

161-1-b

"ירושלם, ירושלים"

השם

161-1-b

"Jerusalem! Jerusalem!"
by Violet K. Andrews

מוזיקות המושל

תיקון מוזיקות המושל
מחזור המוזיקה - ינואר 1968
מחזור המוזיקה - דצמבר 1975

13



שם וניק: ירושלים - ירושלים מחזה כרך א'

מחזה פיו: א-7313/18

מחזה פריט: 000jm54

כתובת: 3-312-1-7-7 (נאריך הדפוס: 26/11/2018)

טקסטואל שאל לטוב

לארשי עזילת

0231/6
01231/6
July 15, 1969

~~161-1~~

Mrs. Golda Meir, Prime Minister
Prime Minister's Office
Jerusalem, Israel

Your Excellency:

Enclosed please find a copy of my Letter of Appeal to the Government of Israel - addressed to Mayor Teddy Kollek - regarding the recent events in Jerusalem.

Also, I take the liberty to include herein, "Jerusalem! Jerusalem!". Though this is a modest paper, it may help, nevertheless, to strengthen the point of my Appeal - and together, I hope they will qualify my deep concern for "Jerusalem the Golden".

With very best wishes from across the seas,

BOND
U.S.A.
BERKSHIRE
RESPECTFULLY,

Violet K. Andrews

Violet K. Andrews

35 West 81st Street
New York, N. Y. 10024
U. S. A.

July 15, 1969

The Honorable Teddy Kollek, Mayor
Jerusalem, Israel

My dear Mayor Kollek:

The news reports of July 1st and 2nd have raised apprehensions in my mind which I should like to share with you, in the form of this Letter of Appeal to the Government of Israel. My sole qualification for writing in this vein is that I love Jerusalem, and I hope therefore that the critical edge to my comments will be forgiven, and welcomed nonetheless, for the spirit in which they are written.

Curiously, the July 1st news of the gathering of the "Jerusalem Committee" was pregnant with plans for the city's renewal or consecration, while the July 2nd news of the stationing there of national police headquarters was suggestive of regress or desecration. By its purpose, the restoration plan for the Holy City presupposes reverence for the sacred; by its presence, the police base divests the city of all hallowed character. Both occasions were intended to "reinforce integration", yet both reflect a nation in which the will of the people is divided, notably on unresolved religious issues.

It is as though one hand wants to erase what the other draws in, an inclination that causes Israel to stand in her own light, and compounds - in her desperate struggle for peace - the very opposition against which she struggles. The average Western observer, if interested, is confused.

For me, the juxtaposed events of July 1st and 2nd bring to a head a self-contradictory pattern that seems to obtain generally. I shall digress hereupon - for their relevance to the point of my appeal - to such inconsistencies as:

1. Inviting the world to participate in restoration plans, before dissipating distrust of Israel's purposes and the prevailing image of her as pugnacious, high-handed and arrogant.
2. Expecting love and acceptance of Jerusalem's present status, yet not providing proper educative and spiritual precedents with which to cultivate such love and acceptance.
3. Desiring and needing moral support from the world community, but doggedly pursuing a course that provokes severe censure.

4. Desiring and needing United States aid, in particular, yet jeopardizing fulfillment of promises thus far procured.
5. Aiming for a durable peace, but sowing the seeds of perpetual conflict.
6. Attempting to quell Arab intransigence, but intensifying it by an ill-conceived punitive strategy.
7. Focusing the spotlight upon blow for blow guerrilla skirmishes, obscuring the issues themselves, and
8. Expending Israel's enormous energy and resourcefulness on short-sighted ends, losing hold of the long-range ones.

It would seem the self-defeating tendency suggested above provide reason enough for reassessment of policies - in dealing with both Arab intransigence and world apathy. Measures considered necessary a few years ago may be but impediments now. In any case, the crises of today beg for the most neglected strategy of all - that of human psychology.

Certainly to provoke antagonism is not the way to win good will; and undeniably, the total confidence of the American people could be a most potent weapon of defense for Israel. In assessing the American mentality, it is foreseeable that the use of sledge hammers could never promote a favorable American consensus. Just as the irrational, enraged Arab has no ear for ultimatums - even if ultimatums are couched in terms of peace and benefit for all - neither does the rational American have ear for peace polemics buttressed by high-handed coercive tactics. The United States will not be brought to heel by bravado and intimidation.

In view of the foregoing, to escalate punitive legislation for the purpose of "self-defense and deterrence" seems the height of folly. As "self-defense", this method has been exercised far in excess thereof, to the extent of aggression, giving fodder for Arab propaganda that makes of Israel the villain. As "deterrence", it is equally inadmissible, for in the experience of mankind it has been proven that "wrath moving to escalated wrath ends in disaster", and in the experience of Israel it has been shown that this policy only exacerbates the enemy and repulses friends.

The most disastrous consequence of all: the deleterious side-effects upon Israeli youth. The psychology of vengeance and aggressiveness is bound to ravage the unconscious mental processes of young people - repercussions of which will be felt generations hence. Destructive energy is not readily convertible to creative energy; conditioning to the one deadens the impulse to the other.

Undoubtedly, this is a problem about which your Government is deeply concerned, as are the questions I am about to ask. I should like to ask them nevertheless, to show that there are those in the West who are thinking of them too.

As the Israeli youngsters of today will be leaders of the Nation tomorrow, will they be equipped to construct the kind of peace envisioned by their forebears? Innured to mindless retaliatory tactics as a way to deal with immediate problems, will they be able to approach more complex issues in any other way? Will their experience qualify them to administer to the future "Jerusalem at the crossroads of the one-world-to-be"? Will they wish to serve the sacred and the holy to satisfy the needs of a spiritually hungry world? And will they seek to prove worthy of the trust reposed in them as Sovereign and Keeper of the City holy to all?

Relevant to these, is the search for the sacred coming from the young generation of the Western world - a phenomenon in fact and a cue to be heeded. Great numbers of American youth - Jewish and Christian - are in rebellion against an age that has stripped life of moral meaning, and they are turning to Hinduism and other forms of mysticism for the religious experience. In serious student seminars across the United States, young people are saying: "For a while everybody thought the physical and material world was the only thing that mattered. It's only just now that we've come to know better. There are a lot of us that feel we can have a faith in the sacred which will help us to create a better world." They are right. Veneration for that which is sacred in the world is the only thing that will prevent the world from devouring itself.

The Synagogue and the Church of the West - stultified by obsolete and irrelevant methods - are examining their own failure to fill the spiritual needs of these searching young people. The Israeli Nation - with the "Holiest of Holies" in the palm of her hand - cannot do less. It is conceivable that, one day, Western youth will look toward Jerusalem as the "Omega Point" of their spiritual quest.

This brings me back to the initial impetus for this letter: the July 1st and 2nd headlines. That the presence of police power in Jerusalem nihilates the sacred and inviolable quality of the city is self-evident; that the restoration plan contains an element of sacrilege, though less perceptible, is so nonetheless; and I appeal to you to reconsider the wisdom, or its lack, of both these moves.

The idea of rehabilitating united Jerusalem is intrinsically good, but other factors cancel out its good, namely: the element of bravado and grandiosity in which it was conceived, and the political

motivation behind it. Not only do these add to the storehouse of anti-Israel sentiment, but they are incompatible with sound artistic expression. By the nature of the aesthetic principle itself, such motivation is bound to produce spurious aesthetic results.

Tarnished by political expedience, the present plan carries with it also the stigma of injustice. Is it not unfair to proceed with vast alterations, inviting the assistance of "foreign" experts, before the Arab population and the various religious groups - whose roots in Jerusalem are deep - have become reconciled and psychologically ready to collaborate in the plans? It seems most arbitrary and autocratic to push under the rug their feelings and voice in the matter. And if the news accounts are accurate, "requisitioning Arab lands, bulldozing Arab homes, evicting Arab families" - to make way for "integration" - will never convince the world of the righteousness of Israel's deep and legitimate claim to the area. Ruthlessness is always offensive under whatever "self-righteous" garb it wears, and unkindness is never justified even by a nation. To foist environmental changes upon the Arab residents before they are psychologically prepared is cruel and unjust, and no monetary or alternate compensation can make up for the hurt and resentment so inflicted. Urban designs, parks, plazas and terraced slopes so begot cannot but defile the inviolable character of the City of the Lord.

