

The Heritage Lectures

28

A Heritage Roundtable:

**Anti-Semitism in the
Modern World**



The Heritage Foundation is one of the country's leading public policy research institutes. With offices just two blocks from the United States Capitol, The Heritage Foundation's research and studies programs are designed to make the voices of responsible conservatism heard in Washington, D.C., throughout the United States, and in the capitals of the world.

The key to Heritage's research effort is timeliness—providing the policy-making community with up-to-date research on the important issues of the day. Heritage publishes its findings in a variety of formats for the benefit of decision makers, the media, the academic community, businessmen, and the public at large. Over the past five years The Heritage Foundation has published more than 400 books, monographs, and studies, ranging in size from the 1,093-page government blueprint, *Mandate for Leadership: Policy Management in a Conservative Administration*, to more frequent "Critical Issues" monographs and the topical "Backgrounders" and "Issue Bulletins" of a few thousand words. Heritage's other regular publications include *National Security Record*, *Policy Digest*, *Education Update*, and *Policy Review*, a quarterly journal of analysis and opinion.

The Heritage Foundation's 100-member staff—which includes several internationally recognized scholars and former government officials—concentrates on four areas of general study: domestic and economic policy; foreign policy and defense; the United Nations; and Asian studies. With some 1,600 individual scholars and research organizations working with its Resource Bank, The Heritage Foundation is uniquely equipped to provide U.S. policy makers with the intellectual resources needed to guide America into the 21st century.

In addition to the printed word, Heritage regularly brings together national and international opinion leaders and policy makers to discuss issues and ideas in a variety of formal and informal settings. Through a continuing series of seminars, lectures, debates, and briefings, The Heritage Foundation provides a forum for the exchange of ideas and a laboratory for developing these ideas into practical public policy proposals.

The Heritage Foundation was established in 1973 as a nonpartisan, tax-exempt policy research institute dedicated to the principles of free competitive enterprise, limited government, individual liberty, and a strong national defense. Heritage is classified as a Section 501(c)(3) organization under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and is recognized as a publicly supported organization described in Sections 509(a)(1) and 170(b)(1)(A)(vi) of the Code. Individuals, corporations, companies, associations, and foundations are eligible to support the work of The Heritage Foundation through tax-deductible gifts.

A Heritage Roundtable: Anti-Semitism in the Modern World

CONTRIBUTORS

Abraham Blumberg, an expert on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, is former editor of *Problems of Communism*. He is a contributing editor to *The New Republic* and recently edited the book *Poland, Genesis of Revolution*.

Marshall Breger, was Associate Professor of Law at New York Law School and Visiting Fellow in Legal Policy at The Heritage Foundation until late 1983, when he joined the White House Office of Public Liaison.

Rael Jean Isaac, a sociologist, has written two books on Israeli politics and a number of articles on political radicalism in the United States. Her most recent book is *The Coercive Utopians*.

Nathan Perlmutter, National Director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, has held a variety of posts in American Jewish circles. He was the Associate National Director of the American Jewish Committee and Vice President of Brandeis University. With his wife, Ruth Perlmutter, he recently published the book *The Real Anti-Semitism in America* (New York: Arbor House, 1983).

Rev. Pat Robertson, a Baptist minister, is president of the Christian Broadcasting Network and host of the TV program *The 700 Club*.

ISSN 0272-1155

Copyright © 1984 by The Heritage Foundation

MARSHALL BREGER: In recent years we have seen a strong resurgence of philo-Semitism among the evangelical Christian community. Based in part on a theological concern for Israel, the Jews for many evangelicals are seen as the covenantal community out of which the Messiah arose. This opening to the Christian Right, however, contains an element of role reversal. Historically, it was liberal Christianity that desired ecumenical dialogue with Jewish groups. Theological tolerance was seen as an inverse proportion to Christian orthodoxy. The recent alliance of many liberal Christian groups with "liberation theology" and Third World politics changed this equation. While the political differences between the evangelical and Jewish communities are clear, the fundamentalist reanalysis of the place of Judaism in Christian millennial theology places their friendship with Jews and Israel on a "Bible-based" bedrock. This outstretched arm from the fundamentalist community places the question of contemporary anti-Semitism in a new and as yet unstudied context.

The study of anti-Semitism reveals a stained and stippled past to Western eyes. While this century has seen a decline in religious anti-Semitism, few can deny the theological roots of anti-Semitism in traditional Christianity. The recognition of that burden is one with which contemporary Christians are struggling in a variety of ways.

Similarly, and particularly in these halls*, it would be dissembling to deny the complex historical relationship between political and cultural anti-Semitism and right-wing political parties and conservative cultural impulses. Certainly this has been the perception. As late as 1955 the Anti-Defamation League made a study of anti-Semitism entitled *Danger on the Right*.¹ In an historical context this perception has sadly been the reality—as the experience of European Jewry in this century makes indubitably clear.

Indeed a study of modern European history explains why this may well be the case. The French Revolution was the nineteenth century's watershed political event (as the Russian Revolution has been called for our own day). Arrayed on behalf of Republican thought were those liberals, radicals, and anti-clerics who also supported political emancipation for the Jews. Opposed to the spirit of the Revolution were royalists and conservatives who attacked not only the Revolution but opposed emancipation as well. Given this bipolar view of the world, the close relation-

1. New York, 1955.

*The roundtable was held in the Lehrman Auditorium at The Heritage Foundation on November 2, 1983.

ship between Jews and liberalism is immediately understandable. The Dreyfus Affair at the century's close, in which anti-Semitic stereotypes provided the opportunity for a replay of these French revolutionary battles, merely underscored this alliance. Given this background one can understand why so many thought that the tradition and fate of the Jews were undissolubly bound to those of the forces of liberalism.

Even so, there has been a constant strain of anti-Semitism on the Left, a strain that has been hidden in the interplay between the social democratic tradition flowing from nineteenth century liberal or Whig thought and the radical socialist tradition built on Marxist categories.

George Lichtheim has written at length on left-wing anti-Semitism, which he calls the "the socialism of fools."² Based in part on Marx's "On the Jewish Question," much of this disdain for Jews and Judaism flows from the writings and opinions of the French socialists, including Fourier and Proudhon.³ Marx himself (descended as he was from a rabbinical lineage) evinced an almost vitriolic dislike of Jews. Indeed, his specific review of the issue attacked not merely the Jewish religion but rather Jews as a race (or should one say class). Accepting the full litany of anti-Semitic stereotypes, "Money," he tells us, "is the zealous God of Israel, beside which no other God may stand."

Marxist tradition has been antagonistic to Jews both as a religious and an ethnic group. This antagonism to Judaism reflected their general antagonism to religion as an "opiate of the masses." Their dislike of Jews reflected in part all Marxist antagonism to group particularity (which cuts against the universality of the class struggle) and the unfortunate acceptance of the Jewish financier as the folk paradigm for the bloated capitalist (thus Marx commenting in 1853 on the campaign to secure the franchise for English Jewry wrote, "It may be questioned whether the English people will be contented with this extension of the suffrage to a Jewish usurer").

