

THE FRIENDLY PERVERSION

**Quakers as Reconcilers:
Good People and Dirty Work**

by H. David Kirk

To the memory of

H. Lyn Harris,
George A. Sutherland,
and Patrick Lloyd,
my three exemplars
of the Quaker way of life.

Acknowledgments

I wish to acknowledge with thanks permission to quote from pamphlets, books, and journal articles, which were vital in developing this essay. I also want to express my deep appreciation to three people who were important in making the essay possible. My friends Rael Jean and Erich Isaac originally drew my attention to the puzzling involvement of Quakers in Middle Eastern affairs. Then they urged me to put my background and interest to work in trying to unravel and explain the puzzle. Rael Isaac and my wife, Beverly Tansey, have given me much help with library research, and with Beve it was possible for me to think out loud about my involvements in and attachment to Quakerism.

CONTENTS

I. To the Quakers	1
II. Good People Indeed	10
III. But Not Without Faulty Thinking	20
IV. Or Even Dirty Work	34
Schematic Summary	60
Bibliographic Notes	61
Appendices	64

Appendix A, Ad from *Jerusalem Post*, July 11, 1978

Appendix B, Sections from *Truth and Peace in the Middle East*

I. TO THE QUAKERS

It seems to me to be a major issue for the Society of Friends... whether on the whole the emphasis is to be for [a] type of open, expectant religion, or whether it is to seek for comfortable formulations that seem to ensure safety, and that will be hostages against new and dangerous enterprises in the realm of truth. Are we charged with hope and faith and vision or are we busy endeavoring to coin repetitive phrases and to become secure resting places for the mind?

—Rufus Jones, "Rethinking Quaker Principles," 1940
in H. Maurer and E. Trueblood (eds.),
The Pendle Hill Reader, 1950, p. 171

This essay is first and foremost meant for those in the Religious Society of Friends who feel keenly that the Quaker way of life is worth preserving. It is also directed to those friends of Friends who look to Quakerism as a light shining in darkness, sustaining their faith in human possibilities. My essay is to draw attention to developments which currently threaten the spirit and the integrity of the Quaker way of life. These developments make it urgent for concerned Friends once more to rethink Quaker principles. Quakerism has indeed become the kind of open religion which Rufus Jones seemed to advocate. Many Friends are today "charged with hope and faith and vision," but what had not been foreseen was that openness could also undermine cherished values of the Quaker way of life. In the process of mounting "dangerous enterprises in the realm of truth" some Friends are currently engaging in activities that have begun to erode and pervert the Quaker way of life. I refer to activities carried on at home and abroad in the name of Quakerism, supposedly fostering universal human fellowship, but actually sowing the seeds of discord and endangering human lives. As self-appointed brokers in the Middle East conflict Quaker activists have done just that. What are my personal stakes in writing this essay? My position is that of a friendly outsider, someone who for many years shared in the Quaker community and has remained concerned with the spirit and integrity of its way of life. At the same time, being a Jew, I am deeply

concerned for the future of the State of Israel and the security of the Jewish people. Both of these I see endangered by well-meant but foolhardy enterprises carried out in the name of Friends.

To begin with I must tell a story literally out of school. In January of 1978 the annual Hagey lectures at the University of Waterloo were given by two social scientists of note, Kenneth and Elise Boulding. Kenneth is a well-known economist, Elise a sociologist. Both are prominent members of the Society of Friends. Their lectures were entitled "The Nature and Sources of Peace," "The Evolution of Peace," and "Policy for Peace." On January 16 Elise Boulding gave the second of these lectures. At the heart of her talk was the idea of "imaging," thinking ahead to "what a disarmed world would look like." At one point she said: "One reason we've done so badly on disarmament is that it just isn't credible." Because of an event which occurred during the question period following her lecture I went to the audio-visual department which had taped it, to listen to the record of what had been said. To my dismay the question and answer session had not been taped, so that what I report here about it is a matter of memory—my own and that of two others present. What I report of Elise Boulding's statements made during her lecture is a matter of record.

While somewhat rambling, her lecture had interesting highlights. She gave the following examples of "imaging" among others: "Some of the writings of revolutions in the Third World... look at images of the future; they want work for laborers, food for stomachs of young and old people." Referring to the student movement in the United States some years ago Elise Boulding remarked: "The last meeting of the Weathermen* before they went underground was in our living room in Denver." The students engaged in 'imaging': "... what they were going to do after the revolution. Some of them mechanics, some carpenters ... there were to be peace, work, food—no war, no strife." Apparently the Weathermen had been meeting in the Boulding's living room because "it was the only place that wasn't bugged." At one point she spoke of separatist movements: "Not just breaking apart but affirming identities not evident before." It was left unclear whether she was referring to French Canadian issues. The final sentence of her lecture was: "If we don't work on images, the strategies won't do us a bit of good." Who would want to quarrel with that?!

*Weathermen. A nihilist faction of the American radical fringe group SDS (Students for a Democratic Society), devoted to the spreading of its political ideas by bomb explosions, apparently in the belief that the creation of chaos would automatically be followed by a new Brotherhood of Man ...

—Donald Cameron Watt, Professor of International History,
University of London, in *The Fontana Dictionary of Modern Thought*
1977, p. 671

•The Polish writer Tadeusz Borowski has coined this term to mark the world of the Nazi concentration camps.

A FRIENDLY PERVERSION

Subsequent events are, as I have said, not a matter of record but of memory only. As I recall it, one member of the audience asked whether Elise Boulding would comment on terrorism as an evident threat to peace. The lecturer's reply was somewhat along these lines: She had read an account by an Algerian woman terrorist which spoke of the victims in compassionate terms. Apparently the woman terrorist was about to throw a bomb into a cafe filled with women and children and the sight of them made her feel very sad. Boulding told the questioner that she had been very much moved by this account, adding something to the effect that such people resort to terrorism because they are powerless. For me this was a shocking reply, shocking because of its naiveté and the implicit perversion of Quaker values. Had Elise Boulding's remark been merely a private lapse of good sense in a public place, or did it represent a more significant ideological departure from the pacifist principles of the Society of Friends?

Such questions might have been left unexplored had it not been for the fact that I had at that time been reading Quaker literature dealing with the Arab-Israeli conflict. I had become especially amazed by a document purporting to be the result of a working party's study sponsored by several Quaker organizations. Among these were the American and Canadian Friends Service Committees. This document, entitled *Search for Peace in the Middle East*, copyrighted in 1970 by the American Friends Service Committee (AFSC), had meanwhile gone through at least 18 revisions. What struck me in reading this Quaker report was that the study group and its sponsors, though they claimed to serve as honest brokers between Arabs and Israelis, were instead anything but unbiased. The authors say: "We firmly believe it is possible to be both pro-Jewish and pro-Arab." Perhaps it is true in some abstract sense, but in the context of their report the Quaker study group did not demonstrate even that. Its criticisms consistently depreciate and deprecate the policies and politics of Israel and of its Jewish supporters in the United States. At the same time little if any similar deprecation is evident when the report discusses Arab governments or terrorist organizations.* Throughout *Search for Peace* and its plan for a Middle East settlement the Quaker authors seem unable or unwilling to distinguish between the relative merits of Israel and the PLO. I therefore found it impossible not to think of this book as a concerted if indirect attack on Israel's statehood.

From the title of my essay alone the reader will surmise that I am not unbiased. In any partisan essay it is well to be candid concerning one's

*It appears in fact as if there were oblique legitimations for Arab terrorism in the report. Thus on page 14 of the 1970 version published by AFSC reference is made to the meaning of the Arab term "Fedayeen": these "Palestinian fighters," says the Quaker book, are "those-who-sacrifice-themselves." I could not help wonder, as I read this, whether a reference to "sacrifice themselves" must not have a powerful appeal to religious pacifists. Self-sacrifice is urged in religious pacifism in lieu of the sacrifice of others. Perhaps such motives can even cleanse the evil of fighting with worldly weapons?!

TO THE QUAKERS

motives. In my case it is the more important because of my long-term and intimate connections with Quakerism. Because there is such a strong link between my erstwhile membership in the Society of Friends and my writing of this essay I wish to speak here briefly of matters that are part of personal history. As a boy at school in England I had been charmed by the mystical message of that of God in all people, and the quiet waiting in God's Light at the heart of the Quaker way of life. In the political turmoil and the dehumanization of Jews prevalent in the Europe of the mid-nineteen-thirties I experienced these values as extraordinary aspects of human sanity and goodness. Continuing to attend Friends meetings in England and America, it appeared to me that here at last was a basis for universal human fellowship. By 1939, when I was 21, I had been taken into membership of the Orange Grove Monthly Meeting of Friends in Pasadena, California. I was a true convert; I loved the Quaker way of life; I was conversant with Quaker writings and ideas old and new, with Fox and Woolman, Rufus Jones and Thomas Kelley. The stories Friends told of their past—doing justly by Indians and living in peace with them, accepting women as men's social equals and children not as chattel but as persons meriting respect, being the first group in America to give up the holding of slaves—these seemed to confirm that Quakerism was for me not apostasy but the fulfillment of my liberal German-Jewish heritage.

There was another source that fed my conviction that it was possible to be Jew and Quaker simultaneously. About the time of my admission to membership in the Society of Friends I had also become acquainted with Martin Buber's rendition of the hasidic legends, then only available in German. These stories, together with Buber's *I and Thou* seemed to me to confirm the view that there is a universal mystical tradition—Jewish and Quaker alike. Furthermore, Buber seemed also to support my pacifism, even in the midst of war. If the Quaker message extolled non-violence and love for one's enemies, so did Hasidism. Take for example this moving legend:

The Commandment to Love

A disciple asked Rabbi Shmelke: "We are commanded to love our neighbor as ourself. How can I do this, if my neighbor has wronged me?"

The rabbi answered: "You must understand these words aright. Love your neighbor like something which you yourself are. For all souls are one. Each is a spark from the original soul, and this soul is wholly inherent in all souls, just as your soul is in all the members of your body. It may come to pass that your hand makes a mistake and strikes you. But would you then take a stick and chastise your hand, because it lacked understanding, and so increase your pain? It is the same if your neighbor, who is of one soul with you, wrongs you for lack of understanding. If you punish him, you only hurt yourself."

A FRIENDLY PERVERSION

The disciple went on asking: "But if I see a man who is wicked before God, how can I love him?"

"Don't you know," said Rabbi Shmelke, "that the original soul came out of the essence of God, and that every human soul is a part of God? And will you have no mercy on him, when you see that one of his holy sparks has been lost in a maze, and is almost stifled?"

Strange as it may seem at this point in history, I felt justified by such ideas in refusing military service, working instead in alternative service units in forestry camps and as a mental hospital attendant. Membership in the Society of Friends and the Jewish Peace Fellowship gave me the support for a position so deviant from the mainstream point of view of the war years.

The revelations about Hitler's death camps had begun to shake my pacifist convictions when, in 1949, there appeared Isidor Goldstein's account of his five years in the Warsaw Ghetto (*The Stars Bear Witness*). I recall how this book shook me, for I had to face my conscientious objection not in terms of abstract principles but of human realities. I was haunted by images of the Umschlagplatz, the central point for deportations in the ghetto, images of corpses and starving children in the streets, and the abject misery and horrors suffered by the Jews of Europe generally. Goldstein's account had convinced me that violence, far from being necessarily wrong, had served the ghetto fighters to sustain their humanness. From then on I read all I could of the growing literature of the Holocaust, and became increasingly aware of the folly of my pacifist stand, however sincerely I had held it. But I did not get lost in the details of horror upon horror. I began to think about my duty as university teacher: Could what I had been learning be shared with students? I found that the Holocaust was not dealt with in history or political science, psychology or sociology. So, in 1966 I began a course in which the study of slavery was combined with that of the death camps. When I realized that this was a mistaken analogy I separated the material and taught the sociology of Nazi racism and the holocaust separately from the subject of slavery. Recently I renamed the course: HOLOCAUST: THE UNMAKING OF SOCIETY for I regard the ultimate horror inflicted on Jews and Gypsies to have been the destruction of the social bonds that make us human beings. When we are kept from protecting child or parent, spouse or friend but are made to concentrate all our energies just to stay alive in "a world of stone," we have ceased living in human society.

Teaching is often as enlightening to the instructor as to the student. I was unable to cope with this oppressive material year after year, and by 1970 I declared a moratorium for a while. I needed to find out for myself how it all had come about, what the social sources of this travesty had been. That is how

TO THE QUAKERS

I read and re-read the history of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Europe, of the middle ages—Germany and Poland in particular—of the crusades and the attendant destruction of many communities of Jews in the Rhineland. Eventually I discovered the world of the Church Fathers and their sermons with its vilification of Jews and Jewry, language that would be repeated through the centuries by populist agitators and country priests, by Luther and Houston Stewart Chamberlain, and then by Hitler and his minions. When I read Norman Cohn's illuminating book *Warrant for Genocide* I came at last to fathom how one and a half millennia of Jew hatred had coalesced into the Nazi's holocaust.

My making use of Holocaust literature in a sociology course began during the latter half of the nineteen-sixties. I was then still officially a Friend, in spite of my renunciation of pacifism a decade earlier, and in spite of my increasing discomfort with the fact that contemporary Quakerism is more traditionally Christian than I had once wished to believe. By the beginning of the sixties I had stopped active participation in meeting affairs. By March 1969 I had resigned. Here is a portion of my letter to the clerk of Hamilton Monthly Meeting:

..I have decided to give up my membership in the Society of Friends. For a long time I have not been an active member of your meeting. Some years ago I began to realize I had moved away from the central beliefs of Friends. Whatever I may have believed, thought, and felt in 1939 when I was accepted into membership in California, I am now neither a Christian nor a pacifist... had I been clearer in my own mind I would have taken the step (of resigning) sooner...I hesitated a long time before I could write this letter, mainly because of the many warmly human connections that I have been able to enjoy within the Society of Friends over the years. I owe a great debt to members of the Society. When I came out of hate-filled Germany to school in England in 1934 it was among Friends that I came to taste for the first time the full sense of being a person in my own right..."

In this essay I therefore speak with more knowledge than that of the educated bystander. I speak as a former insider. But this fact is bound to be suspect: no one loves a convert, and one tends to distrust the convert who eventually defects. It would therefore be easy to dismiss what I have to say to Friends as the sour note of a disgruntled ex-member. The fact is that I am not a disillusioned and inimical defector but sympathetic to much of Quaker thought and values. I left not only to affirm my own integrity but that of the Quaker way of life.

When I first learned that groups of Friends, especially the American Friends Service Committee, were active in promoting the cause of the PLO, I
refused

A FRIENDLY PERVERSION

to believe it. Then I read the literature produced and published by the AFSC and to my dismay discovered that there was indeed truth in the charge. Now I had to confront my Quaker past as earlier I had to face my pacifism. I had to ask myself what I knew of Quaker ways of viewing the world, that might explain why some Friends could come to be apologists for terrorism, as had apparently been the case with the Quaker social scientist who lectured at my university. It seemed time for someone like myself to study this issue systematically, but without any false claim of ethical neutrality. It was the more important that I should attempt such a study since in the two decades of reading and teaching I had come to see that a strong Israel was a necessary condition for the survival of the Jewish people. One could not be aware of the incredible facts of the Nazi depravity and the centuries of exclusion and pogroms that preceded it and not be a partisan of an unassailable Israel. These then are my motives for writing this essay. It has been created out of the urgency to stand by Israel at a time when she is beleaguered not only by enemies but by Friends. Israel's overt enemies are too well known to require identification. Lately, under the pressures of oil diplomacy and the related economic slump, more of her Western friends are deserting her. Why then worry about a small group of religious pacifists who, perhaps in the mistaken belief that they are helping to bring peace, are giving aid and comfort to Israel's sworn enemy, the PLO? The answer is quite simple: Friends have much greater influence in political circles of North America than their numbers would suggest. Their long history of humanitarian service has earned them a reputation for absolute integrity and reliability. Even when they oppose government policies, as they invariably do with respect to military spending, Friends are listened to respectfully. When such people turn their peacemaking attentions to an issue like the Middle East, their pronouncements and efforts at intervention will carry weight because of their credibility.

This is a partisan essay: Its primary interest is the security of Israel. But it is also concerned with what I had long held to be the "good order of Friends." I truly believe that the activities of such groups as the American Friends Service Committee (AFSC) on behalf of the PLO and other revolutionary opponents of the State of Israel are perverting that order. Accordingly this essay has been named "The Friendly Perversion." Readers of Jessamyn West's *The Friendly Persuasion* will recognize the pun and some may resent it. But no slight is intended to the Friendly Persuasion-either to West's stories or to the way of life which they describe. If there are those who are offended by my title, let them look with care into the relationship between certain political actions of Friends and Quaker faith and practice.

The subtitle of my essay is not likely to smooth ruffled feathers. In it I refer to Quakers as "good people" and some activities by some Friends as "dirty work." Here too I have borrowed, namely from Professor Hughes' famous paper "Good People and Dirty Work."² Writing after World War II, Hughes

recounts interviews with Germans about the by then well-documented genocide perpetrated by the Nazi regime. Many of the respondents claimed not to have known anything about the horrors. Obviously it would be unjust to suggest a similarity between Quakers and Nazis or even those Germans about whom Professor Hughes wrote. But there is a parallel between the two situations and I want to note it here. The great mass of the German people may have been "good people" but they gave their votes and approval to a political program which never completely tried to hide its "dirty work." Granted that most Germans would probably not have sanctioned the extermination of Jews and Gypsies, few demurred when Nazi policies excluded Jews first socially and then physically from participation in civic life.

The allusion of this memory to the situation of Quaker intervention in the Middle East conflict is not as far-fetched as it may seem. Most Quakers would probably not want to see Israel or the Jewish people hurt or endangered, but I have heard no voices from inside the Society of Friends to disassociate themselves from and to disavow the activities of organizations like AFSC in regard to revolutionary movements and terrorism. Take for instance its *Quaker Service Bulletin*, Fall of 1976. There Jim Bristol asks whether AFSC supports terror. In reply he says that the organization supports struggles for liberation. What does such a reply mean? If movements which claim to be fighting for some kind of liberation use terrorist means, does their unexamined goal justify the terrorist means? Or, to look at another Friends' publication, *Quaker Life*, for July-August 1977: In "Nations Talk of Peace" Martin McDaniel writes that friends must examine terrorism in light of the peace testimony. One approach is to take whatever action is necessary to apprehend terrorists. But this is not the only approach. At root one often finds social injustices. The frustration of these injustices drives people to acts of terror, as in the case of the Palestinian terrorists. If these injustices were corrected the reasons for terrorism might be eliminated.

There is still time for more rational and responsible voices to be heard and for prominent Friends to assert themselves against policies and actions of which they do not approve but which are being carried out in their name. Let such Friends now make it clear that the uninvited interventions by the American Friends Service Committee do not have their sanction or support. Let them now "speak truth to power" in their own organizations, a confrontation which cannot but serve the interest of integrity among those who adhere to the good order of Friends. As long as those Friends who disagree with the AFSC's activities remain silent they will hurt not only Israel but their own religious society. In this essay I shall try to show why this is so. When the most valued of Quaker insights are being turned into mere techniques for manipulating and coercing others into compliance, it can hardly be consistent with obedience to the Light Within. When otherwise good people try to bend others to their will without their consent then such dirty work will erode and pervert the integrity of their way of life.

My critics will wonder why I have had this essay published by a group which speaks first and foremost for the national interests of the State of Israel. I have done so because my bias is precisely the security of Israel, a security which I see undermined by much of recent Quaker activity. If by confronting that activity I can bring greater security to Israel *and* greater integrity to the Religious Society of Friends I shall be well rewarded.

II. GOOD PEOPLE INDEED

"... where men profess to be so meek and heavenly-minded and to have their trust so firmly settled in God that they cannot join in wars, and yet by their spirit and conduct in common life manifest a contrary disposition, their difficulties are great."

John Woolman, *Journal and Major Essays*
edited by Phillips Moulton, 1971, p. 88

In this essay I want to make sense of the discrepancy between the religious-pacifist way of life of Friends and their intervention which time and again has seemed to favor the PLO. Perhaps some answers might be found in the documents where Friends have spoken to each other and to the world outside. Actions may at times speak louder than words, but words can clarify and amplify actions, or they can contradict and obscure them. Quakerism, being without formal creed, has depended on insights shared as personal concerns which may become translated into collective decisions and actions. My question has been how I might, in the confines of this essay, identify written materials that could be seen to represent the principal viewpoints of Quakerism. To do so I have chosen a pamphlet series issued at Pendle Hill, the well-known "Center for Religious and Social Study" maintained by the Society of Friends in Pennsylvania. I believe that in these writings, which have appeared since the middle of the nineteen-thirties, the Quaker viewpoint has attained its most lucid expression. In this essay I shall therefore draw frequently on the Pendle Hill sources.

