

# SKANDALON

Vol. III, No. 7

SKANDALON

January 12, 1965

## EDITORIAL: The Arab Viewpoint and Dr. Elbow

Previous to the Christmas vacation, our campus was disturbed by a series of articles and letters regarding a speech made by Professor Elbow of the Division of Social Sciences, entitled Shalom Means War: The Arabs and the Palestine Question. Skandalon reluctantly enters an area of debate already too cluttered with personalities and publications. Nevertheless, when a charge of anti-Judaism is levied by one member of the academic community against another, we deemed it both necessary and proper for us to examine the evidence and act accordingly.

Having done so, we feel the charges made by Dr. Eson and his attack upon Dr. Elbow in a recent issue of Counterpoint (Vol. I, No. 7) were unwarranted. Dr. Elbow was reporting, not supporting, the viewpoint of the Arabic peoples still suffering from the years of Arabic-Israeli conflict. We believe the information given by Dr. Elbow is extremely important to someone who wishes to understand the full significance of the problems involved. Certainly, the exegesis, as Dr. Eson pointed out, is not complete; but the facet explored is, nonetheless, an extremely relevant and important one. One does not effectively combat an irrational viewpoint by dismissing it and ignoring it; if the Arab viewpoint is irrational, it is nevertheless necessary to explore it if we are to come to grips with it. Clearly, as can be seen from reading Dr. Elbow's speech, this viewpoint is explored in some depth. Certainly, he was not unsympathetic to the Israeli viewpoint; nor, contrary to Dr. Eson's charge, did he attempt to present the Arab viewpoint as an "objective" one.

The choice of title may have been unfortunate, not because of any intended malice, but because of the possibility of misconstrual. "Shalom," it must be said, is a Hebrew word of especial significance to the Jews; it should not have been used flippantly. Nevertheless, what was, after all, only a breach of good taste should not, as has been done, be misconstrued as a breach of principle.

As a service to the university community, we have, therefore, reprinted Dr. Elbow's speech (see pages 3, 4, and 5). While it does not include his comments on the slides shown or the subsequent question period, it is otherwise a complete and faithful transcription of the WSUA tape recording, made on November 18, 1964. We publish it in the hope that future discussion shall be confined to the real question: how does one deal with the Arab-Israeli conflict, considering the deep psychological bases of the problem?

-Editor

\*\*\*\*\*

## SOME THOUGHTS ON ECUMENICISM

Let us ask a question: What is ecumenicism? Ecumenicism is that feeling that has recently swept over all Christians. It is that feeling that has caused people to say not, "I am a Protestant," "I am a Roman Catholic," or "I am an Orthodox"; but, rather, "I am a Christian!"

This point was basically brought home to me on two occasions: the first in 1962, when his Eminence, Archbishop Iakovas spoke in Endicott; the second during my conversation with the Reverend Frank Snow after the recent Advent Bible Vigil.

On the first occasion, the Archbishop answered a question of mine about the possibility of organic union among the various branches of the Christian church by beginning, "As a Christian..." He continued to say that he believed in union among the various branches of the church. Notice that he not only affirmed his belief in organic union but that he began with the words, "As a Christian." On the second occasion, Mr. Snow said to me of the Advent Bible Vigil that Protestants and Roman Catholics had discovered that they could pray together to the same God.

The lesson to be learned here is obvious. All Christians, whether Roman Catholic, Protestant, or Orthodox, have a common belief in one God, one Christ, and one salvation. All clergymen everywhere have one common aim--to save our souls. Let us all realize that there is one God, the same for all of us, and that eventually we will all be judged by the same Christ. The dogma, whether the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father or the Father and Son together is for the theologians to argue. Let us all realize that there is one God and that all clergymen are striving for our salvation. If we realize this one fact--we have an excellent basis for the much hoped for and often prayed for union.

-James A. Economides

A CHRISTMAS PILGRIMAGE  
In the Style of Art Buchwald and the Tradition of Plato

A new school is opening in my home town under the auspices of the Nathaniel Brandon Institute, to teach the Objectivist philosophy of Ayn Rand. Jumping up and down with enthusiasm, I decided this was for me. I leaped into my capitalistic Le Mans, and went speeding into the city, happily ignoring the decadent road signs posted by those mindless instruments of the Great Society--the Rochester police. I selfishly used two parking places for my car, so as to insure myself against some careless fool who might possibly dent my bumper or mar the finish. I approached the building where I was expecting to begin a new life, confidently entered the elevator, and proceeded to the third floor. A middle-aged woman was sitting at the desk.