The conceptual tension between socialist thought and Judaism is one between the particularist concerns of Judaism—nation, religion, ethnic group—and the universalist focus of socialist thought which seeks to collapse social individuality and group particularity into a single class perspective. This is a tension with which socialist theory has struggled since its inception. The Austro-Marxists, cognizant of the jerry-built ethnic character of the Habsburg monarchy, sought to accommodate

2. George Lichtheim, "Socialism and the Jews," in *Collected Essays* (New York: Viking Press, 1973), pp. 413–47.

3. An exception must be made for Henri de Saint-Simon, a confirmed philo-Semite.

national interests, including Jewish group interests, within a Marxist framework. At various points the Soviets trumpeted (but never delivered) a "nationalities policy" which carried with it similar stated objectives.

For the Jews this tension has been particularly unfortunate. Whether from personal self-hatred or pervasive anti-Semitism, the particularity of the Jewish community was almost constantly ignored in the Marxist equation. "Do not speak to me," Rosa Luxemburg wrote on being told of the devastation of Central European Jewry after World War I, "Do not speak to me of Jewish sorrows. I cannot," she continued, "find a special corner of my heart for the ghetto."

In this context, of course one had a choice. One could opt for the universal over the particular. As the Count de Clermont-Tonnerre in the French Revolutionary Assembly pointed out when addressing the question—"The Jews should be denied everything as a nation, but granted everything as individuals."

This form of anti-Semitism attacked the Jewish people, not Jews in their persons. And indeed those who wished could try chameleon-like to erase their past, seeking anonymity if not solace in the more general claims of European nationality or class solidarity. During the growth of European nationalism, Jewish nationhood was condemned. For many, the price of equality was the denial of particularity. Thus Heine (who paid this price and struggled with the consequences throughout his life) pointed out that conversion was the price of acceptance in Western society.

There remains a second more enveloping form of anti-Semitism in which Jews could not opt out of their peoplehood. I speak, of course, of the racial views propagated by the Nazis. Anti-Semitism under Nazi racial theory, does not focus on the voluntary choice of Jews to be Jews, but rather on their racial or ethnic status. Viewed as a nationality or race, Jews are assigned that status at birth and carry it through life on their identity card. They cannot withdraw.

The problem of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union is particularly vexatious. For the Soviets, too, view Jews as a racial or ethnic group and treat them as such in developing their international policy. Indeed they are treated far worse. Assigned Jewish nationality, the Soviet Jew is denied the cultural expression afforded other nationalities in the Soviet Union. To understand Soviet anti-Semitism, one must analyze not only Marxist attitudes toward Jews but traditional Russian "folk" anti-Semitism as well. For the Kremlin both strains merge. Anti-Semitism becomes a conscious and deliberate tool of state policy played like an accordion to accommodate Soviet domestic concerns.

What we have seen therefore since World War II is a fundamental political realignment of the anti-Semitic impulse in the Western world. As W.D. Rubinstein has noted, "Today, the main enemies of the Jews and Israel are almost exclusively on the left, most obviously the Communist states, the radical Third World anti-Zionist nations and their sympathizers in the West."⁴ Right-wing sources of anti-Semitism have declined, as Israel is increasingly seen as an embattled outpost of Western values and Jews are understood to participate in the establishment Western consensus. In contrast, left-wing anti-Semitism has increased. Submerged since World War II by Western guilt over the Holocaust and the commonality of purpose during the struggle against fascism, left-wing anti-Semitism has returned in an especially virulent form since the Six Day War where the epithets once reserved for Jews are now hurled at Zionism. This antagonism has taken obsessive forms. Third World countries with no experience of Jews cast Israel among the imperialist devils. Left-wing churchmen from groups such as the National Council of Churches demand that Jews carry the yoke of sainthood. While this antagonism has largely focused on Israel—deemed arrogant, pushy, and financially exploitative by enlightened circles (all old anti-Semitic stereotypes)—the fallout has already begun to affect Jews as well as Israelis. While fiction writers like John LeCarre allow their characters the luxury of such distinctions, the sad fact is that, in practice, anti-Zionism soon conflates into anti-Semitism. A recent speech given by the Jordanian Ambassador to the United Nations exemplifies this point, "(The Zionist) cabal . . . controls and manipulates and exploits the rest of humanity by controlling the money and wealth of the world. It is a well-known fact that the Zionists are the richest people in the world. . . ."

One can but wonder as to the rationale for this anti-Semitic tendency (disguised as it is by the United Nations banner of Zionism is racism). Does it reflect the historical socialist commitment to universalism with its concomitant antagonism to Jewish nationalism? Or is there something else—a belief, however unstated, that more can be demanded of Jews and of the Jewish state than of other nations?

Against this background some inexplicable aspects of anti-Semitism remain. Some commentators have sought to situate the causes of anti-Semitism in the growth of anti-modern social and political movements attendant upon the rise of nineteenth century capitalism. For them, it is conditions in the larger society that create or discourage anti-Semi-

4. W.D. Rubinstein, *The Left, The Right and The Jews* (Universe Books, New York), p. 77.

tism.⁵ In a surprisingly similar vein, Jean-Paul Sartre in his classic psychological analysis *Anti-Semite and Jew*⁶ argues that Jewish identity is a function of the anti-Semitic attitudes of the general community. In his view, then, the Jewish question exists because of scapegoating needs by the dominant society. Without anti-Semitism the Jews would assimilate and the problem would over time resolve itself. Fortunately or unfortunately we have not been able in our day to test the truth of this proposition. For anti-Semitism as a social phenomenon has not vanished but rather found new social sources to fuel it.

Here, however, I travel ahead and enter into the domain of the panelists. Thus, I shall leave further insight and wisdom to our four guests.

Our first speaker is Nathan Perlmutter, National Director of the Anti-Defamation League. His topic is "The Real Anti-Semitism."

NATHAN PERLMUTTER: I have reacted to anti-Semitism professionally, mainly as active discrimination. I distinguish that from bigoted views which, while requiring counteraction, I suspect are less resilient, less vulnerable to change. And so we have traditionally fought discrimination. We fought it in housing, and within the memory of most of us, there was hardly a city in this country that did not boast not very long ago, restricted or euphemistically called exclusive neighborhoods. And we fought it in education—the quota system. We fought it in employment discrimination. When I got out of college I wanted a white collar job. Column after column of want ads, even in *The New York Times*, read CHR only; that meant Christian only. And we fought it in resorts. Our files contain photographs from Miami Beach—not more than 25 years old—saying no dogs or Jews allowed. And, of course, we always fought hate groups—the Ku Klux Klan, for example. But that was yesterday. Today, Jews live pretty much where they can afford to live. In education, I doubt that there is a single ethnic group in America with more college graduates than among Jews. As for employment, Jewish income is its own answer. I can think of several resorts, famous resorts, which yesteryear would not have a Jew and today would not be in business were it not for Jewish conventions and Jewish clientele. And the Klan, the feared symbol of hate groups, has not a governor, not a mayor, not a police chief among its

5. This debate is reviewed in Jacob Katz, "Misreading of Anti-Semitism," *Commentary*, July 1983. See also Hannah Arendt's *The Origins of Totalitarianism, Part I* (New York: Harcourt Brace, Jovanovich, 1968) describing anti-Semitism as a secular nineteenth century ideology.

