

THE ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT: A MORMON DILEMMA?

by James B. Mayfield

Professor James B. Mayfield, Assistant Professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Utah, examines the issues in the Arab-Israeli conflict from the point of view of a Mormon scholar.

The power struggle inherent in the Arab-Israeli confrontation is taking place in a deep chasm of conflicting goals and aspirations. The visible issues that separate the Arabs and Israelis may not seem overly complex to the average American; such issues are often defined in simplistic terms and thus suggest easy solutions. Yet beneath the surface of an uncomplicated analysis, which tends to describe a complex problem in terms of black and white categories, there exists a deep ideological conflict between two nationalisms. The circumstances of contemporary history have brought Zionists and Arab Nationalists into an inevitable clash over the territory of Palestine. To the devoted Zionist, who has for centuries dreamed of a Jewish revival, there can be no state of Israel outside of Palestine. Arab nationalists, who have known centuries of conquest, division, and exploitation, first from the Ottoman Empire and then from the Western powers, now, too, dream of the moment when all Arabs' lands, *including Palestine*, will be united in one great Arab State. The circumstances of history have brought these two national movements to a peak of territorial aspiration, and the struggle for Palestine has become identified as a reflection of the national revival and development of these two great Semitic peoples.

Americans in general, and Church members in particular, with their enthusiasm for spectator sports, tend to approach the Arab-Israeli rivalry by choosing sides. The general tendency is to see this dispute almost as a Wild

West film, with the civilized "good guys" fighting the "blood-thirsty natives." Yet the Palestine problem is not like a Western film or a Foreign Legion saga, for, in fact, it more closely resembles a Greek tragedy. A tragedy is not a conflict between "light" and "darkness," between "truth" and "error." It seeks to illuminate the clash between two equally valid forms of justice. As in all tragedies, there is little hope for a jubilant conciliation based on some rational compromise solution. The tragic choice in the Arab-Israeli confrontation appears at this moment to be between a bloody battle of mutual annihilation and an unacceptable and frustrating compromise created more out of the imperatives of the situation than from any sudden break-through of mutual understanding.

It is a gross mistake and an over-simplification to assume that this conflict is based simply on a misunderstanding. It is the utmost naïveté to believe that Arab fanaticism and hostility is merely the creation of revolutionary Arab leaders and that the removal of a Nasser or an al-Skukairy would allow the Arab to realize the positive side of Zionism.¹ The Arabs do not oppose Zionists because they fail to understand Zionism but because they understand it only too well — and this is the tragedy, for both feel compelled to control the same area.

For many it is evident that the claims and counterclaims of the Arab-Israeli struggle are irreconcilable. Ethnically the Jews may claim descent from Arab to whom this land was promised for an inheritance through the lineage of Isaac, Jacob (Israel) and Judah; yet the Arabs also declare their genealogical ties to "Father Abraham," through the "Twelve sons of Ishmael." If one argues that Jewish religion and culture have deep historical roots in the land of Palestine, others will contend that the Arabs have inhabited this land for more than a thousand years. Jews, of course, turn to the Balfour Declaration issued by the British government in 1917, which stated that "Her Majesty's government views with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people. . ."; but the Arab will note that the Balfour Declaration further added ". . . it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine," and then further point out that the British, through the MacMahon-Hussein Correspondence of 1915 (two years prior to the Balfour Declaration), promised political inde-

¹At this point it may be well to clarify certain terms utilized in this paper. Judaism refers to the religious system of ethical teaching expounded and defended by Jewish theologians since the time of Jesus Christ. In contrast to this Jewish theology, which is generally embodied in a series of commentaries on their sacred texts (the *Talmud*, the *Haggada*), modern "Zionism" is a secular ideology based upon nationalism, not religion. Zionists, while willing to utilize Judaic theological precepts to justify the creation of a Jewish state, do not require, nor even emphasize a religious basis for their political activities. Many Jews are "Zionists," others are not; some are in fact vigorously anti-Zionist. One fairly substantial group of anti-Zionist Jews have organized the American Council for Judaism. They publish a quarterly journal entitled *Issues*, and seek to sharply distinguish between Judaism, the religion, and Zionism, the political movement. The Arabs have interpreted Zionism to mean a Western-sponsored political movement, established for the specific purpose of creating a Western colony in the midst of the Arab world.

