Correspondence

Of Jews
and the State of Israel

To the Editors: A relative of mine introduced me to Worldview early this year, and I immediately subscribed. It is an outstanding collection of distinguished thought.

As an active member for many years of The American Council for Judaism, I am particularly interested in Worldview's hospitality to non-fanatical views about the Middle East. The most recent contribution to sanity in this area is the article by Prof. Horowitz ("Israel Developing") in the September issue. I applaud the conclusions numbered two and three which he arrives at, together with the substance of his preparatory reasoning. And of course I congratulate him on his recognition of the contradiction between Jewish power and Jewish morality, a point which has, even decades ago, been clearly stated publicly by spokesmen for my organization and guest writers in its publications.

I have but one reservation about Prof. Horowitz's discourse. To my way of thinking he has fallen into the Israeli trap, in which the national interests of a political nation are equated or identified with a religion. I am by far the most religious member of my family, and at the same time, and largely for that reason, I am the most free of the peculiar "irredentist" policies of Israel. To me, the fall of Israel (which is not going to occur in the foreseeable future) would be the same kind of tragedy that Prof. Horowitz describes as that which would be experienced by nonreligious Jews. It would indeed be a terrible thing if Israel were to fall, but no more terrible than, for instance, the two falls of Czechoslovakia have been. I am not a shareholder in Israel; if Israel should fall, I would grieve, as I do for Czechoslovakia, but as a Jew I should not be damaged any more than my Christian neighbor would be. And there are many Jews—and I know many of them—who share this conviction, profoundly. There is even a strictly Orthodox group here, the Friends of Jerusalem, with similar views.

This is why I do not go along with Prof. Horowitz's first conclusion. Israel and black Africa or red China or white Finland can have whatever relationship they please. To the degree that such relationships might affect the United States, they affect the Jewish citizens thereof—not more and no less. To conceive of any relationship between two foreign countries as bearing on the relationship of different categories of citizens of our country to one another is stretching the long arm of coincidence past the breaking point. Any catalyst from any foreign country in solving our domestic problems will avail us Jews nothing, nor, I believe, do we even want it to be attempted. If fellow-citizens of America, of different colors and/or religions, cannot arrive at a satisfactory symbiosis directly on their own ground, by their own efforts and on their own predicaments, then all of us are on the wrong planet.

Richard Korn
New York, N.Y.

Irving Louis Horowitz Responds:

Needless to say, it is always a delight to receive kind and good words on an article—particularly when the commentary is as articulate as Mr. Korn's.

I agree with Mr. Korn that there is a sense in which the downfall of any nation-state—particularly one of real substantive worth—is as catastrophic as the downfall of any other; and at the level of the nation-state, the comparison he makes between the possible fall of Israel and, let's say, the fall of Czechoslovakia to Hitlerism in 1938 is indeed comparable. However, I do believe that there are both religious and ethnic dimensions that make it difficult to speak of the fall of Israel as simply the fall of a nation-state. Indeed, the very dimensions I was alluding to in my article indicate that the entire Middle East cannot be spoken of simply in nation-state terms. There are matters of people as well as nations involved; and I think in this the irony is that both the Israelis and the Arabs have a shared sense of parenthood and destiny, which indeed makes the solution to the national question all that much more difficult and complex.

More on India

To the Editors: Worldview's three articles on India in the August issue contribute to the stocktaking following the 1971 crisis and its results. Doubtless, as Gunar Myrdal says, Gandhi might be disappointed in evidence of corruption and violence and the postponement of economic and social reforms. Yet the reforms (some of which the Mahatma might not have understood or endorsed) are under way in a new wave of postwar confidence and some euphoria. Perhaps the new India will make progress on its long-standing ambition to become more self-reliant.

James V. Schall comments that India's use of military force means that it "deliberately renounced" an ethical quality to its public policies but doubts that the change is a substantial loss because the quality was exaggerated. Yet the ethical quality was often blended with realism, as in the first Kashmir episode and the taking of Goa. India applied this mix in the East Bengal affair, helping victims of repression while the world did nothing and also reducing Pakistan by half. Ernest W. Ranly's discussion of the Fourteen-Day War as a justified war can be placed into the context of Indian traditions without distorting them. To interpret Indian behavior in 1971 as contrary to its own values would be to miss its subtleties.