6. New York, Schocken Books, 1948.

10,000 members. That is a tinny echo of the Klan of our troubled memories.

And so we come to anti-Semitism today. Or to my preference, rather than "anti-Semitism," what it is today that threatens Jews—no matter their having largely overcome discrimination, no matter their having prevailed over the hating yahoos. My thesis maintains that, as the practice of democracy has increasingly neared the promise of democracy, that promise that personal rights are to be cherished and that brute privileges and punishments are abrasions on democracy, we Jews and Gentiles, too, of whatever color have done well. The free market, so to speak in civil rights, has been good for once discriminated against groups and has made a respectable woman of the Statue of Liberty.

But of late something has gone amiss. Today group rights have resurfaced in the guise of the quota system. Nowhere is this more dramatically evident than in the current controversy over President Reagan's nominations to the Civil Rights Commission. We hear of his authority or lack of authority to fire and to hire. We hear of his packing the Civil Rights Commission. But what really has prompted the opposition to his nominations is the fact that his nominees oppose the racial quota system. The old quota system was designed to exclude specific groups. The new, currently popular quota system is designed to include specific groups. But a quota system by definition means that some groups will be arbitrarily punished, and some groups will be arbitrarily rewarded. And in the process of rewarding and punishing groups, we ride roughshod over individual rights. The racial quota system, because it hurts individuals, is bad for Jews and for all manner of people. It is bad because the institutionalization of racial quotas establishes a precedent for other groups to demand a fair share. Why not? If group X has a given quota, why should not Italian Americans or Irish Americans have one, too? Or that perhaps most overlooked group in America, those white Anglo-Saxon Protestants? What then happens to the rights of individual Americans, regardless of their race, color, or creed?

My thesis also maintains, with a winking smile at General Motors, that what is good for the United States is good for Jews. In the millenia of our wanderings, Jews have not had a warmer, a snugger harbor than the American democracy. Coupled with this easily demonstrable fact is this: The Soviet Union is today the world's most calculatedly anti-Semitic government, and it is a military Goliath. Consequently, while forty or so years ago, I as a young man was disquieted by isolationists on our political right, because their pacifism fueled the Nazis' disposition to war, and because their isolationism was a *de facto* indifference to Nazism's anti-

Semitism, so today, on the threshold of middle age, I am disquieted by so much that I hear in the peace movements, on the left, our latter day isolationists. I am disquieted as an American because I treasure freedom. It must not be left vulnerable to Communist muggers. And as a Jew because, plainly said, Communism is not only an armed Goliath, not only aggressive regardless of the race, color, or creed of its victims, but is as well the preeminent publisher, distributor, and practitioner of anti-Semitism in the world today.

This contention that I am making, that Jewish interests are now under a stronger siege than under old-fashioned anti-Semitism, sets in motion new tactics required to assure Jewish superiority. So it is that several years ago, before it became fashionable, my organization, the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, supported a meaningful escalation in America's defense budget vis-à-vis the Soviet Union. So it is that my organization has urged cutbacks in our level of support for the United Nations, which serves as a megaphone for anti-Americanism, anti-Zionism, anti-Semitism.

Now I have touched very lightly on Jewish interests related to civil rights and Jewish interests related to defense. You might assume that my concern with the security of Jews sees me keeping a watchful eye over my left shoulder. It is a correct assumption, but not a completely correct assumption.

A word then about the Right. Not the caricature of the far Right, but a word about the respectable Right. And the word will be in the form of recounting to you a conversation I had in this city about two years ago. It was in the weeks preceding the AWACs debate in the Senate. What the papers like to call a highly placed government official called and asked if I would have lunch with him. Our conversation was predictable. His argument was in favor of the sale of AWACs; mine, no less predictable an argument, was against the sale. After lunch, seeing we were going nowhere, I said affably that I would like to make the 3:00 shuttle back to New York. He was going to the Pentagon. In the limousine, I suppose I was mischievous; I said to my acquaintance, "You know that if a Martian had overheard your arguments for the sale and mine against, he might have concluded that on the merits, the issue makes for a very close call." He chuckled and agreed. I felt that I had baited my conversational trap. I continued, "You know I was a hypocrite. When I argued that the Saudis would not become part of the peace process just because of the sale, I really don't know. I suppose I argued it because it suits my bottom line opposition." He chuckled louder and said that's true. "But," I said, "you were a hypocrite, too. You don't know that they will join the peace

process." He laughed agreement, saying, "Of course it's true." We had now arrived at the Eastern Airlines Terminal and as the chauffeur was getting out to let me out the door, I said, "Well if you're a hypocrite and if it is a close call, why is the Administration pushing this sale so hard?" His answer is still with me. He said, "Nate, do you know how much \$8.5 billion is?"

My point is that conservative regiments, to my mind, have a vulnerable flank. It is those who, though they profess conservative values, including anti-Communism, will nonetheless sell their wares to the Soviets, propping them up with pipeline assistance, high-tech, and the like. These people on the Right are selling the Communists Lenin's proverbial rope. Indifferent as they are, then, to the consequences of nourishing Communism, as a Jew I am not really surprised that they would lobby to sell armaments to Israel's sworn enemies.

In conclusion, there is less anti-Semitism in America today. But what is there is more dangerous, too, because of the prospect of transforming civil rights gains into reverse discrimination, of making our foreign policy isolationist, and because in the rush for arms contracts we are in danger of rendering an ally, Israel, vulnerable. This is far more dangerous for Jews than several miscellaneous Klansmen in a cow pasture near Birmingham, Alabama.

DR. BREGER: Our next speaker is Abraham Blumberg, who will discuss anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union.

ABRAHAM BLUMBERG: Any discussion of the nature, role, and political uses of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union and in the Soviet bloc, must begin with at least a brief examination of the historical roots of anti-Semitism in these countries. While it is true, as one eminent scholar of this subject recently observed, that "it is usually the attitude of the government rather than the attitude of the subjects which determines the impact of anti-Semitism upon the Jewish population," it is equally true that governments, whether autocratic or democratic, mirror to a larger or lesser extent the popular attitudes of their subjects. And it is also true that their ability to manipulate these attitudes for particular political purposes is directly related to their magnitude and intensity. Which is to say—to put it in the crassest of terms—that you cannot organize a pogrom unless you find enough thugs willing to participate in it, and that you cannot go on placing all the blame for a country's perennial misfortunes on any given ethnic or religious group unless there are enough people in that country willing to believe that this is indeed the case. There is a mordant Polish joke about two Poles, one of whom says, "You know it is all the fault of the Jews and the bicyclists." "Why the bicyclists?" asks his

companion. "Why the Jews?" he responds.

