

dominance in the government would guarantee the infusion of Labor ideals in national education. In retrospect, we can see how wrong they were.

Indeed, three decades later the Zionist right wing, long the apostles of fetishizing the state, came to power and gave their coalition partner, the National Religious Party, the portfolio for Education and Culture. Zvulun Hammer, a religious and not a "pure" nationalist, has sought, albeit with caution, to enhance the religious content of the curriculum of the secular state schools which he oversees along with the religious ones. Labor, in the meanwhile, is dominated by statist technocrats and finds itself not only in opposition but bewildered and unsure of its own vision and goals.

#### The State Has Become An End In Itself

Israeli and American Zionisms have met where the means become all and ends— ideology— are negated. What this ultimately signifies is the triumph of right wing Zionism— a triumph, if the above analysis is correct, prepared by the Labor Zionists. With this triumph the State *qua* State becomes an object of worship, nationalism runs rampant, and there is no place for a critical Zionism. The promotion of *aliyah* today exemplifies what this implies: how often are American Jews told to move to Israel "because it is good for the State" (i.e. American Jews are a means to the end of the State), rather than because *aliyah* responds to dilemmas to their *own* lives (in which case, the State is a means, and only a means, for the well-being of the Jewish people)? The two approaches represent difference between a statist Zionism and a humanist Zionism.

Ahad Ha'am once wrote an essay entitled "Anticipations and Survivals" in which he tells us that in each age there exist beliefs that are out of step with their times, hidden in "watertight compartments" in the minds of a few, with no practical effect. These are "survivals" lacking the conditions which originally nurtured them, and their contemporary appearance of life "is illusory: it is no real life of motion and activity, but the passive life of an old man whose 'moisture is gone and his natural force abated'."

Alongside "survivals" there are "anticipations"— ideas yet in their youth, alive (like "survivals") in a world that doesn't understand them. Writing in 1892, Ahad Ha'am saw the Return to Zion as a "survival" which, given the right developments, could flourish as new life, and become as a soul to

a body. For there is hope for both "anticipations" and "survivals," he insisted, as long as they have a breath in them.

#### Zionism is Nearly Lifeless

The Zionist world today is composed of bodies without souls, institutions with red tape in their veins; their appearance of life is illusory as demonstrated by the surreal world of the Zionist Congress held this past December. (How many delegates returned to the *Golah* complaining that there was too much "politics" at the Congress? Better to be "pragmatic.")

A vibrant, critical Zionism is but a survival today, somewhere in watertight compartments in the minds of a few. Shall it suffocate or break out and breathe? Here then is one task for thinking Zionists: an intellectual guerrilla war against the Zionism of today. Before Zionism's future lies the question of finding a form of itself relevant to the conditions of the times. In the era of Beginesque triumphalism this is to ask: can the survival become an anticipation too— an old-new soul giving rebirth to a decaying body? ●

---

#### Sh'ma: of, by and for the readers

For twelve years your subscriptions and contributions have supported *Sh'ma*. Now is the time to renew that support.

A gift of \$1.43 will entitle you to a copy of Eugene Borowitz's Harvard Divinity School Convocation Address. Those who contribute \$150 or more will receive Elie Wiesel's *Somewhere A Master*.

Send your tax-deductible contributions to *Sh'ma*, Box 567, Port Washington, NY, 11050. Along with your checks, reactions to past issues as well as ideas for future issues are welcome. ●

---

#### Promoting racism in israel

##### *Eric H. Yoffie*

On February 26, 1980, an article entitled "The Mitzvah of Genocide in the Torah" appeared in *Bat Kol*, the student publication of Bar-Ilan University, which is Israel's major Orthodox institution of higher learning. Written by Rabbi Israel Hess, the article is an explanation of the

---

*Eric Yoffie is a rabbi and the Director of the Midwest Council of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.*

commandment in Deuteronomy 25:17 to obliterate the memory of Amalek. Rabbi Hess notes that the commandment requires the killing of babes and sucklings, and forbids the showing of mercy. Amalek, he tells us, is any nation that declares war against Israel. In response to such a war, "God proclaims a counter-jihad" in which He Himself participates. Lest the reader thinks that Rabbi Hess is referring only to an abstract halachic matter, he concludes by stressing that we shall all soon be called upon to wage a *milchemet mitzvah* (a war of religious obligation), the purpose of which will be to exterminate Amalek. Today's Amalek is not identified, but it is not difficult to guess whom he has in mind. Following the article's publication, there were no expressions of protest from the *Bat Kol* editorial board, Bar-Ilan students, or the university administration, and it was later reprinted in other newspapers.

