

# TIKKUN

*Editor and Publisher*

Michael Lerner

*Associate Editor*

Peter Gabel

*Executive Editor*

Alice Chasan

*Book Editor*

Michael Kazin

*Jewish Book Editor*

Michael Paley

*Fiction Editor*

Melvin Jules Bukiet

*Poetry Editor*

Marge Piercy

*Media Editor*

Jay Rosen

*Literary Editors*

Phillip Lopate, Leonard Michaels, Francine Prose, Mordechai Richler, Linda Zisquit

*Contributing Editors*

James Atlas, David Biale, E. M. Broner, Arnold Eisen, Christopher Lasch, Ruth Messinger, Gina Morantz-Sanchez, Ilene Philipson, Ruth Rosen, Lisa Rubens

*Assistant to the Publisher*

Randi Locke

*Circulation & Production Manager*

Michael Burns

*Art Consultant*

Hali Weiss

*Editorial Staff*

Jonathan Graubart, Elliot Neaman

*Interns*

David R. Adler, Kevin Arnovitz, Jared Blank, Amy Helfman, Joshua Pearlman, Jenefer Poyen, Yigal Schleifer, Paul Schor, Michael Steinberg

*SJSJ*

Akiva Lerner

*Controller*

Valerie Bach Vaz

*Israel Office*

Aaron Back, Beth Sandweiss

*Editorial Consultants*

Heather Ashley, Christina Büchmann, David Gewanter, David Green, Shifra Raffel, Josh Weiner

*Editorial Board*

Martha Ackelsberg, Rachel Adler, Eric Alterman, Gar Alperovitz, Michael Bader, Michael Berenbaum, Rachel Biale, Heather Booth, Jay Cantor, David Cohen, Dan Cohn-Sherbok, Gerald Cromer, Dorothy Dinnerstein, Elliot Dorff, Peter Edelman, Leslie Epstein, Sidra Ezrahi, Gordon Fellman, John Felstiner, Nan Fink, Saul Friedlander, Amos Funkenstein, Laura Geller, David Gordis, Arthur Green, Joshua Greene, Colin Greer, Robert Heilbroner, Hal Jacobs, Burt Jacobson, Reuven Kimelman, Daniel Landes, Hillel Levine, Tzvi Marx, Daniel Matt, Marshall Meyer, Jo Milgrom, Jo-Ann Mort, Ilana Pardes, Victor Perera, Robert Pinsky, Judith Plaskow, Letty Cottin Pogrebin, Aviezer Ravitsky, Lillian Rubin, John Ruskay, David Saperstein, Zalman Schachter-Shalomi, Howard Schwartz, Chaim Seidler-Feller, Gerald Serotta, Drorah O'Donnell Setel, Stanley Sheinbaum, Uri Simon, Michael Steinlauf, Daniel Thursz, Milton Viorst, Al Vorspan, Arthur Waskow, Steve Wasserman, A. B. Yehoshua, Idith Zertal, Steve Zipperstein

## Letters

### CLINTON

To the Editor:

How I wish that Clinton and his entourage would read your editorial ("Clinton's Economic Crusade: The Missing Ingredient," March/April 1993) and adopt the language and the vision that you propose! If Clinton's people could frame their policies in the language of building, to use your language, "a new ethos, an America based on loving and cooperation and caring for each other, an America that embodies a set of values" rather than trying to make us more efficient at competing, a leaner and tougher America ready to promote our self-interest in the world capitalist market, they could indeed build a base of support that would last. But Clinton's people just aren't smart enough to understand what you are saying. I'm sure that what they think you are saying is

that you've got a few slogans for them to use, and in that case, they are content with their own speechwriters. But what TIKKUN is really saying is that there's a whole new way to do politics, a new way to think about the world, based on a different way of thinking about what human beings are. Do you really think that the policy wonks and narrow thinkers who Clinton has surrounded himself with are able to think this deeply, to question dominant paradigms, to rethink the whole way that they do politics? I'm willing to accept your account of Clinton himself and his responses to TIKKUN's politics of meaning—but I just don't see how you are ever going to pierce the wall of resistance that will inevitably greet your ideas from those who are Clinton's gatekeepers and policy experts, most of whom are more likely to feel threatened than enlightened by a politics of meaning. So I doubt very much

TIKKUN (Vol. 8, No. 3, ISSN 0887-9982) is published bimonthly for \$36 per year by the Institute for Labor and Mental Health, a nonprofit, tax-exempt organization, 5100 Leona St., Oakland, CA 94619-3002. Application to mail at second class postage rates is pending at Oakland, CA and additional mailing offices. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to TIKKUN, POB 460926, Escondido, Ca. 92046. TIKKUN subscribers are members of the Institute for Labor and Mental Health.