One of the Pendle Hill pamphlets is Brinton's "Sources of the Quaker Peace Testimony." The author notes that though early Friends made frequent reference to the Christian gospels, the main source of their inspiration derived from what they called the "Inward Light":

...we must take the Quakers seriously when they claim to have arrived at their fundamental doctrines as a direct result of the movings of the Divine Spirit of Truth in their own hearts. This

A FRIENDLY PERVERSION

Spirit within was called by many names, each suggestive of some aspects of its working. It is a Light, a Seed germinating in the Light, the Spirit of Christ making possible the Christ-like life. (p. 12)

Brinton continues by showing that this mystical doctrine of direct revelation was also responsible for tending early Quakers toward a humanitarian universalism:

The Light was not divided among men so that part should exist in one and part in another. It is the same divine Light which shines into every human soul, creating a bond of unity, of mutual reverence, and of understanding. (p. 12)

Though it took Friends "a full century to reach and act on the discovery that slave-holding was inconsistent with their religion," they also "freed their slaves a hundred years before the Civil War." Likewise, early Quakers deduced their pacifism from the doctrine of the Light Within. They were thus not peace propagandists so much as they were anxious, in George Fox's words, to live in the virtue of that light and power which takes away the occasion of all wars. Howard Brinton contrasts the "Light Within" with the idea of conscience. The latter is influenced by training and environment as well as by the Light. For Quakers the Light is not synonymous with conscience but rather it is that which shines into conscience. And it is this fact which he sees as the source of the divine universalism in humans:

The belief that the Light is within all men means that every person is capable of taking an advanced position and can be appealed to on these grounds. The same identical Light shines in every heart however obscured by selfishness and greed. Hence the non-violent method of good will and confidence will sometimes produce unexpected results because it reaches something in the other person which responds in similar fashion. That of God in one person arouses similar capacity in the other. Men tend to rise to what is expected of them. No human being is so depraved that nothing but force can appeal to him. (p. 19; emphasis added)

This quotation must be read in the context of the time; by then the Nazi machine had controlled Germany for seven years, it had reduced the Jews to helpless chattel, sacked Czechoslovakia and Poland and France, while it was currently bombing Britain. There, in the midst of that new tyranny, which was totally devoid of humane impulses, the Quaker proclaims that God dwells equally in all men, however depraved or whatever their loyalties. This universalism may have made Quakers tolerant folk, but it may also have taken from them the capacity to distinguish clearly between what was good and what evil. This possibility is expressed poignantly by a former deputy of the

GOOD PEOPLE

German Reichstag, the Weimar Republic's parliament, who in 1940 was a political refugee in the U.S. Friendly to Quakerism, Friedrich Sollmann says in his Pendle Hill pamphlet "Religion and Politics":

The concentration camp is a new form of an old institution. Secret police, inquisitions, torture, gallows, the stake, the cross were used long before Hitler and Mussolini. Such methods are neither German nor Russian peculiarities. The Religious Society of Friends can be counted among the rare examples of reasonable tolerance through the centuries. This may explain why, in the present confusion, the Quakers refuse to participate in popular accusations and rash judgments. (pp. 8, 9; emphasis added)

But responsible citizens cannot escape from making judgments and accusations, even though they be not rash or popular ones. Sollmann is clearly warning his Quaker readers not to forget that:

There are no good or bad nations. But there are bad systems of government. The unprecedented power of modern dictatorships lies in their efficiency in oppression, persecution, and corrupting propaganda. Religious people in free countries must face this fact. All comparisons with dictatorships in pretechnical times are misleading. There was never a total dictatorship before Lenin, Mussolini, or HitlerNow for the first time in history we have systems which can effectively regiment all human activities: politics, economy, art, entertainment, education from the kindergarten through the university. Love and marriage are regulated by laws for purifying the race. Religion must exalt the leader ...It is incorrect and unwise to talk as if there were only a difference of degree between modern democracy ... and the totalitarian dictatorship ... No critic of democracy would talk of "difference of degree" if he had once lived under a dictatorship and had there tried to lecture on Christian democracy, Christian pacifism, or Christian love for men of all races and classes. (pp. 14, 15; emphasis added)

And what of the good citizen in such a system, and furthermore, what becomes of the universalist religious attitude? Again Sollmann speaks the painful truth:

Where under such a system is there any place for Christianity?... Let nobody mistakenly point to the agencies of the Quakers in Europe. The impressive relief work of the Society of Friends in Germany, Spain, France, Poland, Italy and certain other territories under dictatorship has been possible only because

these agencies have for the time being wisely limited their activities to charity. A word against militarism, conscription, or conquest would result in long imprisonment, and the immediate suppression of the Society of Friends. (pp. 16, 17; emphasis added)

This knowledgeable critic notes that Quakers may remain silent out of necessity, but this does not make them able to stand above the issues. But Quakers themselves have not so readily understood this fact. The evidence suggests that instead their universalistic ideology misleads them into seeing all antagonists equally wrong or right, seeing that all are capable of containing the divine Light. This confusion is reflected in Pendle Hill pamphlets three decades after the ones by Brinton and Sollmann. In one of these, Thomas Silcock's "Words and Testimonies," Friends are asked to recognize the ever-changing character of moral imperatives:

There are new perspectives, a wider range of contacts, new possibilities of virtuous and diabolical action; and we must think about them, try to act according to our own insights and be willing to talk about them. (p. 22)

But having said that one must talk about the new circumstances, he cautions his readers not to be glib "about being willing to talk about any moral problem":

The impulse to call certain acts unspeakable, and, in fact, not to speak about them, has often been useful. I should be unhappy if people too freely discussed the possibility of hanging living human beings on meat hooks as punishment. I believe the impulse to perform any act, toward which we have no specific drive, can be partly curbed by making it unfamiliar and shocking. (p. 23; emphasis added)

This caution I interpret to mean that by talking about it we may make it both ordinary and acceptable. But however reasonable, there is also an element of denying evil in it. That denial is amply borne out in the second of the later pamphlets. In his "Memories and Meditations of a Workcamper" David Richie tells how in 1946 he went to Poland to organize workcamps for the American Friends Service Committee. In the course of more than ten pages there is not a single reference to the horror of the Warsaw Ghetto or the deathcamps, though by then their existence was generally known. Nor did this Quaker, who for years had organized and directed students and other volunteers in work with the dispossessed, ever refer here to Jews. Jews seem not only physically absent (as most of them had been murdered) but socially and conceptually also. *The unthinkable was indeed usefully omitted!*

If the members of the Religious Society of Friends rely on a mystical source of enlightenment, the concerns and action programs have again and again brought them into close working contact with non-sectarians. In several instances this "differential association" has led individual Quakers to positions considerably more radical than those they might have held had they remained insulated within the protective walls of their meetings. One such Friend was Thomas Paine, radical philosopher of the American Revolution. But however radical the occasional Friend became in the course of following through a concern, the majority of Quakers tended toward a conservative quietism—at least until the beginning of the post-World War I era. The war had led some of the younger members who had refused military service, to initiate relatively large-scale projects of humanitarian service and social reconstruction. Some Quakers engaged in child-feeding programs in Austria and Germany and others helped in the reconstruction efforts in the new Russia. These people came in contact with political thought and action that must have challenged their own. It was this amalgam of their traditional humanitarianism and challenging new ideas that led to the establishment of the American Friends Service Committee. In its organizational context projects could be initiated and developed more effectively than the individual efforts of concerned Quakers could previously accomplish.

What the A.F.S.C. was for Quaker action, the establishment of Pendle Hill came to be for the spiritual motor of the Society of Friends in America. In that Quaker think-tank old values were sharpened up, and new points of view could be more systematically explored than was possible in the more traditional settings of local meetings. The Pendle Hill pamphlets became by the mid-thirties reference points for the revival of a more aggressive spirit within the Society. Two of these early pamphlets represent the clarion call to a more general radicalization of American Quakerism. I am thinking here of Richard Gregg's "The Value of Voluntary Simplicity" which was published in 1936, and Mildred Binns Young's "Functional Poverty" which followed it three years later.

If for Proudhon property appeared to be theft, for Gregg and Young it stood in the way of maximum human fellowship. Thus for Gregg, who had been a student of Gandhi's and who had lately authored *The Power of Non-Violence*, property and war were not unrelated. In his pamphlet he says:

For those who believe in non-violence, simplicity is essential. Many possessions involve violence in the form of police protection and law suits. The concentration of much property in one person's possession creates resentment and envy or a sense of inferiority among others who do not have it. Such feelings, after they have accumulated long enough, become the motives which some day find release in acts of mob violence. Hence the possession of much property becomes inconsistent

A FRIENDLY PERVERSION

with principles of non-violence. Simplicity helps to prevent violence. (p. 20; emphasis added)

So far we have merely a rewording of thoughts anticipated in the writings of John Woolman almost two centuries earlier. But in Mildred Young's pamphlet they are made considerably more radical:

My thesis is that some of the means for freeing our lives lie in drastic limiting of material possessions and processes, in a discipline which paradoxically has its reward in extension of our facilities and of our strength and insight to use them to the full....(thereby) we open into a realization of personal responsibility, of the oneness of human life, of what has been called unlimited liability.

...Now, frankly, most of us have our hands so full of baubles that we haven't even a finger free with which to reach out and satisfy the claim of unlimited liability. Poverty, or some approximation to it, willingly assumed, would set us free both for finding our responsibility and for fulfilling it when found. That is why I have called it functional poverty.

...It is to be taken up as a way to freedom, and as a practical method for finding the time and strength to answer one's deepest need to be serviceable for a new world. I cannot come near these brothers and sisters of my wider self, no matter how sincerely I may think I want to, if I am swaddled round in the trappings of wealth and privilege. I am like someone swelled out with a life-preserver, unable to embrace my dearest friend. This poverty is then a stripping off of encumbrances, a practical condition of preparation for work and the performance of it. (pp. 5-7)

Young's call was for a mixture of millenarian communalism and a Kropotkin-like decentralism; property becomes a limitation rather than a facility, in the way of a richer life of human fellowship. The Youngs and their children did indeed translate this point of view through a radical transformation of their daily lives. What she expressed so forcefully in her pamphlet influenced a whole generation of young Friends who took seriously her message, later refined in "Participation in Rural Life." That hers was not an isolated voice, that in fact she had other radical religionists taking a very similar direction can be seen in the writings of Dorothy Day, especially her column "On Pilgrimage" which regularly appeared in the pages of the *Catholic Worker*.

But writings alone could not radicalize an entire generation of Quakers. Something more powerful and immediate than pamphlets did so: it was the entry of the United States into the war. Thousands of young men who

claimed to be conscientious objectors to military service required opportunities for alternative service. This opportunity was provided by the joint action of the three "peace churches"—the Society of Friends, the Mennonites, and the Church of the Brethren. In the camps and other service units of Civilian Public Service (C.P.S.) the religious objectors found themselves closely associated with some whose resistance to war service was motivated by philosophical and political rather than strictly religious views. In principle this was not to have happened, since the Selective Service Act provided for the right to alternative service only when an objector could declare that he was motivated in his commitment to non-violence as a result of religious training and belief in a "supreme being." In actuality many a draft board chose not to struggle with some of the philosophical and political bases of various objectors. And in this way a new condition of "differential association" came into being, in which the camp discussions frequently took the turn toward radical interpretations of the origins of war, and radical solutions to be applied once this war was finally finished. This "differential association" took place not only in C.P.S., however, but also in prison camps where objectors whose draft boards had refused to grant them alternative service, met up with some religious objectors who had refused to accept government assignments to Civilian Public Service.

There was another factor which probably contributed to the radicalization of the post-war generation of Quakers. Already during the nineteen thirties there had been new recruits to Quakerism from among the liberal Jewish emigrants from Western Europe, fleeing from Nazi oppression, and aided by Quaker groups in Britain and North America. Among these new "convinced Friends" were intellectuals and various types of political dissidents whose cosmopolitanism enabled them to join this movement which was religious, but not "Christian" in any formal, theological sense—i.e. as long as they joined the Hicksite branch (General Conference) Friends. While these newcomers to Quakerism became acculturated to its outlook and manners, they inevitably brought into the relatively insular world especially of the Friends' meetings in America, a more cosmopolitan perspective. Like myself, such recruits may have sought to harmonize their liberal political views with the new-found spiritual realities and community life of the Quaker meetings. In this process they inevitably introduced ideas, sentiments, and beliefs that influenced the so-called birth-right members, especially the younger ones, who had become restive under the often conservative governance of meeting elders.

Whether or not one agrees with these impressionistic views of radicalization within the Society of Friends, it must be remembered that the seeds of radicalism nourished by vital social concerns, have always been present in the Quaker movement. The doctrine of the Inner Light in all human beings makes possible the thrust of radical concerns which may, as in the case of John Woolman's persistent attack on slaveholding, wear away opposition

A FRIENDLY PERVERSION

and eventually take the entire sect with it. *What has not been present before the decade of the seventies, and what is so antithetical to the central message of the Quaker peace testimony, is the appearance of a seeming consent to the necessity of violence. In trying to make sense of this remarkable "Quaker mutation" it is well to note the words of that firm though friendly critic of the Quakers of thirty-five years ago. In his Pendle Hill pamphlet entitled "Religion and Politics" Sollmann warned against toying with revolution:*

Because of its very nature democracy can not be developed rapidly. All really great things in life grow slowly; this seems to be an unavoidable law in nature and ethics. There is a deep wisdom in the old practice of Quaker business meetings, the practice of not hurrying decisions. (p. 22)

Friedrich Sollmann is also skeptical of the intellectuals who rush into criticism of the slow and sometimes bumbling methods of political democracy:

Only in totalitarian systems is unvoiced surrender of the masses possible; the acceptance of poverty and hardship without eventual protest would be impossible in a democracy.

It is the lack of revealing criticism which has deceived so many well-meaning intellectuals into becoming supporters of Communism and Fascism. Even political scientists of note have made astonishingly superficial statements about conditions in Russia, statements which they could not have made if they had had at their disposal the multifold sources of information open, alike to friend and foe, in every democracy. (pp. 26-27)

In this first part of my essay I have shown that there is a strain of consistency in the mores and the way of life of the Society of Friends. Prominent in that way of life is the Peace Testimony. But I have also shown evidence that this consistency is obtained in part by a kind of trained incapacity to see contradictions—a kind of false consciousness, which aids such Friends in looking away from ugly realities of the political world while trying to do good. The strain of consistency is also aided by the absence of an overt creed, which allows Friends readily to interpret changing events in terms of their ideology of "that of God in every person." This ideology has tended to make Quakers sensitive to the circumstances of underdogs and the oppressed, a sensitivity that has led to "concerns" and helping actions over centuries: the anti-slavery movement and the underground railroad, prison reform, asylums, and women's rights, the plight of migrant workers, refugees, and displaced persons. These impulses have more recently, however, justified an affinity between Quaker organizations like the A.F.S.C. and revolutionary, often anti-democratic, movements like the P.L.O. and societies like Castro's Cuba. Here then we see the possibility that the peace testimony of the Society

GOOD PEOPLE

of Friends may be serving as a sanction for quite different activities, activities essentially at variance with that testimony.

I am not trying to imply, however, that groups like the American Friends Service Committee intend to deceive. I believe that Landrum Bolling who chaired the study group which produced *Search for Peace in the Middle East* is sincere when he states that the report is "even-handed." I also believe Louis Schneider, the current Executive Secretary of the A.F.S.C., when he says that his organization "seeks to find practical expression for the religious and moral imperatives of love, compassion, and dignity of each person, the non-exploitation of individuals who are blessed in the sight of God ...We take it as primary that we should honor all people and see no person as an enemy. We agree with the observation in the Gospels that there is little merit in loving one's friends; it is in loving one's 'enemies' that one is truly tested."³ What I do think is that these Friends and other members of their organizations are the victims of their own rhetoric, that they consume their own smoke. But that also implies that they tend to confound the issues, however much it may be done unwittingly.

Let me in closing this part of my essay contrast the pacifism of these Quaker spokesmen with that of Mahatma Gandhi. The latter was far less naive and apparently much more honest with himself. I refer here to a passage in which George Orwell discusses Gandhi's pacifism.

Of late years it has been the fashion to talk about Gandhi as though he were not only sympathetic to the western left-wing movement, but were even integrally part of it. Anarchists and pacifists, in particular, have claimed him for their own, noticing only that he was opposed to centralism and State violence and ignoring the other-worldly, anti-humanist tendency of his doctrines. But one should, I think, realise that Gandhi's teachings cannot be squared with the belief that Man is the measure of all things, and that our job is to make life worth living on this earth, which is the only earth we have. They make sense only on the assumption that God exists and that the world of solid objects is an illusion to be escaped from.

*...Gandhi's pacifism can be separated to some extent from his other teachings. Its motive was religious, but he claimed also for it that it was a definite technique, a method, capable of producing desired political results. Gandhi's attitude was not that of most western pacifists. **Satyagraha**, first evolved in South Africa, was a sort of non-violent warfare, a way of defeating the enemy without hurting him and without feeling or arousing hatred. It entailed such things as civil disobedience, strikes, lying down in front of railway trains, enduring police charges without running away and without hitting back, and the like...*

...Even after he had completely abjured violence he was

A FRIENDLY PERVERSION

*honest enough to see that in war it is usually necessary to take sides. He did not—indeed, since his whole political life centered round a struggle for national independence, he could not—take the sterile and dishonest line of pretending that in every war both sides are exactly the same and it makes no difference who wins. Nor did he, like most western pacifists, specialise in avoiding awkward questions. In relation to the late war, one question that every pacifist had a clear obligation to answer was: "What about the Jews? Are you prepared to see them exterminated? If not, how do you propose to save them without resorting to war?" I must say that I have never heard, from any western pacifist, an honest answer to this question, though I have heard plenty of evasions, usually of the "you're another" type. But it so happens that Gandhi was asked a somewhat similar question in 1938 and that his answer is on record in Mr. Louis Fischer's *Gandhi and Stalin*. According to Mr. Fischer Gandhi's view was that the German Jews ought to commit collective suicide, which "would have aroused the world and the people of Germany to Hitler's violence." After the war he justified himself: the Jews had been killed anyway and might as well have died significantly. One has the impression that this attitude staggered even so warm an admirer as Mr. Fischer, but Gandhi was merely being honest. If you are not prepared to take life, you must often be prepared for lives to be lost in some other way. When, in 1942, he urged non-violent resistance against a Japanese invasion, he was ready to admit that it might cost several million deaths.⁴ (emphasis added)*

Louis Schneider may genuinely believe that one ought to love one's enemies, and Landrum Bolling that his group's effort was "even-handed." But it is certain that neither man would admit that their organized actions might help to destroy Israel and drive the Jews into the sea. I am thus not imputing evil motives to any Friend or any Quaker organization. What I have been saying is that the good people, and their radical consciences, are currently destructive, principally to the vital interests of the Jewish people, and secondarily to the Friendly Persuasion. Next I must explore what has made this process possible.

III. BUT NOT WITHOUT FAULTY THINKING

"You can have an enormous self-satisfaction and an enormous conviction of having done the right thing and knowing the right thing and this can be just totally fallacious. The thing that I've been trying to say all this year to Friends is that truth has two meanings. On one hand it is the opposite of lies, and on the other hand it's the opposite of error. There has been a certain tendency in Quakerism to confuse these two, to suppose that if you weren't lying you couldn't be in error; and that isn't so. You can be as honest as the day is long and still be totally and absolutely wrong. We somehow, you see, have to think about error and how to avoid it. *He whose heart is pure has the strength of ten; but if he doesn't know what to do, he will be terribly dangerous.* There's an enormous need for the marriage of these two concepts of truth."

—Kenneth Boulding in
Mayer-Boulding Dialogue on Peace Research,
Pendle Hill Pamphlet 153, May 1967, p. 27
(emphasis added)

At this point we are asking what makes it possible for some Friends to intervene in the Middle East conflict against the wishes of Israel's legitimate government, which alone is entitled to make policy for Israel's well-being and survival. What gives such groups as the A.F.S.C. the sanction to enter the conflict as self-appointed brokers? In this part of my essay I shall pursue that question in terms of faulty reasoning, i.e. when the conclusions drawn do not follow from the premises. Ironically, I am greatly assisted in doing so by no other than the good mind of Kenneth Boulding whose quotation occurred in a context in which he sought to emphasize the importance of Quakers' moving from a quietist "inward peace" to an activist outward peace. Here I shall take his view of intended truth as the essence of Quakers as "good people." But good people, intending to be truthful, can be in grievous error, and such error may lead them, perhaps

unwittingly, into actions that become dirty work and that thereby undermine and subvert the good order of Friends.

