



Max M. Kampelman Papers

Copyright Notice:

This material may be protected by copyright law (U.S. Code, Title 17). Researchers are liable for any infringement. For more information, visit www.mnhs.org/copyright.

NATIONAL COMMISSION
OFFICES

National Chairman
MAXWELL E. GREENBERG
Honorary Chairmen
SEYMOUR GRAUBARD
BURTON M. JOSEPH

Chairman, National
Executive Committee
KENNETH J. BIALKIN

Honorary Vice-Chairmen
LEONARD L. ABESS
EDGAR M. BRONFMAN
MAXWELL DANE
LAWRENCE A. HARVEY
JACOB K. JAVITS
PHILIP M. KLUTZNICK
CARL LEVIN
ARTHUR LEVITT
SAMUEL H. MILLER
BERNARD NATH
ROBERT R. NATHAN
ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF
MATTHEW B. ROSENHAUS
BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL
WILLIAM SACHS
MELVIN H. SCHLESINGER
S.O. SHAPIRO
THEODORE H. SILBERT
SIDNEY R. YATES

Vice-Chairmen
DOROTHY BINSTOCK
JERRY DUBROF
BRUCE I. HOCHMAN
MAX M. KAMPELMAN
PHILIP KRUPP
MILTON MOLLEN

Vice-Chairman, National
Executive Committee
THOMAS D. MANTEL

Honorary Treasurers
BENJAMIN GREENBERG
RICHARD M. LEDERER, JR.

Treasurer
CHARLES GOLDRING

Assistant Treasurer
HOWARD P. BERKOWITZ

Secretary
MARTIN L.C. FELDMAN

Assistant Secretary
SEYMOUR D. REICH

National Director
NATHAN PERLMUTTER

Associate National Director
ABRAHAM H. FOXMAN

Assistant National Director
Director of Development
ROBERT C. KOHLER

President, B'nai B'rith
JACK J. SPITZER

Executive Vice-President,
B'nai B'rith
DANIEL THURSZ

President, B'nai B'rith Women
EVELYN WASSERSTROM

DIVISION DIRECTORS

Administration
HAROLD L. ADLER

Civil Rights
JUSTIN J. FINGER

Communications
LYNNE IANNIELLO

Community Service
SHELDON STEINHAUSER

Leadership
DANIEL S. MARIASCHIN
Program
THEODORE FREEDMAN

General Counsel
ARNOLD FORSTER

ADL FOUNDATION
Executive Vice-President
BENJAMIN R. EPSTEIN

Anti-Defamation League

ADL of B'nai Brith

RECEIVED
OCT 3 1980

September 30, 1980

Mr. Max M. Kampelman
600 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037

Dear Max:

Enclosed please find 6 copies of the ADL - NCCB - Secretariat for Catholic-Jewish relations memorandum on the third meeting of our joint Working Study Group, and a copy of the USCC News release.

I want to thank you once again for your cooperation and presentation of the paper, which deeply impressed the people attending the meeting. I want to apologize for the delay in writing and sending you these copies. I have been out of the country, lecturing in Argentina on bioethics. It was an interesting experience, not only the lecturing itself, in a program jointly sponsored by a Jewish organization and the Catholic University, but also for the meetings I had with my Catholic contacts.

We have sent copies of this memorandum to ADL Regional Directors, to all the bishops in the United States, officials at the Vatican, the CELAM, the Latin American Bishops' Conference, ecumenical groups, and the Christian media. Several ecumenical groups, or Catholic-Jewish committees, requested copies for their members. A good example of this is the Boston committee (see the enclosed memorandum from our office). I will keep you informed of any response that I might be receiving.

With best wishes for a year of health and peace,

Very cordially yours,

Leon

Rabbi Leon Klenicki
Co-Director
Department of Interfaith Affairs

LK:egg
Enclosure

"National and International Tensions: A Jewish Perspective"

Remarks by

Max M. Kampelman

before

the Anti-Defamation League -

United States Catholic Conference -

National Conference of Catholic Bishops

Joint Working Study Group

Washington, D. C.