**Manuscript submission: Do not send letters of inquiry.** Become familiar with the kinds of articles TIKKUN prints by becoming a subscriber and regular reader. Non-fiction and poetry: send either to our NY Editorial Office (PO Box 1778, Cathedral Station, New York, NY 10025) or to our California Office (5100 Leona St., Oakland CA 94619-3002; area code 510-482-0805). Book reviews: send queries to Michael Kazin, Dept. of History, American University, 4400 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20016; (202) 885-2415. Fiction: Melvin Bukiet, 529 W. 113th, NY, NY 10025. Submissions must be accompanied by a self-addressed stamped envelope, or they will not be considered or returned. Our evaluation process may take up to four months. Copyright ©1993 by the Institute for Labor and Mental Health. All rights reserved. Opinions expressed in TIKKUN, including the editorials, are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the editorial board or of the people listed on the masthead.

**Israel office:** P.O. Box 10528, Jerusalem 91103; (02) 436 007.

**Subscriptions** can be placed by calling (800) 846-8575 or mailing a check or Visa/Mastercard/AMEX info to: TIKKUN Subscription Service, PO Box 460926, Escondido, Ca. 92046. \$36 for 6 issues, \$72 for 12 issues, \$108 for 18 issues. Add \$13 per year per sub for Canada and Mexico, \$16 for all other countries. Subscriptions to TIKKUN are tax-deductible. Please pay for all orders in U.S. funds (including postal money orders) or with checks drawn from a U.S. bank only. Institutional subscriptions: \$50 for 6 issues. Limited availability of back issues—call the toll-free number above.

**All subscription problems** can be dealt with by calling 1-800-846-8575 or writing to TIKKUN Subscription Service, PO Box 460926, Escondido, Ca. 92046. Please allow 6-8 weeks for any subscription transaction, including receiving your first issue, solving subscription problems, or changing your address. (You may get a bill or a renewal notice after you've already paid or renewed. Please disregard. Bills and payments may cross in the mail.)

**Articles appearing in TIKKUN have been indexed in** *Political Science Abstract*, the *Alternative Press Index*, *Book Review Index*, *Index to Jewish Periodicals*, and *Religion Index One: Periodicals (RIO)*; in *Magazine Index*, *Magazine Index Plus*, and *Academic Index*, all available from Information Access Co., (800) 227-8431; and in the *Left Index*. 16 mm and 35 mm microfilm, 105 microfiche, and article copies are available from UMI, 300 North Zeeb Rd., Ann Arbor, MI 48106. Audiotaped back issues are available free of charge for blind or visually impaired people at the Jewish Braille Institute of America, Inc., (212) 889-2525.

**U.S. newsstand and bookstore distribution** by Eastern News Distributors, Inc., 2020 Superior St., Sandusky, OH 44870; (800) 221-3148.

if we are likely to hear very much of your new paradigm from Clinton—despite the fact that you've made an overwhelmingly clear argument for why it would be in his interests to take this perspective more seriously.

Regina White  
Saint Louis, Missouri

To the Editor:

I was heartened to learn that Hillary Clinton had asked you to send TIKKUN to the White House. It's unrealistic to expect that the Clintons are going to adopt the politics of meaning very

quickly—the pressures for a politics-as-usual are so overwhelming that it's amazing that they are willing to go as far as they do using the old paradigm. But eventually I think that Hillary and Bill will both come to understand that their own policy initiatives would get more support if they were framed within the context of the kind of ethical and spiritual vision that TIKKUN proposes. Michael Lerner's articulation of a "politics of meaning" is one of the most original ideas I've seen in the past few decades—so don't abandon it or play it down just because it

doesn't get an immediate response from the Clinton people. Just as Bill Clinton recognized that it was your perspective that made the most sense

#### MAY & JUNE TIKKUN EVENTS

**NY Salons:** (all are vegetarian pot-lucks)  
May 15: "Judaism and the Body", 144 W. 80th St., 1st floor, 7:30; May 25: Tikkun Leyl Shavuot (traditional study of Jewish texts, 10 p.m.-2 a.m., 255 W. 95th, #1D); June 13: "Tensions Between Blacks and Jews," 529 W. 113 St, 1st floor, 7:30.

