land was never really carried out completely. Numerous allusions are made to the fact that the Majority of the Tribes were "slow" in going about their conquests, despite the picture of initial widespread success – like an ancient *blitzkrieg* – given in Joshua, and extensive lists of Territory are later given of the Lands not actually conquered. In Judges, it would appear Joshua conquered very little at all of the total "Inheritance" except the Highlands of Ephraim – the heart of what was later to be called "Israel".

References abound throughout and on into the Samuel Books to the numerous Peoples the Israelites did not drive out and who, therefore, were living there to this day in "servitude". Many of David's chief heroes, not to mention his Bodyguard, are from

Alien Peoples living among the Israelites – no less a person, for instance, than Uriah the Hittite! This seemed to be the general picture – numerous Subject Peoples living among and with the Israelites in general harmony very often under a mutual Pact of Protection.

The situation South of Bethlehem seems to have been particularly confused with various groups of Edomites, Moabites, Amalekites, Ishmaelites, and Kenites living more or less in a symbiotic arrangement with the People of Judah. One is struck by the similarity of this situation with the present-day one in everything but names and dates.

But what is different was that the Israelites clearly blamed themselves for having incurred Yahweh's Wrath for having broken the ban – for not having driven all the inhabitants out before them as He originally – so the portrayal has it – vouchsafed unto Moses and ordered them to do when expressing His Special Favor. They did not do this thing. They allowed the Subject Peoples to remain and mingle in their midst and so they were polluted by them.

This is the Deuteronomic scheme of things, so influential in the later portrayal of the Conquest of and History of Palestine. It was because they had defied the ban of Yahweh, because they had allowed the inhabitants of the Land to remain, that they had become involved in all the disastrous situations of the present Era – i.e., the time of writing the various texts. It was a result of this policy, as well, that they had absorbed the customs of the Local Peoples and were sacrificing to foreign

gods, building altars on the High Places (even though these altars are clearly presented to us in Genesis as being set up, for the most part, by the Patriarchs themselves) under Sacred Trees and Poles, and sacrificing to the *Baals* and Golden Bull-Calfs of the Canaanites and other neighboring Subject Peoples like the Moabites, Edomites, Jebusites, etc.

This is the explanation given by the Old Testament for the inability of the fledgling Israeli Nation to live up to the rigid Monotheism seemingly preferred by Yahweh and to the hard Strictures of Justice He demanded – a defect in character they would appear to have in common with just about all of Mankind. Who can say that there is not at least some truth in it on the analytic level if not on the religious one?

Suppose we were to apply this explanation to the present Period. Would we not come up with a similar conclusion that most of the problems of the present-day State of Israel relate to the Palestinian People both within and outside the borders of the State, i.e., the former inhabitants of the Land? To a certain extent, too, it is true however repellent and most people would probably admit it if they dared – that had the latter-day Israelis been able to drive the former inhabitants of the land out in a more complete manner and taken over a more homogeneous Territory, they would have had few of the problems they are having today.

In the ideal this solution is the most desirable now just as it was thought to have been then, but in practice it goes by the boards, once again, just as it did then. Despite what the other

Nations of the World might feel or the protests they might utter, nothing works like a *fait accompli* – an assessment the present Leaders of Israel have tried to make use of in their putting down new settlements in various parts of the Occupied Territories. Nor have they felt strong enough to do so in a wholesale manner.

Certainly there would have been protests. Certainly there would have been dislocations and, no doubt, much inhumanity and suffering (there is no "right" solution when it comes to two Peoples fighting over the same Land. He it is who is probably right is he who succeeds most – as awful as such a proposition is to contemplate); but had the two populations been separated once and for all and, let us say, utterly – for example, as at the Jordan River – populations grown up in new circumstances would have soon grown accustomed to their new circumstances and long since put down new roots.

