

also restricted magazine collections from the pre-1949 period.

—Fudan University History

Department Seminar Library

Basic reference books are available, and I was able to borrow some general historical descriptions.

—Beijing Library

Having a letter of introduction enabled me to use the catalogue of foreign magazines published before 1949. I was able to see the issues I had requested four days after ordering them.

—Beijing University Library

Here too a letter of introduction gave me access to the storeroom where pre-1949 magazines were kept. I was able to read there and to make copies. —Academia Sinica in Beijing, Institute for World Religion

Mr. Wang had organized a meeting with Prof. Gao Wangzhi. Prof. Gao gave me some useful advice. His main research was into the assimilation of the Jews in Kaifeng.

—City of Kaifeng Civil Administration
Mr. Shi Zhongyu replied to my letter of inquiry that there was no information to be had about Jewish refugees.

Systematic interviews of eyewitnesses were not possible. The district where the German refugees lived, or had to live, has not only changed in physical appearance, but also in the structure of the population. Potential eyewitnesses live in other districts, or have moved away. If after forty years they are still alive, they remember little, or they suffered during the 'Cultural Revolution' because they had had contact with foreigners. Without contacts, and luck it would not have been possible to achieve very much in this area.

Research work in the Peoples' Republic of China is still marked with difficulties in obtaining information and requires enormous personal effort. But despite of all difficulties and setbacks, it is the exchange of ideas across all frontiers that brings the hope that the work of the research student will, and can serve not only the scientific subject, but a better understanding in general.

BOOK REVIEW

MAO'S JEWISH DENTIST A Book Review by Theodore Katz

Magdalena Robitscher-Hahn, *Im Geist Yanans*. Edited by John Sterling, 169 p. Frankfurt, 1980.

Dr. Robitscher-Hahn's book *Im Geist Yanans* tells the story, through letters written to her son in the USA, of her experience in China as a teacher and Mao Zedong's dentist, as well as the more important facts of her life before and after this exciting time. Though her life was full of trials — she was a young widow with an only son who died in America at an early age — she remained courageous and optimistic and is an inspiration to us all.

Dr. Robitscher-Hahn was born in 1899 in the part of Austria which became part of Czechoslovakia after World War I. She was a German speaking Jew, loyal to Czechoslovakia, who had to flee from Nazism. Educated as a dentist she sought to establish herself in Bolivia but was not allowed to practice her profession. In 1946, through UNRRA, she came to Shanghai which together with the larger part of China was under the rule of Chiang Kai-shek. Shortly after her arrival she discovered so much corruption that she decided to join the communists under the leadership of Mao Zedong in their stronghold in the city of Yanan. She describes with enthusiasm what she met there: a poverty far outweighed by a great deal of idealism.

During her year, 1946-47, in Yanan Dr. Robitscher-Hahn worked as both a dentist and a teacher. She met several times with Mao Zedong, Zhou Enlai and General Zhu De. She writes that Mao Zedong was one of her patients, and she was nervous when she first met him but was relieved to find his teeth were almost perfect!

Dr. Robitscher-Hahn also worked at improving the general hygiene in Yanan. The toilets were dreadful, so she designed a superior one (which was even named after her!). Fingernails were often long and dirty. She gave a lecture on the virtue of properly kept fingernails, and tells how she noticed with horror during her lecture

that the chairman of the meeting was himself a case in point.

The book is well worth reading and presents very personal and charming impressions of the world in which Dr. Robitscher-Hahn lived. Sometimes she is too optimistic and naive, but this is balanced by her — in its best sense — childlike faith. She met with heartfelt warmth from her Chinese friends, and found that in China Jews were hardly ever exposed to anti-semitism. In contrast, when she went to the USSR, she was discriminated against both as a Jew and as a "German". Later, when Peking and Moscow became enemies, her ties with China added to her discomforts, and she left the USSR and spent the last years of her life in a Jewish old-age home in Frankfurt.

In the Field

(continued from page 2)

ments are being made by China Passage, a corporate member of SJI. For more information call 314-469-0222.

Our Woman in Beijing

Come September, S.J.I. Board member Wendy Abraham will be off to China for a year as resident director of the Council on International Educational Exchange, headquartered in Beijing. She also has an article on Chinese Jews coming out in the September issue of *Hadassah* magazine.

RUDOLF LOWENTHAL FUND

The Sino-Judaic Institute plans to re-publish the out-of-print Lowenthal Bibliographies on the Chinese Jews. This most important work needs to be made available to scholars and other interested persons.

The cost of publication is \$5000, and we request **Points East** readers to make contributions to the Sino-Judaic Institute, 3197 Louis Road, Palo Alto, California 94303. Please note on check, "Rudolf Lowenthal Publication Fund."

Thank you!



POINTS EAST

An occasional publication of The Sino-Judaic Institute

VOL. 2, NO. 2

AUGUST, 1987

CHINA AND THE MIDDLE EAST: Principles and Realities

By Zhongqing Tian

Reprinted from
Middle East Review
Winter 1985

Dr. Zhongqing Tian is a research fellow at Shanghai Institute for International Studies. The views reflected in this article are his own personal analysis. They do not represent those of the Chinese government or of his Institute.

INTRODUCTION

China's perception of the Middle East and her policy toward that region are based on three factors: (1) the revolutionary theory of the Marxist leaders; (2) China's world strategy and her general foreign policy; and (3) the realities of the Middle Eastern countries and their attitude toward China.

For the People's Republic of China, the Middle East is more or less a paradox. Friendly contacts existed between China and that part of the world even in ancient times, when the famous "Silk Road" was opened and the fleets of the "Central Empire" reached the mysterious Arabian peninsula. Yet, by the first half of the twentieth century, the linkage between the two had virtually withered away. Although both the Middle East and China belong to the Orient geographically, they bear little resemblance to one another ideologically and culturally. It is noteworthy that Overseas Chinese reside in almost every corner of the world except in the Middle East. The same political and religious leaders in many Middle Eastern countries who resist Western influence also refuse to tolerate communist thought. Hence it is not easy for China, a socialist country with moderate economic power, to carry on diplomatic activities in the Middle East. However, over the past three decades, a carefully considered foreign policy implemented in a consistent manner has enabled China to develop a firm diplomatic foothold there.

Unlike China's relations with the two superpowers, which have undergone so many turns and dramatic changes, China's relationship with the Middle Eastern countries is comparatively stable and coherent. Over the past thirty years China has adopted some basic beliefs and principles that have defined her position vis-a-vis the Middle East: (1) both China and the Middle East belong to the Third World; (2) China firmly supports the Palestinian cause; and (3) Arab unity is of utmost importance if the Arabs expect to defeat the Israeli invaders. Nevertheless, as the world situation is ever changing, China's assessment of and behavior toward the Middle East must also undergo some adjustment. Generally speaking, China's Middle Eastern Policy in the past thirty years can be divided into three stages.

THE FIRST STAGE: From the Mid-1950s to the Mid-1960s

The Conference of Asian and African States held in 1955 in Bandung, Indonesia, was the starting point. During that conference, Chinese premier Zhou Enlai first met with Egyptian president Nasser, Palestinian leader Shukairy, and representatives of Syria and Lebanon. Zhou listened to their explanations of the Palestine question and expressed his great sympathy for the Arab stand. Not long after this meeting, China established diplomatic relations with Egypt, Syria and Yemen. The trend for developing friendship with "progressive" countries continued. China hailed the victory of the Iraq revolution of 1958. In 1962, China established diplomatic relations with Algeria. With the addition of Morocco, Sudan and Tunisia, China had established friendly relations with eight countries in the Arab world.

In the 1950s and 1960s China showed great enthusiasm in supporting Arab countries in their struggle against colonialists and for national independence, and proved itself a trustworthy friend. For example, both in

(continued on page 4)

THE MYSTERY OF THE MOSHE LEAH CHINESE SCROLLS A SUMMING UP

By Leo Gabow

In July of 1983, a curious article appeared in the Israeli newspaper, Maariv. Roughly translated, the article reads as follows:

"A JEW LOOKING FOR CORRESPONDENTS"

"His name is Moshe Leah. He is 35 years old. Religion: Jew. His occupation: clerk in a Printing Company. He lives in Taiwan and requests to correspond with people of all ages and all occupations. In the letter that Moshe Leah sent to Israel, for the purpose of establishing a connection with penpals, Moshe writes, 'I am the son of Abraham, from the Jewish Community of Kaifeng-fu. My grandfather fled with my parents to Taiwan.'"

Upon receiving the Maariv article from a friend in Israel, I immediately entered into correspondence with Moshe. I advised him of my longstanding interest in the Kaifeng Jews and enclosed copies of articles I had written on the subject. I also asked him a number of questions that would hopefully provide some documentation regarding his Kaifeng origins. We embarked on a lengthy correspondence that continued for more than three years.

I was perplexed about his having both a masculine name, "Moshe," and a feminine name, "Leah." The explanation was stunningly simple. Moshe had actually written to Maariv as "Moshe Lea," apparently unaware that the common transposition from Chinese to English is "Li." Maariv inadvertently added the "h." Moshe, bowing to what he considered to be the superior knowledge of Maariv, proceeded to sign his name "Moshe Leah." The name "Li" incidentally, was of interest as it was the name of a former Kaifeng-Jewish clan.

(continued on page 13)

From the Editor:

As promised, this issue of *Points East* presents two articles with very different points of view on Chinese-Israeli relations. Dr. Tian's article represents a view of the Middle East from a Chinese perspective. Although Dr. Tian's views are, specifically his own and not those of the Chinese government, there is a high degree of similarity between the two. Of the second piece on the subject, my own effort, I will say nothing but will leave it to you to judge. Also of note in this issue is Leo Gabow's article on the Moshe Leah scrolls -- which surely must be the last word on the subject!

