

Zionism

Anna Rist

The Editor has responded to my criticism of what has often seemed to me the almost automatically pro-Palestinian "line" followed by this and other journals when treating of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, by agreeing to publish this article in which I set out to redress the balance by supplying some of the crucial facts of Israeli and Jewish history which are ignored by partisan accounts. To omit more recent examples of this kind of bias, the reviewer of Lucas Grollenberg's book *Palestine Comes First* in "New Blackfriars" of May 1980, after giving a tendentious resume of the "true facts" of the history of the conflict which glossed over a number of salient facts, ended with the revealing assertion that since Grollenberg's facts are "right", any other account is "wrong" and therefore should not be published — an attitude which should speak for itself. Fair-minded people — as one assumes the great majority of the readers of *New Blackfriars* strive to be — will wish to weigh all relevant facts. This account aims not to deny legitimate Palestinian claims but to supply some facts which are the context of those claims and to invite readers to enter into the minds of the other side in the historical conflict, the Israelis and the wider Jewish community. It will already be clear, I hope, that for me "fair-minded" does not necessarily equal fashionable liberal *bien-pensant*.

Since I first wrote this article then has come the unlooked for breakthrough of the P.L.O.—Israeli accord of September 1993, which gives hope of further steps toward a peaceful solution of both sides' needs and an eventual and exemplary burying of the hatchet, and even of the fruitful co-existence of both parties, to the great benefit of the civilized world. I know that this vision is already at work like a leaven in the hearts and minds of many Israelis. That the path to this Promised Land will be far from easy is obvious, even without the attempts at sabotaging by a number of violent and unreasoning interest-groups, but the enterprise is afoot and needs our assiduous prayers. It also deserves that we give up all unthinking rhetoric and increase our understanding of Jew as well as of Arab.

I will begin by declaring my own interest. Perhaps surprisingly,

since I am “half” Jewish, when I first became aware of the conflict, in the 1960s, I was inclined to accept the simplistically pro-Palestinian position probably assumed by most of the academic circle in which I moved. In particular, among our friends was a very likeable and unexceptionable Christian Arab refugee, whose family had been dispossessed of their land. My Jewish relations were happy enough in England, where some of the family had been for several generations, and not very interested in Zionism, so when in the ‘seventies a school-friend with husband and four children pulled out of a comfortable life in Canada to settle in Israel, my fondness for her allowed me to look on this as a quirk no doubt understandable from her point of view. We had survived the War as children and I instinctively shied away from looking too closely at the horror which came to be referred to as the Holocaust. I felt that in my father it had confirmed a strong sense of inferiority about being Jewish: a race everywhere despised, and by Nazis deemed fit only for degradation and slavery followed by extermination. He told of a trip through Germany in the early thirties with a friend, how they met up with some German youths who, when it dawned on them that these new English acquaintance were Jews, actually cowered away from them in mingled fear and contempt. with exclamations of “Juden!” “Sind Sie *Juden?*” I recalled this much later when I read of how the young Freud, seeing his father submitting to being jostled in the street. received a lifelong impress which surely influenced his interpretation of what was sick in Catholic Vienna. I did not want to feel inferior and so preferred to concentrate on my mother’s unassailable Englishness. To this day, I believe, I could not visit the site of Auschwitz, nor even the Holocaust Museum in Jerusalem. Contact with my friend, a serious-minded girl who learned Hebrew at the weekends, made some inroads on this defensiveness. Once she lent me a book about the Nazi persecution, but I read little of it, I did not want to know.

Nor do others. The world at large has become inured to the Holocaust; there are even moves to pretend it did not happen. The very word is convenient for docketing and disposing of it: one more regrettable episode to be laid at the door of a few fanatics. I have heard a German professor complain that it is false to say that six million Jews were murdered: it was only five and a half million. And when an exceptional priest spoke during a sermon of the chagrin he had felt at the revelations after the War, a member of his congregation followed up with a pointed ‘bidding-prayer’ for the gypsies slaughtered in the camps. On the surface, of course, the prayer was unexceptionable: in the context the clear message for the congregation was: “Don’t suppose

that Jews were special or the only ones, just because they make a fuss about it." Of course, they were not the only ones: gypsies fared no, and Slavs little, better, not to mention the deformed and the defective: all were *Untermenschen* and must make room for the self-styled Master-race.