"Hello," I said, stretching out my hand.

"We don't give money to panhandlers here," she replied, staring at my open palm. Blushingly, I withdrew my hand and assured her that I had come to enroll in the Nathaniel Brandon course--on Objectivism. I threw in the word "Objectivism" because I wanted her to know I had been thinking about it. Thawing slightly, she smiled at me.

"Well," she said, taking a pin from her drawer. "We're glad to have you with us." She pinned a \$ sign to my lapel. I was flushed with excitement. "Before I take your money," she continued, "I have to ask you some questions. We have to be sure we're getting the right kind of people, you understand."

"Oh, yes," I replied with a disarming smile. "We certainly don't want any of THEM in here."

"Quite right," she said. "Now then, what is your opinion regarding welfare?"

"Welfare," I said. "Usually, I try not to think about it." She frowned. "But when I do think about it," I added hastily, "I think it is a ghastly device invented by people who don't want to create." She was smiling again, and, encouraged, I went on. "People who accept welfare don't have any values," I said, "people who GIVE welfare don't have any values. They rob a man of his self-respect!" She was beaming.

"Next," she said, "What do you think about--GOD?"

"Who?" I asked.

"I can see you're one of the good ones," she said. "What, then, do you believe about racism and those dirty segregationists?"

"Why, I'm against them," I replied brightly, "they're absolutely irrational. Racists aren't really human beings."

"Then would you support the Civil Rights bill?" she asked slyly.

"Certainly not!" I replied indignantly. "That's an invasion of man's right to his property, and that's sacred."

"It's WHAT?" she shrieked.

"Inviolable?" I said.

"Better," she said. "We can discuss that in class; but what if an irrational human being stood between you and a value?"

"Well, first I'd warn him to step aside," I told her. "Then, if he persisted in being irrational about the whole thing, I'd crush him like a hedge-hog on the New York State Thruway. He would have given up his right to live by such behavior."

"Excellent," she said. "This next question will merely be a formality, because you are obviously IN. What are your opinions regarding Medicare for the aged?"

"It's rotten," I said to her, "just rotten. All those old people, just eatin' and consumin'. Why, they don't create or give society values or anything. They just sit and rot. To force the producing population to provide for their maintenance--why, it's criminal, that's what it is. If folks would stop this talk about providin' medical care for the old people, maybe we could stop stifling free competition and, in addition, decrease the surplus population." She nodded her head happily at my highly rational approach to overpopulation. "Yes," I said, "now you take my grandfather. He's a minister, a good man once, but now that he's getting old..." I suddenly noticed that she was frowning, as if I had said an obscene word.

"What do you mean," she said, carefully enunciating every syllable, "that a minister was a 'good man'?"

"But I didn't mean," I stammered, "what I meant to say was--ah, maybe he was a SELFISH minister?" But I was too late. She stood up from her desk, her mouth firm and hard. Reaching upward with her right hand, she clutched my \$ sign and ripped it from my lapel.

"Get out," she rasped.

"But," I stammered.

"Out," she ordered.

"Just give me one more chance," I pleaded.

"We're a rationalistic movement," she said, "we can't afford any of you spiritual mystics."

With tears in my eyes, I made my way to the elevator, descended to the ground floor, and returned to my car. There was a ticket on the windshield. The fuzz in this town have no Christmas spirit.

A TRANSCRIPTION OF PROFESSOR MATHEW ELBOW'S SPEECH  
TO FORUM OF POLITICS, ENTITLED "SHALOM MEANS WAR: THE  
ARABS AND THE PALESTINE QUESTION"

I'm happy to be here and be back in the United States after two years away. The topic--some of you may have wondered about--is called "Shalom Means War." Now, of course, the word "Shalom" means peace. It's a Hebrew word. And so why have I chosen the title, "Shalom Means War"? The reason for this is that the very fact that you have the state of Israel existing--a state in which the national language is Hebrew, in which the overwhelming majority of the people are not Arabs but Israelis, although there is a minority of about two to three hundred thousand Arabs--this very fact militates for a state of war. As you know, there is no peace in the Middle East--witness the recent incident between the Arabs and Israelis on the Syrian border. There were signed truces in 1949 but no permanent peace.