pendence for the Arab nations (including Palestine) in return for Arab support against the Ottoman Turks during World War I.²

The real issue separating the Arabs and the Israelis is largely a function of two competing nationalisms, both requiring the same piece of territory to fulfill their perceived destiny. Since 1948, guerrilla warfare, propaganda exchanges and boycotts, border incursions, commando raids and counter raids, intensive suspicion, and continuing efforts to rally outside support for their respective viewpoints have all obstructed a meaningful Arab-Israeli *détente*. The fundamental encumbrance is largely a reflection of both antagonists' reluctance to compromise or recognize any merit in the claims of the other side. Positions have thus become frozen and antithetical. Each side reiterates its case with the predictability of a phonograph record, while evincing no willingness to acknowledge the existence of justice in the other side's contentions.

THE MORMON DILEMMA

When Ben Gurion proclaimed the new state of Israel in 1947, many members of the Church were convinced that this was to be the inauguration of the predicted restoration of the House of Judah. The eventual gathering of the Jewish people to Jerusalem is a cardinal principle of Mormon theology and has been prophesied by all the leaders of the Church since the days of Joseph Smith. On October 24, 1841, Elder Orson Hyde, one of the Twelve Apostles of the Church and earlier commissioned by the Prophet Joseph Smith, stood on the Mount of Olives in Palestine and there offered a dedicatory prayer which included among other things these words:

Thou, O Lord, did once move upon the heart of Cyrus to show favor unto Jerusalem and her children. Do then now also be pleased to inspire the hearts of kings and the powers of the earth to look with a friendly eye towards this place, and with a desire to see thy righteous purposes executed in relation thereto. Let them know that it is thy good pleasure to restore the Kingdom unto Israel — raise up Jerusalem as its capital, and constitute her people — a distinct nation and government with David thy Servant, even a descendant from the loins of ancient David to be their king.³

Thus, interestingly enough, a young Mormon Elder dedicated the land of Palestine for the eventual gathering of the Jewish people at least forty years prior to the development of the modern secular ideology of Jewish Zionism. In 1879 Wilford Woodruff, who later became the President of the Church, voiced a firm conviction concerning this gathering of Judah:

²For two excellent scholarly studies of the conflicting promises issued by Great Britain to both the Arabs and the Jews see:

J. C. Hurewitz, *the Struggle for Palestine*, (New York, 1950);

William R. Polk, D. Stramles, E. Asfour, *Backdrop to Tragedy: The Struggle for Palestine*, (Boston, 1957).

³Joseph Smith, *History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book Company, 1957), Vol. IV, pp. 456-57.

I wish in this testimony to say that the time is not far distant when the rich men among the Jews will be called upon to use their abundant wealth to gather the dispersed of Judah, and purchase the ancient dwelling places of their fathers in and about Jerusalem, and rebuild the holy city and temple. For the fullness of the Gentiles has come in, and the Lord has decreed that the Jews should be gathered from all the Gentile nations where they have been driven, into their own land, in fulfillment of the words of Moses their law-giver. And this is the will of your great Elohim, O house of Judah, and whenever you shall be called upon to perform this work, the God of Israel will help you. You have a great future and destiny before you and you cannot avoid fulfilling it.⁴

While the concept of a gathering is implicit in Mormon theology, some question has arisen concerning the fulfillment of these prophecies. The scriptures are legion in both the Bible and the Book of Mormon, all suggesting that the House of Judah will be gathered to Palestine — "the land of their inheritance." Yet many of the scriptures in the Book of Mormon give the impression that the Jewish people must first believe in Jesus Christ before the promised gathering will be fulfilled:

2 Nephi 6:11 . . . the Lord will be merciful unto them (Jews), that when they shall come to the knowledge of their Redeemer, they shall be gathered again to the lands of their inheritance.

2 Nephi 10:7 But behold, thus said the Lord God: When the day cometh that they shall believe in me, that I am Christ, then have I covenanted with their fathers that they shall be restored in the flesh, upon the earth, unto the lands of their inheritance.

3 Nephi 20:30-34

And it shall come to pass that the time cometh, when the fulness of my gospel shall be preached unto them;

And they shall believe in me, that I am Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and shall pray unto the Father in my name.

