

a competitive edge in the economic struggle with Japan. He notes that the National Machine Tool Builders Association, which sent a study mission to Japan in 1981, did *not* find that Japan was more advanced technologically. The strength of the Japanese firms was due not simply to investment in equipment but to “dogged” long-term management, to “aggressive” marketing, and to the fact that the Japanese “pay an unusual amount of attention to the training and motivation of [their] work force.”

The issues raised by Melman and Noble will influence profoundly the life of everyone in this country; they deserve to be the focus of a sustained national debate. That debate is not taking place and shows no sign of starting, so it comes as no surprise that neither author displays much optimism about the future.

For Melman, the classic social contract—that is, the ability and willingness of management to carry out the efficient organization of work—has been broken. Economic renewal will require new modes of governance in economic life and, most fundamentally, the extension of decision-making power to those within the producing

occupations. While Melman offers a number of exciting possibilities for instituting the reforms he considers essential, there is at present little or no movement in this direction.

Noble envisions the promise of a rational and humane second Industrial Revolution in broader terms than Melman. Not only could it bring economic renewal, but also a more democratic, egalitarian, creative, and enjoyable society. But the social promises and consequences are excluded from the decision-making process, while the compulsion to make technical fixes continues, fueled by newly inflamed competitive fears:

“[W]e see not the revitalization of the nation’s industrial base but its further erosion; not the enlargement of resources but their depletion; not the replenishing of irreplaceable human skills but their final disappearance; not the greater wealth of the nation but its steady impoverishment; not an extension of democracy and equality but a concentration of power, a tightening of control, a strengthening of privilege; not the hopeful hymns of progress but the sadder sounds of despair, and disquiet.” **WV**

enables us to invent our own way of life, unwittingly brought into the world the unnatural condition of anarchy from which stems the destructive and tormented quality of what we call history. As we move forward, our task is to knit together a new wholeness to contain the pathogen of power and to allow our most humane values to dictate our destiny. The task is demonstrably begun and in the coming centuries can be achieved, God willing we have the time.

In the meanwhile, as we strive for this more whole order, we are compelled to wrestle with the problem of power and the painful more dilemmas it imposes upon us.

Andrew Bard Schmookler

Bethesda, Md.

Brian Thomas responds:

“For instance” may not be proof, but it can be refutation, which the case of Gandhi is for Schmookler’s parable—the alleged humaneness of the British empire notwithstanding. (The British have yet to relinquish Northern Ireland, by the way.) A disconfirming instance need not have universal application, and so I share Schmookler’s skepticism of nonviolent noncooperation as a method of Native Americans in their war against genocidal, territory-grabbing whites. I also share his hopes for containing “the pathogen of power” and allowing humane values to prevail. I remain skeptical of his parable.

Correspondence

TRIBAL CONFLICT

To the Editors: In his review of my book, *The Parable of the Tribes* (September '84), Brian Thomas begins by lamenting the cheerlessness of my theory of the role of power in shaping the development of civilization. He concludes by adducing the cheerier example of Gandhi and by declaring that this example “undermines the parable’s pretensions to explanatory power.” This does not do the theory justice.

Gandhi’s example suggests the glad tidings that we can have our cake and eat it too, i.e., that we can maintain moral purity and still win, rendering unto God what is God’s without having to pay a moral tax for living in Caesar’s realm. Would that it were so; would that the requirements for survival in a dangerous world did not compel us to make morally painful choices.

“For instance is not proof,” Mr. Thomas says in criticism of my method of argument—and of course he is right. That applies also to his use of Gandhi. Gandhi’s success with nonviolence occurred against perhaps the most humane and liberal of the imperial systems, and at a time when powers weakened by two devastating world wars

were having to relinquish their colonies anyway. Does this “for instance” really undermine my theory of the necessities imposed upon civilized peoples by the unrestrained play of power in an anarchic intersocietal system? It has been well asked, how many Gandhis have disappeared unnoticed and ineffectual into the Gulag? And is it plausible to think that Native Americans—and countless dispossessed and decimated peoples throughout history—could have escaped their fate had they been adept at practicing non-cooperation?

The inevitability of the rule of power in an anarchic world is the pessimistic thrust of the parable of the tribes. Mr. Thomas criticizes not only this dark view, but also the “discrepancy” between this and my optimistic goals. I’ve done my work too well, he says, leaving no escape hatch. But there is an escape, and a reason for optimism: The historic anarchy of the overarching intersocietal system need not be permanent.

We emerged out of the regime of nature, a harmoniously ordered system shaped by eons of biological evolution. Ten thousand years ago we, the creatures whose creativity

ISRAEL: THE INCIDENT IN QUESTION

To the Editors: Mark A. Bruzonsky’s contribution to your issue of September, 1984 (Excursus: “Israel: A Shameful Silence”), is a shameful statement, mixing half-truths, innuendo, and lies.

He says: “Last April 12 four teenage Israeli Palestinians commandeered a bus.” They were, he says, “not armed with guns.” He fails to say that these four terrorists (“teenage”) were armed with dangerous explosive devices, that the hijacked bus was an Egged passenger bus, that the terrorists held the passengers hostage and threatened to blow up both bus and passengers.

Mr. Bruzonsky talks of the length to which Israeli authorities went to suppress the evidence of “this occurrence” (the storming of the bus by Israeli forces and the death of two of the terrorists while in their custody) and observes that “for the first time in Israel’s history, an establishment Hebrew newspaper was closed.” He fails to disclose that the newspaper, *Hadashot*, was closed

because it violated an express censorship order on suppression which was applicable to all newspapers in accordance with Israeli security considerations. This act of publication by *Hadashot* was condemned by most other Israeli newspapers, which, even among Israel's severest critics, are not generally viewed as being overly sympathetic to the government.