Now, people have said to me, "Isn't it true that this state of war has been kept alive by the governments?" And to a certain extent, I would say this is true; that is, the Arab governments have refused to allow any kind of permanent settlement of the refugees, although some of them are permanently settled, and particularly in Jordan. There are hundreds of thousands of them still living in camps. No great factories have been erected--no permanent projects. For example, the United Nations, UNRWA--is called the United Nations Relief and Works Administration, it has done only really very little in the way of works because the Arab states have refused to allow any kind of permanent installations. They want the refugees in a state of temporary settlement so that they will go back to their homeland--which is now Israel. On the other hand, I think it is not only the governments; I think there is a deep-seated feeling among the people, and everywhere I went I was exposed to this. For example, in the fall in Beirut, Lebanon, they celebrate--or commemorate--Balfour Day, and there are speeches by professors at the American University of Beirut and throughout the city on the "infamous Balfour Declaration"--in which, you will remember, the British government expressed its intention of making Palestine a homeland for the Jewish people. In the spring, on May 15--again another day of commemoration--they commemorate the terrible disaster, the defeat, and you remember May 14 was the foundation of Israel--May 15 is the day they commemorate. And again speeches, great emotion--I remember the student body of Beirut College for Women met together in the auditorium, and one of the professors from the American University spoke, and he said that in the end justice would come and "we will, we will return, we will return." But even individual students--of course, many of my students were refugees, refugees who had been able to establish themselves outside of Palestine, some in Beirut, some elsewhere, Jordan--even they had this very bitter feeling that they had been driven from their homes, and willy-nilly they were going back--back not as second-rate citizens, because they said the Arabs in Israel today are second-rate citizens under military control--but back as full-fledged citizens not in an Israeli state but in an Arab state.

And, you know, pride is a fundamental factor in the Middle East, and I think their pride has been hurt--the fact that they were defeated. They admit that they were defeated in battle, and they admit that this was partly due to the treason of their own leaders--I'm thinking particularly about Dala of Jordan, who was assassinated--but despite all this, they say the time will come, has to come, when they will reconquer what is now Israel. And they speak very often of the Crusaders and the fact the Crusaders were there for maybe a century or a little over and then they were pushed into the sea, the same way the time will come for them to push the Israelis out into the sea.

The more intelligent young people and faculty members tend to distinguish between Zionism, which they hate, and, of course, Jews. Now there are indigenous Jews--I mean there are Jews living in Lebanon that have been living there for years. These people are accepted, and many of the Moslem and Christian girls are friends with Jewish girls--there are a few Jewish girls at the college where I taught. However, very often you'd find that some Arabs are unable to make this distinction between Zionism and Judaism. I remember one particular man, a professor over there who was a fairly important person in the Church and had a great deal of influence: as far as he was concerned they were one in the same thing--and Jews were dishonest, they were people who used trickery, they were evil--and he hoped that by a quick coup the Arabs would one day be able to reestablish themselves in Israel.

And so it goes. I had students living in Jerusalem--the Arab portion of Jerusalem--who could look across the wall and see their property which had been, of course, confiscated, and this made feelings even worse. I think in this country we fail to really understand the deep-seated feelings among the Arabs toward the establishment of Israel--and, of course, who gets the blame? Why, the United States. We recognized Israel first of all the great powers, and we have supported Israel. And, of course, the Arabs fail to distinguish between

public support, which in the last several years has been rather modest--we have given more, much more, to the Arab states--and the private support that comes from Zionist organizations in this country. Among other things that they have to say are the following: they fear very much the population increase in Israel which could occur through the emigration of, say, Russian Jews--they say what happens if the million or more Jews in Russia--I think there are two or three million in Russia--are suddenly allowed to leave? What happens in the Middle East? The present state of Israel couldn't possibly hold them. This would mean expansion, Israeli expansionism, which they fear very much. And, of course, the Israelis do have a good army, and among the Arab states I guess the only really good army is the one in Jordan. Egypt has a fairly large army, but it is bogged down in Yemen at the present time. So, they fear this expansion. They also are very much upset by the very idea of Zionism, which, in its unadulterated form means that this is a homeland for all the Jews of the world. Now I know not all Zionists are that extreme, but if you take some of the statements of Ben Gurion, who says you American Jews, you belong in Israel--French Jews, English Jews--why, the Arabs say there will be no end to the increase in population; there are, after all, twelve million Jews in the world.