June 17, 1980

cc: Rabbi Rabinowitz
" Haberman
" Mandelbaum

Thank you for your invitation to participate with you in your deliberations. You are all to be commended for nurturing and stimulating this Catholic-Jewish dialogue.

Although my contribution is to explore in particular "A Jewish Perspective" to the subject of our concerns, I will heed that label only after reminding you that the Anti-Defamation League, which I have the honor to represent here today as its Vice-Chairman, was founded in 1913 not only "to stop the defamation of the Jewish people," but also expressly "to secure justice and fair treatment to all citizens alike."

In that same spirit, I note my identification as a member of the Board of Governors of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, known as the University of the Jewish People, and also my identification as a member of the Board of Governors of Georgetown University, that truly exceptional Jesuit institution of higher learning.

I. Historical Perspective

Our American democratic society takes great pride, and justifiably so, in the principle of the separation of church and state. Our Founding Fathers felt secure in this constitutional separation of these substantial human commitments, because this early American society was already firmly rooted in a religious tradition and there was every reason to believe that this tradition was an essential part of the society and the government it would establish.

In the early days, before the states united to form our nation, the Judaic-Christian ethic was a driving force in the community. The Hebrew language was frequently the language of prayer of the early Puritans. Indeed, the Hebrew words are still evident in the emblems of some of our great early universities. As further illustration of the prevalent appreciation of our common religious roots, the second President of the United States, John Adams, four years before his death in a codicil to his will, bequeathed funds for the establishment of a school in which Hebrew was to be taught along with the classical languages, because, as he wrote in a letter to Thomas Jefferson, "I will insist that the Hebrews and their teachings have done more to civilize man than any other nation."

Indeed, it might well be said that our whole democratic system is the political expression of the Judaic-Christian ethic. The ancient Hebrew tribes made their historic contribution to civilization by proclaiming to their neighbors that there was only one God. The immense significance of that insight was in the concept that if there is only one God, then all of us are His children and thus brothers and sisters to one another. In a real sense, here lies the basis for our law, our system of jurisprudence, our political democracy.

It is important for us to note that the ancient Hebrews might not even be remembered today, except as a learned footnote in the history of the Near East -- and certainly their offspring would have been lost in the vast chasm of history -- had this new and astute insight not been proclaimed and then found expression in the message and preachings of the Hebrew prophets, in the later teachings of the great scholars, the Rabbis, and the preachings of Jesus and the Disciples. History reports that in the year 70 A.D., as the armies of Israel were going down to defeat before the Romans, Rabbi Jochanan Ben Sakai, later recognized as the founder of the Diaspora, found his way out of Jerusalem and into the camp of the Roman general, where he asked for and received permission to found a university and thus perpetuate the principles of Judaism. The Jews lost their state at that time and their temple, but they salvaged the essence of their reason for being, their value system, their place of learning, and thus began the process of finding the strength to survive exile in the Diaspora.

A word now about the historic and spiritual continuum between the Old and the New Testament -- between the Torah and most particularly the Sermon on the Mount as understood and recorded by Matthew.

Jesus appeared on the Jewish scene at a time when there was considerable ferment regarding the correct understanding of the Torah. This was theologically important because there was a Messianic expectation in the air and the Torah, the Law for the People of the Book, was expected to play a central role in the Messianic age. The Great Instruction, through the Sermon on the Mount, was obviously a teaching to provide a guide as to what the Law was or should be, how the Torah was to be interpreted if its permanent validity was to be demonstrated and maintained.

The purpose of the Great Instruction was clearly not to diminish the Torah, the written law. It was, rather, to separate from it the superficiality and rigidity that threatened to smother the Law and lose its essence.

