

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE
הוועד היהודי האמריקני
רחוב אתיופיה 9
Jerusalem — ירושלים
ISRAEL

The UN's Anti-Zionism Resolution: Christian Responses

by Judith Hersheopf Banki

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE
Institute of Human Relations
165 East 56 Street, New York, N.Y. 10022

AJC-pamph-Interreligious Affairs Box
603+703

CONTENTS

PREFACE.....	i
INTRODUCTION.....	iv
ROMAN CATHOLIC RESPONSES.....	1
CATHOLIC PRESS COMMENTARY.....	9
PROTESTANT, ORTHODOX AND EVANGELICAL REACTIONS....	16
REGIONAL AND LOCAL CHURCH ASSOCIATIONS.....	26
PROTESTANT AND ORTHODOX PRESS COMMENTS.....	29
ECUMENICAL AND INTERRELIGIOUS RESPONSES.....	33
CAMPUS MINISTRIES.....	43
OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.....	45
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	50
SUGGESTED READING.....	55

PREFACE

The resolution proposed by radical Arab nations and their allies that sought to stigmatize Zionism as "a form of racism and racial discrimination" was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on November 10, 1975. This survey of Christian responses to the UN's anti-Zionism resolution documents reactions from representative Christian leaders and institutions during the several months following the adoption of that declaration.

Under normal circumstances, this study—even though it is the most comprehensive and well-documented of its kind—would be regarded as an historic record of a past event, perhaps mainly of interest to interreligious historians. Unfortunately, the campaign to defame and discredit Zionism did not subside with that episode; it is a continuing effort, and more than likely augurs a pattern of future threats and challenges to the Jewish community. Later meetings of the UN Economic and Social Commission (May 1976) were the scene of vicious harangues intended to caricature Zionism as racism incarnate. Informed observers anticipate that this campaign will continue unabated at other international meetings on environment, habitat, economic development—no matter how unrelated to Zionism.

What is behind this obsessive Arab drive, and what relationship does that have for this document?

Within large segments of the Jewish community, in Israel, the United States and elsewhere, there is a deeply-felt conviction that welcome as have been some recent signs of moderation on the part of some Arab leaders, radical Arabs appear determined to undermine the existence of the Jewish State. These sustained polemical assaults against Israel and the Jewish people both inside and outside the United Nations are widely perceived in the Jewish community as a calculated strategy on the part of Arab leadership to isolate Israel and her support system of world Jewry as pariahs among the nations.

To insist that the world community recognize the demonic and destructive character of this campaign is not paranoia. Ample and frightening precedent is to be found in the experience of racism in our country, and on a more diabolical level, in the Nazis' genocidal campaign against the Jews. Explaining how the lynching of blacks was possible in the United States in the mid-20th century, the distinguished Professor Gordon Allport noted, in *The Nature of Prejudice*, that every episode of lynching of black people in the South was preceded by a period of "verbal violence." Black people were verbally

assaulted by epithets which denied them of their human dignity, their very humanity, and reduced them to abstractions. Once blacks were dehumanized by such "verbal violence," it was relatively easy for racist mobs to engage in lynching. An abstraction—a dehumanized abstraction—makes little claim on human compassion.

In a like but infinitely more extensive way, the Nazis set about systematically to dehumanize Jews. With the enormous arsenal of Goebbel's propaganda machine—from the crude caricatures of Streicher's cartoons to sophisticated films and "scientific" textbooks—at their disposal, and a pre-existing foundation of widespread anti-Semitism to support their efforts, they succeeded in large measure in reading the Jewish people out of the human family, and therewith set the stage for the planned murder of six million men, women and children.

The anti-Zionist propaganda campaign that radical Arabs and their allies have been waging with such tenacity and consistency is but an effort to replicate the mass dehumanization of Israel and the Jewish people as a preliminary stage in their determined program to liquidate Israel. How else can one explain the incessant speeches and resolutions of Arab spokesmen of which this genocidal statement by the representative of Libya delivered on March 24, 1976, at the 1897th meeting of the UN Security Council is characteristic:

This racist entity in the Middle East must be destroyed and it will be destroyed one day.

(S/PV/1897. p. 92)

One of the primary messages to emerge from this document is that the leadership and masses of the western Christian world were quick to understand and condemn this massive and determined effort to dehumanize Israel and, by extension, the Jewish people. That response does not imply unanimous Christian—or, for that matter, Jewish—approval of every policy or political action of the Israeli government. But the "big lie"—the propagandistic assault on the movement which embodies the legitimate aspirations of the Jewish people—was roundly rejected by Christian spokesmen on factual, moral and historical grounds.

The outpouring of friendship and solidarity documented below is profoundly encouraging. But sober reality reminds us that the "big lie" has not been laid to rest. Its promoters have won a number of diplomatic victories at international assemblies, at whatever violence to normal rules and procedures, and are apparently determined to use this slander as

a means of isolating and undermining Israel. Christian understanding and support will be needed for months and years to come—until peace is finally established in the Middle East and hatred is banished from the face of the earth.

*Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum
National Interreligious Affairs Director
American Jewish Committee*

INTRODUCTION

On November 10, 1975 the United Nations General Assembly adopted, by a vote of 72-35, with 32 abstentions, a resolution defining Zionism as "a form of racism and racial discrimination." The adoption of the resolution, if not the exact tally of the votes, had been foreshadowed some weeks earlier when the Third Committee of the United Nations General Assembly, at its 30th session on October 17, adopted the same declaration.

In the United States, and in many other parts of the world, Christian leadership denounced both the substance of the resolution and its adoption by the UN General Assembly in forthright and powerful language. Much of this response was immediate and spontaneous, and it came from every level of the organized Christian church community: from the leadership of national Catholic and Protestant institutions, from regional and local church groups, from ecumenical associations, from *ad hoc* communal groups, from campus ministries and from individual clergy, academicians and religious journalists.

There have been differences—sometimes sharp differences—between the Jewish community and various Christian church groups and institutions in their respective understandings of threats to Israel's continued existence and on ways of resolving Middle East tensions. The discovery by Jews after the 1967 Arab-Israeli War (and to a lesser degree after the Yom Kippur War of 1973) that some Christian groups and leaders did not share their overwhelming concern for the security and survival of Israel as the foremost priority in resolving the Middle East conflict led to some angry charges and counter charges and to some withdrawal from interreligious dialogue.

The UN vote to brand Zionism as racism, however, evoked a near unanimity of criticism from Christian spokesmen. Some of it was cautious and diplomatic, more of it was outraged and denunciatory, and it came not only from traditional friends of Israel, but also from sources not normally politically supportive of Israel within the context of Middle East politics.

These responses are documented below, with a concluding summary and interpretation. This report, encompassing reactions from October through the end of 1975, is based on material sent to the American Jewish Committee from Christian church groups and ecumenical associations in the United States and other parts of the world, from its own field staff and foreign offices, from newspaper reports, and from Christian and Jewish colleagues whose numbers prevent individual acknowledgement, but whose cooperation is deeply appreciated. While comprehensive, it does not claim to be complete. The demands of space have necessitated

the condensation of much of the material. It is possible that some statements or actions by church groups or leaders have escaped notice, but no public declaration on the UN action has been knowingly omitted. Unless otherwise noted, all dates cited are 1975.

Judith Hershcof Banki

ROMAN CATHOLIC RESPONSES

Vatican Sources

While Pope Paul VI made no comment on the UN action, mild criticism of the resolution came from two Vatican sources. Cardinal Jan Willebrands, president of the Vatican's Commission for Religious Relations with Judaism, said in Rome that the resolution served "neither justice nor the well-being of peoples in the Middle East." After a talk on the 10th anniversary of Vatican Council II's Declaration on non-Christian religions, Cardinal Willebrands, who is also president of the Vatican's Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, voiced amazement that the UN passed the resolution without defining the meaning of "Zionism" or "racism."

Vatican press spokesman Federico Alessandrini, writing in a private capacity in the Vatican weekly *L'Osservatore della Domenica*, questioned,

How could the United Nations permit themselves to abandon their institutional role, which is the search to resolve the problem and bring peace? How could they make a gesture which could further complicate the Mideast situation and provoke bitter intransigency?

Alessandrini, a veteran observer of international affairs, defended a prior UN vote to admit the PLO on an equal footing with others in Mideast discussions on the grounds that "all parties should be able to express their views and participate," but then asked:

How do you logically accept this along with the next resolution which seems destined to rekindle in the other party the complex of fear, siege, ostracism?...This would certainly not be the way to obtain greater Israeli willingness to accept United Nations resolutions of the Middle East.

Inside the United States

In the United States and in many other parts of the world, Roman Catholic reactions were more direct, more critical and more responsive to the substance of the resolution. Archbishop Joseph L. Bernardin of Cincinnati, president of the United States Catholic Conference, expressed his "profound disagreement with, and great disappointment at" the UN vote. "The resolution is unjust," he declared, "...and opens the door to harassment, discrimination and denial of basic rights to members

of the Jewish community throughout the world."

Touching a theme which was echoed by several other Christian leaders, Archbishop Bernardin combined his vigorous opposition to "this ill-conceived and ill-defined measure" with support for "essential United Nations activities."

Cardinal John Cody of Chicago strongly endorsed Archbishop Bernardin's comments in a separate statement. Noting it had been more than ten years since Vatican Council II had declared the Church's opposition to "hatred, persecutions and displays of anti-Semitism...at any time and from any source," Cardinal Cody expressed "deep regret" at the UN action; he also reiterated Archbishop Bernardin's charge that the resolution was unjust and opened the door to persecution of Jews.

Archbishop Thomas A. Donnellan of Atlanta addressed himself to the anti-Semitic implications of the resolution. During the course of a two-day Vatican II Commemorative Conference sponsored by the American Jewish Committee and the Archdiocese of Atlanta, the Archbishop declared, "Anti-Semitism is evil, and should be denounced and repudiated wherever it rears its head."

Cardinal Terence Cooke of New York also touched on the anti-Semitic aspect of the UN action. Recalling the Vatican Council declaration, he declared:

We must reject anti-Semitism just as much when clothed with seeming legality at the United Nations as when crudely exhibited on a neighborhood street corner.

Cardinal Cooke's remarks were delivered by Msgr. James F. Rigney, rector of St. Patrick's Cathedral and chairman of the Archdiocesan Ecumenical Committee, at a protest rally in New York City on November 10.

Cardinal John J. Carberry of St. Louis said the vote was "particularly distressing" because the UN, an organization "founded on the principles of peace and justice, finds itself in the position of advocating division and discord....The reckless statement of the General Assembly is a far cry from the high ideals expected by John XXIII," he declared.

Archbishop Peter L. Gerety of Newark called the vote an "abhorrent action" and an "outrage."

"It is a grievous thought," Gerety said, "that a people who, in our lifetime, have been victims of the most terrifying form of racism the world has ever seen, should now be unjustly accused of racism themselves."

The archbishop also has issued a pastoral letter on the brotherhood of Christians and Jews in which he urged Catholics to reject any sentiments of hatred or any displays of anti-Semitism at any time and from any source. He concluded:

A long history of suffering has made Jews particularly apprehensive of the threat of horrible things to come. We ought to share that apprehension and fight the slightest sign of hatred or of contempt for Jews on the part of others and most of all on the part of ourselves.

Bishop James A. Hickey of Cleveland urged that the United Nations resolution equating Zionism with racism "be counter-balanced immediately by the willing response of those who are anxious to build rather than destroy."

Extending his "profound sympathy" to the Jewish community, Bishop Hickey also expressed hope that the UN resolution would not undermine "our commitment to that body, a consequence that the nations of the world, whatever their position or power, can ill afford."

Father Edward H. Flannery, executive secretary of the U.S. bishops' Secretariat for Catholic-Jewish Relations, reacting to the vote, described Zionism as "that immemorial longing of the Jewish people for a homeland which runs like a golden thread through the Jewish scriptures and liturgy."

"To label this longing 'racist,'" he continued, "is a political ploy that perverts the clear meaning of Zionism and insults our common humanity."

Father Flannery noted that the vote was taken on the anniversary of "the Hitlerian bloodbath when fires were set all over Germany, synagogues burned to the ground and 30,000 Jews arrested and sent to concentration camps." He continued:

The world peace organization, designed for a noble purpose, has celebrated this ugly anniversary in grim fashion, using its forum to publish a shocking endorsement of anti-Semitism.

I believe that in view of this and other earlier actions by the United Nations it is inevitable that our government reassess the nature and conditions of its support for the world body.

Father Flannery condemned the UN action from several other podiums. In speaking engagements in Orlando, Florida; Providence, Rhode Island and Fairfield, Connecticut, he called for increased Christian awareness of traditional anti-Semitism

and said the UN "equation of Zionism with racism is an atrocity and a terrorism." He also urged the American Catholic Church, in the spirit of collegiality, "to teach the Church throughout the world about Zionism. We cannot wait for this information to seep down from the Vatican," he said.

Bishop Walter F. Sullivan of the Richmond, Virginia Diocese said that the UN vote was "another sad chapter in the history of the ongoing oppression of the Jewish people." He added, "We must identify with our Jewish brothers and sisters in their continued struggle for survival and equality."

Bishop Sullivan also criticized the UN resolution during the course of his participation in a Hanukkah service at a Richmond synagogue—the first such participation in that area for a bishop—and he was also a signatory to a statement issued by religious leaders in Richmond.