**San Francisco:** June 27, Founding conference of Committee for Judaism & Social Justice. Call 510-482-0805 for info.

## INTERNSHIPS AT TIKKUN

*Summer 1993 or Sept. '93 - June '94  
New York or S.F. Bay Area Office*

TIKKUN's internship combines an introduction to the world of publishing with an intensive involvement in the intellectual and political life of one of the country's most controversial and well-respected intellectual magazines.

Read and evaluate manuscripts, proofread, research, recruit writers, promotion, fundraising, help organize the TIKKUN conference of Jewish writers and Jewish writing, work to strengthen Students for Judaism and Social Justice, solicit new subscribers, leaflet, office grunt work, outreach to media, work on developing TIKKUN's cable television show, and more.

There is no money available to pay for interns—the work is entirely voluntary. Summer interns can sometimes use the experience to help them get into graduate school. Nine-month interns often find that this experience helps them get full-time paying jobs in publishing. Graduate students often manage to use the opportunities that they get in this work (e.g. recruiting articles from respected academics in their field) to advance their careers in academia.

Interns are expected to work at least twenty-four hours during the summer weeks, and at least sixteen hours per week for the nine-month internships.

To apply: Write a self-revealing letter to Michael Lerner, Tikkun, 251 W. 100, New York, NY 10025.

## RESEARCH ASSISTANT

*May and June in New York and/or  
June 20-August 25 in Berkeley*

Pay: \$8/hr. Full-time (i.e., expected pay: \$1280 per month)

Seeking junior faculty or very talented graduate student who is already familiar with the literature to assist in preparing detailed summaries of the current debates in at least one of the following areas:

1. Neo-cons versus liberals; progressives and the right: the major theoretical debates in the past twenty years and their latest developments.

2. Current debates in American Jewish life. The major debates about the impact of the Enlightenment and Emancipation on Jewish life; Zionism; the Holocaust, socialism; the impact of modernity and postmodernism, and how these are to be understood Jewishly.

3. Current debates about Jewish theology, history, and literature. What are the main debates, in your estimation, and in what way does or should their outcome matter to a contemporary progressive Jewish intellectual?

To Apply: Send detailed letter about yourself, showing your familiarity both with the subject matter and with the perspective of TIKKUN magazine. Indicate on which coast and during which time periods you are available. Send your recent writing plus names and phone numbers of two people who are familiar with the quality and speed of your writing. Mail to: Michael Lerner, 251 W. 100, New York, NY 10025.

## CONFERENCE OF JEWISH WRITERS AND JEWISH WRITING

*New York City — January 16-18, 1994*

What is the place of Jewishness in the emerging multicultural world? Is there a way of embracing our Jewish particularity without falling into the kind of ethnic chauvinism whose manifestations in Bosnia and Eastern Europe we find abhorrent? How do we overcome the compulsive individualism of contemporary American culture and reconnect with what is exciting and nurturing in our Jewish cultural heritage? We invite novelists and poets, writers for magazines, television, movies, and academics. There will be a special focus on the needs of new writers just beginning their careers.

Pre-registration until Nov. 1: Incomes under \$15,000/yr: \$55; \$15-30,000: \$70; \$30-60,000: \$125; over \$60,000: \$170. Prices rise dramatically after Nov. 1. Register soon: Tikkun, 251 W. 100, New York, N.Y. 10025.

Paper or session proposals accepted through June 12.

of past failures of the Democrats, so future political leaders and maybe even the liberal and progressive social change movements will come to understand that your politics of meaning provides the only plausible direction for social change and the healing and repair that your magazine's name endorses.