But there is a particular reason why Christians should keep the countless Jewish victims in mind. Not only because the Jews were our forefathers in the faith which was God's chosen preparation for the Redemption in Jesus the Messiah (Christ) — or, as Pope John XXIII movingly expressed it when receiving a Jewish delegation. "I am your brother Joseph": not only because Judaism is still the world-religion closest to Christianity in outlook and aspiration; but even more because of the longstanding persecution by Christians of Jews in many parts of Europe, where their ancestors had settled in the diaspora following the Roman campaign against Judea in A.D.70.

This inveterate experience of persecution, hardly calculated to draw Jews to Christianity as the religion of brotherly love, made the Jewish communities all the more inward-looking and added an underdog's subservience to dealings with Gentile neighbours. To these the Jew was most obviously useful as banker and money-lender, since the Biblical prohibition on taking interest on a loan was binding on Christians, but on Jews only as between Jews. Denied most openings in national life and the professions, not a few turned their talents in this direction, one calculated to make them the more odious in the eyes of their clients, for whom they in turn had scant friendly feeling. So a reputation for rapacity and guile helped to justify the populace's antipathy to this alien in their midst who, forced to live by his wits, often seemed uncannily good at whatever he turned his hand to! "This repugnance (became) almost instinctive over a thousand years of history". writes Maxime Rodinson in *Israel and the Arabs*. Professor Rodinson a French Marxist Orientalist and student of Islam, is Jewish and has lived and worked extensively in Arab lands; his account can be recommended as by no means biased towards Zionism. That the repugnance of which he speaks still operates in contemporary Britain is attested by the quite recent trial of Lady Birdwood for distributing hate-literature which even repeated the medieval "blood-libel" about Jews murdering Christian children.

In the consciousness of innumerable Christians whom God alone can judge, the Jew's original sin was that of having "sold Christ". The very name of the traitor Judas means "Jew". and in making inferences from this etymology — as was done in reverse on an ITV programme during in Holy Week 1993— it can be conveniently forgotten that

another disciple of Jesus, the unassuming “Patron of lost causes”, bears the same name. The cry of the whipped-up multitude as reported in the Gospel, “His blood be upon us and upon our children!” was looked upon throughout Europe as a pretext to victimize those Jews who would not accept baptism. For some even baptism could not wash away the hereditary taint in the eyes of their Christian neighbours. Tens of thousands were massacred, tortured, burnt at the stake or driven to suicide. In 1190 the Jews of York took refuge from their persecutors in the Castle and rather than be handed over to a murderous mob outside, killed themselves and their families to the last man, woman and child.

Survival lay in mobility and in an intensified adherence to their faith in their role as God’s chosen people. Indeed, needing to explain to themselves the hostility they aroused and naturally not as ready as “Christians” to see it as proof of their wrongness and inferiority — they attributed their sufferings precisely to this role, and accepted them with a resignation to which their heartbreaking literature attests. Had not the Maccabees — whose moving story is also read on feasts of the Church’s martyrs — set them the undying example of martyrdom? It was not until the nineteenth century, with the growth of Liberalism in numbers of secularized Jews began to achieve relatively secure positions, particularly in German society. Thus the conviction began to grow that no-one would help them if not themselves. Conservative forces, including the Churches, often found it convenient to make appeal to inveterate prejudice by branding as “semitic” plots the manifestations of the new Liberalism. In western Europe, despite some episodes of which the Dreyfus case is the most notorious, anti-Semitism mainly subsided underground, waiting to be whipped up by a Hitler in a period of national grievance. But in the Russian empire, where Jews were obliged by law to reside within the Pale of Settlement (effectively Poland), they were subject to hideous pogroms. I exist — under God — because in the late nineteenth century my grandfather — whose third son was to fall in love with a daughter of an old Catholic family — was taken from Krakow to London as a boy by his widowed mother, part of a great Westward migration of Jews from the harsh laws promulgated by Czar Alexander III and the renewed wave of violence ushered in by his reign, which continued sporadically until the end of the regime in 1917 and the abolition of the Pale of Settlement. The pogroms, though often fomented by a government willing to divert public discontent from its true causes onto an age-old scapegoat, were made possible because anti-Semitism had become endemic in Catholic Poland as well as Orthodox Russia and with the connivance of both Churches. England under Cromwell — for whom eschatological theory

coincided with economic advantage — had become relatively tolerant of Jews and remained so, but the culminating blot upon the Polish record is that when, after the Second World War, a remnant of Polish Jews who had escaped from the Nazis tried to return to their homes, they were turned upon and forced to flee again.