On purely artistic grounds, I am wondering if the total plan - apart from repairs and immediate needs - is not an altogether ill-timed and misplaced priority. The rush for "instant" restoration runs the risk of producing an artificial façade, reminiscent of the "cultural" building boom in America, in which lavish and pretentious centers of culture are springing up as a show of culture which is dead. It runs the risk too of producing merely decorative and stylized designs - externally conceived, imitative perhaps, or assembled from a miscellany of heterogeneous ideas. At best, it might succeed as a "memorial" to the past dissociated from the present. But is it not the desire of the Israeli people to integrate the past with new and contemporary realities?

Surface planning will never bring about such an integration. As it takes time for a tree to grow, so too it takes time for a people to find ^{its} best expression. Jerusalem has not yet had time to develop an integrated personality, nor has it yet found the peace and serenity which are prior conditions for the creative impulse to flourish. A city such as Jerusalem - regenerated - that shall remain as "man's most durable testament", deserves a plan that in due season will emerge from the deep reservoir of her culture, and a plan that will stem from the purest of motives.

May I suggest again that it is altogether too soon to attempt to "dress up" the terrain on so sweeping a scale - before the population is harmoniously knit together, and before a cultural and spiritual synthesis of the past and present has had chance to take root. It is this inner synthesis that one day should determine the outer garment.

Therefore, I appeal to the Government of Israel to reevaluate so premature and wasteful an enterprise, and to await the ripeness of time when a restoration plan shall evolve from an organic unfolding from within, from the integrity of inner quality and innate structure - as Frank Lloyd Wright would have it. This great architect, deeply concerned with the democratic ideal and with the principle that man's physical environment should reflect that ideal - in his book "The Living City" - envisioned that "the entire native scene would soon become harmonious expression of the better nature of modern man himself.... (that)The ideal of organic unity held firmly in mind, well in hand, the architect would himself gradually become a spiritual power, equal to his vast new opportunities."

No less can be expected for "Jerusalem the Golden", the living city of the future, the omega point of man's democratic and spiritual ideal.

Respectfully submitted,



Violet K. Andrews

35 West 81st Street
New York, N. Y. 10024
U. S. A.

cc.: Golda Meir ✓
Abba Eban
Moshe Dayan
David Ben Gurion

JERUSALEM! JERUSALEM!

by

Violet K. Andrews

J E R U S A L E M ! J E R U S A L E M !

by

Violet K. Andrews

© Copyright, 1969, by Violet K. Andrews
All rights reserved.

To Joseph, my husband

In blessed memory

'And the nations shall know that
I am the Lord that sanctify Israel,
when My sanctuary shall be in the
midst of them for ever.'

Ezekiel 37:28

C O N T E N T S

INTRODUCTION	5
AN IMPASSE IN THE CITY OF THE LORD	8
a. International versus Universal	
b. The Universal Horizon	
c. An International Presence vs. The Divine Presence	
d. Insoluble?	
THE MONOTHEISM OF ISRAEL	16
a. An Eternal Legacy	
b. A Functional Energy	
c. Kingdom of Unification	
d. Peace	
e. The Eternal Covenant	
f. A Modern Saga	
g. Fulfillment in Jerusalem	
"JERUSALEM SHOULD REMAIN UNIFIED"	27
CHURCH AMBIGUITY	32
DISTRUST	36
ZIONISM AND JUDAISM	41
a. A Synthesis	
b. Distortion of Old Testament Reality	
c. Ominous Forebodings	
APOSTLE OF PEACE	47
SUMMIT MEETING IN ZION	50
FOR THE SAKE OF YOUTH	52
CONCLUSION	56
AUTHORITIES AND BIBLICAL PASSAGES CITED	58

INTRODUCTION

Conspicuously absent from the controversial debate on the question of Jerusalem has been the "religious dimension." Yet, logically, this aspect is bound up with both the premise and the determinant for any resolution in connection with the Holy City.

To statesmen of the world charged with resolving so hallowed an issue, reverent consideration of the monotheism of Hebrew Scripture, as eternally associated with Jerusalem, is a necessary condition. For want of any rationale, however, based on the reality of the One God of the Universe and His all-containing Unity--the essence of monotheistic thought--fallacious argument has preponderated to do violence to a manifestation of the Divine Unity in our own time: the survival of the Nation of Israel, with unified Jerusalem in her midst as symbol and center.

A most misleading argument, circulated by Arab propagandists, is the separation of Zionism and Judaism as two unrelated domains. And this--a divisive ploy to nihilate the theological and historical justification of Israel's nationhood--has been wielded as a major political weapon for the avowed aim to drive Israel into the sea. Another

fallacy--the detractors would have the world believe--is that Zionism began as a purely modern movement to secure asylum in Palestine for victims of Nazi persecution. But close attention to Hebrew Scripture and to the accuracy of history would make plain the integral kinship between Zionism and Judaism in both the empirical and ephemeral sense, and that the roots of the "Zionist movement" go back to the farthest reaches of time.

Zionism antedates the practical impetus given it by the Jews in Diaspora--in the middle of the nineteenth century--to reconstitute the nation's political identity in Palestine (or Zion, her poetic name). Zionism precedes in time even the exile of the nation from her native soil almost two thousand years ago--the expulsion accompanied by the intention to return. The inception of Zionism as a political movement dates back aeons before, to the early Biblical era, upon the arrival of the Jewish people at the foot of Mount Sinai. It was then, amid "thunder and lightning and a thick cloud upon the mount, and the voice of a trumpet exceeding loud" (Exod. 19:16) - the sound of which has reverberated through the centuries and around the globe, that the "spiritual democracy" of Israel--a fusion of nationality and faith as a single phenomenon--was called into being by Divine behest. And it is the continuity and living reality of this same spiritual democracy that shall remain

as integrant to Hebrew monotheism for as long as Hebrew Scripture shall endure.

In the spirit of fullest inquiry into the misconceptions that loom up as actual obstacles to peace in the Middle East--and in the world--the following pages suggest the need of searing "self-examination" within the Christian Church of her own position toward Zionism and Judaism.

In the same spirit, the author has ventured a glimpse into the vast realm of universal monotheism as related to Israel's current struggle for self-preservation and for peace. It is hoped this less than adequate glimpse may serve to challenge theologians and Biblical scholars to illuminate in depth--for our statesmen locked in stalemate--the genuine monotheistic principles at stake in Israel's struggle, and thereby give new impetus and new direction to the quest for permanent peace on earth.

AN IMPASSE IN THE CITY OF THE LORD

a. International versus Universal

The aftermath of the Arab-Israeli war, 1967, has thrust the City of Jerusalem at the mercy of political strategy, unprecedented in her long and turbulent history. And though the reunification of the city--as a result of the war--is in fact a spiritual triumph for all men of faith, it has but added fuel to strife and controversy, even amongst the highest echelons of the Church hierarchy. The contention is generated, chiefly, by a conflict of concepts regarding the true significance of the Holy City.

The world bodies of Churches and the United Nations, on the one hand, underscore the "international character of Jerusalem and the Holy Places"--maintaining that the city derives her unique importance from the presence of religious shrines and the ancient memories associated with them. The Nation of Israel, on the other hand, tenaciously and consistently seeks to ensure respect for the "universal interests in Jerusalem and the universal character of the Holy Places"--affirming that Jerusalem holds within her boundaries, not dead relics of the ancient past, but monuments to the everlasting dynamism of the monotheistic belief, viable for today.

b. The Universal Horizon

With respect to the universal view, it is as an integrant element of the monotheism of Israel, as the symbol of the Unity of the One God of the universe, that Jerusalem holds a central position within mankind as the "Holy City." Just as the city derives holiness directly from God, so the religious shrines in her midst obtain to "holiness" in context with the same primal source. Hence it is Jerusalem that confers sanctity upon the shrines, not that the shrines confer sanctity upon Jerusalem.

With world-wide concern focused primarily upon the holy places, it is evident that Jerusalem as a constituent with the Divine Unity has been relegated to antiquity, that the Presence of God in Jerusalem has been eclipsed, and that the shrines themselves have become objects of worship and veneration. The contest for custody of the shrines, then, is being fought on a spiritually hollow stage, totally withdrawn from "the holy origin and the holy destination" (Buber)¹ --and as such, the City of God and all the shrines remain merely as historic landmarks drained of their "unique" importance.