Building on the principle that if there is only one God, all of us are his children and then brothers and sisters to one another, Leviticus (19:18) could command: "You shall not take vengeance or bear any grudge against the sons of your own people, but you shall love your neighbor as yourself, I am the Lord." This noble assertion of human brotherhood came to mean in the established wisdom that one should love his neighbor and hate his enemy, but that injunction to hate one's enemy cannot be specifically documented any place in the Torah. Indeed, in the same chapter of Leviticus that commands the love of one's neighbor, there is to be found the equally strong requirement to love the stranger who sojourns with you as one's self (19:33-34)

Here is the basis of the famous Hillel story about the essence of the Torah being recited while standing on one foot as meaning that one should not do unto others that which one would not want done to oneself. Thus, the belief of Many Jewish scholars that universal love is a principle rooted in and required by the Torah.

But it was Jesus who proclaimed and unequivocally asserted this essence of Jewish law as he saw it, the teaching that one love his enemies and pray for those who abuse him. This extension of love to one's enemies had scriptural basis in Exodus (23:4-5). And it had and has a basis in any profound undertaking of love, if love is to be properly distinguished from self-interest. Here was a revelation that strengthened and clarified the very essence of Judaism and the real implication of the message of the early Hebrew tribes with their assertion of the oneness of God.

If there is, therefore, any reason for the Jewish people to exist as an integral segment of our society, given all of the controversy that existence has inflamed over the centuries, it is because they identified and now hopefully still represent a community of brotherhood. Should that be lost, there would be no reason for being. No wonder, therefore, that throughout history, Jews, and Jewish organizations, epitomized by the Anti-Defamation League, have been so closely allied with human welfare causes designed to realize on Earth the brotherhood of man.

II. National Community Tensions: Jews and Social Justice

There is a broad spectrum of national community tensions that concern us all. The Jewish role in dealing with, preventing, or resolving such societal anxieties is well documented, but the role is not particularly more noteworthy than the role played by other sensitive individuals, groups, or religiously motivated organizations. What is perhaps unique is the height of sensitivity understandably possessed by a people whose history has too often been one of a persecuted minority wherever they have placed their heads to rest.

The American experience to the Jew has been a unique one. The hospitality and freedom here produced a loyalty to the institutions and a commitment to the principles of liberty which nurtured that hospitality. American Jews constitute the largest most favorably situated Jewish community in the world and this fact is viewed as an awesome responsibility.

In the summer of 1790, after the troubled years of the American Revolution, the first President made a tour of the new Republic and came to the little

seafaring town of Newport, Rhode Island. Following that tour, he wrote a letter to the Hebrew Congregation in Newport, which had greeted him. It was in 1654 that the first Jews arrived in the land, 23 Portugese Jews to New Amsterdam, seeking freedom in the new land. By the time of the Revolution, there were only about 2,000 scattered in all 13 colonies, but George Washington had come to know some of them, such as Haym Salomon, who had provided him significant assistance. The George Washington letter reaffirmed that "All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship" and went on to say: "May the Children of the Stock of Abraham, who dwell in this land, continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other Inhabitants, while everyone shall sit in safety under his own vine and fig tree, and there shall be none to make him afraid."

That the organized Jewish community is identified with the struggle for justice and equality in the nation is, therefore, fully understandable.

Jews were not only among those who supported the American Revolution. They were also among the leaders of the Abolition movement, just prior to the Civil War, with seven Jews receiving the Congressional Medal of Honor for heroism during the Civil War.

And Jews could be found among the leaders of the struggle against the sweatshop and the other indignities of the Industrial Revolution before it was modified and fashioned by the humanism of the Judaic-Christian ethic.

Jewish immigrants, many of whom like David Dubinsky of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, escaped from Czarist Russia to pursue their socialist and humanitarian ideals, formed the nucleus of the newly organized labor unions, the economic expression of human brotherhood. Names like Dubinsky and Samuel Gompers, founder of the American Federation of Labor from his base as

leader of the cigar makers, became synonymous with this significant humanizing effort which permitted industrialization to spread its blessings on our society without the tensions of the class struggle.

