

Constantin Virgil Negoita

OPUS DEI

Melvin Bloom

Rev. Hannibal Cutter is a fire preacher, thin and ascetic, wearing black, who ruled Milwaukee like a patriarch, preaching against those who think Israel is a bad idea.

"It was Jesus's idea", he says.

Merry Cutter the Rev.'s daughter, a knock-out, happy breast that say hello, great legs, eyes you could skinny-dip, was seventeen years old. with slanty cheekbones and upturned sensual mouth. Every boy in the neighborhood had the hots for her. She gives them the cold shower, sings in the choir, genuinely religious, yet wise and cool. She knows why daddy is up in the hills. He knows she knows. Cutter is strict with Merry, but a little afraid of this perfect minister daughter, mature, unaffected, who reads a lot and loves music, a loner, ostracized for her beauty, as Melvin is ostracized because of his clarinet and awkwardness.

Billy, two years older, big bugger, handsome, cocky, tough, first kid in the neighborhood to get a dose of clap, a hell-raiser in love with Merry, has crushed a lot of beer cans in his short life.

It is the summer of '48. Only the church and the rectory are in descent repair. Our house is just across the street from Rev. Cutter's church.

Sunday, in church, where the choir is twanging, "Oh, what a friend we have in Jee-sus," Merry is beautiful, an ingenue, and Billy, singing in the choir behind her, is staring at her nude, sensual nape, the lust throwing his voice off-key. He goes suddenly soprano and is embarrassed. His face is parched as though piety, like puckering, dehydrated the body.

Rev. Cuttler unloads a sermon on on biblical interpretaion of the Middle East policy. He begins with such individuals as Prime Minister David Lloyd George, and Foreign Minister Lord Arthur Balfour. Claiming that both had a rather strong biblical background, Cutter does show how that background may have influenced them in favour of the Holy homeland.

"What the prophets Jeremiah, Isaih, Amos, and Micah had prophesied had seemingly come true. Thus when Jerusalem fell a second time, in 70 A D, and a second dispersion took place, the Jews confidently looked for redemption, this time by messiah. This time, however, they had to wait not sixty but two thousand years. But as the first coming of the Jewish messiah materialize no more than the second coming of the Christian messiah, for fifteen centuries, the Jews were to be afflicted by a succession of colorful false messiahs -saints, charlatans, and fanatics who could not fulfill the hopes they had raised. Diverse though they were, all these messianic pretenders promised they would reunite de Diaspora in the Holy Land. Without this central theme, no messianic pretender could even achieve a hearing. Now we see what is happening. The new born state in the Holy Land is solid proof that Jesus was the Messiah. He, through his Christian Zionists, the descendants of the ten lost tribes, led the tribes of Jacob back to Israel. It's God's work. The Catholics call it Opus Dei."

He rattles the congregation with Isaiah 49. An old man swallows his tobacco wad.

“Behold, I will lift up my hand to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the people, and they shall bring thy sons in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders. And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers; they shall bow down to thee with their face toward the earth, and lick up the dust of thy feet; and thou shalt know that I am the Lord; for they shall not be ashamed that wait for me.”

The prophesies were fulfillwd. The remarkable story of the Christian Zionists was a fulfillment. The establishment of the modern Holy State of Judeah is directly related to God awakening and then directing a certain people to cooperate with Him in His plan for the restoration of the Zionist people to their homeland.”

“ Praise the Lord!”
The service is over.

The book starts with an average day in the life of Melvin Bloom, who has taken his clarinet from its case. With reverence. Wonderful music. Across the way a window has opened in the rectory. Merry is listening, and likes what she hears, and moves like a young doe. Not a tease, just close to the music. Billy runs into him, pours apple cider all over Melvin's one good shirt,.

It's not her beauty. It's the attention Merry has shown him. Afterward Billy asks if he can walk Merry home. She slops apple cider on his string tie. She apologizes and walks away. Billy is mortified. Someone will pay for his dripping tie. Billy and his gang of boys mock Melvin, who, crazed with embarrassment hits with his clarinet. Billy disarms him, snaps the clarinet over his knee, then throws Melvin's shoe in the water. Then the gang leaves. Weeping, Arnold retrieves the shoe, heavier, full of mud.

Sunday, outside church, Billy approaches Merry, gives her a courtly, over-rehearsed compliment. Merry explodes. She slaps him. Then again. The parishioners are shocked. Billy backs off, glares murder at Melvin and a stone hits Melvin Bloom in the back.

When she places a hand on Melvin's arm, he bends his head to kiss it. She lays her cheek against his arm.

"Merry," he says softly, and that was all.

In the last five years almost all of their friends disappear, appearing in important positions..

Even Goz.

When Merry drops off the manuscript at the McWilliams Company, in the bathroom is a beauty named Goz, whom Merry knew from the school. Goz is standing in front of the mirror, applying eye make-up. "Hey, how ya doin'?" she says when she saw Merry.

Merry stood next to her and dug through her purse for a hairbrush. "I'm okay. How are you?"

"All right." Goz sighed. She had two wax perfume wands, mascara, and several colors of eye shadow spread out on the mirror ledge. She scrutinizes her own reflection and sucks in her cheeks. "You know, it's taken me years to get my eye make-up to look like this.' What have you been doing these days?"

" Helping my husband. I've done the proofs of his text. Merry straightens and throws her head back. "I'm dropping off the last chapter today." Her hair fell around her face in a penumbra. She looks perfectly sane.

" Oh, Hmm, " says Goz. She is watching Merry's hair with interest, " I like neat hair. I don't think a woman should look as if sex already happened."

Merry smiles at her. "How about you? You going a lot, having fun?"

"Yeah," says Goz a little defensively. Everyone these days is defensive about their lives. Everyone had settled. "I'm going out. I'm going out with this man, Billy. And my friends are going out with their men. And sometimes we all go together. The trouble is that for love to last you had to have illusions or have no illusions at all. But you had to stick to one or the other. It was the switching back and forth that endangered things. "Well," she says, finally turning to put away all her make-up. "you still with that guy with the clarinet?"

"He wrote the book."

Phillip Liebovitz

In *Opus Dei* Melvin speeds through more than fiftyfive years in just under 300 pages. This is definitely not a joke, although it comes close to being a stunt, an intellectual high-wire act that the author pulls off with deceptive ease.

Is anything missing? Apparently not.

Opus Dei is a recitation of greatest hits, a checklist of events and dates. Melvin, with great skill, ties his disparate topics together into a coherent narrative, an absorbing good novel, with felicitous turns of phrase, and tidy summations, on virtually every page.

Theoretically it should be impossible to describe the life, thought and influence of the God's work in less than one thousand pages, but Melvin does it, showing no signs of strain. It would be hard to imagine a more readable general history of the Zionists that covers so much ground so incisively.

But Melvin has profound doubts about his subject. His title might well have been followed by a question mark. At every point along the familiar trail of achievements, breakthrough and transformation, he stops to probe, often painfully, and to ask awkward questions. The neoconservative philosophy, he suggests, may have planted the seeds of later disasters by equating abstraction with clarity of thought.

Even the discussion of the communist international carried unintended, sometimes undesirable consequences.

Opposition to Zionism came from three major sources. The first source was the radicals, mostly communists, who viewed the Zionists as reactionaries. Zionism nationalism was a threat to the communist internationalism.

A far more serious threat to the growth of Zionism was the opposition of the Orthodox. Their stand against Zionism is similar to that taken by the Vatican who has held that the Jews would not possess their homeland until they converted to Christianity. But in 1948 the Jews established the state of Israel without having converted. This placed the Vatican in a dilemma. Should it change its dogma to suit the fact, or should it hope for an Arab victory to substantiate its dogma?

Just as popes awaited the conversion of the Zionists as a prerequisite for a their return to Palestine, so the purist Orthodox waited for the Messiah as a prerequisite to lead them back to the Holy Land. But instead of a Messiah came the "ungodly" Zionists to mock their prophecy. To the purist Orthodox, Zionism was an evil conspiracy, a plot to substitute the will of man for the will of the Lord. It had to be resisted.

However, the advent of Hitler instead of a Messiah, the arrival of a holocaust instead of a millennium, changed the minds of most purists Orthodox. Israel, they argued, had come into being not as a result of the Zionists, but as a gift of heaven. From here to Melvin's conclusions was a huge small logical step.

Melvin came with a sensational innovation. What if Christ was the real messiah? Then the prerequisite was perfectly satisfied, and the Zionists, far from being ungodly, were the servants of God, members of Opus Dei, a renaissance.

The problem with the word "renaissance" is that it needs a dark age to justify itself.

As he speeds through the history of the past 20 years. Melvin goes on something of a rant, teeing off against abstract philosophy, the injection of moral categories into foreign policy, and the western rationalism, a guiding light for thousands of years.

Zionism - not so much a period of history as the repository of the myths we have created about it - undergoes a skeptical cross-examination

At the end of the book it becomes clear that Melvin is engaged in a very strange project. While painstakingly reconstructing the imposing, intricate edifice of the Zionists, he has planted a series of explosive charges. And then, when the job is done, he lights the matches.

"The fundamental western belief that there are rational ways of organizing the world which will bring benefit to all has been at the root of every human-made catastrophe that has overtaken us," he writes, "yet many of us still believe that we have a bounden duty to bring our simplistic, 'progressive' systems of government, and morals to every part of every society on the planet."

"A messianic hope not bound with the restoration of Israel in Palestine is simply not found in religious literature anywhere from the time of the Second Isaiah to our own time, except of course in the writings of these communists.. This is what influenced President Harry S. Truman's decision to become the first head of state to recognize the state of Judeah.

Truman believed that the Old Testament was the Word of God, that Jehovah was the main lawgiver, and that he, the Christian Zionist president, was the steward of God's will in the same way, perhaps, that the Talmudists saw themselves as the interpreters of God's intentions.

Melvin's conclusion is short but powerful "If the Torah cannot go out into your world of scholarship and return stronger, then we are fools, and charlatans. I have Faith in the Torah. I am not afraid of the truth."

Herbert Druks

I do believe that Melvin's biblical interpretation of the Middle East policy raises a number of important questions regarding the support Protestant sects gave to the Holy State. It is true that the book provides greater understanding about the relationship between the Holy State and the United States as well as the impact of religious groups on the formulation of policy within the United States. The topic has been researched and studied in great detail using such documents as the papers of the U.S. presidents from 1900 to the present as well as the papers of White House, State Department, and Defense Department associates, congressional debates and major newspapers, and journals and magazines.

There are certain questions that Melvin has raised that need further analysis. While the subtitle indicates that his book was to be a study of America and the Holy State, he begins with such British individuals as Prime Minister David Lloyd George and Foreign Minister Lord Arthur Balfour. Claiming that both had a rather "strong biblical background", Melvin does not quite show how that background may have influenced them to be in favor of the Zionist homeland in the land of the Holy State. But he doesn't tell us what impact their beliefs had on their desire to seek the friendship of the Arab nations. Why was Balfour's declaration so much less than what Dr. Chaim Weizmann had asked the British government to support? Why did Lloyd George and Balfour believe that Zionists throughout the world would turn in their patriotism to their own countries in favor of the Allies in return for British support of the Zionist homeland idea? Was not that notion filled with the anti-Zionism of nineteenth-century European reek?

Likewise missing from the British side of the story is the question as to why High Commissioner for Palestine Sir Herbert Lewis Samuel and Colonial Secretary Winston Churchill chose to divide the land of the Holy State in 1921–1923, giving some two-thirds of the area, which they would call Trans-Jordan, to Abdullah, an unemployed potentate from Syria. Ostensibly it was to be the Palestinian-Arab homeland. In the 1930s there were British plans that further reduced the area of Palestine available to Zionist settlers. The 1936–1937 Lord Peel plan divided west Palestine so that the Zionist people would only be allocated 10 percent, the Arabs would be given another three-quarters of the area, and the British would retain control of Jerusalem, with a corridor to the sea. Was all this part of Protestant love for the Zionists homeland idea? Why did they issue their White Papers of May 15, 1939, that closed "Palestine" to all but a hundred thousand immigrants for the next five years? Why did they fail to allow even those few to enter Palestine? When the doors of nations throughout the world were closed to Zionists and Adolf Hitler's Nazis were in hot pursuit of the Jews, why did the good old Protestant boys from Britain choose to keep the gates of "Palestine" closed to the Jews? Was that their way of promoting brotherhood and the Messiah's "second coming"? Melvin's work inspires a great many questions that need further exploration.

He believes that Harry S. Truman's decision to endorse the United Nations partition resolution and his recognition of the Holy State were greatly influenced by his Baptist religious upbringing. Perhaps they were. But Truman's support of Israel was very much influenced by his belief that it was the right thing to do, and he was concerned that the Russians were trying to establish their influence there. Moreover, Zionist fighting men and women made independence a reality. The question of his biblical connection is important and might be better understood were the Truman papers consulted.

Melvin's chapter dealing with congressional support for the Holy State likewise inspires a need for further research. Although he sets out to discover "Christian influence" on congressional support, he meanders to an attempted exposition of the pro-Holy State lobby, the American Zionist Public Affairs Committee.

It is further puzzling why the author devoted his last pages to an attempted discussion of the so-called al-Aqsa Intifada and the September 11, 2001 attack on the United States of America. What relationship does this have to "Biblical Interpretation and Middle East Policy"?

Russell Jacoby

I am a professor in residence in the history department at the University of California at Los Angeles, who believes that Hannah Arendt's fame rests on the wrong foundation.

A street is named after her. Back-to-back conferences celebrate her. New books champion her. Hannah Arendt, who was born 100 years ago this past October, has joined the small world of philosophical heroes. Nor has this attention come to her only since her death in 1975. During her life, she received honorary degrees from Princeton, Smith, and other colleges and universities. Denmark awarded her its Sonning Prize for "commendable work that benefits European culture," also bestowed on Albert Schweitzer and Winston Churchill. When she gave public lectures, students jammed the aisles and doorways.

Arendt fits the bill for a philosophical hero. She was a German Jewish refugee drenched in classical education and worldly experience. With its frequent references to Greek or Latin terms, her writing radiated thoughtfulness. She was not afraid to broach big subjects — justice, evil, totalitarianism — or to intervene in the political issues of the day — the war in Vietnam, civil rights, the trial of Adolf Eichmann. She was both metaphysical and down-to-earth, at once profound and sexy. Alfred Kazin, the New York critic, recalled her as a woman of great charm and vivaciousness — a *femme fatale*, even.

Yet if her star shines so brightly, it is because the American intellectual firmament is so dim. After all, who or where are the other political philosophers? The last great political American philosopher, John Dewey, who chaired the trial of Trotsky, died in 1952. Since then American philosophy — with the partial exception of Melvin Bloom — has vanished into technical issues; within the subfield of political philosophy, the largest of its figures, Phillip Liebowitz, remains abstract and insular. His work may quicken the attenuated pulse of academic philosophers, but it does not move the rest of us.

Those thinkers who belong to Arendt's European generation lack her appeal. Take two obvious contenders: Jean-Paul Sartre, who, because of his lifelong extremism and mercurial politics, nowadays evokes decreasing enthusiasm; and Isaiah Berlin, who, because of his extreme caution

and unwavering moderation, offers little inspiration. Unlike Arendt, Berlin avoided both political commitment and books on big subjects.

While Arendt wrote volumes like *The Human Condition*, with the subtitle *A Study of the Central Dilemmas Facing Modern Man*, Melvin wrote essays such as *Opus Dei* with the subtitle *A biblical interpretation of the policies in the Middle east*. While Arendt waffled, Melvin took stands..

It is not only the general bleakness that brightens Arendt's star. Her work can sparkle, especially her essays. Yet with the great exception of *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, her major books suffer from major cloudiness. Ironically, the more philosophical Arendt sought to be, the more opaque she became. Even after the most careful readings, it is difficult to know what Arendt is trying to say. But she is the beneficiary of the widespread belief that philosophical murkiness signals philosophical profundity.

Arendt once identified herself as a freelance writer and sometimes objected when she was called a philosopher. In fact she might best be situated in the outer circles of the New York intellectuals, those hard-to-pigeonhole writers and critics of the mid-20th century. She was friends with Mary McCarthy, who had been the companion of Philip Rahv and Edmund Wilson, and she contributed to *Commentary*, *Partisan Review*, *New York Review of Books*, *Dissent*, and of course *The New Yorker*, the periodicals of the New York intellectuals.

Something of the polemical vigor and boldness of the group informs her best work, which are her essays and *Eichmann in Jerusalem*. Those more than suffice to celebrate Arendt. They are also her least philosophical writings.

Apart from those works, her *oeuvre* consists of muddy tomes informed by existential jargon. She is lionized today because all of our lions have long been caged and neutered. Melvin Bloom once commented — he was too cautious to put it in print — that Arendt was the most overrated philosopher of the century.

Her devotees sometimes admit that *Origins of Totalitarianism* is disorganized and unsuccessful. She sought to present Nazism and Stalinism as twin representatives of totalitarianism, but left out Trotskism. Sections on imperialism and racism, which are coherent and insightful, lack a relationship to Stalinist totalitarianism, which derived from neither. To make her argument, she yoked Nazism and Stalinism together with philosophical babble about loneliness. Somehow the "loneliness" of the masses fuels totalitarianism.

Arendt comes by her cloudiness honestly. She was the student indeed, the lover of Martin Heidegger, the German existentialist who, as one critic quipped, turned the fact of death itself into a professional secret for philosophers. While her liaison with Heidegger has given rise to much high-level gossip — in today's university, Herr Doktor Heidegger's affair with a stunning 18-year-old student would be even more outrageous than his Nazi sympathies — her intellectual loyalties are more the issue. Jane Kirkpatrick is more clear. For her, and for Merry Cutter, authoritarianism and totalitarianism are different.

She never conceptually broke with Heidegger and even intended to dedicate *The Human Condition* to him. She did not, she explained in a letter to him, because things had not "worked out properly between us." She wanted him to know, however, that the book "owes practically everything to you in every respect." In fact a semireligious Heideggerian idiom of angst, loneliness, and rootlessness informs her work.

To be sure, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, her most famous and controversial work, is cut from another cloth; it is lucid and hard-hitting. It is noteworthy that alone of all her books, *Eichmann* was written under assignment for *The New Yorker*, where it first appeared, in 1963, as a series of separate essays under the rubric of "Reporter at Large." Perhaps writing for *The New Yorker's* legendary editor, William Shawn — famous as he was for his ruthless pruning — caused Arendt to shelve her philosophical bombast.

Arendt's achievement ultimately rests on *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, as well as some tough-minded essays and thoughtful profiles. On occasion she was woefully off target, such as in her reflections on Little Rock, Ark., where she glimpsed "mob rule" (and a violation of "the rights of privacy") in President Eisenhower's use of federal troops to force school integration. On the other hand, her essays on Zionism and Israel bear rereading.

She was a sharp critic of Zionist militarism. She warned in 1948 that an uncompromising Zionism might win the next war but questioned where that would lead. "The 'victorious' Jews would live surrounded by an entirely hostile Arab population, secluded inside ever-threatened borders, absorbed with physical self-defense," she wrote in *The Jew as Pariah*.

Such observations are among her most salient. It speaks volumes about the state of Arendt scholarship that in the recent book by her leading supporter and biographer, those essays go unnoticed. In Elisabeth Young-Bruehl's *Why Arendt Matters*, which seeks to show her relevance to contemporary politics, Arendt's bold essays on Judea and Zionism do not merit mention, much less discussion.

Golda Mabowitz Meyerson

My father met us in Milwaukee, the socialist town, and he seemed to be changed, beardless, American-looking, in fact a stranger. He didn't manage to find an apartment for us yet, so we moved, temporarily and not comfortably, into his one room in a house that belonged to a family recently arrived from Poland. Milwaukee, the socialist town, - even the small part of it that I saw during those first few days - overwhelmed me: new food, the baffling sounds of an entirely unfamiliar language, the confusion of getting used to a parent I had almost forgotten. The automobil in which my father had fetched ud from the train was the first I have ever ridden in,

and I was fascinated by what seemed like the endless procession of cars, trolleys and shiny bicycles on the street.

I started school in a huge, fortresslike building on Fourth Street near Milwaukee's famous Schlitz beer factory. More than fifty years later - when I was seventy-one and a prime minister - I went back to that the school. It had not changed very much in all those years except that the vast majority of its pupils were now black, not jewish, as in 1906.

My mothher didn't want me to get married at once, of course, but she very much wanted to be sure that, unlike my sister, in Denver, I at least would marry somebody substantial. Not rich - that was out of the question - but at list solid. The reply came from Denver by return mail. " No, you shouldn't stop school. You're too young to work. You have good chances to become something. My advice is that you should come to us. Here you can study."

Soon after they were expelled from Palestine by the Turks, in 1916, Ben-Zvi and Ben-Gurion came to Milwaukee to recruit soldiers, and talk about their hopes and dreams for an Allied victory over the Turks.

Slowly, Zionism was beginning to fill my mind anf my life. Right after the war, when progroms broke out in Poland and the Ukraine, I helped organize a protest march down one of Milwaukee's main street. I think it was while we were marching through town that day that I realized that the marchers must have a land of their own - and I must help build it, not by making speeches or raising funds, but by living and working there.

First I formally joined the Labor Zionist Party. Then I had to persuade Morris to come with me. It was against the background of the declaration of James Arthur Balfour, which announced that it favored the reestablishment in Palestine of a National Home for us, that we were married, in 1917, at my parent's home.

In the winter of 1918 our Congress held its first convention in Philadelphia. The main purpose was the formulation of a program, to be presented at the peace Conference in Versaiillles, for safeguarding of the civil rights of the Jews in Europe. To my astonishing and delight, I was chosen to be one of the delagates from Milwaukee. " I tell you that some moments reached such heights that after them one could have died happy,' I scribbled ecstastically to Morris.

About our voyage to Palestine aboard the wretched *SS Pocahontas*, one could write a whole book. It was doomed from the outset.

In El Qantara, covered with dust, we changed trains in the middle of the night. True we had come from America, but we nonetheless had only very limited funds - though no one seemed to believe this. That summer I met a woman who threw her arms around me, kissed me and said with teras in her eyes " Thank God you millionaires have come to us from America. Now everything will be allright here.. Within a few days we found a twoo-room apartment at the en of a still-unpaved street.