The logic, of course, is impeccable. But the fact remains that, at least in the recent past, there have been plenty of people in Poland ready to believe that it was the Jews who installed a hated Stalinist regime in their country; that it was the Jews who had seized all important positions in public life, thus blocking the way to advancement to all "genuine Poles"; that the Jews, in concert with something called the "international Zionist conspiracy," have worked tirelessly to discredit the good name of Poland in the eyes of the world; and that all the country's horrendous economic and political fiascos were the work of Pole-hating Jews. The man who was told that all his country's misfortunes were caused by Jews and bicyclists would, therefore, reject the second charge as absurd, while eagerly embracing the first. And the government, unscrupulous enough to exploit such witless prejudices in order to deflect attention from its own misdeeds, would not find it difficult to mount a campaign against a sinister, omnipotent enemy, the Jew—and to get away with it in the bargain.

East Central Europe has been for the past century and a half the locus of the most virulent and elemental Jew hatred. I need hardly dwell on Russia, the birthplace of bloody pogroms and of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion. With the exception of Bulgaria with its small Sephardic community, and some of the lands that now constitute the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the multimillion Jewish communities of Eastern Europe have led a precarious existence, being continuously subjected to physical assaults, economic discrimination, religious fanaticism, and the denial of civil, cultural, and national rights. Even in Czechoslovakia, that singular bastion of democracy, prosperity, and liberalism in inter-war Central Europe, popular hatred of Jews was always beneath the surface, particularly in Slovakia. This is borne out by the fact that the post-war Communist rulers in Czechoslovakia found it possible to fan and incite latent anti-Semitism, first by staging the infamous Slansky trial in 1952, most of whose defendants were portrayed as agents of a worldwide "Zionist conspiracy," and then sixteen years later in 1968 during the so-called Czechoslovak Spring, when those who tried—unsuccessfully—to bring about "socialism with a human face" were again branded as "imperialists" and Zionist spies, even though the overwhelming majority of them were not even Jewish.

The causes of popular anti-Semitic feelings and prejudices in Russia and Eastern Europe are as complex, multifaceted, and sometimes contradictory as were the Jewish communities that inhabited these countries: from the ultra-orthodox Hasidim in Sub-Carpathian Rus, to the highly assimilated Jews of ethnic Hungary, all the way to the heterogeneous

Jewish populations of Poland, Lithuania, and the Ukraine, with their intense religious and national consciousness that manifested itself so brilliantly in the various religious and secular movements that swept that part of the world in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.

In some areas, Jews were hated by peasants as the symbols of wicked capitalist exploitation. In others, they were resented as competitors by the nascent middle classes. In some, the virus of anti-Semitism was spread by large parts of the Catholic clergy. In others, the fiercest enemies of the Jews were the local extreme nationalists. Yet when due allowance is made for the often conflicting causes of popular anti-Semitism, there are still two outstanding features that pertain to the region as a whole. First, in all these countries Jews were perceived as representatives or agents of foreign ideologies, of foreign cultures, or of foreign powers. In Russia, Jews were seen and are still seen by contemporary Russian nationalists, including even so otherwise heroic a figure as Alexander Solzhenitsyn, as corruptive carriers of rotten Western values, deeply inimical to the virtues of genuine Russian Orthodoxy, indeed of the "Russian soul." In Poland, the Jews were often portrayed as allies and admirers of Poland's traditional enemy, Russia, and in the western part of Poland—in Silesia—Jews were often identified with the Germans. In parts of Romania, Jews were regarded as representatives of the hated Magyars, and in Slovakia as representatives at once of the Hungarians and the Germans. Example after example bears out the thesis that, for all these inconsistencies, the image of the Jew was fundamentally that of an alien—culturally, religiously, and politically inimical to the indigenous population.

The second feature common to all these countries, and not unrelated to the first, is that the Jews were identified with Communism, that is, with the most implacable enemies of the pre-war status quo. Now like every lie this one, too, has a kernel of truth, but only a kernel. In Tsarist Russia, Jews were indeed prominent in the various revolutionary movements, including even in the Socialist Revolutionary Party, a radical peasant-based movement. The irony, of course, is that while there were a fair number of Jews among the early Bolsheviks, these were highly assimilated Jews like Trotsky, Radek, or Zinoviev, all of whom contemptuously rejected any ties with Jewish culture or religion. Among the moderate Social Democratic Mensheviks, on the other hand, there were many Jews as loyal to Russian culture as to their own ethnic and cultural roots. Odd though it may sound, the anti-Semitic policies of Stalin—who, as we know from his own daughter, was imbued with the most atavistic animosity toward Jews—were in effect directed at precisely at what might be called the internationally oriented Communists. It was these people whom

Stalin, with his deep-seated paranoia, suspected of being agents of subversive ideas and subversive political programs—subversive, that is, of the type of national Communism that he was bent on bringing about in the Soviet Union.

There is a single thread running from the purges of the late 1930s, which saw the decimation of numerous non-Russian Communist cadres, including of course, the Jews, to the vicious anti-Semitic campaign of the late 1940s, the “Doctors’ Plot” of January 1953, which literally threatened the physical security of Russia’s 2.5 million Jews, all the way to the anti-Semitic purges that swept Eastern Europe in the late 1940s and early 1950s, and for that matter the anti-Semitic campaigns in the 1960s and 1970s as well. The threat is that of “the Jewish danger”—of an alien group hostile to the countries in which it resides, maintaining suspicious links with its co-religionists or co-nationals abroad, imbued with a passion for power on the one hand, and with a profound hostility to the native populations on the other.

It must be stressed that, in importing Soviet-style anti-Semitism into Eastern Europe at the end of the war, Stalin had his job cut out for him. Though he made use of Jewish Communists, many of whom had joined the Party in the belief that it represented the only bulwark against Fascism and anti-Semitism, to seize power in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, he did not find it difficult to sacrifice them on the altar of expediency, to make them the scapegoats for the failures of his own policies and of the policies of the native Communist regimes. For not only were there enough people in Poland, Hungary, or even in Czechoslovakia prepared to believe that the Jews, as aliens and Communists, were indeed responsible for the economic catastrophes and the terror that their countries experienced in the late 1940s and early 1950s, but the regimes themselves were, to a large extent, imbued with traditional anti-Semitic hatreds. In that respect there are striking sociological parallels between the elite that came to power in the Soviet Union in the 1930s and those who came to power in Eastern Europe two or three decades later. Largely semi-educated men and women of peasant or lower middle class origin, they married their faith in Communism as an instrument of power with the dark prejudices and animosities they had inherited from their fathers. It is therefore scarcely surprising that in some of the countries of Eastern Europe, most glaringly in Poland and Romania, the regimes have come more and more to resemble the fiercely nationalistic, authoritarian, xenophobic, and semi-fascist regimes that ruled Eastern Europe in the late 1930s.