I do not want to suggest that their tragic experiences in Christian lands justify everything that Jews or Zionists do or desire. What it is necessary to understand is that the movement known as Zionism which, beginning in the nineteenth century, climaxed in the setting up of the state of Israel in 1947, was a response to this long history of persecution. The so-called Holocaust came as the horrific confirmation of the needs which the Zionists had long maintained, for a national identity and habitation for the Jewish people. Other localities were considered, but Palestine answered the age-long nostalgia of the Jews for their ancestral homeland, where, moreover, communities of Jews had persisted, and at times flourished, since Biblical times: Tiberias, Hebron and Safed, as well as Jerusalem, were centres of rabbinical learning.

This and other facts stand over against the popular misconception that Palestine before 1947 was simply an Arab nation, or even state, which the Zionists somehow appropriated. The state of ignorance on this history may be illustrated by a relatively educated Catholic I met who evinced a “politically correct” distaste for everything connected with the state of Israel, but did not know that that state had been authorized by the United Nations — and did not want to believe it when told! For those willing to face them what are the other relevant facts?

Until the 1914-18 War, Palestine, an area which included modern Jordan, was a neglected territory of the decaying Empire of the Ottoman Turks, sparsely populated, mainly by Arab village-dwellers and by the nomadic Bedouin, apart from its Jewish centres and the ancient ports of its Mediterranean seaboard, with their motley populations. In the late nineteenth century, a movement to create a haven from persecution in the Biblical homeland saw small groups of settlers begin to reclaim the Palestinian soil; agriculture was an occupation from which Jews had long been cut off by life in the ghettos and in which they hoped to find a new sense of identity. From these beginnings developed the collective farms (*kibbutzim*) and co-operatives (*moshavim*).

It was not only Jews who over the centuries had dreamed of an *Aliyah*, a Return to the Promised Land; gentiles who also had envisaged it include Napoleon Bonaparte and Lord Shaftesbury. But

the official birth of the Zionist movement can be dated to 1897 when the Viennese Dr. Theodor Herzl, convinced finally by the Dreyfus case that a national homeland was the only solution for Jews, convened a conference and set up the World Zionist Organization. The Father of Zionism died seven years later at the age of forty-four, worn out by his labours in the cause.

Immigration continued. Agricultural settlements and the wine industry were fostered by Baron Edmond de Rothschild, he whose sons became bankers to most of Europe. Early in the present century a group of Jews in Jaffa, then the gateway to Palestine, bought a tract of land to the north of the city, on which was begun the settlement which in time was to be named Tel Aviv.

The Great War was a turning point. In November 1917, the British government, in consultation with those of France and Italy, issued through the Foreign Secretary, Lord Balfour, a declaration of intent to set up a Jewish National Home in Palestine, and this was endorsed by other powers, including the United States. Whether an independent state was envisaged remained unspecified; this development was, however, explicitly accepted by, among others, Lloyd George and President Wilson. As a result of the war, the League of Nations granted Britain a mandate to administer Palestine, and into this mandate was specifically written the Balfour Declaration. However, British hopes of ruling Palestine when the Ottoman Empire fell, together with the influence of General Allenby and of T. E. Lawrence who with his Bedouin forces had helped to bring about Turkish defeat, had by now further weakened British resolve, as had a series of Arab attacks on Jews in 1920 and 1921. With the thirties, the British began to fear Arab support for the growing power of Nazi Germany. Already the Mufti of Jerusalem, whom Lord Samuel, the British High Commissioner and a Jew, had appointed despite a previous conviction for inflammatory anti-Jewish activity, was a friend and ally of Hitler, whose genocidal intentions he approved.

New limits were imposed on Jewish immigration. In the early thirties, desperate shiploads of refugees from Nazism set sail from Rumania. but few both survived the voyage and eluded deportation by the British. After the War the new Jewish International Agency set itself to smuggle survivors out of the Displaced Persons camps and aboard ships bound for Haifa, manned by the Palestinian Jews defence organization, the Haganah. Ugly scenes ensued in which those who fell foul of the Royal Navy blockades were herded into cages and deported to Cyprus. The most notorious episode involved the *Exodus 1947* which sustained battle with British destroyers off the coast of Palestine.

