troops. The U.S. energy crisis heightens the danger. General Yitzhak Rabin in an interview with Washington columnist Joseph Alsop, an ardent apologist for Israel, insisted that the U.S. cannot remain a world power unless it can control its supply of oil. The General said: "Your jugular . . . run[s] through the Persian Gulf. Yet you have no means to defend [it]. . . . [The U.S.] must cease to be a great power unless you can find means to solve this terrible problem." This insinuation that the U.S. must fight in the Middle East—directly or through Israel—is preposterous. Is it? Not at all.

Rabin was not just airing a private opinion. Much earlier, another Washington syndicated column reported that the Israelis have been talking about a shift in their relations with the United States. From Tel Aviv Rowland Evans and Robert Novak wrote: "Some Israeli [military and diplomatic] specialists . . . are now quietly pointing out that this military power [in Israel, resulting from the recent flood of U.S. arms there] can be useful to the U.S. in terms of the strategic balance in the Middle East and the Red Sea." The columnists went on: "Couched in . . . strategic terms were veiled prophecies that Israel could be America's savior if, for example, Saudi Arabia . . . were the sudden victim of a left-wing coup. Just how . . . is left unclear."

The implications are staggering. Evans and Novak concluded with their own warning: "Israeli military power may have a place in America's future, as indeed it did in the 1970 Jordanian civil war. But if that place becomes not merely peripheral but central, the entire West could suffer terribly in the future."

The suggestion of Rabin and the line of argument being insinuated by Israeli authorities were confirmed in a surprising way from the floor of the U.S. Senate on May 21, 1973, in a major speech by Senator J. William Fulbright. Foreseeing an "ominous possible scenario for the years ahead" in the Middle East he warned that as a result of the oil crisis U.S. "policy-makers and policy-influencers may come to the conclusion that military action is required to secure the oil resources of the Middle East, to secure our exposed 'jugular.'" He said: "*We might not even* have to do it ourselves, with militarily potent surrogates available in the region" (italics added). Referring to Iran, which has only recently ordered $2.5 billion worth of sophisticated weapons from the U.S., Senator Fulbright pointed out that the Shah of Iran is known to aspire to a "protecting" role for the Gulf region. Fulbright added that he had heard ominous talk of a possible Israeli strike against Libya similar to the one against Lebanon on April 10, 1973, and of the possibility of an Israeli invasion of Kuwait.

Senator Henry Jackson's reply to Fulbright on this point is interesting—especially in its phrasing. Jackson, branding as a "most unfortunate suggestion" Fulbright's warning that Iran and Israel might act as U.S. military agents in the Middle East, went on to say that, because "Arab apprehensions are even now a major source of instability in the Middle East," Fulbright in making the suggestion is "utterly irresponsible." But nowhere does Jackson deny that Fulbright's statements are correct.

What should Israel do differently? How should U.S. policy change? A prerequisite for answering is sober reflection on today's realities.

Correspondence

[from p. 2]

work. My job is a bore, but it's a good living. My creative interests do not pay me anything unless I can sell their products. What we need is a society where income is separated from work. But this is a different article. *But* in a moneyed society you *are more liberated* if you have money than if you don't. A matter of degree. This is why many feminists overromanticize work. They get money.

Irene Saylor

Harrisburg, Pa.

Mr. Barber will respond in a later issue to the letters from Dr. Liebert and Ms. Saylor and to other correspondents. Meanwhile, he writes:

I have checked the Paris phone book and find no Florence Ponce de Leon listed—a discovery which strengthens my suspicion that Florence Ponce de Leon may actually be a man, perhaps a chauvinist staffer at *Playboy*, intent on discrediting *Worldview*'s women readers. The letter is a caricature of the stereotypical traits chauvinist men are forever trying to impose on women: it is spiteful, mindless, petty, irrational, vindictive, and hysterically irrelevant to the substantive arguments advanced in "Man on Women."

But the stereotype is far too broadly drawn to fool anyone; and so, M? Ponce de Leon, your attempt to slander women by representing them so odiously must inevitably fail.

Israel & Jews for Nixon

To the Editors: As one of the "Nixon Jews" (what an unfortunate phrase!), I should like to comment on the article by Fred Lazin in the May, 1973, *Worldview* ("Rabin and Jews for Nixon"). Mr. Lazin attacks the former Israeli ambassador to the United States, Itzchak Rabin, for suggesting that the Jewish community (and Israel) gained as a result of the fact that heretofore loyal Democrats were persuaded to switch to President Nixon in the 1972 elections. Rabin's point was that now that Jewish voters could not be taken for granted by either of the two parties, the competition for support could only result in a

(continued on p. 63)

Correspondence

[*from page 47*]

gain. Lazin thinks that Rabin's observation was fallacious. His reasoning is based on the fact that American policy is not much influenced in any case by the "Jewish vote"; that the Jewish community does not care that much about Israel; and that in any case McGovern and Nixon had the same views about Israel.