The opinions of Rabbi Hess are significant because they indicate a distressing trend which has become increasingly apparent in the State of Israel in the last decade. In certain Orthodox circles, Rabbis and others, quoting Torah and speaking in the name of Jewish law, have expressed views about the relations between Jews and non-Jews that are such a departure from normally accepted thinking on such matters that one can only react to them with incredulity. Their underlying assumption seems to be that the hostility of the Gentile world to the Jewish people has created an unbridgeable gap between Jew and non-Jew. This hatred is seen as being so intense that it demands, with the supposed approval of the Jewish tradition, a radical response on the part of Jews to the non-Jews who live in their midst and on their borders.

#### Gentiles Suspected of Intent To Murder

A second striking example of this phenomenon is an exchange of letters between Rabbi Shimon Wizer and a Yeshivah student serving in the Israeli army (*Niv Hamidrashiyah*, vol. 11, pp. 29-31, and vol. 13, pp. 211-212). The student had asked his teacher about the application of the concept of *tohar haneshek* (the purity of arms) to the Arab non-combatant population during wartime. The Rabbi struggles with the question of how to judge a Jew who murders a Gentile during peacetime, but proceeds to assert that "in any case, in time of war, one is obligated to kill." He explains his conclusion by pointing to the talmudic principle that if one comes to kill you, you should arise and kill him first. When applying the principle to Jews, Rabbi Wizer points out,

it is valid only when there is firm reason to believe that your attacker has murderous intentions. However, the non-Jew in wartime "must always be judged as one who comes to kill you, except if it is otherwise clear that he has no malicious intent." Rabbi Wizer insists that his view of *tohar haneshek* is the correct one according to halacha, and he laments the fact that the Israel Defense Forces have accepted the Gentile meaning of the term, thus forcing them to suffer unnecessary casualties.

In response to his Rabbi's answer, the soldier concludes in his letter that "during wartime I am permitted, and even obligated, to kill every Arab man and woman who happen across my way. I am obligated to kill them even if this leads to complications with the military code." Concerned that so many children are misled by the "rationality" that is so prevalent in Israeli society, the soldier urges that this concept of *tohar haneshek* be taught in Israeli schools, especially the religious ones.

In a later defense of his position, Rabbi Wizer reaffirms his stand, and adduces as support an opinion by Rabbi Abraham Zemel which "arrived at a similar conclusion." Rabbi Zemel's views are also worthy of consideration. They appeared in an article which was written while he served as Chief Military Rabbi of the Central Command, and which contains a halachic justification for the killing of non-Jewish civilians, including women and children, in time of war: "Thus they say: 'And the best among the Gentiles thou shalt kill,' and one must never trust that a non-Jew will refrain from causing harm to our forces." The Chief of Staff suppressed the article, but it later found its way into the secular press (*Haolam Hazehe*, no. 1915).

#### Proponents of Racism Well-known

The proponents of these views are in some cases well-known and highly respected figures. For example, Rabbi Eliezer Waldenberg, the winner of the 1976 Israel Prize, has contended that it is forbidden for non-Jews to live in Jerusalem: "I, for example, am for maintaining the law that forbids non-Jews from living in Jerusalem, and if we are to maintain this law in a proper fashion we would need to expel all non-Jews from Jerusalem... In like manner, it is forbidden to us to permit non-Jews to be in a majority in any city among the cities of Israel" (*Haarets*, May 9, 1976).