I shall now proceed to discuss two aspects of the Quaker way of life which I see instrumental in making for dirty work by the process of faulty reasoning. These two components of Quakerism's good order are (1) its commitment to the belief that there is that of God in every human being, and (2) its commitment to the practice of group decision-making by consensus, inherent in the Meeting for Business. As we look more carefully at these two cornerstones of the Friendly edifice we will note that they are undoubtedly basic to the good order, but not necessarily transferable to circumstances outside of the community of believers.

The Light Within — Premise and Conclusions

Let us begin with the Quaker premise that "the Light Within" is universal, that God's light shines into every human soul. And let us accept this view here as true. Does it follow from this premise that all human beings are equally accessible to the Light, or that when they are that it will reveal to each the same view of the good? Clearly that is not so; we see it all the time in everyday life, and in the extraordinary events we call "history." The truths which some hold to be self-evident are anything but self-evident to others. The discovery by anthropologists that culture defines reality, and that the relativity of cultural definitions make for relativity in social realities, contradicts the ready possibilities of universal human community. But whether the Light Within can make for universal human community, it is clear that all genuine bridging of differences in outlook and ways of living is not a matter either of good words or even of good deeds. The Quaker message appears not to recognize this; thus in literature sent out by the American Friends Service Committee in March 1971 there is a note asking for contributions, saying these "can help men of good will throughout the world to *surmount the barriers of culture and ideology.*" (emphasis added)

This error of assuming that all human beings are equally accessible to the Light of God because of the premise that the Light of God is within each, has been more generally called "the fallacy of accident," as "for example, when people argue from the rational nature of man to the rationality of any particular transaction, or from the fact that men are inherently curious to the explanation that kissing originated in curiosity."⁵ I recall an event in Quaker history that vividly illustrates this error. Sometime in 1939 Rufus Jones had travelled to Germany with a delegation of Friends to try to persuade the Nazi government to allow Quaker activities in aid of German and Austrian Jews. An article in the *Canadian Friend* (February 1939, p. 6), written by Rufus Jones himself, describes contacts between high-ranking Nazis and the three Friends, Robert Yarnall, George Walton, and Rufus Jones. At one point they

FAULTY THINKING

...had an important visitor, the Finance Minister, Dr. Schacht, who told us in confidence of the way in which plans for a vast emigration of Jews from Germany is being worked out. This plan, of course, is not our Quaker plan, but if it can accomplish the purpose we shall rejoice.

In our two-fold work of arranging for relief and promoting emigration, we had visits to the Heads of most of the important departments of the governments. We were received courteously and in a friendly spirit. On all occasions we had an opportunity to interpret our Quaker aims and ideals, to review the story of our work in Germany and Austria, and we were received with a heartiness and friendliness which greatly cheered us. We have every reason to believe that the moment of our arrival was a favorable one and that the coming of the Quakers in this crisis, like the earlier coming touched a deep chord in the hearts of the people and there can be no question that the members of the government with whom we worked—some of them very prominent men—received us in the spirit in which we came and made us feel that the old friendly atmosphere is not wholly vanished. (emphasis added)

It seems unreal to read such lines now, for the question cannot be avoided whether Rufus Jones was seriously saying that the Nazi elite was receiving the Quakers in the same spirit in which they had come to Berlin. If Jones, Yarnall, and Walton really held this to be true, and one must assume that they did, then they were clearly in error. What would have made for such an error in judgment, what would have made these men who were not born yesterday, who knew that Nazi Germany represented the renunciation of so much they held to be good and important, believe that they were received in the same spirit of friendship with which they came? Let me suggest that this is a telling example of the fallacy of accident in which the author has argued from the Light within the visiting Quakers to the motives and value commitments of the Nazi leadership which received them. I recall another reference to the Quaker visit to Berlin. Rufus Jones had come to the West Coast and was addressing Friends in Los Angeles. I heard him at the time, telling how the three Friends had come to the Foreign Ministry to put their plan for aiding Jews before government officials. Jones told how the three men were kept waiting in a room for quite a long time and how they sat quietly meditating. It appears that the interview which followed that "silent meeting" went very well, but Rufus Jones did not hesitate to let his audience in on the fact that the room where they had waited had certainly been bugged, and that not having spoken must have aided the group in being seen as harmless to the Nazi regime. Clearly these men were not naive, yet they somehow persuaded themselves that, Nazi realities notwithstanding, they were received in the same spirit in which they had come! One may of course argue that this myth was necessary for the successful conclusion of their mission, i.e. that without

this erroneous view they could not have carried it out so well, but such an argument in no way removes the fact of fallacious reasoning by the visiting Friends.

What does all this have to do with the question of how Friends have become the self-appointed brokers in the Middle-East conflict, and how they have apparently become partisans of interests bent on the destruction of Israel? Let me suggest that the fallacy of accident which has now been illustrated in relation to Friends' thinking did not pose a problem to the internal consistency of the Quaker way of life as long as the Society of Friends was a sect, relatively closed to external influences. This "particularistic" feature of the sect thus shields it from issues which would too greatly strain its ideology and way of life. But when the sect becomes more and more "worldly"—more and more in touch with the issues of social and political life surrounding it, and thus more "universalistic" and open to outside influences, the membership will increasingly be exposed to experiences and ideas not in harmony with the sectarian precepts. This is precisely what I think has happened first during the 19th century and even more during the present one, as Friends have come in contact with powerful forces like the anti-slavery movement, the struggle for women's rights, and the labor movement. The native radicalism inherent in the Society of Friends acted as a force for "harmonizing" the Quaker way of life and ideologies and other ways of acting alien to it. In that context I regard the Berlin visit by Rufus Jones and the two other Friends, as a watershed. They were conservative Friends, moved by the radical spirit of their Quaker way of life, to brave the lion's den. They wanted to help, but they understood and accepted the political limits of their power. I believe that such conservative realism was shortly afterwards to become "outdated."

Toward the end of World War II a new generation of Quaker activists had moved into leadership positions in their home meetings and in the ancillary organizations like the American Friends Service Committee and the Friends Committee on National Legislation, as well as teaching posts in higher education. Their thinking, activated by the association with other war resisters, was further shaped by the political events of the nineteen fifties and sixties: the McCarthy witch-hunt, the Korean war, nuclear tests and demands for nuclear disarmament, the civil rights movement, the Viet Nam war and the revolt against it. As Friends came increasingly in contact with such movements, as they engaged in "differential association" with non-religiously motivated radicals of the left, they had the same experience that the famous worker priests of France had in the early nineteen-fifties. It will be remembered that there was a movement to have Catholic priests leave their parishes and their clerical garb and become workers in factories and mines to try and wean their fellow workers away from the Marxism that Catholics regard as the opiate of the soul. But as will also be remembered, the French Catholic hierarchy came to fear this movement, for ideology tends to be a two-

FAULTY THINKING

way street—the persuader may himself become differentially persuaded. Clearly some priests had become Marxists and the result was that the program of the worker priests was stopped.

Although the parallel with the French-Catholic situation is imputed by me, I believe all the evidence points to it having occurred here. Quaker work camps had brought young people open to radical experience into the fold of the Society of Friends. And Friends born into the Society had during the war years experienced—a new degree of radicalization in the alternative service units or in prison. The radical universalism of a Richard Gregg or a Mildred Young was now placed into a context which called for a wider world view and opened new avenues for activity. No longer limited by the economic constraints of the Great Depression, the new Quaker activists were offered new service opportunities with new funding available in the post-war economic boom. Now it seemed possible to think ahead to a utopia in which not only war but "the barriers of culture and ideology" might be surmounted. If the unprincipled campaign by Senator McCarthy set this utopia back during the early nineteen-fifties, it was nourished by the Supreme Court's 1954 decision against racial segregation and the mushrooming movement around Martin Luther King. The movements for nuclear disarmament and racial equality were for some years informed and guided by a Ghandhian ideology of non-violent struggle.

But a decade later less pacific points of view came to predominate. Thus the Students' Non-violent Coordinating Committee (S.N.C.C.) was manifestly no longer committed to non-violence, and other groups, allied with "black power" and the "new left" came to be outspokenly anti-Semitic, albeit camouflaged as "anti-Zionism." Some of those currently in active positions in A.F.S.C. and kindred Quaker organizations were involved in such radicalized groups during the late nineteen-sixties and early seventies. This experience will have put their pacifist convictions under a strain of "cognitive dissonance," i.e. an awareness of the limitations imposed by the Quaker way of life if taken at face value. This strain may have induced some activists to try and adapt the Quaker faith and practice to the theory and praxis of Marxist and other radical points of view. If they did so they were in left field politically but not figuratively! Just listen to this voice of a British Friend:

"Quakers might do more to consider how far their own outlook and witness are limited or distorted by a particular social and economic background. They could do more also to face the ethical issues of the use of power in politics—for example in relation to social change. A young Russian in Moscow once put to me the view that for all their social activity, the Quakers were essentially a passive organization because they gave insufficient emphasis to the acquisition of political power as an essential

preliminary to the achievement of good society. Friends believe in the universal and practical relevance of their ethical principles, but have they wrestled with ways of implementing these principles in large-scale areas of social explosion where gentle gradualism is brushed aside? The Quaker concern for reconciliation and the rejection of violence can still make a significant contribution to the ethics of social and political change. Such a witness, however, must also show that it has taken into account interpretations like this one from Mao Tse-tung—Revolution is not the same thing as... painting a picture or doing fancy needlework; it cannot be anything so ...mild, kind, courteous, restrained and magnanimous.’⁶

Compare this Friend's concern for "implementing (Quaker) principles in large-scale areas of social explosion where gentle gradualism is brushed aside," with another Friend's caution written in the midst of the Nazi explosion:

*History teaches us that premature actions are reactionary rather than progressive in their effect, creating national and international explosion no less evil than belated action. The counsel to 'rashness and vain glory' is dangerous and it is typical of the short-lived dynamic of dictatorship.... How many ... lauded the reforms of Hitler—until it became clear that his excellent program of physical training was for military purposes only, that universal employment had created the biggest war machine in history, that the new-found German self-respect was racial fanaticism? And how many more hailed the dawn of the new order in Russia only to find one class tyranny substituted for another and a foreign policy which turned out to be the old imperialism in a new red dress? Then they cried out bitterly against their **former** idol, but they had only themselves to blame. No Lenin or Stalin can alter the fact that real progress grows slowly and can not be imposed by the decrees of a few men, even if those men have the highest ideals!*

Is it not remarkable that Friedrich Sollmann's voice of wisdom should so soon be forgotten and supplemented in Friends' literature by William Barton's counsel? If the radical Friends of today assume that they can combine the concern for reconciliation and the rejection of violence with the Maoist or Napoleonic view of revolution as an omelet which cannot be made without breaking eggs, then such Friends have not understood or accepted the limits of the power inherent in the Quaker way of life. And if they are mistaking that way of life with the Marxist-Leninist precepts it is perhaps understandable because of the confusion engendered by the fallacy of accident, which in their case tends to make every radical means reasonable and sanctioned because

each has its place in a human situation, presumably illuminated equally by the Light Within. Now I must turn to the second cornerstone of the Quaker way of life, the method of reaching decisions.

Decisions by Consensus: Right Means in Wrong Places

*"Only in its method is the Society of Friends unique. The Quaker meeting for worship and the Quaker meeting for business are unique institutions. It is their purpose to expose the soul to the Light from God so that peace is removed if it ought to be removed, or attained if it can be attained."*⁸

These words by Howard Brinton, one time director of Pendle Hill, quite correctly link the meeting for business with the meeting for worship, based as they both are on the practice of patient waiting in silence, and obedience to the promptings of inward illumination. Immediately we become aware that the Quaker meeting for business is deeply religious in origin and practice, and that it is part and parcel of the Quaker way of life. When in the mid-nineteen-thirties there was an upsurge of interest in guided group thinking, a prominent Friend, then Professor of the Philosophy of Religion at Stanford University, warned:

*"We must guard against the over-enthusiastic notion that this (Quaker) conference method is applicable to all problems.... But with this warning in mind, we may safely proceed to see what genuine sharing of thought can accomplish under able guidance.... The purpose of this essay is to give to those, already interested in the general conception of co-operative thinking, an introduction to essentials of the Quaker conference procedure ..."*⁹

After a brief introduction to the ways in which the Quaker method of business meetings arose, Trueblood notes that "this method is a unique form of the general conference method, marked by four conditions, all of which are necessary. These four conditions refer to (1) the nature of the group, (2) the mood of the gathering, (3) the qualifications for participation, and (4) the method of ascertaining the decision." Let us follow Trueblood briefly through his four points¹⁰, for with their aid we will be able to see more clearly how A.F.S.C. methods imperil not only Israel but the Quaker way of life.

(1) Group solidarity is assumed in the use of the Quaker method It is expected that (the) persons who make up the group shall already have many experiences and convictions in common. They are bound together by affection for each other and by adherence to a common faith.... There are many Quaker groups in which this condition is lacking, and when it is conspicuously lacking, the entire method breaks down.

- (2) *The expectation of corporate guidance is central to the mood of the Quaker gathering. Friends have a strong conviction, when differences arise, that there is a right way and that this may well be shown to them if they are sufficiently sensitive. This is why decision is often postponed when there is a marked division in the group.... we can see how similar the mood of the Quaker discussion is to that of worship and how alien to the debating mood. The debater seeks to win, but the worshiper seeks to listen and share.... Though the problems faced are often those having to do with the practical aspects of life, they are approached in the spirit of prayer and devotion.... Often, when a problem is particularly difficult, especially when there are strong sympathies on opposite sides, someone will rise and suggest that the entire assembly give up speaking or arguing and join in a time of quiet waiting on God....*
- (3) *All present may share in the deliberations of the group, regardless of age, sex or education. In many gatherings for discussion participation is based upon the holding of office or being elected as a delegate, but Friends, from the beginning, have adopted a platform of radical democracy....*
- (4) *The "sense of the meeting" is the basis of decision, rather than a division into majority and minority. This sense of the meeting is practical unanimity and failure to arrive at it is usually the occasion for postponement. Each group has a "clerk," a person appointed to fill the double office of chairman and secretary. The clerk is appointed, not to guide the discussion, but to make a faithful record of what the real convictions of the group are. His main qualification is sensitiveness to what others think....*

The Quaker meeting for business is thus not without worldly interests, but it cannot be seen as a strictly secular affair. It is always combined with the readiness to submit the worldly concerns to the divine light, whence they may be illuminated and understood anew. But this Quaker method of doing business has in fact become separated from its religious moorings. The caution sounded by Trueblood "against the over-enthusiastic notion that this conference method is applicable to all problems" has not been heeded. Thus Stuart Chase," the popularizer of post-war social science, saw in the Quaker meeting a panacea for group problem solving. Toward the end of the chapter devoted to the Quaker business meeting he says:

The Quakers have found a road to agreement and obviously a wide one. You can use some of their methods in the next meeting you attend, in every meeting for the rest of your life. But before you can use the total approach, a definite structure must be in place.

To begin with, Quakers are like-minded people, coming mostly from the same sub-culture in society, the "upper-

middles" and the "lower-uppers," as W. Lloyd Warner might classify them. They know each other well; many are born in the faith—"birthright" members. They are not in so much of a hurry as most Americans; they can afford to let the right decision make itself known in due time. Their motto seems to be: When in doubt, Wait! —while the American hustler counters with: When in doubt, Act! And as we said earlier, Quakers begin with a religious conviction that it is their duty to find agreement.

Quakers meet usually in small face-to-face groups—a great help in problem-solving. As we have seen, they have learned a high degree of control over their egos and have all but banished from their gatherings the loud-mouthed, dominating type. They know how to listen, a function much neglected by most Americans. They respect the judgment of others, hoping to find there a new dimension for group judgment. This is not so much neglected by the rest of us as unheard of.

Note how Chase has generalized the specific and limited approach of Trueblood's. Of course Chase warns that "a definite structure must be in place" if you want to "use some of their methods in the next meeting you attend." And what is that "definite structure"? For Elton Trueblood it was the group solidarity derived from common convictions and adherence to a common faith. It was solidarity based on religious faith and practice. For Stuart Chase this religiously wrought solidarity has become a class likeness, a "consciousness of kind" that stems from styles of life rather than a way of life like the Quakers'. And when Chase looks at the Quaker emphasis on consensus he finds that too possible and practicable within secular business procedures:

As for the rule of unanimity, I know of one board of directors that tries to practice it—the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey. The twelve directors meet once a week, and the executive board of five within the larger board meets every business day. All twelve are drawn from the active operations of the company—production, sales, personnel, but not the legal department. They seldom take a vote. If disagreement develops—say over a project to build a new refinery—the technical staff is called in, equipped with charts and statistics. The board listens to the facts. When the final decision is made they are all in it. Nobody says later on, told you so."¹²

These references from 1951 may strike one as ludicrous now, but the image of "Quaker democracy" has by no means paled. Following the People's Temple tragedy Theodore Roszak, author of *The Making of a Counter Culture*, had a long article in the Los Angeles Times dealing with the problem of cults.

Reminding readers that all established churches were once sects and cults, he said:

*"The cults of the modern world include the Mennonites, the Brethren, the Amish, the (Hutterite)Bruderhof—all gentle and retiring pacifists. The Quakers, who have for so long been numbered among the most precocious democratic and humanitarian forces in Western society, began their history as an outlandish sect of enthusiasts guided by an obstreperous prophet whose loyalty to 'the inner light' transcended all law and convention."*¹³ (emphasis added)

There we have it then, Quakers are among the most precocious democratic forces of Western society! Such a fiction cannot aid Quakerism or its way of life. In fact, it would appear as if the distortion of the Friends' unique decision-making process has had "un-Quakerly" effects for groups within the Quaker orbit. To demonstrate this let me once more turn to the American Friends Service Committee and its activities as self-appointed broker in the Middle East conflict.

During the second week of February, 1977 the A.F.S.C. convened a conference in Chevy Chase, Maryland, dealing with the topic "The New Imperatives for Israeli-Palestinian Peace." There were Israeli doves and Palestinian Arab militants, and Americans Jewish and non-Jewish. There were also several observers, among whom were two university professors who subsequently published their observations of the conference. I have found both Professor Marvin Maurer's article¹⁴ and that by Professor Robert J. Levy¹⁵ enlightening if disturbing. In what follows I shall draw heavily on the Maurer article, for it sheds light on the way in which this A.F.S.C. sponsored and directed conference used the Quaker method of business.

...it is useful to review some of the principles related to Quaker meetings, as modifications of these procedures enabled the staff and participating Quakers to direct meetings to a desired conclusion or consensus. The traditionally silent meeting functions as a mechanism to enable the word of God to be voiced through the voice of participating Friends. (p. 37)

...at these meetings harmony has priority over conflict. When modified for purposes of handling secular political meetings the A.F.S.C. has a sharply honed tool at its disposal which minimizes and/or nullifies disagreement and effectively guides the participants in a group to arrive at the desired consensus. (p. 38; emphasis added)

At the risk of being redundant I must draw the reader's attention to the lines

FAULTY THINKING

which I have emphasized. Here the Quaker method of the meeting for business has been "modified for purposes of handling secular political meetings." Note that far from having the solidarity of like-minded participants in a religious fellowship, the conference brought together heterogeneous constituents who were there supposedly to learn how to bring peace to the Middle East. To the trained observer (Maurer is a political scientist), the Quaker method of conducting business has in the hands of the A.F.S.C. become "a sharply honed tool." A tool for what? A sharply honed tool which "minimizes and/or nullifies disagreement and effectively guides the participants in a group to arrive at the desired consensus." While I do not regard the Quaker method of arriving at consensus in the religiously-based business meeting as "democratic," it is appropriate there, for it fits the assumptions, practices, the way of life of the Society of Friends. *On the other hand I regard the use of the Quaker business meeting in the context of the A.F.S.C. conference as a piece of blatant and insidious manipulation, with any consensus obtained by it as obtained under duress. It seems to me to have been an exercise most "un-Quakerly," especially since it was apparently given the sanction of Quaker practice. If Stuart Chase and the board of directors of Standard Oil of New Jersey think the Quaker method applicable to the board's business procedures, that appears to be a piece of harmless buffoonery. But if a group which has long and honorably borne the name of Friends uses the Quaker method "as a sharply honed tool" to manipulate attendees of a political conference, then the Quaker method has been badly used, then the Quaker way of life has evidently been perverted. If one doubts that this is so, let Marvin Maurer relate incidents from the conference:*

A spokesman for the Arab-American university graduates not only blamed Israel for the Palestinian diaspora but said that by arming the Christians, Israel created a Palestinian Auschwitz at Tal Zaatar. The applause was loud and sustained. The A.F.S. C. moderator asked that the usual question-answer period be suspended. He called for one minute of silence so that the audience might "feel" the horrors that were so vividly described. (p. 38)

and again:

During the meeting of the mass media workshop abuse of the term "Jewish Zionist" became so pronounced the A.F.S.C. moderator imposed a minute's silence in order to restore "harmony." (p. 39)

By suspending the question-answer period and asking for silence the moderator effectively "nullified disagreement" but was the act "even-handed" or heavy-handed? Was this the same kind of silence that would be called for in a Quaker meeting for business where the members know each other and share a sense of common purpose? Was this not, in this setting and

among these people, a tool for manipulation and control? What the moderator has done is to act as a pseudo-clerk in a pseudo-Quaker meeting for business, without the base of solidarity presupposed among Friends.