It is only when a situation lingers on in a partially solved, partially unsolved, partially settled and partially unsettled manner – as it continues to do now – that hopes for a Restoration and a new Irredentism begin to flourish, particularly in those places where former inhabitants were subjected to the worst living conditions and most frustrations as, for instance, in the Refugee Camps. Palestinian Nationalism today is rampant most of all in the Refugee Camps among a generation that never saw Palestine and not so much in the areas of Palestine itself – where there are still Arabs living, at least not so visually and stridently.

The original Mandate for Palestine awarded to the British by



the League of Nations contained both Palestine and the Land on the other side of the Jordan, later known as Transjordan. If, when the initial dislocations occurred in 1948, Palestinian Existence had been effectively erased from the West Side of the Jordan and forced on to the East, would the situation today have been anything like it is now? If a clean break had been made – in much the manner of the Old Testament's idealized portrait and not the Truth of its Historical Recounting – if both populations had been forced onto their respective sides of the River, would Israel have been subjected to the sorts of endless pressures she is being subjected to today? It is doubtful.

Certainly there would have been great bitterness. Certainly there would have been scars that would not have healed – perhaps for generations – but there are now as well with less to show for them. There might even have been the same intermittent warfare back and forth as now, but nothing like on the same scale.

The human consciousness is a pliable, even a moldable, thing. Had there only been this one constellation of circumstances to adjust to rather than the present shifting situation in the Middle East, there is no doubt it would have begun to accustom itself to it – as it does now to a certain extent. But what an easier and far simpler set of circumstances to adjust to these would have been – how much less taxing in terms of stress and the impact on the subconscious.

But we are speaking now in terms of the ideal – as the Old Testament does – not the reality. The reality is what we have before us today. The point one is attempting to make, however, is

had the ideal been followed – if an initial complete separation and break could have been made – it is very doubtful if we would be involved in anything like the same bitterness and uncertainty we are involved in today.

In its own way, that is what the Old Testament was attempting to say about the situation of the Israelite People of its day. If they could have achieved the Conquest properly – if they could have wiped out the original inhabitants root and stalk instead of hardly at all or, at best only partially – then they would have been spared the problems they were forced to encounter afterwards. If they had been able to start from scratch to begin their National Existence in a homogeneously wholesome manner, then they would not have had to go through many of the experiences that later weighed so heavily on them.

But is this not the dream of a good many Peoples with regard to the history of their National Existence? Is it not the dream of a good many, people themselves with respect to their own actual lives? How many of us actually get a chance to live or really do live the sorts of lives they would have wished to live – probably very few. Still, if nothing else, the dream sometimes points the way to a clearer, more substantial reality.

Take, for instance, the Turks on Cyprus. Is this not now what they are doing in as thorough and complete a way as possible – setting up facts, insisting on a complete separation of the two Peoples, even if they have to impose it by force and enforce it themselves? Of course, the downside regarding the Turks is that they are taking the lion's share and richest part of the Island

itself but, then, the Israelis are blamed for doing the same thing in the fertile imagination of the Refugee Arab as he thinks about his supposed former splendor.

The point one is trying to make is that such a solution is not impossible. As a matter of fact, in the end, it is probably the best or, at least, the healthiest of all the solutions so far put forward by either side. It is just impractical at the present time. But the approach of the Old Testament is not wrong. At least as a model it could work and could have worked – it is just that, at the present moment it cannot be applied. Neither can we, as individuals, bring our sensibilities to apply such a solution as our Ancestors could not then – though such solutions have been applied to us even in a more monstrous and inhuman variety as, for example, in Germany from 1942-45.

Suppose we were to apply this line of thought to the present situation on the West Bank of the Jordan River in Palestine. What would have been the solution of our Ancestors, if only ideally and not in practice, to such a problem? It's obvious. They would simply have expelled the seven hundred thousand or so remaining Arabs on the West Bank to the other side of the Jordan and created a viable homogeneous Homeland for their People – perhaps giving them a reasonable time to move, perhaps not.