He says that "under increasing pressure from within Israeli society itself, the Israeli Government finally established a secret Army commission—its report undisclosed to this day...."

The incident in question occurred on April 12, 1984. Shortly thereafter, Major General Meir Zorea was appointed by the defense minister to head a commission of inquiry into the causes of the deaths of the terrorists. By May 28, 1984, barely six weeks later, the commission had issued its report to the defense minister and the defense minister had issued his statement. This public statement appeared in the press the next day and was reported in the *Jerusalem Post* on May 29, 1984. The statement was a full one. It said in part:

"12. The commission's findings on the personal level point to suspicions that some security forces personnel broke the law. Accordingly, an investigation will be conducted into these suspicions, further to which it will be determined what legal steps will be taken. The investigation will be carried out by the investigation branch of the Military Police and the Israel Police, in conjunction with the State Attorney's Office. Similarly, disciplinary measures will be taken against a number of other members of the security forces who did not carry out the obligations they had in this instance.

"13. Findings on the institutional level, relating to the establishment of procedures for the detention of terrorists captured by security forces, are, for the most part, acceptable to the minister of defence, and he will take steps to have them implemented.

"14. The minister of defence regards with the utmost gravity, and strongly condemns, the behaviour that led to the deaths of the two terrorists captured on the bus, behaviour that is in clear contradiction to the basic rules and norms incumbent on all, and especially on the security forces. Not even the special circumstances of this case justify such behaviour. Therefore, legal action will be taken, in accordance with the evidence emerging in the investigation against those suspected of illegal acts or behaviour. Furthermore, all possible steps will be taken to ensure that there is no recurrence of such an incident."

Less than four months have elapsed since

the report was turned over to the military prosecution so that criminal charges, if any, might be brought. Under most civilized legal systems, the process of investigation leading to indictment and prosecution is a lengthy one—far longer than the lapse of time to date in this case. A fair-minded person would have pointed out that a commission of inquiry was quickly established and its main findings made public.

Mr. Bruzonsky cites as a source for his unsupported allegations of "barbarism" toward and "murder" of Palestinians material sent to him by Yigal Arens. Neither of the two "facts" that he tells your readers about Yigal Arens—that he is the son of Defense Minister Moshe Arens and that he is a professor of computer science at the University of Southern California—provides any relevant basis for evaluating Yigal Arens's competence in the area under discussion. What would have been relevant—and what was missing from the article—is that Yigal Arens is identified with an extreme left-wing political group that is supported by less than .1 per cent of the Israeli population. Had Mr. Bruzonsky mentioned this fact, your readers might have been better able to evaluate Yigal Arens as a source.

There was indeed an uproar in Israel over these events. Again, a fair-minded observer would view this response by the Israeli public as an indication of how uncommon such incidents are, and how much vitality there is in Israel's democratic instincts and open society. Mr. Bruzonsky's piece tries to distort and conceal this.

Maurice S. Spanbock
New York, N.Y.

Mark Bruzonsky responds:

Were Mr. Spanbock correct in his charges of half-truths, innuendo, and lies, he would indeed have something to be outraged about. But the information in his letter simply does not support his charges.

Some years ago, before I had traveled widely in the Middle East, before I had visited with Arab and Palestinian leaders in addition to hearing the Israeli side, and when I too had to rely on the general American press for information, I might have reacted much as Mr. Spanbock has. Indeed, I once did, some nine years ago, in a lengthy letter to a friend who was then an assistant to U.N. Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim—a letter, incidentally, widely distributed at that time by the American Zionist Youth Foundation. Now, frankly, I know better than to rely on government statements, embassy releases, or self-serving ministerial proclamations.

Let me reemphasize the main themes I

focused upon, themes which Mr. Spanbock does not appear to challenge.

- The two Palestinians were beaten, possibly tortured, to death after being taken into custody, and a giant cover-up was attempted.

- None of the American Jewish organizations so quick to condemn mistreatment of Jews anywhere in the world protested either what happened or the fact that those involved have not been tried.

- Such brutality against Palestinians has become increasingly documented by the Israeli press and by independent observers.

As for the specifics of Mr. Spanbock's letter

- Nothing that I wrote contradicts the additional points he makes about the hijacked bus or the newspaper that was closed. But what he adds was well-known—appearing on the front page of the *New York Times*—and there seemed no need for me to repeat it.

- Mr. Spanbock's extensive quoting from the statement by Israeli Defense Minister Arens also in no way contradicts what I wrote. The army report itself has never been made public, those involved have not been indicted and brought before a court, and we are left with nothing but a cryptic statement from the very man who might bear responsibility for what happened.

- As for Mr. Spanbock's suggestion that it is still likely that charges may be brought against those who are alleged to have murdered the two Palestinians, I hope he is correct. Should this occur, the very point I made in my comment will have been recognized—that only by bringing the perpetrators to trial can Israel continue to claim fair treatment toward its Palestinian citizens and subjects.

- Lastly, the person I primarily quoted to support my own view that what happened in this case is no longer an aberration in Israel is one of Israel's foremost journalists writing in what may be Israel's best newspaper—Yoel Marcus in *Haaretz*. I also quoted from Moshe Arens's son, Yigal Arens, who is a personal friend and someone who reads Hebrew and closely follows the Israeli press.

In sum, it is unfortunate that Mr. Spanbock seems to have missed the main points of my comment. I cannot fault him for being concerned, nor can I criticize him for bringing additional points of information to the attention of *Worldview* readers. But what he concludes are half-truths, innuendos, and lies in my commentary still seem to me a fair presentation of what informed people need to know and what can be reasonably and responsibly concluded.