The nexus between authoritarianism or totalitarianism (the difference

between these two terms in this respect, to me, seems largely irrelevant) and anti-Semitism has surely been demonstrated again and again. It was hardly an accident, as Marxists would say, that the junta which had ruled Argentina until recently had also been permeated with intense nationalism on the one hand, and poisonous anti-Semitism on the other. But it is only in Communist states—or some Communist states at least—that this has reached its most revolting apotheosis.

I have dwelt for a long time—too long, I suspect—on the endemic roots of anti-Semitism without thus far offering many concrete examples of its political use by Soviet and East European Communist regimes. I have done so because, first of all, I believe that it would be impossible to understand current Soviet or East European Communist anti-Semitism without at least touching on its genesis and history, and secondly, because I am confident that some of the details, especially of most recent origin, are fairly familiar to this audience. Let me then, in conclusion, make a few general remarks.

First, it would be a mistake to consider Soviet or, say, Polish anti-Semitism as a fundamental or consistent feature of Soviet, or Polish, or other Communist East European foreign policy. Rather, anti-Semitism is an instrument to be brandished and exploited whenever the regimes in question deem it useful to do so. The predisposition to use anti-Semitism as an instrument of policy is ever present. Yet how and when it is used depends entirely on either internal pressures or external needs. In 1941, for instance, despite all of Stalin's anti-Semitic domestic policies, the Soviet Union, in an attempt to enlist the support of world Jewry for its war efforts, countenanced the formation of the so-called Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee. Many Yiddish writers—committed Communists—were allowed to voice Jewish sentiments that had been forcefully suppressed in the preceding decade, and to address their brethren not in the name of proletarian nationalism, but in the name of the common fate and aspirations that link Jews all over the world. In the spring of 1947, Gromyko made his famous pro-Zionist speech at the United Nations, and shortly thereafter the Soviet Union was one of the first countries to recognize the State of Israel, and to welcome Golda Meir as the Ambassador of the new fledgling state. We know, of course, what happened subsequently. The arrival of Golda Meir sparked a surge of Jewish nationalist sentiment among Soviet Jews. Within a year, Moscow decided to court the Arab states, indeed the "Third World" in general, and changed its policy almost overnight. The Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee was closed, all Yiddish periodicals and newspapers were liquidated, thousands of prominent Jews were arrested. Twenty-six of the

finest representatives of Yiddish letters in Russia were executed after a secret trial in which they were accused of being Western spies, and the regime launched its infamous anti-cosmopolitan campaign on the one hand and an international anti-Zionist campaign on the other—a campaign, of course, which has outlasted Stalin and his successors.

In early and mid-1970s, when the Soviet Union was hoping to get more credits and economic aid from the West, the anti-Zionist campaign was muted, and in an unprecedented act, the Soviet leaders allowed several hundred thousand Jews to leave the country over the next seven to eight years. Now that relations between the Soviet Union and the West, particularly the United States, have dramatically deteriorated, anti-Zionist propaganda of the most odious kind has gained a new lease on life, and Jewish emigration has come to a virtual standstill. Should relations ever improve, I would not be surprised if the anti-Zionist campaign—the loathsome books, pamphlets, and newspaper articles, the refurbished Protocols of the Elders of Zion, the activities of the so-called Anti-Zionist Committee, which was organized last spring—were to recede or be muted again, and yet another emigration movement were to be set in motion.

Nothing, in my opinion, is likely to alter the domestic discriminatory practices against Soviet Jews. But however elemental the anti-Semitic prejudices of the Soviet elite, that elite has proved extraordinarily pragmatic, flexible—if you will, unscrupulous. Nothing is holier in the Soviet lexicon—not the canons of Marxism-Leninism, not the cult of any leader currently in power—than the dictates of expediency. As for Poland, where anti-Semitism has played so prominent a role in the policies of successive Communist regimes, anti-Semitism as an internal weapon has become increasingly less viable, largely because the Polish population has to a considerable extent freed itself from this virus, and also because during the heyday of Solidarity virtually all Polish intellectuals of any distinction had waged a valiant struggle against it. Furthermore, the Polish regime is so profoundly discredited in the eyes of its subjects that nearly everything it says meets with hostility and disbelief. At the same time, however, as Moscow's faithful ally and—indeed—beneficiary, Jaruzelski will support the Soviet Union's foreign policy, including its anti-Israel and anti-Zionist line. He can scarcely afford to act otherwise.

In sum, then, anti-Semitism in the Communist countries of Eastern Europe is rooted in and shaped by a variety of historical experiences. Accordingly, its manifestations vary from one country to another. But above and beyond its indigenous character, it has also become a political weapon to be employed with cynicism and impunity—nowhere more so than in the most powerful Communist state, the Soviet Union.

DR. BREGER: Dr. Rael Jean Isaac now will speak on anti-Semitism in the Third World.

RAEL JEAN ISAAC: A delegate to the U.N. Women's Conference in Copenhagen in 1980 overheard a conversation between a U.N. official, a woman from Thailand, and a woman from Egypt. The U.N. official said, "You women should make peace for your country." And the woman from Thailand said, "No, that's impossible. The Israeli woman is not a human being. She is possessed by the worm of Zionism. She can only be reached by the sword." The co-chairman of the American Jewish Congress was present at that Conference and she had one of those canvas bags saying American Jewish Congress on it. She was warned not to carry it. And she said, "To my shame I hid the bag. I was totally unprepared for my fear." Sonia Johnson, an ERA activist and a writer (and currently a splinter party candidate for President of the U.S.), said she overheard someone say the only way to rid the world of Zionism is to kill all the Jews. She said the anti-Semitism at the Conference was overt, wild, and irrational.

This account of anti-Semitism at a largely Third World conference was printed in *Ms.* magazine, which printed it two years after the fact, suggesting that there was quite a bit of soul searching at *Ms.* before they made their final honorable decision to publish it. Many First and Second World sisters presumably shared some of the sentiments expressed there, but the uninhibited character of their expression probably owed much to the presence of so many Third World women, those from Arab countries acting as the spearhead.

Now the presence of anti-Semitism in many Third World countries is, on the face of it, remarkable because a great many of them have no experience of Jews. Thailand, for example, whose representative spoke so passionately at the U.N. conference, has no Jewish community. Yet the United Nations, which, of course, is a forum dominated by Third World countries, has become, as William Buckley noted some years ago, "the most concentrated assembly of anti-Semitism since Hitler's Germany." Daniel Moynihan, as the result of his experiences at the U.N., said that "anti-Semitism has become a unifying global ideology of the totalitarian left." Unfortunately, there is a tendency for anti-Semitism, often called anti-Zionism, to become the ideology of much of the Third World, not limited to the totalitarian left.