From public statement and debate, it is apparent that emphasis upon the "international" has obscured the "universal" horizon, leading to half-knowledge as to what it really is that makes Jerusalem so unique a sanctuary. The

universal concept, as expounded with clarity and eloquence by Israel's spokesmen, is never acknowledged, nor challenged--it is simply ignored.

But for any solution that will ensure enduring peace in the Middle East, root level consideration cannot be shunted of the universal imperatives of Biblical Monotheism associated with Jerusalem, the significance of those imperatives in the Hebraic experience, and--the most neglected aspect of all--their significance in the total Christian experience. In the last analysis, it will be through the acknowledgment of universal monotheism, and not its denial, that peace and security can become a reality in Jerusalem, and from Jerusalem radiate to the whole dimension of human existence.

c. An International Presence
vs. The Divine Presence

The prevailing opinion amongst the clergy on the question of the holy sites, is to establish in Jerusalem an "extraterritorial" status for them under United Nations jurisdiction. Officially adopted in a Resolution, 7 July 1967, by the National Council of Churches--sanctioned by the World Council of Churches, and the Vatican in seeming accord--

the decision reads: "We support the establishment of an international presence in the heretofore divided city of Jerusalem which will preserve the peace and integrity of the city, foster the welfare of its inhabitants, and protect its holy shrines with full rights of access to all. We encourage the earliest possible advancement of United Nations proposals to make such arrangements possible."²

While not expressing administrative control over Jerusalem, the wording of this statement is purposely vague--according to spokesmen for the Council--to leave room for as much international control as will be feasible to arrange in the future.

Thus, by seal and sanction of the world Church bodies--in unanimity--the sanctity of the Holy City and the shrines shall repose in the trusteeship of an "institution of international character," a United Nations agency. Accordingly, this agency is to be elevated to the stature of a Presence to supplant the Divine Presence. An international presence to sit on the "Throne of the Lord!" (Jer. 3:17).

The prospect of occupation by an alien, mundane presence in the midst of His Sanctuary--where God alone "hath made Himself known for a stronghold" (Ps. 48:4)--raises a specter of incongruities that would make impossible the release of those spiritual forces the Church ardently desires.

While such an occupation, or protectorate, might ensure the physical safety of the shrines, it would by its presence drain all spiritual incentive for preserving them. While monitoring freedom of access to the shrines, the attending administrative control superimposed upon the people of the region--without consent of the people--would crush the very principle of freedom, as spiritually conceived at the foot of Mount Sinai. This is not to mention the preposterous encroachment upon the capital city of a Sovereign State.

An "occupation" in whatever guise is repressive by nature. Far from nourishing the religious instincts of mankind, repression undermines it. The contemplated blueprint to push God into a guarded enclave is the epitome of repression--a colossal witness to the imprisonment of the human spirit and breakdown of the moral unity of man. Moreover, it represents a most flagrant trespass upon the Divine prerogative that "Jerusalem shall be inhabited without walls... 'For I,' saith the Lord, 'will be a wall of fire round about, and I will be the glory in the midst of her'" (Zech. 2:9).

The protagonists in the power game--who vie for dominion over Jerusalem in the name of "religious" concern for the holy places--seem not to remember that, over and beyond boundaries, eclipsing national and international rivalries for

sovereignty, God is the Absolute Sovereign, and that no foreign presence could ever usurp His Divine Presence. The contenders also seem not to remember that God appointed His own "ministers" whom He exalted above ambassadors and statesmen sitting in the highest chambers. In addressing Jerusalem, He proclaimed: "'I will make Peace thy government, and Righteousness thy magistrates'" (Isa. 60:17). And in an everlasting covenant, He anointed the nation of Israel as guardian and protector of the City of the Lord.

In effect, the wrangling debate in both clerical and political quarters, over a solution for Jerusalem, is a disputation with God. The artful use of religious rhetoric to manipulate the destiny of Jerusalem has led inevitably to frustration and deadlock, for it is self-defeating to rant pious and devout concern for the Holy City in the same breath that blots out His Omnipotent Purpose.

d. Insoluble?

"For a generation the world has heard politically inspired threats of war of extermination against Israel.... During this period we Christians have said little and done little to seek assurance for Israel that extermination would not be her fate." This earnest acknowledgment by the National

Council of Churches--in its Resolution of 7 July 1967--
fortuitously stumbles upon a clue to the frustrating dead-
lock that prevents any movement toward peace in the Mid-
East.

By specifying "assurance for Israel" that ex-
termination would not be her fate--for Israel only--but not
an assurance for the world Christian community, the declara-
tion reveals two significant and interacting factors: the
first, a total Christian detachment from the destiny of the
modern State of Israel; the second, an astonishing ambiguity
of the Church position in relation to the roots of her own
faith--the monotheism of the Old Testament. Indirectly, both
of these factors tend to aggravate conditions that encourage
the ominous threats against Israel. For a hostile Arab world
preparing to extirpate the monotheistic nation from the
foundations, the incendiary influence of Christian apathy
and uncertainty cannot be minimized.

Though the same 7 July 1967 Resolution declares:
"Christians, as well as Jews and Muslims are closely bound
by historic ties to the land where all three faiths had their
origins," it is apparent that those origins have been so
obscured by time as to be completely lost. The monotheistic
character of the origins and the profound role of the Nation
of Israel in their founding and development, therefore, remain
a complete mystery.

The next section deals with salient features of the monotheistic origins that are intrinsically linked with the modern State of Israel and her spiritual and political capital, Jerusalem. Without their consideration, the monotheistic vision of a united human race and the reign of world peace will be entirely lost to view. In particular, for statesmen charged with resolving an issue that will effect the peace of the entire world, to gain comprehension of the fundamentals of the issue is a prerequisite.

THE MONOTHEISM OF ISRAEL

a. An Eternal Legacy

Hebrew Monotheism, or the religion of Judaism, is the belief in the absolute unity of the One living God of the universe. Theologian and scholar, Leo Baeck explains:

"To the Jew the unity of God finds its essential expression in the unity of the ethical.... As monotheism means the One God, so it also means the one command and the one righteousness....

"The ethical monotheism of Israel is a religion that has been founded.... In so far as this form of a religion is a creation, embodying an entirely new and fruitful principle, we are entitled to call it historically--quite apart from supernatural conceptions--a revelation.... Nothing like this birth of monotheism out of Israel's moral consciousness has ever occurred elsewhere in history.... Historically the fact remains that monotheism was given to mankind by Israel and by Israel alone....wherever else it is found later, it has derived directly or indirectly from Israel.

"The nature of this religion was conditioned by the existence of the people of Israel, and so it became one of the

nations that have a mission to fulfill. That is what is meant by the election of Israel....

"Judaism stresses the kingdom of God not as something already accomplished but as something yet to be achieved, not as a religious possession of the elect but as the moral task of all.... For Judaism, the whole of mankind is chosen; God's covenant was made with all men.... Thereby the unity of the human race becomes an ethical demand of all the nations upon earth. The nations themselves are enjoined to create this unity.... Only when Israel can live securely among the nations will the promised time have arrived, for then it will be proved that belief in God has become a living reality."³

b. A Functional Energy

The legacy of ethical monotheism that the Nation of Israel transmitted to the generations of man, is contained in her eternal testament, the Torah--a body of living principles evolved through experience and usage as the most satisfactory basis of human community. Had there been no nation of Israel, this immortal work--unsurpassed for its influence in the humanization of man--would never have been produced. Its laws reflect the rounded life of national existence.

Biblical monotheism, then, may be defined, not as an abstract doctrine, but as a functional energy activated by community living. Through actual family situations--family law developed; through the exigencies of commerce, trade, husbandry, labor--laws of obligation and property took concrete form; and through the process of governing--administrative laws truly representative of the spirit and ideals of "all the congregation" of Israel were consolidated. (The immortal words of a great American, "government of the people, by the people, for the people," owe their ancestry to the fruits of experience of the Hebrew commonwealth)

As pointed out by J. H. Hertz: "Torah treats of every phase of human and national life, civil as well as religious, physical as well as spiritual-- in the eyes of the Torah, nothing human is secular...all alike disclose the will of God.... It is of the utmost importance to grasp this characteristic feature of the Torah."⁴

c. Kingdom of Unification

To comprehend the essence of the monotheism of Israel, it is essential to realize the sovereign position the nation holds in the unitary concept of God and history, and the relation of the nation to her capital. It is Israel in Jerusalem that matters. Just as the nation is the

life-force which gave form and meaning to the monotheistic idea, so too, "a strong and unified metropolis, at once the religious and political center of the country, will concentrate and invigorate the whole nation, and spread blessing through the body of which it is the head"

(Kirkpatrick).⁵ The nation and her center are indivisible in Jewish monotheistic thought.

