there is little hard evidence to suggest that the fears they aroused in Israel necessarily worked in favor of the Likud. But it is quite certain that they did not help the Alignment, despite reports that indicated American preference for an Alignment electoral win.

One is still left with the troubling question of why all the pollsters were so wide of the mark. Part of the answer lies in the very high percentage of those who were "undecided" right up to election day. The pollsters tended to ignore this factor, or to divide the undecideds between the major parties. In any event, the undecideds seemed to have voted en masse against the Alignment. But that in itself is not enough of an answer. It appears to be certain that many people included in the polled samples deliberately misled their questioners, probably from an innate fear of admitting, even to themselves, that they were going to vote against the government.

YOSEF GOELL *writes for the* Jerusalem Post.

Manahem Begin on Extremism & Terrorism

Following are excerpts from a dialogue between Menahem Begin, head of the right-wing Likud Party and the man likely to be Israel's next Prime Minister, and Dr. William Berkowiz, rabbi of Congregation B'nai Jeshurun here. The discussion, last Nov. 15, was part of a program under the synagogue's institute of adult Jewish studies. The transcript was made by B'nai Jeshurun.

Rabbi William Berkowitz: Mr. Begin, you've said that people have called you dogmatic or an extremist. Do you feel you are dogmatic or an extremist? And if not, how do you respond to these charges?

Menahem Begin: I am not impressed with name-calling or these words. Yes, in the course of our struggle in the resistance during the 1940s for our just cause there were people who called me an extremist. What do these words mean? We, the Jewish people, have been persecuted, tormented, tortured, and ultimately physically destroyed. What looking behind should we have done during the 1940s when we heard from afar the trains running from all over Europe toward one destination: Death to the Jew, whether at Auschwitz, Treblinka, Babi Yar, and all the others where that process of killing a nation continued for five long years.

The world did nothing to try to rescue part of them. At the very same time, Eretz Yisrael, the Land of Israel, the land of our forefathers and of our children, promised by the British as a national home for the Jewish people, was now being subjugated by the British, and its gates were shut to the Jews. When does a human being need a home more than at the time when he is not only being persecuted but even physically destroyed?

And, therefore, we rose in revolt against the British. We did it to make it possible for the Jews to come home in conditions so that never again will a bloodthirsty, two-legged beast try to destroy a Jewish child. We had to fight for statehood, for national liberation, to ensure the salvation of the Jewish people. Is this dogmatism? Or is this devotion to a just cause and the simple love for a people?

Our fight was for personal liberty and political independence. Otherwise, we would have been handed over to the Arab majority and then the end would have come to the existence of our people. This, then, was more than just a fight for individual liberty. It was the fight to save a nation from complete and utter physical destruction. This is why there hasn't been a fight for liberation as justified as ours in the annals of mankind.

Therefore, there is nothing dogmatic about it, but sometimes people make the mistake of assuming that if a group of men fought for liberation, then they believe in force. It is a complete mistake. Such men never believe in force. They believe in the great moral values of a free human being. Had they believed in force, they could not have started the fight and they surely couldn't have continued in it, because force is always on the other side—the side of the enslaver.

In this struggle, we were *again* the few against the many, the weak against the strong. We didn't believe in force. We do not. We detested physical force. We believe with Abraham Lincoln that right is might, not vice versa. Only because of this could we have continued fighting. For, at one point a certain equilibrium is created in history between the forces involved. On one side is brutal physical force; on the other side, faith in the justice of a human cause. With that equilibrium, one molecule of self-sacrifice decides the issue, tilting the scales, and the just cause wins. Nothing dogmatic about this.

Rabbi Berkowitz: How would you reply to those who have said that Menahem Begin is an extremist?

Mr. Begin: There is nothing extremist about this point of view. We have never been extremist. What did we want then? What do we want now? Let us take the attitude of the Arab countries vis-à-vis Israel.

The great Arab people, whom we respect, now have 21 sovereign states with an area of 12 million square kilometers. The land of Israel belonging to the Jewish people is a very small little country and yet the Arabs even want this country. Where is the justice in that? They should have 22 states, and the Jewish people should have no country whatsoever?

After 19 centuries of dispersion, persecution and humiliation, we cannot live without Israel. It was true, in previous generations, but it is especially true now, because on Israel depends our national security; and so if you ask, is it extreme to believe in the right of one's people to their own country?, I can only reply there

is nothing extremist in this. For a Jew to love Zion is moderation because Zion is the faith of our people throughout the centuries that the land of Israel should be the land of Jews. If this means extremism, then we should ask ourselves, Are we considering the Bible when we use that word? Is the Bible extreme?