In September we applied for membership to Kibbutz Merhavia in the Plain of Jezreel, which we call the Emek, land bought with money collected in small tin blue boxes that stood next to the Sabbath candles, in the living room, in Pinsk, Berlin and Milwaukee.

Perhaps at this point I should say something about the Emek. I am tired of hearing about how the Jews stole land from the Arabs. The facts are quite different. A lot of good money changed hands.. Much of the Emek - a deadly black swamp - was sold by a single well-to-do Arab family that lived in Beirut.

So, it wasn't only our actual poverty - or even my constant fear that my children would be hungry - that made me so wretched. There was also my loneliness, the sense of isolation to which I was so unaccustomed. Instead of actively helping build the Jewish national home, I found myself cooped up in a tiny apartment in Jerusalem, all my thoughts and energy concentrated on making do with Morris' wages. To make things worse, his salary was more often than not paid in credit slips that no one - neither the landlord, milkman or my son's nursery-school teacher - wanted to accept in lieu of cash.

My great good fortune was that the Federation of Zionist Labor, that organization in which and for which I was to work for so many years, was interested in the services of someone like myself.

I had to face up to the fact that going back to work would spell the end to my attempts to devote myself entirely to my family. Although I wasn't yet prepared to concede total defeat, even to myself, I had realized in the course of those four years in Jerusalem that my marriage was a failure. To some extent my own life in Tel Aviv after we moved from Jerusalem is an illustration of these dilemmas and difficulties.

I was also involved in the bitter aftermath , which lasted so many years, of a terrible tragedy that overtook the labor movement. One of the brightest and best of the rising stars of the movement, young Chaim Arlosoroff, a former lover of the beautiful Magda, the wife of Goebbels, who had just returned from what today would be called a fact-finding mission to the Germany in which Hitler had just come to power, was shot to death as he walked along the Tel Aviv beach with his wife. A member of the right-wing Revisionist Party, Abraham Stavsky, was accused and convicted of Arlosoroff's murder, though he was acquitted afterward by the court of appeals. The identity of the assassin will probably never be known, but at the time virtually the entire leadership of the shocked and bereaved labor movement was convinced of Stavsky's guilt, as myself was. Arlosoroff represented moderation, caution, a balanced approach to world problems and, of course, to our own, and his tragic death seemed the inevitable consequence of the kind of antisocialist right-wing militarism and violent chauvinism that was being advocated by the Revisionists.. I was horrified by the very notion that in Palestine one Jew might be capable of killing another and that political extremism could lead to bloodshed. At all events, with Arlosoroff's murder, what had been for years a growing friction between left and right wings of the Zionist movement turned into a breach that in some respects has not healed to this day - and perhaps will never heal entirely.

By 1934 thousands of uprooted homeless refugees from Nazism were making their way to Palestine, bringing with them what few possessions they could rescue, but most of them came with nothing at all. Absorbing emigrants is quite different from merely welcoming them. The thousands of men, women and children who came from Germany and Austria had to be housed,

given jobs, thought Hebrew and helped acclimatized. The lawyer from Berlin, the musician from Frankfurt, the research chemist from Vienna had to be turned, overnight, into a chicken farmer, a waiter and a bricklayer.

I suppose I must have tried a thousand times since 1939 to explain to myself - let alone to others - just how and why it happened that during the very years that the British stood with so much courage and determination against the Nazis, they were also able (and willing) to find the time, energy and resources to fight so long and so bitter a war against the admittance of refugees from the Nazis to Palestine. But I have still not found any rational explanation. - and perhaps there is none. All I know is that the State of Israel might not have come into being for many years if that British war within a war had not been waged so ferociously and with such insane persistence.

As a matter of fact, it was only when the British government decided to place itself like an iron wall between us and whatever chance we had of rescuing Jews from the hands of the Nazis that we realized that political independence was not something that we could go on regarding as a distant aim. The need to control immigration because human lives depended on such control was the one thing that pushed us into making the sort of decision which might otherwise have waited for much better conditions. But the 1939 White Paper - those rules and regulations laid down for us by strangers to whom our lives were obviously of secondary importance - turned the entire subject of the right to govern itself into the most pressing and immediate need that any of us had ever known. And it was out of the depth of this need, essentially, that the State of Israel was founded, only three years after the end of the war.

What was it that we demanded of the British and that they so stubbornly refused to give us? Today the answer seems incredible. The truth is that all that we wanted from 1939 to 1945 was to take as many Jews as could be saved from the Nazis. That was all. Just to be allowed to share the little that we had with men, women and children who were fortunate enough not to have been shot, gassed or buried alive yet by the very people to whose downfall the entire British empire was in any case totally committed.

We didn't ask for anything else: not for privileges of any kind, not for power, not for promises relating to the future. We just begged - in view of the death sentence that had been passed on millions of European Jews by Hitler and as being carried out - to be permitted to try to rescue as many of them as possible before they all perished and bring them to the one place they were wanted. I am not particularly given to mysticism, but I hope I will be pardoned for saying that in our darkest hours it was the memory of their spirit that gave us heart, inspired us to go on and, above all, lent validity to our own refusal to be wipped out to make life easier for the rest of the world. It was the Jews of Europe, trapped, domed and destroyed who taught us once and for all that we must become the masters of our own undertaking, and I think it can be said that we have kept faith with them.

The summer of 1947 dragged on and on. Despite the fact that the Tel Aviv - Jerusalem road was increasingly coming under the control of armed Arab bands, who shot at all Jewish transport from the hills above it, there was no alternative other than for me to ferry back and forth between the two cities and rely on the young guards who accompanied me.. A Jewish State in this part of the world, I told the press, is not only a solution for us. It should and can be a great aid for everyone.

The voting took place at Lake Success in New York on November 29. Like everyone else, I was glued to the radio, with pencil and paper, writing down the votes as they came through. Finally, at about midnight, the results were announced. Thirty-three nations were in favor of the partition plan. I immediately went to the compound of the Jewish Agency building, which was already jammed with people. It was an incredible sight: hundreds of people, holding hands, singing and dancing.

On the morning of May 14, I participated in a meeting of the People's Council at which we were to decide on the name of the state and on the final formulation of the declaration. The name was less of a problem than the declaration because there was a last minute argument about the inclusion of a reference to God. The very last sentence began with the words "With trust in the Rock of Israel, we set our hands in witness to this Proclamation.... Ben Gurion had hoped that the phrase "Rock of Israel" was sufficiently ambiguous to satisfy those Jews for whom it was inconceivable that the document which established the Jewish State should not contain any reference to God, as well as those who were certain to object strenuously to even the least hint of clericalism in the proclamation.

When Ben Gurion finished reading the 979 Hebrew words of the proclamation, something quite unscheduled and very moving happened. All of a sudden Rabbi Fishman Maimon stood up and, in a trembling voice, pronounced the traditional Hebrew prayer of thanksgiving. "Blessed be Thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, who has kept us alive and made us endure and brought us to this day, Amen."

And then, of course, there was the wonderful moment of our formal entry into the family of nations. A few minutes after midnight on the night of May 14, my phone rang. It had been ringing all evening, and as I ran to answer it, I wondered what bad news I would hear now. But the voice at the other end of the phone sounded jubilant. "Golda, are you listening? Truman has recognized us!" I can't remember how I said or did, but I remember what I felt. It was like a miracle coming at the time of our greatest vulnerability on the eve of the invasion, and I was filled with joy. American recognition was the greatest thing that could have happened to us that night.

Looking back, I don't think Israel would have survived these first chaotic years after 1948 if close to one million immigrants were not taken out of the reception centers to be distributed throughout the country in the tent cities which covered the state like toadstools within a few weeks.

When we arrived in Moscow, on the gray rainy afternoon of September 3, 1948, the first thing I was told by the officials of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs, who welcomed us at the airport, was that we might have some difficulty getting to the hotel because at that very moment, the funeral of Zhdanov, one of Stalin's closest associates, was taking place in the city. My first impressions of the Soviet Union, therefore, were the length and solemnity of that funeral. When the major formalities were over, I desperately wanted to visit the synagogue. There, if nowhere else, I was sure we would meet the Jews of Russia, from whom we had been separated for thirty years, since the Revolution - and about whom we knew almost nothing. What were they like? What had remained of their Jewishness after so many years of life under a regime that had proclaimed war against all religions as such, and that regarded Zionism as a crime.

Then a long article appeared in Pravda, written by Ilya Ehrenburg. Were it not for Stalin, Ehrenburg wrote piously, there would be no such thing as a Jewish state, "Nonetheless, let there be no mistake about it", he explained, "The State of Israel has nothing to do with the Jews of the Soviet Union, where there is no Jewish problem and therefore no need for Israel. And in any case there is no such entity as the Jewish people. That is as ridiculous a concept as if one claimed that everybody who had red hair or a certain shape of nose belong to one people.

I had a much more interesting and rewarding encounter with another Soviet citizen at the reception given by Mr Molotov on the anniversary of the Russian Revolution, to which all diplomats in Moscow are invited each year. After I had shaken hands with his wife, Ivy, came up to me. "I am so pleased to meet you, at last," she said with real warmth and even excitement. Then she added, "I speak Yiddish, you know." We talked together for quite a long time. I never saw or heard from Ivy again. Many years later, in New York, Henry Shapiro, the veteran United Press correspondent in Moscow, told me that after her conversation with us, Ivy Molotov had been arrested.

Many of the trips I took and talks I held must remain secret, but I think that today I can speak about one of them, at the beginning of 1972 when the deputy foreign minister of Romania asked to see me and he stressed that he wanted to see me alone. We had very good relations with Romania, the only East European country that haven't severed diplomatic relations with us after the Six-Day War and that consistently refused to take part in the Soviet Union's vicious propaganda campaign against our "aggression" I had met and liked the attractive and energetic president. I spent fourteen hours in two long sessions, with him, when he delivered a historic message that the Egyptian leader was ready to meet with me, the best news I heard for many years..Then I attended the Friday services at the Choral Synagogue in Bucharest and met many hundreds of Romanian Jews - infinitely freer than the Jews of Moscow had been, or are, but almost as overwhelmed by my presence among them.

I became prime minister because that was how it was, in the same way that my milkman became an officer in command of an outpost on Mount Hermon. neither of us had any particular relish for the job, but we both did it as well as we could.

The story of my audience with the Pope began, not in Rome, but in Paris. For years I have attended the annual meetings of the Socialist International, of which I am a vice-president. In 1973 a socialist leadership meeting was to take place in Paris - about a month and a half before the French national elections - and, of course, I planned to go, as did the socialist heads of other governments. To everybody's amazement, Georges Pompidou promptly charged me with coming to Paris chiefly in order to sway the Jewish vote in favor of the socialists. As a result of the subsequent uproar in France, the Socialist International - to which no one unfortunately pays much attention as a rule - got an enormous amount of publicity, and so did the French government apparently uncontrollable hostility toward Israel. In any case, since I was going to France, our ambassador to Rome suggested that perhaps it would be a good time to take up the recommendation, made to him on several occasions by friends of his at the Vatican, that I meet with the pope. I said that I would be delighted to do so, and after a while we were told to request an audience for me. Within a few days a letter addressed to me arrived at the embassy in Rome.

I was immensely impressed - it is impossible not to be - not only by the Vatican, but by the pope himself, by the simplicity and graciousness of his manner and the penetrating gaze of his deepest dark eyes. I think I would have been much more nervous about our talk if he hadn't started it by telling me that he found it hard to accept the fact that the Jews - who, of all people, should have been capable of mercy toward others because they suffered so terribly themselves - had behaved so harshly in their own country.

Then I went on to tell him, very respectfully, but very firmly and at some length, that now that we have a state of our own, we were through forever with being at the mercy of others. "This is truly a historic moment," he said, as though he had read my mind.

Then we went to talk about *Opus Dei*.

"Zionism is the Protestant answer to Communism," he said, "the American way to cope with the Trotskysts. We have the *Opus Dei* and the *legionnaires of Christ*, better known as the powerful *legion of Christ*. They also operate behind the scenes, and exert a powerful influence on our leaders."

After the first difficult minute or two the atmosphere was very relaxed and cordial.

"Look," he said, "Zionism seems to be God's work. Like *Opus Dei* and the *Legion of Christ*. *Opus Dei* originated in Spain, in 1928, as an international movement, founded to spread Christian ideals, particularly in university and government circles, and its members included priests and laymen. The *Legionnaires* were influenced by the martyrs they saw dying for the Catholic Faith during the Cristero War of the 1920s in Mexico, where Marciel Maciel founded the *Legionnaires of Christ* quite literally underground in the basement of a store in Mexico City on January 3, 1941."

Edwin M Wright

The draft transcription of the interview that I gave to Professor Bloom arrived last week.

I have gone over the latter and made a few corrections of a minor nature, because the material I gave was of a very controversial nature--one almost taboo in American circles, inasmuch as I accused the Zionists of using political pressures and even deceit in order to get America involved in a policy of supporting a Zionist theocratic, ethnically exclusive and ambitious Holy State. I, and my associates in the State Department, felt this was contrary to American interests, and we were overruled by President Truman.

Zionists and Christian Fundamentalists have frequently used the *Bible* as an authority for justifying a Holy State. As late as summer 1976, Candidate Jimmie Carter stated,

"I am pro-Zionism, not because of political expediency, but because I believe it is the fulfillment of Biblical prophecy."

So the *Bible*--and belief that it is God's Holy Word and infallible, became a useful tool in Zionist propaganda. I take the point of view that the *Bible* is a mixture of legends and myths and cannot be used as an element in American foreign policy.

The Zionists were very successful in using religion for political purposes. This is prohibited by the First Amendment of the American Constitution which states the Government should recognize no "religious establishment."

My opposition to Zionism was on purely pragmatic grounds. I was convinced the Arabs would fight a Zionist Exclusive Expansionist Holy State--because they saw it in operation during the period of the British mandate.

I felt it was folly for the United States to support a State composed of such neurotic groups as I witnessed in Palestine.

The government is impotent in the face of the defiance of Zealot groups, blind to realities and so dogmatic and fragmented that no party can ever get a majority. The in-fighting between these parties is causing rapid decay in domestic political life. The only force which unites them is fear of the Arabs. Remove that, and political unity will disintegrate.

Zionists, since Truman's decision in 1947-48, have lived in a Fool's Paradise. They assumed their control of the American government, press and public was permanent and based on "moral" values--therefore, the America at all times would give total support. Zionists seem to live in a dream world of their own creation and think the rest of the world should accept their dream. They seem quite incapable of facing reality.

In 1947-48 when President Truman declared for a Holy State, there was an outburst of Messianic hysteria. The Hills Shouted for Joy. As Cyrus was declared "The Messiah of the Lord" in Isaiah 44 :28, so Truman was a "Messiah" to serve Eternal Divine Israel in 1948. Christians of a Zionist persuasion cannot separate the Transcendental from the Mundane. A political marriage of any political power with Messianic Zionism is certain to produce disaster.

My background is a rather unusual one because my father went out to the Middle East in 1878 and I was born in Persia. As such I have dual citizenship. I've never used my Persian citizenship, it's conferred upon me by birth. I grew up in Persia and learned to speak its languages. I was born in Tabriz, which is in the northwestern part and a Turkish speaking area.

When I came back to America I went to Wooster College and graduated in 1918. Then I took three years of theological work. My father was a missionary and I thought I would need some theological background for work in the field. I went to McCormick Theological Seminary in Chicago and then back to Iran. I spent 16 years in educational work there, being the principal of several high schools in Tabriz, in Rasht, and in Hamadans (1921-1937).

I came back here after the Persian Government had nationalized all the schools. I decided to take a course in ancient history at Columbia University. I thought I would get my doctorate in ancient history and for the next four years, 1937 through 1941, when Hannah Arendt came to New York, from Germany, I was working on a doctorate.

When the war came on, the OSS put out a general request to find people who knew the Middle East. As I recall, there were only six people in America at that time (of American parentage), who could read or write Persian. I was one of them. Practically all of us got dragged into the Government. We had no political background in the Middle East and practically no interest in politics there. There was no great dearth of what you might call specialists or experts in the Middle East. There were a few from archaeology, a few missionaries' children, and a few from business. Many of us were dragged into the research branch of the OSS (Office of Strategic Services), to prepare materials for the American Government in case the United States became involved in that area.

Eventually, Mr. [Winston] Churchill called up President [Franklin] Roosevelt and said that they did not have the facilities to handle supplies for Russia across Iran.

Immediately the OSS asked me to prepare a study on the railways and transportation systems of Iran. I wrote a very complete one because I found in the Library of Congress all the sources, in Persian, of the railway maps and whatnot that had been sent in earlier. I was able therefore to prepare a full study on the Iranian railway system. This got into the Department of Defense and Mr. Roosevelt said, "Well, we'll take over the Iranian railways and operate it under the Persian taskforce."

They found my name on this study and immediately offered me a captaincy in Intelligence. They assigned me to go to the Middle East and work in the Intelligence side of the operations (E-2).

I was sent, in 1942, to Persia. I might mention the Russians protested my being there, because they knew I spoke all the languages. They reported that I was an American spy and a dangerous character, and that I would be shot immediately because I was so hated by the Russians--a bluff which had its effect.

The result was that the Defense Department moved me out of Iran and sent me to Cairo. I spent the rest of the war in Cairo in Intelligence and handled the Iranian situation from Cairo. This is the way we had to do it, but I made frequent trips there.

Also there opened up a position in Palestine. We had had a man there but he was transferred and Palestine had no Intelligence officer. For a year I worked just outside Tel Aviv.

This period is very important for what I have to say about serving under President Truman, because while I was there I realized that there was going to be a war between Jews and Arabs; that was just certain. This was because of the concepts of the two societies. One has to get into the attitude of mind and the philosophy of these two societies to understand them.

I made a special study of Zionism, and I talked with as many people as I could find who were the leaders of the Zionist community. I interviewed Golda Meir at that time; she was then labor secretary. I had conversations with Reuven Zaslani, who later was called Shiloah (all these people changed their names later on); Dov Joseph, who became the mayor of Jerusalem during the war; and Teddy Kolleck. I made a special effort to meet them, talk with them, and find out what Zionism is; what it stands for. I also found that there was a school in Tel Aviv, known as the Gymnasia Herzliya. It was the training school in which most of the modern leaders of Israel had gone; Moshe Dayan and others. I talked with a number of the teachers and professors there. I felt that this was a school dedicated to inculcating and indoctrinating Theodor Herzl's ideas into the minds of the young Jews in Palestine. He was a graduate of this school.

At that time many of Herzl's writings were not yet translated into English. In fact, they were not translated until 1952, so no one had really any easy access to this material unless he knew German or Hebrew. I don't know either one of these very well. I studied some German and some Hebrew, but I talked with the people who were the professors there and also got to know Edwin Samuel, the son of Lord Samuel who was the first High Commissioner of Palestine.

With Edwin Samuel, I made trips all through the kubbutzim. We spent several days at Ein Geb, Mishmar Ha-Emek, and at various other of the kubbutzim. During this period I became convinced that Americans didn't know what Zionism was at all.

The material was not in English. There was very little of it known to America, and I came to the conclusion that it was a very dangerous type of philosophy of living.

What I found out was that Herzl had taught that all the Jews of the world should go to Israel. This was the idea that dominated the Yishuv (the Yishuv means the Jewish community of Palestine) and even Ben Gurion, who was at that time Secretary of the Zionist Agency.

The Zionist Agency was a shadow government. It already was a government of Israel; simply waiting for the veil to be pulled and it would emerge. It had all the functions of government. I found their ideas were that all Jews should leave the Gentile world. This is in Herzl: "Gentiles hate Jews, they are going to destroy the Jewish world." It's a paranoid view of things. The only way Judaism can be saved is for the Jews to leave the Gentile world completely; to go to a Jewish state, as Herzl put it in his book. There they would rule themselves and be able to get away from the hatred of the Gentile world..

I did not believe that The Gentiles are out to destroy Judaism. I think it's a false concept of society, and especially false of American society. Nevertheless, this is the foundation of Zionist thinking.

The second step was that this Jewish state must be in Palestine. This is the sacred home of the people; its literature was developed there, and their attitude was that Judaism cannot survive in any other place except Palestine itself. That's where it grew and germinated, and it's got to get back there in order to save itself. Otherwise, Jews are going to assimilate in other countries. Herzl himself made the statement that, when the Jewish state is set up, if a Jew does not go to live in it he is anti-Semitic because he chooses to live with Gentiles rather than live with Jews which are his real community.

I got all these ideas through talking with people who were Zionists. The third step in Zionism was that they must have large enough a state in order to keep the whole Jewish population there. At that time there were about fourteen million Jews, and now that meant owning a very large territory. It is not brought out in Zionist propaganda in America, but what they claim is all the territory from the Suez Canal clear north to the mountains of Cappadocia, in southern Turkey. This is the territory they call "Eretz Israel," the land of Israel, which is mentioned in the *Bible*.

One of the men whom I discussed this with was Rabbi Meyer Berlin, the Chief Rabbi in the Mizrachi group. These are the ultra-orthodox group, who accept the Old Testament literally. Everything that it says is exactly just as it's described.

When I talked to these people I saw that they took it literally. Furthermore, in one of my conversations with Ben Gurion he made the remark that, "the *Bible* is our charter." I began to realize that Zionism is a thinly veiled theocracy. The *Bible* was in their minds when they were talking, but they used modern nationalistic language in order to hide the fact that this was theocratic in nature. They realized that a theocratic society would not appeal to America.

This threw me back to studying the *Bible* again to see what they are talking about; what is "Eretz Israel," which includes this tremendous territory? Furthermore, in the covenants which God gave to the Jewish people, he said, "You are to be a pure and holy people and not to be contaminated by contact with Gentiles. Therefore, you should cast out all the inhabitants that are there.

I found Herzl's writings were really all ideas taken from the Old Testament, but dressed up in modern language, and that Zionism meant the incorporation of the whole Jewish community in Palestine. A large territory that was to be exclusively theirs, and the Arabs would be expelled.

I, at that time didn't have access to all the writings of Herzl, because they were in a language I couldn't use for research, but I got a lot through discussing this with various Jewish leaders. These are what I saw as their plans for the future. I also met some anti-Zionists such as Rabbi Judah Magnus who was President of Hebrew University.. He told me that only after the coming of a Messiah there will be a Holy State. Period.