It is easier for me to get excited about what has yet to be printed than what is already committed to paper. The next few issues are going to be very interesting. Upcoming are several articles on proposed film projects on the Kaifeng and Shanghai Jewish communities. Also upcoming are a number of articles on the Indian Jews of Mizoram and a fascinating conjectural piece by Leo Gabow on reasons for the assimilation of the Chinese Jews.

Do remember to renew your membership in *SJI* when it comes due and if you can contribute something more, it truly would be appreciated. Lastly, please keep those articles and letters coming. Thanks.

Anson Laytner

Points East:

An Occasional Publication of the Sino-Judaic Institute

Anson Laytner, Editor

Editorial Office:

510 Securities Bldg., Seattle, WA 98101
(206) 622-8211

The Sino-Judaic Institute

3197 Louis Rd., Palo Alto, CA 94303
(415) 493-4096

Points East is published by the Sino-Judaic Institute, a tax-exempt, non-profit organization. The opinions and views expressed by the contributors and editor are their own and do not necessarily express the viewpoints and positions of the Sino-Judaic Institute.

President, Leo Gabow; **Vice-President,** Michael Pollak; **Secretary,** Anson Laytner; **Treasurer,** Albert Dien; **Honorary Chairman,** Louis Schwartz; **Board of Directors,** Wendy Abraham, Arnold M. Belzer, David C. Buxbaum, Mark Ejlensburg, Helaine V. Fortgang, Seymour Fromer, Frederic Kaplan, Ronald L. Kaye, Lawrence Kramer, Dennis Leventhal, Donald D. Leslie, Andrew Plaks, Arthur Rosen, Joshua Stampfer, Marvin Tokayer; **Counsel,** Robert Grodsky

IN THE FIELD

China Offers College Courses In Judaism

A university in China for the first time offered formal courses on Israel and Judaism this semester. Martin Edelman, professor of political science at the State University of New York in Albany, was appointed a visiting professor in the Department of International Politics at Beijing University. He taught three courses: Israeli politics, Jewry and Jewish culture as well as a graduate seminar on U.S. Middle East policy.

Edelman taught there during May and June. Several faculty members and advanced graduate students from Chinese universities have studied with him at SUNY in the past as part of an exchange program between the schools.

New Articles On Chinese Jews Appear

In the past few months several articles on the Chinese Jews by S.J.I. members have appeared. Professor Irene Shur wrote the feature article "Chinese Puzzle: Who Are the Jews of Kaifeng?" for the March issue of the *Jewish Monthly*; Wendy Abraham wrote "The Jews of Kaifeng: A Diaspora Community Clings to Its Identity" in the March issue of *Moment*; and Michael Pollak wrote "The Youtai of China . . . Our Kinsmen?" in the Spring issue of *United Synagogue Review*.

A Shanghai Resource

Tess Johnston, who had an article in *Points East* 1,3, has joined S.J.I. She is now with the U.S. Embassy in France. She writes that she has various directories and maps pertaining to Jewish life in Shanghai. Readers requiring specific information or travelers to China "transiting Paris" are invited to contact her c/o American Embassy (ADM), APO New York 09777 or American Embassy, 2 Avenue Gabriel (42-96-12-02, ext. 2800), respectively.

Our Man in Sweden

Theodor Katz, whose book review appears in this issue, writes that he frequently lectures on Chinese Jews. He has spoken in numerous cities in Sweden, in Denmark, Norway, Finland, Switzerland, Israel, W. Germany and most recently in East Berlin.

Jewish Heritage Tour of China

Rabbi Jeffrey Stiffman of Congregation Shaare Emeth in St. Louis is organizing a Jewish Heritage Tour of China November 4-21, 1987. Arrange-

(continued on page 14)

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Chairman of Sino-Judaic Institute
Palo Alto, California

Dear Sir,

I hope this first letter see you in all fine. How great and interesting the published on Kaifeng Jews that makes famous around the world. Hence, according to the advised by our Patron Sam M. Daniel Hon. President of Congregation of Bina, New York with shyingly on behalf of this poor Community I do pray to hear my humble petition for your kind consideration and to take action. That, we the sons of Menasse (the lost tribe among 10th) return to our previous religion as a newly blown rose since the last 12 years only. But I would say frankly that we had been striken by poverty because of the neglected area by Government. We desired to communicate your institute, we stand before you in need of religious materials viz., Talith, Tefilen, Mezuzah; we also need your financial aid in order to build a Synagogue cum Midrasha. We bitterly need your financial aid for running Ulpan and Judaism course in this land. Please note that we are also the remnant people who astraying from Western Stony Shutter cave of China and being of branches of Kaifeng Jews who later on had been lost again out of China through the dark thick jungle of Kachin, Shan Karen and plain of Mandalay in Burma by many years gone. But we didn't forget at all time that we are the favoured sons of Menasse through the oral tradition songs that handed down to us by our fore-father.

Sir, please do remain alert to us and be prompt service through the same blood we were and being connected with oriental diaspora who have been suffered several anti semitic.

With much Jewish love. Shalom B'vracha
Gideon Rei, Chazan
The Kehilath Menashe Synagogue
Head Office
MAMRE I.B. Road
P.O. Box-16
Churachandpur 795128
N.E. India

(Ed. Note: In our next issue we will feature several articles on the Aizawl, Mizoram Jews.)

Dear Editor:

I found the February issue extremely informative and I particularly appreciated the articles by Prof. Gao Wang-Zhi. I am writing, however to point out several misstatements in the reprint article, "To China with the Rebbetsin" by Amelie Jacobovits. On p. 4, towards the end of the first column there is a reference to an unmarked grave which she thought might be that of my mother Annie Brown. The cemetery she visited I believe is situated in the former Bubbling Well Road, whereas my mother was buried in the now demolished Baikal Road cemetery, so the unmarked grave is certainly not hers. Moreover, her grave was not unmarked. My father, the Rev. Mendel Brown, was not an American but a naturalized British subject, who came to Portsmouth, England, as a child and never had an opportunity to visit the United States. The man who questioned her at the St. John's Wood Synagogue was not his grandson but a nephew. His only grandson lives in New Jersey and was not in England at the time.

Henrietta Reifler
Seattle, WA

Dear Mr. Gabow,

May I acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 18th and the subsequent arrival of the *Points East* newsletter. In that regard your

sponses. He seemed inordinately concerned with being linked, however indirectly, with The People's Republic. As I was in a large measure interested in the history of the Kaifeng Jews, this indirect linkage was deemed undesirable. On more than one occasion, Moshe wrote that it was his father who expressed these fears, and that he had to submit to his father's will in all matters.

On several occasions I asked Moshe if he would receive visitors with whom he could personally discuss the photo/scrolls. He refused to see anyone on the grounds that his father would not allow visitors into his house.

Moshe also declared that he had the original negatives to the photo/scrolls. I asked him to send them to me on loan, as I hoped to develop better positives than those done in Taiwan. At first Moshe agreed, but later wrote that his father would not permit the negatives to leave Taiwan, despite my best assurances that they would be returned.

All in all his responses and his letters for the most part rang true, though a number of small points were of a nagging nature.

The solution to the identity of the scrolls, had to be determined without reference to Moshe's narration. This was finally done by Leslie, and in the view of this writer, we can now say, HIC JACET THE MOSHE LEAH SCROLLS.

It goes without saying that I owe a large debt to Michael Pollak, Donald Leslie, Irene Eber, Rabbi Silver, Manfred Lehmann and Nathan Bernstein, who doggedly pursued the research trail.

It took three years for my "discovery" to turn out to be a dead end.

DOING RESEARCH ON SHANGHAI JEWRY IN CHINA

By Mulan Ahlers

I am a Ph.D. candidate from Cologne, West Germany, and I spent seven months mostly in Shanghai doing research on World War Two Jewish refugees. Within the framework of a short scholarship from the German Academic Exchange Service I stayed from February to August 1985 at Shanghai's Fudan University, and during the month of September was generously supported by the Hong Kong Historical Society for additional local research work. My subject of interest is the connection

between the history of Shanghai and the fate of the German refugees.

Research students from West Germany who go to the Peoples' Republic of China have to be officially sent and will be provided with advisors. Why, nevertheless, my arrival at Fudan University was somewhat surprising, why I had to abandon my original plan to leave end of May, and why I unexpectedly was in the hands of two most friendly advisors is another story about research conditions in the PRC. In the end I knew that I had been a kind of pioneer anyway. Thanks to the efforts of Tess Johnston a precious part of the former Beth Aharon Synagogue could be saved. When I, about a month later, went to see the stone at the Shanghai Museum, I was told it was being repaired — having been broken during transport — and after restoration would probably be exhibited. That's another story about finding and preserving material of Jewish history in Shanghai.

The first advisor I met was Mr. Zhuang, Head of the History Department at Fudan University, and recently returned from a lengthy period of research in the United States. He had intended to write about the Jews in Shanghai, but had not yet realized the project. I had his full approval for my project, though at the same time he warned me that there was little material to be found in Shanghai. As head of department, Mr. Zhuang had not much time to spend with me. My constant advisor from April 1985 was to be Mr. Wang.

One of my advisors, Mr. Wang, is a specialist for the History of Foreign Missionaries in China, especially the work of Matteo Ricci. He tried to find the sites of the old synagogues in Shanghai, and made it possible for me to go there. He also contacted various institutions where information about the Shanghai Jews was possibly to be found. Mr. Wang also put me into contact with Professor Gao Wangzhi that time at Academia Sinica, Beijing, and helped me to make numerous other contacts. Many people had prophesied that I would achieve very little during my stay in Shanghai. Thanks to the support of my Chinese teachers and advisors these prophesies proved to be not correct.

As to the information I obtained through 1985 the following institutions have none or little material: —City of Shanghai Foreign Affairs Bureau

(Shanghaishi waishi bangongshi)
No information about the pre-1949 period.

