

PROCEEDINGS FIFTH PLENARY ASSEMBLY
BRUSSELS 1966

PROCEEDINGS
of the
FIFTH PLENARY
ASSEMBLY
of the
WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS



360.3
W

WORLD
JEWISH
CONGRESS

BRUSSELS 1966

1966

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE
Blaustein Library

WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS

Fifth Plenary Assembly

Brussels July 31 – August 9, 1966

PROCEEDINGS



WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS
GENEVA

CONTENTS

OPENING SESSION

Addresses of Welcome:

Dr. NAHUM GOLDMANN, <i>President, World Jewish Congress</i> .	7
MAITRE ALEXIS GOLDSCHMIDT, <i>President, Belgian Section, World Jewish Congress</i>	9
Mr. ROBERT DREYFUS, <i>Chief Rabbi of Belgium</i>	11
Mr. WILLY DE CLERCQ, <i>Deputy Prime Minister of Belgium</i> .	12
<i>Address by Mr. ABBA EBAN, Foreign Minister of Israel</i>	13
<i>Presidential Address by Dr. NAHUM GOLDMANN</i>	24

SECOND SESSION

<i>Adoption of Rules of Procedure</i>	36
<i>Election of Credentials Committee</i>	36
<i>Nominations for Presidium</i>	36
<i>Adoption of Agenda</i>	37
<i>Addresses by Fraternal Delegates</i>	37
<i>Resumption of Debate on Approval of Agenda</i>	42

THIRD SESSION

<i>Composition of Presidium</i>	47
<i>General Political Debate I.</i>	
<i>Introduction by Mr. ALEX L. EASTERMAN, Director, International Affairs Department, World Jewish Congress, London</i>	49

FOURTH SESSION

Special Discussion: Peace and Disarmament

<i>Introduction by Dr. ISRAEL GOLDSTEIN, Honorary Vice-President, World Jewish Congress</i>	61
<i>Addresses by LORD RITCHIE-CALDER OF BALMASHANNAR, Sir Montague Burton Professor of International Relations, University of Edinburgh</i>	65
<i>Mr. WILLIAM EPSTEIN, Deputy Special Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General at the Disarmament Conference in Geneva and Joint Secretary of the United Nations Disarmament Commission</i>	72
<i>PROFESSOR HENRI LAUGIER, former United Nations Assistant Secretary-General in charge of Social Affairs and former Representative of France on the Executive Board of UNESCO</i>	76

FIFTH SESSION

<i>General Political Debate II. (continued)</i>	81

SIXTH SESSION

<i>General Political Debate III. (continued)</i>	98

SEVENTH SESSION

<i>General Political Debate IV. (concluded)</i>	110
<i>Summing up of the Debate by Dr. GERHART M. RIEGNER, Secretary-General, World Jewish Congress</i>	117
<i>Announcements by the President</i>	120
<i>Reply to the Debate by Dr. NAHUM GOLDMANN</i>	120

EIGHTH SESSION

<i>Special Discussion: Israel and the Diaspora – Mutual Responsibilities</i>	
<i>Addresses by RABBI Dr. MAX NUSSBAUM, Chairman, American Section, World Jewish Congress.</i>	123
<i>Mr. LOUIS A. PINCUS, Chairman, Jewish Agency for Israel</i>	125
<i>Dr. S. LEVENBERG, Chairman, International Affairs Com- mission, World Jewish Congress</i>	128
<i>Mr. ITZHAK KORN, Chairman, International Affairs Com- mission, Israel Executive, World Jewish Congress</i>	130
<i>Debate on Israel and the Diaspora</i>	132

NINTH SESSION

<i>Report of the Credentials Committee</i>	134
<i>Introduction to the Debate on Cultural Problems: Jewish Values and Challenges</i>	
<i>Introduction by LORD SIEFF OF BRIMPTON, Vice-President, World Jewish Congress, and Chairman of its European Executive</i>	135
<i>Addresses by PROFESSOR NATHAN ROTENSTREICH, Rector, Hebrew University, Jerusalem</i>	137
<i>PROFESSOR ANDRE NEHER, Chairman, Department of Hebrew Language and Literature, University of Stras- bourg; Chairman, Cultural Commission, World Jewish Congress; President, French Section, World Jewish Congress</i>	143

TENTH SESSION

Introduction to the Debate on Cultural Problems (continued)

Address by PROFESSOR LEON DUJOVNE, Professor of Philosophy and Law, University of Buenos Aires	149
Tribute to the Memory of Dr. A. Leon Kubovy by Dr. NAHUM GOLDMANN	157
Debate on Cultural Problems I.	158

ELEVENTH SESSION

Debate on Cultural Problems II. (continued) 161

Debate on Cultural Problems III.