It is not as if the Arabs on the West Bank have no other place to go or the Arabs of the World do not inhabit Territory from Morocco to Baghdad, much of which under-inhabited. They do inhabit this Territory and they have got this Land mass. In addition to this, they are perhaps the richest single group of

Nations presently existing in the World with enough gold and oil reserves to pay for each citizen of Palestine perhaps some ten times over. But what is their solution to the problem? Their solution to the problem is to cry for more not less. Not being satisfied with such a Land mass, with such riches, they want more. They even want bits of Territory of dubious value they lost – supposedly in an unjust manner – like Palestine.

The demands cascade and build up. Plus the World credits them and slowly falls into line with them, mostly because no Nation dares to stand in the face of such overwhelming economic potential even though most are acutely aware of the sometimes unreasonable – sometimes fanatical – character of the wielder of this economic power.

24. The Old Testament Ideal or Why we Must Become Hebrews once  
again

No one is here advocating that the Israelis expel the Palestinians on the West Bank tomorrow any more than one is advocating that the Mosque of Omar be overturned. One is not so inhuman as to advocate or do either of these things – at least not at the present time – though circumstances might come about where either or both became unavoidable.

What one is suggesting is that these kinds of behavior norms can be held up as how a self-confident People, proud of its heritage, might like to approach a given situation. These might be the ideals of a desirable future Existence with which a Territorial People might like to arm itself with as did the Hebrews or the Israelites in the Ancient Period of our Existence. Such Ideals (observed in the breach, if not in practice), more or less served them well; who can say they will do us any less?

Fortified by such ideals and even such goals for the future, when such things could be accomplished with a minimum of human pain and dislocation, there is little doubt how an Israeli Government that had to face the pressures of the World, that had to face the pressures of the Russians and Americans in Sinai in 1973, the combined pressures of the Arab and Muslim nations since, the constant demands, jibes, taunts, and insults of the United Nations for the last Quarter Century, and the disaffection of the so-called Civilized Nations of Western Europe, because of would act.

The ideals sketched above need not necessarily be put into

practice anymore than they were in Old Testament Times; but, armed with such principles and fortified with the self-confidence of a Free People easily at home in its own Land, a new pattern of behavior would emerge. We might not any longer be the renowned "Sabras" (prickly pear cactus) with prickly outsides and soft, sometimes over-ripe insides; but we would become a People whose insides – whose Soul, whose Spiritual Strength – would once again match its physical development.

We would no longer be acting out our part on the World Stage in terms of some blind charade put on in response to some inner plot line we have of what the World – our former Masters or, at least, former Gatekeepers – expected of us; but in response to some deep inner convictions of our own. Strengthened by a sure clear knowledge of what we had been commanded to do in our Forbearer's words or what we intended to do, we would be able to play out our part upon the stage of life with far greater easiness, flexibility, and confidence.

This was the spiritual development neglected by the Early Zionists in their rush for a political and territorial answer to "the Jewish question." This is the reason why in Israel our physical development has outstripped our mental and spiritual development.

These are the sorts of principles we could teach our children. These are the sorts of ideals that would stand them well in the turrets of their tanks through successive wars – through successive waves of enemy attack. This is the sort of "Fighting Faith" we will need in order to survive in the Middle East, the

sort of beliefs the Middle East has always generated – the sort of beliefs we should have been looking for instead of pursuing the idle caricature of Bourgeois living in Western Europe and to a certain extent America.

These People are not our People. Their problems are not our problems. Would perhaps that they were – but we live in a whole other configuration of circumstances which have nothing to do with the sort of prosperity they enjoy.

The experience and behavior of Castro's Cuba or even present-day Communist China or North Viet Nam would more resemble the sorts of sacrifices we are being called upon to make – the sorts of trials we can be expected to be called upon the face. Yet our neighbors, incongruously and inappropriately enough, make more use of these stereotypes than we do though they resemble them not a jot. We are, without doubt and have been for sometime, a spiritually crippled Nation. We came back to Palestine – most of us unwilling and still unwilling – in spite of ourselves and when we did, we returned armed with two thousand or two thousand five hundred years of *Diaspora* principles and *Diaspora* living.