The very name Israel disturbs them terribly, and the curious thing is that they take an attitude of "ostrich"; that is, they try to hide their heads in sand. The textbooks which we used, the maps that we used, all had the word Israel crossed out. Time Magazine, which--the Time International was the one way we kept up with the news; and Time Magazine had the pages on Israel cut out. Any advertisements on Israel would be cut out. Also, one bookstore finally gave up getting the Middle East Journal, which is perhaps the best journal on the Middle East, because whenever there was an article on Israel, it was cut out. Sometimes these articles were twenty pages, thirty pages; the bibliography on Israel was cut out. Imagine trying to teach in that kind of situation. Well, somehow or other, the textbook that we were using--one of the textbooks we were using--Fisher, the middle east history--came through without being censored. And the chapter on Israel was still there. So I told my students, "Look, we are going to read this chapter and talk about it." And they said, "Oh"; they are very emotional--"Oh, no, Dr. Elbow, we couldn't possibly--the subject is much too painful--we can't do it." And I said, "If Israel is your enemy, you'd better know about your enemy." I said, "Once we had this attitude in the United States." We didn't study Russia--remember? And it's been the same thing about China, and now I think we are beginning to realize that we have to study these regions. And so we did spend a little time on Israel, but it was very painful for them. And they did read the chapter.

There are so many things of this nature that one could emphasize and relate. For example, among the more intelligent students--and I'm thinking of one student in particular who is doing her senior thesis under me--the question came up, if there were a war between Arabs and Israelis and the Arabs did win, what then? And this girl sat and thought a minute--she had been studying the refugee problem--and she said, "Well, if we won, then there would be over a million Jewish refugees, and that would be a problem." And I thought this ability to think in this was--this kind of mutuality, reciprocity, in thinking, was very good, but you find people like that in the minority. They are among college and university students. The prejudice, the feelings, are very, very, very strong.

As to hopes for the future of settlement--before I left from the United States for the Middle East, I thought, well, in some way, there could be a compromise. But having been there, the possibility of some kind of permanent peace looks very distant. For one thing, any Arab leader that would deign to make peace or at least even sit down at the conference table with the Israelis would probably be assassinated. This has happened to several; several Lebanese leaders were assassinated who really wanted to make peace. And then the Arab contention is that, well, they say they want to go back to the 1947 partition line, which is a kind of ridiculous partition--I'll show a map of it later. And then the other demand is that they want all the refugees to have a free choice of going back to Israel or being compensated for their land. Well, in the first place, the partition line of 1947 is unviable--it simply wouldn't work. It divides up Palestine into a number of little pieces. Secondly, if all the refugees went back to Israel, and there are a million of them, Israel would become an Arab state. Of course, that would please the Arabs, but it would not please the Israelis. And the Israelis cannot accept them. As far as a compromise--say 50-50 or 75-25--the Israelis admit some refugees and the rest of them are compensated--this is terribly difficult, because Israel now feels that admitting refugees is admitting a fifth column into the country. The Arabs in Israel, many of them are under military control, so that if you were to admit a hundred thousand Arabs you would admit a fifth column of a hundred thousand people. So, no real progress has been made at all. The only step forward--practical step forward--has been in terms of unfreezing the funds