Under orders from the then Foreign Secretary, Ernest Bevin, its four-thousand-five-hundred passengers were returned in caged vessels to their port of embarkation in southern France, where a diplomatic stalemate detained them on board for three weeks before orders came from London to return them to the Displaced Persons camps in Germany, adding another month's voyage to their ordeal.

The response of some Zionists to British obstructionism was a more extreme nationalism, which caused a split in the Haganah from which issued the Irgun. From this in turn split off in 1948 the fanatical Stern Gang, which viewed Britain rather than Germany as the real enemy and terrorism as a legitimate weapon. As happens with nationalist movements, there were divided aims. Extremists in the Irgun, who wanted a purely Jewish state, took to terrorist tactics. Their most notorious act was the blowing up of the King David Hotel in Jerusalem in July 1946 — though the Haganah, and officially the Irgun also, envisaged a multinational state with equal rights for both Jewish and Arab citizens. These differing aims have continued to be reflected in the two main political parties in Israel. It is notorious that the two last prime ministers from the Likud Party had a terrorist background: Benjamin Netanyahu is the first leader of Likud—now in opposition—to have grown up in a relatively stable Israel. It has been further unfortunate that while votes are almost evenly divided between Labour and Likud — now less than formerly the respective parties of the Ashkenazi (European Jews) and the Sephardim (Asiatics) — the Israeli system of proportional representation has tended to leave disproportionate power with minuscule right-wing and ultrareligious parties.

On 29 November 1947 the United Nations passed a resolution partitioning Palestine into two states, one Arab and one Jewish, with Jerusalem an International city. The Arabs rejected the partition out of hand. It would have secured them the central portions of Palestine ("Judea and Samaria" and much of Galilee) as well as the Gaza strip and a border with Egypt, while the Jews were assigned the desert area of the Negev, the coastal strip from Acre to south of Tel Aviv (excluding Jaffa) and Eastern Galilee, as well as Jewish settlements in the designated Arab parts.

On 14th February 1947, Bevin announced that Britain would withdraw from Palestine. On 14 May 1948 this withdrawal commenced and David Ben Gurion proclaimed the State of Israel. Between those dates, fighting and terrorism by both Arabs and Jews took place with but small British intervention, usually in the Arabs' favour. A force of Arab irregulars entered Palestine, attacked settlements and besieged the

Jewish Quarter of Jerusalem. The Irgun responded with reprisals culminating in a massacre of the inhabitants of the village of Deir Yassin, undoubtedly meant to terrorize Arabs into fleeing. A few days later Arabs ambushed a hospital convoy on its way to Jerusalem: after an epic resistance, most of its personnel of doctors and nurses were dead.

The night of the proclamation of the State of Israel, the Egyptians bombed Tel Aviv, and the following day saw a combined onslaught by the armies of the neighbouring Arab states, united in a pledge to annihilate the nascent state. But in the eight-month war which followed. David repulsed Goliath. At its end Israel, in addition to the Negev and the coastal strip assigned to her, held all of Galilee as well as a corridor to Jerusalem. The Arabs held Judea and Samaria and the Old City of Jerusalem — what became known as the “West Bank” of the newly named Kingdom of Jordan. The siege of the Jewish Quarter by the Arab Legion is another epic tale. When resistance, organized by one of the rabbis, finally collapsed, its synagogues and houses were razed and burned, to rise from the ashes after the war of 1967.

For no peace was made, nor could be, while the Arabs remained committed to Israel’s destruction — to “driving the Jews into the sea”, as their rhetoric ran — and the refugee problem on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip now added fuel to their resentment. Many Arabs had fled from their homes, the more readily in that they expected imminent victory. Certainly many were intimidated or dispossessed. Others became citizens of Israel, not a few living in prosperity and all with the new-found advantages of a modern welfare state. Education was provided in Arabic — Israel’s second official language — by Arab teachers, and Arab representation was provided for at local and even at national level, though hampered by the systematic intimidation of Arabs who might have come forward for these roles.

I point to these facts not to deny the wrongs that were perpetrated but in mitigation of the stereotype of the Israeli or the Jew which many Catholics and others seem to subscribe to without thought and without troubling themselves to get to know any of the people they so dismiss. So it comes to be overlooked that Jewish religion and culture emphasise justice and brotherly love, and that many Israelis are personally sympathetic to their Arab neighbours. My school-friend, practising as a doctor near Haifa, has perhaps a special love for the Bedouin women and children among her patients, and Fr. Marcel Dubois O.P. narrates a particularly poignant episode during the Yom Kippur War, in his fascinating book “L’Exil et la Demeure” (Jerusalem 1984, p 173: “Jacob eut Peur et il s’Attrista”).