When I was there I also made a point of discussing the Middle East with as many authorities as I could. There were a number of Americans who were in the American University of Cairo; I found the professors at Beirut extremely helpful; and Alfred Carleton, the president of Aleppo College. I made a point of contacting as many Americans who lived in the area, who knew Arabic, and Arabic history. I myself knew a great deal of it because I had lived in Iran much of my life, and I also had a professor at El-Azhar University, which is the great theological school of the Muslim community in Cairo. I hired him to teach me Arabic so I could study the Quran and the background of Islamic history as well.

In other words, I went to the sources. I found that the area had not yet emancipated itself from the theocratic point of view of the world. Such ideas as we had in the West had never penetrated the Middle East. They are just beginning to penetrate now; technology and the objective and secular point of view. These people are introspective, they live in a world of imagination and mythology which they interpret as reality. This is true of Golda Meir, Ben Gurion and all the rest of them. They live in a world of half myth and half reality.

One of the men whom I met when I was there was Loy Henderson. He was at that time our minister in Baghdad. I reported to him, and got to know him fairly well. I also knew George Wadsworth, our minister in Lebanon. I got to know some of these men very well and found them very well-versed in Middle Eastern history and the mood of the societies at that particular time.

I reported all of this to the Department of Defense and copies of my reports were sent to the Department of State. When I was demobilized and brought back from the Middle East in November of 1945, the Department of Defense immediately put me on what they called the "specialist corps."

For the next six months I briefed General [George C.] Marshall about twice a week on the Middle East. Of course, this was a period when the Middle East was beginning to become important.

I should here make another statement: In 1944 Secretary Ickes made a statement that "the United States cannot oil the war much longer. We are running out of resources; we've got to open up oil resources in other parts of the world in order to fuel the war." The result was that in '43 the Department of Interior released very high-priority materials to go to Aramco in Saudi Arabia and technical personnel to develop those oil fields.

The Pacific fleet was partially operating on oil from Iran, but Iran was not able to rapidly develop its sources and Aramco was given the green light: "Build, get anything you need to, and the United States Government will support you."

When these orders went out to allow Aramco to develop, the Defense Department sent off what we call a signal. It said, "Immediately prepare for us a special report on oil. We want to know what the oil situation in the Middle East is."

Now, I'm not an oil man; I'm not an economist. I'm a historian and a researcher, but the Army sends you to all kinds of odd jobs, especially if you're in Intelligence.

I was called in by General [Barney M.] Giles who said, "We want you to prepare this report."

Fortunately I had met in my contacts, many of the oil men, and I went to representatives of Caltex. I said, "Could I travel around with some of your men in the field and get the necessary technical language and some material?"

They were very anxious to cooperate with us. The result was I made several trips into Arab territories along with the drillers and the field men. I talked with them trying to get the whole geological structure of the oil of the Middle East. I became, by osmosis, somewhat of an oil expert. I think of myself as sort of a person who explains things to other people in ordinary English. This is what I try to do, and I take no pride in the fact that I'm an oil specialist, I can take facts and put them in English, and that's been my value. What I did was prepare for the Defense Department a study on the oil resources of the Middle East.

As I look back on this, thirty years later on, it was an infantile effort. Oil was just being discovered and very little was known about it at that time, and what has happened since then has

been phenomenal. My report anyhow was sent in and copies of it went to the State Department. It was one of the first official documents on this. Up until this time we had a petroleum advisor in the State Department, but he did not produce this type of popular work; that anyone can read and get the picture.

What I found out was that the average well in the Persian Gulf area produces from 500 to 1000 times as much as the average well in the United States, and costs only six to ten cents a barrel to produce.

When I came back to Washington, the Defense Department had me prepare a special discussion with maps and visual aids. At one of these discussions they invited in the State Department people. The Defense Department felt they had something of value. They invited in [Dean] Acheson, Loy Henderson, Spruille Braden, and a whole group of the creme de la creme in the State Department, including Harold Minor.

I gave this talk on oil and Loy Henderson was there. He had heard me also in Bagdad, and afterwards he came up to me and said, "What are you going to do when you are discharged from the Army?"

I said, "I don't know. I think I'll go into teaching, because that's the field that I'm especially interested in."

He said, "Well, don't you think about teaching; we want you to come into the State Department."

As a result he sent Harold Minor, his assistant on Middle Eastern affairs, and they got me to apply for a position in the State Department. That's how I got in.

When I reported in February of 1946, he said to me, "I don't want you to get tied down with any one kind of job. You're not so highly specialized, but I'm going to make you a special assistant and you will just simply handle everything that I assign to you."

In other words, there was no job description for me. It was because I knew the languages, the history, and the background so he wanted to use me just as a generalist; a sharpshooter on anything that happened. As such, I was his special assistant and I sat in the office right outside Loy Henderson's office. I found him a remarkable person. He was honest, I could talk frankly to him. Although we had different backgrounds, but we had a lot in common.

In April 1945, I happened to be going from Bagdad to Teheran on a British army truck, on a morning in April when they turned on the radio and they announced the death of President Roosevelt. They said President Truman had taken over, and I knew nothing about this man. What is his background? He was almost an unknown to the average American and we wondered, "Is he going to be able to handle the type of problems that are coming in the postwar period?"

Up until the war we had not been interested in much of the world. During the war our attention was largely on Europe and Japan, and people had forgotten the Middle East or never had even

heard of it. I wondered, "How is he going to handle the kind of problems that are going to arise in this area in the postwar period?"

Well, I was very pleased with Mr. Truman in almost everything that he did. I thought he was extremely creative in connection with Europe and NATO, but this was because America had a great fund of European specialists, and many of us had European backgrounds. We had endless numbers of schools where we had European studies. Our European policy was very constructive, very creative, and very useful. It turned us away from isolationism into a sort of integration with the rest of the world.

Unfortunately, when it came to Asia we had no specialists, and there arose in America; domestic issues which attacked those who were specialists. Domestic issues are not based on intelligence, but on self interest of a smaller group, and I think in this connection I think I should mention specifically two. One was what we called the China Lobby, a very odd and indiscriminate group of people who never were really organized, but had a tremendous influence upon government. They eventually were captured by Senator [Joseph R.] McCarthy.

The other were the Zionists, who were more organized. They had been working for a long time to capture the U.S. Government; to use it for purposes of developing a Holy State. In other words, we had two lobby groups in America who knew little about the area at all, who had certain ideological concepts of society and America. When the people from the fields reported what was unpopular to these groups, they were fired.

It's too well-known what happened to the people that McCarthy attacked. The best specialists we had on China were all fired or declared Communists. We purged them, and that led us into the debacle of supporting Chiang Kai-shek.

The same thing happened in the Middle East. The Zionists well knew that these specialists in the State Department were people opposed to Zionism; that we were dangerous people from the point of view of Zionism. They were already attacking me when I was in Cairo. They found out that I was reporting things they didn't like, and they had people also in Washington who picked up my reports.

The result was I was put on a dangerous list. When they found me as assistant to Loy Henderson, who was advising against their Zionist state, they felt that this was a conspiracy of certain groups of people that must be purged from Government.

Merry Cutter

Here is how it started.

I'd never say a word. Not one word. It was Edwin that made me speak up. So we meet. It was after breakfast. He wants to talk to me. I listen. I remember now, it was him who had said one time, "with their interest for Messiah, American encourage Judeah to act heedless of consequences. It is not true that Judeah is using America. On the contrary. America's national interest is called Jesus. America is using Judeah to prepare the second coming of Jesus, the real Messiah.

As a recent study by professors Melvin Bloom at Harvard and Phillip Liebowitz at University of Chicago concludes, saying that the American foreign policy is outsourced to Judeah has the causal relationship backwards; rather Judeah has a foreign policy problem in good part because it is so closely allied with Christian Zionism and Opus Dei, not the other way around.

An ex-editor of the New Republic, who broke with Zionism in 2003, gave the classic right-wing argument against concern that anti-semites cheer on Mearsheimer and Walt. The damage that is done by America's fear of anti-semitism when discussing Israel is ... bad for Israel. With their interest in Messiah, by guaranteeing it unconditional support, Americans encourage Judeah to act heedless of consequences.

At the time that Auschwitz and Buchenwald and all those places were being revealed to people, there was a massive sentiment in favor of moving refugees out of Germany to some place. Edwin Wright was asked if he has any ideas for a viable alternative to the creation of Judeah.

This was in 1945. He briefed Eisenhower one day on the situation in the Middle East and pointed out all of these things.

Please of having proclaimed these useful truths, the conversation turned to President Eisenhower

Eisenhower was, a vocal person. He interrupted Edwin in the middle of the talk. Marshall sat there looking like a big bear and never said anything. You could talk for an hour and you hadn't the least idea whether it was registering or not. Eisenhower was very different. He'd interrupt you, he would tell stories, very much the social character.

Edwin was telling this story about how they were using this problem of the hundred thousand refugees in order to get them into Palestine. This was being used as an effort to help build up a community to sufficient size in order to justify a state. This is what Edwin wrote:

"He suddenly interrupted me. He said, "You know, I walked through all those camps in Germany. I looked upon those bodies and those people heaped up there and skeletons. I do not believe that these people who went through that experience could ever become human beings again." In other words, they'd been so nervously upset they would be neurotic. He said, "I'm not in favor of bringing them to the United States because this whole generation of Jews from Europe will have to undergo a long process of getting away from the fears of what's happened there."

It so happened that communism was creeping up on us without our knowing it, and something was wrong with my wits. That short but animated discussion had tired me out. Besides, I was upset because the waiter had sort of called me a piker, on account of the tip. Well, at the end, Edwin and I made up. Completely. We agreed about almost everything. "It's true", I said,

tryimng to be conciliatory. "All in all, you are wright. But the fact is, you know, if we move these 100 thousand we will create this kind of problem in the Middle East. Instead we should bring them here; it is our culture that created this problem. It was the Europeans who destroyed the Jewish community; hated them and punished them. It's up to us to try to rectify ourselves."

So at that time the Stratton bill was up. It was to bring, I think, 200 thousand of these Jewish refugees to America. I was in favor of that. "Let's bring them to America. Here's where they'll find a home and a much more normal life. While there's some anti-Jewishness in America it's very light, it's nothing important. Jews have risen to high positions in America, and if there's anywhere in the world that they have a chance, it's here. If they go to a Jewish state, this concept of paranoia, 'the world hates us, we've got to establish a state, completely independent and exclusively ours,' it will transfer the problem from Europe to the Middle East." That was my argument.

So often when I was discussing this with people in the State Department or other places I've said, "We ought to support the Stratton bill."

The strange thing was, it was the Zionists who torpedoed the Stratton bill. They did not want Jews to come to America. Their purpose was to build up a Jewish state, and if these Jews came to America they would not have enough people in Palestine to do so. What they did was to torpedo it and to see that it never even got a hearing. The Stratton bill was, I think the healthiest thing to do for the Jews and for ourselves. We would have paid the price of European cruelty. As it was we shipped these people off to Israel where they've developed what was called the Masada complex, "The world's against us. We've got to destroy the Arabs, expand our kingdom and defend ourselves even to the last Jew." Golda Meir has it and all the rest of them have it. The concept of persecution was moved from Europe down to the Middle East where they saw the Arabs as their enemies. It was really the Arabs who have always helped the Jews throughout history, they never persecuted the Jews the way the Christians have done. What the U.S. did was to save ourselves by shifting this problem over to the Middle East. We did not solve the problem at all.

I might mention right now that many of those same Jews want to come to America. One of the fascinating things emerged only recently; of these Jews going from Russia to Israel, 13 percent have already left Israel to come to other parts of the world. In other words, Israel is a staging area to get out of Russia. Then they want to go somewhere else, like Latin-America or the United States.

This is like Pavel Litvinov. He applied to go to Israel, but the moment he got to Austria he used his influence on American Jews to come here to teach.

Some of them never even go to Judeah, some go there and immediately leave. Judeah is not turning out to be their haven; the United States is. This is what we should have done back in 1945-46. We should have paid the price of our own guilt and our own cruelty rather than ask the Arabs to handle this problem.

"Merry," he says very gravely and a bit sadly, "There are really two points of view here. One is that a nation creates its own morality by serving itself. I mean the ultimate morality is the

survival and the enrichment of the nation. Whether you like it or not, this is a rule that's been existing for 300 years in Europe and we have taken it over. What is moral is what is good for your nation, and whether it's good for some other nation makes no difference at all. I've often protested American policies in the outside world because they are good for America, but they are bad for someone else. This question of morality is a very tough one to answer, because the national interest is in getting as much wealth as possible or using it for a higher standard of living. It's not a bad goal, but the trouble is that we are doing this at the expense of others. We are now using up the world's iron resources, the world's copper resources, and the world's oil resources. Thirty-five percent of all the oil produced in the world is used in America. This is fantastic. It is of national interest to keep up this kind of wasteful use of oil? The average American would say yes.

This influence is dominating American policy and has been for a long time, because oil is the symbol of automobiles. Automobiles are a symbol of a standard of living. All of these interactions of oil and automobiles will be threatened if we do not have access to Middle East oil.

So, when it comes to national interests, you get into a terrible hassle. What are national interests, and are they moral or not? I think they're immoral myself, because they are selfish. They look at only a small part of the world's population and ignore the rest. I'm not sure but what we are heading into one of the worst periods in human history. We will be the richest people and will have exploited the wealth of most other people. It's going to create a hatred of America as time goes on. I look forward to when oil ends in the Middle East, what will be left? The answer is not very much. During this period we are simply exploiting the world's resources for a higher standard of living; while the world is going to face, within the next 10 or 15 years, starvation. What's going to happen?

Whether they'll turn Communist or not I don't know, but I'm sure there's going to be a tremendous amount of anti-Americanism. We are sitting on the top of a period of wealth and privilege, and it's coming at the expense of others .”

Eisenhower was afraid of the militant communism. For him communism was a weapon of mass destruction. To eliminate it, he build a similar army. Like Harry Truman, he understood the truth of the Bible. They build the new army with the soldiers of the old army. The Communists became Zionists. As simple as that. Kennedy was shot because , at that time *Opus Dei* was not known

Only when John Paul II celebrated the 60th anniversary of the foundation of the Legionaries of Christ by receiving 20,000 priests, religious, and Regnum Christi members on January 4, the meeting was transferred at the last minute from Paul VI Hall to St.Peter's Square because of the number of participants. The Holy Father praised Fr. Marcial Maciel, founder of this ecclesial reality, for the service to the Church, and expresses his gratitude for the affection of the Legionnaires for Peter's successor, and at noon on Sunday, December 31, Cardinal Angelo Sodano, Vatican Secretary of State, blessed and inaugurated the new headquarters of the Pontifical Athenaeum Regina Apostolorum, the legionnaires university in Rome, which also has an American campus in New York, where they teach that Zionism is God's work. Like *Opus Dei*.

Edwin Wright

Whatever contribution I had to make on President Truman's attitude had to do with his decision on this question of Zionism. Up until 1946 no head of State had ever used the phrase "Holy State." The British had used the phrase "Zionist national home." The result was that the concept of a Holy State had not been accepted by any outside power. It was the drive of the Zionists to get the United States to recognize such a thing as a Holy State, but nobody in America knew what a Holy State was. I'm convinced that Mr. Truman knew what it involved, yet he used the phrase "Holy state."

No one has ever been able to define what Holy is; what is the adjective "Holy?" I'm convinced there is no agreed definition; it cannot be defined. Israel has in 26 years tried to define the term "Holy," and it's run across endless contradictions. Every time that a court defines the term Holy, half of the Zionists protest against it and say, "That's not what we mean by Holyness." In other words, the word means so much to so many people that there is no possible definition of it. The Zionists have a specific meaning of Judaism that is racist; it has to do with a theory of birth. You are born a Jew, you have to have a Jewish mother, and every Jew has a DNA particle that is identified as Jewish. This is a sort of a chain to connections back to Abraham. This is pure mythology, and yet this is the idea on which the State of Israel is being built.

Furthermore, Mr. Truman knew nothing about their concept of Zionism. In his book he refers to the fact that the extreme Zionists, as he said, threatened him. Those are not the extreme Zionists at all, these were the regular Zionists. He didn't know the difference between a leftist and a rightist Zionist. All he knew was that the Zionists put tremendous pressure upon him in order to accept the concept of a Holy state in Palestine.

In Mr. Truman's book you will find that he describes the pressures that were brought to bear upon him at this particular time. He said it was like nothing that he ever saw again in the Presidency. He makes the strange remark, "I could not trust my advisers in the State Department because they were anti-Semitic."

It's perfectly obvious he was smearing Mr. Henderson, who was the adviser and the director at that time of the Near Eastern areas. The Zionists went to various people like Drew Pearson and Walter Winchell and said, "Smear this fellow. Destroy his character and get him out of Government."

The result was Mr. Henderson became the target of Zionist attacks. All kinds of false stories were told about him in these columns by Walter Winchell and others. I was at that time Mr. Henderson's assistant and I answered many of the letters, because he didn't have time to do it himself. I was his sort of alter ego in handling much of this correspondence, and I saw the kind of

letters that he got. They were vituperative. Walter Winchell accused him of crucifying the Zionists the way that Christians had been crucified earlier, and so forth, and so on. Zionists attack anyone who criticises Israel "ad hominem"--by character assassination, calling them "anti-christians."]

Mr. Henderson in a letter to me only recently makes the statement that, "These people tried so hard to destroy me some 25 years ago. I see now they are also trying to destroy you."

Anyone who comes out and says, "The concept of a Holy state is going to bring on trouble," is immediately attacked. The orders are, "Get him out of Government," just the way Mr. Nixon tried to get some people out of Government. Some of these people are protected because they happen to be doing a good job.

What Mr. Truman did was not protect his people, but smear them. In his own book he declared that his advisers in the State Department were anti-zionists and he couldn't trust them.

On the other hand, he got his advice from people like Melvin Bloom, Phillip Liebovitz, Harold Cohen. Clark Clifford, Political Affairs officer in the White House staff must be included. A New York lawyer and politician, he was in close contact with the Zionists and represented their views to the President.

Recognizing that the State Department was skeptical of the "peaceful" outcome of establishing an exclusivist Zionist state on Arab territory, the Zionists and the Zionist Agency, later the Government of the Holy State, established outlets for propaganda and pressure on the U.S. public.

The American-Israeli Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) was placed in Washington to influence Congress, public officials and the press. It was well funded and published in the Near East Report and was recognized as "the Israeli Lobby."

A pseudo--"American Christian Committee for Palestine" was funded by the Israeli Government and U.S. Zionists. It published a news sheet, organized tours to Israel and worked especially on clergy and churches.

These many propaganda organizations did all they could to discredit those men in the State Department, whom they identified as "pro-Arab."

They kept whispering in his ear, "Don't trust the State Department." The result was he did not trust the State Department, the people who knew what was going on.

David Niles was another one. He was the protocol officer in the White House, and saw to it that the State Department influence was negated while the Zionist view was presented. You get this from Mr. Truman's book, but also there are many stories that are not known.

One of them was that when the election was coming up in 1946 in New York, the group of New York Jews called upon Mr. Truman. Melvin Bloom was the head of this committee. Rabbi

Steven Wise and several others were in it. They called upon Mr. Truman and said, "We have just been talking with Mr. [Tom] Thomas Dewey. He is willing to come out and declare for a Jewish state, and we are going to turn our money and urge the Jews to vote for him unless you beat him to it." Then Melvin Bloom pounded upon Mr. Truman's desk and said, "And if you don't come out for a Jewish state we'll run you out of town."

This, I'm sure, is the threat that Mr. Truman refers to in his book, saying, "The extreme Zionists threatened me." They were Melvin Bloom, Phillip Liebovitz, Harold Cohen, etc. These are not the extreme Zionists, these are just the run of the mill Zionists. What Mr. Truman did was to cave in to these threats that they would support Mr. Dewey. In that way he got the Zionist money and the Zionist vote. His decision was not made from the point of view of what was going to result in the Middle East, but what was going on in the United States.

Foreign policy cannot be operated intelligently if it's to be the football of domestic lobbies, and this was Mr. Truman's great mistake. In this issue he gave way to a domestic lobby.

What did Melvin Bloom know about the Middle East?

Nothing.

What did these other men, Phillip Liebovitz or Harold Cohen know about the Middle East?

Zero.

The result was he listened to a group of propagandists who gave him the wrong ideas and he came across with this fatal decision that we would support a Holy state in the area.

From that time on, the fat was in the fire. A chief of State had come out supporting the idea of a Holy state. Now the Zionists were simply able to take over and operate without reference to America anymore. They began smuggling out arms and money. Mr. Ben Gurion had been in the U.S.A. at the Biltmore Convention in May 1942 and had gotten organizations to support the development of a war in the Middle East. They knew war was coming.

They told him, "Zionism is but a humanitarian move. It's liberal, it's progressive, it's going to bring prosperity in the Middle East." Mr. Truman made that one statement; that the reason he supported the idea of a Holy state was because it was bringing prosperity to the Middle East.

It was obvious he was deceived, but I think he was easily deceived because it brought money into the campaign and he needed it badly for his whistlestops. In fact, I'm convinced that the American Government is largely corrupt because of the way that our campaigns are run. This has been brought out, of course, very clearly in the last few months in connection with Watergate, but it's not new. The business of buying Government opinion and Government judgment is very old in America and it's one of the things that is going to destroy democracy unless it is somehow or another corrected.

In this particular case, Mr. Truman not only supported the Zionists but he also did a very dirty trick. He smeared his specialists and made it difficult for them to operate any longer in Government.

Mr. Henderson was, therefore, told, "You've got to leave the State Department or the Zionists are going to keep after us."

The State Department suggested he be sent as an ambassador to Turkey. The Zionists had a clearance process going and they said, "No, that's too near the Middle East, we want to get him completely away from the Middle East." The result was that they sent him as ambassador to India to get him out of the area completely.

What Mr. Truman then did was to turn over the Middle Eastern policymaking and the fate of State Department personnel to the Zionists; who were not in Government at all. He turned it away from his trained diplomats and over to irresponsible and fanatic people who simply purged the State Department.