When we use that word, are we considering all the teachings, all the history, all the suffering of the Jewish people? Let us make it clear that whoever loves the Jewish people and the land of Israel and stands for that right is no extremist. He's just a patriot.

Rabbi Berkowitz: In presenting the questions to you in which I said that people at one time referred to you and the Irgun as dogmatic and extremist, by the same token some people also have accused you of being a group of terrorists, and my question is this: How do you counteract the accusation of some people, even those who may have believed in the principles you stated, that yours was a terrorist group?

Mr. Begin: Times change, and many people who called us those names then now admit that perhaps they were mistaken. This is why I was invited in 1967 to join the Cabinet—even by the very people who called us those names in 1947. And we worked together for three years in good understanding in a government of national unity with these same people, with the disciples of Ben Gurion, the members of the Haganah, and Palmach.

Now about that horrible word "terrorism." That word stems from the Latin "terror," meaning fear. Indeed, there were people who used terror. The word in its political use stems from the French Revolution when there was in-fighting between the various groups which overthrew Louis XVI and tried to build a republic. All of them died under the guillotine, and that was called terror. In other words, people were arrested or their heads fell in order to terrorize and instill fear among the French.

A century later there was a group in Czarist Russia which used personal assassination of the Czar or a governor to instill fear in the Czarist government. The Russian people considered them heroes. They risked their lives. They died on the gallows, and went on fighting because they said it is an oppressive regime. But admittedly they took upon themselves that word.

We never used terror. We never wanted to instill fear into anybody's heart. Ours was a classical fight for liberation. We never used personal assassination. In the Irgun, we carried out *military* operations against an overwhelming force of 100,000 British soldiers equipped with heavy guns, tanks and planes, and supplemented by 30,000 British policemen.

When we started our fight for liberation at the end of 1943, we were 388—less than 400 men. We finished with 10,000 fighting soldiers. Thousands of our members and those who helped us were arrested. Some were executed while others were deported to Africa to concentration camps. Therefore, that term "terrorist," doesn't fit us at all.

Otherwise, all the fights for liberation should be called, and should have been called, terror—including the war of liberation by the American people. They, too, rose in revolt, fighting arms in hand and gaining independence. No one would dare to call that terror.

I would like to add that if anyone should again use that word "terrorist," applying to our struggle for liberation, he takes upon himself the risk of dividing the fighters of the Jewish people, which include the Haganah, the Irgun, the Lechi, the volunteers of 1948 and the members of our victorious army. We never made a distinction between our fighting group and the others.

But if a person should repeat that word in connection with Jewish fighters, he takes upon himself the peril of artificially making a comparison with those who today are referred to as the so-called Palestine Liberation Organization.

We fought to save a people. They shoot in order to destroy a people. Look at the methods we used. We did whatever was humanly possible to avoid civilian casualties, sometimes at the risk of the lives of our own fighting men. We used to warn away any and every civilian, whether Jew, Briton or Arab, from the zone of danger in advance.

Still Available

AMERICAN-ISRAEL DIALOGUES

Published as Special issues of Congress Monthly

2nd DIALOGUE
"The Problems of Being Jewish in Israel and The United States"

5th DIALOGUE
"The Nature of Jewish Distinctiveness"

6th DIALOGUE
"The Future of a Relationship: American Jewry and the People of Israel"

7th DIALOGUE
"Transmitting the Jewish Heritage in Israel and the United States"

8th DIALOGUE
"Reciprocal Rights & Responsibilities of American and Israeli Jews"

9th DIALOGUE
"Contemporary Jewry as a Majority in Israel and Minority in America"

10th DIALOGUE
"The Relationship Between Jews and Revolutionary Forces"

11th DIALOGUE
"Jewish & the Creative Process"

12th DIALOGUE
"The Contemporary Meaning of Zionism: New Definitions & New Directions"

$1.00 each
Order from: Congress Monthly
15 E. 84th St., N.Y., N.Y. 10028

What do they—the so-called PLO—do? They make the civilian population the target of their bloody attacks on men, women and children. They never express regret or sorrow when they have "succeeded" in killing an innocent Jewish man or woman or child. On the contrary, they rejoice in it. And that is the difference between fighters and killers. That is the difference between the Jewish underground and those killers of the so-called PLO.