We must pass rapidly over the conflicts of the near halfcentury of Israeli history. Israel was readily persuaded to join Britain and France in the Suez adventure of 1956 and overran Sinai and the Gaza strip, but subsequently withdrew. In 1967 the build-up of Arab threats of a Holy War which surrounded Nasser's blockade of the Straits of Tiran led to the Six Day War in which those territories were reconquered, the West Bank occupied and also the Golan Heights — from where the Syrians had long been accustomed to bombard Israeli settlements and set fire to crops. Of a different kind of significance was the capture of East Jerusalem from Jordan. Fr. Dubois reports that such was the discipline and spirit of the Israeli army that in the fighting in Jerusalem no single act of rape was committed. But from that time on most — not all — Israelis, however liberal their attitude to the Palestinian question, will draw the line at ever again relinquishing any part of the Holy City.

In 1973 on Yom Kippur, the Day of Atonement, when Jewish men had been fasting from both food and drink from sundown on the previous day the armies of Syria and Egypt concerted a renewed attack, the Egyptians breaking through the Sinai positions while through the Golan Heights and deep into Israel the Syrians mounted the biggest tank-offensive in history, turned back by the heroic self-sacrifice of many, including now of those young enough to have been born in the homeland they were called on to defend.

Throughout the seventies, sections of the Palestine Liberation Organization based in Lebanon conducted warfare across Israel's northern border, bombarding settlements in the Galilee. This was the period of Arab terrorist strikes throughout the world. Dissent among the Palestinian Arabs themselves led to anarchy in Lebanon and the intervention of Syria, bent on maintaining her balance of power with Iraq.

The election, by a small majority, of the Likud government in 1977 might be viewed as marking Act Two of the Israeli drama. The more idealistic Labour Party built by such people as Ben Gurion, General Moshe Dayan (himself an Arabist) and Golda Meir, and which broadly envisaged a pluralistic democracy with perhaps the surrender of some territories in return for guarantees of security ("Land for Peace"), was replaced by an outlook which regarded Judea and Samaria as rightly parts of the Jewish nation and their occupation by Arab forces in 1947 as illegal in view of the Palestinian re-election of the U.N. partition of Palestine.

None the less, in 1979 the Sinai peninsula was returned to Egypt as part of the Camp David agreement whereby the two countries normalized their relations — a piece of statesmanship which was to

cost President Sadat of Egypt his life at the hands of Muslim extremists. Syria and Iraq remained implacable. In 1982 Israel went on the offensive to try to end the P.L.O. base in Lebanon. The adventure foundered as world opinion was outraged by the massacres in two refugee camps adjacent to Beirut — actually perpetrated by Lebanese Christian militias, but the architects of Likud, General Sharon and Prime Minister Begin, were rightly held to share in the responsibility. It may be that they could not rely on Israeli troops — trained in a discipline and spirit derived from the British army, as well as from Jewish cultural norms — to engage in such acts.

That Israel needed to create a buffer zone in Southern Lebanon seems indisputable. As recently as 1990, when my son worked on a kibbutz on the Lebanese border, hardly a day passed without some incident: usually an unlucky Palestinian youth or two, armed not merely with a Kalashnikov and grenades but with the Koran and the promise of a martyr's reward, and quite possibly drugged, would be propelled across the border to create what mayhem they might.

Indignation against Israel came to centre upon her refusal to end her occupation of the West Bank. In the Eighties hardline Zionists began to settle there with the intention of creating a *fait accompli* and then with the Nineties came the tide of immigrants from the former Soviet Union, where long habits of anti-semitism were still operative, but which Jews had been prevented from leaving, their talents were too useful to the nations which despised them, and which now are set back by their loss! With a population thus swollen, the temptation has been great to use the Territories and at the same time increase security. Nor can anyone who has driven along the road between Jerusalem and Tel Aviv, where Israel is a mere coastal strip some ten or twelve miles wide, be unaware of her vulnerability if they are returned.