[Like Bishop Sullivan, a number of Roman Catholic leaders were co-signers of statements issued under other auspices—from local communities, or from ecumenical organizations or associations. For example, Bishop Philip F. McNairy, Roman Catholic bishop of Minnesota, criticized the UN resolution in his capacity as chairman of the Minnesota Council on Religion and Race. Archbishops James V. Casey of Denver and Charles A. Buswell of Pueblo signed a statement of Colorado religious leaders, as did Auxiliary Bishops George Evans and Richard Hanifen. Providence Bishop Louis E. Gelinou's statement appeared jointly with other Rhode Island religious and civic leaders. Bishop David F. Cunningham of Syracuse signed a joint statement of concern with others in his area. Bishops Vincent Leonard of Pittsburgh and William Connare of Greensburg were signatories of a joint statement by Pittsburgh area Christian leaders. Bishops Carroll T. Dozier of Memphis and James D. Niedergeses of Nashville were among 60 Christian leaders signing a letter of protest to UN Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim, drafted during the Second National Jewish-Christian Relations Workshop held October 28-30 in Memphis. For the most part, these joint declarations and their signatories are detailed in the section of this document dealing with interreligious and ecumenical responses.]

Denunciations of the racism-Zionism link also came from various national Catholic organizations and from archdiocesan committees dealing with human relations or ecumenical issues. The National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice, a federation of Catholic groups and individuals concerned about civil rights and social justice, spoke out in unequivocal terms. In a statement issued in Washington by its board of directors, the NCCIJ declared:

This resolution is indeed an obscene one, as the United States rightly termed it. If it becomes official United Nations policy, it will be the source of endless anti-Semitic attacks on Israel and its Jewish supporters around the world.

We recognize racism when we see it. We recognize anti-Semitism when we see it.

Zionism is not and never was racism.

This resolution is anti-Semitism at its worst.

We will support our own government in its efforts to reverse this vote and urge those nations who supported the resolution to reconsider their vote.

Similarly, the president of the Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights charged that the UN resolution was an expression of anti-Semitism. Father Virgil C. Blum, S.J. said the UN action constituted

...another demonstration of the highly objectionable and divisive practice of labelling social, political and civil rights issues as ideological or religious as a means of dividing people, creating hostilities and setting groups against groups.

The Catholic League condemns this divisive practice, not less when used in controversies about the right to life of unborn babies, the civil rights of North Ireland Catholics and tax funds for the education of children in church-related schools than when used in controversies about the right of the Jewish people to have a homeland in Israel.

Archdiocesan organizations which issued statements included Cardinal Krol's Commission on Human Relations (Philadelphia), the Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs Committees of the Archdioceses of Detroit, Baltimore and Albany, New York, and the Catholic-Jewish Committee of the Archdiocese of Boston. Cardinal Krol's commission declared:

It is most distressing that the United Nations, whose charter we affirm, whose operations we support and whose goals of peace, justice and unity, we applaud, should by a policy of numbers, by a majority vote, allow itself to be used as an instrument of discord, injustice and division.

We are confident that all reasonable people realize that facts are not determined by majority vote, and that unsupported charges discredit the majority voting and not the

target of their charges. It is our fervent hope that the United Nations will take effective measures, to preclude a repetition of being exploited by those who are more interested in promoting hostility than peace.

The Detroit statement took the form of a letter to UN Secretary-General Waldheim signed by members of the Archdiocesan Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs. Expressing "deep personal dismay" at the adoption of the resolution by the UN committee, they continued:

The history of Zionism is clear and open to all to see. It arose not out of racial discrimination, but in reaction against racial discrimination. As a movement, it grew only because anti-Semitism in countries throughout the world reached genocidal proportions during the period of the Second World War. Zionism represents one of humanity's noblest attempts to free the world of the crimes of racism and genocide, which is the logical outcome of racism. Any attempt to equate Zionism as such with racial discrimination is both historically absurd and morally obscene. From last Friday's vote, one can only conclude that, sadly, we are witnessing today a recrudescence of that same horrifying racism against the Jewish people which precipitated the Zionist movement in the first instance. The irony is obvious and not a little frightening when the racism stems from a world body such as the United Nations.

The Baltimore Archdiocesan Commission for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs, in a statement signed by its chairman, Fr. Brian M. Rafferty, expressed "horror at the recent action of the majority" in the UN General Assembly. First, said the commission, the branding of Zionism as racism is an

utterly baseless assertion concerning a decades old movement which has been nurtured by a faith which has lasted for millenia. While this faith sees a close link between a people and its land, and while it demands respect for its own unique self-view, it, in no way, disparages or demeans any other people or group.

Secondly, the statement continued,

with this action the UN has debased itself into a senseless, mindless throng forsaking any pretense of being a forum for wise and cool discussion of the world-wide problems which plague our human family.

The Commission on Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs of the Diocese of Albany reiterated Archbishop Bernardin's "profound disagreement with, and disappointment at" the UN action. In

letters to Secretary-General Waldheim, Ambassador Moynihan, Senators Javitz and Buckley and Albany congressional representatives, Fr. Howard Hubbard, chairman of the commission, supported the stand of the U.S. delegation, urged "vigorous opposition" to the implementation of the resolution, and said that the "lamentable action" of the UN had placed the world today in "serious jeopardy."

The Catholic-Jewish Committee of the Archdiocese of Boston, in a statement supporting the U.S. position on the resolution, noted "the obscenity" of equating Zionism with racism. Pointing to "the natural rights that all peoples have to a national homeland," the statement warned that the UN, which "has given voice in the past to some of the most decent and humane instincts of mankind," jeopardized its world standing and credibility by adopting the resolution.

The Catholic Interracial Council of New York called the initial adoption of the resolution by the UN Third Committee "a shameful and appalling act," which "threatens to make a mockery of the UN's avowed and noble effort to eliminate racism." In a statement issued by its executive director, John Garra, the CIC pointed to its long record of opposition to racial and religious bigotry. Of the attempt to link Zionism and racism, Mr. Garra said:

We recognize Zionism itself as part of the long fight against racism. For more than a century it has been a movement of the Jewish people to save themselves from discrimination by establishing, through peaceful means, a nation in the Middle East ready to live at peace with its neighbors.

To seek to enlist the UN in a global campaign against Zionism as a form of racism is not only to distort the truth, but it is a means likely to incite racist hatred and anti-Semitism against Jews and other groups whose sympathies lie with the State of Israel.

In addition, various Catholic scholars and priests spoke out as individuals. Fr. John T. Pawlikowski, OSM, president of the Catholic Theological Union in Chicago, expressed his "very deep concern" in a letter to Secretary-General Waldheim. Fr. Pawlikowski wrote:

The resolution is most unjust and will only further erode the credibility of the United Nations. Israel is not a perfect society. But neither is any other member. Such a politically motivated resolution as this undercuts the Committee's ability to deal with racism where it really exists such as in South Africa. It likewise will seriously

weaken support for the United Nations here in the United States.

The dean of the Seton Hall University Law School, John F. X. Irving, called the resolution "a facade which cloaks its question of Israel's right to exist," and said the United Nations action "has created enormous disappointment in free men everywhere." Dean Irving made his remarks at a rally protesting the resolution in West Orange, New Jersey.

Msgr. John M. Oesterreicher, director of the Institute of Judeo-Christian Studies at Seton Hall, described the resolution as "slanderous." In an article in the *Morning Star Ledger* (November 14) he pointed to the declaration of Israel's founding fathers that the state will maintain "complete equality of social and political rights for all its citizens, without distinction of creed, race or sex," and that the founding fathers had extended the hand of peace and good neighborliness to all states and peoples around them. "No sooner had these words been spoken," wrote Msgr. Oesterreicher, "than the Arab governments, so appealed to, tried to have their armies wipe out the newborn state." Noting the technical, medical and agricultural assistance given by Israel to 62 countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America, he asked, "what has happened to some of the beneficiaries of Israeli friendship that they now see in that unique service a form of racism?"

"Anyone who thinks that the condemnation of Zionism concerns Jews alone is a fool," he added. "It is an attack on the moral code of the universe, and thus an attack on anyone who wears a human face."

In a telegram to Secretary-General Waldheim, Sr. Ann Gillen of the National Coalition of American Nuns, declared that the equating of Zionism and racism would "crumble the very foundations" of the UN. "As a Christian, I protest the anti-Semitic terrorism polluting the UN," she wrote.

Fr. James S. Conlan, in a radio commentary made on New York Station WINS November 16, said that the United Nations vote focused on "a moral iniquity" which was the root of most Middle Eastern problems:

To deny the right of a free and viable homeland for the Jews of the world is to close one's eyes and ears to the vicious cruelty heaped upon the Jews over the centuries. Anti-Semitism is a curse upon the entire human race. It deforms us. It cripples us. It demonizes us....The six million Jews heartlessly murdered in our time are six million witnesses to the fact that as long as humans inhabit this earth the disease of anti-Semitism can turn

us into beasts.

Fr. Conlan also drew attention to the explosion of a bomb in Jerusalem as an indication of widespread support of the Palestinian cause and noted that "there are many indeed who feel that the Palestinian Arabs are victims of an enduring and unendurable injustice."

In a letter published in the *Catholic Universe Bulletin* of Cleveland (November 21), Sisters Jane Pank, H.M. and Ruth Ann Bruner, H.M. and Patricia R. Lange declared that "this obvious game of political manipulation" had violated "the rights of human beings to build their own future—theologically speaking, to work out their own salvation in freedom..."

Catholic Press Commentary

Editorials in national and diocesan publications, and in the writings of syndicated columnists, ranged from coolly analytical to passionately angry. Overwhelmingly, however, the UN action was denounced and viewed as an incitement to anti-Jewish hatred.

Describing the vote "a perversion of logic," *Commonweal*, the national biweekly published by Catholic laypersons, probed the consequences of the resolution in depth. (December 5).

While in one sense the UN action "was meaningless—sheer theatre," wrote the editor, in another sense it "has the profoundest implications, for it brings into doubt the intellectual and political integrity of the world body, just as surely as it brings Zionism under unfair onus wherever in the world people are disposed to take the UN seriously."

Exploring the relationship between anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism, *Commonweal* noted that the terms are "not precisely synonymous" but that to see a connection between them "is not irrational phobia," since anti-Zionism may be seen as the newest development in the hatred of the Jewish people as primeval myth:

In the Middle Ages, it was religious bigotry; in the nineteenth century, economic ills; in the earlier part of this century, pseudo-scientific racism. In this analysis, the "war" against Zionism is only the latest metamorphosis of the myth, this time directed against the great enterprise of the modern Jewish people concretized in the State of Israel.

The editorial stressed the urgency of an educational campaign "to acquaint people generally with the true meaning of

Zionism and the theological and psychological identification of Jews the world over with Israel as the Land sacred to Jewish history and vital to Jewish safety and survival as a people." At the same time, temptations to reprisal and vindictiveness against the UN should be resisted; despite its flaws, the UN "remains the most important forum for international debate and opinion in the world."

In a later (December 19) article in *Commonweal*, Thomas Powers thoughtfully explored the American press reaction to the UN resolution, describing most of it as "rhetorical excess." While "no people has suffered more from racism than Jews, it is the history of the Jews in fact which gives the word its most horrific connotation...that still does not fully explain the heated reaction to the UN anti-Zionism resolution."

It is the displacement of the Palestinians which is at the heart of the issue, Mr. Powers wrote. "The proper way to answer a charge of racism is not to ignore the facts behind the charge—in this case, the fact of Palestinian displacement—but to explain why they do not constitute racism."

America, the national weekly publication of the Jesuit Fathers, maintained a detached tone. In a November 22 editorial, *America* noted that the resolution had met "stronger opposition than the Arab lobby usually encounters on UN votes on the Middle East" partially because "rather than being simply pro-Palestinian, the resolution was exclusively anti-Israel—an important distinction for those many countries whose first devotion is to national liberation."

While declaring that the resolution was "rhetorical flourish rather than a program of action," *America* pointed to potentially serious consequences:

Some might argue that rhetoric is better than bloodshed, but in this instance, if one takes the terms of the rhetoric seriously, an essential condition for peace in the Middle East—the recognition of Israel's right to exist—has been denied.

Our Sunday Visitor, a conservatively-oriented national Catholic weekly, commented (November 23) that the adoption of the resolution "is far more tragic for the UN than it is for Israel." Pointing to "the irony that the Soviet Union practices real racism and racial discrimination in its treatment of the Jews and that there is no real freedom in most of the countries that support this terrible resolution," the editors acknowledge that the resolution might portend some danger to Israel:

But the real danger is to the United Nations. Control of

the General Assembly was seized for political purposes of the worst kind. The United Nations can survive only with the trust of free people in the world. A wound has been inflicted on the Jewish people but a far more dangerous wound was suffered by those who inflicted it and by the UN that was used as their political instrument.

Fr. Andrew M. Greeley, a columnist widely syndicated in both the Catholic and secular press, commented in two separate columns on the UN action. In one, he chided Catholic radicals for their silence in the face of the "recent anti-Semitic binge at the UN," where

the gun-toting Arab terrorist Arafat gets a standing ovation, the mad racist Amin is widely applauded, Israel is thrown out of UNESCO and now anti-Semitism is established as the official policy of the "people of the world."

On this issue, Father Greeley wrote,

there is no escape. When the official body allegedly representing the people of the world announces that the existence of Israel is an act of racism, you either loudly dissent or you must be assumed to be going along with what your official "representatives" have endorsed.

In another column, he extended his criticism to the World Council of Churches for passivity in the face of Jew-baiting. "When the 'parliament of the world' goes on record as equating Zionism with racism, the Christian parliament of the world should not lose a second in issuing a condemnation in the strongest language," Father Greeley wrote. But no such condemnation would be forthcoming, he surmised, because no Christian body today would run the risk of offending the Third World. Lashing out at the World Council of Churches for its acceptance of political double standards, Father Greeley wrote, "both the UN and the World Council of Churches are the products of democratic liberal optimism; both have failed because neither liberalism nor democracy mean much in most countries of the world." Father Greeley also wondered why the Vatican—"where George Wallace recently was not granted a papal audience but General Idi Amin was"—was silent on this issue.