With centralization as the natural consequence of unity, the universal force of the Divine Energy is readily grasped as converging toward the center of His nation at Jerusalem, and radiating from the center to the uttermost ends of the earth--transcending boundaries of nation and nations and gathering up all in the One Kingdom of God, which Martin Buber has called the Kingdom of Unification. This represents the culminating aspiration of Hebrew monotheism--as set forth in Isaiah (2:2,3; 11:9) and Zechariah (14:8,9)--when the mountain of the Lord's House shall be exalted above the hills, unto which all the nations shall flow, and out of which shall go forth the law, the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. The acknowledgment of the Kingdom of Unification shall be a prelude to the day when the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.

d. Peace

The crux of the Kingdom of Unification may be summed up in the one word shalom, peace. Shalom is manifest in the second half of the Holy City's name, Yerushalayim, its antecedent Yeru, denoting foundation. Jerusalem is known as the "City of Peace" or the "Foundation of Peace"--the rock upon which the peace and unity of the universe rests.

Undefinable in dictionary terms, peace, in Hebrew, suggests more than an armistice between contending parties. It exceeds even a state of tranquility, or freedom from oppression and tyranny. Pre-eminently, "peace" is a fundamental pillar of the absolute unity of the one God of the universe; it is the corollary of the rule of one Justice that unites the human race, the heavens, the earth and all there is therein as one supreme fraternity.

A remarkably concise word containing so much, shalom, in Hebrew liturgy, confers peace upon him that is far off and upon him that is near, upon the whole house of Israel and upon all mankind. Its every utterance--in salutation as in prayer--expresses an ineffable longing, welling up from a conditioned tradition of centuries, for the fulfillment of universal peace in Jerusalem as sanctification of the Divine Unity.

Just as "righteousness and justice are the foundation of His Throne" (Ps. 97:2), so "the work of righteousness shall

be peace" (Isa.32:17). Indeed, the whole idea of the Divine Unity is dependent upon the preparation of His Kingdom on earth through the consummation of righteousness in peace. "Through their unity is revealed the deepest content of the unity of God" (Baeck).⁶

e. The Eternal Covenant

It can be seen that the "monotheistic belief"--peace, its goal, as sanctification of the Divine Unity--is the source and *raison d'être* of the total Hebraic experience; and that this monotheistic belief is irrevocably linked with the "spiritual marriage," or covenant, between God and the Nation of Israel. Just as human community was essential to effectuate the inner workings of His Divine Energy, so, too, was an intimate relationship between God and man--epitomized by the Divine betrothal.

The entire Hebrew Bible is a dialogue, in antiphonal cadences, as between bride and bridegroom: "'I will be their God, and they shall be My people'" (Jer.31:32). And when God proclaimed, "'I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and have taken hold of thy hand, and kept thee, and set thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the nations'" (Isa. 42:6), this betrothal was sealed "as

permanently as the phenomenon of nature." Martin Buber points out: "Try to delete the words: 'Ye shall be Mine own treasure from among all peoples' (Exod. 19:5) from the account of the coming of Israel to the wilderness of Sinai, and the whole story collapses."⁷

Though God addressed Himself to "all the congregation" of men, it was through "His own treasure" that He was to become "for a name of joy, for a praise and for a glory, before all the nations of the earth" (Jer.33:9). Thus, it became the world-historic mission of the Zionist Nation to rally all the nations of the earth to serve His Divine Unity. This consecrated mission which sank deep into the consciousness of the Jews--individually and collectively, from the humblest to the greatest--had the binding power to sustain them these long centuries, through the tragic vicissitudes of exile and religious persecution.

"Only when a conviction has far-reaching greatness and its defenders are aware of its sublimity, is it heroic for man to live for it alone. By having preserved and still preserving its old spiritual possessions, Judaism maintains its unshakeable belief that it is guarding the religion of all humanity.... Judaism's conviction of its own value and future gave it the spiritual freedom to acknowledge the world-historic importance of the messianic missions of both Christianity and Islam, even though Christianity's treatment

of the Jews could rarely be considered messianic"
(Baeck).⁸

Through Christianity and Islam, which adapted the monotheism of Israel as the base of their own creeds, knowledge of the Old Testament was carried to the uttermost ends of the earth. But most importantly, the Hebrew legacy--in its pure form--was spread by the Jewish Nation itself, during the years of exile. To whatever corner of the globe the Jews wandered--and in whatever circumstance--they carried the Torah with them, sheltering it in their midst as their most precious possession.

The covenant with God remained with the people, for it was sealed in their flesh. The Lord had said: "'In their inward parts, and in their hearts will I write it'" (Jer. 31:32). "When thou walkest it shall lead thee, when thou liest down it shall watch over thee, and when thou awakest it shall talk with thee" (Prov. 6:22). "Be nigh unto the Lord our God day and night" (I Kings 8:59). And when the Lord had said, "'My spirit that is upon thee, and My words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of thy seed's seed from henceforth and for ever'" (Isa. 59:21), its continuity was assured. To this day, the Divine words are being handed down from generation to generation--in their pure context and with undiminished intensity--as every Jewish child

reared in the faith knows, and to which the present writer can attest.

f. A Modern Saga

The Nation of Israel never ceased to exist during the years of dispersion. It was a nation in exile waiting to return to the land of its birth.

The same civilization that reared the authors of the Hebrew Bible--to whom had been illumined the character and will of God--continued to yield a long line of scholars, sages and men of Divine insights, all through the post-Biblical era and beyond. Their literature never stopped increasing. Indeed, "against all...attempts of pagan or Christian rulers to shut up Judaism in itself and prevent its spread" (Moore),⁹ the exiled nation through Judaism continued to fecundate the soil wherever on earth its seed was scattered--for the fact that Hebrew Monotheism carries the germ of growth within its own nature. When the nation returned to its land--in our century--it did so enriched by both its own literature and the sum of experience accreted in Diaspora.

Imbued by the consuming faith in its immutable destiny, the same nation that served His Unity with all its heart, with all its soul and with all its might (Deut. 6:5), for almost 4,000 years, has with equal tenacity renewed its

physical bond with the soil. The modern State of Israel has labored to "renew the waste cities, the desolations of many generations" (Isa. 61:4). It has brought forth living waters to irrigate the parched land, redeemed stagnant swamps, planted forests, caused the bare heights to foliate, and carpeted the valley floors with verdure. In a herculean effort, the people of Israel have transformed a barren and neglected desert, and--as no other peoples have ever lifted a finger to do--have made the "garden of the Lord" to bloom again.

This demonstrable achievement, in our time, has provided the world with a crowning act of redemption, and with irrefutable evidence that Hebrew Monotheism is still "kicking and alive." The same impassioned imperative of the ancient Israelites--"Justice, and only justice shalt thou pursue" (Deut. 16:20)--and the great Biblical concept of Peace, animate the people of Israel today. Rooted in the unbroken tradition in which it was conceived, Hebrew Monotheism remains a viable, living force in the life of the nation, strengthened, not weakened, by time and adversity. Unharried, and in peace, the modern state has new chapters yet to write in the spiritual history of mankind.

g. Fulfillment in Jerusalem

It can be understood, that a nation that served His Unity in unbroken tradition for so many centuries-- with a constancy without parallel in the history of man-- could never tolerate a breach in the unity of Jerusalem, the eternal symbol of His Divine Unity. Therefore, the reunification of Jerusalem, 7 June 1967, was a momentous event that brought forth the stirring evocation of Major General Moshe Dayan: "We have returned to the holiest of our holy places, never to depart from it again!"

Indeed, as the mountains surround the Holy City, so too, the triumphant Israeli troops wrapped about her their loving and protective arms, to defend her with their lives, to ensure that never again shall she be rent asunder. A saga of breathtaking heroism unfolded when a centuries-old hope and dream became this reality.