More might have been said by the writers about the Nixon Administration's callous and inept response to the crisis. Washington's recognition of Bangladesh has helped American-Indian relations. But they could im-
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The Pacific Rivals
by the Staff of Asahi Shimbun.
(Foreword by Edwin O. Reischauer; Weatherhill/Asahi; 431 pp.; $10.00)

The title is misleading, for the focus is not on rivalry in the Pacific. The book is, rather, as the subtitle suggests, "A Japanese View of Japanese-American Relations." Imagine, if you will, a Tokyo resident reading 400 pages of articles from the New York Times on Japan and you get some idea of what this volume, put together by the staff of one of Japan's leading newspapers, is about. Imagining the American counterpart to the book is difficult, however, because neither the Times nor any U.S. newspaper has devoted that much attention to Japan. The reasons are obvious—not the least being that we conquered and occupied their country—but the result is nonetheless a "curtain of ignorance" for which Americans are primarily responsible. Pacific Rivals is composed of several hundred brief articles focusing on history, economics and politics. Although religion and culture tend to be shortchanged, the collection remains an eminently useful reader that explains the daisy-plucking ambivalences of Japanese love, resentment, admiration, disgust, hatred, and apparently endless fascination for America.
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prove further if both sides discarded outdated or untrue images of one another.
Paul F. Power
Department of Political Science,
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, Ohio

American Community
To the Editors: In "The Death and Rebirth of American Community" (Worldview, July) James Sellers writes about the greatest affliction a society can suffer: the lack of life-informing myths. I regret that his article was so tentative and question-begging. But I do not blame him for this. Having myself on several occasions written on the same theme and not got much beyond the starting line, I realize the difficulties involved and so am always grateful for a fellow-grasper's efforts.

In that spirit, then, I offer the following observations. I take it that Mr. Sellers would agree with me that the great intellectual and political task of our century is to restore the category of life to a position of primacy in our thinking, our talking and our doing. To this end it is helpful to invoke, as he does, mythic archetypes. Mythology is the strongest and most persuasive affirmation of life that human culture has furnished. I am not altogether happy with the appeal to initiation rites, however. For one thing, the practical rite of initiation in our own society is enacted in the schools. But the latter are so much part of the problem under discussion that I wonder if we can continue to look hopefully to them for any solution. Second, initiation rites suppose that there is some more or less stable and accepted scheme of values into which the young can be initiated. Again, it is this scheme that is under protest. Thirdly, since Sellers is much concerned with the hero theme, I think it might be better to stress the classic hero's mythic path through separation from present values, to contact with a deeper vision, to a return with some salvific message. Separation-renewal-return. Our present predicament could then be located somewhere between the first and second step. It is true that America has departed from its innocence and "died" to its "recent past." But it has not yet made effective contact with those sources of replenishment that make a "moral revolution" promising. It does little good to appeal to such "structural bonds" as federal power and property holding. Equally well one could argue that these are prime causes of our alienation. And I fear that Mr. Sellers is quite wrong when he says that the gladiator hero of the American past is no longer reflected in the movies. The Godfather and Detective Doyle (to cite but two examples from recent film fare) are very much "aggressive, masculine and egoistic."

I agree that there are "stirrings." The voices of creative protest he mentions—blacks, women, students, the poor—are real enough and significant. But one stirring is conspicuously absent from most of our deliberations on this question, and I refer to an affirmation of the continuity and solidarity of all forms of life. We cannot both hope for rebirth and, for example, continue our exploitative ways with nature. As the poet Wendell Berry has written beautifully: "There is no earthly promise of life or peace but where the roots branch and weave their patient passages in the dark." We reach step two of the mythic pattern when we learn again the fertilizing power of the earth and the humbling lesson that man too is subject to the eternal rhythms of all living things, that there is a necessary homology between things cosmic and things human. Because we have forgotten this we have (as Berry says) made ourselves lonely among the creatures and have alienated ourselves from the ways of creation.

Sellers touches gold when he says that the Declaration of Independence needs to be worked over by a new generation of artists and story tellers. And not just this document...
but our experience as a whole. It is, again, one of mythology’s enduring lessons that our existence is stale and flat until it is transformed by the vivifying touch of the artist. But I would hope that the task be proposed would be carried out in rich anthropological context rather than a narrowly political sense. A “saving myth for all of us” implies much more than equal rights for minority groups. And we would go very wrong if we limited our efforts to bringing about a “new American myth.” One of my correspondents (Robert Reiss of Arlington, Va.) suggests that the 200th Anniversary of the promulgation of a Declaration of Independence be celebrated by the promulgation of a Declaration of Interdependence of all peoples. He writes: “It would seem appropriate when the United States marks this event, having developed from a small nation to a nation of world stature, and when many other peoples have won political independence or are in the process of doing so, that the emphasis in world affairs should be changed from political independence to human interdependence, from political values to humane values, to those natural attributes which underlie all human aspirations and action—regardless of nationality, race, color, religion, economic and technological development, or of political systems” (my emphasis).