Even if his thesis is correct, it still does not refute the obvious point: that whatever influence the Jewish voter has, whether little or much, it is enhanced if he is seen as not being in the pocket of either party. The fact of the matter is that the great interest shown by the press in the "Jewish vote" did serve to enlarge the impact of the Jewish community in the political life of the country.

However, Lazin's basic thesis is questionable. He quotes from the symposium "McGovern, Nixon and the Jews" in the September, 1972, issue of *Commentary* in which "it is argued [that] if McGovern were elected he would support Israel and its policies for the same reasons as Nixon." *What Lazin fails to mention* is that the *Commentary* symposium contained two articles—one by Nathan Galzer urging support for McGovern and one by Milton Himmelfarb calling for a Nixon vote.

The citation from *Commentary* brought by Lazin is from the pro-McGovern Glazer article. Himmelfarb says: "For a Jew, McGovern's inferiority to Nixon should be manifest." The fact that President Nixon was, in the words of the Israeli representative, the best friend Israel had ever had in the White House, was an important element in the mind of anyone concerned about Israel. The whole worldview of McGovern and his relationship to the geopolitical problems facing the Middle East were a matter of concern to many—Jew and non-Jew—who wanted to protect the integrity and security of Israel.

Now, of course, it is possible to see the situation differently and to believe that it makes no difference who is President—the attitude toward the Middle East will be the same. But this is a matter of legitimate debate and difference of opinion. Mr. Lazin is entitled to his opinion. Rabin was entitled to his opinion. And the voter—Jewish and non-Jewish—was certainly entitled to choose between the two options. Since the future peace of the world does in great measure depend on events occurring in that crucial part of the world, it is a legitimate issue in the Presidential elections, and not only for Jews. This was Rabin's point, and I do not see it refuted by Lazin.

Lazin is also wrong about the Jewish community. In his view, their fervent support of Israel is possible because it coincides for the moment with American foreign policy. He asks: "Does anyone really believe that the organized American Jewish community would publicly challenge a Presidential policy that claimed great popular support?" He cites as evidence the relative absence of militancy during the Holocaust period.

The fact of the matter is that the *organized Jewish community did* oppose the policies of Eisenhower and Dulles in 1956-57 during the Suez crisis and now supports the Jackson amendment. The thirties are different from the seventies in two crucial ways: The Holocaust *did* occur, and it is drummed into the minds of adults and youth that more Jews could have been saved had there been more activity on their behalf. The second factor is the existence of the State of Israel, which has affected the consciousness of the leaders of American Jewry.

Be that as it may, what I object to most in Lazin's statement is that he repeats the canard that the reason why a good percentage of Jews (by no means a majority) deserted the Democratic candidate was because "they were no longer willing to sacrifice in order to build a more just society." Again Himmelfarb, in the latest issue of *Commentary*, has shown that the richer the Jew the less likely he was to vote for Nixon. I know how hard it is for a person like Lazin to understand the fact that it is possible to believe that not only the policies of McGovernites would bring a "more just society." A good case can be made that justice is furthered by an open society, without quotas and schemes that only spend money but show few results. Of course it is possible to argue in the reverse. But the point is that people like Lazin (who usually pride themselves on their "liberalism") ascribe only base motives to others and good motives to themselves. It was a revulsion against this kind of self-righteousness that was partly responsible for the McGovern debacle.

Lazin's observation that the efforts of the "Nixon Jews" might have cooled the ardor of leftists for Israel would be sound if the anti-Israel attitude of radicals were not based on more profound sources. What motivates the opposition to Israel is the mystique of the Third World, support for the policies of the USSR and China, and a subtle kind of anti-Judaism which is evident in leftist literature. This has *little to do with whether Jews support* Nixon or do not support him.

Jews, like everyone else (perhaps more than other people), are complex and decide how to vote on the basis of different considerations. Some of these are "Jewish" and some of these are of a more general nature. If it is acceptable for blacks or unionists to take their interests into account, why is it wrong for Jews to ask whether candidates for public office would better serve their interests? It is the growing awareness among Jews of the legitimacy of this approach which troubles people like Lazin who believe that while others are permitted to take self-interest into their considerations, only Jews should be "universal."

Seymour Siegel
Jewish Theological Seminary of America
New York, N.Y.