

Correspondence

The "Peace Movement"

To the Editors: Permit a brief comment on James Finn's *Excursus III* ("Peace Against the U.S.," *Worldview*, May), which I have just had the chance to read and am in basic agreement with, but...

Whatever is meant by "peace movement"..."protest movement"....and "pacifist groups," which Finn variously uses in his notes, there is no doubt that the myriad of "peace-oriented" organizations have had difficulties in discerning a common standard of justice for our own country, the Soviet Union, the Third World, etc.

This difficulty has been far less a dilemma within the pacifist community—say, the AFSC, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the War Resisters League—than Finn notes. I raise this concern only because others have recently found it convenient to criticize the nonviolent movement for an illusory inconsistency.

That the Angola demonstration recently held should meander down to the Soviet Mission to the U.N. is less a surprise than a part of movement tedium. Merely to give a few examples:

—At the Montreal World's Fair a mass international march converged on both the USSR and U.S. pavilions to call for disarmament...

—In December, 1969, the WRL sponsored the first demonstration to use civil disobedience at the USSR Mission as part of a protest on behalf of dissenters within the Soviet Union (three of us went to jail for this, the case that established the right to protest in front of the Mission).

And, to skip to the present:

—In October, 1973, various pacifist groups called upon the parties to the Middle East conflict to cease all fighting and arms shipments. This included a visit to the USSR Mission...

—There have been three demonstrations since then that I know of including the Angola one; in fact, some of us have become "friendly" with both American and Soviet diplomats as a consequence of these contacts.

The inevitable irony is that there is little media reportage of such events as

these because they do not conform to preconceived stereotypes of what pacifists do. But we will try harder.

Allan Solomonov
Fellowship of Reconciliation
Nyack, N. Y.

Dependent Israel

To the Editors: In the excellent article "Dependent Israel: The Two Options" in the April issue of *Worldview* the authors [Mark Bruzonsky and Israel Singer] refer to Zionism as a political idea. I wish they would have developed the thought that the religious groups are promoting a military right-wing outlook. For it would seem to me that the answer to many of the problems is to recognize Zionism as a political entity and disestablish the Jewish religion.

Last November in a lecture in Jerusalem I heard Abba Eban refer to Hebrew and the requirement of an Ulpan as the basis of identity for the State of Israel. The language of the Old Testament or Bible has become a living language to welcome the Jew home to his native land. Thus the question I would raise is whether the lack of independence is due to the lack of a personal religious faith, which the Jews of America display but which is not evident in Israel. Were not the revivals and the testing of faith of the Great Awakening of the 1740's a necessary precondition to the American Revolution?

As a Christian, I would hope that the Old City of Jerusalem, as well as the Mount of Olives and Mount Scopus, would be part of a unified City of Jerusalem. The authors object to the ghetto mentality of Israel, yet use their boundary for Jerusalem as the Old City, which would return Mount Scopus to the boundaries of the Palestinian state.

Christopher Niebuhr
Albany, N.Y.

Mark Bruzonsky Responds:
That Jerusalem should be unified in the sense of being a single and open city is not at issue, we think. Various plans are being debated, including one by Lord Caradon, author of Security Council Resolution 242, who foresees two sister cities—one Jewish and one Arab—under a single municipal administration.

(Continued on p. 58)

WORLDVIEW

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of *Worldview* is to place public policies, particularly in international affairs, under close ethical scrutiny. The Council on Religion and International Affairs, which sponsors the journal, was founded in 1914 by religious and civic leaders brought together by Andrew Carnegie. It was mandated to work toward ending the barbarity of war, to encourage international cooperation, and to promote justice. The Council is independent and nonsectarian. *Worldview* is an important part of the Council's wide-ranging program in pursuit of these goals.

Worldview is open to diverse viewpoints and encourages dialogue and debate on issues of public significance. It is edited in the belief that large political questions cannot be considered adequately apart from ethical and religious reflection. The opinions expressed in *Worldview* do not necessarily reflect the positions of the Council. Through *Worldview* the Council aims to advance the national and international exchange without which our understanding will be dangerously limited.

Philip A. Johnson, *Publisher*

Editorial Board:

Hans Morgenthau, *Chairman*
William J. Barnds
Eugene B. Borowitz
Noel J. Brown
Jorge Dominguez
James Finn
J. Bryan Hehir
Donald F. McHenry
Paul Ramsey
Seymour Siegel
Paul Sigmund
Kenneth W. Thompson
Howard Wriggins