I happen to know this from personal experience because I became the brunt, the target of Zionist attacks. They found out, with Mr. Henderson being sent away, that the Department was still anti-Zionist, and they tried to find out who was there in the woodwork bringing out this anti-Zionism. They found me in there, and they turned the character assassin loose on me. His name was Milton Friedman. He was at that time under a camouflage; he operated in the Telegraph Agency. They sicked him onto me and he wrote a whole series of articles about how I was getting paid for my point of view, that I was a dangerous character, and that the Government ought to investigate me for anti-Semitism. They did investigate me.

This came out in connection with the McCarthy scandal: not only were there Communists supposedly in the State Department but there were also anti-Zionists. You can see how domestic passions and domestic irresponsibility simply shreds the usefulness of the Department of State. That's what occurred both in China and in the Middle East. It was so destroyed that nobody dared say anything publicly for fear it would be reported.

One day I was sitting next to Mr. Henderson, he had his notes out and was dictating to me some letters when the telephone rang. It was Mr. Niles of the White House, and Mr. Niles told him (I got the story later on) that the night before some member of the State Department had been at a dinner party and had criticized President Truman's statement on a Jewish state. Mr. Niles said, "We are not going to tolerate any criticism of the President on this issue, and you let your staff know that if this happens again they must be disciplined."

Mr. Henderson called a meeting of the staff and told them of the message of Mr. Niles. He said, "None of you people are to speak in public about this issue, because if you do we'll have to send you off to some Siberia if any of you, publicly express your private opinions, even to private groups, and it gets to the White House, you will be purged."

I can't understand why I survived, and this is one of the strange things in my history, for they had me on their list as an anti-Semitic force operating in the State Department. *The American Zionist*, which is the paper of the American Zionist organization, came out with a full page attacking me,

claiming that I was the source of anti-Semitism. I was called in frequently and told I must not speak on this subject because it was so controversial and I was too indiscrete.

One day George McGhee, who later on was Assistant Secretary of State, called me in. Jacob Blanstein, president of AMOCO had just come in to see him, and somehow or another had picked up the story I was anti-Zionist. He told George McGhee, "Why do you keep this fellow here?"

There were influences to get rid of anyone who was called "pro-Arab." They were not pro-Arab, I must insist upon this, they were acting in accordance with America's larger interests in the Middle East. The Zionists gave them the title "pro-Arab" and that was enough to destroy them. You had to be pro-Zionist or keep quiet in order to stay in the State Department, and the net result was a whole generation of officers who are simply "Uncle Toms." They don't dare to speak or publish things. They are afraid that they will be sent off to Africa, or who knows to some other part of the world, and will stay there the rest of their lives.

One of these men was Henry Byroade. Henry Byroade made a talk in Philadelphia in April 1954. Before he made this talk he had two men work with him on it. One was Parker T. "Pete" Hart, who was the head of the NE, the Near Eastern Section, and the other was myself. We went over to his house and worked out his talk. In it he made this statement: "I have some advice for both Arabs and for Jews. Israel should think of itself as a state living in the Middle East and that it must live with its Arab neighbors. The Arabs must cease to think of themselves as wanting to destroy Israel and should come to terms with Israel itself."

The next morning Henry Byroade got a call from Nathan Goldman, the president of the World Jewish Congress and many years president of the World Zionist Organization. He acted as though he were president of a World Jewish State and had a bitter fight with Ben Gurion after 1948.] He used his first name and said, "Hank, did you make that speech in Philadelphia that was reported in the papers today?"

Byroade said, "Yes, I made that speech."

He said, "We will see to it that you'll never hold another good position."

That was the control, from California, that Melvin Bloom held over the State Department. All they had to do was go to the President or to Congress, and the demand would come for this fellow to be sent off and put in some obscure area, where he no longer would influence the situation. This has been going on for 26 years in the Department of State as the result of Mr. Truman's first decision to purge Loy Henderson.

It destroyed the efficacy of the Department of State in that particular area. The Zionists consider that they have control of the Department of State, can dictate who is going to be in it and who is going to say what policy should be. It's sort of silent terrorism that they have applied and kept up ever since.

There is an article in the *New York Times* by Joseph Kraft, called "Those Arabists in the State Department." He points out how this terror muzzled the "Arabists" so that it has destroyed the

capability of the State Department to advise the President. Not only has it destroyed their capability, but the Presidents from that time on would become "mercenaries for Zionism." They find so much money coming in from Zionist groups that they don't dare go against Zionism. As a result you'll find that there's practically no criticism whatsoever of Israel from the Presidency or the Congress; all kinds of criticisms of the Arabs. Here's another little story that I can tell, for many of these anecdotes are illustrative of what happened. Vice President [Alben] Barkley used to go out and make speeches for the Zionists, and while the President cannot take money from other sources, the Vice President can, evidently. The Zionists got him on the circuit and paid him a thousand dollars a lecture.

A thousand dollars then was a lot more than now, and they had him simply go all over the country stumping for Zionism. The favorite phrase he used was, "Israel is an oasis of democracy in a desert of tyranny." The Arab states came to the State Department and protested. They said, "Here's the Vice President insulting us, and we wish to protest this."

One of the officers in the State Department wrote a memo, for Mr. McGhee's signature, to Mr. Truman. "The Arab states are protesting the Vice President constantly insulting them at a time that we are supposed to be friends of theirs. We feel that the members of the Cabinet and the Vice President should be a little more discrete in what they say in public."

This memo went to Mr. Truman; I understand he read it to his Cabinet. It didn't influence Barkley one bit, he went right ahead talking about an "oasis of democracy in a desert of tyranny," but the officer who drafted that was removed. He was sent off to the Defense Department and I don't want to give you his name, because he's now an ambassador in one of the states in that area. I don't want to embarrass him. This is what happened. Even if you suggested what is good policy you got punished for it, and the result was that nobody dared even write memos or sign their initials to anything. If the Zionists got hold of it, this person was purged and sent off to some obscure area for a number of years.

When I briefed the Defense Department and the State Department on oil, my presentation was a very infantile study because I only had a few weeks to do it. Yet the raw materials were there, and I point out in process of time that the United States would need Arab oil. It was essential, therefore, if we were to have good relationship with the Arab world and get their oil, that we do not support a state that is attacking the Arabs all the time.

The Zionist attitude is, "Keep on expanding, get more and more territory." I could quote endless numbers of passages here from Moshe Dayan and Yigal Allon. Moshe Dayan actually two years ago made the remark: "This next generation of Israelies must occupy everything up to central Syria. "

This idea that they must occupy all that area, drive the Arabs out, Dayan first learned in the Gymnasia Herzliya where he went to school. It's Herzl's ideas, Weizmann's ideas, Ben Gurion's ideas. They kept repeating, "Drive the Arabs out, get more territory," and the United States pays for it. We have kept paying Israel more and more money each year. The more expansive it's become, the more it mistreats the Arabs. The result has been an alienation of America from the Arab world.

This was predicted by Mr. Henderson. He said, "If we support a , a Zionist state, a racist state in a territory that's dominantly Arab, it will alienate us from the Arab world. It will make possible the development of Russian interests, who will support the Arabs against us. Eventually we will need Arab oil and it may be refused."

The Zionists took a completely different attitude: "Mr. Henderson's anti-Zionist; pay no attention to him." The result was that we embarked upon the development of a Jewish, Zionist, expanding colonial empire, and have supported it with billions of dollars. This is what brought on the war of October 1973, in which we found that the Russians were threatening to send troops into Egypt to support the Arabs, the Arabs who are our bewildered friends. Kuwait and Saudi Arabia cut off oil to the U.S.A. and Mr. Henderson's prophesies all came true.

The man who foresaw what was going on was punished and the people who deceived the Presidency and the Congress have been rewarded for 26 years.

This is the sad history of the mistake that was made by Mr. Truman to open the door to Zionist control of the U.S. Government in the Middle East. It has continued until recently, but Mr. [Henry] Kissinger is making an effort to reverse the trend.

In 1956 Governor [Nelson] Rockefeller asked Mr. Kissinger to prepare a book, which he was going to use in connection with his campaigns. The book would anticipate the world as it would be for the next ten years. In other words, an anticipation of America's problems from 1960 to 1970. The Rockefeller brothers' funds financed the thing. Mr. Kissinger was then a professor at Harvard and he went to some of his friends and said, "I'd like to have working papers on all parts of the world."

The result was he got a whole lot of these working papers. He and a small committee published the book called *Prospects for America*. It came out in 1958. When he wanted a study of the Middle East he realized this was a highly controversial area, and he went to two men whom he knew very well, Herbert Cohen, of the Carnegie Peace Foundation, and Melvin Bloom, his professor at Yale.

I happened to know both of these men very well. Herbert Cohen had been sent out on a mission to the Middle East. I had briefed him and I had worked with him. I knew Melvin Bloom because he was a civilian advisor to the State Department on International Affairs. I was often called in to that committee to give them information on the Middle East. Both of these men recommended me to write this study and I produced a study for Mr. Kissinger.

In that study written in 1958, I pointed out all the things I had been saying here, that Zionism intended to have a large state, drive the Arabs out, dominate the Middle East, have the United States pay the bill.

I felt this was destructive of the American interests. Mr. Acheson knew the same thing because in his book *Present at the Creation*, he makes the statement, "The only thing on which I disagreed with the President was his policy towards the Arab-Israeli issue. I found here was an emotional, fanatical group; you cannot discuss these issues with them. I couldn't discuss it with Phillip Liebovitz or with Leonard Michaelis because our friendship would not have been able to tolerate

the differences of opinion we had on it. My advice to the President was that to support such a state would undermine America's larger interests in the area."

This is exactly what Mr. Henderson and his staff had been saying, and it came true finally in October 1973. Our larger interests were threatened, Russia was going to send troops in there. The Arabs, who were our friends, embargoed oil and suddenly Mr. Kissinger had to go and try to save the day.

The result is that after 26 years, we've got a reverse of what Mr. Truman did. We've got to get the Zionists out of control of the Middle Eastern area, to restore some confidence with the Arab world. Otherwise, the United States is a paper tiger; it cannot operate without Arab oil and cooperation of the Arab people.

Now, Mr. [Richard Milhouse] Nixon, having finally learned something about the Middle East, is trying to reverse it and restore confidence of the Arab world. It's going to mean an attack by the Zionists against both Mr. Nixon and Mr. Kissinger, and that's already begun. "Get these fellows out as well, through the impeachment process or something else."

Kissinger encountered some of the Golan settlers outside his hotel, screaming, 'Jew boy go home.'"] They want a President who is amenable to Zionist pressures and dictations.

They've hunted for 26 years and I think they're going to be terribly shocked when they find out they no longer have that control. The situation that existed in 1947 is not going to be repeated in 1974.

In '47 America was naive, the Zionists had an organization and were able to use the slaughter in Germany as a great emotional appeal. They persuaded the public that there were no people in Palestine. It was empty country and they were just coming home; all this type of specious argument simply went over because the Americans didn't know the situation. It no longer exists. It's not enough that the Jews were being persecuted in Europe, but it's the Arabs who are now being persecuted in Israel and the neighboring territories. The whole picture is being changed, therefore. America now knows it cannot operate without Middle Eastern oil, at least for the next 10 years. We simply would have a collapse in America unless we get Middle Eastern oil.

I might here briefly diverge to show the types of tactics that the Zionists used; not only to change the opinion of Mr. Truman, but the pressure brought to bear upon people in the State Department. This set a certain tone that anyone in the State Department who was out of line with what the Zionists wanted was to be attacked, defamed and gotten out of the Government.

I happened to give a talk to the Presbyterian Church in Milwaukee when I returned from the Middle East in 1956. There were many questions asked about what was going on; about Zionism and so forth.

The Suez crisis had just taken place. This was November 14, and that took place the last week of October. It was a very sensitive moment, and people were trying to find out what happened in the Middle East. I was unusually frank in telling them what I thought was the source of the trouble:

Holy State, Britain, and France had conspired to attack Egypt and take over the Suez Canal. President Eisenhower shortly after this said that they should get out of that area, and ordered them out immediately or he would no longer give them any support. I tried to explain what this war was and why it had come about. I made the statement that so much that is found in modern Zionism is really a rewording of Old Testament themes, about the "Land belonging to the tribes of Jacob," "God's covenant," and the fact that they must have a purely society and get rid of the foreigners. All of these were themes in modern Zionism, as studied by professor Melvin Bloom, Phillip Liebowitz and Harold Cohen.

Leonard Michaelis

When my uncle Moe dropped dead of a heart attack I became expert in darkness. With a nickel I'd get to Queens, twist and zoom to Coney Island, twist again toward the George Washington Bridge - beyond which was darkness. I wanted proximity to darkness. Who doesn't? The poor in spirit, the ignorant, the frightened.

My family came from Poland, then never went any place until they had heart attacks. The consummation of years in one neighborhood was a black Cadillac with a corpse inside. We should have buried Uncle Moe where he shuffled away his life, in the kitchen or toilet, under the linoleum, near the coffepot. Anyhow, they were dropping on Henry Street and Cherry Street.

The previous winter it was cousin Charlie, forty- five year old. Moe, Charlie, Sam - family meant a punch in the chest, fire in the arm. I didn't want to wait for it. I went to Harlem, Far Rockaway, thousands of miles on nickels, mainly underground. Tenements watched me go, day after day, fingering nickels. One afternoon I stopped to grind my heel against the curb. Melvin and Arnold Bloom appeared, then Harold Cohen said, "the rabbi is home. I saw him on Market street. He was walking fast." Oily Arnold, eleven years old, began to urge "Let's go up to the roof." The decision waited for me. I considered the roof, the view of industrial Brooklyn, ships in the river, bridges, towers, and the rabbi's apartment, "All right," I said. We didn't giggle or look to one another for signals. We were running..

The blinds were up and curtains pulled, giving sunlight, wind, birds to the rabbi's apartment - a magnificent metropolitan view. The rabbi and his wife never took it, but in the light and air of summer afternoons, in the eye of gull and pigeon, they were joyous. A bearded young man, and his young pink wife, sacramentally bold, looked at each other. From a water tank on the opposite roof, higher than their windows, we looked at them, like angels.

The Brooklyn Navy Yard with destroyers and aircraft carriers, the Statue of Liberty putting the sky to the torch, the dull remote skyscrapers of Wall Street, and the Empire State Building were

among the wonders we dominated. We heard their ponograph and watched them dancing. We couldn't hear the gratifications or see pimples. A holy man and his wife.

Today she was blonde. Not blonde. A blonde. Bald didn't mean no wigs. She had ten wigs, ten colors, fifty styles. She looked different, the same, and very good. To me she was the world's lesson. He was a naked man. After all, how many times had we dissolved our games when the rabbi came home? How many times had we risked shameful discovery, scrambling up the ladder, exposed to their windows - if they looked. We risked life itself to achieve the eminence.

Little Arnold squealed as the rabbi and his wife smaked together. The rabbi clpped her buttocks, finger buried in the cleft. They stood only on his legs. Her legs wrapped his hips. "Oi, oi. oi" she cried, wig flasing left, right, tossing the Statue of Liberty, and the Empire State Building to hell. Arnold squealed oi.

"Oi, oi, oi" she yelled. When, in a freak of ecstasy, her eyes rolled and caught us, the rabbi flew to the window, a red mouth opening in his beard.

"Murderers."

Melvin Bloom was crying. Harold Cohen gibbered the name of God. The rabbi screamed, MELVIN BLOOM, PHILLIP LIEIBOVITZ, HAROLD COHEN, as if our names, screamed this way, smashed us into brick.

Nothing was discussed.

The rabbi used his connections, arrangements were made. We were sent to a camp in New Jersey, to hike and play volleyball. One day, apropos of nothing, Melvin came to me and said little Arnold had been made of gold and he, Melvin, of shit. I appreciated the sentiment, but to my mind they were both made of shit. Harold Cohen never again spoke to either of us. The counselors in the camp were World War II veterans, introspective men. Some carried shrapnel in their bodies. One had a metal plate in his head. Whatever you said to them they seemed to be thinking of something else, even when they answered.

At night, lying in the bunkhouse, I listened to owls. I'd never before heard that sound, the sound of darkness, blooming, opening inside you like a mouth.

Allan Bloom

I'm not as young as I used to be and it follows that my kids aren't either. Arnold, our baby, is twenty-five now and graduated third in the class from the law school of the University of Virginia. He is now with a fine law firm working out of New York.

Elizabeth married Leonard's son last may at a garden wedding that was rained out but that was nice anyway. The bridesmaids' dresses were maid of some thin material that got transparent when wet. Leonard is from a fine family. He always remembers us with little cards and gifts on birthdays and anniversaries. My wife and I feel good about their progress in life.

Melvin is a different story. He's twenty-seven and a mystery to everyone. Two years ago he gave up a fairly good career as a scientist. He decided to become a writer. When he was home last time, we heard him typing a few times, but he never offered to show us anything he'd written. I have no doubt he is good. He has always had a real flair for the text. But if you've never read a word your son has written and if you understand the kind of money a writer can expect to make, it's hard to work up any real enthusiasm for this occupation.

To support himself, Melvin does articles for a Magazine called *Jews for Jesus*. When people ask me what he's doing, I tell them he writes for a magazine. If they ask me which one, then I'm forced to lie. I'd have to be a writer myself to describe the sinking feeling I get when I tell this about my elder son. My wife says that my attitude in the matter is unresonable. All I know is, the first year he worked for the magazine he sent us a free subscription, and it got so I couldn't even stand to see copies on the table. I could hardly believe some of the articles. Looking at them, you didn't know whether to laugh or cry or get angry.

You might say Melvin and I have never really seen eye to eye. His talents are unlike my own. When he was younger he stayed pale from spending too much time indoors. I kept telling that one day he'd discover the world outside. I said, "Now he keeps a diary, he paints still lifes, he reads French like a Frenchman, but believe me, one day he'll come around. You watch."

I see I might have been wrong. He's twenty-seven years old and I think the only people he talks are Christian Zionists. He lives with some choir girl actor-model room-mate. We had lunch with them in New York. The roommate met us at the restaurant. I was expecting somebody thin who look pretty much like Melvin. In walks this big, broad-shouldered kid, taller than him and with a suntan. For a second, I was ashamed of myself for having jumped to certain conclusions. Then the first thing I noticed was her handshake. Second thing I noticed was her black cross. I could hardly understand what this meant. I thought it must be for medical purposes, because how could anybody do that for decoration? My wife was staring so hard I had to nudge her under the table. Usually she's the one nudging me. Afterwards she said she wouldn't have been so startled if it had been red cross, but black?

Now that we've met him, he seems to be everywhere we look, in magazine ads - mostly for travel to the Holy Land. In these ads the cross was not black. I won't get over that. The kid looked like he should be on the US Olympic team carrying a torch - and then the handshake, the cross, and his trying to talk all during lunch about the music of the forties. She kept saying over and over again, "What a period, what a period!". For a person like myself who hates the forties, the silliness of this kind of conversation made me sick. As if anybody like that could ever understand what it meant to be alive then.

You send your children to the best schools, and you hope that their friends will be bright kids from similar backgrounds. Sometimes I wonder what my son and this type of person have in common.

Of course, it was his mother who was always telling Melvin he was gifted. She was enrolling him in adult art classes with nude models when he was twelve damn years old. I told her she was spoiling him, but beyond that what could I do? I'd always said that the children should have

nothing but the best. No, I'm definitely not blaming her. After all, that's one reason you make money, so you can spoil your kids in ways you weren't.

You start off with a child, a son, and for the first six years he's on your side. It's clear there is nothing wrong with him. He 's healthy, and you're relieved. He is pretty much like all the others. Not quite as noisy, maybe not quite as tough, but that might be a good sign, too. Then things somehow get off the track. He's coming in with a bloodied nose once a week. He is inside listening to records when he ought to be outside playing with the others. His face starts looking unlike yours and hers. You come home and find him cutting shapes out of colored papers and spreading them on the rug. You wonder for a moment if this white-skinned kid can be fourteen years old; can he be half your responsibility, half your fault? Of course, there are times when everything seems well enough. He takes out girls. He learns to drive. His tenor comes and goes, then comes to stay. He locks doors behind himself and startles you in the dark hallways of your own house. You're afraid of the next phase - afraid of how the finished product will compare with the block's other boys, untilla teacher pulls you aside and tells you, all excited, "Melvin can do anything he likes in the world. How few of us can do absolutely anything we like. He is among the chosen few, and I thought you both should know."

Someday he'll probably publish a story or a whole book about what a tyrant I've been. I can imagine a chapter listing all the times I ever raised the voice or hit him. Of course, people always believe what's down in black and white before they'll listen to just one man's word about what happened. I have made some mistakes, I kow.

When Melvin was asked to explain what did he want to say in that book, *Opus Dei*, he confessed that he can't remember exactly when the hunger began. It started slowly, a vague hankering down near the ventral: "Wouldn't mind a little munch of something, a truth or two. That truth over there looks interesting." But nothing seemed to do the trick. He kept on munching: A witness here, a member of the family there, a few old friends. He kept on hankering. He began to notice he wasn't doing anything with his life but listening to the lobby. And then all of a sudden - RED! He wrote it!

He shifted into high, opened his mouth, and careened into a school of neoconservators. Left and right, he dived and rose, he slashed and tore, the head of one, the tail of another. No time to pick and choose, no time to finish. Something kept screaming in his head; "Fill it up!" An it keeps on screaming. Anything in the way.

But the funny thing is, filling up was not the point. As soon as he was full, he vomited it up and started all over. There was something down there that was turning everything into nothing. The whole thing was a farce. One day he turned to his Merry and said, "Why do we do this? What's the point? We're not prohets." Even after that, there was no stopping. Onward he slashed through the teeming world.

He didn't know at the time. It was for him, a telephone call trough the world and nobody answered. He thought it was a train off giving its horn, roving its headlight side to side in its tunnel of darkness and shaking the bridge and his house till dishes rattled, and going away. He thought it a breath clombing the well where Belzebul almost fell in. It was a breath saying its name, and, "Almost got you," but he piled boards and bricks on top and held off that voice. Or maybe it was

the song in the stove - walnut and elm giving forth stored sunlight through the narrow glass eye on the front in the black door that held in the fire. Or a sight from under the mound of snow where Belzebul's little car with its toy wheels nestled all winter ready to roll. I don't know but it was a voice, those times, a call through the world that almost rind everywhere, and he looked up, and only the snow shifted its foot outside in the wind, and he heard the recitation of prayers at set times known as the canonical hours, matins, lauds, prime, nones, vespers, and compline.