The A.F.S.C. staff, aided by seasoned Quakers, were able to implant a distinct pattern to a major part of the proceedings. Invariably a meeting started with a declaration that we are all humanitarians and we want to establish an aura of mutual trust in order to engage in meaningful exchange and dialogue. Such an aim is not alien to Quakers who believe "that personal relationships can reach across conflicting ideologies." (p. 38)

Could this manifesto "that we are all humanitarians" bent on "mutual trust" and "meaningful exchange and dialogue" be the functional equivalent of the Quaker meeting's solidarity derived from previous participation in a religious fellowship? If so it is once again a shallow substitute, and more suited to manipulation than to genuine dialogue. Maurer evidently thinks so too, for his account continues as follows:

Then due homage was usually paid to the sufferings of the Jews during the 1930s and 1940s. However, now we must accept the fact that the Israelis have committed grave injustices to Palestinians in the name of providing a homeland for Europe's cast-off victims. "Auschwitz" and "diaspora" became standard metaphors to describe the plight of the Palestinians. (p. 38)

Jewish participants were asked to tolerate some anti-Semitic remarks in order to keep the lines of communication open. It was argued that Palestinians cannot be expected to be understanding or asked to cool their anger until justice was achieved. Instead we must concentrate on erasing stereotypes including the one that associates the P.L.O. with terrorism. (p. 39; emphasis added)

These and other incidents make it very clear that the Quaker method has been taken entirely out of context. As it did not occur in a Quaker meeting nor even in a setting like that of the board of directors of an oil company, but among persons who represent different and opposing points of view without the base of a common way of life, the method must be considered at best out of place and at worst destructively manipulative. Such behavior on the part of an organization acting and speaking on behalf of Friends does a great disservice to the integrity of the Society of Friends and the Quaker way of life. It is a perversion of that way of life.

While Maurer and Levy have brought together considerable evidence for their view that the A.F.S.C. conference of 1977 was not only hostile to Israel but had

strong elements of anti-Semitism as well, my principal thrust here has been to show that the conference misused the Quaker method of arriving at decisions. And this misuse I see in part at least to derive from faulty thinking. Here the assumption is apparently that the kind of conditions Trueblood has noted do not hold when *Quakers* want to generalize the use of the method. I prefer to think that the use of the Quaker business method in the setting of such a conference derives from errors in reasoning and judging, rather than from an intent to deceive. But whatever the motive, the consequence is utterly destructive. The resulting manipulation of one group is as shameful as the resulting collusion with the other. It seems clear that the manipulation which is implied by the wrongful use of the Quaker method of group decision-making leads ultimately to coercion. Certainly the advice to the Jewish participants to tolerate some anti-Semitic remarks goes far beyond manipulation. And why would these Quaker activists not try to manipulate and coerce those whom they wish to bring in line? Are they not in possession of the truth that the others lack? How else is one to interpret the *title* of the 1977 conference which read: *The New Imperatives for Israeli-Palestinian Peace*?* After all, only that is imperative which is either forced on one by the will of another or by the impact of impersonal circumstances.

The behavior of those who direct and enact the work of the American Friends Service Committee is reminiscent of a great literary figure, equally beholden to religious pacifism, and equally given to good works and service to humanity. I refer to Tolstoy. It happens that Orwell wrote an essay about Tolstoy also. Let me end this part of my essay with his telling portraiture:

A sort of doubt has always hung round the character of Tolstoy, as round the character of Gandhi. He was not a vulgar hypocrite, as some people declared him to be, and he would probably have imposed even greater sacrifices on himself than he did, if he had not been interfered with at every step by the people surrounding him, especially his wife. But on the other hand it is dangerous to take such men as Tolstoy at their disciples' valuation. There is always the possibility—the probability, indeed—that they have done no more than exchange one form of egoism for another. Tolstoy renounced wealth, fame and privilege; he abjured violence in all its forms

*The very phrase "Israeli-Palestinian Peace" is misleading and tendentious, supporting Arab propaganda. The involvement of the Arab states is played down by avoiding the term *Arab-Israel* conflict, although it is the Arab states that have consistently sought to eliminate Israel. The term "Israeli-Palestinian" conflict suggests that the struggle is between natives (Palestinians in a homeland named after them) fighting to keep their homeland from usurpers. This avoidance of the political reality, that is the fact that the Palestinian issue is an integral part of the much larger Arab-Israel conflict, is evidenced in AFSC's propaganda generally.

A FRIENDLY PERVERSION

*and was ready to suffer for doing so; but it is not so easy to believe that he abjured the principle of coercion, or at least the **desire** to coerce others. There are families in which the father will say to his child, "You'll get a thick ear if you do that again," while the mother, her eyes brimming over with tears, will take the child in her arms and murmur lovingly, "Now, darling, **is** it kind to Mummy to do that?" And who would maintain that the second method is less tyrannous than the first? The distinction that really matters is not between violence and non-violence, but between having and not having the appetite for power. There are people who are convinced of the wickedness both of armies and police forces, but who are nevertheless much more intolerant and inquisitorial in outlook than the normal person who believes that it necessary to use violence in certain circumstances. They will not say to somebody else, "Do this, that and the other or you will go to prison," but they will, if they can, get inside his brain and dictate his thoughts for him in the minutest particulars. Creeds like pacifism and anarchism, which seem on the surface to imply a complete renunciation of power, rather encourage this habit of mind. For if you have embraced a creed which appears to be free from the ordinary dirtiness of politics—a creed from which you yourself cannot expect to draw any material advantage—surely that proves that you are in the right? And the more you are in the right, the more natural that everyone else should be bullied into thinking likewise.¹⁶*

Can not the same be said about the activists of the American Friends Service Committee? Their creed "is rooted in the conviction that each human life is sacred, each man a child of God, and that love, expressed through creative action, can overcome hatred, prejudice and fear." They cannot expect to draw material advantage from this creed—surely that proves that they are right? And the more they think themselves in the right, the more natural that everyone else should be bullied into thinking likewise.

Is that too harsh a judgment of gentle people who want nothing more than to help create a world of justice and peace? It is indeed a harsh judgment, but is it wrong? In the final part of this essay I shall bring together evidence for the claim of dirty work. Then the reader can see whether Orwell's judgment of Tolstoy applies to the American Friends Service Committee.

IV. OR EVEN DIRTY WORK

... the reconciler is ...confronted with the quandary of standing up for his integrity and appearing rigid or else of acquiescing in duplicities. All along he has to make adjustments in his attitude to what the situation may demand, hence there is always some play-acting in his endeavors, at least something of St. Paul's effort of being all things to all men, or of the Quaker concern to 'speak to the condition' of people. This means that the reconciler must be as interested in the possible effects of his words as in their truthfulness, though this poses a new challenge to his integrity.

—Richard K. Ullmann, *Dilemmas of a Reconciler*
Serving the East-West Conflict
Pendle Hill Pamphlet #131, 1963

Now I must try to show that the faulty thinking and consequent perversions of the Quaker way of life can lead Friends into dirty work, i.e., into activities which they would abjure on principle. I shall begin with references to aspects of manipulation leading to coercion. Then I shall proceed to discuss collusion, leading to active partisanship on the side of the PLO against Israel.

The A.F.S.C.'s conference at Chevy Chase was called to create a climate for creative problem-solving, but reports by Maurer and Levy as well as other observers have shown that actually much ill-feeling was created there. Throughout the addresses and discussions Israel was singled out as the party which was in the wrong and was to shape up. "At one point during the conference the friendly dialogue collapsed. On February 13, Jewish participants called their own meeting during a free period. They were concerned about the use of abusive terms and the constant linking of the Holocaust to the Palestinian solution."¹⁷ Maurer then tells how this protest was actually nipped in the bud by a group of anti-Israeli Jews and an A.F.S.C. staff member who walked out and joined another group which was meeting next door to discuss human rights violations in Israel. At the same time the

conference organizers sought to make all Jewish attendees feel at home:

There was no lack of effort to make Jewish participants feel that the A.F.S.C. was attentive to their values. In response to the letter of complaint an Associate Executive Secretary issued a mild chastisement to anyone who used stereotypes to characterize any ethnic group. The conference program listed two Sabbath services. A social evening was predominantly devoted to the singing of Hebrew songs and dancing the hora.¹⁸

But these efforts on the part of the conference organizers were apparently not altogether successful. Maurer also suggests that the panels and workshops were so one-sided that even Jewish attendees who otherwise agreed with the A.F.S.C. "left Chevy Chase in a state of consternation—if not outright anger." Even if one wished to discount the reports of alleged anti-Semitic utterances by conference speakers like Harold Piety,* it would be difficult to avoid the impression of the Jewish participants being alternately wooed and worried, treated and threatened—in other words, manipulated. Thus the "human rights" meeting next door to the protesting group of Jewish attendees was chaired by the Vice President of the Association of Arab-American University Graduates, a group very active in promoting anti-Israel sentiment in America. At that group meeting, attended by A.F.S.C. staff and Quakers, the abortive attempt at protest against anti-Semitic slurs was apparently characterized as "narrow." "After some discussion a consensus was arrived at, mainly with the promptings of those who walked out of the Jewish caucus meeting." All agreed to censure Israel; there was no dissent; no vote had been taken.

At the 1977 conference the Quaker business method had thus been employed entirely out of context. It was used in an attempt at conciliating people who were not connected with Quaker faith and practice, and who were, moreover, sharply divided by conflicts of interest and outlook. But since in such circumstances conciliation is not readily to be achieved, one side or another must be manipulated into conformity with pre-determined ends. When even that fails, duress and coercion may be resorted to. Asking Jewish participants to endure some degree of anti-Semitic rhetoric "in order to keep the lines of communication open" is manipulative to the point of duress. Confronting Jewish protesters not only with a boycott of their meeting but with an orchestrated attack on Israel smacks of punitiveness and coercive attempts at bringing recalcitrant conference participants in line.

But this kind of manipulation and coercion did not begin at the 1977 conference. It will be remembered that the A.F.S.C.'s efforts at intervention in the Middle East began officially with the publication of *Search for Peace*. The

*See the article by Robert J. Levy, "Hostile 'Friends,'" *The American Zionist*, Nov. 1977, p. 25.

subsequent conferences were but extensions of that book's goal to serve as a tool for reconciliation between Arabs and Israel. Richard Ullmann's advice to reconcilers to "be as interested in the possible effects of ... words as in their truthfulness" was surely not well heeded at Chevy Chase, any more than in the original Quaker document. To demonstrate the effects of its words on one segment of the contending parties, I shall here make reference to the careful reply by several Jewish scholars.²⁰ Their response should be required reading for any Friend who wants to look this entire sorry episode in the face. I shall introduce here some excerpts from the early pages of *Truth and Peace in the Middle East* to show how the Quaker report was understood by its critics:*

The Jerusalem Conference

Early in 1970, on Quaker initiative, a conference was held between members of the Quaker group, including Landrum R. Bolling, the editor of the report and Paul B. Johnson, Quaker Representative in the Middle East, and several world-renowned legal scholars then resident at the Harry S. Truman Center for the Advancement of Peace, in Jerusalem. The Truman Center group included Professor Julius Stone, University of Sydney (Australia) Faculty of Law; Professor Milton Konvitz, Cornell University School of Law, and Professor Charles Boasson of the Truman Center.

At the time of the conference, the Quakers had already completed their tenth draft. In a detailed critique of that tenth draft, sent to Paul Johnson on February 20, 1970, Professor Stone wrote as follows:

"Dr. Bolling said at our conference on Friday 13th, that he tended to agree with U.S. governmental suggestions that a pro-Arab presentation is required to balance what he claimed was a pro-Israel slant in the mass media.

"How in the light of the above admission as to the background," asked Professor Stone in his critique, "can it be claimed as it is... that this Quaker document is making an approach which is 'objective, balanced, candid, realistic?'"

Professor Stone's question was never answered. (pp. 1, 2)

Why was Professor Stone's question not answered?

From letter of March 19, 1970; Professor Stone to Paul B. Johnson:

"Your letter opens with a statement of thanks ' for the enormous effort in commenting so carefully upon Draft Ten of the Quaker statement on the Middle East.' This naturally led me to expect that you would go on to make some effort to deal with

*For a fuller exposition see Appendix B.

the substantive matters to which my 'enormous effort' had addressed itself. Instead you mainly read me a lecture which seems to assume that the purpose of our dialogue is an exercise in good manners...

..I am saying that our 'enormous effort in commenting so carefully' on your draft deserved a response that would show some comparable effort and care on the part of the Quakers to understand, examine and weigh and measure the merits of our questions and arguments. Your letter makes no such showing despite your appreciated words of courtesy...

"I was led to believe, indeed, that your committee's sole interest was to help the parties and the world in their search for a just and stable peace. Do you, for a moment, think that you can bring the parties closer to this objective unless the positions you take are ones which even if they cannot 'love' they can at any rate respect as representing the utmost conscientious effort to face truthfully the problems each party is really trying to grapple with?" (p. 3)

Can it be that Richard Ullmann's counsel has been so misunderstood that the reconciler was here more concerned with the niceties of dialogue than with trying to understand the other side's reasoning and marshaled facts?

From letter of April 13, 1970; Professor Boasson to Paul B. Johnson:

"...I would be insincere on my part if I were to say that your letter made me feel that I have been of any use or have contributed at all to improvements in your paper. The changes which you mention strike me as verbal only....I feel, however, that some mere changes in the word-choice of your paper cannot alter its biased tenor. There has been some advantage even in blunt words which made the bias patent; more delicate formulation may now require more ample criticism. In short, I do not believe that anything material of my criticisms has been taken account of seriously... (p. 4)

Here again the reconciler has failed his promise. Charles Boasson sees the Quaker response to his critique to have been cosmetic only.

From letter of June 16, 1970; Professor Stone to Professor Gerald Caplan of Harvard University:

"It may be very relevant to know that when I saw Paul Johnson at the Truman Building opening, I pressed him hard about their circulation of the Quaker document in mimeograph among Congressmen ...

*"He claimed that the circulation was by a Washington, D.C. branch without the group's knowledge.**

"I pressed him as to whether that circulated draft was different from what they were about to publish. He said, yes, substantially different.

"I then asked whether the group did not have a duty to write to each Congressman immediately and inform him that circulation has been improperly made, and that the document circulated did not in a number of respects represent their position.

"He was (it seemed to me) quite shameless in saying that, no, they had no such duty. After putting the same question to him three ways, I decided that the fault was not in his good understanding, but in his good intentions." (p. 5)

Here Richard Ullmann's advice has been ignored to the point of scorning the party to be helped toward reconciliation. Clearly it has led Julius Stone to distrust Paul Johnson, and perhaps the entire Quaker venture. Leaving a contending working group's query simply unanswered, making no effort to "examine and weigh and measure the merits of ...questions and arguments" presented by the other side, and evincing more interest in cosmetic than in substantive improvements of one's text—what do such sins of omission and commission imply in this context? Consider the question raised by the Jewish scholars concerning the Quaker method of conferring:

Were the doubts of the Jewish scholars as to the good faith of the Quaker group—doubts which developed out of their experience in discussing the various drafts—justified? Did the Quakers use their meetings with Jewish experts as part of a serious effort to develop additional insight, knowledge and sound analysis? Or were these meetings merely a means of supporting their public claim to have "listened to all sides" and to get an early warning on points of exceptional sensitivity where verbal cosmetics could soften and make future criticism more difficult?

To this reader the apparent evasions and cosmetic exercises in the context of the much advertised "honest broker" role imply nothing less than attempts at *manipulation*. Certainly the Jewish scholars so understood what the Quaker group was doing. In this case the outside world was being manipulated to accept the A.F.S.C.'s role of self-appointed reconcilers. The Jewish critics

*At the end of Chapter 1 of *Truth and Peace in the Middle East* is this telling note: Paul Johnson claimed that the draft had been circulated by a Washington, D.C. branch without the group's knowledge. Was it not Frances Neely, the Friends' chief lobbyist in Washington and herself a member of the Quaker study group, who arranged its circulation to members of the U.S. Congress at that critical time?

were to be brought in line with the reconcilers' pre-determined points of view and plans of action. But however successful the Quaker effort appears to have been with various interested groups in the outside world, the manipulatory strategies failed to convince the Jewish working party. It is in the light of this failure that I understand Paul Johnson's stand on the issue of the circulation among members of the U.S. Congress of an unamended version of the Quaker report. The entire episode of that circulation and the A.F.S.C.'s refusal to inform Congressmen of the facts surrounding the version of the report they had received goes beyond mere manipulation. Here seems to me clear evidence of the application of duress. But if this event is not sufficient for the essay's reader to be convinced of the manipulation-duress sequence, I refer that reader to Chapter X of *Truth and Peace*, entitled "Advice to American Jews." There the authors have carefully dissected the wording of a part of the twelfth draft of the Quaker report. They find that,

... this statement can only be described as threatening American Jews that unless they cut back in their efforts "to register their convictions and desires" as regards "legislative and executive action," they may face an "anti-Semitic backlash"—with all this connotes for the future of Israel and American Jewry... the Quaker authors urge American Jews to limit the exercise of the constitutional rights or face potentially dangerous results...

*This is especially strange and dangerous advice coming from the Quakers, themselves a religious minority, who practice freely so many highly visible forms of civil disobedience in registering their "convictions and desires."^{21**}*

But the Jewish group which authored *Truth and Peace in the Middle East* did not consider the A.F.S.C.'s report as representative of all of Quakerism:

We believe that the great body of the Quaker movement seeks only truth and fairness in its approach to any issue and would reject any "slant" imposed on the facts for any reason. Hence we address this critique also to Quakers themselves. We ask them to review the contents of the report in the light of their own Consciences and critical faculties.²²

*For the complete text of Chapter X from *Truth and Peace in the Middle East* see Appendix A.

**Note: Grand Rapids Press, April 26, 1970—Dateline UN, AP—Headline says Jews in U.S. accused of Pressure Tactics. Quaker-sponsored working party said Saturday that pressure applied by American Jewish leaders has induced public officials to endorse policies toward Israel in which they do not believe. Appeals to Jewish leaders to reassess the character of their support for Israel "and the nature of their role in American politics."