The acceptance of that ideology is, of course, chronicled in the pattern of U.N. resolutions. In November 1974, the General Assembly voted that Zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination. There were sizable objections to that resolution. Seventy-two voted in favor, but 35 voted against, and 32 abstained. In December 1979, there was another resolu-

tion that equated Zionism with racism, and this time only 4 countries voted against and 26 abstained. In other words, the level of protest had dramatically gone down. It had lost its shocking quality to equate Zionism with racism; it had become routine. In 1982 the General Assembly, for the first time, defined Israel as a non-peaceloving state—the first state to be defined that way—and, of course, that paves the way for Israel to be thrown out of the U.N. because according to the U.N. Charter only peaceloving states can be members of the United Nations.

Again there was reluctance to take this new step. Twenty-one countries voted against, though significantly the only Third World country to vote against was little Fiji. A number of Third World countries, especially in Latin America, abstained. But if the experience of Zionism as racism is any guide, Israel as a non-peaceloving state can presumably pick up many more votes in the time ahead, if Israel is not indeed thrown out of the U.N.

The accepted explanation for all this is power politics. The Arab bloc offers its votes on issues of concern to different Third World groups in return for anti-Israel votes. But it is not the whole story, because for example that lady from Thailand was speaking the language of passion and not of power politics. For whatever the initial motive, the votes of these Third World countries have consequences. William Korey has noted that U.N. resolutions are the source of judgment about political reality for much of the Third World. Also people are reluctant to act consistently contrary to their beliefs. There is a tendency to rationalize and to adjust one's belief to one's actions. The noted Jewish philosopher Franz Rosenzweig noted this tendency when he urged Jews, even if they did not believe in the Commandments and the various rituals, to observe them and he said, "Belief will follow behavior."

The Soviets and the Arabs have been helping this natural process along by providing an ideology that permits action and belief to harmonize in the Third World. Basically the countries of the Third World have very little in common, but one thing that they do have is their hatred of colonialism, which is the experience of most of them. And the Soviets and the Arabs make Israel the symbol of colonialism, the symbol of imperialism, and the symbol of Third World racism. Their success marks a great victory of the totalitarian left in making its definitions go beyond the limits of those countries normally in the direct sphere of totalitarian influence.

The origins of the identification of Jews and imperialism go back to the beginning of the century. John Hobson in 1902 made the classic formulation of the economic theory of imperialism. Hobson said that the force behind imperialism is the financier and the great financial houses,

which he said, "are controlled, so far as Europe is concerned, chiefly by men of a single and peculiar race." In case anyone did not get the point he says, "Does one seriously suppose war could be undertaken by any European state if the House of Rothschild were against it?" There were variations on this theme; Werner Sombart, in his book *The Jews and Modern Capitalism*, said that capitalism itself is the product of something he called "the Jewish mind." The Nazis flooded the colonial possessions of the allies with propaganda saying the Jews were the root of British imperialism.

The Soviets and the Arabs have taken over where the Nazis left off. As you have heard, the Soviets hammer the theme that imperialism is the creature of an international Zionist conspiracy. The PLO was the first to identify racism with Zionism and that view was enshrined in its national covenant in 1964, but it did not take the Soviets long to pick up on that. The very next year the Soviet Union proposed an amendment to the Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination which would condemn—and look at the nice touch, typically Soviet—anti-Semitism, Zionism, and Nazism.

Soviet and Arab propaganda efforts have their impact on the Third World. The greatest impact, not surprisingly, is on the non-Arab Islamic world. There are only 250 Jews in Pakistan, but when Pakistan routinely attacks India, it constantly accuses its leaders of engaging in Zionist-Indian plots. This is even though India is trying to outdo Pakistan in its own anti-Zionism. One of the major anti-Semitic journals in the Muslim world, *Yaqeen International*, is published in Pakistan, and in 1982, Pakistan barred a delegation from the European Economic Community because one of the members of the delegation was a Jew.

The impact is also great on Third World countries in the Soviet camp or influenced by the Soviet camp. A recent visitor to China reported that his Shanghai guide said that the Westerners had oppressed the Chinese, but the Westerners in turn were victims of the exploitation of the Jews; so very Hobsonian over there in China. Marxist national liberation movements typically get support from the PLO and they may express their gratitude when they are victorious—pay their debt to the PLO—in the form of anti-Semitic actions. For example, when the Sandinistas came to power in Nicaragua, one of the first activities of the new government was to force the tiny Jewish community of only fifty people at that point out of the country, the synagogue was fire bombed and seized, and Jewish owned property was confiscated. If the guerrillas win in El Salvador, there is little doubt the same sort of thing will happen. The PLO soldiers are serving with the guerrillas in El Salvador according to no less an authority

than Yassir Arafat.

Another source of Third World anti-Semitism, which I think bears mentioning and gets less attention, is the activities of groups in this country who identify with the Third World and spread a devil's theory of Zionism. I am referring to white, new and old, left and black militants. There was an incident recently at the State University of New York at Stony Brook. Ernest Doub taught a class sponsored by the Afrikana Studies Department at Stony Brook. According to the syllabus, the final week of the class was devoted to the study of the three forms of racism—Nazism, apartheid, and Zionism. When there were protests about this, the Afrikana Studies Department sent a memorandum to the Dean of Social Sciences saying that in teaching Zionism as racism Professor Doub was not guilty of anti-Semitism or racial bias, but he was expressing the views of the majority of the members of the United Nations. Well, black studies departments tend to be staffed by militants and often black student papers reveal rather similar attitudes. Moreover, connections are forged with the real Third World. Stony Brook's Afrikana Studies Department had a program of sending students to Marxist Grenada; Grenada may not be so popular with them anymore. The City College Black Studies Department has a program of sending students to Nigeria. Now since these countries have hosted visiting groups, they can have an important impact on the views of present and future decision makers. Of course, the black intellectuals in New York also would have strong links with Third World delegations at the U.N.

Ultimately the attack on Zionism is an attack on the United States, which the Third World tends to scapegoat for its own economic and other failures. It is ironic, of course, that in scapegoating the West, the Third World should be scapegoating the Jews who are the traditional scapegoats of the West. In any case, Israel is viewed as an extension of the United States, and the United States is described as dominated by Jews. Amiri Baraka, whom some of you may remember as LeRoi Jones and who is also a professor in Stony Brook's Afrikana Studies Department, began a recent speech by saying Israel is a running dog of U.S. imperialism—the traditional Soviet line. A meeting in January 1983 of the Non-Aligned Nations said the United States uses Israel as a cover for its intervention in Latin America. There are periodic anti-Semitic tirades at the U.N. Recent ones by the delegates from Jordan and Senegal come to mind. Zionist control of communications, banks, and generally of the United States were proclaimed as fact. But on the whole, venom, which might be a little more costly to direct openly at the United States can with impunity be directed against Zionism. And while the values these countries say

they are against are imperialism, colonialism, and racism, the values implicitly denounced are, of course, freedom and the will to defend it.

DR. BREGER: Finally, the Rev. Pat Robertson will speak on anti-Semitism and contemporary Christianity.