It is too much to expect a People to change overnight, to reconstruct themselves spiritually and culturally in one or two generations, but we must make a start. What is more, we have the riches – we have the material stashed in our Cultural Warehouse, rotting with mildew as it were, to make just such a start. We have only to pull off the childish wrapping paper, the aura of Mythology about these things as we do in our dreams – pull the weapons, so to speak, out of their mothballs and they will once

more be ours.

These are the principles and ideals that will make us into a Courageous People, a Rich People full of self-confidence and yet – as any self-confident People – tolerant and easy-going to fault until pushed too far: generous, noble, intelligent, high-minded – and, yet proud, strict in exacting Justice and Retribution, asking little quarter, yet giving little quarter, slow to anger and yet – when finally roused – ferocious in the staying power and intensity of that response. This is the kind of People we must become if we are to win the day with ourselves, as well as our enemies. This is what is meant by the proposition: "Why we must stop being Jews" and "Why we must become Hebrews again" – or any successful facsimile thereof.

These are the principles that will give us the moral fortitude to stand alone, to deal with people like Kissinger, to recognize him for what he is, though one of our own – primarily an egotist and certainly not a Zionist – in the service of one or another of foreign employers.

It is very difficult for us to know how to respond when the very medicine, we are being offered and which will debilitate us, comes from the hands of one of our own but this has always been the case throughout our History. We must have the courage to see in him the very things in ourselves we are trying to outgrow, escape, and remold and, in so doing, show the other Nations of the World who would treat us or use us – as they have always done our Henry Kissingers – that we are not this and cannot be reckoned any longer or treated any longer in this way.



In so doing, too, we also show to ourselves that we are something else – that in a very real sense our only strength comes from the Lord; that, apart from Him, there is none else; that we have no friends or strength, nor need none; that in standing alone – on our own two feet so to speak – we shall be able to overcome the forces that beset us.

Suppose we had at the time of the Suez Canal Crossing during The *Yom Kippur* War refused to slow down and halt, refused to release the encircled Egyptian Armies and pull back without some firmer sort of guarantees than those we were receiving? Then everyone would say, where would we have gotten our armaments from – how could we have survived?

Well, just as in the last War we might have been somewhat better off without the crippling unending supply of Phantoms – the loss of every one of which cost well into the millions of dollars – if we had been forced back on our own former make-do initiative; so, too, when cut off from the sources of our supply, we would have had to improvise. The weapons we needed would have had to be taken from our enemies as we had done before – in the meantime, the World would have come around in any event.

*"Everyone loves a Winner"* – particularly a colorfully resourceful one and not a cowering one.

So perhaps there would have been more losses. The losses suffered in The *Yom Kippur* War were not so grave. They were not pleasant but they were nothing when looked upon in the light of what it costs to build a Nation. The Russians lost twenty or thirty million people in the Second World War if reports are to

be believed. In the Concentration Camps, everyone perished. Leningrad was a City that lost over half its inhabitants but it survived. There are people who have taken greater losses than we have and lived.

This is the price one must expect when building a State. One should not have expected to walk into the Middle East – as some of our People and some of our Leaders seem to have – and put down a State without any troubles – to pay nothing for it, i.e., in blood. The cost must be great – but the greater the cost, perhaps, the greater its worth. In the process of a costlier war, Israeli Society, too, might have been forced to reform itself – reconstitute itself, tighten its belt, pull together more instead of all pulling separately – with the collective effort extending into the deepest pockets of poverty in the wretched Central Cities or the most luxurious and Middle Class of suburbs, instead of being relegated only to certain corners of the countryside.

These are the things that might have occurred if we had thumbed our noses at the World and followed our own inner lights – had we any to follow – followed the inner Voice propelling us on – that Voice our Ancestors through the intermediation of their Prophets, always identified with God.

## 25. Rebirth

Suppose the Jews or the Israelis were to adopt the idea of "Holy War" – a variation of the view held by the Muslims (both come from the same source, the Old Testament), in any event – which is what the struggle is in any case. What would happen?