It is also easy to see that Israel's past experience even apart from the age-long Jewish experience — can hardly lead her citizens to regard any Arab guarantees along the lines of "land for peace" as worth anything unless backed by effective military supervision. At the point of writing, no peace-treaty has been signed with the parties to the aggression of 1967 which resulted in Israel's acquiring the Territories, with the now longstanding exception of Egypt. However, with the latest diplomatic breakthrough with the P.L.O. there are at last moves towards an agreement with Jordan, and though Syria and many other Arab and Muslim countries have continued to refuse to recognize Israel's right to exist, there are currently gleams of light on some of those horizons too. One is still entitled to ask what country in history, except Israel, has been expected to return territory it has occupied in

response to clear aggression, in the circumstances which have obtained up until now.

All these facts have to be held in mind when judging the attitudes and events of the current Peace negotiations. However, it now seems that Act Three of the Israeli drama opened with the election by a small majority of the Labour Party led by Itzhak Rabin, which has made possible the September Accord with the P.L.O. and a trial of Palestinian autonomy in Jericho and the Gaza Strip.

The Palestinian refugee camps created by the Wars of 1947 and 1967 have been, as could have been foreseen (— Supporters of “safe havens” for Bosnian Muslims seem equally blind to this result —). Yet the undoubted victimisation of their occupants cannot simply be laid at the door of Israel. Apart from the historic responsibility of the United Nations, Arab leaders have seen the camps as a propaganda item worth maintaining, and some attempts to build houses for the inhabitants foundered under threats of reprisals against those who occupied them, as well as under the fear of losing the camps themselves. Subsequently the *Intifada*, posing as a popular uprising, but actually a lavishly funded campaign of strikes and violence in which a lot of Arabs have been reluctantly acquiescent, has aimed at creating just the sort of provocation which leads to reprisals and a propaganda coup. With police and civilian lives at risk, it has sometimes succeeded, as in the notorious shootings on the Temple Mount. These were condemned by an Israeli court, and it is only just to note that far more often the *Intifada* has not succeeded in this aim.

In conclusion, it is relevant to point out to the liberal *bien pensant* that in taking sides with the Arabs in the Middle East conflict, one is not necessarily dealing with people who share one's outlook. Many Palestinian Arabs are Christians and may be better ones than their British counterparts precisely because they they are seldom in fact post-Christian liberals! — but we should not allow our natural sympathies for our brethren in religion to blind us to all other aspects of justice. Contemporary Islam, of which nearly all Arabs are adherents, has shown itself peculiarly prone to extremism. Power has always been viewed as the chief attribute of God, before Whose omnipotence the Muslim regards himself as dust. It was armed might which originally spread Islam; its founder, Mohammed, was perhaps the most successful conqueror in history, and his successors followed suit. Islamic sway extended to Poitiers in the Eighth Century and almost to Vienna in the Seventeenth. However regrettable and unChristian may have been the Crusades —originally Christendom's attempt to roll back Mohammed's conquests— Christianity does not

bear the same warlike character in its origins nor suffer the same indictment. The Crusades have provided a convenient folk-memory for Islam and have not been forgotten, as became patent in the hailing of Saddam Hussein as the new Saladin during the recent conflict with Iraq which involved the latest in the line of Arab assaults to remind Israelis of their continuing insecurity.

It is in keeping with this character that although an early and brief flowering of Islamic civilization proposed tolerance for the other faiths "of the Book", intolerance has been a far more marked feature of Islam. The reason there are almost no converts to other faiths — Take the whole history of French missions in North Africa — is that the convert is in his correlative eyes a renegade who has forfeited the right to life — as Salman Rushdie has done in their eyes for "heresy" even without renouncing Islam. I trust I hardly need to add that this is in no way to suggest that we are justified as Christians in condoning injustice against Muslims any more than against Jews.

I hope that I have shown that the Arab-Israeli conflict is a much more complex matter than many people realize. and that many want them to realize. and that the existence of the Jewish Homeland is an accomplishment, for once, of Western justice. Christians have an abominable record towards Jews. so that one might say that if the Jewish Sanhedrin and the Roman governor were jointly responsible for the crucifixion of the Jew Jesus, son in His human nature of the Jewess Mary. Christians also have crucified Christ over and again in His people. It is more than time that we examined our historic conscience in this matter, as recent Popes and the Second Vatican Council have provided leads in doing. If Jews had reason to feel that they could rely on Christians for justice, they would feel less the need to protect themselves at all costs, which can also mean at the cost of justice. It will take much time and perseverance before we can hope to change their long-conditioned distrust. It is not too early to begin.