Bestowing a blessing of unification upon the Holy City is the Song of Ascents: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that has been rebuilt, as a city that is firmly united.... Peace be within thee. For the sake of the house of the Lord our God I will seek thy good" (Ps. 122:2, 8, 9).

"JERUSALEM SHOULD REMAIN UNIFIED"

The peace of Jerusalem rests upon active monotheistic principles. Those who identify with the monotheism of Israel cannot be the same who would countenance a cleft in any part of His Kingdom of Unification. To deny the unity of Jerusalem is to negate the Unity of God. Inversely, to defend Jerusalem in her totality, entire and reunited--the eternal symbol of hope for the rule of righteousness, freedom and peace on earth--is an affirmation of the Unity of the One Lord of the Universe.

Paradoxically, denial of the restoration of Jerusalem's Unity--as a result of the Six-Day War--has been shouted from every quarter, clerical as well as political, in the fiction of "annexation." The stiff rebuff to Israel by the Church community for "unilateral annexation of the Jordanian portion of Jerusalem" gives to Israel, in fact, the eminent distinction of being the only people on earth that desires to conserve the true symbol of Biblical monotheism. At the same time, insistence upon "annexation" indicates that--for twenty years--it was and still remains perfectly acceptable to the Church to consider half of the Holy City as a separate territory.

This is disappointing. For, if religious denominations who profess the monotheistic belief do not hold the Unity of the Holy City inviolable and inscrutable, who will? Auspiciously, the official Church stance does not reflect the will and opinion of numbers of fellow Christians. Many individual expressions of concern run counter to official statements.

For example, sixteen eminent Christian theologians jointly issued a declaration, conveying their deep-felt conviction for upholding the monotheistic character of Jerusalem, as follows:

"Jerusalem Should Remain Unified.

"The fate and destiny of Jerusalem impinges crucially upon the relationship of Christianity to Judaism.

"Judaism has at its center an indissoluble bond between the people of Israel and the land of Israel. For Christians to acknowledge the necessity of Judaism is to acknowledge that Judaism presupposes inextricable ties with the land of Israel and the city of David, without which Judaism cannot be truly itself. Theologically, it is this dimension to the religion of Judaism which leads us to support the reunification of the city of Jerusalem.

"During the past twenty years the city of David has experienced an artificial division. This has resulted in a denial of access to their holy places for all Jews and for Israeli Arabs of the Muslim faith. It has also severely

limited accessibility to Christian shrines for Israeli Christians. This injustice, we must confess, did not elicit significant protests on the part of the religious leaders of the world.

"We see no justification in proposals which seek once again to destroy the unity which has been restored to Jerusalem. This unity is the natural condition of the Holy City, and now once again assures the world's religious peoples the freedom of worship at the shrines which remain the spiritual centers of their faith.

"We are gratified that the sanctity and protection of the holy places of all denominations have been assured by the Government of Israel, whose record over the last twenty years in providing free access to Christian shrines within her jurisdiction inspires confidence that the interests of all religions will be faithfully honored. This confidence is further strengthened by Israel's offer to place the holy places under independent denominational supervision...."¹⁰

Though many other distinguished Christians were equally prompt and vigorous in their identification with Jerusalem, unified, and with Israel's struggle--showing true grace and understanding, not only of Israel under siege, but of Israel in her genuine Biblical context--the stance of official Christian organizations has remained that of ambiguity, detachment, and almost hostility. Without protest, official

Christendom has let the tiny nation become a "prey and derision to the residue of the nations round about" (Ezek. 36:4), the target of taunt and abuse of the most vitriolic kind. And while the Nation of Israel--isolated from world opinion and in solitude--continues to defend the inscrutable Unity of Jerusalem, the "Dwelling-Place of the Most High" (Ps.46:5) is being manipulated as a bargaining ploy for power politics--the stake of world-wide diplomatic and religious rivalries. By identifying with this unseemly joust, the appearance is given that the Church herself is not at all dealing with the religious aspect of Jerusalem's destiny, but only with the politics of the problem.

For the Church to associate with the power game of political maneuvers to thwart Israel's fulfillment in a unified Jerusalem is demeaning. It is unfortunate, too, that it does so at a time when the spirit of ecumenism and interfaith dialogue have made such excellent progress by emphasis on universal truths shared in common rather than on parochial points of divergence. The Church's entry into the bickering and bargaining political arena gives every appearance of a "flashback" to the age of intolerance when fierce rivalries issued from doctrinal and exegetical differences.

Indeed, it is to be regretted that official Church spokesmen fail to rejoice--as do fellow Christians who hold the Old Testament in veneration--that Jerusalem has at last

been restored to the people of the Book in fulfillment of prophetic prediction, and that a Divine miracle has come true in our time. The status of all religious faiths today can only be enhanced, not diminished, by a spiritual triumph wherever it comes to rest.

CHURCH AMBIGUITY

Unwittingly, the combined Church bodies have assumed the strange posture of professing allegiance to the Divine Unity implicit in Hebrew Scripture, while failing to defend His Unity in united Jerusalem when the test came; of fervently praying for peace, yet appeasing the avowed enemies of peace; of confessing a "sin of neglect" toward the State of Israel, but slanting moral support solely in favor of Arab governments.

Perhaps the most vivid--and most serious--of contradictions is the attitude of Pope Paul VI toward the monotheistic State of Israel. While identifying with Old Testament monotheism--exhorting his flock "to the higher duty of following at all times the authority of Holy Scripture"--he holds in utter contempt the sovereignty of that country, which as a body politic had given it birth, and as a body politic in existence today gives it credibility.

One contradiction generates another. The Pontiff, in a frozen posture of neutrality--remaining equally indifferent to the reality of Israel's existence and the Arab threat to liquidate her existence entirely--has thrust himself between two conflicting ideologies: the Biblical concept of peace, which seeks absolute abolition of warfare as

sanctification of the Divine Unity, and Jihad, an Islamic doctrine which sanctifies war for the spread of Islam.

This is disconcerting, for the Pope has been among the most articulate pleaders for peace in the modern world, making "peace" the central theme of Christian prayer. What is more, he has distinguished himself by implementing his own prayers for the "great and yearned-for gift of peace, of which the world has so much need," with active service and mediation. Addressing himself to the Synod of Bishops, 30 September 1967, he emphasized: "We shall not confine our concrete activity on behalf of peace to public statements or demonstrations; but shall devote ourselves in every way possible to proclaim and promote...the peaceful establishment of civilized humane peace in the world.... We are prepared to support every available genuine initiative for peace."¹¹ And in his first commemorative "Day of Peace" message for 1 January 1968, he explicitly stated: "Nor can one rightly speak of peace where no recognition or respect is given to its solid foundations."¹²

These fervent declarations of "intention of service and of example" in defense of peace where it is threatened immediately suggest Jerusalem as the central focus of the Pope's attention. But strangely, with their utterance, he ceased to exert pressure pro or con on the issue of the Holy City--at least publicly--and instead, scattered his "concrete activity" around the periphery of the world.

As self-appointed mediator in Vietnam and other crisis areas his efforts intensified, at the same time as in the Middle East his detachment became more chilling and remote--only occasionally and casually reminding the "men involved" in that region to refrain from resumption of arms and to come to a settlement.

Thus, neglecting to tend the "solid foundations" of peace in Yerushalayim, the City of Peace, the Pope's impassioned pleas have the ring of mere rhetoric. Indeed, he cannot make a case for peace at all, when by his posture of neutrality he gives encouragement to the Arab Nations who foment for war--by whose decree, "No peace, no negotiation, no recognition of Israel,"¹³ the City of the Lord is exposed to constant threat and acts of war.

Pope Paul cannot be unaware that his apostolic ministry summons him to seek first the peace of Jerusalem, for in her peace the knowledge of God will radiate to all the peoples of the earth, even to Southeast Asia. It is self-evident that when no recognition and respect are given to the solid foundations in Zion, there is very little hope of achieving a true and lasting peace anywhere else in the world.

It is incumbent upon the Pontiff, therefore, to thaw his frozen posture of neutrality and take a positive, unequivocal stand--on the highest platform of monotheistic thought--in defence of the Divine Unity; to concentrate the

power of his authority and initiative behind the "glowing center"; to rally a united Church to align as partner with the State of Israel in defending the restored unity of the City of the Lord.

