

on the cordial note just struck by the Iraqi Ambassador (he was referring to the latter's gloss of the Kassem-Nasser rift). But, the chairman went on to say, Mr. Asha had received another query for which he had a prepared answer to deliver. This reading covered: Senator Fulbright's charges with respect to pro-Israel pressure groups; the "freedom of the seas" amendment to the Mutual Security Act; the picketing of the Cleopatra; Ben Gurion's visit to the U.S. (part of a "sinister and malicious design"); and the hospitalized Cleopatra sailor (whose injuries were attributed to the Zionists.)

It should be noted that these rehearsed question-answer exchanges, evocative of a press interview in a totalitarian country, were all devoted to the Palestine controversy. For the Institute to have facilitated them seemed to me most irregular.

For most of the remainder of the day (May 6th) the Institute returned to the field of inquiry traced out so carefully by Professor Schacht. It is pleasant to be able to single out Professors Firuz Kazemzadeh of Yale (subject: "Non-Arab Muslims and the Arab Nation Concept"), Rouhollah K. Ramazani of the University of Virginia (subject: "Pan-Arabism and Soviet Policy: Today and Tomorrow") and S. D. Goitein of the University of Pennsylvania (subject: "Arab Nationalism as viewed from Israel"). The first and second are both Iranians who, it might be said, defined, respectively, the historic Persian and Ottoman attitudes toward Arab nationalism and the modern Iranian and Turkish attitudes toward the Soviet rapprochement. Professor Goitein, formerly of the Hebrew University, presented the Israeli viewpoint with moderation and yet considerable force. His entry into the lion's den was, I thought, well received by the audience.

"Ugly Coincidence"

I am reminded, however, that, more often, audience reaction was a stimulant to extremism from the platform. A considerable number of those present were manifestly pro-Arab and many of the questions were weighted against Zionism and Israel. Often, when one of the several Israelis on the floor stood up to ask a question or make a short statement, shouts of laughter or of protest went up. Most of the outbursts seemed to come from a rooting section of Arab students. Yet I found these displays far less objectionable than the vein of prejudice exposed by a segment of the non-Arab audience. With occasional justice, Zionists have been accused of not drawing an essential distinction between an anti-Israel viewpoint and an anti-Jewish one. However, my experience at this conference -- which I refer to with reluctance -- indicates the identification of the anti-Semite with a "pro-Arab" position. This process was strikingly embodied in the person of one of the conference guests. He was Harold Noel Arrowsmith, a resident of Baltimore, prominently associated with George Lincoln Rockwell of Arlington, Virginia, the man whose mission it is to recreate the Nazi party in this country.

During an intermission Arrowsmith came up to one of the Israelis and insulted him loudly and in appalling language. He began his tirade by saying: "I am a goy, but you are a mad dog." During the afternoon session, he submitted a question to Professor Goitein regarding an alleged Jewish plot in 1916 to drag the United States into the war against Germany. Professor Goitein replied that the situation in the Middle East was grave enough without dealing with such nonsense. On May 7th, the last day, Arrowsmith brought along anti-Semitic pamphlets which he distributed among the audience. Officials of the Institute put an end to these deliveries and later apologized to the Israelis present for Mr. Arrowsmith's behavior. But he was