Ricardo Cisneros  
San Antonio, Texas

To the Editor:

Yes, there's a struggle going on between two paradigms of politics. I'm a new subscriber to *TIKKUN*, and I'm proud to be identifying with your paradigm—a paradigm that places ethical vision and spiritual connectedness at the center of politics. Since I started to receive *TIKKUN* a few months ago I've begun to raise these issues to friends, and I'm stunned at how many people agree with your perspective once I've taken the time to explain it. I wish there was some more sexy way to present it besides calling it "the politics of meaning," because it's an idea that has amazing explanatory power. I'd given up on politics for the past two decades, but with the election of Clinton on the one hand, and finding *TIKKUN* and its really good idea of how to move the Clinton presidency in a progressive direction, I'm re-energized. What I've decided to do is to spend some time every day convincing some new person about the politics of meaning and why it's better than the politics of rights and entitlements. Sometimes I need your help to explain it more fully—but luckily, I get *TIKKUN* and it's been doing a good job of giving me the concrete things I need. Keep up the good work.

Millie Richards  
Denver, Colorado

To the Editor:

As a veteran of the sixties and an engaged intellectual for social change, I am dismayed by what can only be described as your fawning over Bill Clinton. While there may be a legitimate case for acknowledging the resonance of the symbolic politics of a Clinton presidency with what you call the "liberatory spirit" generated by the sixties, much of the substance of Clinton's administration remains wedded to a corrosive and retrograde politics-as-usual. Granted that his positions on reproductive and gay rights carry on a tradition of self-determination and

tolerance for diversity that emerged in the sixties and energized movements through the eighties, these positions cannot be the only measure of a transformative politics for the nineties.

In particular, I find your capacity to overlook and downplay Clinton's continuance of imperial and militaristic policies to conflict with both the spirit of the sixties and the needs of the nineties. One of the critical motivating forces for change in the sixties was the anti-war and anti-imperialist movement. To neglect Clinton's blemished record as a supporter of contra forces in Nicaragua during his tenure as governor, and right-wing Cuban factions during the campaign was a betrayal of any commitment to either the rule of international law, the regard for human rights, and a sense of solidarity with those struggling against the arrogant power of the "pax Americana."

Perhaps in the flush of ridding Washington of the troglodytes of the Right, you turned away from casting a sharp eye on the contradictions of Clinton's politics and lost sight of any responsibility for the oppressed of the Third World. However, what will you now say to those Haitians languishing in terror and prevented by the Clinton administration, in violation of international law, from seeking refuge in the United States? What do you say to those civilians in Iraq who, as a consequence of the militarism of their brutal dictator and the punitive politics of the Pentagon and Secretary Aspin, continue to suffer? And finally, how do you explain to Third World peoples that the Clinton administration is looking after their true interests when the new undersecretary of the Treasury for international affairs, Lawrence Summers, called for the exporting of more pollution to the Third World?

While I know that *TIKKUN* realizes that the moral repair of the world requires more than rhetorical and symbolic change, it is disturbing to see how oblivious much of your commentary has been to the real grounding of Clinton's politics. I hope you can come down to Earth now and begin to speak truth to power. And if we should, in the best tradition of the sixties, give power to the imagination, we must not forget those who are ground down by an imperial politics still emanating from Washington.

Fran Shor  
San Diego, California

*Editor Responds:*

American imperialism is not the explanation for all the world's woes, nor is it sufficient explanation for some of the problems in Clinton's foreign policy (e.g. his retreat from democratic promises on Haiti and Bosnia).

I haven't forgotten that the dominant economic arrangements in the world market function to keep the poor nations impoverished and that the mass starvation in many of those countries is not a product of nature but of international social relations that were established by the advanced capitalist countries and that benefit the few at the expense of the many. But I don't see Clinton as someone who is trying to strengthen this arrangement, but rather as someone who has never fully grasped the connection, and whose moral sensibilities would lead him to challenge them if he did.

That Clinton is a moral human being is something that standard leftist accounts have no room for. However, for those of us who see the complexity and goodness in Clinton, the task isn't simply to stand on the sidelines and throw intellectual darts, but rather to find a way to connect with his goodness and move it in a constructive direction.

That's why we've been emphasizing the politics of meaning that Clinton responded to when he wrote me in the past. The politics of meaning proposes an ethos of caring and community that stands in sharp contrast to the ethos of selfishness and me-firstism and looting that is a central part of the capitalist market. The logic of a politics of meaning eventually leads to challenging the imperial politics that would strengthen the hegemony of the rich over the poor on a world scale.

