

that end. While such goals are often and clearly stated, the undergirding rationale usually goes unexamined. A large part of it has to do with the uneasy conscience of the West that is peculiarly, and understandably, troubled by the oppression of blacks by whites. The white South African's injustice is abhorrent because he is one of "us"—of our civilization, our culture, our race. That is why black majority rule is grasped as a moral goal. If blacks oppress and slaughter blacks, that is "their" business; we white Westerners are not implicated in their crimes. The internal settlement in Zimbabwe/Rhodesia is not acceptable because whites ("we") still have too much power, and because the new black government there is not likely to cooperate in the staging of the main event, the assault on South Africa.

The complexity of racism's web seems almost infinite. Among those of us who opposed America's war in Indochina some reached far in order to argue that the war was essentially racist. Most people were not convinced by that line of reasoning. But nobody can deny the obvious and overwhelming factor of race in everybody's thinking about Southern Africa. Lest anyone forget, he is reminded by apartheid regulations that measure everything from the shade of skin to the shape of cuticles in order to determine what human and political rights a person is to have. Those who are most impassioned about the odiousness of apartheid believe that a majority of Americans will share their passion when they "become educated" or "have their consciousness raised" about what is going on in South Africa. But as people become more knowledgeable about what is going on throughout Africa, they will be less and less persuaded that the answer is simply majority rule, that the answer is simply racial. If there is an answer, it is to be found in a search for proximate justice beyond the racisms that are all too evident among South Africa's reactionary friends and revolutionary foes.

In its policies regarding Zimbabwe/Rhodesia, Namibia, and South Africa itself, the U.S. is now perceived as moving, or drifting, in support of the revolutionary option. It is by no means clear that the administration has popular support on this course, or even that most Americans are aware of it. So long as U.S. support for the revolutionaries is purely political, it may not become an issue of major domestic controversy. As one official puts it, "We can do what we want, short of sending arms or troops." Perhaps so, but the luxury of purely political support might be short-lived. The warning cry about "another Vietnam" has been raised too often, thus losing some of its credibility; but very sober analysts believe that South Africa could become another Vietnam. One hopes that is excessive, but, to the extent it is at all plausible, it is important to recall what many claim is the chief lesson to be learned from Vietnam: It is impossible for a democracy, even if (especially if?) it is the strongest nation in the world, to engage in a foreign conflict without a

secure consensus of domestic support. The elements of such a conflict in Southern Africa—black versus white, apparent cooperation with the purposes of the Soviet Union, and alliance with some of the most despotic regimes in the world—are a certain formula for domestic dissension that would make the Vietnam years look by comparison like an exercise in national unity.

We are, one hopes, a long way from war in Southern Africa. But there are ominous clouds gathering, while American policy appears to drift. Now is the time to search for accommodations that can hold off the all-out warfare so confidently predicted, and perhaps desired, by antagonists who refuse to recognize that the hope for justice in Southern Africa is not black or white.

## EXCURSUS II

### *Thomas Land on Moscow and Anti-Semitism*

Still embarrassed by the prewar pact between Communist Russia and Nazi Germany, Soviet propagandists are increasingly blaming the Jews for their own tragedy in the Holocaust. As the official Soviet news agency, Tass, put it recently: "The Zionists' collaboration with the Nazis led to a catastrophe which cost the lives of nearly six million Jews."

A review of Soviet publications since the 1967 Middle East war shows a continuous and intensifying anti-Semitic propaganda campaign, says the London-based Institute of Jewish Affairs in an authoritative new research study, *Soviet Anti-Semitic Propaganda*. The campaign has now reached the columns of *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, the influential mass-circulation daily newspaper published specifically for young people.

There are many reasons for the campaign, quite apart from Russia's culturally rooted anti-Semitism and the well-tried convenience of blaming the shortcomings of a cumbersome, centrally planned economy on a conspicuous racial minority.