In the first place, the Jews or the Israelis are accused of all manner of arrogance anyhow: double-dealing, harshness, repression, expansionist sentiments, militarism. Suppose they were to adopt a few of these traits in actuality, instead of always being "Good" in the boy-scout sense of that word – in the sense of always being patient, letting your enemy strike the first blow, taking terrorist outrage after terrorist outrage, always responding never seizing the initiative – what would happen? There would be the same yelps of outrage from their enemies but this time, for a change, with some cause.

As long as the World is going to call the Jews all these things – and the Israelis in particular – and believe it, why not give them some cause for doing so? The Arabs scream and bleat over the slightest indiscretion or outrage. Why not really give them something to scream and bleat about?

The affect could be no worse and the Jewish People certainly no worse off. It is not necessary that we always be in the "Right" – it is not necessary that we always be "Good" in some sophomoric conception of these terms – as long as we really feel we are being True to ourselves and are carrying out what we sincerely believe to be our God's Commands to us.

Since the Israelis are accused of expelling the Arabs from

their lands in any case, why not expel some Arabs and do it in a way that we would derive some benefit from? Since we are accused of trampling on the rights of the Arabs in the Occupied Territories, why not really trample on them a little by blowing up the Mosque of Omar for instance?

Here is a manner of behavior in line with some of the principles already delineated. Here would be an act which would at least bring us closer to the day we are all attempting to arrive at, that is, a day when the reconstruction of the Third Temple becomes feasible. Here would be some madness with a method to it – plus, it would send a chill down the spines of the enemies of the Jews that would possibly reverberate through History. Why is it always Our Temples that must be destroyed? Let us be brave, let us be cocky, let us be men.

Consider what would happen if a group of Jews, private or otherwise – even sponsored by the Government, as the C.I.A, is by the American Government – were to gain access to the Temple Mount; and, in response to the throwing of babies out of windows or the machine gunning or grenading of rooms full of teenagers, not stoop to our enemies methods and bomb their Refugee Camps thereby brutalizing ourselves in the process as they are brutalized. But responded in kind, repaid them in kind, by going up to the Temple Mount and blowing up the Mosque of Omar which does not belong there in any event – the third Holiest Building in Islam – as the Arabs would certainly not hesitate to do to us.

Lest anyone doubt the validity of the last proposition, let him simply take a walk some day on the Mount of Olives and see

the terrible desecration and destruction the Arabas have wrought on the Jewish Cemetery there – their response to “the Jewish Question” while they administered these Areas. The Western Nations have even helped by constructing a tourist hotel over the wreckage of a part of it. Screams of horror, outrage, and revenge would erupt from across the Arab World. The whole of “the Civilized World” would be shocked and outraged that “the Jews” had stooped to doing such a thing. Let them be. At least we would not be killing anyone – only blowing up a building.

Was anyone ever shocked while Hitler was carrying out his bloody outrages or Hajj Amin al-Husseini or the others, at least enough to stop them or to care to do anything about them? No. There is a double standard abroad in the world – one when it comes to dealing with “Jews”, another when it comes to dealing with other Peoples.

Very well then, let us stop being “Jews”; let us rob them of their satisfaction at having this one People to kick around in the World. The abuse we take in the United Nations is despicable. No other Nation would be called upon to take such abuse. No other Nation would have been called upon to surrender the gain of The *Yom Kippur War*, won at such a price and after such a dastardly sacrilegious attack. No other Nation could have been put through the horror of the Concentration Camps in the way we were and to the extent we were without a finger being lifted in its defense.

All right, then, it is time to stop being “Jews.” It is time to become “Hebrews” once again. Let us see what the World will make of that. If nothing else, it will certainly do wonders for our

own spirits and morale. This would be the proper responses to such outrages. This would be a response that would hurt every Arab, every Muslim man on the street, as we are hurt. This would be replying in kind in a way which not one of them could misunderstand. This would be a like throwing down a gauntlet before their faces. We have never done this before.

We have tried to sneak back to the Holy Land unobtrusively – almost like curs. All right, you say, we do all these things. You say we are murderers, brutes – all right we shall become them and then see how you like us. This would be a way of polarizing the conflict once and for all because, once having committed such a dreadful act and sacrilegious outrage, there could be no peace between us. But wouldn't that be better than the present situation where there is no peace anyhow? Have the struggle above board, have it out in the open where there is no turning back – not for any of us.

