

ternational equilibrium. This new administration has increased its defense budget considerably and is again willing to accept worldwide responsibility. Its language toward European allies is still very polite—consultation is the word used most often. But how long will it accept what it sees as unfair burden-sharing. Senator Tower pointed out at the Wehrkunde meeting “If by the shortcomings of our European Allies a situation should occur in Europe where the risk for the security of our forces becomes unbearable, American public opinion will force the withdrawal of our troops. This would be a tragedy for the Free World.”

In the Federal Republic of Germany a broad consensus supporting the Alliance exists. Political leadership has the opportunity to create in addition a new consensus for a higher defense budget. But until now the government has made no efforts to fight for such a goal—which can be explained by a veto power of the far left which regards Europe as an island of detente in a troubled international world. How long will the American people accept this policy? On the other hand the Soviet Union is offering *more* detente in Europe with the strategic aim of decoupling Europe from the United States. The longer the present West German government delays following the new American leadership, the more difficult it will be to get public support for stronger defense efforts and the new American policy. The Federal Republic of Germany is confronted with a period of turmoil.

Werner Kaltefleiter

The Timerman Affair

That anti-Semitism is still abroad in the world is hardly stop-the-press news. It has been part and parcel of official Soviet policy since the death of Lenin. It has been the intellectual baggage of influential elements in British and French society. The Arab world, behind the fig-leaf of “anti-Zionism,” has embraced it. The Terror International, in both its “black” and “red” excrescences, has made it an article of faith. And anti-Semitic organizations thrive even in the United States.

But does the presence of anti-Semites, even when they happen to hold government office, justify the wholesale tarring of nations and peoples with the anti-Jewish brush? To the Liberal Establishment the answer is “Yes”—but very selectively. If the country in

question has not been washed in the blood of Marx, great liberal journals like *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* bandy the accusation of “neo-Nazism” with fine abandon. Otherwise there is silence.

Exhibit A is the case of Jacobo Timerman, the Polish-born Argentine publisher who was arrested, tried, acquitted, and exiled. Mr. Timerman, who was welcomed in Israel and repaid the hospitality by accusing its government of cowardice, contends that he was arrested and tortured because he is a Jew and an enemy of “Nazi” repression. The liberal media have accepted him at his word, though the small but influential Jewish community in Argentina and Jewish publications in the United States offer convincing documentation to refute his charges.

What are the facts in the Timerman case?

Mr. Timerman’s publications—he had made himself a substantial fortune in the newspaper and magazine fields—swayed with the political winds as government followed government in a troubled Argentina. He could hardly be called an enemy of the military junta which he now denounces. In fact, his newspaper, *La Opinión*, in February of 1976 called for a military coup against the corrupt and crumbling government of Isabel Peron. When the military responded, Mr. Timerman was hardly one of its enemies, and his later opposition by all accounts was hardly of the kind to keep the junta awake. In short, he played the game with an eye to profit—which is no crime.

What then was the cause for his arrest? If it was not his putative championing of “human rights” that brought him trouble, why should he have been taken into custody?

Mr. Timerman’s downfall is directly traceable to David Graiver, who owned 45 percent of his newspaper, *La Opinión*. Mr. Graiver, a minor-league Vesco type, was caught with his hand in the cookie jar by American, Belgian, and Argentine banking authorities, and he promptly disappeared. But in the course of investigating his tangled financial affairs, Argentine authorities learned—through an inadvertent slip by his wife—that he had been banking and investing the very sizable funds of the Montoneros, the major terrorist group then attempting to overthrow the government.

It was not too farfetched an assumption that if Mr. Graiver was working with and for the Montonero terrorists, his business partner might also be involved. Mr. Timerman was taken into custody by the military authorities solely on that assumption—not because he was a Jew or a “crusading” publisher. At a time when

the average Argentinian could not leave his house for fear of terrorist depredation, the government's reaction was hardly unreasonable. What is significant is that the Argentine Jewish community, which dashed to Mr. Timerman's defense, suffered no reprisals for its efforts on his behalf. Anti-Jewish publications certainly seized on Mr. Timerman's arrest and proclaimed it proof of the iniquity of all Jews. Certainly, too, there were overtones of anti-Semitism in the case. The military group which questioned him included anti-Semites, but it was not simply the creature of the military regime. It had operated in the past under both democratic and dictatorial regimes. Much of this questioning had little to do with Mr. Timerman and dealt with obsessions such as "The Protocols of the Elders of Zion," Menachem Begin, and the mythical Jewish connections of the anti-Semitic Palestine Liberation Organization (which was deeply involved with the Montoneros.)