Special Discussion: Problems of Jewish Youth

Addresses by RABBI ARTHUR J. LELYVELD, President, American Jewish Congress	165
Mr. AHARON YADLIN, Deputy Minister of Culture and Education of Israel	169
RABBI Dr. SAMSON R. WEISS, Executive Vice-President, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America	171
Dr. MANFRED GERSTENFELD, Chairman, World Union of Jewish Students.	174

TWELFTH SESSION

Debate on Cultural Problems IV.

Special Discussion: Jewish Community Problems

Introduction by PROFESSOR ARYEH TARTAKOWER, Chairman, Israel Executive, World Jewish Congress	177
Addresses by Dr. JUDAH J. SHAPIRO, Secretary, National Foundation for Jewish Culture, New York.	178
Dr. TOBIAS KAMENSZAIN, President, Va'ad Hakehilot of Argentina.	186
Dr. ASTORRE MAYER, Chairman, Standing Conference of European Jewish Community Services	188
CHIEF RABBI Dr. MOSES ROSEN, President, Federation of Jewish Communities of Rumania	191
Debate on Cultural Problems V. (continued)	193

THIRTEENTH SESSION

<i>Special Discussion: Germans and Jews – A Problem Unresolved</i>	
Statements by Groups of Delegates	197
Introduction by Dr. NAHUM GOLDMANN	201
Addresses by PROFESSOR GERSHOM SCHOLEM, <i>Hebrew University, Jerusalem</i>	205
PROFESSOR GOLO MANN, <i>Professor of History, Technische Hochschule, Stuttgart</i>	219
PROFESSOR SALO W. BARON, <i>Professor Emeritus of Jewish History, Literature, and Institutions, Columbia University, New York</i>	230
Dr. EUGEN GERSTENMAIER, <i>President of the Bundestag of the German Federal Republic</i>	243
Statements by Dr. JOACHIM PRINZ, <i>Chairman, Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations</i> . . .	248
Dr. HENDRIK GEORGE VAN DAM, <i>Secretary-General, Central Council of Jews in Germany</i>	251
Conclusion by Dr. NAHUM GOLDMANN	255
Messages from the FEDERAL CHANCELLOR OF THE GERMAN FEDERAL REPUBLIC	258
The PRESIDIUM OF THE GERMAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC PARTY	258
PROFESSOR KARL JASPERS, <i>Professor of Philosophy, University of Basel</i>	259

FOURTEENTH SESSION

Declaration by MAITRE ALEXIS GOLDSCHMIDT, <i>Head of the Belgian Delegation</i>	266
<i>Special Discussion: Human Rights</i>	
Introduction by Dr. MOISES GOLDMAN, <i>Chairman, South American Executive, World Jewish Congress</i>	266
Addresses by Mr. DAVID A. MORSE, <i>Director-General, International Labor Organization</i>	268
PROFESSOR RENE CASSIN, <i>President, European Court of Human Rights; former Chairman, Commission on Human Rights of the United Nations; President, Alliance Israélite Universelle</i>	277
PROFESSOR MILAN BARTOS, <i>Vice-President, Serbian Academy of Science and Arts</i>	281
Concluding Statement by Dr. MAURICE L. PERLZWEIG, <i>Director, International Affairs Department, World Jewish Congress, New York</i>	288

FIFTEENTH SESSION

<i>Eulogies of the Deceased</i>	293
<i>Debate on Cultural Problems VI. (continued)</i>	296

SIXTEENTH SESSION

<i>Debate on Cultural Problems VII. (concluded)</i>	308

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

<i>Report and Resolutions of the Organization Commission</i>	321

EIGHTEENTH SESSION

<i>Report and Resolutions of the Cultural Commission</i>	330
<i>Report and Resolutions of the Political Commission</i>	338

CLOSING SESSION

<i>Report and Resolutions of the Political Commission (concluded).</i> .	348
<i>Message from Mr. ZALMAN SHAZAR, President of the State of Israel</i>	357
<i>Elections</i>	358
<i>Memorial Address on the Occasion of Sholem Aleichem Year by Mr. YAAKOV ZERUBAVEL</i>	369
<i>President's Closing Remarks</i>	370

APPENDIX I.