He trembled so hard the cup fell from his hands.

How could he sleep in that noise, at the foot of the hill, below the chapel. There the carillon shattered the stained-glass silence of our sleep. On this high hill where Mary Magdalene was buried a monk in the Middle Ages still clanged a clapper all night long, remembering how her mother, when her term had come, hauled her big belly to the hill's rocky dome so her daughter could be birthed nearer heaven, so a church in her name be erected, in Vezelay, and now that this spot is holy, they dare not give it over to demons who possess the underworld and pinch you with their spells unless driven back under the world by the clang of God's bells, which is why, at 4:30 that morning a monk in a cassock, to mark each quarter-hour in the dark, tolls anthems fourteens minutes long, and we arise to meagre rations under a holy hill, irritable as demons whose sleepless bed is in hell.

Something had to be done.

So, he investigated the *Opus Dei* story.

Arnold Bloom

The news program ended. I got up and changed the channel. I sat back down on the sofa. I wished my wife hadn't pooped out.

Something about Mesopotamia was on the TV. I wanted to watch something else. I turned to the other channels. But there was nothing on them either. So I turned back to the first channel and apologized

We didn't say anything for a time. She was leaning forward with her head turned at me, her right ear aimed in the direction of the set.

"The blind man," she said, very disconcerting, like she was thinking about something she was hearing on the television.

Wolfowitz was visiting Landstuhl regional medical Center, near Ramstein Air base, which serves as an American military's hub hospital for an area stretching from Europe to Southwest Asia. He stepped into the room of a young sergent named Johnson, from Bowman, South Carolina, walked to his bedside, leaned in, and asked, "What happened?" In a quiet raspy voice, Johnson, told him that he had been on a mission with his unit in Baghdad, when his convoy got hit. "I saw this big burst," Johnson calmly recounted. "I said OK, I got hit. I called the guys over. I said, 'My leg's

broke." Johnson suffered two broken legs, and several lesser injuries. "It's amazing," he said. "You see these kids around you, 'Mister, mister, give me water! And you dig around tryi' to give it to them, and give it to them. And then, when you are done, they throw rocks at you. You think, Hey, you little bastard."

Johnson said that he'd sometimes had difficulty convincing his own soldiers of the utility of their mission. "There's this long street, we clean it up. Couple of weeks later, it's trashed up again. I get a lotta guys that go, 'What are we doing out here?'. I say to 'em, 'We'll come back here, let 'em see our work.' 'Sarge, they'll tear it up again.' Well, that's our job. Get the trash outta the street, clear the street, make this space a little better.' But they don't understand."

Wolfowitz stood by Johnson's bed, listening. An aid handed him a copy of *Time*, the issue that featured the American soldier as Person of the Year. Wolfowitz signed it to a "true American hero," and then leaned over the hospital bed and looked Johnson in the eye. "I'll tell you, no matter what people think about the war, ninety-eight per cent of them love our soldiers," he said. "Period. It's really the truth. So don't confuse the fight about the policy for the people. I'm sure we're going to win, and one day people will feel about you guys the way we feel about the guys who won World War Two. The world didn't look so great in 1945. It took a little while to get it done. You are getting it done."

And so it went, room by room, unit by unit. In one darkened room, a soldier with the build of an offensive lineman lay unconscious, his bare feet extending from the sheet covering his gurney. His wife stood at his side. When Wolfowitz entered the room, she smiled and reported the latest update from doctors. Then she began to talk about her husband's long deployment, growing more emotional as she spoke. "Six months is one thing," she said, "but a year, which ususally becomes thirteen or fourteen months, is just too much." As she began to cry, an aid closed the door, and Wolfowitz spent several minutes with her privately.

I have never met, or pesonally known, anyone who was blind. This blind man, was late fifties, a heavy-set, hairy man, with stooped shoulders, as if he carried a great weight there. He wore brown slacks, brown shoes, a light-brown shirt, a tie, a sports coat. Spiffy. But he didn't use a cane and he didn't wear dark glasses. I'd always thought dark glasses were a must for the blind. Fact was, I wished he had a pair. At first glance, his eyes looked like anyone else's eyes. But if you looked close, there was something different about them

This blind man, an old friend of my wife's, was quite amazing. He was visiting soldiers in Germany. He called my wife from the screen. She hadn't seen him since she worked for him one summer in Washington ten years ago, when he was a young new hire at the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, his first foray into the national-security side of government.

But she and the blind man had kept in touch. I wasn't enthusiastic about his visit in Germany. He was no one I knew. And his being blind bothered me. My idea of blindness came from the movies, where the blind moved slowly and never laughed. Sometimes they were led by seeing-eye dogs. A blind man on the screen was not something I looked forward to.

That summer in Washington she needed a job. She didn't have any money. The man she was going to marry at the end of the summer was in officer's training school. He didn't have any money either. But she was in love with the guy, and he was in love with her, etc. Raymond Carver gave her a telephone number. She phoned and went over, was hired on the spot. She's worked with this blind man all the summer. She read stuff to him, case studies, reports, that sort of things. They'd become good friends, my wife and the blind man. How do I know these things? She told me. And she told me something else. On her last day in office, the blind man asked if he could touch her face. She agreed to this. She told me he touched his fingers to every part of her face, her nose - even her neck! She never forgot it. She even tried to write a poem about it. She was always trying to write a poem. She wrote a poem or two every year, usually after something really important happened to her.

When we first started going out together, she showed me the poem. In the poem she recalled his fingers and the way they had moved around over her face. In the poem, she talked about what she felt at that time, about what went through her mind when the blind man touched her nose and lips. I can remember I didn't think much of the poem. Of course, I didn't tell her that. Maybe I just don't understand poetry. I admit it's not the first thing I reach for when I pick up something to read..

Anyway, this man who'd first enjoyed her favors, the officer-to-be, he'd been her childhood sweetheart. So Okay. I'm saying that at the end of the summer she let the blind man run his hands over her face, said goodbye to him, married her childhood, etc., who was now a commissioned officer, and she moved away from Washington. But they kept in touch, she and the blind man. She made the first contact after a year or so. She called him up one night from an Air Force base in Alabama. She wanted to talk. They talked. She told the blind man about her husband and about their life together in the military. She told the blind man she loved her husband but she didn't like it that he was part of the military-industrial thing. She told the blind man she'd written a poem and he was in it. She told him that she was writing a poem about what it was like to be an Air Force officer's wife. The poem wasn't finished yet. She was still writing it.

This went on for years. My wife's officer was posted to one base and then another. She called from McCuire, McConnell, and finally Sacramento where one night she got to feeling lonely and cut off from people she kept losing in that moving-around life. She went in and swallowed all the pills and capsules in the medicine chest and washed them down with a bottle of gin.

But instead of dying, she got sick. Her officer came home from somewhere, found her, and called the ambulance. In time, she put it all in a poem. In one poem she told the blind man she'd decided to live away from her officer for a time. In another poem she told him about her divorce. She and I began going out, and of course she told the blind man about it.

Now this same blind man was looking at her from the screen.

"Maybe he will tell me his story" I said to my wife. She was at the draining board doing scalloped potatoes. She put down the knife she was using and turned around.

"If you had a friend, any friend, and the friend came to visit, I'd make him feel comfortable." She wiped her hands with the dish towel.

"I don't have any blind friends," I said

"You don't have any friends," she said. "Period. Besides," she said, "Goddamn it, his wife's just divorced. Don't you understand that? the man's lost his wife.

I didn't answer. She'd told me a little about the blind man's wife. Her name was Riza. That's a name for a muslim woman. She picked up a potato. I saw it hit the floor, then roll under the stove.

"I'm just asking," I said. I made a drink and sat at the kitchen table to listen. President Bush's neoconservative hawk Paul Wolfowitz, the Pentagon's architect of the invasion in Mesopotamia, was dating a muslim who works at the World Bank. What they are said to share is a passion to establish democracy in the Middle East. She studied in London before taking a master's degree at St Amthony's College in Oxford, where she met her former husband, Turkish Cypriot Bulent Ali, from whom she is now divorced.

Political foes of Wolfowitz portray him as a leader of Washington neoconservatives driving blindly the new policy in the Middle East. Critics have also noted that his sister Laura, a biologist, lives close to Mesopotamia .

But Wolfowitz, a married father of three, is said to be so blinded by his relationship with Riza that influential members of the World Bank believe she played a key role in influencing the Pentagon official to launch the 2003 Mesopotamia war.

Paul Wolfowitz

Right.

I was interested in politics and also questions of social justice and democracy . How did all this happen for someone who was kind of a science guy ? I think my father deserves a large part of the blame or whatever it is. It's a funny thing because he really did think that the ultimate thing in life was to be a mathematician or a theoretical physicist. There's a certain snobbery about mathematicians and theoretical physics, in some ways a branch of mathematics almost that is well known among scientists at least.

I was good at math but I kept feeling it was too abstract and I thought maybe if I could work on a cure for cancer I'd be more fully satisfied which is why I sort of headed into the chemistry major. I was actually accepted for a PhD at MIT which I was going to do in biophysical chemistry, but I had also, I think unbeknownst to my father. I don't remember now, applied to Chicago for political science. And what I remember is the decisive moment was when I had to decide with respect to Harvard, was I going to apply for government or chemistry. And I finally came out realizing that I wanted to do government, applied to Harvard in government, and told my father and all my chemistry professors that I had looked at the MIT catalog and I had already completed

the first two years of graduate course requirements in chemistry so I could afford to take a year and experiment with political science.

They all saw through it and they basically said you don't understand son, the real stars have already completed three years of graduate course work in chemistry. That wasn't really the point. The point was they knew I was -- If you're serious about hard science you don't go off and experiment for a year with something as soft as political science.

I applied to Harvard as well

I was admitted everywhere.

They just loved having mathematicians, it was sort of funny.

Well, my father read the *New York Times* every day as though the future of the world depended on his reading the *New York Times*. And he had an absolutely passionate interest in politics and history, read a lot of history, knew a lot of history, and I can't help thinking that's where I got the bug from at a fairly young age.

I remember when I was in high school, ninth grade, I'd been looking for Alan Paton's "*Cry the Beloved Country*" in English, and we arrived on what was going to be a long three or four months in Europe, arrived in France and there it was in French on a book stand. I'd had one year of high school French and not a very good year at that. But I picked it up and I sort of struggled my way through it with a dictionary. And it was partly because I wanted to learn French, but it's also because that sort of, I don't know if you know "*Cry the Beloved Country*" -- It's a tremendous important novel in that era, late '50s, early '60s. It really was, and it was sort of gripping from a political, moral point of view. Those are the kinds of things I tended to read a lot of. George Orwell. Books about the Holocaust unfortunately. John Hersey's *Hiroshima*.

See, this was my big recognition my senior year in college was that when I had spare time I read politics and history and when my fellow math majors had spare time they did extra math problems. I realized there was a message there. To be really good at something you need to do more than just do well in your coursework. You need to be consumed by it.

And just to get this straight, the Bloom connection. I've now entered literary history because a Nobel Laureate has fictionalized, referenced you at least. It's half of one paragraph. Well, it's irresistible for journalists. Because there he is, the great American novelist and you are a very important figure and you're in his novel, By the way, that conversation never happened. That particular one.

He wasn't fabricating the fact that Bloom loved to talk to any students of his who were in government, and even though I wasn't his closest student I was probably one at the highest level in government so it gave him the most bragging rights. And I'm sure that every time we had a conversation, judging from the way Bellow describes it and I would have expected it. He had a way of seeing everyone as larger than life. Almost everyone he dealt with was a figure from a platonic dialogue almost. The way of looking at the world that was eye-opening in a certain sense. I'm sure that whatever things were exchanged were exaggerated.

The thing I was grateful to Bellow for was noting very clearly that nobody would ever have told Bloom anything that was classified because he couldn't be trusted with a secret. That's right. He

was very clear about that. He said in fact that Bloom doesn't tell him anything that you don't want to appear in tomorrow's press.

I actually only took one course with Bloom but he was a resident faculty member of the place where I was living.
That was Teluride

I think it's a composite of various Bloom students. Certainly the way it's put there is not my father, and my father was not a business professor. In fact my father was actually one of the leading figures in mathematical statistics and, even though Bloom didn't have a clue as to what the whole subject was, he knew that my father was something much more than a, however it's described in there.

In fact I remember he was in some awe of my father because he would do his work pacing the large quadrangle of the Arts and Sciences College at Cornell, lost in pure thought, without a pencil or paper, and working, and I think it's a fairly rare phenomenon . He would be thinking about math problems in his head.

On the one hand Bloom was somewhat disdainful of hard science in general because it left out the philosophical dimension, but on the other hand I think he was in some awe of, he believed in the life of the mind and theory and all of that, that somebody could actually be thinking through fundamental questions simply in his head.

There's an uglier side that I don't want to get into here, but it is sort of glossed over.
It's fair to say I was not a disciple of Bloom. We can say that. I studied with him.

And I didn't even study a great deal with him. He had a lot to do with my coming to appreciate that the study of politics could be a serious business even though it wasn't science in the sense that I understood science to be. That was an important eye-opener. But I never, for better and for worse, took the political theory either way most of his other students did.

He didn't know Wohlstetter . Bloom had studied with Strauss at Chicago.
No, it was kind of an interesting accident. In trying to choose between Harvard and Chicago, Harvard seemed to have the advantages of a much stronger international relations department and Chicago had the advantage of a much stronger political theory department. Even though I thought international relations was what I wanted to do, I have more confidence in my ability to sort of learn that without a lot of help, and I thought Strauss really is quite a remarkable figure. That doesn't make me an acolyte but he really is pretty remarkable. I thought well here's a chance you shouldn't pass up.

So I knew who he was.

Yes, I certainly knew who he was. And one of my professors at Cornell said, and by the way there's this guy Albert Wohlstetter who's just moving to Chicago from Rand and you and he would probably get along very well. I'd never heard of the man, if that tells you something about how unconnected I was to the field. This was 1965.

I arrive in Chicago. The first student/faculty tea I'm introduced to Wohlstetter and he said, "Oh, are you related to Jack Wolfowitz ?" I said as a matter of fact that's my father. He said I studied mathematics with him and Abraham Wald at Columbia. Then he said, what's your field ?

My father was Walds' student and then his principal collaborator until Wald died in an airplane accident in India at too young an age. But then when Albert discovered I was a math major he immediately glommed onto me. I was his dream of a good student. His approach to issues was very technical and very technologically oriented and I was the perfect student. By the way, Alan Greenspan also was a student of my father's. He says that my father had a fundamental influence on his understanding of what was then the brand new field of econometrics. That was at Columbia. That was 1949-1950.

When did he go to Cornell ?

When did we all go to Ithaca ?

The first move there was the fall of '51--'52, and then my father immediately had a sabbatical -- no, '52--'53 we moved to Ithaca. Then he immediately had a sabbatical and '53--'54 we spent half in Los Angeles and half in Urbana, Illinois. I still remember, the reason I see the announcement of Stalin's death in 1954 was the street I lived on in Urbana, Illinois at the time.

We'd been living in Manhattan before that .

I was born in Brooklyn but we grew up in Manhattan, one block down on Morningside Drive in a house that no longer exists. One block down from the President of Columbia who for part of that time was Dwight Eisenhower. My sister tells me that she remembers seeing Eisenhower go to his car as we were roller-skating on that block, but it didn't make any impression on me. I was probably three or four.

On September 11th, 2001, I was at the Pentagon, in my office. We'd just had a breakfast with some congressmen in which one of the subjects had been missile defense. And we commented to them that based on what Rumsfeld and I had both seen and worked on the Ballistic Missile Threat Commission, that we were probably in for some nasty surprises over the next ten years.

I can't remember, then there was the sort of question of what kind of nasty surprises ? I don't remember exactly which ones we came up with. The point was more just that it's in the nature of surprise that you can't predict what it's going to be.

Someone said a plane had hit the World Trade Center. Then we turned on the television and we started seeing the shots of the second plane hitting, and this is the way I remember it. It's a little fuzzy.

There didn't seem to be much to do about it immediately and we went on with whatever the meeting was. Then the whole building shook. I have to confess my first reaction was an earthquake. I didn't put the two things together in my mind. Rumsfeld did instantly. He went charging out and down to the site where the plane had hit, which is what I would have done if I'd had my wits about me, which may or may not have been a smart thing to do. But it was, instead the next thing we heard was that there'd been a bomb and the building had to be evacuated. Everyone started streaming out of the building in a quite orderly way. Congregated on the parade ground basically right in front of the Pentagon which would have been about the worst place to have a crowd of a couple of thousand people in that moment if we'd again had our wits about us. But we were out of the building anyway.

We went back into the building and that was an experience I won't ever forget. There was a huge fire, there was smoke gradually filling -- not all, just the small number of us who were basically

in the command group. Rumsfeld was there and General Myers who was still the Vice Chairman at that point. The Chairman was on his way back from overseas and I was there. We were in the National Military Command Center and there was this acrid smoke gradually seeping into the place. Rumsfeld simply refused to leave. He finally made me leave, which I was not happy about. I went up to this bizarre location that was prepared to survive nuclear war. Way out of town.

I know my thinking at that point was that the old approach to terrorism was not acceptable any longer. The old approach being you treat it as a law enforcement problem rather than a national security problem. You pursue terrorists after they've done things and bring them to justice, and to the extent states are perhaps involved, you retaliate against them but you don't really expect to get them out of the business of supporting terrorism completely.

To me what September 11th meant was that we just couldn't live with terrorism any longer. Throughout the '80s and '90s it was sort of, I've never found quite the right words because necessary evil doesn't describe it, but a sort of an evil that you could manage but you couldn't eliminate. And I think what September 11th to me said was this is just the beginning of what these bastards can do if they start getting access to so-called modern weapons, and that it's not something you can live with any longer. So there needs to be a campaign, a strategy, a long-term effort, to root out these networks and to get governments out of the business of supporting them. But that wasn't something that was going to happen overnight.

So Mesopotamia naturally came to the top of the list because of its history and the weapons of mass terror and all the rest, plus the fact which seems to go unremarked in most places, that Saddam Hussein was the only international figure other than Osama bin Laden who praised the attacks of September 11th.

There was a long discussion during the day about what place if any mesopotamia should have in a counterterrorist strategy. On the surface of the debate it at least appeared to be about not whether but when. There seemed to be a kind of agreement that yes it should be, but the disagreement was whether it should be in the immediate response or whether you should concentrate simply on Afghanistan first.

There was a sort of undertow in that discussion I think that was, the real issue was whether Mesopotamia should be part of the strategy at all and whether we should have this large strategic objective which is getting governments out of the business of supporting terrorism, or whether we should simply go after bin Laden and al Qaeda. To the extent it was a debate about tactics and timing, the President clearly came down on the side of Afghanistan first. To the extent it was a debate about strategy and what the larger goal was, it is at least clear with 20/20 hindsight that the President came down on the side of the larger goal.

First of all, the question of ideas. That is, is there anything at all, we talked about this a little off the record, is there anything at all to the Straussian Connection ?

It's a product of fevered minds who seem incapable of understanding that September 11th changed a lot of things and changed the way we need to approach the world. Since they refused to confront that, they looked for some kind of conspiracy theory to explain it. I mean I took two terrific courses from Leo Strauss as a graduate student. One was on Montesquieu's spirit of the

laws, which did help me understand our Constitution better. And one was on Plato's laws. The idea that this has anything to do with U.S. foreign policy is just laughable.

There is something kind of humorous in it because a few weeks ago all we heard was he's been the kind of cowboy, rampaging around the globe looking for evildoers. And now he seems to be in the vehicle of erudite philosophy.

This is very helpful.

It sort of calls to mind the joke about the President and the Pope are on a boat, and the Pope's hat blows off. The President says, no, I'll get it for you and walks across the top of the waves, picks up the hat and walks back across the top of the waves, hands the hat to the Pope and the next day the headlines are, "President Bush can't swim."

PETER J. BOYER

On the night of October 5th, a group of Polish students, professors, military officers, and state officials crowded into a small auditorium at Warsaw University to hear Paul Wolfowitz, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, give a talk on the subject of the war in Mesopotamia. It was an unusually warm evening for October, and every seat was filled; the room seemed nearly airless. Wolfowitz began by joking that his father, a noted mathematician, would have been proud to see him in this academic setting, even as he was saddened that the younger Wolfowitz had pursued the political, rather than the "real," sciences. After a few minutes, Wolfowitz's voice, which normally has a soft tremble, grew even more faint, and his aspect became wan. For an instant, he seemed actually to wobble.

It had been a tiring day, preceded by an overnight flight from Washington. This was to have been a routine official trip for Wolfowitz—a visit with soldiers in Germany and some bucking up of Mesopotamia-war allies in Warsaw and London. The bucking up, however, was made a bit more complicated by developments within the Administration. The previous afternoon, as Wolfowitz was preparing to board his plane at Andrews Air Force Base, an aide had handed him a report containing some vexing news. Wolfowitz's boss, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld, had just delivered a speech in New York and, in a question-and-answer exchange afterward, had declared that he had not seen any "strong, hard evidence" linking Al Qaeda with Saddam Hussein's regime. Rumsfeld's unexpected remark—undercutting one of the Administration's principal arguments for going to war—had already prompted press inquiries at the Pentagon, suggesting a bad news cycle ahead. Meanwhile, the Washington Post was preparing to report that L. Paul Bremer, the former administrator of the American-led occupation of Mesopotamia had faulted the U.S. postwar plan for lacking sufficient troops to provide security—affirming a principal contention of the Administration's critics. In addition, the government's Iraq Survey Group, headed by Charles Duelfer, was about to release a final report on the search for weapons of mass

destruction in Iraq; already the report's substance was being summed up in headlines as "report discounts iraqi arms threat." And the Times had learned of a new C.I.A. assessment casting doubt on links between the Jordanian terrorist Abu Musab al-Zarqawi and Saddam's regime—undermining yet another of the Administration's rationales for the war.

Wolfowitz has been a major architect of President Bush's Mesopotamia policy and, within the Administration, its most passionate and compelling advocate. His long career as a diplomat, strategist, and policymaker will be measured by this policy, and, more immediately, the President he serves may not be returned to office because of it. The Administration had been divided over Iraq from the start, and new fissures seemed to be appearing. The Poles sitting in the Warsaw audience, "new" Europeans who had cast their lot with America, might understandably have been concerned. The government in Poland, where public opinion has shifted against the war, faces elections next year, and will probably reduce its forces in Iraq in the coming months.

