

in deterrence and retaliation. To say that "true" peace afforded to Israel is conciled and forgiving neighborly move away from politics into utopia. We have the present without will be no future.

The argument that, in view of long-range shells and missiles no longer matter does not convince me. Every inch of advance of the Syrian in the Yom Kippur War has left its scar in our memory.

Now it is possible that at some time in the future, in the course of predictable shifts of power (precisely, the Powers), such a Palestinian state will be established anyhow. When that happens, we shall have to work at our salvation within the new parameters. I only hope that, if such a time comes, we shall have the opportunity to write to each other to discover what we think!

And in the meantime we must try to make the best of this unhappy situation. Protect ourselves against attack; control our own extremists; grant as much autonomy and freedom as possible; foster friendly contacts and show ourselves to be fair and reasonable and, whenever we can, generous. Since we cannot command affection, we must strive to earn respect, for our own sake as much as theirs.

It is possible to imagine, is it not, that with the passage of years the antagonisms will get blunted and some of the bitterness will fade? The leaders on both sides who are associated with the unyielding hostility will have left the scene. The loyalties and attachments in successive generations will have loosened; the hankering for return and revenge will have lost its edge. The magnet of the unmitigated Arab wealth will have gradually emptied the refugee camps. After all, it is not as if objectively the refugees had nowhere else to go and could not fashion a constructive life for themselves.

By the end of the century (not all that long to go), the vast majority of people in Israel will have been born there. The roots will have been struck ineradicably deep. The fact of Israel's existence will be time-honored and beyond questioning. A degree of ac-

(September 1982)

Fighting Intellectual Anti-Semitism

Jonathan D. Sarna

Among the many forms of contemporary anti-Semitism, few are more pernicious than the intellectual variety—that is, anti-Semitism with academic pretensions. The problem is not new. Almost eighty years ago, Solomon Schechter, then president of the Jewish Theological Seminary, coined the term "higher anti-Semitism" for that "which burns the soul though it leaves the body unhurt," and pointed out that it was a particular feature of "so-called civilized countries."

"Higher anti-Semitism" in Schechter's day took the form of pseudo-biblical scholarship attached to venomous attacks against Judaism and the Jewish people. Hatred also masked itself as the "science of race," which purported to demonstrate, in the words of Madison Grant, author of *The Passing of the Great Race*, that "The cross between a white man and an Indian is an Indian; the cross between a white man and a negro is a negro; and the cross between any of the three European races and a Jew is a Jew."

Today such intellectual anti-Semitism has largely disappeared. It has been replaced by hate-mongering in

Jonathan D. Sarna is the author of the forthcoming People Walk on Their Heads: Moses Weinberger's Jews and Judaism in New York (Holmes & Meier).

the cloak of history. Modern practitioners call it historical revisionism, and through it hope to achieve a radical reinterpretation of the past. At the center of revisionist studies stands the Institute for Historical Review. Among its publications is *The Journal of Historical Review*, which describes itself as a "scholarly" journal, and comes complete with the usual academic trappings.

A quick reading of *The Journal* suffices to penetrate its objective veneer. Featured in the first issue is an article by Arthur R. Butz, an associate professor of electrical engineering and computer sciences at Northwestern University, on "The International 'Holocaust' Controversy," which discusses the widely publicized theme, advanced in his book of the same name, that the Holocaust is "The Hoax of the Twentieth Century." Subsequent articles, many by academicians, "expose" other alleged "myths," employing tortuous logic, arguments from silence and misreading of evidence—all accompanied by extensive footnotes—to "prove" that concentration camp gas chambers were in reality nothing more than "cold storage rooms," that evidence documenting the Holocaust is "faked" and that those who truly suffered in World War II were non-Jews, Germans in particular.

Articles parroting Arab propaganda, with titles such as "The Mendacity of Zion" and "Palestine: Liberty and Justice," extend the process of "revisionism" to the Middle East crisis. Snide comments about the Talmud (such as "That particular tome is brim full of allusions to toiletry [*sic*] and sexual functions and dysfunctions"), and on worldwide Jewish power prove that "revisionism" is firmly planted in traditional anti-Semitism.

How can Jews respond to this malicious rigamarole? Four strategies suggest themselves. They are best described as outrage, silence, instruction and obstruction. Each has been put to use in different places at different times.

Outrage involves strong expressions of stunned shock with emotion determining response. Those who loudly express their feelings do so because they insist upon remembering Holocaust martyrs "in their very

guts and bones . . . lest their memory perish," as the philosopher Emil Fackenheim put it. His commandment not to hand Hitler yet another posthumous victory finds fulfillment through their mouths.