<i>Resolutions and Decisions of the Fifth Plenary Assembly</i>	
<i>Political Resolutions</i>	377
<i>Cultural Resolutions</i>	390
<i>Organizational Resolutions</i>	394
<i>Constitution of the World Jewish Congress, as amended by the Fifth Plenary Assembly</i>	396
<i>Elections</i>	401
<i>Composition of the Executive Committee</i>	403
<i>Composition of the Governing Council</i>	405

APPENDIX II.

<i>Composition of the Assembly</i>	407

INDEX	435

OPENING SESSION

July 31, 1966 (evening)

In the Chair: DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN;
later LORD SIEFF OF BRIMPTON

1. OPENING OF THE ASSEMBLY AND WELCOME TO GUESTS AND DELEGATES BY DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN, PRESIDENT OF THE WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS

It is with great satisfaction that I open the Fifth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress. While I will not at this time go into the details of its structure, I will simply say that this is the most representative Assembly that the Congress has had in its thirty years of existence.

We are very happy to be holding this Assembly in the bastion of democracy that is Belgium, a country that has fought for democratic ideals; and we are very pleased to be here in cooperation with the Jewish community of Belgium, a community with a great tradition, and which was severely reduced in size during the Nazi occupation.

I have taken the liberty of addressing the following cabled message to His Majesty King Baudouin:

ON THE OCCASION OF THE MEETING OF ITS FIFTH PLENARY ASSEMBLY THE WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS REQUESTS YOUR MAJESTY TO ACCEPT THE EXPRESSION OF ITS MOST PROFOUND RESPECT STOP IT TAKES THE OPPORTUNITY OF RECALLING THE ACTIVE SYMPATHY DISPLAYED BY THE ROYAL FAMILY OF BELGIUM AND BY THE BELGIAN POPULATION TOWARD THE JEWISH COMMUNITY DURING THE NAZI PERSECUTIONS STOP IT IS HAPPY TO BE ABLE TO HOLD ITS DELIBERATIONS IN A COUNTRY TRADITIONALLY ATTACHED TO LIBERTY AND THE RESPECT FOR THE INDIVIDUAL WHICH ARE PERMANENT VALUES OF JUDAISM.

I have the great honor and pleasure of transmitting to you His Majesty's reply, which we received today:

I APPRECIATE VERY MUCH THE EXPRESSION OF SYMPATHY WHICH YOU CONVEYED AS WELL AS THE HOMAGE RENDERED TO THE BELGIAN NATION FOR THE HELP IT GAVE TO THE JEWISH POPULATION DURING ITS SEVERE TRIALS.

I EXTEND MY BEST WISHES FOR THE SUCCESS OF YOUR CURRENT PLENARY ASSEMBLY TO WHICH MY COUNTRY IS HAPPY TO OFFER ITS HOSPITALITY FOR A FEW DAYS.

BAUDOUIN

I am most pleased to welcome His Excellency Mr. Willy de Clercq, Deputy Prime Minister of Belgium, representing the Government of Belgium; His Excellency Mr. Abba Eban, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Israel, representing the Government of Israel; Rabbi Robert Dreyfus, Chief Rabbi of Belgium, representing the Consistoire Central Israélite de Belgique; and Maître Alexis Goldschmidt, President of the Belgian Section of the World Jewish Congress.

I have the honor to greet the ambassadors of Israel, Switzerland, the German Federal Republic, Austria, Australia, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and Canada; the chargés d'affaires of Brazil, Denmark, Finland, France, Hungary, India, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, the United States of America, Uruguay, and Venezuela; the diplomatic representatives of Bolivia, the Dominican Republic, Italy, New Zealand, South Africa, and the United Kingdom; the representative of His Eminence Cardinal Suenens; the representative of the president of the Protestant Synod of Belgium; the representatives of Belgian authorities: the senators, the secretaries-general, directors-general, and representatives of the ministries of Agriculture, Foreign Affairs, Justice and Defense, and the representatives of the Belgian municipalities.

I am happy to greet among us the representatives of the secretary-general of the United Nations, the International Labor Office, the Council of Europe, and the European Economic Community; and the representatives of the following international nongovernmental organizations: International Conference of Catholic Organizations, International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, World Council of Churches, Commission of the Churches on International Affairs, International Committee of the Red Cross, International Council of Women, International League for the Rights of Man, International Commission of Jurists, International Law Association, Pax Romana, World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations, International Catholic Union for Social Service, World Young Women's Christian Associations, World Assembly of Youth, International Social Service, International Federation of Deportees and Resistance Internees, International Federation of Resistance Movements, and the International Federation of University Women.