—City of Shanghai Office for Religious Affairs

(Shanghaishi zongjiaoshiwu ju)
According to Mr. Wang, the Jewish refugees had been heard of here, but there was no information to be had. Other foreigners had already tried to obtain information here, so had a professor from Beijing and another Chinese scholar. Names could not be mentioned.

—City of Shanghai Committee for Minorities' Affairs

(Shanghaishi minzushiwu weiyuanhui)

No information about foreigners.

—City of Shanghai Civil Administration

(Shanghaishi minzheng ju)

No records were to be found here.

—Shanghai Public Library

Possession of a student card allowed me access to the foreigners reading room, and to Chinese and foreign publications. Still, it was not possible to see catalogues regarding pre-1949 material. Book title, or title and date of newspaper articles had to be given to order publications. It generally took one week before the requested material was issued.

Some newspapers and publications that I knew about, and had information pertaining to the Jewish refugees during the Thirties and Forties were not available. The onetime Zikawei Library is kept in a storeroom to which outsiders are not admitted. —Shanghai Archives

It was five months before I was allowed into the Archives. An American student who had worked there before me for about a year spoke positively of the Archives, and I too was treated in a friendly manner there. Still it was noticeable that my business was not very welcome. I was able to see the Shanghai Municipal Annual Report in English, but concrete questions were not answered. The reason for this was that my research dealt principally about foreigners in Shanghai about whom there was little information; documents from the period after 1949 were simply not to be had. This was also the case with some material about the pre-1949 period.

—Fudan University Library
The university library had a central catalogue with free access. There are

interesting to know if at any time, some Jewish groups wrote without these endings." To which Leslie replied, "The lack of final letters may prove an ignorance of Hebrew on the part of the copier. . . It is less likely to be caused by some Jewish groups writing without these endings. I am back with my original suggestion, a meaningless copy of Hebrew letters and words. Sorry!"

Are the Hebrew characters on the scrolls the "meaningless" work of someone ignorant of Hebrew as Leslie and Paper problematically suggest, or do they represent a language that we have not yet been able to decipher? These were the still unanswered questions.

Doctor Nathan M. Bernstein, a former practicing Orthodox Rabbi from La Habra, California, definitely identifies a part of the scroll. In his article in the San Diego Jewish Press Heritage, August 16, 1985, he writes, "There is no question that part of the scroll is Isaiah. . . There are Hebrew words and Aramaic." In a private communication to me, Doctor Bernstein advises that after further study, he has identified specifically the parts of Isaiah the scrolls were taken from. He was among the first to make such specific identification.

The first break in the case, regarding the authenticity of the scrolls was in a letter I received from Professor Irene Eber of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. A Paleographer in the National Library in Israel, studied the photo/scrolls, and reported on Scroll #2, the "Isaiah Scroll," to Professor Eber. I quote from her letter to me dated October 19, 1985. "The text is an incomplete collection of verses from Isaiah 38, 39, 40, in between of which are unclear words, perhaps abbreviations of the missing words. The writing is a combination of early 3rd century B.C. letters with medieval and modern letters. 'א' is Dead Sea as is 'ב' and 'ג'. 'ד' is medieval and 'ה' is modern. The text is written on clean paper, with relatively fresh ink, even lines, no punctuation (along models of old writing), written in Oriental style with a reed. Paleographically the combination of letters can only be a forgery, as א was not known before the Dead Sea Scroll find. Paleographic examples of ancient letters are only known in the 20th century."

For the first time the Moshe Leah "Isaiah scroll" is associated with Dead Sea texts and for the first time the "Isaiah scroll" is clearly designated a

"forgery."

The next event of interest was a letter to Michael Pollak, dated November 19, 1985, from Rabbi Emanuel Silver, Curator of the Hebrew section of the British Library, Department of Oriental Manuscripts. Mr. Pollak had sent Rabbi Silver all of the Moshe Leah material, and requested his opinion. Quite independently, Rabbi Silver concluded, ". . . the most puzzling features of the text are the peculiar forms of many of the characters and the peculiar orthography. You will recall that I remarked immediately about both when we looked at the photograph together. Anybody slightly acquainted with the Dead Sea Scrolls will notice at a glance the overall similarity of the hand to that of certain documents of the Dead Sea caves, and anyone a little familiar with the Dead Sea texts will be struck by the resemblances in orthography."

Rabbi Silver takes issue with the Israeli paleographer on several points. He could not comprehend how the paleographer was able to determine that the "Isaiah scroll" was written with "relatively fresh ink." Nor could he understand how the paleographer could determine that the scroll itself was "clean paper," or "even that it is on paper." He wondered how the paleographer could determine all this from an indistinct photograph.

Rabbi Silver is loathe to attribute forgery to the copier of the scroll. He says that he has copied material in order to preserve the contents of the original, with no thoughts of forgery in mind, and this could also have been the case with the Moshe Leah scrolls.

On December 10, 1985, Professor Manfred Lehmann, President of the Manfred and Anne Lehmann Foundation, in a letter to this writer, advised that "The letters have a remarkable similarity with the Dead Sea Scroll letters, especially the lamed, the Final Mem, Heth, etc. There was a time when Hebrew had no 'sophy' letters."

Quite independently, the above three scholars noted the similarities of characters in the "Isaiah scroll" and the Dead Sea texts. But where do we really stand now? It is true that we know more about the contents of the Moshe Leah scrolls, but the Dead Sea tie-in, raises additional questions.

Michael Pollak opines, "For the Isaiah scroll to be authentic, it would presumably have had to be copied well over two centuries ago," for if the scrolls had originated in Kaifeng, as Moshe Leah claimed, it is extremely doubtful that any Chinese Jew in Kai-

feng had the ability to do such work for the past few centuries.

On the other hand, it could have been done by anyone skilled in calligraphy, with the intent of producing a forgery. The ingenuity of the forger is most marked in their production of archaeological artifacts for sale to tourists. Indeed, even scholars have occasionally been victimized.

Nevertheless, Pollak thought it would be "wiser" to conclude that the scrolls were "very old family heirlooms," and that they should be submitted to intense calligraphic analysis.

And here matters stood until February 27, 1986, at which time Professor Donald Daniel Leslie discovered the exemplar from which the photo/scroll was copied. Leslie wrote the following in an article to *Points East*, Vol. 1, No. 2, April, 1986, "I feel that it is necessary for me to state publicly my firm conviction that these two scrolls from Taiwan are nothing but a hoax. . . Assuming that the calligraphy is similar to that of the Dead Sea scrolls, as stated by several scholars (see Pollak's analysis), what does it show? It shows, in my opinion, that the scroll is a recent copy, in fact a forgery made since the Dead Sea scrolls were discovered in the 1940's and published in the 1980's."

Leslie continues, "The source of this forgery, is, I believe, the book by J.T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (Studies in Biblical Theology No. 26), published in French in 1957, English edition in 1959, second impression 1963). Plate No. 9 at the end of the book is 'the older Isaiah manuscript from Cave 1 (c 100 B.C.) opened at chapters 40 and 41' . . . I believe that this Plate No. 9 includes all the passages given in the Moshe Leah photo. . ."

Leslie has thus finally demonstrated, at least to this writer's satisfaction, that the "Isaiah scroll" is a forgery, i.e. "a copy of a recent book, done in Taiwan within the last thirty years."

Leslie concludes, "It would be churlish not to thank Leo Gabow and Michael Pollak for their efforts. . . Without their perseverance in identifying the second scroll as based on Isaiah, and its calligraphy as like that of the Dead Sea scrolls, I would not have been able to identify the source of the forgery. I would add that Irene Eber in her letter to Leo Gabow, had no doubts that this scroll was indeed a forgery."

As my correspondence with Moshe Leah was quite extensive, I had noted some peculiarities in some of his re-

port together with the content are excellent and make fascinating reading.

In view of my own experience and that garnered by you and your colleagues, I feel that the time is now ripe to establish a parallel framework in the United Kingdom.

Toward that end, I have discussed the matter with some associates and I now write to ask whether you would be kind enough to give us your moral support. I am of the opinion that an interchange of views and information would benefit us all in our joint endeavours to extend knowledge of our past Jewish Heritage in China and its impact in the future.

Phyllis Horal
London, England

PRESIDENT'S REPORT July, 1987

June, 1987, marks two years of the existence of THE SINO-JUDAIC INSTITUTE. I can report the following.

Status: We are a non-profit, tax exempt organization, listed as such, federally and in the State of California.

Membership: We have over 150 members. While this figure is not large, it is certainly select. Some of the finest scholars around the world have joined the SJI. Nevertheless we hope to embark on a program to increase our general membership.

Recommendation: We plan to form Chapters of the SJI in various parts of the country. Such Chapters would have membership committees; program committees; conduct lectures, etc. Those members interested in participating in local Chapters, please contact LEO GABOW, SINO-JUDAIC INSTITUTE, 3197 LOUIS ROAD, PALO ALTO, CA 94303.

Finances: We have close to \$6000 in our treasury. Four members have made generous donations. Two gave \$1000 and two others donated \$500 each.

We have no salary expenses or staff expenses. All of our work is volunteered and we keep expenses to a minimum. Our major expense is the printing of *Points East*, which costs about \$1000 per issue. Our second major expense is postage.

Recommendation: Following the Chapter recommendation, fund-raising committees should be formed for specific projects. Among these projects are the following:

- Translation of Judaic materials into Chinese for distribution to scholars in China and to those Kaifeng Jews who are interested.
- Re-printing of the important RUDOLF LÖWENTHAL BIBLIOGRAPHIES. This project is of immediate interest.
- Publication of a scholarly Journal to present material not available

elsewhere.

d) Collection of artifacts, photographic material, literature, bibliographies, etc., to be presented to interested Chinese Institutions.

These are only some of the projects we envisage, and appear to be within our grasp.

The Jews of Kaifeng Exhibit: This exhibit, born at Beth Hatefutsoth on the Tel Aviv University Campus, is currently touring the United States. San Francisco was the first city to sponsor the exhibit and its presentation formed the basis for the exhibit elsewhere.