But the question is, "How do you build a mass constituency for a politics of meaning?" Certainly not by using the same old language and tired phrases of a defeated Left! My answer: by showing that an ethically and spiritually based politics makes more sense, both because it speaks to our deepest experience, and because it provides a possible bridge to the ethical sensibilities of Clinton and those who surround him. Perhaps this strategy will never work, and the Clintonites will never actually feel adequately engaged by our politics of meaning to force them to rethink what they are doing. But it is worth a try, because this is a far more plausible strategy than that of those who think that they can "sing the

old melodies" and excoriate others who no longer respond to the tune. Clinton needs the politics of meaning, because without it his own constituency won't have the intellectual, moral, spiritual, and psychological foundation to hang in there with him through the intricacies of the debates that lie ahead. And should he ever fully and unequivocally commit to a politics of meaning, lefties would have a much stronger foundation from which to raise the quite legitimate concerns about the way that the world economy keeps so many people in economic misery.

## RAP MUSIC

To The Editor:

I was glad to see Marshall Berman's piece on rap, and while I think it's important for progressive Jews to pointedly distance themselves from the way that conservative Jewish leaders denounce rap, I cannot endorse Mr. Berman's disingenuous remarks regarding Public Enemy's "Welcome to the Terrordome."

Chuck D's use of the phrase "so-called chosen" is bigoted, and dangerous. If, as Berman insists, he should be viewed as a poet, not a journalist or lawyer, then why not an anti-Semitic poet? The fact that Berman can point to Jews who are "messianic and implacable" and who are "arrogant in their opinion of themselves" does not make Chuck D, the self-described "follower of Farrakhan," any less of a bigot.

Mr. Berman also fails to mention, in his several references to Ice Cube, that Cube's latest record contains a number of crude anti-Semitic statements. He criticizes Black "Uncle Toms" during one cut, for "tryin' to be white or a Jew/ well who are they to be equal to?" Elsewhere on the record, he rails against his former group, NWA, and their Jewish producer, and says, "can't be the 'nigga4life' crew/ when you got a white Jew/ tellin' ya what to do." And later in the same cut, he again condemns NWA for consorting with us filthy Juden: "you let a Jew/ break up my crew?" Offended, anyone?

As I said, it is extremely important that progressive Jews also speak out against conservative Jewish voices on this issue. In this regard, Mr. Berman is partly correct when he says, "The B'nai Brith Anti-Defamation League (ADL) and other Jewish groups have overreacted to ['Terrordome']."

The racially biased outcries from the Right, however, ought not to translate into craven apologetics on the Left. We have a responsibility to engage someone like Chuck D in an honest progressive debate on his insensitivity toward Jews. This is in no way inconsistent with recognizing rap, at its best, as a beautiful art form, nor with supporting African-American struggles for social justice. I should mention that I give Mr. Berman enormous credit for writing the first Jewish article on rap I've ever seen that treats the subject with a semblance of objectivity and good faith. Yet I think we Jews ought to be very consistent in our denunciation of anti-Semitism, and never withhold entirely legitimate objections when epithets are hurled our way, by anyone.

David R. Adler  
New York, New York

### *Marshall Berman Responds:*

One of the exciting things about rap is that so many thousands of kids engage in it, along with a great many who aren't such kids any more. So rap and rappers fill the whole spectrum of beliefs and values alive in our culture today, from the best to the worst. Indeed, some of the most interesting and perplexing incarnate both the best and the worst.

I'm not going to analyze Public Enemy again, but I'm curious about Adler's epistemology. Given a range of an image's possible meanings—"so-called chosen frozen"—I wonder how Adler knows that the true meaning is the anti-Semitic one. But I'm glad he mentioned Ice Cube's latest record, *The Predator*, which was in one of my drafts but didn't make it into print. *The Predator* has a lot of pretty awful stuff in it. It maligns Jews, all right, but it insults Asians, homosexuals, women, and whites even more virulently. We are right to be disgusted with Cube's anti-Semitism, but we also should recognize that it's only one aspect of a thoroughly and profoundly disgusting worldview. In fact, the ambience of *The Predator* is a black hole where indignation devolves into nihilism and militancy into misanthropy. Ice Cube's furious energy only deepens his personal abyss. (Though it may be that he'll be able to cry all the way to the bank!)