Similarly, it is in the area of civil rights, especially ensuring those of Black Americans, that we find a particularly fertile history of Jewish concern and action. Jews were among the founders of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, with the Spingarn brothers holding national offices in the organization for many years. It is, therefore, useful to pause here for a further examination of the intricacies of the Jewish-Black relationship.

When President Truman in 1946 established the President's Committee on Civil Rights, there began a period of intense activity in civil rights which produced impressive progress unparalleled in American history since the end of slavery. This was due in large part to the joint effort of Jews and Blacks working with lay and church leaders all over America representing the conscience of our democratic society.

Divisions began to appear in the early 1960's, with the emergence of the radical New Left in concert with Black nationalism. The growth of anti-Semitism among the Black extremists of the 1960's tracked the anti-Semitism harbored by the Radical Left, and was capsulized by such sloganeering as: Jews are the oppressors of the black ghettos, Israel is the instrument of American imperialism, and Zionism is racism. As much a rejection of the established Negro leadership as a revolt against the white dominated society, the black power movement which spawned much of the anti-Semitism was based on the concept of separatism. It rejected any white support for civil rights, with special

hatred vented towards Jews because they had been so prominent in civil rights activity. Malcolm X set the pace for black power advocates, as he declared:

In America the Jews sap the very life blood of the so-called Negro to maintain the State of Israel, its armies and its continued aggression against our brothers in the East.

This hostile, inciteful attitude, in no way representative of Black leadership, received encouragement as differences developed within the civil rights movement on definitions of "affirmative action" and their impact on racial quotas. The Bakke case became the battleground. On June 28, 1978, the Supreme Court rendered its decision, by the slimmest of majorities, 5 to 4, that the University of California Medical School at Davis had implemented an unlawful admissions quota system because it denied the right of whites -- even disadvantaged whites -- to compete for 16 of the 100 spots in the entering class which were set aside for members of minority groups "economically and/or educationally disadvantaged." At the same time, the Court affirmed that race could be considered as one factor in admissions programs seeking redress of past discriminations. In sum, while the Court rejected the use of quotas as a device in university and college admissions, it declared permissible the favorable consideration of racial factors for the "benign" purpose of rectifying disadvantages created by ancient wrongs.

The Court's decision in Bakke posed a tough philosophic issue: could the consideration of race in admissions programs ever be truly benign? The ADL and an associated group of organizations submitted a brief amicus curiae, which addressed the issue. That brief went to great lengths to express the ADL's

long-held commitment to equality for each person without regard to race or creed, its solid opposition to discriminatory practices, and its support for corrective measures that would repair historic disabilities without infringement of the constitutional rights of others. Counterbalanced against these concerns was the ADL's conviction that as the most invidious form of discrimination, the racial quota violates the fundamental American principle of judging people on the basis of individual worth and capacity rather than on the basis of race. With this in mind, the brief forcefully asserted:

A racial quota cannot be benign. It must always be malignant, malignant because it reduces individuals to a single attribute, skin color, and is the very antithesis of equal opportunity; malignant because it is destructive of the democratic society which requires that in the eyes of the law every person shall count as one, none for more, none for less.

It should be noted that the Court, speaking through Mr. Justice Powell's majority opinion, expressed much the same doubts about the benign effects of a quota as was advanced by the ADL.

A year and a day after its decision in Bakke, the Court shifted courses in the Weber case by upholding the voluntary affirmative action plan of the Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. That plan granted preferences to black employees over more senior white employees in admission to in-plant craft training programs. For example, at one particular plant the corporation established a training program and selected trainees on the basis of seniority, with the proviso that at least 50 percent of the new trainees were to be black until the

percentage of black skilled craft workers in the plant approximated the percentage of blacks in the local labor force. Again, while entirely sympathetic to the plight of the minority workers, the ADL filed an amicus curiae brief opposing the Kaiser Aluminum program on the grounds that it institutionalized a racial quota, and thus breached, as in Bakke, the notion of advancement on the basis of merit rather than on the basis of skin color or religion.