Surely, the authors of *Truth and Peace* were not unbiased. Their bias is in favor of Israel's statehood and the survival of her people, but the diligent reader will discover that again and again *Truth and Peace* brings together factual information which can be checked for its accuracy. However concerned the A.F.S.C.'s team may have been with being truthful, they were clearly far less concerned with being properly informed, or when informed, to correct more than the offending language. The reconcilers' dilemmas are thus exacerbated and the challenge to their integrity is increased by the fact that they have not done their basic homework. Low-key manipulation of Israel and American Jewry may appear to be a sign of independent thought, however faulty, but there are indications that the A.F.S.C.'s activities have also had outside sponsorship. I have already noted that Landrum Bolling is reported to have said at the Jerusalem conference in 1970 "that he tended to agree with U.S. governmental suggestions that a pro-Arab presentation is required to balance what he claimed was a pro-Israel slant in the mass media." But the A.F.S.C. looks at least as much to the USSR for guidance on Middle East issues as to the U.S.A. Thus, referring to U.N. Resolution 242, the *Truth and Peace* study points out:

*...the Quaker authors start from the premise that the Soviet-Arab interpretation is correct and that while Israel is bound to withdraw from all the territories it occupied during the Six-Day War the Arabs are not required to carry on direct negotiations with Israel. This premise serves as the touchstone for all of the report's recommendations on how to achieve a Middle East peace.*²³

When one considers that the A.F.S.C.'s principal concern is not simply justice for either Arabs or Jews but the prevention of a superpower confrontation in the Middle East, it becomes entirely understandable why that organization has arrogated to itself the role of reconciler there. It also becomes understandable why the A.F.S.C.'s study report and its subsequent conferences should betray so much bias against Israel and its supporters in the United States. If anyone is to be sacrificed for the sake of "world peace" it might as well be the smallest unit. But such nasty thoughts are not worthy of reconcilers, and the A.F.S.C.'s reconcilers no doubt do not consciously think them. But most Jews, out of utter necessity, do:

*... the tragedy of the past two thousand years of Jewish history has made Jews highly sensitive to the issue of Jewish survival and renaissance—and that issue, for them, is now inextricably bound up with the issue of Israel's survival as a free and independent state. Most non-Jews, although they may have deep concern about the people and affairs of the Middle East, are spared the intense sense of urgency which informs Jewish sensitivity on the subject.*²⁴

I do think that many Friends "have deep concern about the people and affairs of the Middle East." But do they understand the sense of urgency with which Jews regard "the issue of Jewish survival and renaissance"? Do Friends understand that for most Jews that issue "is now inextricably bound up with ... Israel's survival as a free and independent state"? I do not know how Friends generally understand this issue, but I am afraid that those Friends who now make policy in and for the American Friends Service Committee decidedly do not. Take for instance this report of an A.F.S.C. delegation's four week trip to the Middle East. The trip took place between May 19 and June 14, 1975. The nineteen persons in the group were to be given first-hand experience in understanding the people and affairs of the area. The report says that "in Israel the prevailing impression among Israelis is that all Arab states and the P.L.O., labeled by Israelis as 'terrorists,' still seek the liquidation of the Jewish state. Arafat's dream of a secular democratic state is seen as a code term for uprooting their country and people. They keep bringing up the P.L.O. charter. It was hard for us to convey to Israelis our own impression of Arab moderation and desire for peace." Why wouldn't the Israelis bring up the P.L.O. charter? That document is very explicit as to the fate of the millions of Jews who settled in Palestine after the end of the British Mandate. They'd be sent 'home,' to such anti-Jewish welcomes as would await them in Poland, Russia, Yemen, and North Africa. As for the fate of Israel as a free and independent state, that is of course foretold in "Arafat's dream."* His 'secular democratic state' is simply a pseudonym for the end of the State of Israel, and thus the end of the Jewish dream of a secure homeland. The A.F.S.C.'s delegation may have had deep concern about people and affairs but had not done its homework. Had they read the P.L.O. charter they might have been less sanguine about Arafat's "dream." The Israelis live in the real conditions in which P.L.O. bombs explode on school buses, and in markets, and where that organization daily threatens everyone's life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. Why *not* call the P.L.O. what it is: a terrorist organization? Why, evidence to the contrary, should the Israelis have accepted the A.F.S.C. delegates' "*impression*" of Arab moderation and desire for peace? The reader will recall an earlier delegation of Friends to Nazi Germany having "no question that the members of the government... received us in the spirit in which we came"!

The report of the 1975 delegation also tells of the A.F.S.C. delegation's visit to Yad Vashem. Yad Vashem is a memorial museum to remember the Holocaust and its millions of victims. Unlike other such memorials it tries to list the names of every known victim, child, woman, man, of all nationalities, of all ages. Instead of recalling only mass graves and gas chambers, it reminds the

Not long ago, during the pilgrimage period in Mecca, Arafat is reported to have called for a jihad (holy war) against Israel. He did so again toward the end of February 1979 from Teheran. People who intend to create "secular-democratic" societies do not invoke *holy* wars, whether Moslem jihads or Christian crusades!

visitor that these travesties happened "to people... to men, women, and children, one by one."* The delegates "visited Yad Vashem and Ramallah Friends Meeting in the same day. Some cried in Yad Vashem while others questioned the psychological validity of preserving this bitter memory. Later we attended the Friends Meeting in occupied Ramallah, joined hands and sang one of the few permitted protest songs—We Shall Overcome. All of us were shaken, some to open weeping, by the experience."

Some of these delegates cried at Yad Vashem, while others questioned the validity of keeping alive the memory of the children, of the women, of the men, the memory of those to whom the Holocaust had happened one by one. But these same delegates did not hesitate to keep alive inflammatory sentiments inherent in misleading labels like "occupied" Ramallah and "the few permitted protest songs." Let me first deal with the issue of protest. Israel has much wider freedom of expression than its Arab neighbors. To the best of my knowledge these Quaker delegates could have sung whatever they liked, without any interference from the Israeli authorities. What then was the loaded phrase about "the few permitted protest songs" to do but to brand Israel as oppressive in the eyes of the Quaker readership at home? Next let me deal with the phrase "occupied" Ramallah. In *Search for Peace in the Middle East* the A.F.S.C. study group speaks approvingly of the British administration in Palestine. The Arabs did not like that administration any more than did many of the Jews. But there is no evidence in the Quaker report that its authors considered Ramallah then to have been occupied territory. And how did the Arab residents of Ramallah and surroundings fare and feel under *Jordanian rule*?

...On November 21 (1966), shop and business strikes broke out in the Ramallah area. The (Jordanian) army, called in to intervene, employed tanks to restore order. The Jordanian authorities imposed a curfew and closed all schools. Similar events recurred through November and December in most other towns (of the West Bank). On November 24 the Jordanian army again employed tanks and tear gas. Twenty demonstrators were killed and many more wounded. On December 8, 1966, a general business strike was forcibly suppressed by the police and the Jordanian Army.²⁵

Have the Friends so critical of Israel's administration of West Bank areas been similarly critical of Jordan's administration? I have found no evidence of it. Again, the term "occupied Ramallah" is evidently intended to brand Israel in

*These words are from a letter by Bronson P. Clark, former Executive Secretary of AFSC. Writing to prospective contributors in 1973 he said: "Democracy, justice, poverty, truth, war—these are things that matter only because they happen to people, happen to men, women, and children, one by one."

A FRIENDLY PERVERSION

the eyes of the Quaker readership at home. Whose language are Friends using here, if not the terms and slogans of Israel's enemies?

The report on the nineteen delegates' tour, and its misleading images of Palestinian Arabs as a people oppressed by Israel, has distinguished company in the A.F.S.C.'s vocabulary. Marvin Maurer recalls some of the opening remarks by Louis W. Schneider, the A.F.S.C.'s Executive Secretary, at the 1977 conference in Chevy Chase:

He paid homage to the victims of the Holocaust and those who died in the Warsaw Ghetto. Then his train of logic shifted to today's Palestinian refugees. In a theme that would be amplified throughout the meeting, he implied that Israel created these new refugees. Or as a New England Regional A.F.S.C. publication expressed it last November: "Now Israelis are making Jews out of Palestinians. In the Palestinians I recognize my Jews."²⁶

It is instructive to compare Maurer's notes with those by another observer at the conference:

Schneider informed the audience that he had visited Israel in the Spring of 1976 during the time when Jews were observing the thirty-fourth anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto uprising. He went on to say:

No one for a moment would suggest that the Holocaust and Israel's occupation or administration of the West Bank and Gaza Strip are at all equivalent. But it was deeply saddening to have been in Israel during the season when Jews were celebrating one of their own struggles from tyranny—in this case, the Warsaw uprising—and the Arab minority in Israel were heard voicing their own aspirations for freedom during their demonstrations against Israeli control.

Despite the initial denial, it is evident that Schneider offered a comparison between the struggle of the Jews against the Nazis in the Warsaw Ghetto and the struggle of the Arab minority in Israel against Israeli control. Schneider offered the premises of an argument by analogy and allowed his listener to draw the conclusion that Israeli control over the Arab minority is comparable to Nazi control over the Jews of the Warsaw Ghetto. Schneider thus obliquely compared Israelis to Nazis.²⁷

Such analogies and metaphoric expressions represent a form of Orwellian "doublethink." They re-define and restructure the reality of the social world. In

the Quaker Doublethink displaced Palestinian Arabs are likened to Jews under the Nazi heel, while the State of Israel is made to appear similar to Nazi Germany. Aside from the fact that such obscene metaphors represent an assault on people who still have the stench of the crematoria in their nostrils, the metaphors are patently false.

Arabs who for over a generation have lived in refugee camps are the victims of many forces. Thus Arab absentee landlords created landless peasants, and the Arab states used these landless people as a political weapon against Israel. When the term "refugee" is applied to such people one ought to keep in mind the different meaning it had in the case of Jews trying to flee Nazi-dominated Europe. The Jews mostly had no place to go to; few countries were hospitable enough to offer shelter and civil rights.* But displaced Arabs are "refugees" in a very different sense. They live among their own brethren in terms of culture, language, and faith. They do not live in a foreign land; in fact most of them have moved only short distances from one part of what used to be British Mandatory Palestine to another. They could easily have been absorbed by neighboring Arab states (as indeed many have been) if their status as "refugees" had not provided these states with a handy political weapon against Israel. The Arab states seem to have thought it in their interest to keep before the world an image of Arabs "dispossessed" by Jews. As one of Israel's statesmen has recently written:

... the 800,000 Jewish refugees from Arab lands ...were saved, transported, absorbed and trained to be useful citizens by the Jewish people in Israel and elsewhere. By contrast, 500,000 Arab refugees are still maintained in international charity camps—thirty years after the War of Independence—kept there as pawns by their Arab brethren, who are too busy gambling away billions of Petro-dollars at the gaming tables of Monte Carlo or Las Vegas to care for them.²⁸

None of this is to condone the troubles experienced by displaced people, but rather to point to the essential falsehood of the metaphor which likens the Arab refugees to the victims of the Nazi enormity. For Jews under the Nazi yoke there was only degradation, dehumanization, and death, while for Arabs in Israel there is dignity, livelihood, and civil rights, including the right to protest. Of all the people active in the Middle East Quakers should have known from first-hand experience that the Arab refugees never suffered anything like the fate of Europe's Jews under Hitler. Friends have been active among displaced Arabs, distributing food for the United Nations Organization. They know that people did not go hungry in the camps, that the sick

*In her classic study *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, Hanna Arendt notes that stateless persons taking refuge in France enjoyed civil rights only when they committed a crime. Then they were given the same treatment as any French citizen under French laws.

were cared for, that families were kept together, that there was no planned cruelty. Why then these misleading metaphors now, by spokesmen of Quaker service? Why?

The false metaphors employed by the A.F.S.C. functionaries have more pernicious consequences than the insult they represent to survivors from the Nazi adventure in racist genocide. The faulty thinking which such metaphors sponsor and sustain now reinforce and justify further travesties. It is the same sequence we have seen earlier-on in this essay: faulty thinking leads to behavior that undermines and perverts the Quaker way of life. Having consumed the smoke of their own metaphors the A.F.S.C. functionaries have convinced themselves of the truth of the implied allegations against Israel. This "truth" now allows them, in good conscience, to create a climate that favors the P.L.O. More insidiously yet, it allows them, again in good conscience, to undermine the security of the State of Israel. In the following pages I shall show evidence for these accusations of A.F.S.C.-sponsored dirty work.

Legitimizing the P.L.O.

In Maurer's report of the 1977 conference at Chevy Chase he says of the introductory address by Louis Schneider:

In order to remedy the injustices inflicted on the Palestinians he urged that the P.L.O. be recognized as the representative of a Palestinian state comprising the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. In turn, he assured the Israelis he favored the survival of Israel within its pre-1967 borders. He also expected the P.L.O. to recognize the existence of Israel.²⁹

On the surface this principal spokesman for the American Friends Service Committee supports Israel, even while he gives his support to the P.L.O. The theme of the A.F.S.C.'s support for Israel recurs in its publications. Thus in the introduction to its "Middle East Peace Education Packet," dated June 1974 there occurs this paragraph:

The A.F.S.C. has a long history of working with Jews and Arabs. Assistance to Jewish refugees from Nazi Germany began in 1931 and aid to Jewish civilian war victims occurred in the Middle East as late as the October war of 1973. Between the beginning of this work and now, there has been a long and*

*I have puzzled at this miracle of prescience on the part of the AFSC. How remarkable to have begun "assistance to Jewish refugees from Nazi Germany" two years before there was a Nazi Germany! Lest the reader think that I am making a mountain out of a molehill typing error, let me invite him or her to look carefully at the letter to the editor of *The Jerusalem Post* dated Feb. 2, 1979, and signed by Louis W. Schneider and James S. Fine (see p. ??).

DIRTY WORK

valued history of cooperation with Jews and Jewish organizations in this country and abroad. The A.F.S.C. believes in the State of Israel and supports its secure existence. Our hope for peace in the Middle East is focussed on the Israelis as much as on their Arab neighbors. (emphasis added)

Some time later the A.F.S.C. sent a letter to all candidates for the U.S. presidency. That letter, signed by Louis Schneider, included the following sentences:

A recent trip to the (Middle East) by several members of the American Friends Service Committee... convinces us of urgency. We would therefore like to share with you our perspective on the issue:*

—We have supported the legitimacy of the State of Israel since its inception. We also endorse Palestinian Arab self-determination including the establishment of a Palestinian Arab State. —... we believe that there can be no peace in the region without mutual recognition and accommodation of Israeli and Palestinian national aspirations and rights and without the attainment of peaceful, recognized boundaries by the Israeli State and the Palestinian state-to-be. (emphasis added)

Here we see that the old "even-handedness" is at work, with a semantic sleight of hand trick added. There is an "Israeli State" and a "Palestinian state-to-be." The allusion to the inevitability of a Palestinian state—not just autonomy within Israel, or administration by Jordan or Egypt—gives away how these A.F.S.C. policy-makers have pre-determined the outcome in their minds. They have obviously decided that the only just solution is a separate state for the Palestinian Arabs. And it is also clear that they have decided that the P.L.O. is the proper vehicle for the creation of such a state. Thus in the A.F.S.C.'s "Middle East Newsletter" for July-August 1976, its editor (Rosalie Riechman) says:

...While events in Lebanon may lead to the conclusion that the P.L.O. will be so seriously damaged that it will not be able to negotiate with Israel, we would view this as a set-up back (sic!) for the prospects of real peace. At present the P.L.O. is the most representative organization of Palestinians and must be part of the negotiations. (emphasis added)*

- Apparently a reference to the 19-person delegation of 1975.
- I suspect that this is a typing error and was meant to read "set-back," but as suggested by Freud in his *Psychopathology of Everyday Life*, such errors sometimes reveal hidden thoughts of the writer. Could Ms. Riechman have meant that the P.L.O. had been set up not to be able to negotiate with Israel? Set up by whom?

A FRIENDLY PERVERSION

A similar tone-emerges from another source of A.F.S.C. literature:

... Any attempt to exclude the PLO from talks in Geneva or anywhere else, or to force the Palestinians to accept Kissinger's 'United Kingdom' which would only fulfill Herzog's dream of "melting" the Palestinians into the Arab States, robbing them of their identity as a nation, must be exposed and opposed, for this is the recipe, not for a durable peace, but for continuing conflict.³⁰

Having determined that the Palestinian Arabs must have a state of their own, and that the P.L.O. is the proper agent to establish it, the A.F.S.C. now sets about to clean up the image of that organization. Thus a concerted effort is launched to make Friends and friends of Friends believe that the P.L.O. is ready to help with the peaceful Middle East solution projected by the A.F.S.C. Thus *Quaker Life* for September 1976 gives a list of definitions including among them this one: "The Palestine Liberation Organization is an umbrella association of moderate, independent Palestinian resistance groups." In the same issue is an article by Allan Carter Kellum entitled "Middle East Peace—the Emerging Consensus." Kellum asserts that the Arabs no longer want to throw the Jews into the sea. The P.L.O. has replaced that objective with a democratic secular state and an "even more conciliatory short-range objective—a Palestinian ministate in the West Bank and Gaza Strip."

There is something remarkably naive about a writer who informs his readers that this moderate body, the P.L.O., is no longer intent on throwing the Jewish citizens of Israel bodily into the sea, but that what is now sought is a secular-democratic state* where the State of Israel currently exists. But note how wonderfully conciliatory these "erstwhile" antagonists really are: Their *short-range objective* is a Palestinian ministate on the West Bank and Gaza. *Nota bene:* these conciliatory "ex-enemies" of Israel will accept sovereignty over their own mini-state for the time being until, by whatever means they can muster, they can get rid of the State of Israel, and send all but a handful of early Jewish settlers back to their former "homes."

Some spokesmen for the A.F.S.C.'s point of view are more blunt: Thus Joe Gerson** writing in *Israel and Palestine*, *** December 1976, laments that the

*As late as the end of February, 1979 Arafat is quoted by several newscasts to have said in Teheran: "Under the leadership of Ayatollah Khomeini and with the help of the Iranian freedom fighters, we will free Palestine. We are all Moslems under the same flag of Islam and we shall continue our struggle against Zionism." Does that sound like a proposal for a "secular-democratic" state?

**Gerson is Regional Director for Palestinian Issues with the AFSC in Cambridge, Mass.

****Israel and Palestine*, published in France by an anti-Israel exile from that country, Maxim Ghilan. This publication is openly pro-P.L.O. and consistently hostile to Israel.

DIRTY WORK

situation (i.e. the civil war then raging) in Lebanon might weaken the P.L.O. In an A.F.S.C. publication he had said some months earlier:

...Peace is possible. While it may not be realistic to expect Palestinian Arabs and Israeli Jews to immediately embrace the harmony of a bi-national or democratic secular state, there have been strong indications from some people on both sides that they would accept a two state solution as the basis for peace...

The two state solution (or transitional arrangement as it is referred to in P.L.O. circles) is not only a "nice" or "moral" solution, but it appears to be the realistic one as well. It meets the minimum needs and appears to be in the long term interests of both peoples.³¹ (emphasis added)

It should be carefully noted that this admission of the real aims of the P.L.O. for expansionism beyond the West Bank and the Gaza Strip recurs elsewhere in A.F.S.C. publications, as in an article by Joe Gerson in *Peacework* of December 1976. In other words, the American Friends Service Committee is at best a divided house. On one hand its Executive Director reiterates that "A.F.S.C. believes in the State of Israel and supports its secure existence" and "we have supported the legitimacy of the State of Israel since its inception." On the other hand its Regional Director for Palestinian Issues in Cambridge, Mass. reiterates that the two state solution promoted by A.F.S.C. is recognized as "a transitional arrangement" after which the State of Israel would be replaced by "a bi-national or democratic secular state." Now it clearly isn't possible to support Israel's secure existence and that state's legitimacy and at the same time to look forward to its demise. The latter is precisely what the P.L.O. advocates and Joe Gerson and Rosalie Riechman and other A.F.S.C. functionaries wholeheartedly support. That viewpoint was also aired at the 1977 conference, as reported by Maurer.³² At a meeting held to consider alleged human rights violations by Israel against Palestinian Arabs "it was agreed that full civil rights could only be achieved in the context of a bi-national state. By definition, a Zionist state could not possibly provide human rights for all." Why a Zionist state by definition cannot provide human rights for all is not explained, nor why the several Islamic states are not similarly censured. It is important for the reader to consider the A.F.S.C.'s position. *Its call for a two-state solution is two-tongued: Some of its officers not only admit that this might, but that it should, lead to "Arafat's dream" and thus to the end of the State of Israel. Far from its claimed "even-handedness," the A.F.S.C. has become an active partisan of the P.L.O. and thus of the enemies of Israel.*

De-legitimizing Israel

As if it were not enough to be actively engaged in legitimating the P.L.O., some Friends are also whittling away at the legitimacy of the State of Israel.

A FRIENDLY PERVERSION

This can be approached with historical or legal arguments; another way is in terms of fundamentalist* Bible Christianity. One such theological attempt appeared in a Quaker periodical in 1972.³³ The author, Calvin Keene, makes reference to the fundamentalist Christian belief that the return of the Jews to Palestine portends the return of Christ and the end of the world. He notes that for some Christians the re-establishment of Israel therefore fits into the way they understand God's prophesy-based plan for the salvation of mankind. Thus, Keene says, such people regard Israel favorably "without critical regard for moral issues in the Middle Eastern situation." He holds, however, that this attitude is based on an inaccurate interpretation, to the effect that the second coming (of Christ) would follow the re-establishment of the State of Israel. His view is that biblical predictions were not intended for a period thousands of years later, and that Israel must be judged by the practice or lack of practice of justice, mercy, and righteousness.