Let the backsliders, the slackers, understand it for what it is. Let it be understood as a War of the whole Jewish People against the whole Arab People. Let the War be polarized once and for all – finally. Let our youth too understand there is no end to it. Let them, too, have no further illusions about it. Let them understand it for what it is as the Muslims do – a Holy War. This would stiffen their backs. This would stiffen the backs of some of the hangers-back among us. There would be or could be no turning back after this. And should there be? Do we not indeed wish to re-establish our Third Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine? Do we not indeed wish to rebuild our Third Temple – our Glory?

Let us answer these questions now and venture forth once and for all – once ventured forth, there can be no turning back. Let us elevate the struggle to what it, in fact, is – a Religious One based on Religious Beliefs. Let us up the ante as it were. For is it not a Religious Belief that we were to come back to this Land? Is not the very Religious Document, we have been talking about, the only Title Deed we have to this Land and for such a Return?

Why then are we so embarrassed about it – why be so "Jewish", so squeamish? Let us raise this struggle to the level of a Holy Struggle between the whole of the Arab People and the whole of the Jews. Then the doubters among us would know for what they are fighting. Then those who are dying among us would know for what they are dying.

And is it not better to go like this if we must indeed go – and, if we must indeed go, no political *modus vivendi* will save us (just as, if we are to succeed in this struggle, nothing the other side sets up against us can make us fail) – than to go as we did just thirty or forty years ago? For nothing. Six million people for nothing. Was not this sacrifice enough of "a Holocaust"?

Once this single act was done with the complicity of the whole Jewish People – if not that of the Israeli Government – then the other side would know what they were struggling against, then our own side would even understand the stakes of the struggle they are involved in. Have we come back after two thousand years only to fail? Have we returned to our Land only to live like dogs in it and not like men? Let this one thing be done and from that

moment on the whole of our People will be in the hands of the Lord – in His alone and in no one else's.

In closing, let us consider one further character weakness we "the Jews" have always suffered from and still suffer from. We do not know how to be happy – we do not know how to feel joy. We feel joy like some thief in the night as if the person we stole it from were going to come and take it back again from us. Let us experience joy as any proud and healthy People would experience joy – fully and completely.

Take the triumph after The Six-Day War. The Jews of the World were embarrassed. For awhile they felt joy but nothing very deep-seated. It quickly disappeared, as if the thief in the night would come and take it away, and so he did during The *Yom Kippur* War. In Israel, too, there was much rejoicing at first but then this quickly disappeared into a new spirit of over-confidence, of false cockiness, of brashness – a perversion of the very sensibility we are talking about. With this brashness came an even greater acquisitiveness than before.

So, what had been a New Spirit after The Six-Day War rapidly disintegrated into a general mediocrity – a Bourgeois orgy of spending and acquisition. It Infected all levels of the society from the highest to the very lowest and, of course, with it came rampant inflation even before the inflation that gripped the World several years later. The joy and rejoicing – legitimate joy and rejoicing at a victory hard-won and well-deserved, already indistinguishable from the new brashness – rapidly gave way to self-doubt and uncertainty.



The Israelis were not popular anymore in the World; they were no longer the underdogs. Now they were the top dogs. It was a position they were not used to occupying and it upset and confused them – it embarrassed them. Would they have preferred the other? It would appear so. Well, if they would have preferred it, it wasn't long in returning. Now they have it back again.

In any event, between the years 1969 to 1973 the Society was wracked with questions and self-doubt. Are we the aggressors, have we occupied land we should not have, is this the way we want to be – is this the way "Jews" should be? Jews do not behave like this. Jews are not used to occupying land. Jews are not conquerors. We should give the Territories back. We should withdraw. It is immoral to hold on to them.