Fr. John B. Sheerin, CSP, devoted a syndicated column to the UN and Zionism. Reviewing the letter to Kurt Waldheim signed by 60 Christians at the Second Annual Workshop for Christian-Jewish Relationships (documented elsewhere) Father Sheerin wrote that the Arab-African leaders who backed the resolution, "must be challenged for the benefit of the UN itself. They must not be allowed to put the world peace

organization in jeopardy by calumnating all the Jews of the world as well as Israel, a member of the state of the UN in good standing." Father Sheerin concluded:

To allow anti-Semitism to run rampant in the UN would be to pave the way for another Hitlerian era in world history. We can make an act of contrition for Christian sins against the Jews in the past but we Christians would do better than that by trying our best to prevent the Holocaust, the murder of the six million Jews, from ever happening again. We can urge our own government to warn the anti-Semites in the General Assembly to stop their lying tactics. The UN must not become a forum for genocide or a platform for launching a new pogrom.

A roundup of reactions in the Catholic press around the U.S. provided by the Religious News Service (November 17) illustrates the range of critical response to the resolution. With some additions, the following is taken from the RNS roundup:

"Outrage...all time low and anti-Semitism...were among the words used in editorials published by Catholic diocesan weeklies immediately following the UN vote to condemn Zionism as a form of racism.

"We had thought the United Nations had sunk to an all-time low recently when it gave a standing ovation to President Idi Amin of Uganda," said the *Criterion* of the Indianapolis archdiocese. "We were wrong. Accolades for a tyrannical buffoon are small potatoes compared with the attack this week on Israel and Jews everywhere who see Israel as their spiritual homeland."

Calling the date of the resolution's passage, November 10, a "day of shame," the *Monitor* of the San Francisco archdiocese said, "What the United Nations, in reality, has done is to condemn the Jewish people in their homeland of Israel and to incite further hatred of them all over the world." The editorial was written by editor-manager Gerard E. Sherry.

The *National Catholic Reporter*, an independent, lay-edited weekly published in Kansas City, Missouri, said, "By equating Zionism with racism, the UN is transformed from an arena for serious debate to a collection of nationally and ideologically labeled soapboxes for declamation, not dialogue."

In an editorial headline "Anti-Semitism at UN" the Baltimore *Catholic Review* declared, "The United Nations resolution on Zionism is so absurd, it is tempting to write it off as a clownish prank of an adolescent mob. Unfortunately, anti-Semitism is too serious

an evil for anyone—especially Christians—to ignore the resolution."

The Voice, publication of the Miami archdiocese, recounted the difficulty Jews have experienced historically in trying to find a place where they would be accepted. And the editorial concluded, "Zionism is simply a last ditch effort by a tiny fraction of the world's people to have a place to survive in a world that has told them again and again that they must either stop being Jews or be killed...It is those who voted in bad conscience for the resolution who are the racists."

The Catholic Bulletin of the Archdiocese of St. Paul and Minneapolis and the Diocese of New Ulm said that in labeling Zionism as racism the UN had "put itself on record as racist itself." A signed editorial by editor Bernard Casserly called adoption of the resolution "the most disgraceful episode in the 30-year history of the international body."

A call for Christians to "rise up against such an odious attack" was issued by the *Catholic Free Press*, weekly paper of the Diocese of Worcester, Massachusetts. "Zionism and Judaism are, of course, two different things," it said. "But in context of the United Nations mentality today, a slur upon Zionism is an attack against Judaism."

"Bigotry dies a slow death, doesn't it?" observed the Harrisburg, Pennsylvania *Catholic Witness*. But while condemning the resolution for fostering anti-Semitism, it warned that Catholics should not express their righteous indignation at the UN too quickly, noting that the phrase "perfidious Jews" was only a short time ago dropped from the Catholic Good Friday liturgy.

Msgr. S. J. Adamo, editor of the *Camden Star Herald*, said in a signed editorial that Catholic concern for the survival and well-being of the Jewish people should be based on "a sense of shared spirituality."

"The Jews are our people, our brothers, our forebears," he said. "Any injury inflicted on them is harm poured upon the heads of our spiritual grandparents."

"Hopefully, the protests of decent people all over the world will render the UN resolution a piece of meaningless rhetoric," Msgr. Adamo said. "Hopefully, all who abominate racism will cry out against the obscenity of such a cowardly effort to paint as racists the very people who have suffered so much at the hands of racists."

"One searches in vain for comforting signs in Monday's vote in the United Nations General Assembly equating Zionism with racism and racial discrimination," said the Paterson, New Jersey *Beacon*. "The vote was a setback for Israel, for the U.S. and the West, for the UN—and for peace."

Declaring that the Middle East issue was not one of absolute right and absolute wrong, the *Beacon* said that "life for the Arab in Israel is not the paradise painted by Israeli UN Ambassador Chaim Herzog."

"But that is not the same as racism," it said, "and the approach to addressing legitimate Palestinian grievances is not the course which was charted this week by the General Assembly."

Despite its criticism of the Zionism resolution, however, the *Beacon* warned that scuttling the UN by withdrawing U.S. support would be "a case of one folly surpassing another."

"Outrage" was the single-word headline of an editorial in the *Long Island* (New York) *Catholic*.

"A coalition of Arab and other Muslim nations, Communist and Third World countries voted Monday at the UN General Assembly to condemn Zionism as a form of racism and racial discrimination," it said. "This indeed is an outrage."

"Zionism may be termed a form of nationalism, but it is a far cry from racism and racial discrimination," the editorial said.

"Does Zionism smack of racism?" asked the Newark *Catholic Advocate*. "Not even the sponsors of the UN resolution think so. What they object to, is not the Zionist hope, but its realization, the State of Israel, and its bearer through the centuries, the Jewish people."

Dealing in forthright fashion with the ancient Christian assumption that Jews are condemned to wander the earth forever, the *Advocate* declared:

Christian scholars have demonstrated that the idea of the "wandering Jew" rests on a misreading of Scripture. The rejuvenation of the Jewish people and establishment of the state of Israel are rather signs of God's providence, banners of His fidelity."

Fr. James Gandrau, editor of the *Catholic North West Progress* of Seattle (December 12), expressed sympathy for all sides in the Middle East conflict, and concern for the Christian

exodus from the Holy Land. He noted that the Israeli government could not be blamed for the reduction in the number of Christians, since Christian Arabs have been leaving the Middle East for many years.

Pointing to the complexity of the issues in the area, Father Gandrau discounted the suggestion that Jerusalem should be internationalized and said that "Jews and Arabs must work through the Jerusalem problem themselves." While "Catholic concern in the Middle East...must extend equally to Jews and Arabs alike," he sharply criticized the UN action. "The attempt to equate Zionism and racism at the UN was no step forward for peace and justice in the Middle East," he declared.

Perhaps the closest thing to a defense of the UN vote came from Msgr. Charles Owen Rice, a columnist for the *Pittsburgh Catholic*, whose article was reprinted elsewhere. "There is some of the pernicious anti-Zionism, which is anti-Semitism, in the anti-Israel forces who are winning majorities in the UN General Assembly," Msgr. Rice wrote, "but there is another anti-Zionism there which is not anti-Semitism and need not be. If you are a Palestinian who's lost his land...you are not going to like Zionism, and who could blame you?"

Suggesting that Ambassador Moynihan had overreacted to the UN action, Msgr. Rice asserted "Israel's case belongs in the UN," along with "the right of the Palestinian state to come into existence and the right of Palestinians to engage in all deliberations bearing upon their fate." Msgr. Rice was particularly exercised by United States military and financial commitments in the Middle East.

PROTESTANT, ORTHODOX AND EVANGELICAL REACTIONS

International Bodies

Dr. Philip A. Potter, General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, appealed to the UN General Assembly to "reconsider and rescind" its action linking Zionism with racism and declared the Council's "unequivocal opposition" to the equation. In a statement made in Geneva on November 11, Dr. Potter said "Zionism has historically been a movement concerned with the liberation of the Jewish people from oppression, including racial oppression." Further, he defined Zionism as "a complex historical process, expressing many differing aspirations of the Jewish people over the years, and...subject to many misunderstandings and interpretations. None of these could appropriately be used to condemn Zionism as racism."

Urging the UN Assembly to consider and rescind the resolution, Dr. Potter appealed to all parties involved in the Middle East conflict and to the UN to concentrate on implementing pertinent UN resolutions and "to find urgently ways to enable the Palestinian people to achieve their legitimate rights to nationhood and statehood while recognizing the right of the state of Israel to exist peacefully within internationally agreed boundaries."

In the United States

Various officials of the National Council of Churches, the largest umbrella organization of Protestant and Orthodox churches, spoke out against the resolution. After its adoption by the UN Third Committee, but before its endorsement by the General Assembly, Claire Randall, General Secretary of the Council, urged the General Assembly to reject the resolution. Noting that the NCC executive committee had called upon Israel and the Palestinians "to recognize the right of the other party to the same self-determination which they desire for themselves," she declared that "mutual recriminations will not help solve Middle East problems nor contribute to peace," and that the acceptance of the resolution on the part of the UN "will undermine the struggle against racism, and has the potential for reviving an old form of racism, anti-Semitism, in many places in the world."

After the General Assembly vote, two top officials of the NCC office on Christian-Jewish Relationships described the UN action as an "act of political savagery," and urged that it be rescinded. Dr. William L. Weiler, an Episcopal

priest, executive director of the NCC agency, and the Rev. Isaac Rottenberg, a Reformed Church in America clergyman, the agency's chairman, wrote to Kurt Waldheim:

By this uninformed and irresponsible equating of Zionism, the liberation movement of the Jewish people, with racism, the world body devoted to bringing peace among nations has succumbed to an act of political savagery, and has sown further discord among the member states.

As Christians committed to promoting justice and peace throughout the world, we affirm the right of the Jewish people to pursue their own national destiny, and we oppose those who would deny this people of the rights which they cherish for themselves.

They concluded with a call for the General Assembly "to acknowledge the error of this resolution, and speedily to rescind it."

A spontaneous response of "horror" was registered by the Rev. Nathan H. VanderWerf, executive director of the NCC's Commission on Regional and Local Ecumenism. In a telegram to professional colleagues at the American Jewish Committee, he asked "Will we never see the end of anti-Semitism? May God bless you all and save Israel which in part saves us all and our humanity and justice." Mrs. Martha Edens, general director of Church Women United, a national ecumenical movement, described the resolution as "an affront to Jewish people everywhere," and added, "In our position as a non-governmental organization represented at the UN, we have protested this reprehensible act, by signature and speech, and will continue to do so. We particularly deplore the weakening of the United Nations resulting from this resolution, and we fear its implications in regard to the cause of combatting racism."

YWCA

In a statement adopted on November 2, the national board of the YWCA declared itself

...deeply disturbed that in the world political arena the ancient and historic longing of a displaced and persecuted people for a homeland has been equated with racism. The international community cannot afford to be divided in the battle against racism...by political distortions which confuse victims and perpetrators.

The organization called upon its own members "and other Americans to play an informed and mediating role in the elimination of anti-Semitism."

The statement of the national board was endorsed in a separate action by the board of directors of the YWCA of White Plains, Mt. Vernon and Central Westchester on November 24.

Greek Orthodox

Archbishop Iakovos, primate of the Greek Orthodox Church in North and South America, called the resolution "deplorable and offensive." He added:

We profoundly regret that the United Nations, which was established to dedicate itself to serving the cause of peace and justice, saw fit to issue such an imprudent pronouncement that has caused great pain and anguish to all, particularly at times when we all strive for peace and justice in the world.

Other statements were issued by officers and boards of several Protestant denominations and in some instances by state or local judicatories of the same church groups.

Episcopal

A statement issued by the presiding bishop of the Episcopal church, John M. Allin, and Bishop John H. Burt, of the Committee on Christian-Jewish Relations, decried the UN action as "an inexcusable offense against those legitimate aspirations of the Jewish people for a homeland which the UN itself certified back in 1947."

Expressing fear that the resolution might "unleash... international bitterness and regional anti-Semitism," they identified themselves "with our Jewish brothers and sisters" and urged Christians not to forget the relative silence of the church during the Nazi Holocaust. They concluded,

Let us all now resolve that the Christian Church today will stand steadfast alongside those who profess the faith and preserve the religious tradition in which Jesus of Nazareth was raised.

Other Episcopal leaders spoke out in different contexts. Bishop Paul Moore of New York was a major speaker at a protest rally held in New York City. Bishops Frederick Beldon of Rhode Island, Robert Appleyard of Pittsburgh, William Frey of Colorado, Lyman Ogelby of Pennsylvania, Robert C. Rusack of Los Angeles, Ned Cole of Central New York and Jonathan Sherman of Long Island, New York were signatories of joint declarations issuing from their respective regions, documented elsewhere. The Committee

ZIONISM FOR THE 70'S

By Robert Alter

Reprinted from *Commentary*

Since 1967, Israelis feel they are "one vigorous people, belonging together, self-reliant, firmly committed to building its life and to playing its role in history on this particular strip of tragically disputed, blood-soaked soil."

12 pp. 50¢

THE PALESTINIAN JEWS: DID SOMEONE FORGET?

By James W. Parkes

Reprinted from *The New Middle East*

A distinguished church historian examines Palestinian history from the time of Massada to the Arab dispersion in 1948, presenting his conclusions on the role of Palestinian Jews before the Balfour Declaration in 1917.