Users of this method, anxious to avoid being labeled "Jews of silence," scream their protests through every available medium. Defense agencies crank out press releases; letters are sent to local newspapers. Persons with non-Jewish friends in high places implore them to speak out; well-publicized demonstrations take place.

Unfortunately, the act of shouting *gewalt* often focuses attention on the very sentiments the shouters most wish to see forgotten. Those who attack intellectual anti-Semitism sometimes unwittingly gain it recognition. Many who would never have known anything about the Institute for Historical Review may learn about it only as a result of the protests.

Furthermore, the outrage approach may invite a "crying wolf" response—for the more often shouting is heard the less likely anyone is to listen. History teaches us that people become inured to moral outrage depressingly quickly.

Silence is the opposite approach to outrage. This method, fights anti-Semitism by seeming to ignore it, on the theory that publicity is precisely what hate groups crave.

"Notoriety, even the notoriety that results from adverse criticism, has advantages," Rabbi S. Andhil Fineberg advised almost four decades ago in his study, *Overcoming Anti-Semitism*. "Obscurity—total obscurity—is a sad and lonely void for agitators. If they have not yet escaped obscurity, don't furnish a ladder."

Few persons know what historian Lucy Dawidowicz discovered—that many of those involved in the Institute for Historical Review have for years also been involved in extremist right-wing activities of the Liberty Lobby, the best financed anti-Semitic organization in the United States. Though carefully monitored by several organizations, the Liberty Lobby has had little public attention lately, because no data was given to the media, on the ground that such publicity would do more harm than good. The same silent treatment, many ar-

gue, should be accorded the Institute for Historical Review.

One problem in remaining silent is that by not "answering" their enemies Jews expose themselves to the charge of being unable to answer.

Silence speaks an ambiguous message: contempt, or fear, or just plain bafflement. Many Americans view a "no comment" with suspicion, for often it means that someone has something to hide. Not to answer historical revisionists, for example, not only allows them to claim victory by default; it may actually lead some people to give credence to their charges.

Instruction assumes that hatred can be countered with hard facts. Harold E. Quinley and Charles Y. Glock concluded, in *Anti-Semitism in America*, that "Lack of education is the main source of anti-Semitic prejudice in America." They assert that instruction is the best way to reduce prejudice, since "anti-Semitism persists largely because people do not

know enough not to be anti-Semitic."

Those who follow this advice patiently respond to the claims of historical revisionists, hoping that truth will win out in the end. Since the majority of Americans now living have no conscious memories of the Holocaust (a fact that has received far too little attention) they must depend for information on what they learn from others. This theory holds that even if revisionists are not convinced by instructive refutations based on fact, some innocent readers at least might be.

Unfortunately, such well-meaning efforts can unwittingly accord hate-mongers both free publicity and a certain legitimacy. Their vicious ideas may wind up being regarded as serious contributions to the marketplace of ideas, and they themselves may emerge in the public mind as not evil, but just misguided. The controversy about the Holocaust could in the end be viewed as no more than a debate between two competing historical

Victims of America's indifference— and of Hitler's hatred.

For the first time, the callous neglect shown by our government toward post-war Jewish refugees has been fully documented. Leonard Dinnerstein draws on recently de-classified records to detail the shocking mistreatment of the already abused-refugees, the clumsy attempts at "repatriation," the U.S. immigration law that favored Nazi collaborators—and the struggle of a determined few to furnish real help to the cruelly neglected survivors.

"The shocking story of antisemitism, neglect and heroic effort.... A powerful, moving book."—*Publishers Weekly*

"Richly detailed, well-documented and thoroughly researched."—*Library Journal*

AMERICA AND THE SURVIVORS OF THE HOLOCAUST

Leonard Dinnerstein

\$19.95 Photos.
Contemporary American History Series,
William E. Leuchtenburg, General Editor

At your bookstore or direct from

 COLUMBIA
UNIVERSITY PRESS
136 South Broadway, Irvington, N.Y. 10533



interpretations—a far cry from the truth.

Obstruction neither legitimates nor ignores anti-Semites. Instead, its practitioners treat them as enemies and work to undermine them. Where other approaches are basically defensive, reacting to anti-Semitic denigrations and canards, those who practice obstruction seize the offensive and do battle on their own terms.

Most "obstructionists" use perfectly legal means: They work to cut off hatemongers' sources of support, seek media help in ostracism campaigns and support lawsuits brought by persons seeking legal redress from hate groups.

Acting to obstruct the Institute for Historical Review, Holocaust survivor Melvin Mermelstein sued the organization for seventeen million dollars (now reduced to one million) on the ground that the Institute breached its contract by not paying him a promised \$50,000 reward for proving that gassings took place at Auschwitz. The case is now before the Superior Court of California.