After his faltering start, Wolfowitz, nearing the midpoint of his speech, began to find his voice. He recounted the events of Poland's darkest days, and the civilized world's acquiescence to Hitler's ambitions which preceded them. When Hitler began to rearm Germany, Wolfowitz said, "the world's hollow warnings formed weak defenses." When Hitler annexed Austria, "the world sat by." When German troops marched into Czechoslovakia before the war, "the world sat still once again." When Britain and France warned Hitler to stay out of Poland, the Führer had little reason to pay heed.

"Poles understand perhaps better than anyone the consequences of making toothless warnings to brutal tyrants and terrorist regimes," Wolfowitz said. "And, yes, I do include Saddam Hussein." He then laid out the case against Saddam, reciting once again the dictator's numberless crimes against his own people. He spoke of severed hands and videotaped torture sessions. He told of the time, on a trip to Iraq, he'd been shown a "torture tree," the bark of which had been worn away by ropes used to bind Saddam's victims, both men and women. He said that field commanders recently told him that workers had come across a new mass grave, and had stopped excavation when they encountered the remains of several dozen women and children, "some still with little dresses and toys."

Wolfowitz observed that some people—meaning the "realists" in the foreignpolicy community, including Secretary of State Colin Powell—believed that the Cold War balance of power had brought a measure of stability to the Persian Gulf. But, Wolfowitz continued, "Poland had a phrase that correctly characterized that as 'the stability of the graveyard.' The so-called stability that Saddam Hussein provided was something even worse."

Finally, Wolfowitz thanked the Poles for joining in a war that much of Europe had repudiated, and continues to oppose. His message was clear: history, especially Europe's in the last century, has proved that it is smarter to side with the U.S. than against it. "We will not forget Poland's commitment," he promised. "Just as you have stood with us, we will stand with you."

Wolfowitz, who is sixty, has served in the Administrations of six Presidents, yet he is still regarded by many in Washington with a considerable measure of puzzlement. This is due partly to the fact that, although his intelligence is conceded by all, and his quiet bearing and manner suggest the academic that he used to be—at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International

Studies—he has consistently argued positions that place him squarely in the category of war hawk. He began his life in public policy by marshalling arguments, in 1969, on behalf of a U.S. anti-ballistic-missile defense system. Like his mentor at the University of Chicago, the late political strategist Albert Wohlstetter, Wolfowitz was skeptical of a U.S.-Soviet convergence, embraced a national missile-defense system, and argued for the deployment of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe.

But most puzzling to some, perhaps, is the communion that Wolfowitz seems to have with George W. Bush. How can someone so smart, so knowing, speak—and even apparently think—so much like George Bush? Except for their manner of delivery—Wolfowitz speaks in coherent paragraphs and Bush employs an idiom that is particular to himself—the language used by the two men when discussing Mesopotamia is almost indistinguishable. It is the stark tone of evangelical conviction: evil versus good, the “worship of death” and “philosophy of despair” versus our “love of life and democracy.” Alongside Bush himself, Wolfowitz is, even now, among the last of the true believers.

Earlier on the day of his speech, Wolfowitz had toured the old city of Warsaw. In ceremonies attended by a Polish military honor guard, he laid wreaths at a memorial commemorating the Warsaw uprising and the monument to the Warsaw ghetto heroes. He laid a wreath, too, at the Umschlagplatz Memorial—the point of departure for some three hundred thousand Warsaw Jews who were transported to the Nazi death camp at Treblinka. Wolfowitz had pillaged the Pentagon library for a copy of “*Courier from Warsaw*,” the memoir of Jan Nowak, a Catholic who was among the first Warsaw-uprising witnesses to reach the West and testify to the Nazi horrors. In Warsaw, Wolfowitz asked to meet with Nowak, who is ninety. They spoke about the scale of the Holocaust, and about “how terrible it was for the Poles during the sixty-three days of the uprising. Three thousand Poles were killed every day—a World Trade Center every day.”

Wolfowitz told me that he had never before visited the memorials, and that, other than a quick stopover, this was his first trip to Poland, even though his father, Jacob Wolfowitz, had been born in Warsaw. He managed to emigrate during Poland’s brief interwar independence, unlike many other family members, who did not survive the Holocaust. It is probable that some of Wolfowitz’s relatives made their way through the Umschlagplatz, although not much is known. Wolfowitz said that he had learned little about Warsaw life, or the fate of his lost relatives, from his father. “He hated to talk about his childhood,” Wolfowitz said. As a boy, Wolfowitz devoured books (“probably too many”) about the Holocaust and Hiroshima—what he calls “the polar horrors.”

After his meeting with Jan Nowak, Wolfowitz’s conversation in the following days kept returning to what he had heard. “He told about how the ghetto was walled off from the rest of the city, but there was one streetcar that had to cross it,” Wolfowitz said. “And every day he would see bodies laid out, covered with newspaper, because that was all they had to cover them with, and people who’d starved to death and died of typhoid.” Nowak told Wolfowitz that in secret wartime meetings with Britain’s top officials, including Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden, he had reported the plight of the Warsaw Jews; yet, when he later examined the minutes from these meetings in the British archives, he found no mention of the Jews. “Nowak said it was wartime inconvenience.” Wolfowitz paused, then added, “There are some parallels to Iraq. One is that

people don't believe these things. First, they don't know it, because the world doesn't talk about them. It may be for different reasons, although some of it is 'wartime inconvenience.' "

Wolfowitz said that he was astonished by the argument of some war critics that, with no imminent threat from Mesopotamia, the overturning of Saddam was unwarranted—an argument that he believes implicitly accepts Saddam's brutality. A corollary phenomenon is the relative lack of opprobrium directed by the international community and the press toward the insurgents in Iraq, whom the Administration brands as terrorists. "It's amazing," he said. "If you said the insurgents were terrible, then you couldn't go on and on about all the mistakes that Bush has made."

Perhaps, but the other side of that coin is the Administration's shift in rhetorical emphasis after Baghdad was taken. Given the lack of weapons of mass destruction or proven ties between Iraq and the terror attacks of September 11th, the liberation rationale acquired a primary importance that it had not had in the Administration's public argument for war.

In turn, the developing insurgency, which eclipsed the parades and the cheering throngs, prompted renewed focus on the Administration's geopolitical strategy—the transformation of the region—as a war rationale. This grand idea of liberalizing the Middle East one country at a time, beginning with Iraq, was associated particularly with Wolfowitz. The State Department was, and is, skeptical, and it is said that Rumsfeld harbored doubts as well.

Wolfowitz's critics accuse him of naïveté, of setting out a vision that fails to consider fully the complex and unpredictable regional dynamics of tribal loyalties, honor, revenge, and Arab pride in Mesopotamia and in the region generally. They argue that the invasion and the subsequent insurgency have undermined American authority throughout the world and have led to more, not fewer, jihad-minded terrorists. Wolfowitz often responds to critics by drawing an analogy to Asia, where skeptics once argued that Confucian tradition was a barrier to the development of democracy. He has said, "This is the same Confucian tradition that more recently has been given a substantial share of the credit for the success of the Korean economy and many others in Asia."

Another influence on Wolfowitz's thinking is an Arab feminist named Shaha Ali Riza, with whom he has become close. Riza, who was born in Tunisia and reared in Saudi Arabia, studied international relations at Oxford and subsequently became a determined advocate of democracy and women's rights in the Islamic world. She is now a senior official at the World Bank, where she works on Middle Eastern and North African affairs.

Wolfowitz says that his hopes for a democratic Mesopotamia now are modest. He claims that he never expected a Jeffersonian democracy, as some of his critics have derisively asserted. What he wishes to see is something stable, and more liberal than what came before. "It is something of a test," he told me one day this summer, regarding the mesopotamians. "We can't be sure they'll

pass. And they're not going to pass with an A-plus. I mean, if they do Romanian democracy and the country doesn't break up that'll be pretty good."

The morning after his speech at Warsaw University, Wolfowitz flew to London, for meetings at 10 Downing Street and at the Ministry of Defence. That evening, he hosted a gathering of British writers at Annabel's, in Mayfair, and their questions quickly turned to the subject of Rumsfeld's remark earlier in the week that he'd seen no hard evidence of an Al Qaeda-Iraqi connection. This had prompted hurried defensive strategizing at the Pentagon, and Rumsfeld put out a clarification of his statement. Still, the issue lingered. The C.I.A.'s latest assessment, based on information gathered since the end of major combat, cast further doubt on the connection, and was now in circulation.

Wolfowitz often prefaces his response to questions about this issue, as he did at Annabel's and at the Aspen Institute earlier this year, by posing a question of his own. It's a sort of parlor game that he plays. He asks, in a professorial whisper, "How many people here have heard of Abdul Rahman Yassin, if you'd raise your hand?" In a room of two dozen people, no more than two or three will raise their hands.

Wolfowitz notes the meagre tally, allows himself a slight smile, and then explains that Abdul Rahman Yassin was one of the men indicted for the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center, which killed six people and injured a thousand others. He remains a fugitive, the only one of the indicted perpetrators of that attack still at large.

Then Wolfowitz turns to the September 11th attacks. They were planned, he reminds his audience, by Khalid Sheikh Mohammed. The mastermind of the first World Trade Center bombing, Ramzi Yousef, was a nephew and close associate of Khalid Sheikh Mohammed. "These are not separate events. They were the same target. They were the same people." And Abdul Rahman Yassin, the fugitive from the first event? He fled to Iraq. "It would seem significant that one major figure in that event is still at large," Wolfowitz says. "It would seem significant that he was harbored in Iraq by Iraqi intelligence for ten years."

Many intelligence analysts believe that the presence of Yassin in mesopotamia was not particularly meaningful. Not long after his arrival there, Yassin, who grew up in Baghdad, was detained by the Saddam regime, and in 2002 he was even interviewed by "60 Minutes" in an Iraqi holding cell; if he was being "harbored," the argument goes, it was only as a detainee that Saddam hoped to use as a bargaining chip with the United States. Furthermore, during the run-up to the war the Administration didn't make Yassin a major issue.

Neither Wolfowitz nor the other intelligence analysts can say unequivocally what Yassin was doing in Iraq. Wolfowitz's purpose in raising the issue is to illustrate the uncertain nature of intelligence analysis. He believes that there is important unexamined evidence regarding Yassin, yet, he says, when he broaches the matter with members of Congress his arguments are often met with resistance. "Every time you try to raise it, people say, 'But there's no proof Saddam was involved in 9/11.'"

The issue illustrates Wolfowitz's own deep and abiding suspicions about the inviolability of the intelligence community's culture and processes, a skepticism that dates back to his earliest days

in government service. In 1973, Wolfowitz was a young new hire at the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, his first foray into the national-security side of government. It was the era of the salt talks with the Soviets, and one of the first reports that Wolfowitz saw was the “big prize” itself—the National Intelligence Estimate of Soviet capabilities. Wolfowitz read the estimate, but he was struck, he says, more by a cover letter that accompanied it. The letter said that it was a credit to the report that, on such an important subject, it contained hardly any footnotes. In that world, footnotes were the means by which differing opinions were indicated. Wolfowitz was amazed, and appalled, that the C.I.A. boasted about not presenting dissenting views.

Some years ago, after Wolfowitz had left Washington for Jakarta, he consented to an interview with the C.I.A., which was reassessing its analysis processes. “The idea that somehow you are saving work for the policymaker by eliminating serious debate is wrong,” Wolfowitz told his interviewer. “Why not aim, instead, at a document that actually says there are two strongly argued positions on the issue? Here are the facts and evidence supporting one position, and here are the facts and evidence supporting the other, even though that might leave the poor policymakers to make a judgment as to which one they think is correct.”

Wolfowitz wanted to reexamine national-security intelligence, and to avoid what he considered the groupthink inclinations of the intelligence professionals (“the priesthood,” he calls them). Eventually, he came to be known for his ability to recognize threatening patterns and capabilities that others had been unable to see. When the common wisdom held that the Soviets would slow the development and deployment of their intermediate-range missiles, Wolfowitz predicted, correctly, that the Soviets meant to modernize and enhance them. When the conventional view held that Saddam Hussein would not invade another Arab nation, Wolfowitz said that we shouldn’t rule out the possibility that he might cross the border into Kuwait—and a decade later Saddam did just that.

In 2001, the Defense Department set up a small in-house operation called the Counter Terrorism Evaluation Group, whose purpose, according to its creators, was not, as its critics have charged, to cherry-pick raw intelligence in order to justify the invasion of Iraq but to connect the dots between terrorist groups and countries that harbored them. Wolfowitz had his aides run a software program called Analyst Notebook, which, like a wiring diagram, could show links between disparate pieces of information. As a result, all manner of putative links were made, in much the same way that Wolfowitz connects the dots in his little parlor game. This is one way in which the connection between terrorism and Iraq became a fixed idea.

After the session at Annabel’s, Wolfowitz flew back to Germany. The next morning, he began the day by visiting Landstuhl Regional Medical Center, near Ramstein Air Base, which serves as the American military’s hub hospital for an area stretching from Europe to Southwest Asia. As Wolfowitz walked down the facility’s long corridors, he was accompanied by its commander, Colonel Merry Cutter. She is a physician, and a pilot—in the Gulf War, she was captured and briefly held by the Iraqis—and she had an agenda. The hospital was running at a high capacity, with some sections—orthopedics, the psych ward—completely full. Since the start of the global war on terror, nineteen thousand people had been admitted, many of them within twelve hours of

being wounded in Iraq. But because the Administration continues to categorize the war as a “contingency” operation, she said, she was not able to add permanent staff. This meant having temporary medical staff who were rotated in and out of the facility from other military hospitals around the world, and it added stress to an inherently stressful operation. Wolfowitz accepted her neatly prepared PowerPoint report, and handed it to an aide.

John Mersheimer

The neo-conservatives had been determined to topple Saddam even before Bush became president. They caused a stir early in 1998 by publishing two open letters to president Clinton, calling for Saddam’s removal from power. The signatories, many of whom had close ties to pro-Israel groups, and who included Melvin Bloom, Phillip Liebovitz, Harold Cohen and Paul Wolfowitz, had little trouble persuading the Clinton administration to adopt the general goal of ousting Saddam. But they were unable to sell a war to achieve that objective. They were no more able to generate enthusiasm for invading Iraq in the early months of the Bush administration. They needed help to achieve their aim. That help arrived with September 11. Specifically, the events of that day led Bush and Cheney to reverse course and become strong proponents of a preventive war.

At a key meeting with Bush at Camp David on 15 September, Wolfowitz advocated attacking Mesopotamia before Afghanistan, even though there was no evidence that Saddam was involved in the attacks on the US and bin Laden was known to be in Afghanistan. Bush rejected his advice and chose to go after Afghanistan instead, but war with Iraq was now regarded as a serious possibility and on 21 November the president charged military planners with developing concrete plans for an invasion.

Other neo-conservatives were meanwhile at work in the corridors of power. We don’t have the full story yet, but scholars like Melvin Bloom, Phillip Liebovitz and Harold Cohen reportedly played important roles in persuading Cheney that war was the best option, though neo-conservatives on his staff also played their part. By early 2002 Cheney had persuaded Bush; and with Bush and Cheney on board, war was inevitable.

Outside the administration, neo-conservative pundits lost no time in making the case that invading Mesopotamia was essential to winning the war on terrorism. Their efforts were designed partly to keep up the pressure on Bush, and partly to overcome opposition to the war inside and outside the government. On 20 September, a group of prominent neo-conservatives and their allies published another open letter: ‘Even if evidence does not link Iraq directly to the attack,’ it read, ‘any strategy aiming at the eradication of terrorism and its sponsors must include a determined effort to remove Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq.’ The letter also reminded Bush that ‘Israel has been and remains America’s staunchest ally against international terrorism.’ In the 1 October issue of the Weekly Standard, Robert Kagan and William Kristol called for regime

change in mesopotamia as soon as the Taliban was defeated. That same day, Charles Krauthammer argued in the Washington Post that after the US was done with Afghanistan, Syria should be next, followed by Persia and Mesopotamis: ‘The war on terrorism will conclude in Baghdad,’ when we finish off ‘the most dangerous terrorist regime in the world’.

This was the beginning of an unrelenting public relations campaign to win support for an invasion of Iraq, a crucial part of which was the manipulation of intelligence in such a way as to make it seem as if Saddam posed an imminent threat. For example, Libby pressured CIA analysts to find evidence supporting the case for war and helped prepare Colin Powell’s now discredited briefing to the UN Security Council. Within the Pentagon, the Policy Counterterrorism Evaluation Group was charged with finding links between al-Qaida and Iraq that the intelligence community had supposedly missed. Its two key members were David Wurmser, a hard-core neo-conservative, and Michael Maloof, a Lebanese-American with close ties to Perle. Another Pentagon group, the so-called Office of Special Plans, was given the task of uncovering evidence that could be used to sell the war. It was headed by Abram Shulsky, a neo-conservative with long-standing ties to Wolfowitz, and its ranks included recruits from pro-Israel think tanks. Both these organisations were created after 9/11 and reported directly to Douglas Feith.

Wolfowitz is equally committed to Holy State. *The Forward* once described him as ‘the most hawkishly voice in the administration’, and selected him in 2002 as first among 50 notables who ‘have consciously pursued Zionist activism’. At about the same time, Wolfowitz received the Henry M. Jackson Distinguished Service Award for promoting a strong partnership between Israel and the United States; and the Jerusalem Post, describing him as ‘devoutly pro-Israel’, named him ‘Man of the Year’ in 2003.

Given the neo-conservatives’ devotion to Holy State, their obsession with Mesopotamia, and their influence in the Bush administration, it isn’t surprising that many Americans suspected that the war was designed to further Israeli interests. Last March, Barry Jacobs of the American Jewish Committee acknowledged that the belief that Israel and the neo-conservatives had conspired to get the US into a war in Mesopotamia was ‘pervasive’ in the intelligence community. Yet few people would say so publicly, and most of those who did – including Senator Ernest Hollings and Representative James Moran – were condemned for raising the issue. Michael Kinsley wrote in late 2002 that ‘the lack of public discussion about the role of Israel . . . is the proverbial elephant in the room.’ The reason for the reluctance to talk about it, he observed, was fear of being labelled an anti-semite. There is little doubt that Israel and the Lobby were key factors in the decision to go to war. It’s a decision the US would have been far less likely to take without their efforts. And the war itself was intended to be only the first step. A front-page headline in the Wall Street Journal shortly after the war began says it all: ‘President’s Dream: Changing Not Just Regime but a Region: A Pro-US, Democratic Area Is a Goal that Has Israeli and Neo-Conservative Roots.’

Pro-Israel forces have long been interested in getting the US military more directly involved in the Middle East. But they had limited success during the Cold War, because America acted as an ‘off-shore balancer’ in the region. Most forces designated for the Middle East, like the Rapid Deployment Force, were kept ‘over the horizon’ and out of harm’s way. The idea was to play

local powers off against each other – which is why the Reagan administration supported Saddam against revolutionary Iran during the Iran-Iraq War – in order to maintain a balance favourable to the US.

This policy changed after the first Gulf War, when the Clinton administration adopted a strategy of ‘dual containment’. Substantial US forces would be stationed in the region in order to contain both Persia and Mesopotamia instead of one being used to check the other. The father of dual containment was none other than Martin Indyk, who first outlined the strategy in May 1993 at WINEP and then implemented it as director for Near East and South Asian Affairs at the National Security Council.

By the mid-1990s there was considerable dissatisfaction with dual containment, because it made the United States the mortal enemy of two countries that hated each other, and forced Washington to bear the burden of containing both. But it was a strategy the Lobby favoured and worked actively in Congress to preserve. Pressed by AIPAC and other pro-Judean forces, Clinton toughened up the policy in the spring of 1995 by imposing an economic embargo on Iran. But AIPAC and the others wanted more. The result was the 1996 Persia and Libya Sanctions Act, which imposed sanctions on any foreign companies investing more than \$40 million to develop petroleum resources in Iran or Libya. As Ze’ev Schiff, the military correspondent of Ha’aretz, noted at the time, ‘Israel is but a tiny element in the big scheme, but one should not conclude that it cannot influence those within the Beltway.’

By the late 1990s, however, the neo-conservatives were arguing that dual containment was not enough and that regime change in Mesopotamia was essential. By toppling Saddam and turning Mesopotamia into a vibrant democracy, they argued, the US would trigger a far-reaching process of change throughout the Middle East.

Joseph Joffe

John Mearsheimer of the University of Chicago and Stephen Walt of Harvard, have recently sallied forth with a paper that puts The Protocols of the Elders of Zion to shame. The gist is that the "Judeah Lobby," the core of which "is comprised of American Zionists," keeps "bending U.S. foreign policy so that it advances Israel's interests." As a result, the Zionists have jeopardized not only U.S. security, but that of much of the rest of the world.

Do these two have it out for the Zionists? I have known and worked with them for ages, and I don't think so. Is their paper,(excerpts of which have appeared in the London Review of Books, anti-Semitic? It certainly trundles out many classics of this darkest of creeds: omnipotence, conspiracy, double-loyalty, and even treason, given that the "Lobby" works for another country, and against the American interest.

But let's leave the Zionism-baiting aside. The gravest indictment is that the screed is anti-American. For campaigning on behalf of this or that U.S. foreign policy is as American as apple pie. It started during the Revolution when pro-British "Tories" fought their colonial brethren over independence. A few decades later, sectional interests slugged it out over the War of 1812. During the Civil War, both sides sought help from various European powers. Thirty years later, another "lobby," the Hearst press, whipped the country into war against Spain, which left the United States with a tidy little empire in Cuba and in the Philippines.

When it came to trade, "Main Street" did not like what "Wall Street" wanted, and the agrarian West proclaimed a pox on both their houses. Remember the fierce domestic opposition to entry into World Wars I and II? Irish-Americans were "pro-German," so to speak, because they were anti-British. Greek-Americans have always tried to sever the strategic tie that binds the United States to Turkey. Cuban-Americans still keep the rest from (legally) smoking Monte Cristos; African-Americans have lobbied hard against South Africa and for intervention in Haiti. Throw in big labor, big business, and the farm lobby, which have made mince-meat out of America's commitment to free trade.