6 pp. 15¢

PEACE-MAKERS IN JERUSALEM

By Edward H. Flannery

"Practically, the peace-making problem is one of friendship between Arab and Jew, and the efforts of non-Arab Christians are helping out."

4 pp. 10¢

THE PEOPLE ISRAEL LIVES

By Emil L. Fackenheim

Reprinted from *The Christian Century*

"Christians might find the renewal they seek if they were to close the tragic gulf between themselves and the 'old' Israel."

6 pp. 15¢

POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS ANTI-SEMITISM: WEAPON IN THE ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT

Middle East scholars, theologians and other religious spokesmen are distorting Islamic tradition to fit the Arabs' current political designs.

2 pp. Single copy free

CHRISTIAN RESPONSES TO THE YOM KIPPUR WAR

By Judith H. Banki

A comprehensive survey of the Christian attitudes and their implications for Jewish-Christian relations.

122 pp. \$1.50

ISRAEL: LAND OF UNLIMITED IMPOSSIBILITIES

By Barbara Tuchman

Reprinted from *The Saturday Evening Post*

A celebrated writer reports on the Jewish state, "born in violence and encircled by its sworn enemies, and deprived of almost everything except problems."

6 pp. 10¢

ISRAEL'S RECORD OF FLEXIBILITY

"One...myth assiduously promoted by the Arab states...is the notion of Israeli intransigence. Notwithstanding its wide currency...[it] is wholly lacking in substance."

4 pp. Single copy free

NEW QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON MIDDLE EAST PROBLEMS:

A POCKET GUIDE

Brief answers to the most frequently asked questions on the background and major issues in the Arab-Israeli conflict.

16 pp. 25¢

THE PALESTINE QUESTION AND ITS IMPLICATIONS

A background report on the Palestine Liberation Organization and its quest for legitimacy.

6 pp. Single copy free

SUGGESTED READING

AMERICA'S JEWS AND THE MYSTIQUE OF ISRAEL

By Ben Zion Bokser
Reprinted from *Christian Herald*

"It should be helpful for Christians to understand why Jews feel as they do about Israel. [It] may not yield agreement, but it will help sustain our friendship."

4 pp. 10¢

ARAB APPEALS TO AMERICAN PUBLIC OPINION TODAY

A review of the stepped-up Arab propaganda campaign in the United States and elsewhere in the Western world.

24 pp. 25¢

AT PEACE IN JERUSALEM

By G. Douglas Young
Reprinted from *The Jerusalem Post*

The President of the American Institute of Holy Land Studies in Jerusalem gives a Christian view on Israel and the Middle East.

4 pp. 5¢

A BASIC MIDEAST DOCUMENT: ITS MEANING TODAY

By Arthur J. Goldberg
Reprinted from *AJC Newsletter*

The former American Ambassador to the UN discusses the Security Council resolution of November 21, 1967 and the premises underlying U.S. support of the proposal.

2 pp. Single copy free.

to the destruction of the state. Predictably, many of the signatories were individuals who have been active in promoting a pro-Arab, anti-Israel viewpoint: Rabbi Elmer Berger, one-time executive vice-president of the (anti-Zionist) American Council for Judaism; Fr. Daniel Berrigan, S.J.; the Rev. Richard Fernandez, former executive director of Clergy and Laity Concerned; Fr. Joseph L. Ryan, S.J., a Boston priest teaching at St. Joseph's University in Beirut; Antiochian Orthodox Metropolitan Philip Saliba; and Melkite Catholic Archbishop Joseph Tawil.

It is noteworthy, however, that two of the signatories, Bishops George Evans and Richard Hanifen of Denver, also signed the Colorado statement which urged "all Christians, indeed all people of conscience, to join in appropriate expressions of support for our Jewish brothers and sisters, for whom the UN resolution must raise again the spectre of persecution." The fact that these Roman Catholic leaders felt conscientiously able to endorse both statements would appear to indicate that some Christians, at least, see no contradiction between strong pro-Jewish and equally strong pro-Palestinian—and, in the case of this particular statement, anti-Israel—sentiments.

Such a juxtaposition of feelings is difficult for most Jews to comprehend, because they see the anti-Semitism embodied in the UN anti-Zionism resolution not as an end in itself, but as a tool to attack the legitimacy and ultimately the existence of the State of Israel. Most Jews undoubtedly feel that, insofar as anti-Jewish propaganda is promoted by Arab strategists as a means to undermine and isolate Israel, to that extent the struggle against anti-Semitism is linked to firm support for Israel.

Not all Christians feel that same connection, but as the responses documented here would indicate, Christian concern for Palestinians can and does go hand in hand with sympathy for Israel and with a forceful and deeply-felt abhorrence of anti-Semitism.

various forms: open letters or telegrams to rabbis and Jewish communal leaders, public statements widely disseminated, and personal participation in protest meetings held in many parts of the country.

The Rights of Palestinian Arabs

A number of statements issued by Christians combined strong opposition to the UN resolution with a call for recognition of the rights of Palestinian Arabs to nationhood, along with the right of Israel to peaceful and secure existence. Of these statements, only a few clearly asserted that Arab recognition of Israel should precede a Palestinian settlement. ("When and if the Arab nations and the Palestine Liberation Organization accept Israel's legitimate existence, some solution will be found for the Palestinian problems"). Most indicated that the recognition by Israel of Palestinian claims and by Palestinian and Arab states of Israel's right to survival and security should be mutual, and presumably, simultaneous. The implication in most of these statements, although seldom specified as such, was that the Palestinian state or homeland would be created out of territory presently administered by Israel.

These statements and suggestions attest to a fairly broad concern among Christian spokesmen for the situation of Palestinian Arabs. As a humanitarian concern, it is shared by many Jews, along with the desire for a viable political solution that would provide Palestinians control over their own development. But Jews are even more concerned that Israel's survival should not be the price of the solution. An understandable sympathy for the problems of Palestinians is sometimes tapped by those who are hostile to Israel's very existence, in formulations of the problem which make Israel alone responsible for creating the Palestinian plight, and for resolving it unilaterally.

One such statement, which laid all the blame for the Palestinian situation at Israel's door, was circulated by Search for Justice and Equality in Palestine and signed by some 200 clergy and religious, mostly Catholics, from the Boston area.* It urged Israel to permit displaced Palestinians "to return to their homeland"—thus calling upon Israel not only to accede to a separate Palestinian entity, but to open her doors to hundreds of thousands of avowed enemies pledged

*Since this statement made no reference to the UN resolution it is not included in the body of this report.

UN action was thus seen as "a recrudescence of that same horrifying racism against the Jewish people which precipitated the Zionist movement in the first instance." (Detroit Archdiocesan Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs.) Others stressed that the nations which masterminded the resolution practiced more racial and religious discrimination and permitted less freedom than Israel, and that none of them could match Israel's record as a pluralistic democracy.

A number of respondents felt called upon to describe or explain Zionism, some stressing the immemorial link between people and land rooted in Jewish scripture and liturgy, some emphasizing its historical and political function as the national liberation movement of the Jewish people. A few, such as the publication of the Ecumenical Theological Research Fraternity in Israel, explored in depth the intertwining of national and religious dimensions in Judaism. In the words of Fr. Marcel DuBois: "Twenty-eight years of independence, but ninety years of Zionist hope and four thousand years of national consciousness."

An interesting aspect of the response was the call for more information and education about the meaning of Zionism which came from Christian sources as disparate as the German Protestant Church, the (Greek) *Orthodox Observer*, *Commonweal*, and American Catholic leaders such as Msgr. George Higgins and Fr. Edward Flannery. Except for the *Orthodox Observer*, which expressed some confusion about this "ism," the educational program was urged as a necessary antidote to hostile and defamatory propaganda.

Expressions of Solidarity

The feeling aroused in American Jews by the UN vote—a mixture of outrage, anxiety and disgust—were undoubtedly assuaged by the prompt and vigorous reaction of their government, public officials and popular opinion. A special facet of the response from Christians was the frequent expression of solidarity with Jews, sometimes invoking religious tradition ("...the Christian Church today will stand alongside those who profess the faith and preserve the religious tradition in which Jesus of Nazareth was raised."); sometimes based on common humanity ("We have heard this terrible thing...We are not deaf, we are not indifferent. We care."); most often affirming Christian support in the struggle against anti-Semitism ("We...pledge our efforts as elected leaders of the Episcopal Church to be vigilant in standing against every expression of the sickness we call anti-Semitism...").

Such expressions of Christian-Jewish solidarity took

foremost, Christians attacked the resolution because they saw it as directed not only against Israel, not only against Zionism, but against Jews and Judaism: in other words, as an act of political anti-Semitism. As Dr. Robert Moss, president of the United Church of Christ, declared, "We should not be deceived by the use of the term Zionism. The sponsors of the resolution meant by it Jews and Judaism as well as the State of Israel."

Anti-Semitism as an Issue

The overwhelming majority of Christian responses focused on this issue, viewing the substance of the resolution either as clearly and directly anti-Semitic in itself, or as opening the door, in Archbishop Bernardin's words, "to harrassment, discrimination and denial of basic rights to members of the Jewish community throughout the world." In fact, the attempt to brand Zionism with the stigma of racism was considered anti-Semitic *per se*. No one put it more succinctly than the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice:

We recognize racism when we see it.
We recognize anti-Semitism when we see it.
Zionism is not and never was racism.
This resolution is anti-Semitism at its worst.

Attitudes Towards the UN

While criticism of the UN adoption of the resolution was nearly unanimous, a variety of attitudes towards the UN itself emerge from those responses documented above. At one end of the spectrum were those more concerned with potential loss of support for the UN than with the substance of the resolution itself (The United Methodist Church's Council of Bishops). Others attacked the resolution vigorously, but also cautioned against scapegoating the UN, or urged continued support for its essential activities. Perhaps most frequent was the opinion, whether issued in sadness or anger, that the UN had seriously damaged its credibility. At the other end of the spectrum were those so disgusted by the UN action that they urged a reassessment of American financial support of the world body, a position advanced by a number of the Christian spokesmen.

Zionism as an Issue

The vigorous rejection of Zionism as racism encompassed several themes. A number of statements emphasized that Jews have been the victims, not the perpetrators of racism; in fact, the Zionist movement arose in reaction to racism. The

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The UN General Assembly vote branding Zionism as "a form of racism and racial discrimination" called forth an immediate and substantial outpouring of response from Christian church leaders, organizations, ecumenical groups, *ad hoc* associations and individual clergy. The responses were almost universally critical, although the criticism ranged from mild to vehement, and took various forms: resolutions by church boards or agencies; public statements by institutional leaders; joint declarations individually endorsed by Christian leaders on national, regional or community levels; letters and telegrams to U.S. or UN officials; messages to the Jewish community; letters to the press and editorials in religious periodicals.

Not only did Christians usually supportive of Israel speak out, but Christian sources frequently neutral or cool to Israel attacked the UN action. Dr. Philip Potter, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, who during the October 1973 war issued a carefully "neutral" statement which did not mention who started the war, urged stronger support for the UN and called for cessation of arms shipments to both sides, on this occasion took sharp issue with the UN resolution and urged the General Assembly to rescind it. Similarly, various officials of the National Council of Churches, whose general board took the same position as the WCC in 1973, roundly attacked the substance of the resolution. The Roman Catholic hierarchy was more outspoken than in 1973 and was explicitly critical of the UN resolution. Greek Orthodox Archbishop Iakovos publicly attacked the vote as "deplorable and offensive."

These reactions, plus even the mildest of criticisms of the UN from denominational boards and agencies of the United Church of Christ and the United Methodist Church (supportive of both the UN and Palestinian nationalism) indicate that Christian opinion on the UN resolution transcended normative political stances on Middle Eastern issues.

An exploration of the various themes stressed in reaction to the resolution yields some understanding of the near unanimity of response. There was concern that the UN, by endorsing a patent lie, had undermined the principles of its own charter, gravely compromised its moral authority, and seriously jeopardized its mission to preserve and advance the cause of peace. There was concern that Zionism, whether one supported it or not, should not be defamed as racism. There was concern that the authentic struggle against racism would suffer because of the invidious association. But first and

Rev. Simon Schoon, pastor of Nes Ammim (a Christian communal settlement).

The Ecumenical Theological Research Fraternity in Israel, a working group of Christian theologians living in Israel, published an appeal to churches around the world to "become aware of the real meaning of Zionism lest they be influenced by hostile propaganda against the Jewish people and the state of Israel." The publication discussed in detail the intertwining of national and religious dimensions in Judaism, the link between people and land, and the theological and political implications of Zionism.

A forceful statement also came from the Rev. Dr. G. Douglas Young, president of the American Institute of Holy Land Studies. In a letter to the editor of the *Jerusalem Post*, Dr. Young wrote:

I have been accused of being a Zionist—a Christian Zionist—by some of my co-religionists in Israel and in the administered areas. I would like to take this means of thanking them for this compliment...

I will stop being a Zionist when I see some evidence anywhere of a willingness to let Jews live in complete peace and security under Gentiles and some evidence of a country or countries willing to absorb all the Jews that other countries will not. Since there is no such evidence and no such country, Zion or Israel has to be the homeland of the Jews. I am glad to be able to be a small part of it, to be able to encourage it, and to help achieve its goals. I happily invite all who can to speak out and even to come, live and help build Zion.

Fr. Marcel DuBois, who signed the telegram to Kurt Waldheim, also issued an independent statement on the resolution over the overseas band of Israel radio in the French language. Fr. DuBois declared himself "scandalized, once more, by the bad faith—whether deliberate or blind," that inspired the resolution. Calling the UN action the "lowest form of propaganda," Fr. DuBois stated that Jewish nationalism was neither more nor less legitimate than that of other nations born in the last half century. But for the Jews, it was much older: Twenty-eight years of independence, but ninety years of Zionist hope and 4,000 years of national consciousness." He concluded:

It is not by accusing Israel of racism or by denying its right to exist, that one will help it to be more open, tolerant and just, but rather by giving it the possibility of being itself, by inviting it, with all the insistence of friendship and Christian love, to remain true to its Jewish vocation.