Therefore, for the sake of the dignity of the Jewish people, and indeed of all men who fought for liberty, never use that cursed word "terrorist." Always make a distinction between authentic, humanitarian fighters for liberation and the terrorists who want to kill every man, woman and child in Israel. And that difference should always be remembered by every person who respects the truth.

Jerusalem: 1967-1977

Abraham Rabinovich

Last month two milestones in the annals of the Jewish people were celebrated —the 29th anniversary of the State of Israel and the 10th anniversary of the reunification of the City of Jerusalem.

The 10th anniversary of reunited Jerusalem is a sacred and historic occasion. Since its founding by King David 3,000 years ago, Jerusalem has been central to Jewish life. Its rebirth and reunification in our own lifetime is the fulfillment of ancient hopes and aspirations and of the prayer of "next year in Jerusalem."

We publish below Abraham Rabinovich's observations in the Jerusalem Post, *summing up ten years of a united city.*

A tale of two cities that became one. A tale of two peoples that didn't.

A decade so filled with event and portent as to mark a distinct epoch in the 4,000 years of Jerusalem's recorded history.

The stony hills drowsing on the approaches to ancient Jerusalem suddenly swallowed by a metropolis.

Arab *alte zachen* men reappearing with their sacks in the streets of Jewish Jerusalem and singing out for junk in remembered Yiddish.

Arab bombs exploding in the Jewish market place. Jewish shoppers choking the Arab market place.

A world interest so intense that the eviction of a single Arab family from the Old City's Jewish Quarter or the construction of a high-rise building become the subject of international headlines and diplomatic queries.

Palestinian Arabs and Israeli Jews living together in the same city and doing business with each other each day for 10 years while the problem of Arab-Jewish irreconcilability is pondered in the major capitals of the world.

A decade since the removal of the barriers separating eastern and western Jerusalem caused both Arabs and Jews to fear that the gates of hell had swung open. The fears of rape and massacre did not materialize. Neither did any notion that Ishmael and Isaac would embrace on the Temple Mount. The two had the opportunity, however, to note, for whatever it is worth, that the other has a human face.

Ten years ago there were two Jerusalems—hostile neighbors trying to ignore each other's existence. Each was a geographical dead-end, cut off from the mainstream of life in its respective country. Each was an economic backwater losing more people to internal migration than were coming in from elsewhere in the country, although Israeli Jerusalem more than made up the difference with *aliyah*. Israeli Jerusalem was a sleepy government and university town, the country's third largest city. Jordanian Jerusalem lived on tourism and was deliberately inhibited from growth by Amman, which feared its development as a political counterweight to the Hashemite capital.

On June 5, 1967, Jordanian guns opened up on the Jewish city as King Hussein ignored an Israeli plea to stay out of the conflict which had broken out a few hours earlier with Egypt. The guns fell silent two days later as Israeli paratroopers breached the Lion's Gate and reached the Western Wall. The king had lost his gamble. One hundred ninety five Israelis and 645 Jordanians were dead. Eight hundred buildings were damaged. Jerusalem, after 19 years of division, was again one city.

The decade since has been marked by the most intensive development the city has known since King Herod 2,000 years ago. The city was tripled in size by the incorporation of former Jordanian territory. The government expropriated almost a third of eastern Jerusalem territory—the bulk of it rocky, nonarable hills —for the construction of nine housing developments. They were sited on clear strategic lines. Four of them —Gilo, East Talpiot, Neve Yaacov and Ramot, each bigger than most development towns—were cast in a wide arc around the outermost edges of the city. Five others—Ramat Eshkol, French Hill, Maalot Dafna, Sanhedria Hamurhevet and Givat Hamivtar—were built across the battlefields of the Six Day War to link Jewish Jerusalem with Mount Scopus. (The 1967 battle in Jerusalem had pivoted on the effort to effect that link-up.)

There are already close to 40,000 Jews living in these new developments, about 15 percent of the city's Jewish population. The 11,000 apartments which have been finished there so far are to be increased to 28,000 in about five years, making the Jewish population of eastern Jerusalem almost comparable to the Arab population there.

The government has succeeded in creating a physical ring around Jerusalem that would make it difficult ever to pry the city apart again. It has been less successful in its other major objective—reinforcing the Jewish presence demographically. The September 1967 census recorded