Are rappers in special danger of this abyss? Maybe, especially gangster rappers, whose spiritual power comes

from their sense of having passed through the fire. But sometimes the fire burns them out and turns their souls to ashes. This is an occupational hazard, not only of gangster rap, but of modern art. King Lear, the first great modern art work, is about what it's like to live in the hole, but also about what it's like to come through. When somebody we care about falls in, we can only hope he or she will come through and live again. But modern life is risky, and while some will, some won't. I love rap because it's so nakedly out there on the heath with the king and the bastard and the fool, trying to survive and become human and start life again.

## RABIN'S EXPULSIONS

To the Editor:

Your March/April issue was the best American coverage of the situation in Israel, barring none. I sometimes hear people say that TIKKUN is too analytic or heavy or hard to get through—but after reading your lively roundtable debate, your interviews with Israel's leading philosopher Yishayahu Leibowitz and with Hanan Ashrawi, and the gripping and very moving account by Wendy Orange of her experiences as a Jew on the West Bank, I just don't understand how anyone could not find TIKKUN one of the most lively intellectual journals in America. Nor do I understand why you have continued financial problems—there must be 300 American Jewish liberals each of whom would be willing to donate \$1,000 a year to keep TIKKUN in the black.

I don't get it—what gives? Why don't people understand how important you are and put their money where their mouths are?

Sandra Simon  
New York, New York

### *Editor Responds:*

I almost can't believe that I got such a wonderful letter. Normally, people either cheer or attack, but few actually understand that we are always financially struggling, that we are not some huge institution with wealthy or institutional backers, that we need financial support and don't get it. If I had a hundred dollars for every time someone has said "there must be some wealthy liberals out there who would support us" we'd be on easy street, but unfortunately we have nobody to depend upon but people for whom the

\$1,000 donation is a stretch. Moreover, liberals and progressives are more used to critiquing institutions than financially supporting them—though after their institutions collapse they then bemoan their fate. The fact is that we probably do have enough readers who could, if they stretched, afford the \$1000 a year—but they don't do it, magically imagining that someone else will step in and provide the support. Though TIKKUN really functions as a kind of national community center, people who would give a \$1,000 a year to support a synagogue or community center simply don't see themselves doing that for a magazine, even though in their heart of hearts they know that this magazine has a tremendous impact in creating the background realities that make it possible for their own views not to feel so marginalized. On the other hand, there are many people who ought to be supporting us who don't on principle—either because as liberal Jews they feel that we have pressed them too hard by our insistence that they say publicly what they believe privately (a demand that makes them feel that they might lose their influence in the organized Jewish community, so rather than grapple with the moral dimension of our challenge they dismiss us as “too radical”), or because as liberals who “happen to be Jewish” they find that we are too Jewish for them (I can't tell you how many times I've been told by liberal Jewish funders that they wouldn't fund something that was so explicitly Jewish). And then the people who read this letter who will acknowledge what I'm saying, nod their head, hope that TIKKUN survives (which it will, though only by cutting down on some of what makes it so terrific), even hope that someone else will up their annual donation, but still can't see that it is they themselves who are being asked to stretch far more than they've done in the past. Now do you get it?

To the Editor:

It's hard for me to believe that the Israeli peace party, Meretz, could have done something so stupid as to support Rabin's expulsions. I read and re-read the justifications of this action, and I just can't understand how any reasonable person would have come to the conclusion that expelling 400 Palestinians was going to advance the peace process. What, exactly, is the

peace party going to say when Likud returns to power and expels even larger numbers of Palestinians? Why can't it use the same justification—that it's really doing so to reassure the Israeli population, so that it will get a mandate to make (unspecified) concessions at some (future) negotiation?

And Likud will win again in the future, unless Labor produces a real peace settlement. Not a few token concessions, but peace. And there's nothing in what it has been offering that is even close to being sufficient to overcome the tremendous anger that the expulsions have generated, hence nothing close to being sufficient to stop the spontaneous outpouring of rage that is being manifested in the random and misguided violence that Palestinians are now delivering to Israelis. Faced with this violence, Israel will feel compelled to offer less, Palestinian negotiators will be unable to settle for what has been offered, and Rabin will deliver an ideological victory to Likud that Netanyahu's charm will turn into an electoral victory in a few years. All this might have happened anyway, but at least Meretz might have been there to explain it to the Israeli public, instead of being locked into defending the actions that may have put the lid on the coffin of the peace process.