Costa Rican delegate to the UN, vehemently defended Israel in a speech before the General Assembly vote on the resolution. Fr. Nunez, former Costa Rican ambassador to Israel and now dean of the National University of Costa Rica, emphasized that he was speaking from firsthand knowledge of Israel and familiarity with conditions in the Middle East. The problem of our refugees, he said, was a direct product of Arab attempts to destroy the state of Israel because they do not want to accept an independent Jewish state in the region: "If the Arabs had conquered Israel, there would have been no problem of Israeli refugees as no Israeli would have been left alive," he declared. While Israel wishes peace to build a just, democratic society, the Arab extremists seek "the peace of the graveyard," he asserted.

[The day after Fr. Nunez's speech, Jesuit Father Theopane A. Mathias of India, a member of the Assembly's Third Committee, approved his delegation's vote in support of the resolution. "We do not like Zionism because it is racist. It is anti-religious," he said.]

Perhaps the most forceful protests against the UN action came from Christians living in Israel, who expressed themselves in a variety of ways. Eight leading clerics cabled to Kurt Waldheim their shock and protest against "this unwarranted defamation of a movement dedicated to the liberation of the Jewish people"—a people "that throughout history has experienced unparalleled oppression and racial persecution." They continued:

We recognize that Zionism is the contemporary expression of the continuous and living link of the Jewish people to its ancestral homeland and of its aspiration to return to it. In the tragic course of recent history it has not been given to the Zionism movement to fulfill its purpose in a peaceful process. Despite the difficulties of the present situation, we can testify from our own experience that the state of Israel has made serious efforts to live up to its intention—as expressed in its Declaration of Independence—to ensure complete equality of social and political rights to all its inhabitants irresponsive of religion, race or sex.

The telegram was signed by Fr. Michel De Goedt, chaplain of the Catholic community of Jerusalem; Fr. Marcel DuBois, Superior, St. Isaiah House, Jerusalem; Fr. Laurentius Klein, abbot, Dormition Abbey, Mt. Zion, Jerusalem; the Rev. Henry Knight, Anglican priest in Tel Aviv; Dr. Michael Krupp, director Action for Reconciliation, Jerusalem; the Rev. Robert Lindsey, Baptist minister in Jerusalem; the Rev. Coos Schoneveld, secretary, Ecumenical Theological Research Fraternity; and the

nothing of racism in the sense in which the twentieth century has come to understand that term either in the teaching or the practice of Zionism," wrote the Council's officers. "Zionism, as the members of this council understand it, is simply a contemporary political instrument for the realization of an age-old hope of the Jewish people."

Responses from Latin America were limited, but in Argentina an editorial article by Fr. Jorge Mejia in *Criterio* (November 13) sharply criticized the resolution. Fr. Mejia noted that the UN "had curiously omitted condemning terrorism as practiced by Palestinian extremists," and that the vote had been influenced by Arab petrodollars and in some cases motivated by crude opportunism.

While criticizing Israel "for many unjust deeds against the Palestinian population," Fr. Mejia was even more critical of the Arab states for having segregated Palestinian refugees in "provisional" camps since 1948: "Is it not discriminatory to allow a whole generation to grow in poverty, impotence and frustration, and use them later in a bloody war stirred by major international interests?"

The Anglican Synod of Argentina associated itself with the attack on the resolution issued by Dr. Potter of the World Council of Churches in Geneva, and declared that the UN action "could open a new chapter of horror and terror in the history of the long-suffering people of Israel, including the possibility that the Jews of the world might suffer from new and crueler persecutions."

In Venezuela, Msgr. Luis Henriquez, Archbishop of Valencia sent a letter to the chief rabbi, Dr. Pinchas Brener, and the members of the Jewish community conveying his feelings of friendship "at this moment of trial for the Jewish people," and his hopes "that the Jewish community and the state of Israel may, in the not distant future, live in peace and tranquility, to which every state and human community is basically entitled."

In addition, a public statement endorsed by various Catholic priests, Protestant ministers and rabbis appeared in some newspapers in Caracas. The statement emphasized the biblical basis of Zionism and God's promise of the land to the Jewish people.

The Venezuelan Catholic publication, *La Religion*, described the resolution as anti-Semitic and quoted Archbishop Bernardin's condemnation of it, also invoking the language of Vatican Council II's declaration on the Jews.

Fr. Benjamin Nunez, a Roman Catholic priest who is also

process for accusers to denounce the crime they themselves are guilty of."

LICRA (a Swiss-Israel LICA Association and Christian Service group) held a meeting in Geneva, attended by several hundred persons, and chaired by its president, Mr. Gilbert Duboule. Mr. Duboule declared that this attack against Zionism was in fact aimed against the entire Jewish people. LICRA organized street manifestations both in Geneva and Lausanne, and the public responded in large numbers in both cities.

In West Germany, the Synod of the Protestant Church in Germany—the highest Protestant body in that country—resolved to promote a public education program to counteract misinformation being spread in connection with the UN action. The Synod's resolution, adopted by an overwhelming majority on November 6, declared:

The Synod asks the Council of the Evangelical Church in Germany to make every possible effort to present a correct and factual view and judgement of Zionism in public opinion, in educational institutions and primarily in international bodies. One should not permit the revival or toleration of old and new anti-Jewish attitudes under the guise of anti-Zionism...

Our Church as well as our state bears a special responsibility of the right to existence of the Jewish state and...strongly [favors] an understanding of the movements which struggle for the liberation of men from oppression. Zionism as many other emancipation movements of the Third World belongs to this category...

The Association of Roman Catholics in West Germany also denounced the UN resolution as "ill advised" and encouraging "to extremist elements." The Association's president, Bernhard Vogel, said, "It will help those forces which aim at Israel's destruction."

In England, the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Donald Coggan, told the London *Jewish Chronicle* (November 21) he was "gravely concerned at the unfortunate wording" of the resolution, and feared it would only "exacerbate the situation in the Middle East and lead to further damaging anti-Semitism."

In London, the International Council of Christians and Jews denounced the resolution in a letter to Kurt Waldheim from the Council's chairman, Mme. Claire Huchet Bishop, and general secretary, the Rev. William W. Simpson. "There is

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Condemnations of the UN resolution came from leaders of governing bodies of major church groups and from ecumenical associations in France, Switzerland, Germany, England, Latin America and Israel.

In France, in an unusual ecumenical gesture, the president of the Roman Catholic Bishops Conference, Msgr. Etchegaray, and the president of the Protestant Federation in France, M. Courvoisier, issued a joint statement expressing their "profound anxiety" at the adoption of the resolution. The two spokesmen continued:

We know that the word "Zionism" lends itself to various interpretations, but we also know that to charge Zionism with racism...means to forget history and to repeat a language which has been the source of incalculable evils for Jews throughout the world; this means to commit an act which is contrary to peace and to revive permanently latent anti-Semitism. The Christian community is called upon to exercise vigilance on every occasion.

"At the same time," they concluded, "conscious of the gravity of the problems in the Middle East, we shall not cease to ask that to all, Palestinians and Jews, justice be granted in dignity and peace."

The Amitié Judeo-Chrétienne de France angrily protested the adoption of the resolution on both occasions. After the vote in the UN Third Committee, the national board of the Amitié wrote Secretary-General Waldheim, urging him to use his power to avert the adoption of the resolution, and declared:

It is a scandal and a perversion of language to single out one national liberation movement among others—because it is the Jewish people's—to identify with racism, from which that people has suffered so much and continues to suffer.

After the vote in the General Assembly, the Amitié cabled a vigorous denunciation of "this despicable and murderous amalgam..."

The SIDIC Paris Information Bulletin No. 9 (November) described the UN resolution as "an alarm bell, a serious warning, not only for Jews all over the world but for all free peoples...including those who utter such errors...because one does not calm conflict by injecting venom. It is an old, known

Protestant and Jewish religious advisors denounced the UN vote as "the legitimization of anti-Semitism," in a telegram to Kurt Waldheim. They added, "the Zionist movement and the State of Israel are the legitimate expressions of the Jewish people's right to self-determination."

The Campus Christian Ministry at the University of Oregon issued a statement on November 12 over the signature of the Rev. Douglas K. Huneke, Presbyterian University chaplain. Pointing out that the existence of the State of Israel was "no longer debatable," it attacked the resolution as nothing less than a hostile act against Israel which impuned the "credibility and usefulness" of the UN. Branding the resolution as an act of anti-Semitism, it urged people to write or speak out against the UN action. The University of Oregon Campus Christian Ministry consists of United Church of Christ, Presbyterian, Roman Catholic, Methodist, American Baptist, Christian (Disciples of Christ), Lutheran and Episcopal representation. The resolution was sent as a letter to Mark Hatfield as well as issued publicly.

CAMPUS MINISTRIES

Denunciation of the UN action came from campus ministries at the Universities of Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois and Oregon, from the Rutgers campus clergy and from religious advisors at the Drexel and Temple University campuses.

Father Robert J. Cook, president of the Wisconsin Catholic Campus Ministry Association, in a letter to Ambassador Moynihan, described the resolution as "a form of bigotry that strikes at the very integrity of the world organization." Fr. Cook affirmed that the UN had performed many worthwhile deeds for humankind. He continued:

But the shameful act of last week will provide encouragement to cynicism throughout our universities and the people of our land. Even worse, it will confirm the attitudes of many who already wallow in anti-Semitism.

A people longing to maintain their identity and seeking liberation are guilty of nothing but undertaking the quest for rights that are basic to all human persons. Zionism and its adherents have demonstrated time and again their humanitarian stand and their respect for the rights of others.

At the University of Michigan, five Catholic chaplains at St. Mary's Chapel, Ann Arbor addressed an open letter in the *Michigan Daily* deploring and denouncing the UN action as a slander against Jews everywhere. Affirming that Zionism is "an authentically religious and ecumenical concern...for Christians in dialogue with their Jewish brothers and sisters," they warned that the General Assembly "has dealt a severe blow to the future workings of the United Nations."

At the University of Illinois, twelve members of the Religious Workers Association declared that the General Assembly "has gone on record as supporting anti-Semitism and Jew hatred [and] has denied logic, morality and the principles by which an effective United Nations must function..." This statement was signed by Lutheran Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, Catholic, United Church of Christ and Jewish clergy.

At Rutgers University a protest against the UN action was endorsed by the university coordinator of religious affairs and by Catholic, Christian Science, Episcopal, Jewish, Lutheran, Methodist, Unitarian-Universalist and United Church campus ministers and counselors, both at Rutgers and at Douglass College.

At the Drexel and Temple University campuses, 13 Catholic,

for Progressive Judaism, Lutheran World Federation, Church Women United, United Methodist Church Board of Church and Society, International Association for Religious Freedom, American Baptist Churches USA, and the Synagogue Council of America.

Conference; Fr. Edward Flannery; Fr. John B. Sheerin, consultant to the Secretariat for Catholic-Jewish Relations; Fr. Owen F. Campion, editor of the *Tennessee Register*, the Nashville diocesan newspaper; Fr. Edward Duff, S.J. of Holy Cross College, and Sr. Rose Thering, O.P. of Seton Hall University.

Protest signatories included the Rev. Dr. David Hunter, director of education, Council on Religion and International Affairs; the Rev. Landrum E. Shields, a member of the governing board of the NCC and pastor of the Witherspoon United Presbyterian Church in Indianapolis; Dr. A. Jase Jones of the Southern Baptist Convention; Dr. Harry E. Moore, Jr., executive director of the Nashville NCCJ.

In similar fashion, more than 250 participants in a dialogue on Christian-Jewish relations held October 26 in Pittsburgh authorized a statement on the UN Third Committee vote which was jointly issued by Msgr. Francis A. Glenn, chairman of the Ecumenical Council of the Pittsburgh diocese and Sholom D. Comay, president of the American Jewish Committee Pittsburgh chapter. On behalf of the participants, the two spokesmen condemned the UN committee vote, expressed appreciation to President Ford and Ambassador Moynihan for their forthright denunciations of the resolution and declared that the resolution, if passed by the General Assembly, "would seriously weaken the United Nations and significantly undermine the principles upon which it is based."

An overwhelming majority of Canadian and United States religious educators attending the international convention of the Religious Education Association in Philadelphia, endorsed a resolution condemning the UN resolution and expressing concern "lest attacks on Zionism be, in reality, camouflaged anti-Semitism."

In another interesting development, 13 Non-Governmental Religious Organizations accredited to the United Nations issued a joint statement on the Zionism issue.

They expressed the fear that the resolution might hurt the chances for peace in the Middle East, reduce support the UN and might lead to the downgrading of the General Assembly; might harm the Decade for Action Against Racism and Racial Discrimination by confusing and lessening the continuing support for it throughout the world; and might be considered a justification for actions of anti-Semitic character.

Organizations whose representatives endorsed the statement were: Unitarian Universalist Association, Southern Baptist Convention, Council on Religion and International Affairs, World Conference on Religion and Peace, Evangelical Covenant Church of America, Women's League for Conservative Judaism, World Union

to Ambassador Moynihan, to President Ford and Kurt Waldheim. "We hope that the world will recognize that Zionism is not racism, but the effort of the Jewish people to return to the land of their forefathers," they declared. The North Phoenix Corporate Ministry is an association of Protestant churches (including Methodist, Presbyterian, Congregational and United Church of Christ), one Roman Catholic church and two Jewish congregations.