Then shall their watchmen lift up their voice, and with the voice together shall they sing; for they shall see eye to eye.

Then will the Father gather them together again, and give unto them Jerusalem for the land of their inheritance.

Then shall they break forth unto joy — Sing together, ye waste places of Jerusalem; for the Father hath comforted his people, he hath redeemed Jerusalem. (Italics added)

President Charles Penrose notes the apparent contradiction between some scriptures that suggest the Jews would "begin to return but in unbelief," and other scriptures which state that "they shall believe in me, that I am Jesus Christ . . . then will the Father gather them together again, and give unto them Jerusalem for the land of their inheritance." President Penrose argues, however:

In the Book of Mormon, in reference to this subject, it is stated concerning the latter times: "Then shall the Jews also begin to believe in Christ and shall gather home to their own land." Now, some

⁴Matthias F. Cowley, *The Life of Wilford Woodruff*, (Salt Lake City, Utah: Bookcraft, 1964), p. 509.

people have looked upon that prediction in the Book of Mormon and those in the Doctrine and Covenants as a little out of joint; but they are mistaken. There is no prediction in the Book of Mormon, any more than in the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, that the Jews as a people, as a body, will in the latter times, in their scattered condition or in the *first part of their gathered condition*, believe in Jesus of Nazareth as the Son of God, the Messiah long looked-for by their ancestors to come and restore Judah and establish His kingdom on the earth. The two predictions harmonize exactly in your mind when you come to see rightly and understand properly.⁵

Elder Penrose is not explicit in his speech as to how these predictions "harmonize"; Elder Orson Pratt, however, does point out, "Then many of the Jews will believe, although many of that nation will gather in unbelief. But the Book of Mormon has told us that the main part of them will believe while yet scattered. They will receive your [Elders and Seventies] testimony and gather to Jerusalem."⁶

James E. Talmage, in his book, *Articles of Faith*, also suggests that the "full recovery" of the Jews is predicated upon their acceptance of the Savior:

It is evident from these and many other scriptures that the time of the full recovery of redemption of the Jews is to be determined by their acceptance of Christ as their Lord. When that time comes, they are to be gathered to the land of their fathers . . .⁷

It is significant that Elder Penrose speaks of "the first part of their gathered condition," which suggests a later or second part of gathering, and Elder Talmage uses the word "full recovery," which suggests a possible earlier and less than full recovery. Although a partial gathering of the Jewish people has begun, it should be apparent that an important precondition of "full recovery and redemption" of these descendants of Judah has not yet been met.

If all these comments are to be harmonized with the history of the Arab-Israeli conflict of the past four decades, it is obvious that "the gathering" of the Jewish people to Jerusalem must not be identified with one single mass migration. While a small group from the House of Judah has now returned to Palestine, still in unbelief, this "token gathering" should not be equated with the "full" redemption of the Jewish people which is to be fulfilled at some future date.

The present State of Israel constitutes less than fifteen percent of the Jewish population in the world. The present gathering of the Jews to Palestine should be seen more as a "sign" or a testimony connected with the Dispensation of the Fullness of Times and the latter-day work of the restoration than as the fulfillment of the promised gathering of the Jews. Members of the Church must seek to clearly distinguish between the promise of a "true

⁵Address delivered in the Tabernacle, Salt Lake City, Utah, December 15, 1917, by President Charles W. Penrose.

⁶Orson Pratt, *Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 7 (July 10, 1859), p. 186.

⁷James E. Talmage, *Articles of Faith* (Salt Lake City, Utah: the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1956), p. 334.

gathering" seen as a fulfillment of a prophecy pertaining to all Jews and the far more restricted developments of this secular Jewish state, with its commitment to the modern political ideals of nationalism, socialism, and military Zionism. The state of Israel, while obviously a "sign of the times," should not necessarily be seen as a "fulfillment" of the spiritual promises made through the ancient and modern prophets.

Once the membership of the Church delineates these two aspects of an extended process of gathering they will be able more clearly and objectively to evaluate the present policies and actions of the secular state of Israel. The Mormon dilemma largely stems from complete unconditional support and identification with the State of Israel.