The fear of jeopardizing Christian relations in Arab lands no doubt accounts for the ambiguous Church posture. But weighing the smaller stake against the greater dangers a threat to Israel portends--the possible extinction of religion altogether, the increased alienation of youth of the entire world (more about this later), and the total threat to world peace--it may be deducted that the policy of the Church has been warped out of all perspective, contrary to the Christian spirit, and to the point of obstructing the very peace the Church devoutly desires.

DISTRUST

Pro-Arab in tone, official Church statements suggest an undercurrent of the same distrust and fears of Israel as harbored by the Arabs. This is particularly noticeable in the thoroughly one-sided approach regarding three major issues--the refugee problem, the settlement of frontiers, and the solution for the Holy Places in the Jerusalem area.

Concerning the refugee problem, in an effort to expedite relief measures, the National Council of Churches recently conducted a survey of the disasters wrought by the Arab-Israeli wars.¹⁴ The study, however, was confined to the plight of Arab refugees, damages to Arab villages, and to the widely publicized Arab grievances.

It is self-evident that no mid-East survey can possibly be complete that excludes the case for the Jews. In the interest of justice and human rights of which the Church speaks, a "just" study should disclose that the Arab wars against Israel (1948 and 1967), created two refugee problems--the Arab and the Jewish. Yet, there is not a single mention of the parallel mass exodus--during the same

period--of despoiled and destitute Jews from Arab lands, forced to flee anti-Jewish pogroms of savage dimensions. Nor is there a single reference to the massacre and destruction of whole communities of Jews--and confiscation of their property by the Arab States--not because they were Zionists, but because they were Jews.

Humanitarian assistance for victims of war is imperative. But at the same time, it is dangerous to evade the underlying premise, that neither Arab nor Jewish refugee problem would exist at all but for Arab intransigence and avowed aim to annihilate the State of Israel. It is equally dangerous to evade the fact that, for the purpose of effectuating this conspiracy, Arab governments have allowed their own kinsmen to suffer and rot--confined in camps and tent cities--"displayed as a permanent exhibition of human misery, to help Arab propaganda against Israel work its effect on men of good will everywhere." As indeed it has!

In the same pro-Arab vein, Israel's territorial integrity is questioned by the National and World Councils of Churches. Unjustly, they have interpreted Israel's retention of her present more defensible frontier--pending iron-clad guarantees of permanent peace--as "territorial expansion by armed force." Their sharp warning that Israel abandon her negotiating position and retire to the same vulnerable borders

as before the June War, can only undermine the nation's chance of survival. At the same time, it can but strengthen Arab-Soviet propaganda that inverts Israel's tactical defense into imperialist aggression; that perverts the modern State of Israel--citadel of peace, freedom, democracy, and living testimony to the survival of Old Testament Monotheism--into an imperialist nation and a warmonger.

Diabolic Arab invective already has vilified the great Zionist State as a "disgrace," and amongst the Soviet Union's violent attacks on Judaism's concept of Divinity is the infamous remark of Premier Krushchev, "that Israel is a menace not only to the Arabs but also to the whole world."

None of this vilification is publicly protested by official Christendom. There is always "deep concern for the grave situation of the Arab-Israeli hostilities in the Middle East," but never condemnation or direct rebuke by name to the United Arab Republic and other militant Arab States for their evil conspiracy--not alone of nihilating the spiritual center of the monotheistic faiths, but of "genocide," which in the civilized world and under international law is a crime against humanity.

Most conspicuously, the breakdown of the aura of trust of Christian leadership toward Israel is shown by its will to sever Jerusalem from national identity and delegate

her destiny to an impotent, remote international agency-- a plan which would destroy the city's vital monotheistic connection, and hermetically seal off her citizenry from the benefits and facilities of national ministration. In this, the Church has shown an appalling lack of confidence in "a people near unto Him" (Ps. 148:14)--the nation that gave so lofty a legacy to humanity in her eternal testament, that guarded the purity of its tenets for long centuries, and that now ensure the immunity and sanctity of the Holy Places of the three monotheistic religions as a responsibility laid upon her by the universal imperatives of her faith.

No more reassuring guarantee could have been given than the "Protection of the Holy Places Law 5727 - 1967" enacted by Israel's Parliament with these committed words of Dr. Zerah Warhaftig, Minister of Religious Affairs: "Respect for the Holy Places and their protection are in the exemplary and resplendent tradition of the Jewish people and the State of Israel."¹⁵

Impervious to the expressed will of a consecrated nation, the Vatican has flatly stated, "Only an international regime would have the authority and sufficient power to prevent incidents and above all to provide for the maintenance of and free access to holy places which constitute a cultural and religious heritage of many faiths."¹⁶ The

Pope, the National and World Councils of Churches, in accord, refuse to accept as sufficient Israel's guarantees of full security and unhindered access to the Holy Places.

ZIONISM AND JUDAISM

a. A Synthesis

The Old Testament gives eternal testimony to the immutable union of nationality and faith, Zionism and Judaism as a single phenomenon--a union made implicit at the time the nation was inaugurated as a "spiritual democracy" at the foot of Mount Sinai near to four thousand years ago.

As Martin Buber has pointed out: "The men in the Bible...do not dare confine God to a circumscribed space or division of life, to 'religion.' They have not the insolence to draw boundaries around God's commandments and say to him: 'Up to this point, you are sovereign, but beyond these bounds begins the sovereignty of science or society or the state....' If we accept the Old Testament as merely 'religious writing,' as a subdivision of the detached spirit, it will fail us, and we must needs fail it. If we seize upon it as the expression of a reality which comprises all of life, we really grasp it, and it grasps hold of us."¹⁷

Modern Israel gives eternal validity to the Old Testament as a social, political and religious document, all in one, and stands witness to the survival of the same spiritual

democracy of Old Testament origin. The Sovereign status of the State of Israel, today, is a theological fulfillment and Biblical necessity.

b. Distortion of Old Testament Reality

Attempting to obstruct Israel's fulfillment by distorting Scriptural tenets, the Arabs flagrantly proclaim: "We in the Arab world draw a distinction between Judaism and Jews on the one hand, and Zionism and Israel on the other.... We are...anti-Zionist and committed to a policy against the manifestation of Zionism in the State of Israel.... The position of all Arabs, Christian and Muslim, with regard to this issue is identical."¹⁸

Pope Paul VI even echoes Arab policy, commending the Jewish religion on the one hand but denying the Jewish State on the other, and refusing--for reasons of his own--to accord diplomatic relations with the State of Israel. When in 1964, he made his unprecedented pilgrimage to the Holy Places in Israel--lest his visit be misconstrued as recognition of Israel's sovereignty--he clearly replied to President Shazar's words of welcome: "Your Excellency knows and God is Our witness, that We are not inspired during this visit by any other motives than purely spiritual ones. We come as a pilgrim; We come to venerate the Holy Places; We come to pray."¹⁹

Considering the Pope's enormous influence in the Arab Middle East, no stretch of the imagination is needed to gauge the consequences of his attitude toward Israel. Inevitably, his own failure to reconcile the relationship of Zionism and Judaism, and his own obdurate refusal to acknowledge Israel's sovereignty, fans flames of Arab intransigence, and gives support and strength to Nasser's flaunted war cry: "No peace, no negotiation, no recognition of Israel." Inevitably, too, an impression can be drawn--horrendous to contemplate--that the Vatican may harbor her own unexpressed desire that the Zionist state be liquidated. Its failure to condemn can but give tacit acquiescence to the Arab governments' avowed intent to wipe Israel off the map--to bury Zionism and Zionists for good and all in the abyss of annihilation.

Certainly, direct consequences of the papal stance is reflected in the Arab statement: "The position of all Arabs, Christian and Muslim, with regard to this issue is identical." In other words, Christians in Arab lands are also committed to the policy of total destruction of Israel. Christians in Arab lands have also blurred their vision to the Lord's commands: "'They shall not hurt nor destroy in all My holy mountain'" (Isa. 11:9), and--concerning a would-be assailant upon Jerusalem--"'He shall not come into the city, nor shoot an arrow there, neither shall he come before it with shield, nor cast a mound against it'" (II Kings 19:32).