Some powerful responses to the UN action emerged spontaneously during the course of ecumenical conferences which were convening during the time that the UN Third Committee or General Assembly were considering the resolution.

Thus, the Second National Christian-Jewish Relations Workshop, held October 28-30 in Memphis, became the occasion for a letter to Secretary-General Waldheim which was signed by 60 Christian church leaders.

The Christian-Jewish Relations Workshop was co-sponsored by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops Secretariat for Catholic-Jewish Relations, the Office of Christian-Jewish Relations of the National Council of Churches, the Catholic Diocese of Memphis, and the Memphis Jewish Community Relations Council, in cooperation with the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

The Christian signatories declared:

This equating of Zionism with racism is wholly unacceptable. It is a slander against Jews everywhere, since it is a revival of the all too familiar anti-Semitism which has plagued humankind through the centuries. It is moreover a falsehood without historical justification. Worse, it is a denial of the premises and purposes of the United Nations as set down in its charter...

Should the General Assembly recklessly put its stamp of approval on that calumny against Jews around the world and against Israel, a member state in good standing, we would hope that the United States Congress would reexamine the level of its contribution to the support of a self-discredited United Nations.

As previously noted, two Roman Catholic bishops, Bishops Dozier of Memphis and Niedergeses of Nashville, were among the signatories.

Other Catholic signatories included Msgr. George C. Higgins, secretary for research of the United States Catholic

flagrantly offensive to Jewish religious sensibilities." The joint statement concluded:

To those nations that have joined Communist and Arab countries in this base attack, whether out of ignorance of the Jewish religion or out of political expediency, we say by having allowed yourself to revile an ancient religion, you have brought dishonor and shame on yourself.

To the spokesmen of the world's great faiths, on whom the recent lessons of silence in the face of assaults on the Jewish people and their faith surely have not been lost, we express both the hope and expectation that they will declare their unqualified abhorrence and rejection of this shameful act.

In New London, Connecticut, a number of Christian clergy attended a rally protesting the passage of the resolution and in Stamford, a number of Christian clergy joined with others in a statement supporting Zionism, criticizing the nations which voted for the resolution, "many of which imprisoned deserters, oppress and even murder religious minorities..." and endorsing American opposition "to this terrible act." The statement appeared as a public advertisement in the *Stamford Advocate* (November 28).

The New England Committee of Clergy and Laity Concerned for Israel declared, "this resolution discredits the very moral foundation of the UN." Calling upon the UN General Assembly to rescind the vote, the statement declared:

This tawdry act attacks not only the State of Israel, the Jewish religion and the Jewish people, but also assaults the values in our common Judeo-Christian heritage; the basis of democracy and civilization that all Americans cherish.

The statement, prepared by Committee co-chairmen, Fr. Robert Bullock, Rev. Ronald G. Whitney, and Rabbi Murray Rothman, was endorsed by over 100 Christian and Jewish clergy and lay people in the New England area.

The Judeo-Christian Women's Association of Eastern Fairfield County issued a resolution expressing "our thanks and pride in the men who represent us at the United Nations," deploring "this attack on the Jewish people," and expressing concern, love and support to the Jewish people of their community.

The governing board of the North Phoenix Corporate Ministry expressed its opposition to the UN action in letters

world-wide blight of racism, but we cannot permit this malicious slander to the Jewish people everywhere to go unanswered.

In Pittsburgh, seven leading Christian spokesmen said they felt compelled to speak out to "deplore and protest the UN action." Stating that the UN has "descended to a low point in its history," they called upon the world body to reconsider its actions.

The statement was signed by Bishop Vincent M. Leonard; Bishop William Connare of the Greensburg Catholic Diocese; Bishop Roy Nichols of the United Methodist Church; the Rev. Dr. William Aber of the Redstone Presbytery; the Rev. Leonard Schulz of the American Lutheran Church; Bishop Charles Foggie of the AME Zion Church; and Bishop Robert Appleyard of the Episcopal diocese.

A statement of concern drafted by the Rev. Robert E. Grimm, executive director of the Metropolitan Church Board of Syracuse, New York, and endorsed by a number of Syracuse area religious leaders, declared:

We resist any attempts, whatever their form, to renew the age-old persecution of our Jewish brethren and call upon our Christian brethren to come to a more sympathetic understanding of the Zionist dream as part of the age-old struggle of Jewish people, here and everywhere, against persecution and for liberation...

We hope and pray that all parties to present Middle East tensions, particularly the Israeli and the Palestinian people, will each be enabled to realize their own version of the dream of liberation and of homeland with full respect for the rights of others. And we call upon the United Nations to change its present course and return to its dream of providing order, harmony and fulfillment for all peoples of planet Earth.

The statement was signed by Bishop David F. Cunningham, Diocese of Syracuse; Bishop Joseph Yeakel, Syracuse Area United Methodist Church; Episcopal Bishop Ned Cole of Central New York; Rev. Dr. Jon Regier, New York State Council of Churches; Rev. Robert Loyer, Presbytery of Cayuga-Syracuse; Rev. Walter N. Welsh, Grace Episcopal Church; Rev. James Lange and Rev. James Engle, University Methodist Church; and the West End Ecumenical Group.

A public statement jointly sponsored by the Ministry of Social Concerns of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Bridgeport and the United Jewish Council of Greater Bridgeport declared that the UN action "not only does violence to history, but is

It is ironic that those nations which are spearheading this anti-Zionist campaign are themselves the product of national liberation movements. They are denying to the Jewish people the fundamental rights of national self-determination which they claim for themselves..."

The statement was signed by: Rev. Donald R. Boyd, president, Los Angeles Council of Churches, and minister, First United Methodist Church of Los Angeles; Fr. Charles S. Casassa, SJ, chancellor, Loyola Marymount University; Rev. Priscilla A. Chaplin, executive director, Southern California Council of Churches; Rev. George W. Cole, Department of Social and Ecumenical Concerns, Synod of Southern California, United Presbyterian Church; Bishop Norris S. Curry, Ninth Episcopal District, Christian Methodist Episcopal Church; Sr. Renee Harrangue, provost, Loyola Marymount University; Sr. Suzanne Jabro, Confraternity of Christian Doctrine; Sr. Helen Kelley, IHM, president, Immaculate Heart College; Rev. Thomas Kilgore, Jr., Second Baptist Church, past president, American Baptist Churches; Rev. Donald L. Lindblom, executive director, Council of Churches, Long Beach; Rev. Charles Malotte, regional pastor, Disciples of Christ; Dr. Horace Mays, executive director, Los Angeles Council of Churches; Rev. Gerald B. McHarg, Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), president, Southern California Council of Churches; Fr. Donald P. Merrifield, SJ, president, Loyola Marymount University; Rev. R. Truman Northup, executive director, Pacific Southwest Conference and Pacific Coast Region Church of the Brethren; Dr. Randall Phillips, pastor, Wilshire United Methodist Church, past president, Los Angeles Council of Churches; Rev. Fred P. Register, conference minister of Southern California and the Southwest Conference, United Church of Christ; Rev. A. Dale Rose, minister, Eagle Rock Presbyterian Church; Bishop Robert C. Rusack, Episcopal Diocese of Los Angeles; Sr. Marilyn Schafer, Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet; Rev. Robert Walker, National Conference of Christians and Jews.

The San Fernando Valley Interfaith Council declared itself "repulsed" by the UN action. In a resolution sent to Jewish congregations in the area, the council declared, "We want you to know you are not alone in our mutual struggle to achieve justice and dignity."

In Westchester County, New York, a number of Christian clergy and academicians, including presidents of two Catholic colleges, joined with civic leadership, including officers of the Urban League and NAACP, in a public statement of outrage at the resolution. They declared:

As a people of diverse racial, religious and ethnic origins, we share in the common commitment to end the

Should any people or nation be permitted to suffer discrimination and exclusion because of its faith or heritage, then no one is free and each of us is in danger.

Bishop McNairy's letter was forwarded to members of the Minnesota Council on Religion and Race by Albert C. Lehman, Jr., executive director of the Minnesota Council of Churches, for additional signatures.

In Long Island, more than 50 civic and academic leaders representing diverse racial, religious, and ethnic traditions, criticized the resolution as "harmful and counterproductive in the fight against racism and apartheid," and congratulated the U.S. delegation to the UN for its "vigorous and forthright condemnation of the resolution."

Among Protestant leaders signing the statement, which took the form of an open letter to Ambassador Moynihan, and which was published in the Long Island paper, *Newsday*, were Bishop Jonathan G. Sherman of the Episcopal Diocese of Long Island; Rev. William T. P. Rambo, Presbyter for the Long Island Presbytery; Rev. Herbert Chamberlin, president of the Long Island Council of Churches; Rev. Jack Alford, executive director of the Council; Rev. Ronald Bagnall, Lutheran representative on the Long Island Interfaith Council; Rev. Lawrence McCoombe of the Episcopal Diocese; Rev. Clayton L. Williams of the Olivet Baptist Church; and Rev. Robert Behnke of the Lutheran Human Relations Commission.

Catholic signatories from the diocese of Rockville Centre included Fr. Robert F. Fagan, executive director of Catholic Charities; Fr. George Graham, chairman of the Commission of the weekly newspaper, the *Long Island Catholic*; Fr. Francis Maniscalco, director of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine; Msgr. Henry J. Reel, director of the Human Development Office; and Fr. Robert S. Smith, director for Campus Ministry. The letter was also endorsed by a group of black leaders, by presidents and deans of various colleges and universities, by civic and business leaders and by rabbis and Jewish organizational leaders.

In similar form, a number of Christian leaders in Southern California joined in a statement of conscience which appeared in the *Los Angeles Times* on November 5. They declared:

For countless centuries Jews have dreamed of the rights of self-determination in their own homeland. Zionism is a movement which created a democratic Israel integrating a majority of Jews born in the Middle East together with survivors of the Nazi racial holocaust.

Sunday Journal. Criticisms of the UN resolution were issued by Episcopal Bishop Frederick Beldon, Roman Catholic Bishop Louis E. Gelinou, and the executive committee of the Rhode Island Council of Churches, along with statements by Governor Philip Noel, other state officers, U.S. senators and congressmen, mayors of four Rhode Island cities, officers of the Rhode Island AFL-CIO and the chairman of the state Board of Rabbis.

George Van Hoomissen, president of the Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon, conveyed "warm and fraternal greetings... to the entire Jewish community," and at the same time expressed "dismay and outrage" at the resolution. In a letter addressed to Kurt Hamburger, president of the Jewish Welfare Federation, he declared it has "become abundantly clear that 'anti-Zionism' is but a crude and ineffectual mask for anti-Semitism." Dr. Van Hoomissen stated his belief that "Christians and non-Christians alike, where they are not blinded by bigotry, ignorance or ideology are joined in a common bond of concern...they would say to Jews...'We have heard this terrible thing...We are not deaf, we are not indifferent. We care.'"

Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon, the successor to the Greater Portland and Oregon Councils of Churches, is composed of Protestant, Anglican and Roman Catholic denominations.

The board of directors of the Texas Conference of Churches—representing both Catholic and Protestant communions within the state—approved a resolution on the UN action during the course of its semiannual meeting, December 9-10. Noting that the nations which led the campaign "are themselves products of racial liberation movements and are, thus, denying to the Jewish people the fundamental right of national self-determination which these nations claim for themselves," the board's statement called the UN resolution "a step which promotes hatred and endangers world peace..." The statement was forwarded to Secretary-General Waldheim, President Ford, Ambassador Moynihan, and members of Congress from Texas; member churches of the conference were urged to disseminate it to their constituents.

Bishop Philip F. McNairy of the Diocese of Minnesota, in his capacity as chairman of the Minnesota Council on Religion and Race, declared himself "saddened and disturbed at the injustice and inaccuracy" of the resolution in a letter to Kurt Waldheim. Bishop McNairy continued:

Today is a time when cultures and peoples all over the world are involved, some militantly, in the struggle for identity and self-determination. Israel is one of many nations so engaged. Her distinctive characteristic is not of race, but of religion.

A. Eagle, Arizona regional director of the NCCJ, addressed an open letter to Christian denominational executives and pastors of the 50 largest churches in his region, asking their support and assistance in various ways: by helping their congregations to know the facts; by expressing their views to UN officials; by demonstrating friendship, support and encouragement to the Jewish community.

Separate statements were also issued by the NCCJ Georgia region and by chapters in Memphis, Kansas City, and Oklahoma City.

The American Humanist Association, in a statement adopted by its board of directors, called for an "energetic effort" to remove the subject of Zionism "from the context of any programs and discussions focusing on racism or racial discrimination." Describing Zionism as "a national aspiration to statehood but in no way racist philosophy," the board strongly opposed U.S. participation in the UN's anti-racism program "so long as the program remains distorted and compromised" by the resolution.

While condemning the "misuse of the machinery of the UN," the Humanist board at the same time urged the U.S. not to withdraw as a member of the world body, but to remain and support "the positive and constructive work" of the organization.

Statements by existing ecumenical or interfaith organizations or by *ad hoc* groups were issued on a statewide or broader basis from Colorado, Minnesota, Oregon, Rhode Island and Texas, and from New England. Similar statements on a community or regional basis came from Cleveland, Los Angeles, Phoenix, Pittsburgh and Syracuse, as well as from the San Fernando Valley in California; from Bridgeport, New London, Stamford and Eastern Fairfield County, Connecticut; and from Long Island and Westchester County, New York.