First, let us look at the problems the Church must face if the membership identifies itself, at this stage in history, with the secular and military policies of Israel. Within the last few years missionaries have been reintroduced into the Middle East. At present, there are some 15-20 missionaries preaching the Gospel in Lebanon.⁸ Yet from returned missionaries from Lebanon recently interviewed, it was noted that the most effective campaign used against the Church in this part of the world has been to equate our belief in the eventual "gathering of Israel" with the present policies and military activities of the State of Israel. Few Arabs, Muslims or Christians will listen to these missionaries, who are characterized as "Israel spies." Thus, the Church is unfairly identified with a political state that has little in common with the "promised gathering of Judah" that is to be predicated upon their conversion to Jesus Christ. Given the worldwide commission to preach the Gospel to all kindreds, tongues, and nations (including both the Arabs and Jews), it should be apparent that the Church does not and cannot identify itself with any political state.⁹

Equally crucial to this dilemma is the increased interest in millennialism so apparent in the writings and teachings of many "Church scholars." Especially since the June War of 1967, many have been quick to interpret this latest Arab-Israeli confrontation as the literal fulfillment of specific scriptures. This questionable practice of equating particular historical developments with definite Biblical prophecies has many dangers, especially for the unsuspecting member who ties his testimony to this prophecy—historical event relationship. To build one's commitment to the Church on the basis of one's private "insights and interpretations" has often led to disastrous results. How many Church members expected the "Second Coming" to take place prior to 1890 because of "private interpretation"? How many became disillusioned when polygamy was discontinued? How many saw World War I and then later World War II as the final battle of Armageddon with Hitler as

⁸These missionaries are under the Swiss Mission and have established branches in several of the major cities in Lebanon.

⁹At this point it would be well to note that the Church has assiduously maintained its neutrality in the Arab-Israeli conflict. Many Church leaders have close friendships with both Arab and Israeli leaders. One project that clearly shows that the Church does not just identify with Israel is the Brigham Young University's sponsorship of a dairy farm and agricultural experimentation center established in Jordan during the 1950's.

"the obvious Gog of Magog?" What would happen if this secular state of Israel were destroyed? Whose testimony would be shattered? Whose commitment would be shaken? While the state of Israel no doubt is here to stay, especially given the U. S. Government's close ties with Israel, yet the point needs to be made that this secular Jewish state, as a "sign of the times," is not necessary for the ultimate success and fulfillment of the promises made to the Jewish people. The Book of Mormon appears explicit in its declaration that the "true" gathering will occur after the spiritual redemption of Judah. The political situation in the Middle East with its instability and unrest is still subject to catastrophic changes and developments. For this reason the tendency of some members of the Church to identify too closely with the political state of Israel should be discouraged. A rigid and uncompromising attachment to the state of Israel presents obvious dilemmas for any effective missionary program in the Arab world, and arouses uncalled for speculations about the future. Yet the Arab-Israeli conflict erects dilemmas not only for the Church member, but also for all American citizens.

US FOREIGN POLICY AND THE MIDDLE EAST

The Middle East has great strategic significance, and is thus one of the central arenas of world politics. This strategic importance arises chiefly from three factors. First, the Middle East is a bridge connecting three continents. Land, sea, and air routes crisscross the area, linking Europe, Asia, and Africa. Second, the Middle East possesses vast reserves of natural resources — chiefly petroleum. The Middle East contains two-thirds of the proven oil reserves of the world, and nearly three-fourths of the oil presently available to the free world. A third respect in which the Middle East is of immeasurable strategic importance to the United States lies in the area's role in free world defense. The Middle East safeguards the southern flank of NATO, acts as a buffer against direct communist expansion into Africa, and is a vital security zone for protecting the sea and air approaches across the South Atlantic to the Western hemisphere. Today, even more than when Hitler's forces invaded North Africa, enemy control of the Middle East might in the end prove disastrous for the maintenance of Western security.¹⁰

Today the relations between the Arabs and the United States have never been worse. This is indeed unfortunate given the fact that before the Arab-Israeli problem came into existence the prestige of the United States in the

¹⁰John C. Campbell, *The Defense of the Middle East*, (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1960), pp. 3-7. Mr. Campbell strongly notes the problem: "The overriding national interest is the security of the United States — put more starkly, its survival. So long as we have no assurance of a workable system of global arms limitations or of a fundamental change in the aims and character of the Soviet regime, we must keep in the forefront of all our calculations and decisions the deadly threat of Soviet power. . . . From this general approach flows a number of concrete propositions with respect to the Middle East. The entrenchment of Soviet power in that strategic region would bring a decision shift in the world balance, outflanking NATO. Soviet control of Middle East oil could disrupt the economy of the free world. And the triumph of communism in the heart of the Islamic world could be the prelude to its triumph throughout Asia, Africa, and Europe." (pp. 4-5).