Keene's argument is therefore meant to minimize the support Israel can expect from fundamentalist Bible Christians. However much one may sympathize with the view that states should be judged on the basis of their 'practice of justice, mercy, and righteousness,' why is this to be emphasized in the case of Israel, or even applied principally there? One would expect the purportedly 'even-handed' Friends to make this same demand of Cambodia, Cuba, China, Vietnam and the Soviet Union, but the 'moral issues' raised by their activities appear considerably less urgent to their Quaker critics. Once you apply a universal humanist yardstick to judge the behavior of collectivities you will be expected to apply it universally.

Sometime after the article by Keene the same periodical published another in somewhat the same vein. Its author, Harold Smuck³⁴ likewise says that the Jewish claim to Palestine carries little weight; the religious point of view holds, he says, that Palestine was a contingent gift of God. The Jews today are not an obedient people, Smuck says. There is little synagogue attendance. Theologically he returns to the ancient Christian claim that Judaism has been replaced by the Church as God's instrument for blessing mankind. Cautioning his readers to avoid confusion as to what the Bible teaches Smuck says it does not give historical, moral, or theological grounds for believing that God gave to the Jews of Europe and elsewhere this particular Arab-inhabited land.

Smuck's article goes beyond even Keene's in its insistence that Israel does not have theological or moral legitimacy. He intersperses his argument with allegations of an alleged expansionism in the mentality of certain Israelis, and denies that there are historical bases for Jewish claims to the land. But his

By "fundamentalist" is meant the literal interpretation of biblical writings, especially of prophesy.

DIRTY WORK

meanest thrust is among the oldest defamations of Jews and Jewry; he implies that God has abandoned the Jewish people and their religion in favor of a new covenant with the Christian Church. Historically it was this argument that served to make Jewish people into 'outlaws' —literally people outside the law that protected Christians. For centuries this remained the excuse for virulent pogroms, since it is assumed that only he is punished who has somehow transgressed. In a recent book of reminiscences Alfred Kazin speaks of young post-World-War II G.I.'s in Europe who were doing their overseas military duty there. He says that such soldiers, upon meeting Jewish survivors in displaced persons camps, could not readily understand why they had been "in prison" under the Nazis. The fate of Jews has for a millennium hinged on such wildly imaginative incursions into the mind of God. In 1976 the old theological defamation with the very human consequences attached is brought back for the purpose of de-legitimizing Israel. The human consequences are presumably "only" to influence or coerce the Government of Israel into compliance with the Quaker vision of Arab-Israel peace. But if we are to take the A.F.S.C. literature cited above seriously we will see that the human consequences can very well include "Arafat's dream," with the end of Israel and the Jewish people a very likely outcome.

At the time of his 1976 article in *Quaker Life* Harold Smuck was Associate General Secretary of the Wider Ministries Commission of Friends United Meeting (FUM). His article can therefore be taken as the writing of someone not without influence in the Society of Friends. Is it not therefore reasonable to regard this article by Smuck, and perhaps also the previous one by Keene, as part of a larger campaign to convince Friends generally of the A.F.S.C.'s point of view toward Israel and the Palestinian Arabs? In suggesting that these writings may be part of a larger effort I am not proposing a conspiracy theory but a probably well-intentioned original plan to act as honest brokers in a conflict that threatened to involve the two superpowers. But however well-intentioned that original plan may have been, the manner in which it has become orchestrated by A.F.S.C. publications and conferences, now leaves little room for anything but poorly camouflaged dirty work, such as the work to legitimate the P.L.O. and de-legitimate Israel.

In the course of this essay I have from time to time said to Friends that, while my concern is first and foremost for the safety of Israel and the Jewish people, I have also a genuine concern for the integrity of the Quaker way of life. My next remarks should be understood in that context. The reader will remember that I began part IV of this essay with a quotation from Richard Ullmann's Pendle Hill pamphlet *Dilemmas of a Reconciler*. Ullmann says "All along (the reconciler) has to make adjustments in his attitude to what the situation may demand, hence there is always some play-acting in his endeavors, at least something of St. Paul's effort of being all things to all men, or of the Quaker concern to 'speak to the condition of people.'" Ullmann is aware that this poses a new challenge to the reconciler's integrity. Not long ago an event

occurred which should make clear to Friends how much the Quaker reconciler can put elementary integrity at risk.

On July 11, 1978 an advertisement appeared in the *Jerusalem Post*, Israel's major English language daily. This advertisement* was headed AMERICAN JEWS—IN SUPPORT OF PEACE NOW, and begins with the words, "As American Jews who have consistently supported Israel ..." There were hundreds of signatories to this ad. You may be as surprised to learn as I was that among these was no other than Harold Smuck. Apart from the question whether Harold Smuck is "an American Jew," it is difficult to reconcile his ideas in the article "Promised Land" with the claim of consistent support for the State of Israel. You see why I looked back to Ullmann's observation about dilemmas of reconcilers. Behavior such as that exhibited by Harold Smuck poses more than a challenge to the integrity of the reconciler. It threatens the integrity and the credibility of the Quaker way of life.

More Active Dirty Work

We have seen that the AFSC has given double and contradictory messages concerning Israel's legitimacy. On the one hand "AFSC believes in the State of Israel and supports its secure existence." On the other hand its literature, spokesmen, and conference gatherings have systematically promoted a "Palestinian state-to-be." But if the messages were contradictory there is little doubt where the AFSC's focus is. These Friends have determined what the future of the area ought to be. Their devotion to peace and human rights "appears to be free from the ordinary dirtiness of politics—a creed from which (they) cannot expect to draw any material advantage—surely that proves that (they) are in the right? And the more (they) are in the right, the more natural that everyone else should be bullied into thinking likewise." Having determined what the future of the area ought to be the AFSC has set in motion a variety of mechanisms to assure that its goal shall be fulfilled. In the process the PLO is being legitimated as "moderate" and "independent," and is in effect given all the status of a 'government in exile' which only waits to be "reinstalled" in its "own country." That this image is itself propagandistic and of questionable validity does not seem to deter these Friends. Whether they accept Keene's and Smuck's theological arguments, they certainly have promoted an argument by morality. They have consistently suggested that the Government of Israel is unjust and that it violates the civil rights of its own Arab citizens as much as those of the Palestinian Arabs in the West Bank and Gaza. For instance, at the 1977 AFSC conference attended by Marvin Maurer a Human Rights meeting was held, "chaired by the Vice President of the Association of Arab-American University Graduates."

*See Appendix B.

DIRTY WORK

. . . Speakers . . . suggested that standards be set for dealing with Israel's civil rights violations. . . . It was agreed by all in the room . . . that not only should civil rights violations be exposed in the territories occupied after 1967, but the world must be reminded about the abuses taking place in the territories occupied before 1967. . . . Each Israeli violation of civil rights should be exposed on a case by case basis so that Americans can understand what is happening.³⁵ (emphases added)

So this Quaker conference questioned not only the legitimacy of the territories held by Israel since but even those before 1967. That means that the State of Israel as such is being de-legitimated. If "the world must be reminded about the abuses taking place in the territories occupied before 1967" then Israel is made to appear as a usurper state pure and simple. The implication is clearly that Israel in the pre-1967 boundaries was "occupied territory." Even if the AFSC's leadership were to have disassociated itself from such a point of view (which it did not do) its other actions have in any case made such disclaimers meaningless.

In this essay I am certainly not interested in defending human rights violations, nor do I wish to argue against humanitarian concerns by Friends and others on behalf of Palestinian Arabs. I have tried to point to the AFSC's attempts at de-legitimizing Israel by defining its Government as oppressive. More, I want to show that this systematic and distorted picture of Israel as a bully abusing power has led some Friends into more overt acts of direct involvement in the Arab-Israel conflict. Take the statement agreed on at Chevy Chase that "each violation of civil rights should be exposed on a case by case basis." To make such a program possible would require informants who make the information (or rumor) available to the outside world. In Israel that is very simple: Jewish dissidents and Arab opponents are free to move within and outside the country and to make their voices heard in the large number of opposition newspapers. Furthermore, a number of Arab and Jewish citizens of Israel have traveled abroad, disseminating anti-Israel propaganda. Some of them, under the sponsorship of the AFSC have traveled in the United States and have been given audiences on university campuses and among opinion makers.* Such a state of affairs is hardly reminiscent of authoritarian regimes of either the left or the right. On the contrary, Israel as an open society has given far more rights to dissident forces than have any of its Muslim adversaries.

*During the last week of April 1979 the Arab mayor of Halhul in Judea arrived in the U.S. under the sponsorship of the A.F.S.C. Halhul had been the scene a few weeks earlier of an Arab attack on Israelis returning to their homes in Kiryat Arba. After a soldier had fallen as a result of stoning by the mob, shots were fired and two Arabs were killed. Bringing the mayor of Halhul to appear before the church and television audiences as the A.F.S.C. did, was clearly to exploit, with amazing promptness, an unfortunate incident to make anti-Israel propaganda.

This fact of a remarkably free and democratic Israel beleaguered by autocratically ruled nations might give Friends cause to wonder about A.F.S.C. activities. Its *Search for Peace in the Middle East* publication says on p. 55 "Israeli claims to the acquisition of territory by conquest in the June War of 1967 must be abandoned..." However one may feel about the rights and wrongs of that war and its aftermath, Friends ought to consider here the peculiar fact that A.F.S.C.'s efforts have singled out Israel for special treatment. After World War II Russia had taken East Prussia and parts of Poland to secure her borders against new attacks from Germany. Where were the A.F.S.C.'s voices then to speak against the acquisition of territory by conquest? Currently A.F.S.C. agitates on behalf of displaced Palestinian Arabs; Israel is to be primarily responsible for their resettlement. When after World War II the new Poland was compensated for her losses to the East by Silesia and Pomerania, lands that had long been German, many thousands of German-speaking people were made to leave their homes, becoming displaced persons. West Germany opened its doors to and absorbed most of these people during a time of its own difficult reconstruction. And what of the A.F.S.C. then? It refrained from all political agitation for the return of the displaced people to their former homes. Instead it mounted a program to help bring East European refugees to North America. Then, as in 1939 when Rufus Jones and his associates visited Berlin, Quakers helped in the resettlement of refugees without attempting to challenge their countries of origin. As Friedrich Sollmann noted, that is all one can do in circumstances of dictatorship.

In the case of Israel things have been different. In that amalgam of rural pioneers, of survivors from Hitler's hell, and of persecuted Jews from Arab and Soviet lands, democratic institutions have flourished. That open society has been created in the face of hostility and ambushes from every side of the Arab world, now aided and abetted by communist-inspired Third World countries. Into that situation of an open society increasingly at risk have come the A.F.S.C. peace-makers, with their plans for the region, laid down in publications, propagated in conferences, and ultimately carried into a variety of programs in Israel itself. The openness of Israeli society has made these activities possible. Let me therefore ask these questions: Are Friends and their organizations especially endowed with divine understanding? Do Friends, and especially the A.F.S.C. functionaries, see more clearly ahead than the government of Israel and most of its people? If the seers of the A.F.S.C. should prove to have been in error, if the PLO is not, as they claim, a group of moderates but still fully bent on driving the Jews into the sea and if circumstances should conspire to make that possible, who or what will call the false Quaker prophets to account? Or more terribly, who or what would help then to prevent a truly "final solution"? When Friends feel impelled to justify the A.F.S.C. and its Middle East activities as based on good will as well as on good sense, let them ask themselves such questions. In the final analysis

it is the members of the Society of Friends at large, giving financial and moral support to the self-appointed brokers of the A.F.S.C., who must be held accountable.

The facts are these: A.F.S.C. has been acting as if it were a divinely inspired, supra-national body, deciding what the future of the area ought to be. Setting itself up above the democratically elected government of Israel, A.F.S.C. has thus made policy and it has by various devices sought to implement that policy. For some time now the Israeli press has pointed to Quaker involvements in anti-Israel activities. That the A.F.S.C.'s leadership is both aware of, and sensitive to, these accusations is evidenced by the following letter to the editor of *The Jerusalem Post* of February 2, 1979:

QUAKER SERVICE

Sir, — In an article by Joshua Brilliant on January 14 "Quakers," referring in this instance to the American Friends Service Committee, are charged with engaging in political activities in the West Bank. Reference is also made to legal advice being given to Arabs in respect to land seizures. In other current press accounts, the American Friends Service Committee has been accused of operating West Bank projects financed by the U.S. government and of being an agent of the CIA.

The American Friends Service Committee was founded in 1917, during the First World War, to provide Quakers and others with an opportunity to serve in programmes of relief and reconstruction for civilian war victims. For this work, it and its sister organization, Friends Service Council, London, received the Nobel Peace Prize. Since that time, it has carried on a variety of humanitarian, service, and development programmes in the United States and overseas. From 1931 to 1948, the Committee worked in Europe to enable Jews to emigrate to the United States, assisting 100,000 persons.

The AFSC does not engage in political activity on the West Bank. We have not urged West Bank politicians, as alleged in some press accounts, to adopt any political posture, whether pro-autonomy, anti-autonomy, or anything else.

In regard to relations with the U.S. government, the American Friends Service Committee has a firm policy of not accepting U.S. aid funds for its overseas projects because of our wish to maintain complete independence in our operations. (The sole exception to this is the acceptance of ocean freight reimburse-

A FRIENDLY PERVERSION

ments for shipping used clothing to refugees in various parts of the world, since this does not subject the recipient agency to any control by the U.S. government.)

The AFSC has called for the abolition of the CIA in a statement approved by its board of directors in April 1976. The statement rejected and called on others to reject, "clandestine U.S. activities abroad." It reaffirmed "the Quaker ideal of an open society in which all are free to promote peace, equality and justice without fear."

The American Friends Service Committee has carried on projects in Israel and the surrounding Arab countries for more than 30 years. We have sought to alleviate the sufferings of war and to help foster a dialogue among the antagonists that may one day lead to peace. We currently operate three service projects in the region: a Legal Aid and Community Information Centre in East Jerusalem, 13 kindergartens in the Gaza Strip, and an Institute for Information and Consultation in Mental Retardation in Beersheba.

*LOUIS W. SCHNEIDER, Executive Secretary
JAMES S. FINE, Middle East Representative
QUAKER SERVICE
Jerusalem.*

This letter, signed by two senior officers of the A.F.S.C., provides unexpected insights into the organization's activities.

I shall first deal with several matters arising from Louis Schneider's and James Fine's letter. That some sections of the Israeli press have accused A.F.S.C. of being a front for CIA and other U.S. government operations is unfortunate. It is also understandable if you consider that until very recently Quakers have been known only as a religious group concerned with educational and charitable activities. When a Quaker organization emerges in contexts of political controversy, apparently siding with Israel's enemies, the imputation of nefarious connections (e.g. with the CIA) is not atypical behavior for a free press. The fact is that the A.F.S.C., by its own admission in this letter, has operated a "Legal Aid and Community Information Center" in East Jerusalem. As Friends will see shortly, this "service project" is by no means apolitical. In April 1975 the A.F.S.C. opened a legal service office in East Jerusalem to advise Arabs facing legal problems, especially "eviction." This apparently innocent humanitarian activity lent itself to indirect attacks on Israeli government policy. After the Jordanians had captured the Old City in 1948 and expelled all its surviving Jewish inhabitants, the buildings of the old Jewish quarter of the city were looted and then either demolished or taken

DIRTY WORK

over by Arabs. When Israel united the city after the 1967 war it determined to reestablish the historic old Jewish quarter, and rights to places in the rehabilitated dwellings were first given to the Jewish families who had formerly lived there. It is thus hardly surprising that Arab families, who had in effect enjoyed "squatter's rights" for many years, would be displaced. Israel provided new homes for the Arabs so affected, almost always of a higher standard than they had enjoyed before. But "eviction" of Arabs from their "homes" was the theme that lent itself to anti-Israel propaganda abroad.

The newspaper *Maativ* of July 5, 1978 has this report on a case from A.F.S.C.'s legal service: One Mohammed Said Burkan claimed that he had been ejected from the home in which he and his family had lived "from time immemorial, in peace and quiet," and that he should have the right to acquire a house in the Jewish quarter. Burkan proved an embarrassing client for the A.F.S.C. He announced in court that he would never sell land to Jews on religious principles; the court pointed out that if he was commanded to discriminate he was scarcely in a position to complain of discrimination by others. Then it was established that the house in which he claimed his family had lived from "time immemorial" had been a Jewish owned and occupied house as late as 1938. It was further shown that he had left the house, from which he had supposedly been "expelled," long before, and that he had staged the "expulsion" for television cameras (although unbeknownst to the camera crews) with the connivance of his A.F.S.C.-paid lawyer. (The court suggested that the lawyer ought to be tried for transgressing the ethics of the legal profession.)

In his article in the *Los Angeles Times*, dated Wednesday, March 7, 1979, ("Friction Arises in Israel Over Quakers ...") Times staff writer Louis B. Fleming says: "Officially the Israeli criticism claims that the Quakers have gone out soliciting business, fomenting trouble and bad-mouthing Israel. This is denied by James Fine, former head of the center, now regional director of the work of the American Friends Service Committee, and by Jean de Muralt, new director of the center. But de Muralt said he is tightening controls at the office so that there will be no misunderstandings." The implication is of course that the entire accusation against the A.F.S.C. is a "misunderstanding," perhaps derived from loose office procedures. My information from Israel has been such that I find Fine's explanation insufficient, and his summary denial of "the Quakers (having) gone out soliciting (legal) business, fomenting trouble and badmouthing Israel" to be unconvincing.

Now I return to the Schneider-Fine letter to the editor. Look at paragraph three: "The AFSC does not engage in political activity on the West Bank. We have not urged West Bank politicians, as alleged in some press accounts, to adopt any political posture, whether pro-autonomy, anti-autonomy, or anything else." In a very narrow sense that may perhaps be true, i.e. in the

sense that members of A.F.S.C.'s staff may not overtly have "urged West Bank politicians ... to adopt any political posture, whether pro-autonomy, anti-autonomy or anything else." But let's recall briefly two other official A.F. S.C. statements:

"The right of self-determination for Palestinian Arabs must be recognized by all parties to the conflict..."

—from the summary of fundamental guidelines,
in *Search for Peace in the Middle East*, 1970, p. 55

and

"We also endorse Palestinian Arab self-determination including the establishment of a Palestinian Arab State."

—from the previously quoted letter to all candidates
for the U.S. presidency, for the A.F.S.C., signed by
Louis B. Schneider (date not given)

It is surely not quibbling to say that in such official statements the A.F.S.C. has in fact laid down a clearly *political* line, it has taken a *political* posture. Only in the narrowest sense can it be said that this posture is not either "pro-autonomy" or "anti-autonomy." "Self-determination" implies enough autonomy to determine one's own political future, which in turn minimally suggests political autonomy. But Louis Schneider's letter clarifies self-determination to include "the establishment of a Palestinian Arab State." No A.F.S.C. functionary has to be vocal to urge that particular political posture. It has been urged in a number of editions and tens of thousands of copies of A.F.S.C.'s *Search for Peace in the Middle East*. It has been repeated again and again in other Quaker-sponsored publications, some of which have been quoted in this essay. It has been brought back to Israel not only in print but as part of the political equipment of anti-Israel Palestinian Arabs and Jews who regularly participate in the A.F.S.C.'s conferences in North America. How truthful is it really to say that "the A.F.S.C. does not engage in political activity on the West Bank" even without knowing specific facts of its West Bank involvements?

I have skipped over the second paragraph of the Schneider-Fine letter. It begins by invoking the Nobel Peace Prize which was awarded to the A. F.S.C., together with the Friends Service Council, London, in honor of the service they had provided in relief and reconstruction for civilian war victims. That is how many people, who know of Quakers only tangentially, think of them. It is a good reputation which has been honorably earned. But good reputations, honorably earned, can be misused and twisted to serve other ends. I believe that this has actually happened in the A.F.S.C.'s compulsion to act as brokers in the Middle East conflict. Some of the information that comes from Israel suggests that the American Friends Service Committee's leadership is not

unaware of the fact that its current performances are not as readily deserving of praise as those of earlier decades.