A statement signed by six Catholic and Protestant bishops in the state of Colorado declared that the UN action bore "the unmistakable stamp of anti-Semitism," and urged "all Christians, and indeed all people of conscience, to join in appropriate expressions of support for our Jewish brothers and sisters, for whom the UN resolution must raise again the spectre of persecution." It was signed by Episcopal Bishop William C. Frey, Archbishop James V. Casey of Denver, Auxiliary Bishop Richard C. Hanifen, Auxiliary Bishop George E. Evans, Archbishop Charles A. Buswell of Pueblo, and United Methodist Bishop Melvin Wheatley of the Denver area.

In Rhode Island, the statements of Christian leaders were joined with those of civic and political leadership in a compendium which appeared as a public advertisement in the Providence

ECUMENICAL AND INTERRELIGIOUS RESPONSES

This section of the document, incorporating public statements and actions by a variety of organizations or associated individuals, testifies to an interesting development in group life in the United States. There are, of course, national inter-religious organizations and their local affiliates, long established in the United States, whose responses are documented here. In addition to these, however, there are included the reactions of *ad hoc* groups of regional or community spokesmen—sometimes religious leadership of a given community, sometimes a mixed group of religious, civic, academic or professional leadership—who have come together under varied auspices to express themselves on this issue. The variety of the sources from which the following statements have been drawn would seem to indicate that informal networks of communication have developed in communities in many parts of the United States, whose members come together to react to situations they perceive as emergencies. Thus, in a number of regional areas or communities, Roman Catholic, Episcopal or Methodist bishops, executives of councils of churches and other religious leaders issued joint statements with other leadership in their area, often in the form of a public statement in the local press, in participation at various public events, or in letters to United States or UN officials.

The president of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Dr. David Hyatt, denounced the resolution as "a defamation of all Jews everywhere" and viewed the UN action as "an attempt by the Arab bloc to totally denounce and negate altogether Israel's existence." He continued:

Now is the time for all freedom-loving Christians, Jews, Moslems, and persons of all faiths and races to recognize that the cause of freedom and democracy is at stake throughout the world because of this vote and every possible effort must now be made to transform the UN from a political instrument of national self-interest and religious and racial bigotry into a worldwide organization that lives up to the tenets of its Charter and its Declaration of Human Rights—which were fashioned after our own great charters of freedom.

In similar fashion, the national vice-president of the NCCJ, Donald W. McEvoy, sent telegrams to 70 NCCJ offices throughout the nation urging clergy and laity to join in condemning the resolution which was then pending before the UN General Assembly.

Local NCCJ groups and officials also spoke out. Donald

Zionism, however, a movement started in the last century, is another question. To be opposed to the ideology expressed through an "ism," be it rationalism, racism, facism, communism, etc., is possible and oftentimes required.

The existence of Israel is no longer debatable. Israel is a reality. What is currently going on in the General Assembly is not a debate on Zionism *qua* racism, but a hostile propagandistic action questioning Israel's right to exist.

While there were few comments from denominational publications, *engage/social action*, a Methodist periodical, reflected:

Zionism is not racism. Minorities in Israel are treated far better than they are in Arab nations. (Why is racism not an issue in Saudi Arabia? If Israel was a major oil producer would the UN resolution have gained support?) Arab states do not, to put it mildly, have a record of tolerance for Jewish or Christian adherents within their boundaries.

Christians should look well to their own faith before they condemn their Jewish-co-religionists who support the State of Israel against racist charges. As a historic faith, Christianity is grafted onto the root, Israel, and that root is fixed deep in the soil of Palestine. If Zionism is racist, Christendom is racist as well. Thus Christians could do worse than to ponder the words of Karl Barth: "In order to be chosen we must, for good or ill, either be Jews or else be heart and soul on the side of the Jews."

The *Orthodox Observer*, the official publication of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, viewed the resolution as a challenge to the supporters of Zionism to present "a clear, positive and constructive exposition of all that it involves." In a December 10 editorial, the *Observer* expressed some confusion about Zionism and said it was clearly not the same as Judaism:

Judaism and Zionism are not identical. Anti-Semitism has been rejected emphatically by Christianity and every effort must be made continually to ensure its eradication from the hearts and minds of all peoples. The Jewish people and their heritage, which is part of our heritage, are worthy of the greatest respect and admiration. Certainly their right to life, justice and freedom must be guaranteed. And the existence of the State of Israel within secure borders cannot be seriously questioned today.

that Jews constitute one people and thus should form a political community violates the most elementary social and cultural laws." He described Zionism as "a creature of 19th century European racism," and argued that Israeli law and land practices amounted to racial and ethnic discrimination.

Ya'ir Bar Am, pen name of an Israeli citizen who has worked for one of the Zionist youth movements in the U.S., wrote that the UN resolution was "a victory for the hawks on both sides," and that the Israelis and Palestinians would suffer most from it. While critical of specific Israeli government policies, he defended Zionism as the liberation movement of the Jewish people.

Rabbi Daniel F. Polish saw the UN action as "nothing short of a secular passion play—with all the nuances and all the potential for mischief of its religious antecedents."

...While other nations are entitled to a land, Jews are not...While other movements of national liberation are to be hailed, Zionism is to be condemned...Once more the Jewish people are depicted as in league with the forces of darkness, once more stigmatized as a people unlike others, subject to a different standard of judgment.

Robert G. Hoyt, founder of the *National Catholic Reporter*, noted, "Israel is not the least racist nation; but it obviously is not the most." He viewed the resolution as a "consolation prize" for the failure to oust Israel from the UN. Declaring that peace was the great imperative and that it meant risk-taking by each side, he argued that Palestinians must abandon their goal of destroying Israel and that Israelis should risk the creation of the Palestinian state.

John C. Bennett, senior contributing editor of the publication, called the UN action "unjust and irresponsible," but felt it was dangerous to identify those who voted for the resolution with anti-Semitism, and wrong to punish the UN as an organization. Israel's dependence on the United States is essential for Israel's security, he wrote, but unfortunate because the "insensitive and destructive" use of American power creates resentment against Israel for appearing to be an outpost of American power.

The Christian Century, itself ambivalent about Zionism and the original creation of the state of Israel, nevertheless declared:

(In addition to the above, officials of councils of churches in a number of other regions and communities—Long Island, New York; Oregon; Southern California; Los Angeles and Phoenix—signed joint statements issued under ecumenical auspices, documented in a following section.)

Protestant and Orthodox Press Comments

The UN resolution evoked editorial reactions from Protestant publications as far afield as the theologically conservative *Christianity Today* and the liberal *Christianity and Crisis*. The *Christianity Today* comment, written November 7, before the passing of the resolution by the General Assembly, said its adoption by the Third Committee "threatened to make the UN appear irresponsible, prejudiced and anti-Semitic." The editorial continued:

If religious considerations are part of the indictment in the committee's resolution, it is only fair to observe that in this area Judaism is no match for Islam and its strictures against non-Muslims. Muslims who have converted to Christianity can tell the world of the social, economic, and political sanctions that follow as a matter of course. For the Arabs to press this line tells us more about them than about the state of Israel.

The Jews have not tried to destroy any other group of people. Rather they themselves have been the victims of attempted genocide. And it is the extremist Arabs who want neither a Jewish state nor an Arab-Jewish state that pose the real threat of genocide to the Jews.

Christianity and Crisis devoted an entire issue to the UN resolution (December 22), comprising five articles ranging widely in opinion. Space prevents anything but a most superficial summary of those viewpoints.

Rosemary and Herman Ruether explored in some detail the differences between Jewish and Arab nationalism. Zionism "is a self-limited particularity," and Judaism affirms no mission to conquer the rest of the world religiously. Arab nationalism "finds any domination by another group...to be an offense to its identity....To allow the permanent acceptance of a Jewish state within the historical area of Muslim conquest would require a fundamental change in this mindset of Muslim identity."

Ibrahim Abu-Lughad, a Palestinian, professor and author, asserted that Zionism is a form of racism, and "the assumption

The Metropolitan Christian Council of Philadelphia, an association of Protestant and Orthodox communions in south-east Pennsylvania, declared itself (November 15) unequivocally opposed to the resolution and called upon the UN "to reconsider its ill-advised action, to acknowledge the error of this resolution and take such measures as are necessary to rescind it."

This action by its board of directors followed closely on an earlier letter sent by officers of the Council to Kurt Waldheim, calling upon the UN to repudiate the draft resolution and "to prevent that last best hope of humankind from becoming a forum for making a mockery of the vision of universal peace and justice." The letter was signed by the following Protestant and Orthodox leaders: the Rev. John C. Shetler, chairman of the Council and conference minister, Pennsylvania Southeast Conference, United Church of Christ; the Rev. William L. Johnston, president of the Council and executive minister, Philadelphia Baptist Association; the Rev. Dr. William A. Janson, Jr., vice-president of the Council and president, Southeastern Pennsylvania Synod, Lutheran Church in America; the Rev. Carl M. Kleis, secretary of the Council and president, Philadelphia Classis, Reformed Church in America; the Rev. Dr. Rufus Cornelsen, executive director of the Council; Bishop James M. Ault, Eastern Pennsylvania Conference, United Methodist Church; Francis G. Brown, general secretary, Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends; Bishop E. L. Hickman, First Episcopal District, African Methodist Episcopal Church; Archpriest John A. Limberakis, Greek Orthodox Community of Philadelphia; Bishop Lyman C. Ogilby, Diocese of Pennsylvania, Episcopal Church; the Rev. Dr. Frank H. Stroup, executive secretary, Philadelphia Presbytery, United Presbyterian Church in the USA; the Rev. Harrison J. Trapp, moderator, Pennsylvania Baptist Association.

Religious leaders in Richmond, in a statement by the twelve-member executive committee of the Clergy Association of the Richmond Area, declared the linking of Zionism and racism "a falsehood without historical justification" and a "denial of the very promise and purpose of the United Nations."

The executive board of the Manchester area (Connecticut) Conference of Churches unanimously condemned the resolution and extended "to our Jewish neighbors this statement of sympathetic concern for the hurt which that vote has caused them." Similarly, the Greater Cleveland Interchurch Council joined Jews in condemning the resolution.

We remind ourselves and our fellow members in the Christian churches of the all too modest voice of protest raised by the churches during the days of the Nazi Holocaust and we believe that even today there is insensitivity among Christians to the history and aspirations of the Jewish community.

The board offered "the good offices and resources" of the OCC for the furthering of Jewish-Christian dialogue "in the hope of achieving greater understanding and mutual trust."

The executive committee of the Rhode Island Council of Churches unanimously condemned the resolution as "a gross distortion of historical and contemporary fact." "Given UN endorsement," they warned, "this false secular charge can become as devastating to Jews in the future as the discredited religious charge of 'deicide' has been in the past."

A Virginia Council of Churches statement, signed by individual clergymen and laymen, described Zionism as "a movement to bring freedom to the Jewish people...born amidst anti-Semitism [which] reached fruition only in the aftermath of one of the greatest catastrophes in history—the destruction of six million Jews. In approving this resolution condemning Zionism," they continued, "the United Nations has become an instrument of racism."

Among the signers were the council's executive secretary, the Rev. Myron Miller; associate executive secretary, the Rev. Carl Howard; the council's president-elect, the Rev. Constantine Dombalis, pastor of Sts. Constantine and Helen Greek Orthodox Church; Richmond District Superintendent of the Virginia Conference of United Methodists, the Rev. Harold Hughes; the Rev. George Ricketts, executive director of the Chaplaincy Service of the Churches of Virginia, and the Rev. J. Fletcher Lowe, rector of the Episcopal Church of the Holy Comforter.

As noted earlier, Bishop Walter F. Sullivan of the Richmond Catholic diocese also signed the statement, as did two laymen associated with the diocesan office for social development, Walter Grazer and William Vesey; also the Rev. Tim Brindle, a Baptist seminarian, and Rabbi Myron Berman of Temple Beth El.

The board of directors of the Christian Council of Metropolitan Atlanta condemned the resolution in a statement circulated by its president, Mr. Paul Manners and its executive director, Dr. Harmon D. Moore. "Justice for all parties should be done," declared the statement, "but anti-Semitism should and must be denounced wherever it occurs and Christians should be the first to speak out against it."

Protest against the "obscene" UN action even came from an association committed to the conversion of Jews. Dr. Dan Fuchs, of the American Board of Missions to the Jews, circulated a letter of resolution in support of the State of Israel to thousands of Christian leaders in America asking for their expressions of public support. "With world opinion mounting swiftly against God's chosen people, we cannot remain silent," he stated.

Regional and Local Church Associations

Statements attacking the UN action came from state councils of churches in Arkansas, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Ohio, Rhode Island and Virginia, and from city-wide councils for clergy associations in Atlanta, Bridgeport, Manchester and New Britain (Connecticut), Cleveland, Philadelphia and Richmond.

The Arkansas Council of Churches called the resolution "wholly unacceptable" and "a slander against Jews everywhere." While expressing sympathy for those who have suffered on both sides of the conflict, the council said that such sympathy "does not allow us to disregard the malice expressed in the UN's resolution and its dangerous portent for the future."

The Massachusetts Council of Churches, in a statement issued by its executive director, the Rev. Dr. James Nash on November 13, urged the UN General Assembly "to rescind this unconscionable action." "The tragedy of this resolution," they declared, "is that it justifiably destroys the moral stature of the UN in the eyes of the world."

The General Secretary of the New Jersey Council of Churches, the Rev. Paul L. Stagg, in letters to President Ford, Ambassador Moynihan and UN representative Leonard Germent, called the UN action a "repugnant...anti-Semitic attack on Judaism and the Jewish people." Declaring, "There is not a shred of truth in the slanderous charge," he expressed hope that "our government will stand firm while keeping open to rational solutions, consonant with Israel's existence."