Now, as before the June War, Christian Arabs are mobilizing with their Muslim leaders to defile the city of the Lord with another savage assault, not with stones and arrows, but with billions of dollars worth of tanks, shells, bombs, the most deadly offensive weapons, "Even against the Holy One of Israel!" (II Kings 19:22). All Arabs, Christian and Muslim, are learning well from their Russian allies how to burn out God's Presence with TNT explosives.

c. Ominous Forebodings

The Arabs' concocted distinction between Zionism and Judaism--echoed by the Vatican--has been seized upon by Soviet propagandists, who have circulated libelous slogans such as "Zionist imperialists and oppressors," in order to foment global hostility against Jews and Judaism. Repercussions are felt in our own midst. Proliferating as a venomous outbreak of anti-Semitism in the Negro community, the "anti-Israel," "anti-Zionist" posture is being fully exploited by black extremists, in their own "hate-whitey" campaign to help establish an apartheid system in America.

The overall Arab-Israeli conflict--with its anti-Zionist overtones--has served as a favorable conduit for the

Soviet Union to accelerate its own designs to improve its global position--Europe as its target. News analysts report that, "In addition to gaining a better strategic position, the Russians are believed to be hoping to woo leftist elements taking part in the social and economic revolution that is sweeping several Arab countries."²⁰

Moscow's swift and irresponsible move to rearm President Nasser--in his hour of crushing defeat, June 1967--has tightened even more firmly her foothold in that area. Since that time, it is reported that \$2.5 billion worth of Russian arms have been poured into the Middle East (imagine what these billions could be doing for the refugees), with "growing involvement of Soviet military advisers in the armed forces of the United Arab Republic. There is a danger, American officials say, that the 2,000 to 3,000 Soviet military advisers who are assigned for the first time at small-unit-levels in the Egyptian Army, Navy and Air Force could be drawn into sudden combat with the Israelis."²¹

Along with these staggering figures in arms and personnel, the Russians are bringing into Arab lands their special brand of atheism. It cannot be denied that Christian negativism toward Israel and leniency toward the Arab States have served the Russians well. In the absence of a powerful religious front as counter leverage to curb Soviet influence over the destiny of the Arabs, the coast is clear

for interpenetration of both communism and atheism deep in the sands of the Muslim world. Conceivably--if it ever dominates the area--the Russian colossus will come to a face to face confrontation with God at the crossroads: Jerusalem!

APOSTLE OF PEACE

Pope Paul VI holds the "master key" to world peace. By his own example of reversing his refusal to recognize Israel's Sovereignty, he could release the deadlock of Arab intransigence--the one single block that for twenty years has choked off all avenues to peace. So momentous a move on the part of the Pontiff could not be ignored in Arab lands and around the globe where his decisions are binding. By a turn of the latch, he could help our Muslim brothers out of the night of war psychosis; counter the bad counsel of their self-seeking Soviet ally; convert their implacable hatred toward Israel into cooperation and brotherly love. It is within his power to bring in sight an end to the tormenting trial of the valiant people of Israel who are defending the Holy Land, in solitude, and against every obstacle.

As befitting the office of the Apostolate, it is the Pope's clear duty to officially speak for the outraged conscience of all Christendom at an Arab threat aimed at the total destruction of the State of Israel, a threat which carries with it a deathblow to Biblical Monotheism itself, as well as irreparable damage to the Holy Places about which the world is so concerned. To avert the ominous prospect, the urgency of

the hour summons Pope Paul to implement his fervent prayers for peace into a potent act of peace in Jerusalem; to sally forth to the front lines and defend--with all his heart, with all his soul, with all his might--the kind of peace in unity that is implicit in Biblical Monotheism.

It is to be hoped that as an "apostle on the move" as Paul has called himself, he will make another journey to the Holy Land--the happiest and most significant of his papal travels--not merely to venerate the shrines (as in 1964), but to ascend the Mountain of the Lord's House as a true "Apostle of Peace," to acclaim the Divine mandate: "'The nations shall know that I am the Lord that sanctify Israel, when My sanctuary shall be in the midst of them forever'" (Ezek. 37:28).

It can be foreseen that when he should enter Jerusalem with a scepter of peace outstretched, all the inhabitants of the land will shout with such a great shout "that is joined in by heaven and earth" (Delitzsch),²² that the Arabs will ask, "What means this great shout?" Then shall the Pope answer them, "That the Lord hath founded Zion... The Lord of Hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it?" (Isa. 14:32, 27).

"He who makes peace," Martin Buber reminds us, "is God's fellow worker. But addressing conciliatory words to others...is not the way to peace. We make peace, we help bring

about world peace, if we make peace wherever we are destined and summoned to do so.... The prophecy of peace addressed to Israel is not valid only for the days of the coming of the Messiah.... it holds for today. 'And if not now, when?' (Sayings of the Fathers I.14). Fulfillment in a Then is inextricably bound up with fulfillment in the Now."²³

SUMMIT MEETING IN ZION

The single hope of an anxious and tense world rests at the summit, a "summit meeting" in Zion, stamped with the seal of God. Out of Zion, out of the will to acknowledge His Divine Unity at His chosen dwelling place on earth, can there emerge a united harmony and permanent peace for all mankind. But this is not possible unless the survival of the Sovereign State of Israel in Jerusalem--born of Christian necessity, and a conviction as invincible as the courage shown by the Israelis in defending their land and their legacy--becomes the stake of Christianity as it is of Judaism.

It cannot be denied that the fading of the religious imperatives inhering in His Divine Unity is at the root of the "serious decline in the standards of international ethics and morality" (U Thant),²⁴ and that upon the revival of those imperatives depends a just and stable world order. Thus, the responsibility to hasten the advent of peace on earth falls upon men of faith who are affiliated with religious organizations, "That they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to serve Him with one consent" (Zeph. 3:9); that they may shed what is divisive and return to the common monotheistic ground, the primal source, wherein true knowledge of peace can be found.

Upon organized religion rests the challenge that the supremacy of the pure will for peace--untainted by covet or political expedience--can, in fact, bring about peace.

While diplomats of the world are locked in stalemate with their quibbling, and the search for barren peace formulas goes on, there is unrivalled opportunity now for a religious fraternity to assert its role as an effective instrument for peace. This is clearly the time when a united Judeo-Christian front--in solidarity--should rise before the assemblage of nations to enunciate the profound theological imperatives of the universal interest in Jerusalem; to transform the demeaning character of the United Nations debate on the Arab-Israeli conflict, from false vendetta and calumny, to truth and justice in the light of sound Biblical scholarship. Only the might and power of total spiritual rearmament could ever halt the mounting military race, and spare the City of God as prey for larger stakes of rival world powers.

To that end, may all men of faith come forward as a single voice--in statesmanlike and majestic utterance--to "proclaim His name, declare His doings among the peoples, make mention that His name is exalted" (Isa.12:4). When the walls of the United Nations chambers will reverberate with the sound of His name, and the nations will say amongst themselves, "The Lord reigneth" (I Chron. 16:31), the blessings of peace will at last come into view.

FOR THE SAKE OF YOUTH

A most heartening and significant phenomenon must here be noted. During the tense hours before and after the Six-Day War, whilst nations taunted and shook their heads, and Israel's "right to exist" was being tossed back and forth between heads of state--like a macabre ping-pong game--youth of the world came forward to "make glad the City of God" (Ps. 46:5).

Quick to demonstrate on the side of moral truth and justice wherever these are at stake, there has not been, perhaps, another event of our time to which youth reacted with such fervor. The crisis in Israel--very real and urgent--caught fire with them at once. When the cry of Abba Eban reverberated across every continent, "Never have justice, honor, peace, national freedom and international morality been more righteously defended,"²⁵ the youth generation heard and understood.

Notwithstanding world-wide disaffection of youth from the adult establishment--including total rejection of a religious establishment that preaches peace and morality, yet is utterly impotent in effectuating peace or influencing the moral tenure of society--the allegiance of youth everywhere was drawn

irresistibly to the tiny monotheistic State of Israel, where a genuine ideal really mattered. This vicarious response to Israel's struggle, while not consciously religious, was none the less a positive engagement with religious ideas. In essence, a contact was made between the emerging generation and the Lord of All.