Others put pressure on the University of California to deny the Institute the right to hold its Third Annual Revisionist Convention at the University's Lake Arrowhead conference facility. Stimulated, the University discovered that the Institute employed "a pattern of deceit" in trying to rent the conference center.

But some groups, using ends to justify means, go beyond legal action. The Jewish Defense League, for example, justifies violent means of obstructing enemies on the unproven theory that this is necessary to save Jewish lives and prevent another Holocaust. The JDL has long chided traditional Jewish defense agencies for their alleged "timidity." Last June 25th, a group calling itself the Jewish Executioners with Silence (acronym JEWS) took credit for bombing the offices of the Institute for Historical Review, in Torrance, California, repeating the traditional JDL slogan: "Never again." According to the Institute's *Newsletter*, the bombing was the latest in a series of intimidations.

While historical reasons make concrete action to obstruct anti-Semitism seem appealing, the risks are great. Even if some believers, already com-

mitted to fighting for Jewish rights, silently applaud strong-arm tactics, what about the uncommitted and the ignorant? Because American society rightly frowns on those who substitute force for reason, obstructionist efforts can easily backfire and create sympathy for those who actually should be discredited.

Clearly, intellectual anti-Semites have Jews in an inescapable bind. To ignore them can prove to be dangerous; to pay them too much attention can be equally risky. Instruction may unintentionally grant them legitimacy, while obstruction may bring them sympathy. There is no miracle means of combating them.

Yet there is also no cause for despair. For while individually each method of responding has drawbacks, taken together the four methods can work remarkably well. Their unfortunate side effects tend to cancel each other out, while their benefits prove mutually reinforcing.

A little outrage, a little silence, a little instruction, a little obstruction—no better strategy for fighting anti-Semitism exists. The ideal mixture—the exact proportional balance—may prove elusive. But so long as all the right components are available and used, the American Jewish community can do battle successfully against even the most virulent of America's intellectual anti-Semites. □

Working Her Way Back

Fredelle Bruser Maynard

In the fairy tales which fired my childhood imagination, a hero often received a magic talisman before he set out on his quest. This talisman—a stone, an acorn, a bit of colored glass—looked so ordinary that the hero generally put it in his pocket and forgot about it. Then, in a moment of crisis, and usually by accident, the charmed object was produced. It destroyed the fire-breathing dragon, opened the door, worked its magic. The owner was as amazed as everyone else.

Fredelle Bruser Maynard lives in Toronto and wrote Raisins and Almonds, a memoir of a childhood on the Canadian prairies.

When I reflect on the curious course of my life, I see my Jewishness as just such a talisman. As a child, it seemed to me that to have been born a Jew was no great gift; quite the contrary. In the small towns of Western Canada during the 1920s and 1930s, Jewishness imposed if not a burden at least a considerable constraint. I felt excluded from the world of my playmates—the Sunday schools and family celebrations, the lusty singing of "Onward Christian Soldiers" and the prayers to gentle Jesus meek and mild. Furthermore, my Jewishness had little positive content. It was mostly a matter of not doing things other people did—not eating pork, not going to church, not entering (even playfully) into childhood romances because the only boys around were Christian boys.

My parents were not religious. My mother, the rebel in her Orthodox family, was a cheerful agnostic. My father, once a yeshiva student, remained quietly attached to his Judaism, but kept it, in effect, in the bureau drawer along with the tallis and phylacteries he took along in our wanderings across the prairies. I knew virtually nothing of the Jewish religion apart from a few prayers and the alphabet. I knew no Hebrew. I was never taught Yiddish, though I picked up a fair amount as a result of two powerful incentives. One was the series of long visits in Winnipeg with grandparents who spoke no English. The strain of sitting for hours not understanding and, worse, not talking, drove me to Yiddish. And the second challenge was that at home Yiddish was the language of adult secrets, and I decided I had to break the code.

As for the rituals and celebrations of Jewish life—shabbas, Hanukkah, Passover—those I experienced only on occasional visits with observant relatives. Until five years ago, I had never attended a bar mitzvah. I have never been to a *pidyon ha-ben* (ceremony on 31st day after birth for redemption of first-born son of ordinary Jews), never seen a *succa* at Sukkot. I first heard *Kol Nidre* sung in a synagogue when I was fifty years old. So my Jewishness consisted largely of a sentimental amalgam: the figures of my *baba* and *zayde* in their old country clothes, Sholem Aleichem's stories told by my father, blintzes and knishes, a roster of great men who were Jewish (Einstein, Meruhin, Horowitz) and a vague sense of