The Russian Jews demanding the right to emigrate and the more general Russian human rights campaign (whose supporters are not necessarily Jewish) have in fact won some concessions from the Kremlin under pressure from the Western mass media and in the context of détente. In return, the official anti-Semitic campaign has been intensified, associating all political dissidents in the public mind with the Jews and all Jews with a fictitious drive for world domination. Thus the United Nations resolution equating Zionism with racism, which has been dismissed in the West as a minor if odious aspect of the Middle East propaganda war, has been used in the Soviet Union as the focal point of the official anti-Semitism campaign.

The old anti-Semitic linking of "Jews and Freemasons" has emerged in increasingly explicit terms in official literature. The "Zionists [read Jews] and Freemasons" theme was apparently approved only for semiofficial use in 1970. But in February, 1974, the campaign took a turn to the ludicrous with an official, party-sponsored lecture delivered in Moscow in which Valery Emelyanov, a "Candidate of Economic Sciences," seriously condemned what he called the alliance of Zionists and Masons, who, he declared, were seeking to dominate the world by the year 2000.

Perhaps to coincide with the U.N. resolution on racism, a book called *Zionism and Apartheid* was published in Kiev in November, 1975, in which its author, V. I. Skurlatov, defined Freemasonry as "secular Judaism." Skurlatov sought to prove that modern racism was inherited from the biblical concept of "God-chosenness." Then in January, 1977, Emelyanov returned to the theme of Judeo-Masonic world conspiracy in a "memorandum" to leading Soviet political organs. The villain of the piece was the American Jewish organization B'nai B'rith, whose plans for world domination were allegedly so well advanced that its agents had already penetrated deep into Soviet society. The document

described the Carter administration in the United States as "the strongest Zionist/Masonic government in the entire 200-year-old history of that country."

The London institute's research paper compares the Emelyanov "memorandum" with the infamous *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* and notes that elements of the czarist forgery apparently had been inserted deliberately into the document. The study concludes that possibly the "memorandum" was written to influence nationalist and anti-Semitic elements in the party and in the mass media.

Indeed, six months after publication of the "memorandum" the weekly journal *Nedelya*, which is published by *Izvestia*, condemned "neo-fascism, international Zionism," and other forces for their alleged use of Masonic lodges. And in September, 1978, *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, in the most explicit attack yet, castigated the Zionists for using Freemasonry as a "screen" behind which "the chosen ones" (obviously meaning the Jews) sought "unrestricted mastery of the free world."

*Thomas Land is an author and foreign correspondent who writes on world affairs from European capitals.*

## QUOTE / UNQUOTE

### In the Philippines, Freedom From the Press

A Manila columnist, who is a leading spokesman for President Ferdinand Marcos, has advised businessmen who are "harrassed" by reporters to shoot them. Said Teodor Valencia, when reporters "intrude into private business and threaten business with adverse publicity, they deserve some violent reaction."

— *DC Gazette*, May

### Communicating by Radio

Omar Torrijos, Panama's strongman, has told recent visitors that he destroyed a dozen transistor radios during the Senate debate on the Panama Canal treaties, which were simultaneously broadcast in Panama in Spanish. The transistors broke, according to Torrijos, when he hurled them against the wall in anger.

— Robert G. Kaiser in the *Des Moines Register*, January 17

### Motto

If your wife is short, bend down and listen to her.

— an entry in *Sex in the Talmud* (Peter Pauper Press)

### For the State Department Any Year Can Be 1984

Freedom of thought is generally upheld, but there are strong restrictions on public expression of thoughts and opinions.

— Department of State "Country Reports on Human Rights Practices," Yugoslavia (p. 324), submitted to the Congress, February 3, 1978

### Fair Play

...children are the only consistent result of human ecstasy, and it is rather sad that we cannot reserve a portion of the passion used in their creation for their maintenance afterwards....

— from an interview with Peter Ustinov in *Development Forum*, published by the U.N.'s Division of Economic and Social Information, January-February

### Postal Prying

A friend of *Worldview*, a moral theologian, reports receipt of a postcard from Florida picturing a sunny beach filled with scantily clad bathers. Its U.S. postage stamp bore the legend "The people's right to petition for redress."