Our Institute was integrally involved in the organizing of the exhibit in San Francisco. We served on its Committee and supplied all of the speakers for its lecture program. Professor Albert Dien, Michael Pollak, Lawrence Kramer and myself represented the Institute at the Museum. When the exhibit moved to Florida, Prof. Dien delivered the lecture. In New York, Michael Pollak, Wendy Abraham and myself were among the speakers. In Boston, Rabbi Joshua Stampfer and Michael Pollak lectured. Pollak also spoke in Chicago and in October will speak at the exhibit in San Diego.

Other Lectures: Prof. Dien has spoken on the Chinese Jews and related subjects to a number of groups, and will again lecture this month at the Palo Alto Jewish Community Center. Rabbi Stampfer invited me to lecture at his Synagogue in Portland, Oregon, and I have spoken to a number of other groups.

Professor Donald Daniel Leslie has lectured on both east and west coast during his visit to the United States. Several other lectures were organized by our East Coast Representative, Rabbi Arnold Mark Belzer. Another lecture was held by Rabbi Marvin Tokayer.

University of San Francisco Their Institute of Chinese-Western Culture organized a program dealing with Jews around the world. I represented the SJI on their Committee. In respect to the Jews in China segment, our Institute provided advice as to speakers at their Symposium. As a result, Prof. Leslie, Prof. Dien, Prof. Gao Wangzhi, Michael Pollak, and myself participated, all members of The Sino-Judaic Institute.

Moshe Leah Scrolls: This vexing question was finally settled with Prof. Leslie's first-rate analysis. (See Leslie's letter in *Points East*, April, 1986, Vol. 1, No. 2).

Rudolf Löwenthal's Annotated Bibliographies: These important and basic

works on the Chinese Jews, out of print for a number of years, will be re-printed by our Institute, hopefully within the next six months. We are currently seeking funding for this project. WE APPEAL TO OUR MEMBERSHIP FOR FUNDING TO SUPPORT THE REPRINTING OF THE LÖWENTHAL BIBLIOGRAPHIES.

Institute of Religious Studies, Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences: President Luo Zhu Feng and Director Xiao Zhi Tian, are currently in correspondence with us, and write of their "need to acquire information" relative to a history of the Jews in Shanghai and Kaifeng. Rabbi Joshua Stampfer is presently in China and will discuss ways and means of implementing cooperation between our two Institutes. They are compiling a history of religions in Shanghai.

Kaifeng Judaica Museum: We are continuing our efforts in support of a Judaica section in the Kaifeng Museum. We have been advised that the Kaifeng authorities will inaugurate a Judaica Section by the end of this year. Rabbi Stampfer will give us a more complete picture when he returns from China.

While our progress has not been spectacular, we have been growing in importance. We have become a source of information, receiving queries from around the world. Our obstacles have been many. With no paid staff, and with only a few of us engaged in the work of the Institute, our activities of necessity, were limited.

Needless to say, without the support of our general membership, our hands would be tied. We hope you will continue to support our efforts.

Faternally submitted
Leo Gabow
President

Special Thanks to:
MR. & MRS. JACK COWL
of Laredo, Texas
and

MR. & MRS. GREG FOSS
of Edgewater, New Jersey
for their very generous contributions of \$1000 each;
to MS. MARCIA MILLER
of New York City
for her donation of \$500,
and to

MR. DENNIS LEVENTHAL
of Hong Kong
who donated \$500 in honor of the
Bat Mitzvah of his daughter
Dana Marett (Luo Dian-ya).

MISSING PARENTS

We solicit your assistance in this humanitarian project. Mrs. Elizabeth Pugliatti, who now resides in London, England, has spent a lifetime trying to find her "roots."

Curt M. Pollak, Editor
Hangkew Chronicle

Dear Mr. Pollak,

For many years I have been searching for my real parents from whom I got separated as a child in Shanghai. For many years my inquiries led nowhere at all.

However, gradually, I have been able to put together some form of picture of the events in those troubled years which you can see illustrated by the enclosed documents.

That seemed to be the end of the road until very recently, through a set of coincidences too intricate to explain, I was put in touch with one of my father's cousins who knew him before the war and who, amazingly, lives less than a mile away from me.

Through her, I learned that he left Shanghai for San Francisco probably in 1946. However, despite its great emotional significance for me, this chance meeting also did not seem to lead to any concrete results.

Some days later, though, one of the people who had actively been involved in this latest chain of events and who had heard of your organization managed to obtain a copy of your Winter 84/85 edition. I was totally amazed, excited and absolutely delighted to hear of your group and your activities and I feel that no one better than you has a chance of helping me find what I have so desperately been looking for for such a long time.

I would like you to know that I am not carrying out this search out of mere curiosity. Since my adoption, I have had a life full of losses and disruptions which have left me full of insecurity and with a desperate wish to find something of my original and true roots.

I would be very grateful if you could read the enclosed history and documents and perhaps use your records and resources to try and obtain more information.

I would very much like to come to your Reunion 85 but this would be an enormous undertaking for me. Would it by any chance be possible to mention my case to those attending?

Would it be a good idea to publicize it in your columns?

I would value any suggestions and help that you can give me.

I was born in Shanghai and spent my early years there. Those difficult times for me, like for many other people, will always be part of my life: now that I have found the *Hongkew Chronicle*, I would like to keep in touch!

I am enclosing a subscription form and the fee.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully,
Elizabeth Pugliatti

To Whom It May Concern

- I. My mother, ILSE HEDWIG JULIANE KONKOW, was born 1/3/1921 in Waldheim, Falkenhagen, the daughter of Johannes Hermann Konkow and his wife, Lina Konkow (nee Berkheim). See Enclosure 1. (Birth Certificate from Registry Office, Falkensee, Kreis Osthavelland).
- II. On 21/10/1938 she married ALFRED ERICH ISRAEL (born in Berlin on 15/11/1907) at the Registry office in Berlin-Schöneberg (now in West Berlin) and she thereupon became ILSE HEDWIG JULIANE ISRAEL. See Enclosure 2. (Marriage Certificate from Registry Office, Berlin-Schöneberg).
- III. I have no record of exactly when my parents went to Shanghai, China, but it must have been between October 1938 and September 1939.
- IV. I was born either on 17/9/1939 in Shanghai Country Hospital (according to a certificate from the Hospital), or on 17/11/1939 according to the declaration made by Eileen Berge on 17/4/1948 (see Enclosure 4) and to the Adoption Agreement (see Enclosure 6). I was given the name DAISY ISRAEL.
- V. On 3/1/1943 my parents obtained a divorce from the County Court in Berlin (see Enclosure 2, bottom note on Marriage Certificate), but I do not know if this required their presence.
- VI. On 26/5/1943 an agreement of divorce was drawn up by an Attorney-at-Law in Shanghai (Enclosure 5) giving my father custody of PETRA (referred to as 'the older child', about whom I know nothing else) and my mother custody of myself.
- VII. On 29/9/1943 I was adopted by an English woman, EILEEN BERGE, who was married to a Norwegian at that time.
- VIII. I know that up until the time of my adoption (29/9/1943) I spent some time in an orphanage, although I cannot recall what length of time.
- IX. From the Adoption Agreement and Eileen Berge's declaration of 17/4/1948 (Enclosure 4) it would appear that my mother had re-married between May 1943 and September 1943. It seems strange that this could have been possible such a short time after the divorce (3/1/1943). Also note that in the declaration, my mother is referred to as ILSE MARIANNE VON SCHWAZENFELD. I have no explanation for this discrepancy in names.
- X. From the contents of Eileen Berg's declaration (Enclosure 4), it appears that my mother must have left Shanghai for America some time between September 1943 and April 1948.
- XI. Although for a long time I have had no information about my father, Alfred Israel,

I have recently met by chance some distant relatives of his now living in London. Through them I learned that he also left Shanghai for America, probably in 1946.

- XII. My present married name is ELIZABETH PUGLIATTI and I live at the following address:

44 Woodberry Way
London N12, U.K.
Tel: 01.445 5430

SJI CREATING SLIDE SHOW ON KAIFENG JEWS

The Sino-Judaic Institute is preparing a set of slides with accompanying cassette tape on the history of the Jewish community in Kaifeng. The set of slides and tape is meant to disseminate information about the Jews of Kaifeng through presentations at community centers, schools and elsewhere. We would be pleased to receive slides or photos on the subject from those who have been to Kaifeng for inclusion in the set. All such materials will be returned to the sender. Please address your contributions and suggestions to:
Prof. Albert E. Dien
Asian Languages Department
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

China and the Middle East: Principles and Realities

(continued from page 1)

the Suez Canal crisis of 1956 and in the June war of 1967, China not only held massive demonstrations to protest the invasion of Egypt and Syria by colonialist powers and Jewish Zionists, but also offered money and large quantities of foodstuffs and medicines. China's policy toward Algeria provides a further example. China began to provide aid to the *Front de Libération National* of Algeria in the mid-1950s, and was also the first non-Arab country to recognize the Algerian Provisional Revolutionary Government. In December 1963, Premier Zhou visited ten countries in Africa and Asia, choosing Egypt and Algeria as the first two stops. In Algeria, he was hailed by 30,000 people. This may be the best proof of the success of China's initial Middle Eastern diplomacy.

Why did China show so much enthusiasm for the Arab national movements? First and foremost, from its own bitter experience under foreign control for almost a whole century before the liberation of 1949, China took it as its sacred obligation to help

full diplomatic ties."

This is a much more accurate assessment of China's current, pragmatic policy concerning Israel and the Arab-Israeli conflict. In addition, one should note that Hebrew is being taught at Beijing University and that an American Jewish scholar recently went to teach Jewish studies in China. Similarly, Professor Gao Wangzhi, China's foremost scholar of Chinese Christianity and Judaism, is currently studying modern Jewish history in the United States and a descendant of the Kaifeng Jews is studying Jewish thought and culture at the University of Judaism in Los Angeles. The ongoing work of the Sino-Judaic Institute in promoting the cooperative study of China's Jewish communities has also met with much success.