It would be terribly wrong to suggest that all or

most members of Israel's Orthodox community support such ideas. Surely they do not. A relatively small number of *Gush Emunim* members and sympathizers are responsible. However, it must be stressed that these quotations are no longer simply isolated examples, and many more could be added to those offered above. Even more distressing is the fact that with a few exceptions, the Orthodox establishment in Israel has remained silent in the face of these clumsy distortions of Jewish law.

#### **Amnon Rubinstein Takes Exception**

The one public figure who has carefully catalogued these outrages and has attempted to bring them to the public's attention is Amnon Rubinstein, a law professor at Tel Aviv University and a member of the Knesset's moderate *Shinui* party. Unfortunately, Rubinstein's efforts have gained little notice. He is usually ignored or seen as an alarmist, while *Gush Emunim* supporters have vilified him as a Jew-hater and an Arab-lover. He has remained undeterred, however, and has pointed out that not only do such voices bring Judaism into disrepute, but they also could create a dangerous mood which might have serious practical consequences for the Arabs of Israel.

Rubinstein is right, and the time has come for a concerted and forceful protest from the religious community, Orthodox and non-Orthodox, both in Israel and the Diaspora. All those who cherish Torah must be anguished by its use as an instrument of racism. Such sentiments are anti-Jewish, anti-Zionist, and an affront to the entire Jewish people. We must condemn them now, clearly and unequivocally, before they begin to claim innocent victims. ●

#### **Israeli ban on Strauss' music is unjust**

*David Goldstein*

Israel recently reaffirmed its public blackout of the music of Wagner and Richard Strauss as a gesture of sensitivity to the victims of the Holocaust. The linkage of Strauss with Wagner is quite unjust and a clear case of guilt by association.

Strauss actually lived at the time of Hitler and for a short time served as head of the Music Division of the Third Reich. His great works, *A Symphony of Psalms*, *Der Rosenkavalier* and *Salome*, among many others, served to establish him as a leading

---

*David Goldstein is rabbi of Touro Synagogue in New Orleans, Louisiana.*

musician of his time. It is known that he met with Hitler face to face and posed in photographs with him. It is also clear that he did not lift a finger in protest. Alas, he acceded to Hitler just like everyone else.

Yet Strauss was really no more a Nazi than were scores of millions of other Germans who also never lifted a finger to stop Hitler. This is not to extenuate his behavior, only to place it in perspective. Politically, Strauss blends into the masses.

Wagner however stands out like a sore thumb. He was an inspiration for Hitler and for hate.

Though he antedated the Nazis by more than half a century, no man of his time was more Nazi than he. He represented the cultural link between Nietzsche and Hitler, using music to express the leitmotifs of Aryan superiority. This hardly describes the gentler themes of Strauss.

The real difference the two musicians is that for Strauss, art and politics were separated; for Wagner they were one and the same. Further, Wagner genuinely hated Jews and used his not inconsequential influence to prevent the emergence of Jewish composers such as Meyerbeer and Mendelssohn and the poet Heine. His poisonously hateful work, *Das Judentum in der Musik* was calculated to denigrate and sabotage Jewish cultural life in Europe. Indeed, Wagner believed that Jewish life and creativity should be eradicated altogether.

#### **Strauss Ban A Form Hypocrisy**

We live in a strange world, don't we? We regularly turn our backs on gross evil and from time to time even traffic with it, but reserve the fury of our moral indignation for the pitifully insignificant. It is a form of hypocrisy that permits us to trivialize monstrous aberrant behavior and thereby extenuate our own enfeeblement in its face.

I certainly do not suggest that Israel alone is guilty of this. In fact, Israel, of all nations, may be least condemnable. Yet, every other car in Israel is either a VW or a Mercedes. Israel's merchant fleet was outfitted in West Germany as part of the post-war reparations agreement. Trade relations between Israel and Germany are brisk on many levels. Diplomatic relations have been established. But, the music of Richard Strauss may not be heard in Jerusalem's concert halls or over the radio.

The words of Schiller seem apt: "Die