The positions taken by the ADL in the Bakke and Weber cases have led much of the Black leadership to question and challenge AdL's commitment to "affirmative action" and has added to the strains in the relationship between the communities.

It is now appropriate to draw our attention to one other related community development, the emergence of Hispanics as a vital and dynamic minority in the United States. The initial ingredients for a harmonious relationship are present. Both communities have certain common features that lend themselves to the establishment of a meaningful relationship. And both communities have reached out to one another to facilitate common understanding.

As evidence of the spirit of friendship and concern to resolve mutual problems, the ADL and several religious and Hispanic lay groups have established organizational relationships. For example, ADL officials have met with the Northeast Regional Pastoral center for Hispanics to discuss the creation of a "Hispanic -- Jewish Task Force" to meet regularly. I am informed that the ADL has associated with Paul Sedillo, director of the USCC's Secretariat for Hispanic Affairs and the Forum of National Hispanic Organizations, to pursue the possibility of holding a national meeting to explore methods of strengthening the relationship between the Jewish and Hispanic communities. Finally, ADL has

started the publication of a quarterly entitled Nuestro Encuentro (Our Encounter) directed to the Hispanics in the United States. Written in Spanish, this bulletin has been warmly received by the Hispanic community and its daily New York newspaper El Diario - La Prensa, which editorialized:

The publication is of great importance to the relations between the millions of Hispanic Americans and Jews who reside in the U.S. . . . [We look] with sympathy and enthusiasm upon the noble gesture of the Jewish community toward the Hispanic-Americans and [hope] that the beginning of this noble effort contributes to the peace and understanding so necessary to all.

These common efforts demonstrate a joint commitment to live by the words of the great Hispanic -- Jewish philosopher Moses Ibn Ezra, who proclaimed: "Friendship is the most precious gift of Man."

III. International Community Tensions: Israel and Jewish Power

The Middle East is today in the forefront of our Nation's international concerns. In any realistic analysis of the crises in the area, Israel plays only a minor role, but international attention has riveted itself on Israel, disproportionately in my opinion, but enough to justify our attention to the problem today.

One important element of the issue is the question that has been raised as to the extent and propriety of the influence of the American Jewish community in that debate.

Until recently, it was less necessary to emphasize that the people of Israel and the people of the United States shared a common heritage and a common

sense of purpose. From the early days of our founding as a society, as we have seen, the ties that have bound Judaism to American democracy have been strong. But today the ties that unite these two vibrant democracies are being tested. Today there are those who suggest that the American Jewish community may be faced with the dilemma of dual loyalty. It is proposed that the best interests of the United States may no longer be identical with the best interests of Israel. In that context the challenge is subtly presented: "Where do your loyalties really lie?"

There is a misconception in the challenge and an ignorance, if not always a malevolence, in the question. The unique character of American democracy which makes us all proud to be Americans is the fact that our loyalties as Americans, whatever our religious or nationality heritages, are harmoniously interrelated, because these identifications unite themselves in a common faith -- a faith in justice, in human brotherhood and in human dignity.

It is not my intent to over-simplify complex issues, but I have no hesitation in stating that a commitment to these common values is the standard by which policies and politics must be evaluated. So long as these principles remain the guidelines for our country and for Israel, the national self-interest of these two great democracies are in harmony, whatever temporary disagreements and differences of emphasis may exist.

Our concerns, however, are real ones. I do not recall a period in Israel's brief history of 32 years when its standing in the United States has been as tenuous. For a variety of reasons, Israel's moral position has been undermined. And, to the extent that this has taken place, the basic unity of

values and purpose which has endeared Israel to the hearts and traditions of American society is being threatened.

With that background, it is beneficial for us to focus on the question of power and influence to put the role of the American Jewish community in its proper perspective.