To sum up: It is certain, Dr. Tian's claims notwithstanding, that fairly extensive contacts between China and Israel are taking place; that China is interested in promoting the study of Jewish subjects; that China is involved in the Arab-Israel dispute in a new, meaningful and constructive way. While it is true that, ideologically, China will not abandon the Palestinian cause to embrace Israel, it is also true that China's pragmatic foreign policy now views contacts with Israel and negotiations based on mutual recognition and territorial compromise (ideally under an international umbrella) as the best means of achieving peace in the region. To be sure, China still supports the participation of the PLO in such a process and it will continue to be critical of Israel's policies but, in its third stage, China has moved very far from its former embrace of the PLO's position of "armed struggle till final victory." (*Peking Review*, July 18, 1969)

The Mystery of the Moshe Leah Chinese Scrolls

(continued from page 1)

Moshe Leah described his background as follows: He is Jewish on his mother's side. He and his brother Shimon had been given Jewish names, but his sister was given a Chinese name. Moshe did not think this at all extraordinary.

Moshe knew little or nothing about Judaism, only learning from his mother of his Jewish ancestry at the age of 24. Before her death in 1982, she told him that their ancestors "came to China from a land where they were deported to by their enemy. And a King of

Babylon defeated our enemy . . . and allowed Jews to return to Israel, but our ancestor in contrary, came to Orient for the deal of tea and ivory with the tribes of Hsiung-nu, North China."

This oral tradition was of doubtful value, since it would place Moshe Leah's ancestors entry into China during the Han Dynasty (206 B.C.E.-220 C.E.). It was Hsiung-nu (the early Huns) who harried the Chinese at the Great Wall of China. Indeed, it is reported that the Great Wall was originally built as a defense against these early Huns.

Though Moshe's information as to details of his ancestry were necessarily sketchy, he mentioned that his mother previously owned two ancient Hebrew scrolls that had been destroyed by rain leaking through the roof of their house. One scroll dealt with "Moshe's Law of the Book of Geshayeher," possibly Isaiah, and the other scroll exalted human "virtues" in Chinese style.

I was extremely disappointed to learn that the scrolls has been destroyed, as any information throwing additional light on the ancient Jewish community in Kaifeng would have been most welcome. But my disappointment quickly turned to elation when Moshe again wrote that his mother had taken two photos of him looking at the scrolls; one photo taken when he was eighteen years of age, and the other aged twenty-four. Moshe had kept these photos and subsequently sent me the prints.

Print number one is of poor quality and the letters are difficult to identify even with a magnifying glass. Print number two, however, had considerably more clarity.

Despite the fact that Hebrew letters and phrases may be identified on both prints, the language itself appeared not to be Hebrew. Speculation immediately arose as to whether the language of the scrolls could be Judeo-Persian or Judeo-Chinese or even Aramaic.

Mr. Bruce Rodgers of the Albert L. Schultz Jewish Community Center in Palo Alto, California, attempted to transcribe the Hebrew characters on both prints. The transcriptions, along with copies of the photos, were sent to scholars around the world with the hope that the scrolls would yield up its secrets.

Michael Pollak, author of "Mandarin, Jews and Missionaries," replied as follows: "This I am sure of; the lettering is Hebrew and is in Chinese calligraphic style. Especially the long, giraffe-like *lamed*. A few words I can

make out as Hebrew; Adonai, El, Carmel, Shaul (Saul)?"

Professor Donald Daniel Leslie of the Canberra School of Advanced Education in Canberra, Australia; author of the definitive work on the Chinese Jews, "The Survival of the Chinese Jews," and himself both a Judaic scholar and Sinologist, wrote, "There is one possibility that it is part of a genealogy or a Hazkarat Neshamot — I see as possible words ZL (Zichrono Leverachah) and Bat (daughter)."

Professor Herbert Paper, a foremost authority on Judeo-Persian, wrote, "It is quite possible that the text may be written in Judeo-Persian," but he adds, "I have looked at the photo with a magnifying glass and can only conclude that though the letters are more or less Hebrew letters, the text is gibberish."

Upon re-examination of the photos, Professor Leslie wrote, "Scroll one is not Hebrew, probably not Persian. I doubt if it can be Chinese, though I cannot state this categorically. . . Scroll #2 has quite a large number of Hebrew words and even phrases, though perhaps no sentences. Most of the Hebrew is, I believe, quoted from the Bible (possibly only Torah, I am not sure). The parts not Hebrew *may* be Persian (though I don't think so). I do not believe that it includes any Chinese, though again I cannot be categorical. Is it some other language? If so, what?"

Leslie suggested a Judaic scholar, or a Rabbi, could "identify with accuracy all the Hebrew phrases, eliminate Aramaic as a possibility, give an accurate transcription of the non-Hebrew parts." He added, "I am fascinated by your discovery . . . I regret that I cannot decipher it." He concludes, "If we had the actual scrolls, I feel a decipherment would be possible. But it would not be unreasonable to conclude that the copier was ignorant of Hebrew and produced a work that is meaningless."

Professor Leslie's new book on "The Chinese-Hebrew Memorial Book" has just been published, and in his Preface refers to my discovery, and regrets that the matter had not been published.

Michael Pollak considers the photos of the scrolls to be significant while Leslie, in a letter to Pollak, opines that the photos of the scrolls may yet turn out to be an important find.

A point noted by a few scholars, was that the concluding letters of Hebrew words in the scrolls were not written correctly (no "sophy" endings). In my letter to Leslie, I wrote, "It would be

Peoples Republic of China, in a speech to the UN General Assembly, depicted China's position as follows:

The Chinese people have consistently supported the Arab and Palestinian peoples in their just struggle against the Israeli aggressors and have all along opposed superpower contention in the Middle East. We believe that the Palestinian and Arab peoples will persevere in their struggle and carry their fight against aggression and hegemonism through to the end.

Although supportive in word and deed of revolutionary violence against "the violence of imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism, racism and Israeli Zionism," Mr. Qiao, in an earlier speech, did raise China's objections to terrorism as a means of waging political struggles and its opposition to terrorism by groups "divorced from the masses" because "it harms the cause of national liberation and people's revolution." (*New York Times*, October 4, 1972) Nor did Israel's vote in favor of the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations in November 1971 change Beijing's attitude towards Israel. However, seeds were being sown elsewhere that ultimately would bear the fruits of change.

As an outgrowth of their conflicts with the USSR, China and the United States sought each other out in 1973. This breakthrough, coupled with Egypt's severance of relations with the USSR in 1976, Sadat's peace initiative in 1977, the subsequent Camp David Accords and last, but by no means least, the death of Chairman Mao and the ouster of the "Gang of Four" from power, have all led China to its third policy stage.

Contrary to what Dr. Tian has written, China's pragmatic life in foreign policy vis-a-vis Israel has included fairly extensive contact with Israel as well as some basic policy shifts. The two have gone hand in glove. As China moved in to replace the Soviet presence in Egypt and to tighten its relationship with that country, its United Nation's ambassador also met with Israel's United Nation's ambassador in March 1977, the first such ambassadorial exchange since the 1950's. Contacts with American Jews yielded statements from Chinese officials of a complimentary and sympathetic nature as to perceived similarities between the Chinese and Jewish peoples. In March 1979, an Israeli delegation reportedly visited the Peo-

ple's Republic of China to explore economic and commercial ties.

But it was Egypt's peace treaty with Israel that signalled a major Chinese policy shift. China's close ties with Egypt and its concern about any Soviet rehabilitation in the region led it to formally endorse the Camp David Accords, although not without criticizing Israeli intransigence. As China turned from support of the PLO to the fostering of ties with the region's states, it was unable to avoid the PLO's condemnation of the shift. China castigated the Arab Steadfastness and Confrontation Front for allowing itself to be misled by Soviet intentions in the Mideast. The PLO responded in kind by condemning China's war with Vietnam and its support of Camp David. To be sure, China remains critical about Israel's policies regarding the Palestinians and the Occupied Territories, but this is balanced by a change in policy from the Maoist era. In a speech given on July 30, 1977 Foreign Minister Huang Hua declared:

We do not endorse the one-sided idea of certain ultra-leftists that Israel should be eliminated. Since Jews in Israel are also one of the peoples of the world, they have a right to national survival. We really do not want to see the tragedy of homeless Palestinians repeated in Jews.

The Foreign Minister went on to call for Israel's withdrawal from occupied Arab territory and the creation of a Palestinian state alongside Israel. For the Chinese, this was a major policy shift. This shift in support of Israel's right to exist today complements the older policy, the ritualistic propaganda castigation of Israeli policy, much as Dr. Tian does in his article.

At the same time, the reports of Chinese-Israeli contacts are too numerous to discount. The London periodical *Foreign Report* noted in August, 1983, and again in October of that same year, that Israeli arms experts and agricultural specialists had visited China. In October, 1984, the London *Sunday Times* reported that Israeli guns were seen on tanks in China's annual military parade and that Israel was also selling China new tank shells developed in the 1982 Lebanon War. In November 1984, *Jane's Defence Weekly* reported that military deals between China and Israel amounted to 3 billion dollars. In January 1985, the *Washington Times* reported that 200 Israeli experts were working in China, and that the two countries had

an arms trade worth 1 billion dollars and that China had also sold Israel much needed rare metals. The Jewish Telegraphic Agency's (JTA) *Daily News Bulletin*, in June 1985, reported that some 60 Israeli firms were doing business with China, building an airfield, 10 hotels, a solar energy plant and agricultural developments. This was also reported in the *New York Times* on July 22. The JTA later reported, in July 1985, that a Chinese medical expert visited Israel for the 8th World Symposium on Cardiac Pacing. In August 1985, Israel reopened its Hong Kong consulate which had been closed 10 years earlier for financial reasons. Staffed by an experienced diplomat, the Consulate serves as the main point for diplomatic and economic contacts with China. In November 1985, the *Jerusalem Post* reported that Israeli agricultural experts had visited China for consultations on agricultural centers, and the use of fertilizers, pesticides and agricultural equipment. In December 1985, the JTA noted that 3 Israeli professors of earth and water science had visited China, in part to attend an international conference there. The *Near East Report*, in January 1986, quoted a report from the Hebrew paper *Davar* that China had requested "through U.S. companies" for Israel to send it experts in breeding dairy cattle, and that it also wanted Israeli-made irrigation equipment. *Davar* also noted that the PRC had lifted passport restrictions against holders of Israeli passports but that this had not yet been implemented. In September 1986, the JTA reported that China and Israel had signed an agricultural development agreement and that Israel would build a 5 acre permanent model exhibit in Beijing.