Michael Sagentz  
Los Angeles, California

To the Editor:

Wendy Orange's piece is a powerful counterexample of your general policy of insisting that your writers on Israel be Israelis. I delighted in her piece. And yet, even though I hope you'll get Orange to write more, and even though I urge you to accept other pieces if they are as sensitively done, I nevertheless support your general position on this question. I often find myself arguing about Israel based on articles that I've read in TIKKUN, and it often helps to bolster my case to be able to point to the fact that it is Israelis who are writing, not Americans who don't really know the terrain. I remember hearing the criticism of TIKKUN's conference in Israel a few years ago—that you were from America coming to give advice to Israelis—and I must admit that the criticism stung and temporarily deflected my attention from the wisdom of your insights, until you were able to point out that of the eighty-six speakers at your

conference, seventy-nine of them were in fact Israelis and that the points being made by TIKKUN in Israel were being made by Israelis. I realize that there is something irrational about this—after all, I never rejected criticisms of South Africa when they were being made by American Blacks who had never lived in South Africa, or criticisms of Cuba being made by American leftists just because those leftists were not Cubans, or criticisms of Serbia being made by non-Serbs, or criticisms of contemporary Germany being made by non-Germans. But I guess I do feel differently about Israel, do feel that somehow it mattered to me when I realized that you, the editor of the magazine, were personally involved in Israel and not just standing and criticizing from afar, and that your articles are usually written by people whose future lives are deeply intertwined with the fate of the people of Israel. So, don't be absolute about it, but keep going in the same general direction and don't flood us with articles by Americans. I must admit, by the way, that even calling herself a “naive American” helped me a lot, gave me a sense that she understood the problem, and that hence she was more credible in my eyes.

Sarah Levine  
Chicago, Illinois

To the Editor:

Wendy Orange's coverage of her own inner struggle about whether to trust Palestinians or not is one of the deepest, most complex, and sensitive pieces of writing I've ever seen on the Palestinian conflict. Bravo TIKKUN!

Sandor Cohen  
New York, New York

To the Editor:

I am happy to learn that Wendy Orange has gone to Israel to see what it is like to live as a Jew and to learn Torah. However, she will not learn about Torah and the Jews of Israel by “hanging out” with Palestinians in Yehuda and Shomron.

I once learned while studying Torah that a Jew must first learn to love himself/herself, then his family and friends, then his local Jewish community, then the Jewish people as a whole, and then he/she may begin to “love” the “stranger,” that is to say, all of humanity. For a person who does not love himself and where he comes from is in-

*(Continued on p. 74)*

capable of genuine love for others.

I cannot bring myself to love my Palestinian Arab enemy who cheers as missiles crash on Tel Aviv, or who wants to set up yet another Arab state in the Middle East in Israel, the historic and only homeland of my people. Instead of putting her life at risk, for her fears are not irrational, I suggest that she dialogue with the many various groups of Jews that live in Israel. She could start by visiting the family of Simcha Levy, z'l, 45, who was knifed and axed to death by three Palestinian Arab men dressed as women. She believed in Arab-Jewish coexistence and many Arab families made their livings through her. Next, she could visit the Yeshiva of my friend Yehoshua Friedberg, z'l, who was kidnapped and murdered by Palestinian Arabs. She could speak to his friends and see what motivated a twenty-four-year-old Jew to leave the good life in Montreal and come to Israel to learn Torah and to volunteer in the IDF in an elite combat unit. Finally, Ms. Orange must realize that Israel is in a perpetual state of war, not a cold war, but a bloody, hot war, and we as Jews cannot "turn the other cheek" and love our enemies. However, we can learn Torah and begin to learn to love all Jews and our Jewish heritage as we are obligated. Wouldn't that be a better start?

Yehezkel Goldfrad  
Philadelphia, Pa.