Particularly among the educated youth on the university campuses, these were the sort of attitudes that could be observed and the questions that were being asked. The joylessness, the lack of understanding of how to win without denigrating one's enemies or oneself, began to infect the whole of the Society. The Israelis began to swallow the very propaganda the opposite side was manufacturing about them. Are we a Nation of Militarists? Are we Fascists – not realizing that they had to be "Militarists" in order to survive?

It was called by some "the Masada Complex." If Israel had a "Masada Complex" well, then, it was too bad it evaporated by the time of The *Yom Kippur* War. She would have been spared much suffering and much dislocation if she had clung on to it. Instead, once again, she began taking her image of herself from

what the World was saying about her – not from anything substantial within herself which she could hold on to. If she were "Fascist," then she had been "Fascist" all along. She had not just become it.

If she were "Fascist," it was the "Fascism" of a bull-headed and inefficient bureaucracy; it was the "Fascism" of an over-greedy Bourgeoisie. But it was not the sort of "Fascist Militarism" that the World's Liberal Press – inspired by the grist of the Communist Propaganda Mills – was manufacturing.

It is difficult to assess the number of times one might have heard such questions or expressions of indecision, self-doubt, indecisiveness, lack of clarity about who they were or where they were going, one could have heard in Israel during this Period – especially towards the end of it when one should have thought the Israelis would have been "happy". This ended up in what is known as "The *Yom Kippur War*" and a state of unpreparedness and lack of concern a border situation, upon which one's very lifeblood depended, that strikes one as being almost self-destructive and having in retrospect a death wish – if not terribly profligate.

What is it one is trying to say here? One is trying to say there is nothing embarrassing about winning a war. There is also nothing embarrassing about almost winning a second one – though the second one was stopped and the fruits of victory snatched away before they could be savored. There is nothing wrong either with celebrating the fruits of that victory as long as the celebration is heartfelt and longstanding – not a celebration that rapidly disappears like a thief in the night.

What is embarrassing, however, is being a People so inured to coming out on the short end of things that when one finally – after two thousand years – at last comes out on the long end of things, one is left speechless and unable to know how to celebrate it properly.

It is indeed a traumatic experience to wake up and find one has been so crippled by one's History and one's Past that one no longer knows how to feel anything remotely resembling Joy and, when one does feel it, it is but a shallow facsimile of it – like those Israeli soldiers loutishly celebrating their retreat from Sinai and dousing each other's heads with wine and champagne over the occasion. They were, once again, behaving as they had thought they had seen others behave – not according to any inner compulsion to behave.

When this inner compulsion to express Joy, to burst out singing or dancing, to feel one's heart carried away in a swell of overwhelming Joy on a legitimate occasion and for a legitimate cause – despite the suffering (or, in spite of it), in spite of the hardship, in spite of the losses – has been damaged; then the Jewish People is certainly a People in deep trouble.

This perhaps will be the true sign that the Jews have become a Nation like any other: when they can feel Joy like other Nations can, celebration and gladness, and not be ashamed of it – but proud of it. When this Joy can lap over the levees of their hearts and flood and flood for days on end – even for long years – then perhaps they will have become a True Landed People again, confident and at Home, at ease in their self-satisfaction. This

perhaps might be one of the real barometers that can tell us when the Jews have really come Home again.

When the Jews can feel true and sustained Joy, as the Turks might feel it over Cyprus – when they can fire their weapons in the air as the Arabs might do or the Mexicans (even in a Hollywood Movie) in an outburst of unrestrained joy – not being afraid, not looking over their shoulders, not feeling some one is watching them who will come like a thief in the night to rob them of their pleasure.

Do not worry – there is no one watching you, only yourselves; and yet everyone is watching you – the whole World. When the Jews can know this thing, when they can indeed celebrate a Victory dearly won and long fought, when the celebration of this Victory is one of richness and fullness like the Passover Feast or the Maccabean Feast of *Hanukkah* celebrating the beginnings of what turned into the First and Second Commonwealths so many millennia ago; then we might, indeed, with some justice utter the words: “The Jews have come Home again. The Jews are a True People. They have been Reborn.”

*Rosh Hashanah – Shavuot, 5735 (September, 1974 – June, 1975)*