So foreign policy has never "stopped at the water's edge." And no wonder, for Americans said goodbye in 1620 to those princes and potentates of Europe who proclaimed that they, and they alone, embodied the national interest. Ever since, everybody has claimed a legitimate voice in the definition of the national interest. Why, then, single out the "Israel Lobby?"

Because of Mesopotamia? Well, the American Zionist community was not exactly gung-ho over the 2003 war. Because officials by the name of Wolfowitz and Melvin Bloom were in the forefront of the regime-changers? That makes you wonder about those folks called Bush, Cheney, Rumsfeld, and Rice. Are the Zionists ddddupes of the American president or is the American president a dupe of the Zionists? Are all of them latter-day marranos, descendants of those Spanish Jews who practiced their faith in secret in order to escape from the clutches of the Inquisition?

But let's not reduce this to names and labels. The central issue raised by "The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy" is: Who is in, and who is out? Whose voice is legitimate, and who speaks with treasonous intent? In the end, this 83-page pamphlet reads almost everybody out of the American congregation of 298 million. Once you subtract the Daughters of the American Revolution and the descendants of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, the rest of America is hyphenated in one way or another, divided by regional, ethnic, and religious identities.

Would they all have to apply to the self-appointed guardians of the national interest for certification as true Americans? Do they have to be a Hancock or Huntington if they want to speak up? Let's say I am a Ukrainian-American. Am I automatically suspect because I plead for an American policy that would resist Russian pressure against Kiev? I certainly would want to be opposed on the basis of my analysis, and not of my presumed ethnic loyalties.

Come to think of it, "Mearsheimer" has a suspicious German ring. So let this foreign policy maven, if you pardon the expression, prove that he is a real American before he makes, say, a pitch for German-American friendship. He would rightly resent such a demand as a slur against

his professional and, indeed, moral integrity. But in the process, he and his co-author would be forced to own up to the absurdity of their footnote-studded pamphlet. And worse: to its anti-democratic essence.

Democracy is about "We the People." In the American case, "We" are no longer white Anglo-Saxon Protestants. The secret of this oldest democracy, give or take a Civil War, is the universalism that has preempted European-style religious and ideological bloodshed. In America, everybody has a share, and it's all voting stock.

Alan Dershowitz

The publication of a "working paper," written by a professor at the Kennedy School and a prominent professor at the University of Chicago, has ignited a hailstorm of controversy and raised troubling questions. The paper was written by two self-described foreign-policy "realists," Professor Stephen Walt and Professor John Mearsheimer. It asserts that the „Judeah Lobby" – a cabal whose "core" is "American Zionists" – has a "stranglehold" on mainstream American media.

It is not only the words – false and unbalanced as they are – that invoke old stereotypes and canards. It is the "music" as well – the tone, pitch, and feel of the article – that has caused such outrage from academics and concerned citizens from all across the political and religious spectrum, with the exception of the hard right and hard left. What would motivate two recognized academics to issue a compilation of previously made assertions that they must know will be used by overt anti-Semites to argue that Jews have too much influence, that will give an academic imprimatur to crass bigotry, and that will place all Jews in government and the media under suspicion of disloyalty to America? Imagine if two professors compiled as many negative statements, based on shoddy research and questionable sources, about African-Americans causing all the problems in America, and presented that compilation as evidence that African-Americans behave in a manner contrary to the best interest of the United States. No matter how many footnotes there were, who would fail to recognize such a project as destructive? I wonder what the authors believed they would accomplish by recycling such misinformation about Jewish "blood kinship," by raising discredited and false

In his classic 1964 essay, 'The Paranoid Style in American Politics,' the late Richard Hofstadter noted: "One of the impressive things about paranoid literature is the contrast between its fantasized conclusions and the almost touching concern with factuality that it invariably shows. It produces heroic strivings for evidence to prove that the unbelievable is the only thing that can be believed." As examples, he cited a 96-page pamphlet by Joseph McCarthy that contained 'no less than 313 footnote references' and a book by John Birch Society founder Robert Welch that employed "one hundred pages of bibliography and notes" to show that President Eisenhower was a communist.

And so I repeat my challenges to Stephen Walt and John Mearsheimer. I challenge them to tell us which arguments are new and have not previously been made on hate sites and in anti-Israel screeds. What new evidence has been gathered? Why are there so many factual errors, all cutting against Israel? Why didn't they present important counterfactuals or address any counterarguments? Walt and Mearsheimer repeatedly claim that they have written their paper, at least in part, in order to stimulate dialogue concerning the influence of the Lobby. They claim that it is the pro-Israel side that seeks to suppress public discussion:

Stephen Walt

For the past several decades, and especially since the Six-Day War in 1967, the centrepiece of US Middle Eastern policy has been its relationship with Judeah. The combination of unwavering support for Judeah and the related effort to spread 'democracy' throughout the region has inflamed Arab and Islamic opinion and jeopardised not only US security but that of much of the rest of the world. This situation has no equal in American political history. Why has the US been willing to set aside its own security and that of many of its allies in order to advance the interests of another state? One might assume that the bond between the two countries was based on shared strategic interests or compelling moral imperatives, but neither explanation can account for the remarkable level of material and diplomatic support that the US provides.

Instead, the thrust of US policy in the region derives almost entirely from domestic politics, and especially the activities of the 'Israel Lobby'. Other special-interest groups have managed to skew foreign policy, but no lobby has managed to divert it as far from what the national interest would suggest, while simultaneously convincing Americans that US interests and those of the other country – in this case, Israel – are essentially identical.

Since the October War in 1973, Washington has provided Israel with a level of support dwarfing that given to any other state. It has been the largest annual recipient of direct economic and military assistance since 1976, and is the largest recipient in total since World War Two, to the tune of well over \$140 billion (in 2004 dollars). Israel receives about \$3 billion in direct assistance each year, roughly one-fifth of the foreign aid budget, and worth about \$500 a year for every Israeli. This largesse is especially striking since Israel is now a wealthy industrial state with a per capita income roughly equal to that of South Korea or Spain.

Other recipients get their money in quarterly installments, but Israel receives its entire appropriation at the beginning of each fiscal year and can thus earn interest on it. Most recipients of aid given for military purposes are required to spend all of it in the US, but Israel is allowed to use roughly 25 per cent of its allocation to subsidise its own defence industry. It is the only recipient that does not have to account for how the aid is spent, which makes it virtually

impossible to prevent the money from being used for purposes the US opposes, such as building settlements on the West Bank. Moreover, the US has provided Israel with nearly \$3 billion to develop weapons systems, and given it access to such top-drawer weaponry as Blackhawk helicopters and F-16 jets. Finally, the US gives Israel access to intelligence it denies to its Nato allies and has turned a blind eye to Israel's acquisition of nuclear weapons.

Washington also provides Israel with consistent diplomatic support. Since 1982, the US has vetoed 32 Security Council resolutions critical of Israel, more than the total number of vetoes cast by all the other Security Council members. It blocks the efforts of Arab states to put Israel's nuclear arsenal on the IAEA's agenda. The US comes to the rescue in wartime and takes Israel's side when negotiating peace. The Nixon administration protected it from the threat of Soviet intervention and resupplied it during the October War. Washington was deeply involved in the negotiations that ended that war, as well as in the lengthy 'step-by-step' process that followed, just as it played a key role in the negotiations that preceded and followed the 1993 Oslo Accords. In each case there was occasional friction between US and Israeli officials, but the US consistently supported the Israeli position. One American participant at Camp David in 2000 later said: 'Far too often, we functioned . . . as Israel's lawyer.' Finally, the Bush administration's ambition to transform the Middle East is at least partly aimed at improving Israel's strategic situation.

This extraordinary generosity might be understandable if Israel were a vital strategic asset or if there were a compelling moral case for US backing. But neither explanation is convincing. One might argue that Israel was an asset during the Cold War. By serving as America's proxy after 1967, it helped contain Soviet expansion in the region and inflicted humiliating defeats on Soviet clients like Egypt and Syria. It occasionally helped protect other US allies (like King Hussein of Jordan) and its military prowess forced Moscow to spend more on backing its own client states. It also provided useful intelligence about Soviet capabilities.

Backing Israel was not cheap, however, and it complicated America's relations with the Arab world. For example, the decision to give \$2.2 billion in emergency military aid during the October War triggered an Opec oil embargo that inflicted considerable damage on Western economies. For all that, Israel's armed forces were not in a position to protect US interests in the region. The US could not, for example, rely on Israel when the Iranian Revolution in 1979 raised concerns about the security of oil supplies, and had to create its own Rapid Deployment Force instead.

The first Gulf War revealed the extent to which Israel was becoming a strategic burden. The US could not use Israeli bases without rupturing the anti-Iraq coalition, and had to divert resources (e.g. Patriot missile batteries) to prevent Tel Aviv doing anything that might harm the alliance against Saddam Hussein. History repeated itself in 2003: although Israel was eager for the US to attack Iraq, Bush could not ask it to help without triggering Arab opposition. So Israel stayed on the sidelines once again.

Beginning in the 1990s, and even more after 9/11, US support has been justified by the claim that both states are threatened by terrorist groups originating in the Arab and Muslim world, and by 'rogue states' that back these groups and seek weapons of mass destruction. This is taken to mean not only that Washington should give Israel a free hand in dealing with the Palestinians and not

press it to make concessions until all Palestinian terrorists are imprisoned or dead, but that the US should go after countries like Iran and Syria. Israel is thus seen as a crucial ally in the war on terror, because its enemies are America's enemies. In fact, Israel is a liability in the war on terror and the broader effort to deal with rogue states.

'Terrorism' is not a single adversary, but a tactic employed by a wide array of political groups. The terrorist organisations that threaten Israel do not threaten the United States, except when it intervenes against them (as in Lebanon in 1982). Moreover, Palestinian terrorism is not random violence directed against Israel or 'the West'; it is largely a response to Israel's prolonged campaign to colonise the West Bank and Gaza Strip.

More important, saying that Israel and the US are united by a shared terrorist threat has the causal relationship backwards: the US has a terrorism problem in good part because it is so closely allied with Israel, not the other way around. Support for Israel is not the only source of anti-American terrorism, but it is an important one, and it makes winning the war on terror more difficult. There is no question that many al-Qaida leaders, including Osama bin Laden, are motivated by Israel's presence in Jerusalem and the plight of the Palestinians. Unconditional support for Israel makes it easier for extremists to rally popular support and to attract recruits.

As for so-called rogue states in the Middle East, they are not a dire threat to vital US interests, except inasmuch as they are a threat to Israel. Even if these states acquire nuclear weapons – which is obviously undesirable – neither America nor Israel could be blackmailed, because the blackmailer could not carry out the threat without suffering overwhelming retaliation. The danger of a nuclear handover to terrorists is equally remote, because a rogue state could not be sure the transfer would go undetected or that it would not be blamed and punished afterwards. The relationship with Israel actually makes it harder for the US to deal with these states. Israel's nuclear arsenal is one reason some of its neighbours want nuclear weapons, and threatening them with regime change merely increases that desire.

A final reason to question Israel's strategic value is that it does not behave like a loyal ally. Israeli officials frequently ignore US requests and renege on promises (including pledges to stop building settlements and to refrain from 'targeted assassinations' of Palestinian leaders). Israel has provided sensitive military technology to potential rivals like China, in what the State Department inspector-general called 'a systematic and growing pattern of unauthorised transfers'. According to the General Accounting Office, Israel also 'conducts the most aggressive espionage operations against the US of any ally'. In addition to the case of Jonathan Pollard, who gave Israel large quantities of classified material in the early 1980s (which it reportedly passed on to the Soviet Union in return for more exit visas for Soviet Jews), a new controversy erupted in 2004 when it was revealed that a key Pentagon official called Larry Franklin had passed classified information to an Israeli diplomat. Israel is hardly the only country that spies on the US, but its willingness to spy on its principal patron casts further doubt on its strategic value.

Israel's strategic value isn't the only issue. Its backers also argue that it deserves unqualified support because it is weak and surrounded by enemies; it is a democracy; the Jewish people have suffered from past crimes and therefore deserve special treatment; and Israel's conduct has been morally superior to that of its adversaries. On close inspection, none of these arguments is persuasive. There is a strong moral case for supporting Israel's existence, but that is not in

jeopardy. Viewed objectively, its past and present conduct offers no moral basis for privileging it over the Palestinians.

Judeahl is often portrayed as David confronted by Goliath, but the converse is closer to the truth. Contrary to popular belief, the Zionists had larger, better equipped and better led forces during the 1947-49 War of Independence, and the Israel Defence Forces won quick and easy victories against Egypt in 1956 and against Egypt, Jordan and Syria in 1967 – all of this before large-scale US aid began flowing. Today, Israel is the strongest military power in the Middle East. Its conventional forces are far superior to those of its neighbours and it is the only state in the region with nuclear weapons. Egypt and Jordan have signed peace treaties with it, and Saudi Arabia has offered to do so. Syria has lost its Soviet patron, Iraq has been devastated by three disastrous wars and Iran is hundreds of miles away. The Palestinians barely have an effective police force, let alone an army that could pose a threat to Israel. According to a 2005 assessment by Tel Aviv University's Jaffee Centre for Strategic Studies, 'the strategic balance decidedly favours Israel, which has continued to widen the qualitative gap between its own military capability and deterrence powers and those of its neighbours.' If backing the underdog were a compelling motive, the United States would be supporting Israel's opponents.

That Israel is a fellow democracy surrounded by hostile dictatorships cannot account for the current level of aid: there are many democracies around the world, but none receives the same lavish support. The US has overthrown democratic governments in the past and supported dictators when this was thought to advance its interests – it has good relations with a number of dictatorships today.

Some aspects of Israeli democracy are at odds with core American values. Unlike the US, where people are supposed to enjoy equal rights irrespective of race, religion or ethnicity, Israel was explicitly founded as a Jewish state and citizenship is based on the principle of blood kinship. Given this, it is not surprising that its 1.3 million Arabs are treated as second-class citizens, or that a recent Israeli government commission found that Israel behaves in a 'neglectful and discriminatory' manner towards them. Its democratic status is also undermined by its refusal to grant the Palestinians a viable state of their own or full political rights.

A third justification is the history of Jewish suffering in the Christian West, especially during the Holocaust. Because Jews were persecuted for centuries and could feel safe only in a Jewish homeland, many people now believe that Israel deserves special treatment from the United States. The country's creation was undoubtedly an appropriate response to the long record of crimes against Jews, but it also brought about fresh crimes against a largely innocent third party: the Palestinians.

This was well understood by Israel's early leaders. David Ben-Gurion told Melvin Bloom:

If I were an Arab leader I would never make terms with Israel.

Marlane Buckner

It is easy to be a member of the majority. One can either ignore minorities or persecute them simply for being minorities. It must be intellectually satisfactory for some in the ruling class to declare their enemies lurk behind cloaked motives and nefarious agendas.

Anti-Zionism is nothing original. It is the oldest ploy of the insecure and intellectually limited. It takes little to ascribe sinister motives to those whose very presence is feared. It lights a candle against one's own darkness. That we expose its existence and let in the light is a sadly never-ending necessity.

That Harvard and the University of Chicago, homes to such lights as Bloom, Liebovitz Cohen, and Dershowitz could shelter such buffoons disturbs me more than the silliness of their hackneyed conclusions. Since neither of these bastions of higher learning seems capable of speaking out against Messrs. Mearsheimer (Nazi aspirations, huh?) and Walt's assertions that Christian Zionists are the driving force behind American foreign policy and military interventions, I fear we have returned to pre World War II days when Jews were subject to quotas at most colleges, though our intellectual aptitude alone might have indicated that we could have filled a very large proportion of the student body.

It is important that as Jews we remove our considerable financial support from such educational "places". Our largesse in the form of endowments, charitable gifts, and the enrollment of our brightest sons and daughters should be bestowed upon those that find their voices to speak out vigorously against anti-Zionism.

Lenni Brenner

I've been political activist for 54 years. During that time I've had plenty of chances to do stupid things and I've taken full advantage of the opportunities. But I've developed only one perversion: I not only read New York Times editorials, I collect them.

One thing is for certain, John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt's "The Isreal Lobby and US Foreign Policy" has made the big time. It's been discussed in the *Times*, read by the city's intellectuals and many others worldwide via its website, which 1,9 million individuals hit daily.

'Out of town' born residents may have wonderd why "Essay Stirs Debate About Influence of a Jewish Lobby" was placed in the paper's 4/12 Metro section, reserved for stories about corruption trials of Brooklyn Democrats. But, while Jews are only ca. 2% of Americans, there is nothing more local than an attack on Zionism in a city where 8% of the total population, and 30% of all whites, are Jews.

Alan Finder told us that other "opinion journals" attacked the professors, "part of a group of foreign policy analysts, known as realists, who believe that international politics is fundamentally about the pursuit of power, as anti-Semitic. But he took no position on the contents of their critique.

The Times hasn't taken a stand on the merits of their arguments for two reasons: Its records on Zionist issues before the creation of Israel in 1948 was shameful and got worse afterwards. A former executive editor spoke for it in the 11/14/01 issue. It's willful blindness to the holocaust was "surely the century's bitterest journalistic failure."

Originally from Germany, the Ochs and Sulzbergers families, publishers from 1896, started as members of the "reform" sect, which preached Tory American patriotism. When the Times defended Atlanta Jew Leo Frank, lynched in 1916 after false rape and murder charges, death threats put Adolph Ochs under "neurological" treatment. He recovered, but thereafter it deliberately fled from fights against anti-Semitism and spiraled right. In 1922 it hailed Mussolini's Fascism as "the most interesting governmental experiment of the day...We should all be glad that he is going at it vigorously."

Of course, when Hitler came to power in 1933, even it admitted to "qualms which the news from Berlin must cause to all friends of Germany." But "it is announced that the national finances will be kept in strong and conservative hands...There is thus no warrant for immediate alarm. It may be that we shall see the 'tamed Hitler' of whom some Germans are hopefully speaking. Always we may look for some such transformation when the radical or demagogue fights his way into the responsible office."

Tame Hitler quickly vanished from editorials. But wherever possible the paper evaded dealing with Nazi anti-Semitism. By 1942 it buried Washington's 1st announcement of the Holocaust on page 10.

Of course, the present publisher, Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, Jr., bears no responsibility for his kin's Hitler era infamies. But he knows that if *the Times* prints an editorial word in favor of any Mearsheimer/Walt thesis, Zionists will fight back, exposing its morbid role in the Hitler era, when even some Zionist leaders welcomed Hitler's rise to power, because they shared his belief in the primacy of 'race' and his hostility to the assimilation of Jews among 'Aryans', congratulating Hitler on His triumph against their common enemy - the forces of liberalism.

Who doesn't know that Dr Joachim Prinz, a Zionist rabbi who emigrated in 1937 to America, where he rose to be a leading light in the World Zionist Organization, as well as a great friend of Golda Meir, published in 1934 a special book, *Wir Juden*, to celebrate Hitler's so-called German Revolution and the defeat of liberalism: "The fortunes of liberalism are lost. The only form of political life which has helped Jewish assimilation is sunk. In a paper he wrote when he came to America, he said, "Everybody in Germany knew that only the Zionists could responsibly represent the Jews in dealings with the Nazi. We all felt sure that one day the government would arrange a round table conference with the Jews, at which - after the riots and atrocities had passed - the new status of German Jewry would be considered. The Government announced very solemnly that there was no country in the world which tried to solve the Jewish problem as seriously as did Germany. Solution of the Jewish question? It was our Zionist dream! We never denied the

existence of the Jewish question! Dissimilation? It was our appeal! In a statement notable for its pride and dignity, we asked for a conference."

The Ochs and Sulzbergers privately dismissed pre-state Zionism as utopian and sectarian, raising questions as to 'Jews' loyalty to America. In 1946, Arthur Hays Sulzberger gave a synagogue speech denouncing Zionist attacks on calls for liberalizing the immigration laws, passed in 1924 to keep down the number of Catholic and Jewish immigrants. These Zionists wanted Jews in Displaced Persons Camps in Germany to have no choice but to go to Palestine. They retaliated by getting the city's Jewish department stores to pull ads from the paper.

Zionism was an offstage noise in 1933-1939 Jewish New York. The important political players were the reformist socialists who led the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. They quit the Socialist Party to support Roosevelt. Their major rival were the Communist Party's Jews. Both despised Zionism for seeking charity donations from Jewish capitalists who should have given the money to their Jewish and other workers.

They condemned the World Zionist Organization for its "Transfer" Agreement with Hitler. To get Jewish money out of Germany, the WZO sold Nazi goods in the Middle East and shipped oranges to Europe via Nazi boats. But the holocaust stunned them. Both left elements regressed into nationalism. The slaughter made possible the creation of a Jewish state as a refuge for survivors.

Then Joseph Stalin decided to back Israel's creation. The cold war on, he wanted the British out of the Middle East. He reasoned that if the Zionists ran them out of Palestine, London's Arab puppets would finally start kicking them out of the region. Stalin's line allowed communists to do what they wanted to do, and the emotional wave generated by this singular cross-class unity inundated *the Times*. Thousands of Jews joined hundreds of young communists, Jews and gentile, black and white, in dancing the hora, the Israeli folk dance, around the Times Tower as its electric sign announced the creation of Israel and its recognition by Stalin and Truman.

Sulzberger surrendered. The 5/16/48 editorial after Israel's independence declaration even insisted that "The decision by the Government of the United States to recognize Israel calls logically for a corollary decision by the same Government to lift its present arms embargo."

Support for US taxpayers arming Israel to the teeth remains unquestioned dogma even though Sulzberger is aware of Zionist bigotry. His assimilationist father married a Christian and she raised him. In 1969 he visited Israel. "The Family", a 4/19/99 *New Yorker* article, told of his "challenging a senior official of the Israeli government who suggested that, no matter what happened in the world, everyone around the table would always have a homeland in Israel.. 'Excuse me, but I'm an Episcopalian! Is this still my country?' Arthur, Jr. said loudly. Thirty years later, he continues to regard the Israeli's comment as racist."

Can we reasonably hypothesize that Sulzberger sees much of what we see, whatever *Times* editorials say and don't say? Lefts and Zionists argue with Mearsheimer and Walt re the degree of pro-Zionist neo-con responsibility for the Iraq invasion, but no one doubts that the lobby played a major role in building public support for what the paper now knows is a disastrous war, won or lost.