Lastly, the *Jerusalem Post*, in April 1987, reported on an official meeting at the United Nations between Israeli Foreign Ministry Director-General Tamar and China's United Nation's Representative Li on the subject of China's role in the proposed international peace conference on the Middle East currently being promoted by Peres and Hussein. Beyond the significance of the meeting itself was the fact that the Xinhua news agency chose to announce it officially. Chinese commentators in Hong Kong saw this as unprecedented. Said David Chen, China editor of the *South China Morning Post*, "[Beijing's action] indicates China's willingness to take steps towards improving relations with Israel — although those steps may not bring

other people win their emancipation from colonialists and imperialists. Second, after being stymied by the United States in the 1950s and early 1960s, China wanted to form a united front with the Arab countries hostile to the U.S. in order to deal with their common enemy. Third, having become involved in a heated ideological debate with the Soviet Union in the mid-1960s, China was eager to prove by her actions that she was the true standard bearer of the national movement.

THE SECOND STAGE

Entering the 1970s, China underwent a great change in her domestic situation and in the international environment. The Cultural Revolution, which was launched in 1966, had passed its most fanatic period. General Lin Piao, who once advocated exporting the theory of "people's war," died in 1971. Thus, it now became possible for China to pursue a pragmatic line in foreign policy.

Nixon's historic visit to Beijing and the restoration of China's position in the United Nations greatly boosted China's prestige in the world. On the other side, those who wanted to have closer relations with China no longer needed to worry about pressure from the United States. In this general atmosphere China's Middle Eastern diplomacy turned into its second stage, a stage in which China widened her group of friends from Republicans to the Shah, the kings and the Emirs.

The establishment of diplomatic relations between China and Iran in 1971 was a good omen at the outset of this decade. Iran was a major member of the Central Treaty Organization, which, in China's view, was originally operated by the United States. For this reason, China kept her distance from Iran in the 1950s and 60s, though the two countries had had a traditional contact in ancient times.

But in the 1970s China was more willing to stress Iran's resolve in deterring Soviet expansion in the Gulf area and Iran's staunch attitude in dealing with the Western imperialist oil monopoly consortiums.¹ In August 1971, after Princess Ashraf Pahlavi's visit to Beijing, the two ancient friends finally accepted one another. Following Iran's recognition, Kuwait established diplomatic relations with China as did Jordan also.

After the death of the late Chairman Mao, and especially since the setting up of the new leadership stratum headed by Deng Xiaoping, China's

foreign affairs have taken on a "new look". In examining the changes in the post-Mao years, we should not overlook the messages implied in this "new look." First, the new leaders' views on world peace are different from those of the late Mr. Mao. They now hold that a new world war is not unavoidable though such a danger still exists. In the last two years Mr. Deng has more than once proclaimed that helping maintain world peace is one of the three major tasks China has set for herself for the remainder of this century.² He fervently hopes that the world will remain at peace the next twenty years so that China may have a stable environment for domestic construction.

Second, Sino-U.S. relations have further developed since 1978 and Sino-Soviet relations have relaxed to a certain degree in recent years. Third, the "open door policy" has aroused the Chinese people's interest in the outside world, and they now require reasonable explanations for what they see on television and read in the newspapers. To match this new development, more institutions for international studies have been established, and Chinese scholars have more freedom to analyze and to make policy suggestions. This atmosphere is having an important impact on China's approach to Middle East problems. Now China often calls people's attention to the necessity of keeping peace and stability in this dangerous "hot spot". Chinese scholars have begun to study carefully the contradictions and conflicts in the Middle East. This means that China's Middle Eastern diplomacy has entered its third stage — a more pragmatic and more reasonable stage.

CURRENT POLITICAL PERCEPTIONS

Since the end of the 1970s, a number of crucial events have occurred in the Middle East. In 1978 and 1979 Egypt signed the Camp David accords and a peace treaty with Israel. The reconciliation of the two old enemies caused serious division in the Arab world. In 1979 the Islamic revolution took place in Iran. In 1980 the Iran-Iraq war broke out. In June 1982, Israel invaded Lebanon and forced the PLO to withdraw from Beirut. These events are not only of vital importance to the Middle Eastern countries but also affect other parts of the world. Being a large country and a permanent member of the U.N. Security

Council, China pays close attention to these events.

The Camp David Accords: Mixed Feelings. China's stand on the Arab-Israel conflict has been clear and consistent. The Chinese government insists that Israel withdraw from all the Arab territory it occupied in 1967. Moreover, Israel must recognize the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to set up an independent Palestinian state. How to make Israel accept these terms must be determined by the Arabs. Until 1977, almost all the Arab countries thought that war was the only way to win back their lost soil and the rights of the Palestinians. But suddenly Sadat pushed a peaceful strategy and after two years' negotiation concluded a peace treaty with Egypt's old foe. Was he right or wrong in doing so? First, seeking a peaceful way to solve the Arab-Israel conflict was not only Sadat's personal choice but also the wish and will of most Egyptians. For over thirty years, as a major confrontation country in the conflict with Israel, Egypt had suffered great material and manpower sacrifices. It had been involved in four major wars and numerous border conflicts. Year after year, Egypt had to bear the heavy burden of military expenditure. After Egypt's defeat in the 1967 war, the Suez Canal was closed, tourism ruined, the oil fields lost, and the economy of the whole country brought to the edge of bankruptcy. No nation can suffer such hardships endlessly. As a sovereign nation, Egypt certainly has the right to make any decision which it finds in accord with its own interest. But during the peace negotiations with Begin, Sadat acted hastily and did not sufficiently protect the interests of the Palestinian people and the Arab cause in general. As a result, though the Camp David accords and the peace treaty solved the problem between Egypt and Israel, yet the Palestine problem, the key to the Arab-Israeli conflict, remains unsolved. The return of the Golan Heights to Syria and the question of the control of Jerusalem were not even mentioned in the documents. Besides, Sadat's attitude towards the leaders of the other Arab countries was wrong. When he was criticized by them after he had signed the Camp David accords, he should have explained his action patiently to them; instead he responded with harsh words, and this led to the ostracizing of Egypt in the Arab world.

President Sadat was assassinated in 1982, but the peaceful approach to solving the Middle East problem did not die with him. In this connection Sadat deserves a place in the memory of mankind. Nevertheless, the negative side of Sadat's story should always be remembered by the latest participants in the peace process: the stubbornness of Israeli politicians in any negotiations cannot be underestimated; without the participation of Palestinian representatives, any negotiation on the Palestine problem is doomed to fail.

Continuous Support For Yasir Arafat. During Israel's large-scale invasion of Lebanon in June 1982, the PLO armed forces were severely dispersed and had to leave Beirut. One year later, the internal differences within Fatah developed into armed strife and led to the evacuation from Tripoli of Yasir Arafat and over 4,000 of his loyalist troops. Yasir Arafat is an old friend of China. Since Arafat's first visit to China in 1964 as the head of the newborn *Fatah* movement, China has been providing full political and material support to his just cause. Now that Arafat has fallen upon hard times, the Chinese government reiterates its firm support for him. The comments of *People's Daily*³ point out that it was the opposition force within the Fatah that launched attacks against the PLO forces in Tripoli, thereby seriously damaging the PLO.

In an article titled "Evacuation Marks Need for Unity" *Beijing Review* warned that the strife within the PLO "is a development that benefits only Israel."⁴ This is not the way for those with national self-respect and a responsibility for national solution to act. Israel will not treat those who oppose Arafat any differently than it currently treats the PLO leader, and it would still strive as hard to destroy his successors"⁵

In May 1984, Arafat paid his third visit to Beijing and was received by Deng Xiaoping, Chairman Li Xiannian, and Premier Zhao Zhiyang. The Chinese leaders, comparing the setback of the PLO in Lebanon to that of China's Red Army in 1930, comforted him: "Any just cause has to be won through arduous struggle. Your present setback is nothing serious."⁶

Why should China remain on the side of Arafat? For some time now the name of Arafat has been closely connected with the Palestinian liberation movement. Arafat's prestige among

the entire Palestinian people, his legendary experience in the guerrilla war against Israel, his extensive contacts with world leaders, make him unbeatable even after his setback in Lebanon. Besides, Arafat's gratitude for China's aid and his high praise for China's achievements make him welcome to the Chinese government and people. They sincerely hope that the PLO leadership headed by Chairman Arafat will work out their policies in accordance with actual conditions, and win final victory.

Israel: Principles Cannot Be Forsaken. For a long time there has been speculation about the possible establishment of diplomatic relations, or at least of limited economic or cultural links, between China and Israel. This speculation is a response to Israel's ingratiating gestures toward China. Israel formally recognized the PRC as early as 1950, preceded only by countries of the socialist camp and China's neighbors, India and Burma. The Israeli government sent a telegram of congratulations on China's tenth anniversary in 1959. In 1970 Israel did not join the United States voting against the restoration of China's position in the United Nations.