Frederick Thieberger's reflections on the religious emotion may be related to this phenomenon. "A man's spiritual energies," he says, "are fed through direct or indirect channels from a spiritual domain that may best be termed the centre of emotion. The trend and the force of a man's delight in things and the trend of his volition depend on what moves and stirs him. The origin of this emotion...is ultimately governed by an inner contact, which usually flares up all of a sudden, between the individual and an object or a phenomenon in the surrounding world. The individual is stirred to the depths, enlightened, and roused; and if he can fit his emotion into the general course of events, relating, as it were, his whole world to this glowing centre, then the religious character of his emotion becomes particularly marked."²⁶

At the time of Israel's crisis, June, 1967, when Western youths were stirred to the depths, enlightened, roused, and eager to identify with the heroic struggle of their Israeli counterparts--the young and vigorous offshoots of His planting

who, in the hour of peril, responded with one consent and with one will to defend the land of their fathers and their entire heritage (the inbred conditioning of four thousand years in the service of His Unity put to the test)-- a most favorable juncture was at hand for our religious establishment to reach out and communicate.

Paradoxically, in their desperate effort to relate religion to contemporary life, for youth in particular, clergymen and religious educators took no notice of the clarion call: "Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call ye upon Him while He is near" (Isa. 55:6). Insensitive to the stirrings of God in youths, that surfaced as a "revelation" of their own moment during Israel's crisis, the religious Establishment missed its greatest cue.

The survival of the monotheistic religions altogether hinges upon the incentive of youth to preserve for posterity the universal meanings of "The holiest dwelling-place of the Most High" (Ps. 46:5). The point therefore is not to evade, but to illuminate the spiritual significance of the historic process taking place in Zion today. This, of course, is a challenge to the Church to clarify her identity with Old Testament monotheism.

The authority of the Old Testament for the Christian Church stands or falls on her will to maintain the integrity of her origins. For what is sacred to all men of faith, as

Thieberger has defined it, is "the belief in the origin of its own contents, the faith that here is preserved the call of the One Inconceivable God."²⁷ Only from such overmastering certainty can "religion" ever hope to bring the rising generation unto itself. The greatest challenge is to impart to youth--as to all despairing mankind--credibility in the eternal Kingdom of Unification, and to prove that religious denominations mean what they say about their monotheistic pronouncements.

Vacillation--and heedlessness to the empathy for the Holy Land shown by youth--is to banish Him forever as grist for the milling of the God-is-dead theologies. Whereas, to participate in the demonstrable youthful engagement with His Sanctuary, to be able to say: "This shall be written for the generation to come... That men may tell of the name of the Lord in Zion and His praise in Jerusalem" (Ps. 102:19, 22), is to confirm His Self-Disclosing Presence in the here and now. For the sake of our youngsters, who are groping for a genuine faith to sustain them in the world of crisis they inherited, the Establishment can lead the way with the beckoning call: "Come, let us together, 'Walk about Zion, encircle her, and count her towers, mark well her ramparts, and pass between her citadels, that ye may tell to later generations that such is God, our God forever, who will guide us eternally' (Ps. 48:13-15)."

CONCLUSION

Toward a "peace structure...built from its foundations" (Eban),²⁸ the destiny of Jerusalem--the rock on which the peace of the universe rests--cannot be isolated from the broader question of the sovereignty of the nation of which the city is the vital organ. To make sport of that sovereignty, or to seek to dismember Jerusalem--in whole or in part--from the Kingdom of Unification, is, most wantonly, to distort the monotheistic foundations, the sacred covenants implicit in Holy Text. Furthermore, to obtrude an international regime upon any part of the capital city of a nation, is to deny the sovereign and inalienable rights of a nation to her central territory--her official seat of government.

With reintegration of the Holy City, the government of Israel has made clear its policy that it does not seek to exercise "unilateral jurisdiction" over Moslem and Christian holy places; it has given guarantees of unhindered access, protection, and perfect respect for their administration by each denominational interest. The stratagem to deny the rights of Israel to her capital on the issue of the shrines is a spurious and flagrant political expedient, and a mockery to the three great monotheistic faiths for whom the shrines are sacrosanct.

Moreover, the overall distrust of Israel's integrity--a by-product of the systematic and malicious hate campaign of the Arab-Soviet-bloc--is an affront to "the people of the Book" who gave so lofty a legacy to humanity. It is self-evident that perpetual harassment and threats of extinction serve only to impede the flowering and fulfillment of a nation's goals, whereas amity and co-operation in tending the "foundations" can but hasten the day for the vision of peace to become a reality.

By its resplendent tradition, lineage and consecrated will, the Nation of Israel has proven its capacity to nurture a unified Jerusalem toward physical health, as well as toward the empyrean heights of the human spirit.

AUTHORITIES AND BIBLICAL PASSAGES CITED

- 1) Buber, Martin, "Israel and the World," Schocken Books, 1948, p. 143.
- 2) "Resolution on the Crisis in the Middle East Adopted by the Executive Committee of the National Council of Churches," July 7, 1967.
- 3) Baeck, Leo, "The Essence of Judaism," Schocken Books, 1961, pp. 130, 59-61, 252, 233, 274.
- 4) Hertz, J.H., Commentary on "The Pentateuch and Haftorahs," Oxford Univ. Press, Exodus (1930) p. 238, Leviticus (1932) p. 92.
- 5) Kirkpatrick, A. F., "The Cambridge Bible," at the University Press, The Psalms (1901), Commentary to Psalm 133.
- 6) Baeck, Leo, "The Essence of Judaism," Schocken, 1961, p. 122.
- 7) Buber, Martin, "Israel and the World," Schocken, 1948, p. 250.
- 8) Baeck, Leo, "The Essence of Judaism," Schocken, 1961, pp. 79, 246.
- 9) Moore, George Foot, "Judaism," Harvard University Press, 1927, Vol. I, p. 353.
- 10) "Jerusalem Should Remain Unified," Advertisement in The New York Times, July 12, 1967.
- 11) Pope Paul VI, Speech to First Working Session of the Synod of Bishops, Eng. tr., dist. by the Vatican, Sept. 30, 1967.
- 12) Pope Paul VI, On a "Day of Peace," official text issued Dec. 15, 1967.
- 13) Resolution, Arab Summit Conference in Khartoum, Aug. 1967.
- 14) "Report of Deputation to the Middle East," July 19-31, 1968, National Council of the Churches of Christ.

- 15) Divrey Haknesset, 2nd Session, 6th Knesset (June 27, 1967), No. 33, pp. 2421, 2422.
- 16) "The Vatican Note on Jerusalem," June 23, 1967, for circulation to member delegates of the United Nations.
- 17) Buber, Martin, "Israel and the World," 1948, pp. 247, 92.
- 18) Hasan, Saadat, Arab Press Release, July 3, 1963.
- 19) Pope Paul VI at Megiddo, Israel, The Jerusalem Post, Jan. 6, 1964.
- 20) The New York Times, Jan. 5, 1968.
- 21) The New York Times, Oct. 22, 1968.
- 22) Delitzsch, Franz, "Biblical Commentary on the Psalms," Hodder & Stoughton (1887-1889), on Psalm 148:14.
- 23) Buber, Martin, "Israel and the World," Schocken, 1948, p. 239.
- 24) United Nations: Supplement No. 1A, 23rd Session, General Assembly, "Introduction to the Annual Report of the Secretary-General on the Work of the Organization," 16 June 1967-15 June 1968, ch. XI, par. 174.
- 25) Eban, Abba, "From A State of War, To A State of Peace," Address in the United Nations Security Council, Nov. 13, 1967.
- 26) Thieberger, Frederick, "King Solomon," East and West Library, 1947, p. 15.
- 27) Ibid., p. 187.
- 28) Eban, Abba, "Forward to Peace," Address in the United Nations General Assembly, Oct. 8, 1968.

I Chronicles 16:31
 Deuteronomy 6:5; 16:20
 Exodus 19:5, 16
 Ezekiel 36:4; 37:28
 Isaiah 2:2, 3; 11:9; 12:4; 14:27, 32; 32:17; 42:6;
 55:6; 57:19; 59:21; 60:17, 21; 61:4
 Jeremiah 3:17; 31:32; 33:9

I Kings 8:59

- II Kings 19:22, 32
Proverbs 6:22
Psalms 46:5; 48:4, 13-15; 97:2; 102:19, 22;
122:2, 8, 9; 132:13, 135:4; 148:14
- I Samuel 4:5, 6
Zechariah 2:9; 14:8, 9
Zephaniah 3:9