Arab world was higher than any other country in the world. Nevertheless, whatever pro-American feelings existed prior to World War II, they were soon dissipated by the inflamed passions accompanying the disputes between Arabs and Jews over the partition of Palestine in 1947.¹¹

When Stalin died in 1963, the Russian leaders embarked upon a highly successful policy of identifying themselves with all independence movements struggling against Western colonialism. Applied to the Arab world, this policy (up until 1967) had had only moderate success. The Arab nationalist leaders, while welcoming Russian aid and technical advice, rejected their ideology. It is not improbable that Russia encouraged Egyptian belligerency in June, 1967, fully realizing that Arab defeat would be inevitable.¹² The Arab leaders, suddenly finding themselves in desperate need of military aid and support, would be forced to turn to the Soviet Union — their only available ally. The tragedy of the Arab-Israeli conflict is that the Soviet Union has moved into Egypt and Syria, not as conquerors, but as partners and friends. Few who are aware of the tangible results of the last Arab-Israeli War doubt that it was the Soviet Union that came out best.¹³

The obvious and most pressing problem is the need to establish borders considered legitimate and binding to Arabs and Israelis alike. Only a clear-cut guarantee of territorial integrity, backed by a US promise to intervene, that provides the Israelis with an assurance that their right to exist will never be challenged by Arabs, and an equally binding commitment from the US that will assure the Arabs that Israel will be prevented from pursuing an unending expansionist policy against the Arab states, will satisfy both sides. Several responsible Arab leaders have indicated a willingness to accept the right of Israel to exist within the boundaries agreed upon the UN Partition Plan of 1947.

One major aim often ignored is the tremendous need to encourage and support all and any trends leading to responsible moderate Arab leadership. Many fail to realize in this country that most of the hostility, the hatred, and fanaticism is not the simple creation of Nasser, Atassi, or al-Shukairy. The average Arab's approach to Israel is more properly a reflection of the popular Arab mood which has its roots in past Western insults, broken promises, and exploitations.

An integral part of encouraging the moderate element in the Arab world is our need to encourage the Israeli leaders to deal generously with the key

¹¹Many Arab leaders felt the Partition Plan was completely unfair since it allowed the Jewish State with only one-third of the population in Palestine to control over fifty-four per cent of the territory. The Arab population, however, which owned well over eighty per cent of the deeded land in Palestine, was given only forty-six per cent of Palestine.

¹²See John B. Glubb, "Power Grab in Mid-East?" *Christian Science Monitor*, November 11, 1967, p. 1. Glubb argues: "It is absolutely incredible that these [Russian] officers can have thought that Egypt could defeat Israel. And yet, as we have seen, the Soviet Government actually encouraged President Nasser to send his Army into Sinai. To me, the inevitable explanation is that the Soviets wanted Egypt to be defeated."

¹³For a different interpretation of the June War of 1967 see W. Cleon Skousen, *Fantastic Victory*, (Salt Lake City, Utah: Bookcraft, 1967). See also the author's review of Mr. Skousen's book in *Dialogue*, Vol. II, No. 3 (Autumn 1968), pp. 135-37.

issues dividing the Arabs and the Israelis. The aim must be to create conditions in which the Arabs can accept the existence of Israel without unbearable humiliation and loss of self-respect. That is the only way in which Israel will get security — acceptance by the Arabs. The Israelis' craving for security and peace is perfectly legitimate, but it is a deadly error to think that security for Israel can be won by military power, by the expansion of frontiers and by weakening and dividing the Arab world. Every massive reprisal raid or intransigent statement from the Israeli side strengthens the position of Arab extremists and discourages those Arab leaders who will have to gain positions of power if there are to be meaningful negotiations. Israel needs to realize that until she handles her own affairs with more of an eye to moderating Arab extremism, the development of responsible Arab leadership will continually be set back by renewed fears of Israeli expansion.¹⁴

Behind the Arab-Israeli conflict lies a complex, emotion-fraught, and bitter story, many of whose ramifications have now come to permeate not only the contemporary history of the modern Middle East, but also the entire world. The implications of this crisis extend far beyond the boundaries of the Arab world, for they threaten to reinforce the nuclear confrontation inherent in the rigid bipolarized world of the East-West struggle. Both the US and USSR are being forced into rigid commitments by their smaller allies, which, in fact, destroy the flexibility necessary for survival in this nuclear age.