Power is not anathema to a democracy. Power is not evil. Power is the ability to make or to influence decisions and, as an essential part of the decision-making process, is crucial to the proper functioning of a democratic society.

It was de Toqueville who said: "Social power superior to all others must be placed somewhere." In a democracy we place it in a majority. There have been societies that have placed it in the military -- others in a political elite and others with the blue-eyed and blond-haired -- but the powers must be exercised some place. In a democracy it is placed in a majority.

And in all societies civilized thinking understands that the power must be restrained in its exercise, so that, in de Toqueville's words, it has "time to moderate its own vehemence." It was Thucydides who said that "of all manifestations of power, restraint impresses men most."

It is essential that we spend a few moments looking at this role of majority power in a democratic society and there is no better place to start than the Federalist Papers. These papers made clear the unique quality of majority rule in a complex society by pointing out that "democracy requires the continuous formation and reformation of majorities."

The essence of this message is that there is no continuing, easily identifiable, always constant majority. I am a member of a majority in that I

am white and I am a member of a minority in that I am Jewish. We are, each of us, in our differing roles and with our differing perceptions of the common good, at the same time members of a majority and members of a minority. This is a fluid concept. James Madison pointed out that majorities are ever moving and that they consist of a great "variety of interests, parties and sects." These must coalesce to form a majority. Majorities are in effect coalitions, and they are fluid coalitions. This realization, that at different times we may be members of minorities or majorities, is basic toward the development of a respect for minority rights and an appreciation for restraint in the exercise of power.

Madison's faith was expressed in the following words:

In the extended republic of the United States, and among the great varieties of interests, parties and sects which it embraces, a coalition of a majority of the whole society could seldom take place on any other principles than those of justice and the general good . . .

The American Jewish community, therefore, with all of its internal divisions, agreements and differences of emphasis, plays an expected and necessary role in the democratic process when it competes with and cooperates with other minority interests in the effort to form a majority coalition. In discussing Jewish influence, therefore, we are discussing a vital democratic function, a responsibility of citizenship, a process under which all minority groups search for influence and for a role in decision-making.

Given the need for coalitions in the effort to be effective in the exercise of power, it is clear that Jewish influence is limited to the extent that allies can be located in the non-Jewish community. I have already alluded to the invaluable historic assistance from American Presidents and the alliance

Jews have had in the past with the Blacks in America. Our alliance with labor continues. Our support among church groups has been a fluctuating one, but in the early days of Israel's striving for independence, it was indispensable. It is no accident that among the leading modern day spokesmen for Jewish interests in the Congress have been people like Humphrey, Jackson and Moynihan, non-Jews.

Similarly, Jewish influence in decision-making has been directly related to the extent to which Jewish objectives have been consistent with the American "ought." It was Gunnar Myrdal who brought to our consciousness the vital role played by the "ought" of American ideals in the developing saga of our great country. There is an awareness that our "is" may not always be consistent with the "ought." And there is the knowledge that the "ought" might not always be practical or realistic at any given moment. But the inconsistency always brought with it a feeling of guilt and the understanding that the "ought" should be defended and advanced when possible and would inevitably be realized.

The "ought" of American life is the search for an expanding and more meaningful democracy, for greater liberty and equality among all peoples. These are elements consistent with human brotherhood and the ethic of our Judaic-Christian civilization.

The great problem faced by champions of Israel today is in that area. We have lost the exclusive moral position. For years our American universities and churches have been bombarded by a relentless campaign highlighting the Palestine refugee question and the issue of Palestinian rights as a moral issue, with Israel the transgressor and the Palestinians as the victims. Our newer and younger political activists, including many of the younger Congressmen, are men

and women who have been affected by this campaign. These are people who have not themselves lived through the Nazi Period, the Holocaust, the early brutalities, the anti-Semitism and the birth pains related to the creation of Israel. We know that a people without a memory is only half a people and sadly much of our society is today without a memory. The absence of that memory is a significant contributing factor in helping to understand the diminishing influence of Israel and the American Jewish community on the body politic.