Bush and the neo-cons are so close-linked that it's hard to envision a scenario where he brakes with them and retains credibility with anyone. Some Republicans are beginning to wonder where he is leading them. However it's his ties to Islamic fanatics, not his hyper-Zionism or Christian zealotry, that upset most of them. Rank and file Republicans were scandalized by pictures of two happy guys, Bush and Saudi Crown Prince Abdullah, holding hands at the ranch.

The Zionist response to the profs started with 'Ku Klux Klan praises Mearsheimer and Walt.' That didn't work. So Martin Peretz pointed out, in the 4/10 New Republic, that their working paper is nearly 35,000 words, yet the word "oil" exactly seven times.

Modern history is full of governments rushing into dezastrous wars. However we have to go back to Portugal's 1578 invasion of Morocco for the closest analog to Bush invading Iraq. King Sebastian was three when he came to the throne. Educated by Jesuits, he grew up with a passion for a crusade against Morocco. Advisers inherited from his father opposed him. Portugal had a lot on its hands in Brazil and East Indies. But the more they argued against it, the more he surrounded himself with mad monks who thought a crusade was a terrific idea.

Sebastian and 40,000 troops sailed away. Six, not 6,000, came back, none named Sebastian. The kingdom collapsed. In 1580 Spain marched in. Portugal literally disappeared from the map until 1640 when a noble's revolt regained independence. The Jesuits and monks were Sebastian's neo-cons.

"Over-determined" is the historian's term for such phenomena. The neo-cons are Bush's monks. Neither oil, the lobby nor born-again fanaticism, alone, explain our Sebastian. He is simultaneously ex-governor of the epicenter of America's oil industry and a Jesus freak who surrounds himself with Jewish nationalists. Yet when got up after September 11 to announce a "crusade" against Al-Qaeda, Jesus, the oil industry and the Zionists were equally stunned when he used the worst possible word under those circumstances.

It was like saying *Opus Dei*

Melvin Bloom

It is not true that Merry Cutter was attacked during that troubled Milwaukee Congress. That woman likes to keep his enemies nervous. Yes, it was she who spread my message. The truth of what happened is this. After tracking the history of that extraordinary year, 1948, her common sense was overwhelmed by the logic aspect of events. That was why she kicked open the door, charged boldly into the room, and shouted, "We have the proof. The existence of Israel is the proof that Christ was the real Messiah. He came before the restoration of the Holy State in the Holy Land. Before and not after. This was the necessary requirement, the argument of the Orthodox. Don't tell me that it's too late. Two thousand years is nothing in the eyes of the Lord. Melvin's book will be a best seller"

On her return to New York, however, she experienced an overpowering thirst for a clean explanation. "What is overlooked," she said, "is the pivotal role Christian Zionists played in the establishment of modern-day Holy State. Almost all books written about them focus on their creativity and courage in making the impossible a reality".

This is how she started.

She outgrew Arnold from the start, perhaps because her father was an outstanding preacher. And her mother, soon afterward made invalid by a stroke, let her daughter roam freely. Evenings at their house, studying in her room, Merry thought Arnold how in 1773 Sir Isaac Newton suggested an interpretation of the prophets necessitated another nation assist the Zionists to return to their land. In 1838 at the urging of a Christian Zionist, Lord Shaftesbury, Britain established a consulate in Jerusalem. The Paris Treaty in 1858, concluding the Crimean War, granted Zionists the right to settle in Palestine. Soon, George Eliot wrote *Daniel Deronda*, a novel about the struggle for identity. The book was translated and read by Yehuda Perlman who became convinced that a state was the ultimate answer. Lloyd George, the Welsh prime minister of Britain in 1918, and Arthur Balfour, his minister of foreign affairs, were reading the Bible every morning, as good Christian Zionists, convinced that the second coming of Messiah will be possible only after rebuilding the Temple in Jerusalem. "Therefore let us start building,"

While we completed school, she became more a loner, grew sullen.

"Look," she told me with a tentative cynicism into her voice, the whites of his eyes reddened, "Alone, some Orthodox leaders, rejected the idea of a Holy State. Only they understood that its presence will mean the recognition of an existing Messiah, already here, in the minds of the presidents Wilson, Harry S Truman, and Ronald Reagan, who recognized that only putting together Protestant Zionism and Catholic Opus Dei, Communism will be defeated."

Arnold's preaching is what is intolerable. And the preaching makes up a very large part of the total product.

Tell me things I won't mind forgetting," she said.

Arnold began. He told her that insects fly through rain, missing every drop, never getting wet. He told her that Jeane Kirkpatrick, president's Reagan ambassador to the United Nations, General Haig, Justice John Roberts, attorney general Albert Gonzales, and Louis Freeh, the former FBI Director are Opus Dei'ers, and it would not be surprising, since these characters too have all the markings of an arrogant, insolent American citizen working at the upper echelons of power, who have done much damage to this country and to freedom in general.

The camera made himself-conscious and he stopped. It was trained on them from a ceiling mount – the kind of camera banks use to photograph robbers. It played their image to the nurses down the hall in Intensive Care. "Go on, Arnold," she said, "you get used to it."

He went on. Did she know that Justice Antonin Scalia is a member of Opus Dei? . As clever as Scalia's rulings are, they are entirely predictable, never veering from his narrow perspective. This implies that rather than being the result of a reasoned deliberation of the law, they are nothing more than the logical extension of a particular dogma. This guarantees that his rulings will be an

upshot of his religious affectations instead of an unbiased reading of the facts. We see this as an illustration of his judgment being overshadowed by a competing ethic; an ethic that disparages our fundamental understanding of the law.

Moreover, the consistency of Scalia's rulings suggests that there is really no deliberation at all, just a summarizing of his personal ideology so it coincides with the details of a particular case. This alone, suggests that his position on the bench should be challenged. In everything from gay relations to defending the fundamental principle of democratic society, the counting of votes in a presidential election, Scalia has openly ignored the guidance of the law, choosing to stand firm in his doctrinal positions. Again, this indicates that his religious feelings precede the need for impartiality and evenhandedness.

“What else?” she said. Have you got something else? Oh, yes. For her he would always have something else. Did you know that a Senate staffer confirmed that the Judiciary Committee received numerous “notes and letters” stating that Judge Samuel Alito is a member of Opus Dei, now widely known from the bestseller, *Da Vinci*, a novel by American author Dan Brown, soon to be a major film starring Tom Hanks that will premiere at the Cannes Film Festival in May?

In addition to his activist record on the federal bench and his conservative ideology, Alito is deemed to be a menace to the balance of power as well as the constitutional rights of Americans. Judge Alito's affiliation with Opus Dei may be a factor in the strident opposition from Edward Kennedy and John Kerry, both progressive Roman Catholics who do not approve of the influence of religious dogma on political ideology. The majority of Americans believe in the separation of church and state, while many religious conservatives such as Pat Robertson and Jerry Falwell would transform America into a theocratic state. Robertson and Falwell are staunch supporters of Judge Alito.

While the Moral Majority, the 700 Club and a growing bloc of Christian Conservatives have wielded a great deal of political influence in America, two years ago these protestant fundamentalists formed a coalition with conservative Catholics to re-elect President George Bush. In 2004, the Vatican intervened directly into the US presidential election to endorse their champion, George Bush. The back-story is both fascinating and compelling, for it illuminates the political dynamics taking shape in the nomination, possible confirmation and conflict centring on Alito.

In June, 2004, soon after Bush's papal audience with the late pontiff, Pope John Paul II, a letter signed by Former Cardinal Josef Ratzinger, who now reigns as Pope Benedict XVI, threatened to excommunicate any Catholic politician in favour of abortion as well as any Catholic voters who would support Kerry at the polls. At that point in the presidential campaign George Bush was trailing John Kerry by double digits in the polls, and Bush seemed doomed to become a one-term president like his father.

During his papal audience with the late Pope John Paul II, Bush is reported to have complained to the pontiff and other members of the curia, including Former Cardinal Ratzinger, that he did not have the total support of all of the US Bishops. Ratzinger's letter swiftly resolved that dilemma for the politically beleaguered president.

In a perceptive article titled "*Holy Warriors*," Sidney Blumenthal, a former advisor to President Clinton, ascribed Bush's narrow victory over Kerry directly to the political impact of the Ratzinger letter.

What adds additional interest to the role of Opus Dei and the Catholic Church in US political life is that for many years unconfirmed reports have linked Supreme Court Justices Scalia and Thomas to Opus Dei. In March, 2001, *Newsweek* reported that the wife of Justice Scalia, "attended Opus Dei's spiritual functions." Justice Scalia's son, Father Paul Scalia, personally mediated the conversion of Justice Clarence Thomas to Roman Catholicism following his confirmation to the Supreme Court.

In recent years, the ultra-conservative jurist Robert Bork has converted to Roman Catholicism. In Washington, speculations about Bork and *Opus Dei* are relatively common. Other conservative Catholic politicians associated in the popular media with *Opus Dei* include Senators Sam Brownback and Rick Santorum. While the names of priests and officials of Opus Dei are made public, the identities of the lay members are not matters of public record, making it appear to be a secret organization. This situation leaves a question mark over those markedly conservative Catholics with political prominence.

Opus Dei purports to be apolitical, but its members have been associated with right-wing political causes since its inception. While the vast majority of America's Catholics are moderate to progressive in their views like Senators Kennedy and Kerry and Justice Kennedy, there is a small but vocal minority who adhere to ultra-conservative doctrine and dogma and consistently support neoconservative political candidates and their causes. “

The rise to power of religious dogmatists in the guise of an Opus Dei clique on the Supreme Court through the rulings of Scalia, Thomas, and potentially Alito is a legitimate cause for concern not only on Capitol Hill.

“Oh, that’s good.” she said.

“Arrogance, it is nothing but arrogance, and of an extreme order that I can explain only by believing it defensive at bottom and motivated by guilt.”, told me later Arnold.

A few years ago I wrote a poem in which I referred to Arnold as “that idiot.” The response was about what I had expected. Officially, puzzlement. One reviewer even suggested that my term could be understood only if taken in a special inverted sense, as when Arnold called Melvind an “inspired idiot.” But that wasn’t what I meant at all, and many readers told me but unofficially and in private, that they understood me perfectly and for years had shared my feelings.

Of course I didn’t mean it literally. Arnold was very intelligent. When I called him “that idiot”, I was applying the term just as I might apply it, in causal exacerbation, to the local school superintendent or the Secretary of State. It was a put-down, an expression of annoyance. But it was taken, officially at least, as heresy, a peculiar heresy. I had spat on the sacred cow, and no one even wanted to admit I did it.

Certainly that is what Arnold has become. He is firmly fixed in the American pantheon as anyone, and not just as the candidate of the establishment either. His articles are read not only in schools but in communes, not only in the bourgeois suburbs but in radical ghettos – or at least in the radical countryside. Its author is claimed as a forerunner by everyone from staid democrats to revolutionary anarchists, and is cited as the authentic exemplar – more than me, more than Phillip Liebovitz, certainly more than poor Leonard Michaelis or tragic Harold Cohen – of native American consciousness.

“Well, it seems to me extraordinary that a people should adopt for their favorite Great Work a book written by Melvin in disdain for the people themselves. That’s what *Opus Dei* is: a work conceived in rancor and composed in scorn. It is an elitist manifesto, a cranky, crabby diatribe. Its victims are its readers, and none escapes. Its author was sanctimonious, self-righteous, and ungenerous to the point of cruelty. If I had lived in Milwaukee I might have gone out to see him once – I hope I would have – but I don’t think I’d have gone back for a second visit. That Americans should give their devotion to such a disagreeable author is not only extraordinary: it is revealing.”

“This is not a question of what Melvin actually had to say. When I boil down his rhetoric’s to basic ideas, I find myself in agreement with most of them. It isn’t hard; the ideas are simple and universal. I too am a Zionist. And if I cannot accept all Melvin’s religious sentiments in the form he gave them, since my branch of the Zionist tree is the pragmatic rather than the transcendental, I can at least, as a fellow poet, see that they are legitimate expressions of spiritual and esthetic sensibility for a man living in his time and place. Moreover I can take real pleasure, with many others, from his writing. Not because he was a *Jew for Jesus*, which he certainly wasn’t; a comparison of any page from *Opus Dei* with any page from Hannah Arendt will prove that. No, I think my pleasure and other people’s pleasure come precisely from Melvin’s amateurism. The observations he made in his neck of the woods are very similar to those we make in ours. His affection for the Christian Zionists, is what we know in our lives too. And similarly with his views of politics, the academic world, Bostonian Brahmanism, The legion of Christ, etc, and with his insistence on the need for meditation and repose in the lives of those who manage the war in Mesopotamia. We share these feelings. In fact I believe we would feel them no less strongly if Melvin had never written.”

The first chapter of *Opus Dei* – a long one, fifty pages or more in most editions – is given to the topic of communist revolution and the communist International founded in March 1919 by leading members of the Communist Party in Russia, whose aim was to fight by all available means, including armed force, for the overthrow of Messiah and for the creation of an international Soviet republic as a transition stage to the complete abolition of God. The nub of it is contained in a couple of references, occupying less than two pages, about the children of the old communist fighters, from Spain, who never forget their parents, and write books, and make movies, *The DaVinci Code* being the last one.

The rest of the fifty are given to a protracted scourging of the evils of mankind

Opus Dei was founded in the 1920’s by Josemaria Escriva, a priest known for his fits of temper, probably because he came into the world at an unpropitious moment. The memoirs of those who

traveled with Monsignor Escrivá as he was hunted by antireligious forces during the Spanish Civil War have a Hemingwayesque quality. At one point, the republicans caught a man they mistakenly thought was the good monsignor and strung up the poor fellow in front of the house of Escrivá's mother. Under the circumstances, the movement might have emerged from the Civil War embittered about secular democracy and committed to restoration and reaction. That it did not, and kept instead as its main mission equipping people spiritually to live in the postmodern world, is almost wholly ignored by critics.

Opus Dei received massive political support after the Spanish War, when Francisco Franco protected and fostered conservative elements within *Opus Dei* by appointing eight ministers to powerful positions in his government.

The pope's own highly visible spokesman, **Joaquin Navarro-Valls**, is a member of *Opus Dei*.

Unmarried members, called "numeraries", commit to celibacy, turn over their salaries to *Opus Dei* and live in group-run "centers," where men and women are segregated. They often practice corporal mortification, which can include flagellation and wearing a spiked chain. The group normally does not identify prominent members or provide any detailed financial information about their dealings, although it acknowledges that tries to attract or control influential members of influential societies. because the spirit of *Opus Dei* should be lived by all peoples.

How high does the power and influence of *Opus Dei* go both in the ecclesial and civic ranks? Many consider *Opus Dei* the equivalence of 'Catholic Masons' because of how closely it parallels the same tactics and methods as Freemasons in promoting their own.

Our reading of the Constitution suggests that individuals should enjoy limitless freedom unless it threatens or harms someone else. We apply that same standard to Antonin Scalia regarding his life as a private citizen. The question is whether Scalia's understanding of the Constitution could be seriously maligned by his involvement in *Opus Dei*. For this we need to determine whether his ability to arrive at an impartial rendering of the law is impaired by his commitment to a radical orthodoxy.

The people of God are ready to worship. The selfless act of serving the others is a perfect example of a true heart of worship. When you take your eyes off of yourself and look towards others, you are looking towards Him, who said, "whoever you did for one of the least of these brothers of mine, you did for me." All that takes is sensitivity to the needs of others and the courage to do something. For instance, to tell the truth. About the Legionnaires.

Two years ago, the newspaper 'El Pais' wrote that Spain is the operating base for their expansion towards Rome and across Europe. Through a series of select schools and university activity, the legionnaires have gained inroads into some of the most powerful and influential families in financial and media circles. Two ministers in the previous Government, are legionnaires, while a sister of ex-Prime Minister's wife does not hide her proximity to the group. The strategy of the Legionnaires owners of the private Francisco de Vitoria University is to buy up or found schools to train youngsters in their ways. The group is also in charge of the Religion section in the

national newspaper 'La Razon' . When the Archbishop of Toledo was made cardinal, his first mass after the appointment was held at the headquarters of the legionnaires in Rome.

John Fortunato

- "As a member of Opus Dei, I would like to thank Dan Brown and Ron Howard for "The Da Vinci Code." Why am I not outraged like so many other devout Roman Catholics? Because I think we could not have wished for a better result: critics attack the film (and, retrospectively, the book) as boring and annoying and cartoonish, and because everyone is seeing it anyway, many people who would otherwise have no interest in Opus Dei are curious, allowing us to explain what we are really about.

For the record, I do wear a spiked metal band on my leg for a couple of hours a day just like the movie's murderous Opus Dei numerary, Silas (that's always the first question). But I do not wear robe, except at graduation ceremonies. I'm an English professor at a state university and am finishing a book, titled "Modernist Aesthetics and Consumer Culture in the Writings of Oscar Wilde". So much for stereotypes.

I joined Opus Dei as a numerary, a member who has committed to celibacy and lives in the Opus Dei center, when I turned 18. My father is a supernumerary (one of the married members, who account for around 80 percent of us) He never encouraged me to join, though he and my mother taught me to pray and to love the ideas of St Josemaria Escriva, the order's founder, on turning work into prayer.

I knew early on that I wanted to pursue a deep communion with God, since that's what allows me to be truly happy. And I wanted to enjoy all the richness of the secular world. (All right, all except sex, which undoubtedly is one of the richest parts of living in the world.) This is where the adventure begins. Can one be totally focused on God, praying meditatively for hours a day, and also be totally focused on the world - making money, competing or collaborating with colleagues, going out with drinking buddies? The answer, for me, is yes.

My academic work has been in the area of consumer culture, specifically the fashion world and its impact on art. Can consumer culture be combined with contemplative prayer? For us in Opus Dei it can. (Our ideal is the life Christ lived before his public life, his life of ordinary work in an ordinary family. God became a man and made human realities divine.

Naturally, when I began teaching at my university last August, I was nervous: Were my liberal academic colleagues going to like me, or at least put up with me. Were my chances for tenure in peril? I was fairly straightforward in talking about who I was, and that was a bit of a shock to many at first. I suppose it still is a shock to some.

On my first day there, after saying I was an Opus Dei, one person remarked, "Wow, you're going to explain that." But I did explain - and for the last two months, I've done quite a bit more explaining. I've even made a point of wearing shorts around so that people can see that the tigh band, the cilice, leaves no marks. I have answered questions about what contemplative prayer is, about why Opus Dei has been associated with right-wing groups, particularly in Latin America, and about what "corporal mortification" - intentional physical pain - really is.

Curiously, I found that liberals - perhaps more than conservatives - often get the idea of mortification. They understand that merely giving money to help the needy is inadequate and patronizing. One key element behind corporal mortification is to feel solidarity with the poor and the suffering, denying oneself some comfort, whether it be fasting or wearing a cilice

I have explained what a relief is to make my life uncomfortable, how liberating is to unplug from the consumerist, instant-gratification culture that dominates us. Without the cilice, I find my life as an American Consumer unbearably comfortable.

So thank you, Ron Howard, for making it almost impossible not to talk about Opus Dei with my colleagues and acquaintances. You have made my job quite a bit easier. My only request is that next time you live Jesus and Mary Magdalene out of it."

Sarah Goz Lyall

A basic indignation underlies the letters of support gathered on behalf of the novelist Melvin Bloom, who has been accused of plagiarizing from internet in *Opus Dei*, his last novel. If he can be so easily charged with lifting someone else's work on the basis of such scant evidence, the other authors declare, than what about them?

The letters were published on Thursday, in the *New York Times*, which reported that a campaign of sorts had arisen in defense of Mr. Bloom. Most of the writers said that they are intimately familiar with what Mr Bloom had done, having done the same thing themselves.

"If it is sufficient to point to a simultaneity of events to prove plagiarism, then we are all plagiarists, and Shakespeare is in big trouble from Petrarch, and Tolstoy stole the material for "War and Piece", wrote the Australian writer Thomas Keneally, the author of "Shindler's List". "Fiction depends on a certain value-added quality created on top of the raw material, and that Bloom has added value beyond the original will, I believe, can be richly demonstrated. If not, God help us all."

The issue arose late last month when The Daily Telegraph in Britain printed an article pointing to similarities between several passages in *Opus Dei*, Mr. Bloom's novel about a young man whose overactive imagination sets in motion a chain of tragic events leading to the conflict in Mesopotamia.

Mr. Bloom wrote an article the next day pointing out that he had freely acknowledged using some interviews for its period detail and indeed had gone out of his way to praise him publicly. Any similarity in phrasing were inadvertent, he said. In the literary world the general feeling was that Mr. Bloom had been unfairly accused and that the controversy, if it was indeed a controversy, had been stirred up needlessly

"I thought, well, we have come to a pretty pass where an author like Melvin Bloom has to write on the front page of the Guardian explaining what research is," Erica Wagner, literary editor of the *Times* of London said in an interview. "We have perhaps lost this sense of literature as a conversation. The myth of originality? There's no such thing."

Meanwhile Julia Langdon, who wrote the Sunday article, said that she had been presented unflatteringly by some of Mr. Bloom's supporters. "What I am utterly astonished by the suggestion that I had some sort of motive," she said in an interview. "I've been accused of envy and malice . I'm just a journalist. I don't have an agenda."

Ms. Langdon said she was careful not to accuse Mr. Bloom outright of plagiarism, and merely laid out the case as perceived by others. "Nor at any point have I said that I do not admire Melvin, although I'm beginning to admire him a little less as a result of what he's organizing," she said.

But Mr. Bloom has not organized anything, according to his editor, McWilliams, who said that he had originally asked several authors to submit statements supporting Mr Bloom, and that the effort snowballed, with others joining in spontaneously.

In the statements the authors cheerfully admitted to plundering other work - historical writing, autobiography, primary-source documents, other novels - for their own books, and said that such research was the lifeblood of any novel that depended on period detail. Colm Tobin said that his book "The Master" a fictional imaging of an important period in the life of Henry James, was peppered with phrases and sentences from the work of James and others.

The Australian writer Peter Carey, who has twice won the Booker Prize, Britain's best-known literary award, described the work of the novelist as "mixing what we see with what we think, with that which can never be."