Nonetheless, given the nature of the accusations against Mr. Timerman—that he was a partner with Mr. Graiver not only in the publication of *La Opinión*, but also in the financial dealings with the Montoneros—and given the life-and-death struggle in which the Argentine government was engaged and in which thousands on both sides have perished, Mr. Timerman's survival and acquittal was really rather remarkable. It can even be cited as what a Buenos Aires Jewish publication called an example of "inverse"—or reverse—"anti-Semitism."

Ironically, there has been an astonishing degree of press freedom in Argentina, not only now but during the time when the junta was engaged in virtual civil war with the Montoneros. Were there not, then Manfred Schoenfeld would be dead today. Mr. Schoenfeld, a Jew, has been hailed by *The Washington Post* as a hero of an Argentinian "resistance" movement. As editorial writer for the great Buenos Aires newspaper, *La Prensa*, Mr. Schoenfeld leveled his powerful journalistic guns at the junta when Mr. Timerman was arrested. But when the Anti-Defamation League in New York presented Mr. Timerman with its Hubert Humphrey Award for dedication to a free press, Mr. Schoenfeld joined Argentina's B'nai B'rith to protest that Mr. Timerman was never an "independent," never a battler for human rights, and not "ethically commendable." In other words, though Mr. Timerman had suffered, he was not a martyr to his Jewishness or to journalistic principle.

Precisely what was that unethical conduct to which Mr. Schoenfeld referred? The publishers of the German-language daily, the

Argentinisches Tagesblatt, owned by the Aleman family (which has long been known for its anti-Nazism and for its support of Jewish causes) has claimed—and Mr. Schoenfeld accepted the claim—that Mr. Timerman had used his excellent connections with the government and the labor unions to force the *Tagesblatt* to print *La Opinión* below cost, at a loss of an estimated \$40,000 a month.

It would be understandable if Mr. Timerman, since his release and his continued prosperity as an Israeli columnist and a lecturer to the world at large, had focused his attacks on the Argentine government. After his experiences he could almost be forgiven for characterizing it as the Latin American answer to the Third Reich. But he has also mounted a war against the Argentine Jews who saved him. (One Jewish Argentine editor accordingly describes him as “the leading anti-Semite.”) Mr. Timerman’s word for the Jewish leaders in what was once his adopted country is *Judenrat*—a term of hatred given to German Jews who allegedly sold out to the Nazis and contributed to the Holocaust.

After his exile, Mr. Timerman tried to recover the very substantial property which the Argentine government had seized at the time of his arrest. Two prominent Jewish Argentine lawyers took his case—as they put it, because they considered it as “humanitarian duty, without asking or receiving any remuneration.” As his charges of Nazism in Argentina and the perfidy of its Jewish leaders began to spread, the two lawyers accepted the assurances of his family in Argentina that his statements had been “twisted or misinterpreted.” But in October of 1980, there could no longer be any doubt of what he was saying and writing. The lawyers dropped his case and, in a public letter, vehemently noted that he had “presented the perfidious anti-Semites with . . . an excuse for irresponsible and resentful hatred.” That letter was ignored by the press in the United States until it appeared as a paid advertisement in *The Washington Post* on August 4, 1981. Instead, the *Post* suggested that the exposure of Mr. Timerman was a “neo-conservative” plot.

But Mr. Timerman’s war, and his motives for endangering the lives of his fellow Jews by false accusations, is not really the issue. The real question is why *The Washington Post* and *The New York Times* lent their support to a campaign based on little more than one man’s logorrhea. After all, Israel maintains cordial relations with Argentina, a country which has refused diplomatic recognition to the PLO. If the press were really concerned about the Jewish condition in Latin America, then certainly they would have

noticed the brutal manifestation of anti-Semitism elsewhere in the western hemisphere.