Israel's purpose is to kill two birds with one stone: to strengthen its position in international society, and to drive a wedge in Sino-Arab relations. But China has her own strategic considerations. China did not want to alienate herself from the entire Arab world by opening relations with Israel. China's rejection of Israel's olive branch has been unshakable and straight-forward. And whenever there is a rumor about imminent relaxation of Sino-Israel relations, China's denials and clarification are firm and concrete. In the past two years, some Western and Soviet newspapers reported China had purchased 500 million dollars' worth of weapons from Israel; that hundreds of Israeli officers were teaching Chinese soldiers to use them; and that certain kinds of guns and rockets were displayed in the military parade on National Day of 1984. The speaker of the News Agency bureau of the Foreign Affairs ministry of the PRC refuted these rumors rapidly and reiterated that China had no contact whatsoever with Israel. Those who fabricated the rumors should ask themselves: does China so lack weapons and so lack trade partners that it has to buy from Israel? Is China so foolish as to display Israel-made arms in broad daylight and purposely offend

the Arabs when it is making every effort to expand commercial cooperation with them?

However, when China insists on the policy of non-recognition, two distinctions should be drawn. First, it does not imply that China denies Israel the right to exist in the Middle East. The existence of the state of Israel is already an unalterable fact. What China upholds is the universal principle that to seize territory of other countries by military means is unlawful. Israel must withdraw from the Arab territory which she seized in 1967, and she must recognize the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. Only in this way can all the Middle Eastern countries, Israel included, live together in peace and harmony. Second, the Chinese people have no prejudice against Jewish people. On the contrary, as Chinese people and Jewish people suffered similar bitterness in the Second World War, the Chinese people have deep sympathy for the Jewish people, and highly praise the contribution of the Jewish scientists and sociologists to mankind. China believes that most Israeli people love peace and long to co-exist with the Arabs. Those who adhere to a policy of war and expansionism cannot represent the will of the Israeli people.

Iran's Islamic Revolution: a Vivid Lesson. The people's movement in Iran in 1979 brought about the dethronement of the Shah and the founding of the Iranian Islamic Republic. China had maintained good relations with the Shah since 1971, but once Khomeini gained power, China sincerely hoped that the friendship between the two countries could be maintained, and it met with a friendly response from the new regime. In February 1980, a Chinese Muslim delegation led by Zhang Jie, vice president of the All-China Islamic Association, participated in the celebration of the first anniversary of Iran's Islamic revolution. He was received by Ayatullah Khomeini. In February 1981, the Iranian delegation for clarification of Iran's position on international affairs visited Beijing and was met by Ulanfu, Vice-Chairman of the National People's Congress. Through mutual visits, trust was built up and both sides felt there was a solid foundation for the further extension of cooperation. Iran's policy of "neither east nor west" coincides with China's policy of maintaining independence in international affairs. Both China and Iran proclaim that they belong to the Third World

Xinhua News Agency, Beijing, November 23, 1984.

4. See Xin Zhong, "Evacuation Marks Need for Unity," *Beijing Review*, January 2, 1984, p. 12.

5. *Ibid.*

6. *Beijing Review*, May 14, 1984, p. 8.

7. Xing Hua News Agency, Hong Kong, December 2, 1984.

8. *Beijing Review*, January 21, 1985, p. 29.

9. *People's Daily*, January 7, 1985.

10. *Ibid.*

CHINA'S ISRAEL POLICY REVISIONED

By Anson Laytner

Dr. Tian Zhongqing's fascinating analysis of China's policy towards Israel (*Middle East Review*, Winter 1985) suffers from ideological emendation. His three stage formulation of China's Israel policy is faulty on each level: the early period because Dr. Tian ignores the serious negotiations that transpired between China and Israel from 1949 through early 1955; the intermediate period because Dr. Tian glosses over China's radical pro-Palestinian policies of the Cultural Revolution era; and the current phase because Dr. Tian dismisses the contacts that are occurring between China and Israel together with their political implications. In point of fact, it would be more accurate to present the early Israel-China contacts as phase one; the Sino-Arab alignment, beginning with Bandung in 1955 and culminating in the Cultural Revolution attitudes towards Israel, as phase two; and Mr. Deng's pragmatism as phase three.

Absent from Dr. Tian's account of the first phase of China's Mideast policy — and mentioned only in passing later on — is any discussion of the protracted but inconclusive negotiations between Israel and China.

One should note, first of all, the sympathetic attitude of the father of modern China towards Zionism. In a letter written to Mr. N.E.B. Ezra of Shanghai in 1920, Dr. Sun Yatsen declared:

[I] wish to assure you of my sympathy for this movement — which is one of the greatest movements of the present time. All lovers of Democracy cannot help but support the movement to restore your wonderful and historic nation, which has contributed so much to the civilization of the world and which rightfully deserves an honorable place in the family of nations. [Points East 2, 1. February 1987]

Soon after the creation of the State of Israel, David Ben Gurion articulated Israel's policy of non-alignment (i-hizdahut) with the superpower blocs. That same year, in 1949, Israel became the sixth non-communist nation to recognize the People's Republic of China. This step must be viewed from the perspective of the day: 1) the Western block political quarantine that China faced, 2) the pro-Western ties of major Arab League states at the time and 3) Israel's socialist orientation as opposed to the feudal nature of the Arab world and its hostility to communism.

Following Israel's recognition of China, contacts regarding the exchange of diplomatic missions began in Moscow but these faltered with the onset of the Korean War and Israel's condemnation of Chinese "aggression." Negotiations were resumed in 1953 in Burma between representatives of the People's Republic of China and Israel's ambassador to Burma, David Hacohen. In January 1955, an Israeli Trade and Goodwill Mission spent 20 days in China. A five point protocol agreement was signed on February 28. According to Hacohen, China was then very interested in establishing full mutual relations, part and parcel of its quest for wider international recognition. However, China's slowness in agreeing to send a reciprocal delegation to Israel combined with the Israeli Foreign Ministry's fear of antagonizing the Eisenhower Administration, led Israel to delay its decision. On March 28, Hacohen was advised that normalization would be contingent on the visit of a Chinese delegation to Israel. This delay had historic consequences. The next month, at the Bandung Conference, Chinese Premier Zhou Enlai and the Chinese delegation first met with Egyptian President Nasser, Palestinian leader Shukary and other Arab leaders. Immediately afterwards, on April 29, Israel advised China that it sought full diplomatic relations but it was too late. China was non-committal. Soon after, China established diplomatic relations with Egypt, Syria and Yemen. The 1956 Suez War sealed the Sino-Arab alliance for years to come. But the extent of these early contacts, the lost opportunities and short-sighted decisions, cannot simply be dismissed in passing as Dr. Tian does.

II

Dr. Tian's first phase ends with the mid 1960's. His second phase really only begins in the early 1970's. No

doubt because of the still sensitive nature of the period and perhaps not wishing to jeopardize his own position by committing analysis to paper, Dr. Tian glosses over the Cultural Revolution era and depicts the second stage only as "moving towards pragmatism." Although the late Maoist period is dismissed in a brief paragraph, the policies it articulated on Israel are most important and influential. Dr. Tian's own analysis and the official policy of China towards Israel still closely adhere to the Maoist line.

Although China entered phase two as a close ally of the USSR, it emerged, during the Cultural Revolution, as an enemy of both Soviet "hegemonism" and U.S. "imperialism." Whereas early non-alignment was directed solely against the West, with the full support of the Soviet Union, China's Maoist version of non-alignment was anti-Soviet as it was anti-American. As the Cultural Revolution neared and the conflict with the USSR heightened, China found itself competing with the Soviet Union for influence in the Arab world, which meant it had to outdo the Soviet Union in its support of the Palestinian cause.

Thus Al Fatah, even before the creation of the PLO, received Chinese aid and in March 1965, a visiting PLO delegation signed its first military and diplomatic agreement with a non-Arab country. China similarly had courted Egypt, with Premier Zhou visiting there several times in the years 1963-65; and Syria, which was the recipient of Chinese aid in 1965-67. But with Nasser's trip to Moscow in August 1965 and heavy Soviet involvement on behalf of Egypt and Syria in the Six Day War, China found itself shut out from major Arab states. Instead, China became the major arms supplier for the PLO and its more radical offshoots, such as George Habash's PFLP, although here too it had to compete with the greater resources of the Soviet Union. But what it lacked in resources, China made up in rhetoric. Viewing the various superpower efforts at overseeing an Arab-Israeli settlement in the years 1967-73, China could only see a Soviet-American plot to subvert the Arab cause and warned the Arab states against any settlement proposed by those powers since their intent was only to divide the regime into spheres of influence for their own benefit. As late as 1975, Mr. Qiao Guan-hua, the now discredited Chairman of the Delegation of the

and are eager to strengthen their links with other Third World countries.

The triumph of the Islamic revolution presents a very interesting research topic for Chinese experts. Until 1978, it seemed that the Shah had strong control of his subjects, and his economic achievements attained with the support of a huge annual oil income were fairly impressive. Even in 1979, many political analysts believed that the Shah would be able to survive the religious turmoil. But in a short time he lost the game. Many factors can account for the Shah's downfall and the following are only a few of the most fundamental reasons.

1. Enormous income does not necessarily guarantee economic success and social stability. If a regime fails to apply great effort to resolve fundamental social and economic problems but instead turns a deaf ear to complaints of injustice and inequality, the huge fortune could turn into lava in a volcano, on which the ruler one day would find himself sitting. It was unemployment, illiteracy, corruption, waste, and repression that finally led to the Iranian revolution.

2. When developing countries import advanced technology and absorb investment from the developed countries, the importing countries have a serious problem defending their societies against the harmful influences of Western culture and ideology in order to maintain their own traditions and protect the purity of their societies. In Iran's case, people's grievances against the Western way of life were aired through the Islamic movement. In China religious force is not strong, but by no means should we relax our vigilance and let the corruption of foreign culture harm our moral standards and traditional civilization.