The final paragraph of the Schneider-Fine letter begins "The American Friends Service Committee has carried on projects in Israel ... for more than 30 years." But, you see, the schools, the kindergartens, the social workers, the legal aid were all devoted to Arabs. For the Jews who had come to Israel often totally impoverished, from North Africa and other Arab lands, what did the Friends bring? Perhaps to rectify a lopsided impression, the leadership of the A.F.S.C. has recently set out to promote a better image of itself among Israelis. They proposed a dental clinic for residents of Kiryat Shemona, a development town on the Lebanese border. Populated chiefly by Jews who had come to Israel as refugees from Arab countries, the town suffered from severe poverty. But Kiryat Shemona turned down the offer of the dental clinic. Then A.F.S.C. offered to establish an institution for the retarded at Ofakim, a development town near Beersheba also inhabited chiefly by North African Jews. That offer also was refused. The A.F.S.C. proposed funding a research project at Ben Gurion University to help retarded children, and that offer was rejected. The decision in each case was that of the individual community; in the case of Ben Gurion University it was that of the institution.

One cannot help wonder why these offers were turned down when their services would so clearly have been of benefit. I can only guess at the answer. However lamentable, it seems that A.F.S.C. had so destroyed its credibility in Israel that any offer of help was viewed with deep suspicion by the proposed recipients. The Jewish refugees from Arab lands—almost three quarters of a million of them—knew that the crowded "maabarot" which they had inhabited were little different from the living conditions of Palestinian Arab refugees. But while the A.F.S.C. assisted the latter, the Jewish refugees had had no similar offers of help. Also they undoubtedly knew of current A.F.S.C. activities which they rightly or wrongly considered hostile to Israel. So any offer from the A.F.S.C. may have looked like some kind of Trojan horse that could somehow be used against Israel. Thus aid to Jews from Arab lands might be interpreted to mean that the Israeli government was not doing all it should for the "other Israel," the Jews from Arab countries. Were these suspicions on the part of the Jews of Kiryat Shemona and of Ofakim, and those of Ben Gurion University entirely unfounded? In light of the splendid humanitarian record of Quaker service they should have been. But as we have seen, there have been enough instances of real dirty work to raise real doubts. Still, not all of the A.F.S.C.'s efforts at shoring up a sagging reputation have met with resistance. Landrum Bolling, as President of the Lilly Foundation, raised a large sum of money from a variety of U.S. corporations for Haifa University. In return the University bestowed on him the title of "*amit cavod*" which means "honored friend" and approximates an honorary degree.

Does such an exchange of gifts rehabilitate the A.F.S.C.? Can it undo the

damage done by a long-term erosion of trust? Will it rectify the view of Quaker Service in Israel as arrogantly trying to make and implement policy over the heads of the country's government? Such rituals cannot erase the fact that A.F.S.C. is in active collusion with those who would destroy Israel if they could. True, the A.F.S.C. activists cannot expect to draw *material* advantage from their propaganda and strategy. But then not all advantage need be material. Some people draw advantage from social status, from manners, from reputation. Why not draw advantage from feeling oneself to be entirely in the right? Like Tolstoy in Orwell's essay, the A.F.S.C.'s self-appointed brokers, these self-righteous "peace-makers," know themselves to be *unquestionably* in the right. And does not their good 'Quaker Service' label seem to guarantee that they are free from the ordinary dirtiness of politics? My essay has demonstrated that they are not, much as they may wish to think of themselves as motivated principally by altruism. They may at heart be good people, but their faulty thinking has led them to engage in work that is very dirty indeed. This dirty work now poses a serious menace to the State of Israel and to the very lives of its people. At the same time that work also calls into question the integrity of the Quaker way of life which it has so subtly perverted.

Once more — to the Quakers and to friends of Friends:

In this essay I have sought to speak first and foremost to the membership of the Religious Society of Friends. Quakers initiated the American Friends Service Committee and gave that organization their good name. Let me then urge Friends everywhere to look with care into my charges. If they find them to be accurate, as I know they will, then the Yearly Meetings which now support the A.F.S.C. morally and financially must act accordingly. I believe that they will have no other choice than to control the A.F.S.C. or to withhold their support.

This essay is also meant for friends of Friends, for those who though not Quakers themselves respect and trust the absolute integrity of the Quaker way of life. A large proportion of the financial contributions to A.F.S.C. now comes from such persons, groups, and organizations. Let these donors of time and money also consider the charges I have made here, and if they agree with my assessment of the A.F.S.C.'s activities, let them insist that the organization account for the political bias of its policies and expenditures.

Of course I do not expect that the leadership of the American Friends Service Committee will leave these charges unanswered. Their best answer would be a thorough housecleaning, a revision of policies and practices. But that is very difficult for people who have become so deeply committed to their own rhetoric, to what they have convinced themselves is the truth and the way to peace. I am reminded of these telling words by Eric Hoffer:

There are many who have grave scruples about deceiving others but think it as nothing to deceive themselves. Still, it is doubtful whether the self-deceivers can ever really tell the truth.³⁶

SCHEMATIC SUMMARY

How Quakers Reach Decisions

1.
The practice of seeking group consensus in a spirit of patient submission to the Light assumes a community of believers who adhere to the Quaker way of life.

2.
As Quakers created their own organizations to promote planned change, they experienced some degree of 'cognitive dissonance,' that is an inner conflict between commitment to the Quaker method of reaching decisions, and the demands stemming from the politics of rapid social change.

3.
People will try to resolve their inner conflicts, and in the case of the Quaker activists this appears to have made them try to fit the Quaker business method to interventions for conciliation between people who are not connected with Quaker faith and practice, and who moreover are sharply divided by conflicts of interest and outlook.

4.
When the Quaker business method is thus used in contexts for which it was not intended, it becomes 'a sharply honed tool' for influencing and manipulating people, i.e. serving as attempts at bringing one or another party to a conflict in line with some predetermined point of view or action.

5.
Should manipulatory strategies fail to produce the desired results, i.e. if the party to be influenced proves unwilling to agree with or accede to the conciliation plan, the Quaker activists may be tempted to fall back on cruder methods of reaching consensus, such as duress and coercion.

(read down)

PRECEPTS OF
THE QUAKER
WAY OF LIFE

THE IMPACT
OF SECULAR-
IZATION

FAULTY
THINKING

PERVERSIONS
OF THE
QUAKER
WAY OF LIFE

DIRTY
WORK

The Inward Light as Guide

1.
Holding fast to the belief in 'that of God' in all people has long made Quakers sensitive to a universal human need for dignity, caring, justice, and peace.

2.
As their religion became open, Quakers made increasing contact with movements and ideas which partially overlapped with their own; this kind of 'differential association' has fostered links of 'elective affinity' between them and members of other ideological persuasions.

3.
Such affinities have tended to promote the erroneous views that all human beings are equally accessible to the Light of God, and that all who speak in terms of dignity, caring, justice and peace are *ipso facto* motivated by values akin to those of Quakerism.

4.
Not surprisingly, ideological affinities will make for some collusion, i.e. for common cause with people, groups, and movements whose values appear to overlap or even coincide with the Quaker concerns for dignity, caring, justice, and peace.

5.
Once in collusion with such groups, movements, or organizations, Friends can readily become partisans. If then they maintain the illusion of objectivity and 'even-handedness' it will be possible to assume the role of honest broker while actually serving as active promoter of one side's case against that of the other.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC NOTES

1. Martin Buber, *Tales of the Hasidim, Early Masters*, (Translated from the German by Olga Marx), Copyright 1947, 1975. Reprinted by permission of Schocken Books, Inc.
2. Everett C. Hughes, "Good People and Dirty Work," *Social Problems*, Vol. 10, Nr. 1, pp. 3-11.
3. From the *Congressional Record*, September 23, 1976.
4. George Orwell, "Reflections on Gandhi," in *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell*, 1968, Vol. IV, pp. 465,6,7,8. Reprinted by permission of Secker & Warburg and Mrs. Sonia Brownell Orwell.
5. Morris R. Cohen and Ernest Nagel, *Logic and Scientific Method*, 1931, p. 378.
6. William E. Barton, *The Moral Challenge of Communism-Some Ethical Aspects of Marxist-Leninist Society*, Swarthmore Lecture 1966, Friends Home Service Committee, pages 96-91. The quotation from Mao Tse-tung is from *Selected Works*, 1951, Vol. 1, p. 27. Reprinted by permission of the Swarthmore Lecture Committee.
7. F.W. Sollmann, *Religion and Politics*, Pendle Hill Pamphlet Nr. 14, p. 23. Reprinted by permission of Pendle Hill.
8. Howard Brinton, "The Quaker Doctrine of Inward Peace" in Maurer and Trueblood (eds.) *The Pendle Hill Reader*, 1942, p. 119.
9. D. Elton Trueblood, "The Quaker Method of Reaching Decisions," in S.B. Laughlin (ed.), *Beyond Dilemmas-Quakers Look at Life*, 1937, pp. 105-106. Reprinted by permission from J.B. Lippincott and Harper & Row.
10. *Ibid.*, pp. 112-116.
11. Stuart Chase, *Roads to Agreement*, 1951, pp. 53, 54.
12. Stuart Chase, *op. cit.*, pp. 54, 55.
13. Theodore Roszak, "The Cults' Challenge is to the 'Experts,'" *Los Angeles Times*, Dec. 31, 1978, Part IV, p. 3.
14. Marvin Maurer, "Quakers in Politics: Israel, P.L.O. and Social Revolution," *Midstream*, Nov. 1977. Reprinted by permission of the editors.
15. "Hostile Friends," *The American Zionist*, Nov. 1977.
16. George Orwell, "Lear, Tolstoy, and the Fool," in *The Collected Essays, Journalism, and Letters of George Orwell*, Vol. IV, pp. 301-302. Reprinted by permission of Secker & Warburg and Mrs. Sonia Brownell Orwell.
17. Marvin Maurer, *op. cit.*, pp. 39-40.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 40.
19. See Robert J. Levy, "Hostile 'Friends,'" *The American Zionist*, Nov. 1977, p. 25.
20. A. M. Soloway, E. Weiss, and G. Caplan, *Truth and Peace in the Middle East, A Critical Analysis of the Quaker Report*, 1971. Reprinted by permission of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 67.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 70.
23. *Truth and Peace in the Middle East*, p. 31.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 71.
25. Chaim Herzog, *Who Stands Accused?, Israel's Answer to Its Critics*, 1978, p. 73. Reprinted by permission of Random House, Inc.

26. Marvin Maurer, *op. cit.*, p. 36.
27. Robert J. Levy, "Hostile 'Friends,' " *The American Zionist*, Nov. 1977, p. 24.
28. Chaim Herzog, *op. cit.*, p. 19.
29. M. Maurer, *op. cit.*, pp. 36, 37.
30. "The Middle East in 1977—An Analysis of the Present Situation" by Peggy Duff, Peace Press, Dec. 1976. Published in *New England Briefs for Middle East Peacework*, American Friends Service Committee, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
31. Joe Gerson, *The Middle East Conflict*, published by AFSC N.E. Regional Office, July 1976.
32. M. Maurer, *op. cit.*, p. 40.
33. Calvin Keene, "Prophecy and Modern Israel," *Quaker Life*, December 1972 (reprinted by Americans for Middle East Understanding, Summer 1977).
34. Harold Smuck, "Promised Land," *Quaker Life*, September 1976.
35. M. Maurer, *op. cit.*, p. 40.
36. Eric Hoffer, *The Passionate State of Mind*, 1955 (Harper & Row), p. 46

AMERICAN JEWS — In Support Of PEACE NOW

As American Jews who have consistently supported Israel's struggle for security in her homeland while she strives to create a model society for her citizens in the Middle East, we identify with those Israeli citizens who are at the forefront of that movement which is reaffirming Israel's long standing efforts for peace, and is calling upon the Government of Israel to respond creatively and courageously to new opportunities for peace for Israel and her Arab neighbors.

In proclaiming our support for these tens of thousands of Israeli citizens who comprise Peace Now, we identify with their goal of peace and security, and, quoting from their own statement of principles,

WE BELIEVE:

"That Israel must present a genuine program for peace, flexible and realistic, acceptable not only to those who are offering it. It must make possible a real basis for negotiations within the framework of national security and realities.

That settlements and areas are no substitute for peace

That a real and lasting peace is the best possible security border.

That we cannot allow terrorists to divert us from the path of peace, since that is precisely their aim.

That we can — and must — rise above party and individual considerations and bring together each and every one who believes that we must not miss this opportunity for peace."

We call upon all supporters of Israel and Zionism who long for the day when their Israeli brothers and sisters can live in peace and security, to join us solidarily with these Israeli members of Peace Now so that the day will hastened when the resources now expended for necessary military security can begin to be invested in the peaceful pursuits of serving the human need of all peoples for peace and progress in the Middle East.

Georg Achelsberg, South Orange, N.J.
Sylvia Achelsberg, South Orange, N.J.
Paul L. Adams, New York, N.Y.
Bela Alexander, Philadelphia, Pa.
Mimi Alperin, New York, N.Y.
Rabbi Roberto Trachtenberg Alpert, Philadelphia, Pa.
Prof. David Amich, New Brunswick, N.J.
Evan H. Appelbaum, Downers Grove, Ill.
Mary Appelbaum, Downers Grove, Ill.
Carl Appel, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Shoshana Appel, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Sharon Aron, Bronx, N.Y.
Prof. Myron Aronoff, Highland Park, N.J.
Arnold Asher, University City, Mo.
David Asor, New York, N.Y.
Art Avereth, Riverdale, N.Y.
Samuel Avital, Boulder, Colo.
Louis Bachner, Brooklyn, N.Y.
David Jonathan Backman, Philadelphia, Pa.
M. H. Baker, Minneapolis, Minn.
Rabbi Martin Badinson, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Bruce Bailin, San Francisco, Ca.
Walter Bailin, San Francisco, Ca.
Sunny Balaban, Watertown, Ma.
Diane Baker, Cambridge, Ma.
Michael Baroni, Far Rockaway, N.Y.
Gill Barbe, New York, N.Y.
Deborah J. Bartlett, Philadelphia, Pa.
Leah Bass, New York, N.Y.
Paul Basfield, Boston, Ma.
Ronald Bayer, New York, N.Y.
Dore Bazryak, Santa Monica, Ca.
Anna Beck, Highland Park, N.J.
Rabbi Leonard J. Beerbaum, Los Angeles, Ca.
David Beilan, Roseland, N.J.
Ellis Bell, Bronx, N.Y.
Shelvia Bell, Bronx, N.Y.

Norman Elson, Great Neck, N.Y.
Hereshel Elias, New York, N.Y.
Zibet L. Etkind, New York, N.Y.
Irving M. Engel, New York, N.Y.
Mary Eschberg, North Bergen, N.J.
Anna D. Epstein, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Daniel Epstein, New York, N.Y.
Ezra D. Finkelshtain, Philadelphia, Pa.
David M. Epstein, Boston, Ma.
Rachel Evans, New York, N.Y.
Mrs. D. I. Faden, Chicago, Ill.
Maury H. Faden, Hammond, Ind.
Rachel Falcone, Philadelphia, Pa.
Rabbi Falk, Asheville, N.C.
David Farber, Silver Spring, Md.
Evelyn Farber, Silver Spring, Md.
Dr. Jean Feldman, New York, N.Y.
Ran M. Feldman, Berkeley, Ca.
Rachel Fischhoff, Port Huron, Mich.
Shiva Fliss, New York, N.Y.
David Flishegan, Washington, D.C.
Helen Fliss, New York, N.Y.
Richard Fohn, New York, N.Y.
Abraham Fuller, Flushing, N.Y.
Dr. A. Furer, Oak Park, Mich.
Dr. Michael Field, Des Moines, Iowa
Mim. Doris Field, Des Moines, Iowa
Z. Alvin Fildesman, New York, N.Y.
Joseph H. Fliner, New York, N.Y.
Raya Fliard, New York, N.Y.
Bruce Fliss, Northport, N.Y.
Janice Fliss, Northport, N.Y.
Lillian F. Fliss, West Covina, Ca.
Leonard V. Fliner, M.D., Brooklyn, N.Y.
Flayne Fliss, Silver Spring, Md.
Michael Fliss, Silver Spring, Md.

Sylvia Farman, New York, N.Y.
Rabbi Arnold Feinstein, Chicago, Ill.
Morris Hagan, New York, N.Y.
Richard Kalinin, New York, N.Y.
Ben Kanarek, Silver Spring, Md.
Rabbi Daniel Lee Kaplan, Sharon, Ma.
Rabbi Earl Kaplan, Los Angeles, Ca.
Linda Kaplan, Los Angeles, Ca.
Sara Ben Kanarek, Silver Spring, Md.
Joni Kantor, Hyattsville, Md.
David H. Kaplan, Beverly Hills, Ca.
Dorothy Kaplan, Beverly Hills, Ca.
Lee Kaplan, Croton-on-Hudson, N.Y.
Miryam E. Katz, Sunnyvale, Ca.
Roshan Kana, Sunnyvale, Ca.
Bess Katz, Philadelphia, Pa.
Donald Katz, Woodside, N.Y.
Channa Katz, New York, N.Y.
Jay P. Katz, New York, N.Y.
Dr. Joseph Katz, New York, N.Y.
Marty Katz, Philadelphia, Pa.
Masha Katz, New York, N.Y.
Ira Katsenelson, Chicago, Ill.
N. Korman, New York, N.Y.
Abe Kaufman, Fort Charlotte, Fla.
Batya Kaufmann, Van Nuys, Ca.
Ida Kaufman, Fort Charlotte, Fla.
Klaine I. Kertes, Middletown, Conn.
Helene Kaufman, Van Nuys, Ca.
Jeannette Kaufmann, Van Nuys, Ca.
Sam Kessler, Southfield, Mich.
Isaac Kessler, Detroit, Mich.
Bernard Kitzner, Stamford, Conn.
Lillian Kitzner, Stamford, Conn.
Rabbi Stanley M. Kessler, West Hartford, Conn.
Victor Kessler, Birmingham, Mich.
Nathan Kessner, P. O. Box, Hammon, South Beach, Fla.

Joseph Miller, Philadelphia, Pa.
Judith Miller, Philadelphia, Pa.
Rabbi Robert M. Miller, Newton Centre, Ma.
John J. Miller, Ben Aronson, Texas
Lillian Millman, Philadelphia, Pa.
Max Millman, Philadelphia, Pa.
Richard Mills, Northridge, Ca.
George W. Mooy, New York, N.Y.
Aunt E. Morgenthaun, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Harry Movshina, Flushing, N.Y.
Laura Movshina, Flushing, N.Y.
Sue Moyal, Berkeley, Ca.
Alfreda Nalovica, Oak Park, Mich.
Karl Nall, Buffalo, N.Y.
Marganne Newman, Riverdale, N.Y.
Robert Newman, Riverdale, N.Y.
Samuel Norkin, New York, N.Y.
William Norkin, Cambridge, Ma.
Theodore Norman, New York, N.Y.
New Theodore Norman, New York, N.Y.
Jacob Nussbaum, New York, N.Y.
Sylvia Nussbaum, New York, N.Y.
Dr. Irving Nussbaum, Riverdale, N.Y.
Alice Oakes, Chicago, Ill.
Eleanor G. Osterman, Minneapolis, Minn.
William B. Osterman, Minneapolis, Minn.
Rabbi Robert E. Oursch, Cedar Rapids, Iowa
Marvia Falk, San Francisco, Ca.
Gloria Pelegrin, Forest Hills, N.Y.
Rosa Perchancek, Philadelphia, Pa.
Prof. Don Perata, Longmeadow, N.Y.
Leah Perlin, Los Angeles, Ca.
Paul Perlin, Los Angeles, Ca.
Bernard S. Perlmann, Lynbrook, N.Y.
Sara M. Perlmann, Lynbrook, N.Y.
Dorita Pridner, N.E.W. New York, N.Y.

Chaim Seltzer-Feld, Los Angeles
Rabbi Shalom Seviava, New Brwn
Zev Shanon, New York, N.Y.
Rabbi Alexander M. Shapiro, So
Jeffrey G. Shapiro, Ph.D., Water
Kate Shapiro, Rockaway Park, I
Prof. Yaakov Shabtzer, New Yo
Walter A. Shelton, New York, N
Alan Shrago, Philadelphia, Pa
Max Shuldenfand, Oak Park, M
Barbara Glitt Sigel, Philadelp
Burtan Sigel, Philadelphia, Pa.
Rabbi Martin Sigel, Columbia
Healthe Sigel, New York, N.Y.
Leah Silberman, New York, N.Y.
Charles L. Silberman, New Milf
Lynne Silberman, New Milford
Ben Silver, Los Angeles, Ca.
Elizabeth Silver, Los Angeles, C
Prof. David Wall Silverman, Ha
Joshua Sinal, New York, N.Y.
Philip Singer, Los Angeles, Ca.
Julius Siggan, Kingston, N.
I. Philip Sijner, New York,
Rabbi Mitchell Smith, Phila
N.L. Smolcher, Huntington I
Harold V. Smuck, Indiana
Virginia Sniflow, Secaucus, N
Rabbi Joel Soffon, W. Hart
Martha Soloff, Hamden, Ct
Jenny Sorel, Wallham, Ma.
Tina Sorel, Wallham, Ma.
Abe Spitzer, Farmingdale, N.Y.