The record is there for all to see. Cuba, which sings every hemidemisemiquaver of the Soviet line, has driven out all but a tiny fraction of its Jews. When Salvador Allende adopted the anti-Semitism inherent in Marx's philosophy, most of Chile's Jews fled—but they returned when General Augusto Pinochet and his junta overthrew Allende. The Jewish community took the hint when the Sandinistas, with the Carter administration applauding in the wings, imported the PLO's anti-Jewish tactics to Central America. El Salvador's terrorists kidnapped the Israeli consul and executed him, avowedly because he was a Jew. The Jews of El Salvador took the hint and are leaving the country. Guatemala, under the terrorist gun, is witnessing the beginnings of its own tiny Diaspora. As opposed to this, the Jews in Argentina are proclaiming their intention to stay in what they see as their own country. They are, moreover, furious at the "neo-Nazi" libel. They point to their distinguished history in Argentina and their continuing role in its affairs. If they wished, they could leave tomorrow, taking their property with them.

One moment of fleeting sanity came when Simon Wiesenthal, who has devoted a lifetime to tracking down Nazi war criminals, deplored the use of the issue in the Timerman case. There was, he said, no persecution of Jews in Argentina as such, but only of those who had joined the Montoneros and other terrorist groups. Though he did not use the expression, what he described was "equal opportunity repression" during the days of civil strife. Then, feeling left-wing and media pressure, Mr. Wiesenthal claimed that he had been misquoted. The media tried to make an event of this, but, unfortunately for him, Mr. Wiesenthal's remarks had been tape recorded. There has, of course, been no broadcasting of this damaging tape.

From start to finish (if we have indeed heard the last of it), the Timerman case has been an Orwellian spectacle. The anti-Semitic press in Latin America, and the terrorist publicity machine, have made good use of Timerman's allegations as "proof" of the perfidy of all Jews. The press campaign in the United States, moreover, has succeeded in obscuring the substantial changes in today's Argentina and its moves under President Roberto Viola toward a return of representative government. It has also served to make more difficult U.S. moves to restore good relations with a country traditionally on the side of the West.

Of Mr. Timerman himself, it can be said that, had he not existed, the media and the left would have created him. For, when all other attacks fail, the charge of anti-Semitism is usually infallible.

Ralph deToledano

Adam Smith in Sri Lanka

Sunsets over the Indian Ocean are glorious. On the oceanfront lawn and near the pool of the Galle Face Hotel (in Colombo, Sri Lanka), a stream of tourists from Western Europe collects to enjoy the view or explore the marvelous historical treasures scattered throughout this “resplendent isle,” as the name Sri Lanka means in English. However, the majority of these tourists are probably unaware that some very important changes have been taking place on this tropical island in the past few years.

By worldwide standards, Sri Lanka today ranks as a very poor country, with a per capita income below U.S. \$200 a year. Since 1798, the island had been ruled by the British, until in 1948 it was granted independence. Under British rule, the island had developed a sound administrative and physical infrastructure, external financial reserves, and a high literacy rate in English. But between 1948 and the 1970s, the country slowly disintegrated economically and was only kept afloat by massive infusions of money from the international-aid-to-Sri Lanka club, to which the United States was a major contributor.

Sri Lanka’s history dates back 2,500 years to its original settlement by the Sinhala people from the South Asian subcontinent. The Sinhala were followed in turn by the Tamils from South India, Arab traders, Portuguese spice merchants, Dutch traders, and lastly the British. Ceylon (as the island was named under British rule) developed as a plantation economy, exporting tea, rubber, and coconut. Its modern day political evolution developed from the westernization of its indigenous elites in the early decades of the twentieth century. Political progress was rapid. Universal suffrage was granted in 1931 and peaceful independence in 1948. Since then, however, island politics have not been so tranquil. Nationalist sentiments have dominated politics during much of the past thirty-three years. Political disputes between Sinhala and Tamil have often flared into violence, resulting in the establish-