The general board of the Ohio Council of Churches also attacked the resolution in a statement adopted December 24. The board deplored "the hypocrisy surrounding the passage of the resolution," and further declared the UN action "mischief in that it may lead to renewed anti-Semitic acts and attitudes."

While calling on Congress to continue supporting the UN agencies and the General Assembly budgets, the OCC board added:

It would rather be a refusal to support financially an immoral act.

An official of the Southern Baptist Convention, Dr. A. Jase Jones, director of the Department of Interfaith Witness of the denomination's Home Mission Board, also attacked the UN resolution. In a letter to Kurt Waldheim he accused the majority in the UN General Assembly of having "degraded the high principles of...that noble institution." He pointed out that Israel, "the fruit of Zionism, has demonstrated by an even-handed treatment of its racial, cultural and religious minorities that its basic philosophy is completely non-racist." To Ambassador Daniel P. Moynihan, he expressed gratitude for "courageous and eloquent opposition of the resolution," and questioned "whether the U.S. can be a wholehearted partner in the UN after that organization is to be misused and abused in such a manner." Dr. Jones also wrote to Senator Lloyd M. Benston of Texas and to his Congressional representative suggesting that the U.S. government "should immediately reassess the nature of the future relationship of this country to the UN, and he similarly communicated with 29 pastors and denominational leaders, asking them to make their influence felt. "This does not mean taking sides against Arabic-speaking peoples," he wrote. "It simply means taking a stand against the acceptance of the falsehood given legal sanction on November 10, 1975."

The Rev. James E. Wood, Jr., executive director of the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs in Washington, D.C. called the UN vote a "deplorable action...unprecedented in the history of the United Nations."

"This endorsement of anti-Semitism," he declared, "can only seriously erode the future credibility and effectiveness of the UN as an international organization dedicated to peace and human rights."

The Kansas-Nebraska Southern Baptist Convention, during the course of its annual convention in Topeka, took issue with the UN resolution and asked Baptists to "express concern about the matter" to their members of Congress.

A group of evangelical Protestants called "Christians for Israel," headquartered in San Antonio, also criticized the resolution. In a letter to President Ford, H. M. Kraft, Houston representative of the organization said, "For many years, Arab propagandists and their supporters in the Third World and Communist worlds have engaged in a conscious campaign to defame the Zionist movement, their ultimate goal being the destruction of Israel. I am proud that our government has vigorously opposed this overt anti-Semitic trend, and am once again proud of you as our President."

move to lay the entire responsibility upon Israel, a nation which the Arab countries refuse to grant the right to exist. When and if the Arab nations and the Palestine Liberation Organization accept Israel's legitimate existence, some solution will be found for the Palestinian problem.

Lutheran Statements

The Rev. John F. Steinbruck, a Lutheran pastor in Washington, D.C., lashed out at the UN resolution. "The same mindless illogical mob that, during the Black Death days of the 14th century, accused Jews of poisoning Christian wells, appears to be alive and well," he said in the course of a talk to a Jewish congregation in Easton, Pennsylvania. "The embers of a fire that won't seem to go out," he declared, "are now being—ironically—stoked by the Communist east, the Third World regions and oil-soaked OPEC countries where racism is a way of life."

In similar fashion, Lutheran leaders endorsed various local and regional statements noted elsewhere in this document.

Evangelical Groups and Leaders

Criticism of the UN action also came from Evangelical church associations and leaders, including one group devoted to the conversion of Jews.

Dr. Arnold T. Olson, president of the Evangelical Free Church of America in Minneapolis, described the resolution as "another nail in the coffin of an institution seemingly bent on destroying itself." Dr. Olson continued:

Zionism is no different than any other twentieth-century struggle for the recognition of a national identity and self-determination by a people. In other countries we call it nationalism and praise it as patriotic but when it comes to Israel it is branded as racism.

The resolution is another one of a long list of attempts to destroy the State of Israel by the very organization which helped bring it into being.

As Americans we should urge our representatives in Congress to take steps to withhold financial support. The withholding of funds is not a form of blackmail.

But even with its imperfections it stands alone in the Middle East as a democratic society. Of the seventy Arab, Asian, African and Communist countries who voted for this resolution, which can demonstrate a better record of civil rights and religious liberties? The answer is obvious. These largely one-party states, as opposed to Israel's multi-party democracy, are engaging in a mixture of political expediency, cynicism and hypocrisy when they seek by majority vote in the UN to turn ethics upside down.

Presbyterian Statements

No statements were issued by Presbyterian national boards or agencies; however, regional groups or representatives and individual pastors participated in a number of local or regional statements.

The Presbytery of Long Island (United Presbyterian Church USA) declared its opposition to the UN action in a resolution adopted November 25. It called the UN resolution "frankly untrue..." Moreover, "it provides a United Nations imprimatur for further attempts to eliminate the state of Israel and, it could easily encourage or support the renewed practice of anti-Semitism anywhere in the world."

Presbyterian officials who endorsed local and regional ecumenical statements included the Rev. Dr. Frank H. Stroup, executive secretary of the Philadelphia Presbytery; Rev. Dr. William Aber of the Redstone (Pennsylvania) Presbytery; Rev. Robert Loyer of the Cayuga-Syracuse Presbytery; and the Rev. William Rambo of the Long Island Presbytery.

The Rev. Q. Gerald Roseberry, pastor of the United Presbyterian Church in Camelback, Arizona, in an article in the *Scottsdale Daily Progress* (December 9) called the UN resolution "merely one more attempt by Israel's enemies to isolate her from the community of nations and make her more vulnerable to defeat." Rev. Roseberry continued:

The miserable, unrelenting hardships of the Palestinian refugees cry out for solution, but to imply that they are the result of Zionist (read Jewish) racism is maliciously false. The Palestinian problem is primarily political and flows out of the UN's own action, the partitioning of Palestine and creating the state of Israel in 1947, and the subsequent war waged against the new nation by five neighboring Arab states...

The United Nation's "Zionism Resolution" is a cynical

Palestinian people has its own land and its own government." He told the Assembly that he would introduce a resolution at the then forthcoming meeting of the WCC in Nairobi calling upon the UN to reverse its action.

A regional body of the same denomination, the executive committee of the Connecticut Conference of the United Church of Christ, the largest Protestant body in Connecticut, attacked the UN action as "utterly despicable." Their resolution, adopted on November 12, said in part:

We declare to our fellow Americans who are Jews that we stand solidly with them against this action and any other which would fan the flickering sparks of racial bigotry which remain in our midst and we call upon all Christians to continue to oppose anti-Semitism wherever and whenever the opportunity presents itself.

Other United Church of Christ clergy expressed themselves in various contexts. For example, the Rev. Fred P. Register, Conference Minister of Southern California and the Southwest Conference of the UCC, co-signed a statement of conscience with other Christian leaders in his area, as did the Rev. John C. Shetler, Conference Minister of the UCC's Pennsylvania Southeast Conference.

Disciples of Christ

Dr. Robert A. Fangmeier, director of International Affairs of the Division of Homeland Ministries, Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) expressed his outrage at the resolution in a letter to the editor of the *Indianapolis News*. "This Arab-sponsored mischief does their cause no good," he declared, "holds back prospects of justice for the Palestinian refugees, raises doubts about the integrity of any Middle East settlement and further threatens the fabric of the world organization." Regarding Zionism, he wrote:

After centuries of pogroms and persecution in predominantly Christian and Moslem nations, is it racist discrimination to want one small piece of land in the world where Jews may freely practice their own religion and give expression to their own culture? The preservation of a race and religion can be described as "discrimination" only by those who feel they have no right to exist.

Jews in Israel and elsewhere would be the first to admit that Israel is an imperfect political expression of the high aspirations of their religion and culture.

the Rev. A. Dudley Ward of Washington, general secretary; and the Rev. Herman Will, Jr., of Washington, associate general secretary for world peace.

Criticism of the UN action also came from a regional Methodist organization, the Southern California-Arizona Conference of the United Methodist Church. In a letter to Kurt Waldheim, J. Irwin Trotter, director of the Council of Ministries and Mildred Hutchinson, chairperson of the Board of Church and Society declared, "To resort to anti-Semitism as a weapon ...is to let loose demons that no one will be able to control."

Two of the social principles of the United Methodist Church, they wrote, have been condemnation of anti-Semitism in both its overt and covert forms and strong support for the UN. "Our denomination has helped create a favorable climate of opinion for the UN from its inception," they stated, but the recent action of the Assembly "is in conflict with these two principles, and will unfortunately undermine the support that the UN has among our church members." They appealed to the Assembly "to raise the level of discussion regarding this crucial dispute rather than contributing to the confusion of the issues."

United Church of Christ

The United Church Board for World Ministries criticized the resolution as "an ill-advised propaganda device." The 225-member board, which handles mission policy for the 1.8 million-member United Church of Christ, voted to "deplore" the UN resolution, rejecting its method of "voicing opposition to Israel's policies and unwillingness to comply with UN resolutions on the Middle East."

It urged the UN to "find ways to enable the Palestinian people to achieve their legitimate rights to nationhood and statehood and to recognize the right of...Israel to exist peacefully within the internationally agreed boundaries."

The president of the United Church of Christ, Dr. Robert V. Moss, was more explicitly critical of the resolution, labeling it "infamous." Addressing a state-wide denominational assembly in Wichita, Kansas on November 16, Dr. Moss said, "Nations like Russia, Poland and Yugoslavia who fought so hard and suffered so much at the hands of Nazism seem now to have allied themselves with the Nazi philosophy in supporting the UN action." Asserting that the sponsors of the resolution meant by it Jews and Judaism as well as the state of Israel, Dr. Moss added, "There can be no peace and no justice until the continued existence of Israel is guaranteed, and the

anti-Semitic consequences of the resolution, but rather urged the President, the State Department and Congress "to continue to give full support to the UN...and to refuse to initiate any form of punitive action that will intensify the plight of desperate and hungry persons from the Third World nations involved," pointing out that these "helpless masses of people ...had nothing to do with the intricate power politics of the UN General Assembly."

Bishops Roy C. Nichols of Pittsburgh, John B. Warman of Harrisburg, and Melvin E. Wheatley, Jr., of Denver voted against the above statement on the grounds that it was not strong enough in condemning the UN action. Both Bishops Nichols and Wheatley endorsed stronger statements emanating from their local communities, as did Bishops Joseph Yeakel of Syracuse and James M. Ault of Eastern Pennsylvania. Others issued remarks that went beyond the Council of Bishops' statement, both in defense of Zionism and in criticism of the UN. For example, Bishop W. Ralph Ward, president of the Council of Bishops, declared that Zionism "means much more than a political entity. It implies moral and spiritual values characteristic of the Jewish people through the ages. These have to be upheld in the Christian community."

In addition, officials of two Methodist agencies, the Board of Global Ministries and the Board of Church and Society, sent a letter to Jewish leaders in the United States declaring, "Out of Christian conscience, we deplore the irresponsible and self-defeating vote in the General Assembly of the United Nations, which presumed to define Zionism as racist in character. To attempt such a definition is indefensible in historical perspective."

Asserting that the resolution "solves nothing, adds anguish to Jews and endangers support for the UN," the leaders stressed both the right of Israel to exist as a state within clear and recognized boundaries and a hearing for the needs of Palestinians in and outside of Israel, as essentials.

At the same time, the agency leaders cautioned that "scapegoating activity" against the United Nations would result in "additional damage."

The letter was signed for the Board of Global Ministries by Bishop Paul A. Washburn of Chicago, president; Dr. Tracey K. Jones, Jr., general secretary; Bishop James K. Mathews of Washington, vice-president for ecumenical and interreligious affairs; and Dr. Robert W. Huston, chief ecumenical staff officer.

Signing for the Board of Church and Society were Bishop James Armstrong of Aberdeen, South Dakota, president; the

on Jewish Relations of the Ecumenical Commission of the Episcopal Diocese of New York issued a separate statement through its chairman, the Rev. Dr. Lee A. Belford. In a letter to Kurt Waldheim, Dr. Belford declared:

The attempt to equate Zionism with racial discrimination is both historically absurd and morally obscene, and actually leads to a posture of hatred for Jews because they are Jews.

The executive council of the Episcopal Diocese of Connecticut resolved (December 17) "that the equating of Zionism with racism is offensive to our consciences as Christians. We desire to express this response to our UN Delegation and to leaders of the Jewish community in this state and to the press."

In addition, the Diocesan Council of the Episcopal Diocese of Los Angeles, in a separate resolution adopted November 26, voted with Bishop Rusack "in expressing to the Jewish community of Los Angeles through its leaders our distress over [the UN] action; that we extend to them the hand of brotherly love; and assure them of our desire to establish dialogue in all matters of mutual concern." Moreover, the Diocesan Council also voted to incorporate into its minutes a message of Holy Day Greetings to the Jewish community which had been adopted by the Executive Council of the Episcopal Church at its regular meeting in Greenwich, Connecticut, September 16-18. (This message, unrelated to the UN action, extended greetings to the Jewish community upon the celebration of Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur, urged joint study between Episcopal and Jewish congregations, expressed "indebtedness to Judaism for the rich heritage that we Christians possess..." and declared, in part:

We are aware that the history of Jewish-Christian relations has been marked many times with bitterness, pain, prejudice and persecution. We pray that these days will never again be repeated and pledge our efforts as elected leaders of the Episcopal Church to be vigilant in standing against every expressing of the sickness we call anti-Semitism...)

United Methodist

The Council of Bishops of the United Methodist Church issued a statement on November 12 deploring "the one-sidedness of the resolution and its possible impact on delicate negotiations in the Middle East." The bishops' statement was more concerned with potential loss of support for the UN, however, than with the substance of the resolution itself. Thus, it made no reference to Israel or the possible