The real problem we face is that through the absence of memory and through the relentless onslaught of effective public relations, the realities have been distorted. We are witnessing a Kafka-like phenomenon under which Israel is increasingly identified with the powerful and the immoral, while the sins of the terrorists are neglected. The present Israeli government's settlement policy and emphasis in favor of new settlements have regrettably and unnecessarily contributed significantly to this phenomenon.

What about the morality and the legality of Israel's fundamental position in the Middle East? American presidents and the American society have had a rather consistent view of these questions. When John Adams wrote "I really wish the Jews again in Judea an independent nation," he was reflecting Christian theology and Biblical faith. But by 1891, under the administration of President Benjamin Harrison, it was the political conclusion of a Presidential study that the vast area of Palestine belonged to the Jews, historically and legally. The analysis pointed out that the Jews had "never abandoned the land," had never signed a treaty giving up the land, had never surrendered the land, even to the Romans, and for 1,900 years had not only continued to be a presence on the land but had claimed it as a Jewish home.

The land was barren, the population was sparse, but there were Jews living in this area. There have always been Jews in Palestine, beginning long before the Christian era; long before the word Moslem or Arab or Palestine had any meaning or identity. The Romans expelled many Jews, but never all of them. Jews lived in Palestine and studied there. Indeed, there is reason to believe that within the city of Jerusalem Jews have been a majority through most of recorded history.

It was, therefore, to be expected that the Zionists of the 19th century, with the growth of anti-Semitism in Europe, would intensify their efforts for a Jewish national homeland in Palestine. Since the 16th century this area of the Middle East had belonged to the Turkish Ottoman Empire, but during these years, and for the 1,500 years that preceded them, there were always Jews in the Holy Land, then known as Palestine.

When the Allies defeated the Turks in World War I, they captured this area known as Palestine, and the question became what to do with it. In November 1917, Lord Balfour, the foreign secretary of the British government, officially declared that Palestine would be a national home of the Jewish people. When the Allies then turned Palestine over to the League of Nations at the end of the war, it was understandable that President Woodrow Wilson would take a personal interest in the Jewish claim to that area. The League of Nations now had control over the land known as Palestine and decided that a portion of it -- 46,000 square miles -- would be set aside as a mandate for an eventual Jewish national homeland. It is interesting that Woodrow Wilson strenuously protested this decision because he felt that the 46,000 square miles, which included the trans-Jordan area encompassing what is now known as the West Bank, was too

small, truncated and not economically viable. He, therefore, urged a larger area of 66,000 square miles.

I refer to 46,000 square miles and to 66,000 square miles, but I also remind you that the League of Nations turned over 5 million square miles to those "non-Jews" who lived in that area. The word "Arab" was not even mentioned in the League documents because there was no such entity indigenous to that immediate area. The document referred to "non-Jews."

Not one state now known as an Arab state existed as a sovereign entity before 1922, when the League of Nations acted. It was the League which declared the states of Egypt, Saudi Arabia and the Yemens to be sovereign nations. The legal right of those nations to exist has its roots in the same legal documents of the League which established Israel's right to exist.

The League set aside the area of Palestine, the Jewish national homeland, as a mandate under English control, to be governed and moved toward independence under the jurisdiction of the League. It did the same for Iraq and Syria-Lebanon -- which also were mandated. Here, too, the legal rights of these nations to exist is no greater than the legal right of Israel to exist, because the League reaffirmed the rights of the "Jewish people" to "return" to their "historic homeland." These are the roots of Israel's existence under international law.

It was President Truman who helped bring into reality the creation of Israel as a state. Israel was the last of the Middle East nations to be created. It was not until 1947 that the League of Nations' decision was actually implemented, in part due to a resolution passed by the General Assembly of the United Nations -- and Israel came into being. It was an Israel which was not

66,000 miles, as urged by Woodrow Wilson; not 46,000 square miles as mandated in 1922; but which came into being with 8,000 square miles cramped within its boundaries.