MORMON ATTITUDES TOWARD THE ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT

In an attempt to ascertain the degree to which members of the Church are cognizant of the dilemmas presented in this essay, a questionnaire containing six questions was distributed among three different groups to determine their attitudes toward Israel.¹⁵

Question No. 1: Do you think Israel is justified in keeping Jerusalem?

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Undecided</i>
Group I (Wards)	89.9%	9.4%	.7%
Group II (BYU)	89.2%	9.0%	1.8%
Group III (U. of Utah)	79.6%	16.0%	4.4%

¹⁴It is interesting to note among the more moderate Arab leaders their consternation over the Israeli attacks against Jordan and Lebanon during the past few months. These "pro-Western" leaders lament over the attacks against "the only two Arab nations that have consistently refused to accept aid from the Soviet Union." These "reprisal raids" from Israel are, unfortunately, interpreted as a "plot" to force King Hussein and others to repudiate their pro-Western policies. Once all the Arab leaders are being supported by the USSR, then Israel, so these Arab leaders believe, will be able to convince the US to provide total support for the policies of Israel.

¹⁵The three groups which made up the sample answering the questionnaire included:*

- (a) Group I: 258 members of the Church attending Gospel Doctrine classes in 16 L.D.S. Wards selected by an area sample method devised to include a broad cross section of L.D.S. wards in the Salt Lake area.
- (b) Group II: 276 undergraduate students attending the Brigham Young University in Provo, Utah.
- (c) Group III: 236 undergraduate students attending the University of Utah in Salt Lake City, Utah.

Question No. II: Do you think that Israel is justified in keeping the Arab territories (other than Jerusalem) that were acquired during the crisis of June 1967?

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Undecided</i>
Group I (Wards)	72.4%	20.7%	6.9%
Group II (BYU)	78.5%	16.1%	5.4%
Group III (U. of Utah)	65.2%	27.9%	6.9%

Question No. III: Do you believe that the establishment of the State of Israel is a fulfillment of prophecy?

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Undecided</i>
Group I (Wards)	91.8%	4.7%	3.5%
Group II (BYU)	87.4%	4.1%	8.5%
Group III (U. of Utah)	53.5%	24.1%	22.4%

Question No. IV: Do you consider the present policies of Israel to be a fulfillment of Prophecy?

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Undecided</i>
Group I (Wards)	65.5%	20.2%	14.3%
Group II (BYU)	54.6%	12.7%	43.7%
Group III (U. of Utah)	31.9%	25.8%	42.3%

Question No. V: Do you think that Israel should be forced to withdraw from its most recent acquisition of Arab territory if this would bring stability and peace to the Middle East?

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>Undecided</i>
Group I (Wards)	35.2%	52.7%	12.1%
Group II (BYU)	46.2%	54.1%	9.7%
Group III (U. of Utah)	52.9%	42.8%	4.3%

Question No. VI: Who should have responsibility for the Arab refugees?

	<i>Group I</i>	<i>Group II</i>	<i>Group III</i>
Israel	16.6%	31.0%	32.0%
Arabs	36.0%	33.0%	22.0%
United Nations	15.0%	13.0%	5.0%
Israel and Arabs	15.0%	18.0%	16.0%

From the results of this questionnaire, it is apparent that while well over 80% of the respondents are convinced that Israel should be allowed to keep Jerusalem, fewer are willing to admit that Israel should keep conquered Arab territories. Even more significant is the tendency of the respondents to see the establishment of Israel as a fulfillment of prophecy and then a much greater hesitancy to acknowledge the policies and actions of Israel as a fulfillment of prophecy. Question V sharply places into focus the dilemma faced

Groups II and III included students selected from "convenience samples" of classes in Political Science and Sociology. Since a nonprobability technique of selection was utilized for these two groups the percentages are obviously subject to wide sampling variations and thus must be viewed as directional rather than representative. Every third class interviewed was requested to indicate their religious affiliation. From this systematic sample it is estimated that 98% of the students in Group II are members of the L.D.S. Church.