of the Arabs in Israel. Now, this sounds like a very small step--and it is, a very small step--but an important one. But it took years, literally years, before the United Nations was able to get the Arab funds released to the Arabs--these were funds that were in Israel. It was a very complex situation. In the meantime, of course, there are the million refugees--these have increased, more than doubled, partly by birth rate, natural increase, and partly because some of the Bedouins have come in and joined the refugees because they get free handouts. Of these million refugees, about half of them are under the age of eighteen. Every year thirty thousand of them reach the age of eighteen. The birth rate is very great. There are about 187,000 of them who are educated in United Nations schools. It is the United Nations which is keeping them alive. The United Nations feeds them. The United Nations houses them. The United Nations provides an education for them. The United Nations also provides medical care. Clothing is provided by Church World Service and other voluntary agencies. Not all refugees are taken care of by the United Nations, because in order to be a refugee you have, I think it is two or three years, you have had to have lived in Palestine--what is now Israel--that is, two or three years before 1948. You would have had to have lost your home. Now, many people lost their land, but their home was on the Arab side of the border. These people are not considered as refugees and therefore they are not supported by the United Nations but by voluntary organizations, like Church World Service. The people are given rations. They are given rations in terms of, first, staple products like flour and oil, soybean oil, and sugar, and so on. Then, those who need it, particularly the children, are given supplementary rations, supplementary feeding. Probably their condition today is better than it was before they were taken care of by the United Nations. The only thing, and this is the tragic point, is that they have nothing to do. As we shall see, five thousand of them are educated in UN vocational schools--and these are very beautiful schools, very modern--they teach them automobile mechanics, electronics, plumbing, masonry, carpentry, agriculture. And there is also a teachers college run by the UNRWA. But the number that these schools can take is five thousand. Now the last director, the ex-director, John Davis, of UNRWA wants to double, triple, this amount. Other people have said, well, five-thousand is the limit that the Middle East can absorb--the economy of the Arab world is not advanced enough to absorb more than that number of skilled workers. Actually, it would be 2500 a year, because it is a two-year course. Of these 2500 a year, most of them get jobs in Kuwait, the oil state, or in Saudi Arabia, in other parts of the Arab world--not in the section where the refugees are. A few have been given jobs in Sweden. But by and large they go to the other sections in the Arab world. Now, boredom is one of the worst things in the world. And, of course, I think boredom very often plants the seeds for war. Imagine hundreds of thousands of young people with nothing to do--except to get married--they can do that and they can have children--and that is it. They spend their time sitting around. They go in coffee houses. Some of the more enterprising of them open little stores. Very often they sell ties. I saw barrels and barrels of neckties in the city of Gaza. And I don't know what they did with them, but they'd sell them to one another. But, essentially, there is nothing for them to do. And the really dangerous thing about it is that the Egyptians are now trying to organize military units in Gaza and among the other refugees. And if a young man has nothing to do, the idea of joining a military unit, waving a flag, and getting back Palestine, which is in the hands of the enemy, appeals very much.

And so I see the possibility of war in the future, unless something can be done to give these thousands and thousands of young people some sort of a future. What the solution is to it, I don't know. I suppose if we could find jobs for them so that we could triple, quadruple, this number of five thousand in the schools, in the vocational schools, if we could perhaps build factories, if the Arab governments would permit this, and dams, and other great engineering works, and put some of these skilled workers to work, why, this would be very fine. But because of political feelings, the Arab governments will not permit this. That is the situation at the present time. And, of course, the war continues. Shalom is war in that region of the world, as witnessing the present incidents in Syria.

\*\*\*\*\*

A STATEMENT BY DR. ELBOW

Since on its own initiative, Skandalon is publishing a transcript of my talk given some time ago before a meeting sponsored by Forum of Politics, I feel it is necessary to make several comments. First, this is a transcription based upon a tape recording rather than a written manuscript. It has not been edited by me and, therefore, may not be completely accurate in all details. Second, in hindsight it appears that I should have used the expressions, "The Arabs feel...", "The Arabs think...", or "The Arabs say...", more often than I did, in order to make it perfectly clear that I was describing Arab feelings and thoughts. The title itself, "Shalom Means War: The Arabs and the Palestine Question," makes sense only if it is clear that it is meant to describe Arab feelings. Obviously,

Israel wants peace in the region and so does most of the non-Arab world. Since the title has been misinterpreted, I now express regret for having used it. Also the sentence stating that "the existence of the state of Israel militates for a state of war" was and is to be understood as a description of Arab feelings and accordingly, it, too, should be qualified by the statement "according to the Arabs." Certainly I have at no time, either here or in the Middle East, advocated the dismemberment or destruction of Israel, and I have continually pointed out to my Arab friends that the United States supports the territorial integrity of Israel. Other than these clarifications or rectifications, I stand by the speech (excepting, of course, the errors resulting from transforming the oral to the written word).