REV. PAT ROBERTSON: As you know, Christianity began in Israel. Everyone involved in early Christianity was a Jew. Jesus Christ was a Jew. And he said, "I have come as the Messiah of the Jewish people"—the long awaited Messiah. As so often happens in a situation like that, the ruling elite or the ruling religious establishment felt threatened by this and in order to preserve orthodoxy they said, "This man is bringing a heresy that will be harmful to our people and it would be better for the nation if we did away with him. There might also be a revolution against Rome and if the people revolt against Rome they will put it down with bloody oppression"—which of course they did later on. So in the process Jesus Christ was crucified. His disciples said that He really rose from the dead and they first brought the message of Jesus the Christ—which means Messiah—to the people in Jerusalem. First of all, Jewish lay people began to accept the message of Christ and then a number of the Levites, the priestly class, became obedient to the faith. There were no Gentiles in the organization at all. Obviously there was a great deal of persecution on every side, but they took the example of Jesus, who on the cross said, "Forgive them, they do not know what they are doing." He openly wept over Jerusalem, and looking down from the Mount of Olives on Jerusalem said, "How often have I gathered you as a hen gathers her chicks but you would not have me," and He sobbed over it. The Apostle Paul, who was a member of the Pharisee sect, a very militant group of Jewish patriots, said, "I think so much of my Jewish brothers that I would personally lose my own soul's salvation to see them come to the same faith I have." He told his Gentile converts later, "You are being grafted into the promises of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. You are coming into what is essentially Jewish religion, and through the Messiah you have been joined as one with the patriarchs." In the old Temple, the Gentile people were not allowed in; there was a wall that separated them from the Jewish worshipers. But the Apostle Paul said, "This wall is broken down and you are being grafted in as a wild olive into the natural olive tree which is Israel. And if some of these people through unbelief were broken off, they one day are going to be grafted back in too." God decided that He wanted to give all the Gentiles the opportunity to come into the faith that has been cherished in this small nation. Therefore, this has been a blessing to the world.

With this attitude, there was no anti-Semitism. These people were

themselves Jews, and they had the most profound respect for the Jewish nation, the Jewish customs, the Jewish laws, the Jewish religion. The early Christians had no anti-Semitism, but yet, as would often be the case, they were persecuted by the Jewish people because the Jewish people in the Roman Empire accused them of heresy. So they tried to stir up opposition, but Paul and Peter and other men from the Jewish branch of the Christian faith said, "These are our brethren. We must live together somehow in harmony. If they won't accept it we will go to the Gentiles, but we are not going to fight, and there certainly wouldn't be a question of the Christians persecuting the Jews." That is the way it was for many hundreds of years until the Christian Church took over the government of the East and West of the Roman Empire and the Emperor was baptized. Then you suddenly have a linking together of secular power with fervent religious belief. That was not too bad at first, but it was not too many centuries until somebody like Borgia was in charge of the mechanism of the Church who went back and read these early statements and said, "See the persecution, see what these Jewish people did to our people." He did not read the part that said that this was an act of God in order to bring us into the covenants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Instead of that he said, "This is a convenient scapegoat for my problems and let us have what was called an auto-da-fé. Let's just either force conversion or let's kill these people." I stood in the great Catholic cathedral in Toledo, Spain, and read on the wall up high in that gorgeous place that in 1492 there had been an act of faith to God where God's people—the Jews—were cast out of Spain in exile. The Inquisition and the torture having failed, they were sent out. I walked just down the street from that cathedral and here was the lovely synagogue where Moses Maimonides taught and just up from that was the place El Greco did his beautiful painting. Apparently, a couple of hundred years before, there was great harmony in Spain, and even among the Muslims. Abba Eban has written an excellent book called *My People*, which speaks of the golden days in Spain under the Islamic regime when there was great harmony between the Muslims and the Jews. They were allowed to flourish and study the Torah and to understand their culture in a prosperous environment.

In 1492, something unusual happened. Two boats came down the river in Spain at the same time. One boat held Columbus coming to America, and the other boat was filled with Jewish exiles who were going to Turkey to find refuge from the persecution of a Church which was more government than a religious body. It is this heritage undoubtedly that carried on even into the Polish pogroms we have mentioned, carried on into the French church, carried on throughout Europe, because now this

was a doctrine that was sanctified, if you will, by the people who claimed to be religious and were not, to confiscate money, because the Jewish people by being intelligent and diligent, prospered and accumulated considerable wealth, and this wealth was a prize the kings wanted. If they could doll up robbery with Christian verbiage, they certainly tried to do it. Hitler was an heir of that type of person.

So you come into the nineteenth century. Queen Victoria was a very godly woman. She was a true Christian. She called her Prime Minister, whose name was Benjamin Disraeli (it was Da Israeli; his father took that name to identify himself with Israel), and she said, "Mr. Prime Minister, can you give me any evidence for the existence of God?" Benjamin Disraeli said, "The Jew, Your Majesty."

Coming into the twentieth century, you find a couple of courses. On the one hand you find liberal Christianity that does not pay a great deal of attention to the Bible. They do not believe in Israel. They do not believe that the Jews are destined to be anything, and they have tended, as in the World Council of Churches, to be pro-Marxist in most of their pronouncements. In this one finds more or less studied indifference. They assume that Israel is just a group of people who are trying to settle in the Arab lands, and whatever is said in the United Nations, or by the Soviet Union, or by the Arab people pretty much is embraced by the World Council of Churches because they do not embrace the Bible as such.

On the other hand, in America particularly, there is an incredible resurgence of what would be called an evangelical faith that goes back to the Bible. Billy Graham was accused in San Francisco some years ago of setting Christianity back fifty years. Dr. Graham replied, "If that's the case, I've failed. I wanted to set it back 2,000 years." There is a searching, if you will, for Biblical roots and when one goes back to the Biblical roots he finds the Old Testament prophets, the patriarchs, David, and the Apostles, all of whom were Jewish. And he finds Jesus, who was the Jewish Messiah, and the Jewish roots of Christianity. At that point, the evangelicals hold a great affinity for the Jewish people who are alive today, whether they are found in America or whether they are found in Israel. Therefore, there is tremendous support among evangelical Christians for the State of Israel and for Jewish rights. There is an antipathy toward anti-Semitism.

On the other hand, the great problem, to my way of thinking, is focused against evangelicals and Jews. I had on my program today a Romanian. When he was sixteen years old, he had an extraordinary conversion. He turned from Communism to being a Christian and began to be an evangelist in Romania. He told of beatings, he told of torture. His little six

year old girl was choked and shaken by the KGB agents. He told of people put in mental institutions because they believed in God, given injections and put into situations which would result in the loss of their life, or their sanity, or both. This type of persecution has been going on in the Marxist countries, because Marxism is essentially an atheistic philosophy. It is not just economic. It is based on a view of history that becomes a religion, and when you have an ultimate view of history, you have a religion. You have the deification of Lenin, Marx, and the founders of this religion. You find in the Soviet Union an antipathy and hatred of Jew and Christian, because both speak of theistic origins, and this pastor told me that in Romania the Bible is the most hated book. It is interesting that in Russia, as scarce as the things are, you can buy a cow with a Bible; it's that valuable, because they will not permit it. They are terrified of the Bible; they ridicule it.