Y.
aad, N.Y.

's.

Ca.

rk, Md.
. Md.
. Y.
p. Ill.
r Orleans, La.
ny, N.Y.
t, N.Y.

L.

iber, N.Y.

Harbor, N.Y.

ll, Fla.
. Ma.
ld.
Md.

Y.
o, Ca.
ly.
N.Y.
asa, Pa.
l Park, N.J.
rk, N.J.
Pa.
. Ohio
Ohio
l
A

. Ca.
Ill.
tn.
k, N.Y.
Ohio, Pa.
Ca.
Md.
Y.
rdino, Ca.
ANADA
Y.
DA
NADA

Park, Mich.

Md.
Md.
Y.
to, Ca.
a, Mich.
a, Washington, D.C.
Ca.
Mo.
one Park, Pa.
f.
Zoon.
Y.
Beach, Fla.
re, N.J.
N.Y.

f.
cover, N.H.

Stell L. Kirschner, Norbeth, Pa.
David L. Nite, Colorado Springs, Col.
Rabbi Joseph P. Klein, Terre Haute, Ind.
Harry Lerner, Los Angeles, Ca.
Alfred Knobler, New York, N.Y.
Pauline Lerner, Los Angeles, Ca.
Selma Knobler, New York, N.Y.
Lillian Kahn, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Kagel Kaptlows, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Sara K. Kornberg, New York, N.Y.
Bertram Kramer, New York, N.Y.
David M. Kramer, Flushing, N.Y.
Anne Krantz, Jackson Heights, N.Y.
Emanuel Krantz, Jackson Heights, N.Y.
Rabbi Douglas E. Krantz, New York, N.Y.

Rabbi Allen Krauss, San Jose, Ca.
Hillard Kreimer, Philadelphia, Pa.
Irene-Ruth R. Kreimer, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Maurice Kurzman, Yorktown Heights, N.Y.
Nadiah Landerman, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Shirley Landerman, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Ann Landy, New York, N.Y.
Hy Landy, New York, N.Y.
Leopold Laufer, Silver Spring, Md.
Bila Lauder, Silver Spring, Md.
Anson Laytner, Cincinnati, Ohio
Dr. Paul Lehrer, Kendall Park, N.J.
Mrs. Paul Lehrer, Kendall Park, N.J.
Rabbi Daniel I. Leifer, Chicago, Ill.
Dr. Myra Loffer, Chicago, Ill.
James Loffert, 33 Roberts Road, Cambridge, Ma.
Roselle C. Leopold, New York, N.Y.
Rabbi Michael Levinson, New York, N.Y.
Rabbi S. David Levy, Morrisown, N.J.
Max Levi, New York, N.Y.
Jane Levin, Bayville, N.Y.
Norm Levin, Philadelphia, Pa.
Burlen S. Levine, Baltimore, Md.
David Levine, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Irving Levine, Warham, Ma.
Martin Levine, Shokle, Ill.
Jean Levine, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Dr. Perry F. Levinson, N.J.
Mosca Levinstein, Cincinnati, Ohio
Albert Levy, Fremont, Ca.
Irving Levy, San Francisco, Ca.
John Filgelman Levy, Berkeley, Ca.
Joseph Filgelman Levy, St. Paul, Minn.
Judith Levy, San Francisco, Ca.
Miriam Filgelman Levy, Los Angeles, Ca.
Rabbi Richard N. Levy, Los Angeles, Ca.
Rabbi Eugene H. Levy, Tyler, Texas
Bernhardt Lieberman, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Rechel Lieberman, Boston, Ma.
A. Lubin, Wayne, N.J.
Stephen Levy, New York, N.Y.
Gertrud W. Lewin, Cambridge, Ma.
Harriet Lewis, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Miriam Lindenfeld, Ben Lomond, Ca.
Kimberly R. Lindy, Philadelphia, Pa.
Rabbi Charles D. Lippman, Peñon River N.Y.
Joseph F. Lookard, Washington, D.C.
Dr. Bernard Lowen, Chestnut Hill, Ma.
Ian Lustick, Hanover, N.H.
Michael Maccohy, Washington, D.C.
A.B. Magill, New York, N.Y.
Deborah G. Mallman, Raleigh, N.C.
Celia C. Mannes, Washington, D.C.
Sylvia Major, Santa Monica, Ca.
Eliazar Margolis, Watertown, Ma.
Michael Maach, Philadelphia, Pa.
Rabbi Hershel J. Matt, Highland Park, N.J.
Nathan Measner, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Dr. Uriel Meshoulam, Cambridge, Ma.
R. Meshoulam, Cambridge, Ma.
Mrs. Nathan Measner, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Bill Michelson, Forest Hills, N.Y.
Marcella Michelson, Forest Hills, N.Y.
Betty Miller, New York, N.Y.

Abby Phillips, New Rochelle, N.Y.
Harry Phillips, New Rochelle, N.Y.
Ellas Pickery, Chicago, Ill.
Dan Pisor, Philadelphia, Pa.
Sarah Piskin, New York, N.Y.
Barry Pignash, New York, N.Y.
Dr. Alan A. Pollaer, New York, N.Y.
Valerie Polliser, New York, N.Y.
Prof. Gerald Porter, Ardmore, Pa.
Stanley Presser, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Stefan Presser, New York, N.Y.
Peter Prentky, Los Gatos, Ca.
Pauline K. Prisker, New York, N.Y.
Elizabeth Rabinowitz, New York, N.Y.
Sol Rabinowitz, New York, N.Y.
Sheldon Rans, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Gustav and Rachel Rans, Woodbridge, Conn.
Roselle Reichman, Washington D.C.
Saul Reider, Los Angeles, Ca.
Laurel Reiner, Cambridge, Ma.
Rabbi Victor Reinstein, Lewiston, Me.
Neil Reiner, Los Angeles, Ca.
Rabbi Steven M. Reuben, New York, N.Y.
Walter Reizenfeld, Rossville, N.J.
Ruth Robinson, Croton-on-Hudson, N.Y.
Rabbi Michael A. Robinson, Croton-on-Hudson, N.Y.
Deborah G. Reher, Washington, D.C.
Dr. Elliott J. Rosen, Briarcliff Manor, N.Y.
Rabbi Roy A. Rosenberg, New York, N.Y.
Rabbi Aaron Rosenberg, Shaker Heights, Ohio
Melissa Rosenberg, New York, N.Y.
Prof. Joseph Rosenstein, Highland Park, N.Y.
Irvin H. Rosenthal, Ellenville, N.Y.
Dr. Seymour Rosell, Chappaqua, N.Y.
Rabbi Robert Ross-Tabak, Philadelphia, Pa.
Dorothy Rostoker, Flushing, N.Y.
Hy Rostoker, Flushing, N.Y.
Gabriel Roth, Chevy Chase, Md.
Barney Rothman, Sherman Oaks, Ca.
Vera Rothman, Sherman Oaks, Ca.
Esther Rothman, New York, N.Y.
William Rothman, Bronx, N.Y.
Murray Rothman, New York, N.Y.
Rabbi Irving Ruderman, New York, N.Y.
Marsha Rosenblit, New York, N.Y.
Walter Ruby, New York, N.Y.
Linda Rubin, New York, N.Y.
Dr. John Rusky, New York, N.Y.
Dev Sachin, Bronx, N.Y.
Joseph Saidu, Albany, N.Y.
Helin Saks, New York, N.Y.
Rabbi David N. Saperstein, Washington, D.C.
Rabbi Robert Saks, University Park, Md.
Harold Saldinger, Rockaway Park, N.Y.
Alexander E. Salzman, New York, N.Y.
Arthur H. Samuelson, New York, N.Y.
Alvin Sandberg, New York, N.Y.
Gedalia Sandlen, New York, N.Y.
Morris U. Schappas, New York, N.Y.
Adina Schekloff Soback, Flushing, N.Y.
David Schick, Flushing, N.Y.
Hassan Robert S. Sobier, Natick, Ma.
Im J. Schiffer, Melrose Park, Pa.
Louise Schloss, River Edge, N.J.
Michael Schlesberg, Bronx, N.Y.
Leslie Schur, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Rubin Schochet, Jackson Heights, N.Y.
Samuel Schooler, New York, N.Y.
Donald Schoolman, Oostling, N.Y.
Dr. Benjamin R. Schuster, Philadelphia, Pa.
Charles Schwartz, Upper Nyack, N.Y.
Lillian Schwartz, Upper Nyack, N.Y.
Dan Schwartz, New York, N.Y.
Dr. Herbert Schwartz, W. Hartford, Conn.
Earl B. Schwartz, St. Paul, Minn.
Mrs. Herbert Schwartz, W. Hartford, Conn.
Richard H. Schwartz, Staten Island, N.Y.
Dr. Robert J. Schwartz, New York, N.Y.
Robert S. Schwartz, New York, N.Y.

**This Statement has been coordinated by AMERICANS FOR PROGRESSIVE ISRAEL, a Co-
American Zionist Federation, though the above signators supported this appeal as in**

**RAY
resident**

Now—A.P.I. 150 5th Ave, Room 700, New York, 10011, Tel.:

CHAPTER X

ADVICE TO AMERICAN JEWS

In addition to repeated strictures to the "American Jewish establishment" for its alleged identification with "hard-line" elements within the Israeli government, the Quaker authors have some further advice to American Jews. It is instructive in this connection to study the text of the twelfth draft of the Quaker report:

"We appeal to the leaders of the powerful American Jewish community, whose hard work and generous financial support have been so important to the building and sustaining of Israel, to reassess the character of their support and the nature of their role in American politics. Our impression, confirmed by many comments from Israelis inside Israel, is that there is a tendency for the leaders of the American Jewish establishment to identify themselves with the more hard-line elements inside the Israeli cabinet, 'to out-hawk the hawks,' and to ignore or discount the dissident elements, in and out of the Israeli Government, that are searching for more creative ways to solve the Middle East problems.

"As free American citizens, members of the American Jewish community have every right to utilize all the instruments of a free society to register their convictions and desires, and to try to influence legislative and executive action. However, the heavy-handed nature of some of these pressures and their extensiveness have served to inhibit calm and rational public discussion of the issues in the Arab-Israeli conflict. It is not a new phenomenon in American politics, but it is nonetheless disturbing to have Congressmen complain privately that they have signed public statements giving unqualified endorsement for Israel, even though they do not believe in those statements, or have agreed to sponsor resolutions concerning American policy toward Israel of which they secretly disapprove—simply because they are intimidated by Jewish pressure groups. In this situation are clear dangers of an anti-Semitic backlash. No one who is truly concerned about the long-term fate of Israel and the long-term threats to interfaith harmony and brotherhood can be indifferent to those dangers." (pp. 52-53)

Putting aside the many questions of fact which these allegations raise, their evocative phraseology is worth noting:

"... **leaders of the powerful American Jewish community** . . . [should] reassess the *character* of their support and the *nature* of their role in American politics. . . . [They] '*out hawk the hawks*' . . . **ignore or discount more creative ways**. . . . The *heavy-handed nature* of [their] pressures . . . *inhibit calm and rational public discussions*.

. . . Congressmen complain privately . . . because they are intimidated by Jewish pressure groups. . . . Clear dangers of an anti-Semitic backlash [and] threats to the long-term fate of Israel . . . and . . . to interfaith harmony and brotherhood . . ."

Stripped of its pious verbal camouflage, this statement can only be described as threatening American Jews that unless they cut back in their efforts "to register their convictions and desires" as regards "legislative and executive action," they may face an "anti-Semitic backlash"—with all this connotes for the future of Israel and American Jewry. Regardless of motive, the fact that the Quaker authors urge American Jews to limit the exercise of their constitutional rights or face potentially dangerous results clearly implies that American Jews are something less than first-class American citizens. If they are to be subject to "anti-Semitic backlash" when their efforts, though legal and orderly, exceed the authors' norms for propriety, then Jews are being set aside as a special class whose rights "as free American citizens" are effectively limited by the censorship of the non-Jewish majority.

This is especially strange and dangerous advice coming from the Quakers, themselves a religious minority, who practice freely so many highly visible forms of civil disobedience in registering their "convictions and desires." Readers of the twelfth draft—among them a group of professors from Harvard University who met with some members of the Quaker group early in 1970—observed that "anti-Semitic backlash" might already be showing itself in the authors' own treatment of the issue. In later drafts this section was altered to read as follows:

"We appeal to the leaders of the American Jewish Community, whose hard work and generous financial support have been so important to the building and sustaining of Israel, to reassess the ways in which their support can further the cause of peace and security for Israel and to re-examine the full implications of their role with respect to American Middle East policies. Our impression, confirmed by many comments from Israelis inside Israel, is that there is a tendency for some of the leaders of the American Jewish establishment to identify themselves with the more hard-line elements inside the Israeli cabinet and to ignore or discount the dissident elements, in and out of the Israeli government, that are searching for more creative ways to solve the Middle East problems.

"As American Jews, most of whom have a strong sense of identity with Israel, search for ways to express their concern and support. we urge them to make special efforts to explore the variety of options available for peace in the Middle East, to reject simplistic military solutions, and to encourage calm and deliberate examination of all

the issues. The same admonitions, of course, apply to all other groups which attempt to influence public opinion and government action toward the Middle East." (pp. 116-117)

While this language is considerably more felicitous, most of the inferences are still there, recalling the earlier, less inhibited statement of advice. The advice to American Jews "to re-examine the full implications of their role with respect to American Middle East policies," still warns American Jews to be wary of exercising their rights as citizens.

Although the authors may have been motivated only by a friendly desire to warn the Jewish community about the potential danger of anti-Semitic backlash, their use of such evocative phrases in the twelfth draft and the persistent tone of their advice in the final draft indicate (at the least) a regrettable lack of sensitivity.

(It may be noted parenthetically that when the Quaker authors met with the Harvard professors in early 1970 they were pressed to document their charge that "Congressmen complain privately ... that they are intimidated by Jewish pressure groups." They first parried the question and finally could recall only one such alleged complaint, from a congressman whose constituency was virtually free of Jews.)

CHAPTER XI

THE QUAKER ATTEMPT AT INTERVENTION

Along with a great number of expressions of noble sentiment and disclaimers of any special interest, the Quaker report attempts to insulate itself from criticism, by the style and tone which it uses so effectively. Essentially, it eschews inflammatory rhetoric and relies on bland, "even-handed" observations. Inconvenient facts are innocently omitted, however essential such facts might be to an understanding of the issues.

Whole sections of pertinent historical facts are simply left out where their inclusion would have threatened or destroyed the authors' thesis. Thus, the section on "Background" distorts, by omission alone, the whole complex of events that led to the establishment of the State of Israel and the wars of 1948, 1956-57 and 1967. The result is a "background" tailored to meet the requirements of the authors' pre-determined conclusions.

Also, major statements are casually made, with no evidence offered in support, on the apparent assumption that they should be accepted without question merely because they were advanced

APPENDIX B

by men of apparent probity and disinterestedness. Finally, the body of the report draws conclusions without basis even in the material presented by the authors. And it is full of "factual" data tending solely to prejudice the reader against Israel.

As we have seen, for example, the authors reserve their pejoratives solely for the policies, actions and structure of the Israeli government, and for Israel's Jewish supporters in the U.S. There is not a single word of comparable criticism of any Arab government, Arab terrorists or the Soviet Union.

In sum, we find that the Quakers' *Search for Peace in the Middle East*, from its earliest drafts to the final published version, betrays a pre-determined bias, rationalized by historical distortion, that is harmful to the cause of a just and lasting peace.

Nevertheless, in discussing their role, the authors of the report frequently cite the fact that their views have been attacked by both Arabs and Jews as a sign that they are on the right track—that because they are neutral intercessors they may be able to persuade both sides to bridge their differences. But in order to be effective, mediators must be acceptable to and trusted by both sides. Especially when they are self-appointed, as in this case, they are not likely to be successful if they are seen as biased and inaccurate by either side.

The Quaker attempt at intervention in the Arab-Israeli conflict has added to the burden imposed on both sides by the interference of third parties intent on using the conflict to achieve their own goals. Certainly the cumulative effect of the series of contacts with the Quaker authors has been to arouse great hostility toward them among Jews. The dismissal by the authors of the comments on the various drafts by Jewish scholars precludes their ever being acceptable as intercessors; it also endangers the previous good relationship between Jews and the Quaker community, which appears to be sponsoring this anti-Israel intervention. The current state of affairs is particularly regrettable because of the long history of mutual respect and sympathy between American Jews and American Friends and their past collaboration in many humanitarian causes.

We believe that the great body of the Quaker movement seeks only truth and fairness in its approach to any issue and would reject any "slant" imposed on the facts for any reason. Hence we address this critique also to Quakers themselves. We ask them to review the contents of the report in the light of their own consciences and critical faculties.

In the same spirit, we suggest that the facts and analysis which form the substance of our critique may challenge other well-

intentioned readers to re-examine the basis of their own views and opinions about Israel. Certainly the Quaker report group has not been unique in allowing bias and historical distortion, conscious or unconscious, to interfere with a rational understanding of the Arab-Israeli dilemma. Christians who purport to seek only reasonable discourse often accuse Jews of hypersensitivity on the issue of Israel. Yet unhappy experience indicates that, in far too many cases, the underlying difficulty is not related to questions of objective fact or the inherent problems of dispassionate analysis.

Since overt anti-Semitism is no longer acceptable among thinking people of any persuasion, anti-Zionism has proven a convenient, if not convincing substitute. Zionism, it should be realized, is a movement of Jewish national renaissance. It cannot be separated from authentic Jewishness because it embodies Judaism's prophetic vision of justice and peace; its affirmation is at the core of the spiritual and cultural identity **of the Jewish people**.

One of the more tragic aspects of the problem, often reflected in frustrated attempts at constructive dialogue, is that many of the critics of both Israel and its Jewish supporters appear quite unaware of the possibility of their own unconscious prejudice. Even in an age where the spirit of ecumenism and interfaith goodwill have gained new importance, the remarkable force of "theological anti-Semitism" has shown itself in recent years. The basic attitude of some Christians, theologians as well as laymen, is still deeply rooted in the postulate that because the Jews refused to accept Jesus as the Messiah, they are eternally damned and condemned to wander the earth as homeless witnesses to their sin. We believe that by far the largest part of this new evocation of anti-Semitism goes unrecognized because it is *not* conscious.

On the other hand, the tragedy of the past two thousand years of Jewish history has made Jews highly sensitive to the issue of Jewish survival and renaissance—and that issue, for them, is now inextricably bound up with the issue of Israel's survival as a free and independent state. Most non-Jews, although they may have deep concern about the people and affairs of the Middle East, are spared the intense sense of urgency which informs Jewish sensitivity on the subject.

In a world as complex and uncertain as ours, there remains ample room for criticism of the policies and actions of any nation, people or individuals, including Israel and the Jews. Such criticism, of course, is best judged in terms of the objective facts and historical circumstances. This responsibility is no less incumbent on Israel's supporters than on her critics.

It is our hope, therefore, that even beyond the immediate issues

of the Quaker report, our critique may contribute both to a more accurate assessment of the Middle East crisis and to the future of meaningful interfaith dialogue. The search for peace in the Middle East, of course, must go forward. But the tragedy of this Quaker group's self-generated intercession is that the search for peace will now carry the unnecessary burden of another false and biased account of the problem, and a misguided prescription for its solution.

FROM

Truth and Peace in the Middle East

A Critical Analysis of the Quaker Report

by Arnold M. Soloway

with Edwin Weiss and Gerald Caplan

published by

Friendly House Publishers

New York

for

The American Jewish Congress

and

The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith.

David Kirk was born in Germany, the son of Simon and Anna (Simson) Kirchheimer. In 1934, at the age of sixteen, he was sent to England to complete his secondary education. There he first came in touch with Quaker thought and practice. The family migrated to the United States in 1938 where a change of name was part of the wish for a new life. At the beginning of war David Kirk was working as an apprentice cabinetmaker. As a convinced Friend he sought and obtained classification as a conscientious objector. Drafted, he worked for nearly three years in forestry and mental hospital units of Civilian Public Service. Subsequently he studied at the City College of New York and Cornell University. Dr. Kirk has taught at a number of colleges and universities in the United States and Canada. Since 1964 he has been Professor of Sociology at the University of Waterloo in Ontario, Canada.