\*\*\*\*\*  
"THE AMERICANIZATION OF EMILY": A Review

Early in "The Americanization of Emily," Joyce Grenfell asks James Garner, playing a World War II American naval officer: "Commander, what is your religion?" "M'am," replies Garner, "I'm a practicing coward."

Well, thinks the viewer, I can settle back and watch a good comedy with Garner as a World War II "Bret Maverick," a kind of middle-brow anti-hero. But the viewer is in for a surprise and for a superior film. For this is neither a situation comedy nor a serious attempt to turn morality upside down by arguing the virtue of cowardice. Instead it is a comic attempt to describe one way in which the individual can cope with the madness of a bureaucratic machine at war.

Garner plays an ex-night clerk at a prominent Washington hostelry, expert in the art of providing entertainment for V.I.P.'s. He enters the marines in a flush of idealistic enthusiasm. A taste of Guadalcanal cures him, and he takes an opportunity to become a "dog-grabber" for an admiral (played by Melvyn Douglas). A "dog-grabber" is a high officer's aide in charge of providing him with the basic comforts of life--food, drink, and sex, and Garner is a very good one. In London shortly before D-Day, he falls genuinely in love with Julie Andrews, a military chauffeur, whose husband and brothers have already fallen victim of World War II.

The crisis comes when the admiral in a moment of special wackiness proposes that Garner head up a team of photographers to accompany naval demolition experts ashore on D-Day. Why? To demonstrate that the first dead American ashore on D-Day was a Navy man, thereby strengthening the Navy's case in its inter-service rivalries. The admiral's other aide, an Annapolis man (expertly played by James Coburn), eventually goes along with this wild scheme. Garner, frightened to death and protesting vigorously, has to go through with it, and apparently becomes the first victim of German fire on Omaha Beach. Photographs of his corpse are splashed across the front page of every daily paper in the country. But wait, our anti-hero isn't really dead! It was all a ghastly mistake! The next day he shows up with wounded survivors, grumbling about being the victim of a short fired by his fellow aide who accompanied him and encouraged him to do his duty by brandishing a pistol.

But in Garner the Navy has a ready-made hero, and he is whisked off to Washington to appear before a Congressional committee. And this produces the second crisis. Should he cooperate in this farce or not? Should he go along with all of the sham, or should he become a man of principle, reveal what really happened, and open his own front against the mad bureaucracy running the war? The latter, it is clear, would be costly; a couple of years in the brig and much unhappiness for his fiancée. In the end he resists temptation and remains true to his principles; he goes along with the scheme and presumably lives happily ever after.

What is the moral of the story? Garner at two points makes clear that he is neither a thorough coward nor wholly selfish. But he does object vigorously to sacrificing himself for remote, abstract "ideals"--or perhaps better, clichés. Trapped in a massive conflict, all he can do is look out for himself, his family, his community, his country, and his universe--in that order. He will not cooperate readily with the establishment and sacrifice himself to achieve their particular insanities, though he is willing to commit himself to and sacrifice himself for another person. There is much to be said for his point of view. It avoids the unrealities both of the warrior who would rid the world of all evil through force and of the pacifist who willingly sacrifices himself in another way for equally remote ideals of universal peace and brotherhood.

This is an excellent film. The principals perform admirably. The direction is sharp and well-paced. And the dialogue provided by Paddy Cheyefsky is often shrewd, often uproariously funny, and always interesting.

-Kendall Birr

\*\*\*\*\*  
CALENDAR OF EVENTS:  
Friday, Jan. 15, 9:00 p.m. A bus leaves Sayles at 8:35 and the New Dorms at 8:50 for the 9:00 Ecumenical Service.  
The Golden Eye: Fr. John Phelan on Sunday, Jan. 17, 7:30 p.m.  
"The Space Novels of C. S. Lewis." Faculty Study Group on Butterfield's Sunday, Jan. 17, 8:30 and 9:00 a.m. "Christianity and History"; see DeWitt Ellinwood  
The Church of the University Community. Preacher this Sunday: Frank Snow, Campus Minister. Cars leave Sayles at 8:15 for the 8:30 Episcopal Service. Sunday, Jan. 24, 7:30 p.m. Faculty Study Group on Buber's "Two Types of Faith"; see Daniel Odell