3. The Iran revolution revealed the great strength of Islam. In China the study of Islam is still superficial. In order to have a better understanding of the Arab world and the Muslim world at large, it is necessary to study Islam systematically and in great depth.

4. A nation should never link its destiny to the superpowers. When the Shah seemed to be firm on his throne, the U.S. presidents and their men talked about their friendship and admiration for him. But when the crisis came and he was badly in need of advice and help from the United States, the U.S. government just looked on. It was reported that the Shah before his death advised President Sadat not to rely too much on the U.S. In this conclusion he was correct. The super-

powers have their own interests and needs to consider. Sometimes they "have to" sacrifice others to satisfy their broader need, even if it is, as in Iran's case, an ally who had guarded western oil and strategic interests in the Gulf area for many years. When Chinese leaders made up their minds to have no strategic relations with either of the superpowers, they may have had the Shah's story in mind.

The Iran-Iraq War: Holding the Full Bowl of Water Carefully. The outbreak of the Iran-Iraq war in September 1980 did not greatly surprise China. It provided additional strong evidence for China's assertion that the Middle East is one of the world's dangerous "hot spots." Yet as the war drags on, China is quite concerned. Though the war is far from ending, two conspicuous characteristics must be considered: 1). While Israel's invasion of Arab countries remains the major threat to peace and stability in the Middle East, the rivalry and strife within the Muslim world are also worth notice. If the divisive factors among them such as territorial disputes, ethnic dissension, ideological contests, and tribal conflict are not dealt with properly, they may explode into armed conflicts and even large-scale wars. 2). The extension and escalation of the Iran-Iraq war put both the Soviet Union and the United States into awkward positions. After a long period of uncertainty the Soviet Union chose to side with Iraq by providing it with arms. This action not only offends Iran, but also makes Syria and Libya unhappy. On the other hand, its untamed ally Iraq, which is now trying to develop closer relations with moderate Arab countries as well as seeking reconciliation with the United States, will not necessarily henceforth become obedient to the Kremlin. As for the United States, it is easy to proclaim neutrality since it has no good feeling for either Iran or Iraq. However, if the war reaches a point at which the Gulf becomes "safe for no one," as the Iranians have threatened, the United States may face a most serious challenge. All in all, the extension of the Iran-Iraq war runs counter to the will of the two superpowers, but they cannot press the belligerents to cease fire as they did in the Arab-Israel war in 1973. The ability of the superpowers to control Middle East affairs is diminishing.

Since the Iran-Iraq war broke out, China has been trying to persuade both sides to end the bloody conflict as quickly as possible. Both Iran and Iraq

are developing countries, faced with the urgent task of economic development. If they go on fighting, neither can survive without sustaining long-term injury. Now, as the war drags on into its fifth year, the cumulative effects of human casualties and property damage are making themselves felt. Moreover, the expansion of the war is endangering the livelihood of the peoples of the other Gulf countries, as well as international navigation in that area.

China's stand toward the Iran-Iraq war is strictly neutral. The Chinese government studiously avoids making any value judgment on the claims of either contending party. Its reporting on the events is factual and balanced. In receiving senior officials, whether from Iraq or Iran, Chinese leaders have expressed the same hope that both sides will take all interests into account, relinquish all previous suspicions, and end the war as early as possible.

TOWARD MORE AMBITIOUS GOALS

When political relations with the Middle East countries have been mature, China's interest in expanding economic cooperation with them has increased greatly. By the mid-1960s, China had established economic contacts with most Middle Eastern countries, and the volume of commerce has risen each year since then. However, the value of trade with the Middle East in the 1960s and 1970s remained a small proportion of China's total foreign trade. China's exports to the Middle East consisted mainly of traditional agricultural and light industrial products, and her imports from the Middle East were limited to special local goods, such as dates, cotton, and aluminum. China did not import large quantities of oil from the Middle East.

Since the adoption of her open door policy, China has taken steps toward attaining three economic objectives in the Middle East; (1) to sell more of her products in the rich markets of the Middle East; (2) to export her surplus labor to Gulf countries; and (3) to attract as much investment as possible from state and private sectors of Arab countries. To realize these ambitious targets, China has several factors in her favor. First, China has won the political trust of most Middle Eastern countries and need not worry about interference by their governments. Second, China's labor teams

consist of skillful and experienced workers, chosen by the state-run companies and obliged to return home immediately after the projects are completed, Chinese workers pose no immigration problem. Third, China is an attractive place for Arab investors, thanks to her stable domestic situation, her favorable terms for investors in sharing interests, and her official promise to protect investors' rights. In December 1984 a manager of the Chinese Section of the International Business and Credit Bank told the correspondents of Xing Hua News Agency that investors from the Middle East are very enthusiastic about deepening their understanding of China. They regard China as one of the best countries for investment in the Third World.⁷

A recent example of successful bilateral economic co-operation is provided by China's experience with Kuwait. Between 1982 and 1984 Kuwait provided China with loans totalling 43.6 million dinars (about US \$150 million) to finance four projects in China. One such project, Xiamen Airport, has been put into service. In January 1985, Kuwaiti Minister of Oil and Finance Ali Khalifa Al-Sabah visited Beijing for investment-planning discussions with the heads of the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations and Trade. The two parties agreed to set up a Sino-Kuwaiti investment committee, which will play a positive role in promoting investment in China by Kuwait and other Gulf countries.⁸ During the six-day visit Kuwait and China signed several commercial agreements, including a \$30 million low-interest loan to China by the Kuwait Fund for Arab Economic Development to finance two projects: the construction of a hydropower station in Fujian Province; and a joint venture for the large-scale manufacture of ammonia fertilizer using the gas from an offshore field in the South China Sea.⁹ In order to promote China's economic co-operation with Kuwait and other Gulf states, delegations of the China Council for the Promotion of International Trade (CCPIT) and the China International Trust and Investment Corporation (CITIC) visited Kuwait, Bahrain, the United Arab Emirates, and Oman. A number of proposals are under intensive consideration, including the setting up of a joint Arab-Chinese Chamber of Commerce, the establishment of Arab-Chinese banks, and regular exchanges of commercial delegations between

China and the Gulf countries.¹⁰

In her drive to develop new trade relationships, China certainly cannot forget Saudi Arabia. In recent years laudatory reports about this oil kingdom have frequently appeared in China's mass media. China praises Saudi Arabia in four respects: (1) Saudi Arabia stands firm on the side of the PLO and supports the Arab front countries with material aid. The peace plan proposed by Fahd is a feasible plan for solving the Arab-Israeli conflict. (2) As the most important member of OPEC, Saudi Arabia rejected U.S. threats and inducements, took up the oil weapon in the October 1973 War, and thereby made a great contribution to the Arab cause. Within OPEC, Saudi Arabia's consistent policy has played a major role in keeping oil prices stable. (3) Saudi Arabia spares no effort in calming down quarrels among Arab countries and has proved to be a good mediator. (4) Saudi Arabia has made much progress in diversifying its oil economy and is laying down a solid foundation for industrial modernization. As to the possibility of establishing diplomatic relations between China and Saudi Arabia, the Chinese government does not show any hesitation. China points proudly to its friendly Saudi contacts of recent years, such as Premier Zhao's meeting with Crown Prince Fahd in Mexico, and the Saudi Minister Feisal's visit to Beijing as a member of an Arab united delegation. The value of current Sino-Saudi trade either through Hong Kong or through other Arabian Gulf countries exceeds \$100 million per year.

As a Chinese saying puts it: When a melon is ripe, it falls off its stem. China and Saudi Arabia both belong to the Third World and share common view points on many international problems. Hence the two great nations are surely destined to have close relations.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing review of China's past and present policy toward the Middle East is suggestive of her future policy toward that area. In its general approach, it will be built on all her successful experience since the Bandung Conference. It will continue to be in accordance with China's general foreign line, namely maintaining world peace, upholding justice and being open and above board. It will also reflect China's growing interest and great willingness to participate both politically and economically in the Middle East. With this in mind, China's position in the second half of this

decade and even in the next decade on some major aspects of Middle East affairs can be predicted as follows:

1. The Chinese government holds that peaceful negotiation is the best way to solve the Palestinian and Middle East questions. China will therefore take a positive attitude toward an international conference on Middle East questions, and will also support the idea of the UN Security Council playing a major role in solving the conflicts in the Middle East. Meanwhile, China will support the efforts of Arab countries in seeking a fair and feasible peace arrangement.

2. As long as Israel refuses to recognize the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, China will continue to support the PLO's launching various forms of struggle. China will do its best to argue that the PLO is entitled to participate on an equal footing with other parties in the settlement of the Middle East questions.

3. China will continue to oppose the superpowers' struggle for influence in the Middle East, and will warn the Middle Eastern countries not to become dependent on them. But China will be eager to cultivate good relations with all the Middle Eastern countries (Israel excepted) and will not care whether they are close either to the Soviet Union or the United States.

4. China will continue to be neutral in the Iran-Iraq war. And most probably China will take the same attitude toward any possible argument or armed conflict within the Arab world. Nevertheless, neutrality does not mean keeping silent on every issue. It may have been noticed that China condemns the use of chemical weapons in the Iran-Iraq war, and will continue to reject any unjust and inhuman actions in the future.

5. China will continue in her strong criticism of Israeli authorities as long as Middle East problems continue unsolved. No political or economic contact between China and Israel can be expected in the near future. China will not recognize Israel unless Israel is recognized by most Arab countries.

FOOTNOTES

1. See Premier Zhou's speech at the banquet for Princess Ashraf, *People's Daily*, April 15, 1971.

2. The three major tasks were formally set in the opening speech of the Twelfth National Congress of the Communist Party of China by Deng Xiaoping on September 1, 1982. They are: 1) to step up socialist modernization; 2) to strive for China's reunification and particularly for the return of Taiwan to the motherland; and 3) to oppose hegemonism and safeguard world peace.

3. See, for example, the news analysis by