The ancient doctrine that the human psyche is woven into the fabric of the whole world, that we live best when we acknowledge this community of living things, is the fons et origo of images of rebirth, or, as I prefer to call them, images of wholeness. One regular exercise I engage in with my students is to scrutinize our art and culture for such images. We don’t come up with too many in a century that has been dominated by so many negative images. Most frequently mentioned are such images as the swim scene in Camus’s The Plague and Zorba’s dance. Next in order of frequency are the various images of community now emerging (some of which Sellers mentions). Now and again a student will bring up the architecture of Paolo Soleri or the cosmic vision in Dr. Zhivago. Occasionally, too, some of the better students call attention to centering images in such poets as Wallace Stevens or George Sotratis.

I think it would be a very useful service at the present time to draw up a reasonably complete inventory of such images (as a step toward offsetting the prevailing negativity and directing attitudes toward a more celebratory way of life), and I would be grateful to any readers of Worldview who care to contribute some.

Bernard Murchland
Department of Philosophy,
Ohio Wesleyan University

James Sellers Responds:
Mr. Murchland and I have little to quarrel about. On most of the points about which we seem to disagree, I am inclined to say, quite simply, that he presents convincing counterarguments.

On two points, however, I would like to respond.

First, Mr. Murchland has misunderstood me if he thinks I made an “appeal” of some kind to the “structural bonds” of federal power and private property. What I said was that these bonds are so tightly in place that it may be futile to assault them directly by conventional revolutionary means—hence our need of alternatives; of mythic images, for example, that will push toward a change of identity by other means.

Second, one can easily argue, as he does, that classical American hero types, aggressive and egoistic, do continue to appear in the movies and other art forms. What I was concerned to show is that a new image of hero is now appearing and that it, rather than the older image, may have to bear the burden of our next crisis. The question is which of these two images is more salutary, hence more living. In the sense that the older image of hero cannot any longer “save” us, I argued that this image is suffering the fate of any symbol that no longer truly symbolizes: it is dead or dying.

STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND CIRCULATION
(Act of August 12, 1970; Section 3685, Title 39, United States Code)

1. Title of Publication: WORLDVIEW
2. Date of Filing: September 29, 1972
3. Frequency of Issue: Monthly
4. Location of known office of publication: 170 East 64th Street, New York, N.Y. 10021
5. Location of the headquarters or general business offices of the publishers: Same
6. Names and addresses of publisher, editor, and managing editor: Publisher: Council on Religion and International Affairs, address as above Editor: James Finn, address as above Managing Editor: Susan Woolfson, address as above
7. Owner: None. The Council is a private operating foundation.
8. Known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding one percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages or other securities
9. For optional completion by publishers mailing at the regulatory rates (Section 133.121, Postal Service Manual)
39 U.S.C. 3626 provides in part: “No person who would have been entitled to mail matter under former section 4359 of this title shall mail such matter at the rates provided under this subsection unless he files annually with the Postal Service a written request for permission to mail matter at such rates.”
In accordance with the provisions of this statute, I hereby request permission to mail the publication named in Item 1 at the reduced postage rates presently authorized by 39 U.S.C. 3626.

11. Extent and nature of circulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average no. copies</th>
<th>Actual number of copies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of each issue during preceding 12 months</td>
<td>of single issue published nearest to filing date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| A. Total no. copies printed | 5985 | 6340 |
| B. Paid Circulation | | |
| 1. Sales through dealers and carriers, street vendors and counter sales | 404 | 900 |
| 2. Mail subscriptions | 2524 | 3252 |
| C. Total paid circulation | 3385 | 4152 |
| D. Free distribution by mail, carrier or other means | | |
| 1. Samples, complimentary, and other free copies | 181 | 250 |
| 2. Copies distributed to news agents, but not sold | 1659 | 1600 |
| E. Total distribution (sum of C & D) | 5205 | 6002 |
| F. Office use, left-over, unaccounted, spoiled after printing | 680 | 338 |
| G. Total (sum of E & F—should equal net press run shown in A) | 5985 | 6340 |

I certify that the statements made by me above are correct and complete.

(signed) SUSAN WOOLFSON

PS Form 3526 July 1971