Now go from the Soviet Union into Islam. The same thing that is being now aimed at Israel is also being aimed at the Christians of Lebanon and the Christians of Egypt. The Pope of the Coptic Church is under house arrest and has been so for quite awhile. I am told that the Christians in Egypt now have to put a cross on their door just the same way the Jews, for example, in Poland put up the Star of David. It is the same kind of discrimination, because in a Muslim country no non-believer may have a house that is taller than a Muslim's. No church or synagogue may have a spire that is higher than a mosque. You know there is a militancy and it is cloaked, if you will, in a type of overblown rhetoric which bears no relation whatsoever to reality. The great problem we face now in dealing with our diplomats in our foreign policy in the United States is that we do not get entrapped with this rhetoric. We must realize that there is a fight—and it is not just anti-Semitic. It is anti-theism in whatever manifestation it occurs. Or it is anti-Christian/Judeo Christian, it is anti-Biblical. Most of the Third World nations are Muslim. That is where the strong Islamic tendency that speaks of Zionism as being racism. And, of course, the Marxists will use that for their own end. There is the great danger.

I remember meeting with Israeli Prime Minister Rabin on Christmas of 1974. I said, "Mr. Prime Minister, what can I give to the American people?" And he said, "Tell them please, don't exchange principle for expediency." We cannot exchange principle for expediency, nor can we exchange it for money, nor can we exchange it for oil wells, nor can we exchange it for contracts with the Soviet Union, nor can we exchange it for fat and lucrative lending arrangements. There has got to be a time when this nation stands for principle and recognizes the ultimate reality.

DR BREGER: Thank you, panelists. We have just a little time for questions.

WALTER BERNIS: I'm Walter Berns of the American Enterprise Institute. I know of no way of saying what I want to say without being critical of the presentations we have heard today, and I don't want to appear to be critical, if only because I found much to praise in each of them. But I think it's important that what I want to say be said. No one responded to Marshall Breger's challenge—issued toward the end of his introductory remarks—to address the issue of left-wing anti-Semitism. But this surely is the most important aspect of contemporary anti-Semitism, and the connection between the Left and anti-Semitism is not accidental. Perhaps Hitler caused us to forget this, but certain recent events in the United States and especially in the United Nations should serve to remind us of the historical connection between the Left and anti-Semitism.

This history can be said to have begun with the French Revolution. Now, of course, it is true that Jews were, on the whole, friends of the French Revolution and the French Revolution was not an enemy of Jews. Nor was Napoleon. But the French Revolution followed by Hegel gave rise to certain expectations; prominent among these was the idea of the "universal and homogeneous state." Now, in a certain sense, this "universal and homogeneous state" would not be Christian, but it emphatically would not be Jewish and would not have room for Judaism. Karl Marx moved this analysis or critique one step further. I refer to his well-known essay "On the Jewish Question." If his predecessors were confounded by Judaism's ability to perpetuate itself or to survive through history—a survival that seemed to defy if not to deny the so-called laws of historical progress—and proposed as a solution what might be called the emancipation of the Jews from Judaism, Marx, as a friend of mine put it,* proposed the emancipation of *mankind* from Judaism. This can be said to be the program of the Left, which in our time is Marxist.

As I said earlier, we may have forgotten the connection between the Left and anti-Semitism because of Hitler, who, of course, was an enemy of Marxism. But even Hitler's "final solution" policy might be said to have its origins (or one of its roots) in Marx. After all, it was Marx who wrote something to the effect that mankind never poses a problem for itself until its solution is in hand. If in the past, to put it generally, the Left's solution to the "Jewish problem" was to get rid of Judaism, Hitler's "final solution" was to get rid of Jews. Hitler was defeated, and one of the consequences of his defeat has been the gradual re-emergence of left-wing anti-Semitism. I think this is what we ought to have been talking about today.

*The best discussion I know of this issue is by Werner J. Dannhauser. See his article in the June 1981 issue of *The Jewish Journal of Sociology*.

MR. PERLMUTTER: I sense that I am on a beam that is parallel with what you say, but I'm not sure. What threatens Jewish interests now are certain larger issues. I spoke about group rights, defense budgets. Now, obviously, the Left is the source today of support for the racial quota system and the intellectual support for peace movements. However, very interestingly, there's always a gap between what is happening and our perception of what is happening. The Left has its fair quota of Jews, and that's because of recalled anti-Semitism in the old style, which came from the Right. Now the question is whether this is religious in its roots, or whether it is political in its roots. There are given realities that are political realities that one must confront.

Mark Twain in 1900 wrote an essay on anti-Semitism, of all things. He maintained that it wasn't political, and argued that it wasn't Christian in origin, because he pointed out what the Romans were doing before Christianity. He took the argument that anti-Semitism, which, incidentally, he deplored vigorously, was jealousy. The Jews are highly visible, no matter where you look—in medicine, in law. And this kind of resentment? Well, I'm not as prepared today to dismiss that as I was once. Whether you go to Nicaragua or whether you go to those Communist parties in Eastern Europe, which at one point had numbers of Jews in their higher ranks, somehow or another, good old-fashioned human resentment is as malleable a form for making a mold of something you hate as any political philosophy may be.

MR. BERNIS: Well, my point is at least this: Mr. Perlmutter and his colleagues in the Anti-Defamation League are more likely to find anti-Semitism today at the Institute for Policy Studies and in the pages of *The Nation* than they are at The Heritage Foundation or in any of the Christian churches.

DR. BREGER: I'm sorry, but we are going to have to adjourn. Thank you all for a very profitable evening.

28

The Heritage Lectures

While anti-Semitism based on religious prejudice has declined during this century, political and cultural anti-Semitism is as strong as ever, note the experts in this Heritage Roundtable.

Since World War II, there has been a fundamental political realignment of the anti-Semitic impulse in the Western world. Right-wing sources of anti-Semitism have declined, as Israel increasingly is seen as an embattled outpost of Western values and Jews are seen to participate in the establishment Western consensus. In contrast, left-wing anti-Semitism has increased. Submerged since World War II by Western guilt over the Holocaust and the commonality of purpose during the struggle against fascism, left-wing anti-Semitism has returned in an especially virulent form since the Six Day War, where the epithets once reserved for Jews now are hurled at Zionism.

Panelists Nathan Perlmutter, Abraham Blumberg, Rael Jean Issac, Rev. Pat Robertson, and moderator Marshall Breger engage in a wide-ranging discussion of anti-Semitism in the modern world. Their conclusion: anti-Semitism as a social phenomenon has not vanished, but has found new social sources to fuel it.



214 Massachusetts Avenue, N.E. • Washington, D.C. 20002

\$2.00