Goldmann: Zionist challenges the Zionists

Nahum Goldmann, the Zionist leader who has been outspoken in his criticism of Israeli government policy in a series of statements to the press this year, brings to bear seventy years of experience in Zionist and Israeli politics in his critique. Goldmann has been involved in the Zionist movement since the World War I period, beginning with activities in Frankfurt, Germany.

According to accounts in his autobiography, “Sixty Years of Jewish Life,” written in 1969, Goldman always differentiated himself from the more narrow and constricted worldview of most Zionist leaders and rank-and-file. Goldmann claims that from his early years he developed an “absence of a Jewish inferiority complex…. I have never been subject to the Jewish fear of the dominance of the non-Jewish world…. In later years I had dealings with eminent leaders of non-Jewish peoples and countries…. I cannot remember any encounter … when I had the least feeling of inferiority. I recognized that they were different, and in most cases more powerful, but never that they were superior.”

This self-conception, plus a self-professed bent toward “neo-Kantian realism,” has put Goldmann on the front-line of global Jewish affairs, as opposed to the more confined orientation to Palestine of most Zionist leaders. From his standpoint, Goldmann urged the creation of a World Jewish Congress, which came into being in 1936. From the same standpoint, he has been frequently, bitterly critical of the fixations of some of the Zionist movement’s top leaders.

Thus, in his autobiography, he sharply attacks hard-line Zionist ideologues for their direct responsibility in the death of millions of Jews “by their failure, in 1937, to accept a British offer for the partition of the territory of Palestine into separate Jewish and Arab homelands. Goldmann is against this “inability to compromise, the determination to hold on to every inch of Palestine as something historically sacred, an unwillingness to re-

A return to Geneva
—Nahum Goldmann

Among those in attendance when Mr. Nahum Goldmann addressed a synagogue in Cologne, West Germany in November, 1978, was Helmut Schmidt, the nation’s chancellor. The following are excerpts from Mr. Goldmann’s remarks:

... I would like to make a new peace proposal for the Middle East. It may appear to some very contrived, or even impossible. As far as I am concerned, despite its boldness, it is the only hope for solving a problem which has concerned the world public for the past 30 years.

... Today, I am more and more convinced that the course which Israel has taken over the past thirty years of its existence to reach peace and normalization of its relations with the Arabs, is false, and thereby condemned necessarily to failure.

...(In 1949) I envisioned a Jewish state, which would obligate itself to permanent neutrality; whose existence and whose border would be guaranteed by the peoples of the world, primarily by the superpowers. It is to be counted among the political errors of my life, that I did not stand up for this idea...

...(In 1949) the United Nations voted for the creation of a Jewish state, without even having consulted the Arabs. Here began our Original Sin (or downfall).

...(The political isolation of Israel is increasing, only the United States is still giving Israel support, and who knows for how long. The Arab world is ever more polarized, nations such as Saudi Arabia and Jordan are waning in their pro-American positions. Oil prices are rising more, with catastrophic consequences for the west. On top of all this, the delay in gaining peace has led to visible demoralization in Israel, a growth of organized crime, of the Mafia, of tax evasions, and so on.

... An American-Russian collaboration, such as that which lay behind the Vance-Gromyko Declaration of October 1977, is according to my view, irrevocable; it would have provided an excellent basis for a comprehensive peace, but, was defeated unfortunately by the Jewish Lobby.

It is my view that only an entirely new approach can lead to a solution. I propose that the United Nations reconvene the Geneva Conference...
ckon with realities." By contrast, Goldmann defines himself as the man who "finds a formulation by which everybody gains something."

The 1937 dispute with the Zionist hardliners stood Goldmann in good stead once Israel became a state. Since the early 1950s, he has taken several important initiatives and a sharply dissenting stand on a number of key issues:

—the negotiations with West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer for monetary restitution for the Nazi holocaust against the Jews. Many Zionist leaders were against any dealings with Germany at all. This laid the groundwork for Goldmann's later good relations with members of the German and French governments.

—negotiations of a "Near Eastern Confederation" with Egyptian President Nasser, through the mediation of Indian leader Jawaharlal Nehru, in the early 1950s. The deal fell through because of Nasser's lack of confidence that Goldmann could "deliver the goods," i.e., win Israeli government support for the idea. And, in truth, Israeli Premier Ben-Gurion was more intent on launching the Suez expedition against Nasser jointly with Britain and France, a decision which embittered Arab-Israeli relations for a decade.

—an insistence that Israel come to grips with the "reality" of living in the midst of an Arab majority. Goldmann has concretized this in his "confederation" idea, in related proposals for the "neutralization" of Israel, and in more recent proposals that Israel negotiate the creation of a Palestinian Arab state with the Palestine Liberation Organization, under the framework of international security guarantees made by the U.S., the Soviets, and continental Europe.

The overriding limitation of Goldman's policies is his softness toward British Fabian methods—the underside of his "Kantian realism." At one point in his autobiography, after he attacks the Zionist leadership for failing to make adequate overtures to the Arabs, he comments, "If the Arabs were Englishmen, peace could have been concluded between them and Israel long ago." Such a viewpoint could hardly endear Goldmann to those Arabs who resent British manipulation of Arab-Zionist tensions for the past century, and who rightly resent the Zionist movement's historical eagerness to play the role of British front-man in the Middle East.

LaRouche invites Goldmann to tour

Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., an independent candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination, has announced that he intends to cosponsor a nationwide speaking tour for Mr. Nahum Goldmann to make available to the internationally prominent Zionist leader a public forum to present his proposals for the solution of the Middle East crisis.

"While I do not always agree with Mr. Goldmann's views on many matters," Mr. LaRouche explained on Oct. 16, "I consider his contribution vital in upgrading the level of debate on which our Middle East policy in particular ought to be discussed. Mr. Nahum Goldmann's views, if presented to the American public, would contribute significantly in getting a real discussion on the Middle East going in this country."

"I also wish to invite my Republican counterpart, former Governor John Connally of Texas, as well as Senator Jesse Helms, to join me in cosponsoring a nationwide speaking tour for the respected Zionist leader," Mr. LaRouche concluded.