*Special credit must be extended to Mr. Kent Calder, an honors student at the University of Utah, who devoted many hours to the distribution and collection of these questionnaires and especially for his compilation of these percentages.

by the respondents who must make a choice between their commitment to Israel and their desire for peace and stability in the area. The question is not whether withdrawal will indeed bring peace, but rather is withdrawal a legitimate course of action for Israel *if* peace would then be established? This is a big "if" yet close to 45% of the respondents felt that withdrawal was justified if peace could be established.

Although no detailed analysis of this questionnaire will be attempted at this time, some obvious conclusions should be noted. Respondents in Group I and Group II tended to answer questions I, II, and III in a similar way. Question IV shows Group II and Group III (all college students), especially in the undecided category, responding almost the same. Group I (from Question I — yes, Question III — yes) tends to vote in a more orthodox way, and Group II (from Question II — yes and Question V — no) seems to advocate a more militant view *vis-a-vis* the requests that Israel withdraw from conquered territory.

It has been the contention of this essay that the question is not whether the Jews will or should be in Palestine. The dilemma we face is, given the fact that they are there, what should be our approach? The Lord has promised that the Jewish people would be allowed to return to their homeland. This return is seen by the L.D.S. Church as a prophetic manifestation of Joseph Smith's divine calling. The basic dilemma is how to separate the concept of "gathering" as promised by the prophets, and the policy of "expansion" as practiced by the secular zionists of Israel.

The one danger we face is to sit back apathetically and say that these events in the Middle East are God's will and we must accept them. This attitude is fraught with many dangers, not only to the security of our nation, but also to the efficiency of our missionary efforts throughout the Middle East. As an American citizen, one can lament the one-sided support that the United States' Government has extended to the State of Israel. Yet while the United States *is and must be* committed to the right of the Jewish people to have a homeland, an unqualified and unconditional support of this State suggests a danger that George Washington emphasized in his farewell address:

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all; religion and morality enjoin this conduct; and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations, and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation, which indulges toward another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. . . . Excessive partiality for one foreign nation, and excessive dislike of another, cause those whom they actuate, to see danger only on one side; and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other . . . the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the

former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducement or justification.¹⁶

An unqualified support from the United States does not invite a compromising attitude from the Israeli government. Haughtiness, exuberant confidence in the justice of one's policies, and an unwillingness to understand the problems and frustrations of the "enemy" only stimulates a reciprocal hatred and fanaticism. Only the Soviet Union wins in this situation. The shock of the American people in losing China to the Eastern Bloc in 1949 was no more traumatic than would be the communist take-over of the Arab World. This, then, is our dilemma, for the possibility of a communist take-over in the Arab world has never been greater.

Many, of course, suggest that wars and instability are inevitable in the Middle East, and that peace will only come when the Millennial Reign breaks forth in all of its splendor. I reject this approach of apathy and fatalism, for it seems to me that God's eternal plan presupposes man's free agency and intellect, which he can use to improve himself and his environment. Arab-Israeli hostility is not inevitable; nuclear war is not the inescapable fate of all mankind. Men of courage and wisdom have the God-given right to seek solutions, compromises, and policies that alleviate suffering, overcome hostility, and secure a meaningful peace.

The present Russian encroachment into the Middle East is often interpreted as the "colossus of the North" which must seek to conquer Jerusalem but will be foiled in its efforts by the sudden appearance of the Savior. Although this may indeed happen "before 1970," I like to think that peace and stability in the Middle East is still a legitimate alternative, that Russian influence can be neutralized, and that moderate progressive Arab leaders can be encouraged and supported. A foreign policy based on principles reiterated by Washington in his farewell address may yet secure justice, peace, and stability in this area.

¹⁶George Washington, "The Farewell Address," in *American Foreign Policy*, eds., R. A. Goldwin, Ralph Lerner, Gerald Storuzh, (Chicago, Illinois: American Foundation for Political Education, 1957), pp. 131-33.