Israel was recognized by the United Nations and its sovereignty granted, but in size it was smaller than many counties in the United States, while its Arab neighbors occupied a vast area double the size of the continental United States -- 20 Arab nations and one small Jewish state.

But the Jews accepted the decision of the United Nations and the partition it proposed in the hope that this would satisfy the Arabs and that there could be peace. The Palestinian Jews were to live in Israel and the Palestinian Arabs in Jordan. But there was no peace. And in the May 1948 war, with the end of the British mandate, seven Arab armies invaded Palestine. Jordan conquered land on the West Bank, Judea and Samaria, and Egypt captured the Gaza Strip -- lands that did not belong to them and that had never been juridically given to them in international law.

There was no world outcry that the land should be returned, that the aggressors should withdraw to their original borders, and that there should be no profit out of the violence they instigated. But the United States of America, our country, did assert its principles and did remain true to its values. It was President Truman who recognized Israel, and it was our ambassador to the United Nations who condemned the Jordanian invasion of Judea and Samaria as "the highest type of international violation of the law." Not only was Jordan's annexation of the West Bank by violence condemned by the United States, but, interestingly enough, also by the important states of the Arab League. Indeed, this active aggression was condemned by the international

community, and when Jordan later announced that it was annexing the area, only England and Pakistan reognized that annexation.

To those who say that Jewish settlements in the West Bank are illegal, we may ask which nation in the area has a greater moral or legal claim to sovereignty. It may be, as I believe, that it would be desirable or advisable for Israel to withdraw its settlements -- that is to be decided by the process of negotiation and by the likelihood of a real peace -- but there is no moral or legal justification for the assertion that those settlements are illegal.

Let us look further into law and justice.

U.N. Security Resolution 242, adopted at the end of the 1967 war and reaffirmed by Resolution 338 at the end of the Yom Kippur War, is today a common reference point in the negotiations. It calls for direct negotiations between the parties to establish a real peace and calls for the establishment of "secure and recognized boundaries" as part of that peace. Here was an implicit understanding that the 1949 armistice lines after the Arab aggression were neither secure nor recognized, and that Israel was not required to withdraw to these pre-1967 lines but to other "secure and recognized boundaries" to be negotiated between the parties. The resolutions and international law clearly do not require Israel to withdraw from any territory, let alone "all" the territory, short of an agreement to do so.

By no reasonable interpretation can either international law or Resolution 242 be defined to require Israel to be driven back to live in a coastal strip no more than ten miles wide within boundaries fixed by nothing more rational than the battles of the 1948 Arab-Israel war and the resultant pre-1967 armistice lines. Nor does 242 mean, may I parenthetically add, that Jerusalem must be split again to its pre-1967 monstrosity, sealed with machine guns.

IV. Conclusion

In closing, we should not lose sight of the fact that our nation has profound and far-reaching interests in the Middle East, geo-political interests of a vital character. These depend on a strong, stable and independent Israel, just as they depend on an economically healthy and western-orientated Egypt and on a politically stable Jordan and Saudi Arabia. All five of these nations -- the United States, Israel, Egypt, Jordan and Saudi Arabia -- have a common interest in the health and stability of each other and in a system of growing trust, confidence and alliance with each other. That should be the goal of American foreign policy.

Let us remember that the aspiration for peace runs deep in the heart and soul of Israel and its people. Golda Meir once said that she could forgive them for the fact that they forced Israel's young men and women to learn how to kill. Israel's reason for being and the essence of Judaism is faith in and the building of a society based on human brotherhood, learning, culture, civilization, and peace among the people of the world.

That is the essence of the common interest that binds Israel and the United States, that binds the aspirations of the Jewish people with the aspirations of the American democracy, and that ultimately binds all Christians and Jews alike.