To the Editor:

If ever there was proof needed that Jews are no smarter than anyone else, we need only look at the mess that Israelis continue to make in their dealings with the Palestinians. Apparently blinded by their own delusional picture of reality, they daily shriek outrage at the newest armed assaults against them, never once connecting this with the daily shootings of Palestinians by the occupation troops, never once asking themselves if the expulsion of 415 Palestinians might have anything to do with the escalated level of terror they face, never once imagining that Rabin's refusal to consider allowing Palestinians to elect a national assembly that could chart their own direction might make all the talk about "getting back to negotiations" seem less connected to reality and more another public relations stunt. Yet the Israeli press never talks about this, never gives us a hint as to how we might understand what is happening from the Palestinian perspective. So I want to thank TIKKUN for

printing Wendy Orange's very exciting account of the Palestinians and their way of viewing recent developments. I still hate it when a random Palestinian enters a schoolyard and starts to stab random Israeli children, and I will never justify violence on either side. But Wendy Orange's article gave me, for the first time, an understanding of how violence on one side is related to violence on the other.

Yoram Ben Ami  
Washington, D.C.

To the Editor:

Here is a statement concerning the State of Israel and the Law of Return that Palestinian organizations consider discriminatory:

The idea of what constitutes "Jewishness" is bogus. Consider the wooing by the Israeli government of so-called "ethnic Jews," those foreigners, mostly East Europeans, who can prove some vestige of Jewish ancestry. Last year alone, 220,000 of them came to Israel, attracted by an array of taxpayer-paid benefits. These immigrants often speak no Hebrew and, other than having perhaps a Jewish grandmother in the family tree, are no closer to Jewish culture than their "un-Jewish" counterparts. The terminology beautifully discloses this prejudice: If you are an "ethnic Jew" you "go up" to Israel where you belong (aliya) but if you are "non-Jewish" and just want to immigrate, you come from "out" there (hagira).

This passage is a close paraphrase of a few lines from Elliot Neaman's "The Escalation of Terror in Germany," (TIKKUN, Jan/Feb 1993) with "Jewish" and "Israel" substituting for "German" and "Germany," and the Hebrew words bracketed above used in lieu of their German equivalents. It is all too easy to single out only old villains—the Germans—whose fault takes no effort to prove. Immigration to the State of Israel is based on a similar conceptual framework, and no amount of white-washing can deny this, at least not to TIKKUN readers. You may wish to visualize the following two episodes. One is the arrival of thousands of Russian citizens in Ben Gurion Airport, showered with affection and material rewards. The other, a long line-up of Palestinian Arabs at an Israeli ministry trying to arrange entry permits for their

relatives who left the country for a few years abroad. These relatives may have grown up in Jerusalem and speak not only Arabic, but often a lot more Hebrew than the ingathering Jewish exiles. None of this is of much help: the Law of Return excludes these "un-Jews" even if these were born and educated in the country.

It is surprising indeed that the usual moral sensitivity of TIKKUN editors has failed them this time and let a blatant expression of double standards and hypocrisy slip onto its pages.

Yakov M. Rabkin  
Monreal, Quebec

*Editor Responds:*

Even if Rabkin were right that the Neaman article reflected double standards and hypocrisy on this point, we would not have rejected the rest of Neaman's analysis, nor would we have required him to change this point. We frequently print articles with which we strongly disagree. That's our idea of how to model a community sharply divergent from the conformism of the organized Jewish community, by the American Right, or at times even by an increasingly "P.C." oriented American Left.

As to the substantive point, we have always defended the double-standard implicit in affirmative action. And the Law of Return is affirmative action on the international level. We would argue the same case for Bosnian refugees applying for citizenship in a future Bosnian state, but not for Serbian citizens of that same state. In short, it matters whether or not you were the oppressed or the oppressors when claiming a right of return. Communities that have historically faced oppression have historical claims that others do not have. Similarly, it would not be racist for a Palestinian state to give special rights of return to Palestinian refugees and not to Jews who wanted to live on the West Bank. Sometimes these distinctions may require complex and controversial historical judgments, but even if one might occasionally err in making such judgments, doing so is not inherently "hypocrisy."

*CORRECTIONS FOR MARCH/APRIL '93:*

Stewart Burns's name was spelled incorrectly in the table of contents. In "Malcolm X and the Revival of Black Nationalism," the date of Malcolm's death was incorrectly given as 1964. It was 1965.