I am also pleased to have with us the representatives of the following fraternal Jewish organizations: Jewish Agency for Israel, B'nai B'rith, Brit Ivrit Olamit, International Council of Jewish Women, Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture, World Sephardi Federation, World ORT Union, Alliance Israélite Universelle, Board of Deputies of British Jews, Central Board of Hungarian Jews, Central Council of Jewish Communities in Sweden, Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, Conseil Représentatif des Juifs de France,

Consistoire Central Israélite de Belgique, Jewish Community of Copenhagen, South African Jewish Board of Deputies, and the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, as well as the representatives of various Belgian Jewish organizations.

And finally, but certainly not least in affection, I greet the hundreds of delegates who are here this evening. We have this time delegates from Jewish communities in fifty countries, more than at any other Assembly of the World Jewish Congress, and we are very happy that they are here. I would just like to mention by name one delegation, for reasons which you will understand: that of the Jewish community of Rumania, represented here by Chief Rabbi Rosen. We had hoped, with some justification, to have representatives from other Jewish communities in Eastern Europe. But we are an optimistic people: although they are not with us this time, I hope that the day will come when we will have them all at the Assembly of the World Jewish Congress, including representatives of the Jews of the Soviet Union.

2. ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE BELGIAN SECTION OF THE WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS, MAITRE ALEXIS GOLDSCHMIDT

My task this evening is one of the most agreeable that could fall to my lot: to be the spokesman for the most representative Jewish organizations and personalities in Belgium united within the Belgian Section of the World Jewish Congress or in its support, and to express our joy and pride in welcoming you to Brussels. We are grateful to the Executive Committee for having chosen this city, with its international character, as the meeting place for the Fifth Plenary Assembly. The Palais des Congrès where we are meeting has been the scene of many historic debates, of which the most recent, exactly a week ago, marked the establishment of the European Common Market in agriculture. Without doubt during the coming week there will often be prickly problems on the agenda of this Assembly that will be approached with equal determination to assure solutions for the future.

If precedents are an example, the debates of the World Jewish Congress are stirring and impassioned and their conclusions fire the imagination. How could it be otherwise when the man who inspires them is Nahum Goldmann?

Mr. President, you have paid tribute to the eminent personalities tonight present. Allow me, however, to fill a gap in your speech by expressing our admiration for the manner in which you have guided the destinies of the Congress for the past thirty years as its democratically elected president. You have shown what an inspired man can achieve with an indomitable will, able to inspire enthusiasm and devotion. Even

if at times your views have aroused controversy, they have contributed to the renewal and expansion of Congress action. Nothing great or lasting is easily accomplished.

The face of the world has changed since the appeal directed in 1936 to the conscience of the world by Stephen Wise, Leo Motzkin, and Nahum Goldmann. Anti-Semitism is not dead, it is true, but it is morally, if not effectively, condemned. The indignation caused by some scandalous acquittals of former Nazis is symptomatic in this respect. Vigilance, therefore, is constantly needed in order to denounce every recurrence of fascism that threatens the individual, and the World Jewish Congress cannot slacken its efforts to improve the still precarious lot of Jewish communities in some Eastern countries and in the Arab world.

It is, however, in a more peaceful climate that this Assembly of the World Jewish Congress opens. The feeling grows ever stronger that the genocide to which millions of Jews, among them 1,600,000 children under 14 years of age, fell victim, is not regarded as a tragedy of the past like any other. It does not concern Jewry alone; the conscience of the contemporary world was and remains traumatized by it. Spiritual and lay leaders and ordinary citizens alike, all remain scarred by the shame of this century. The result is an ever growing revolt based on the refusal of all men of good will to permit persecution of any kind.

The Jews have experienced persecution in body and soul. Alas, they have acquired an extreme sensitivity to the first indications of discrimination, segregation, and oppression. They are the barometers that record in advance any deviation from democratic principles. This is why the World Jewish Congress, which alerts the responsible authorities whenever any kind of Nazism again raises its head, renders illustrious service to all the defenders of the rights of man. Besides sounding the alarm, the Congress has of course other missions in the general interest. Above all, to increase understanding between Jews and non-Jews, through ever widening knowledge of what Jewry stands for. There is no better means of eradicating prejudice and avoiding misunderstandings, often due to superficial causes. It is not by chance, I believe, that His Eminence Cardinal Suenens has been so good as to be represented here by Monsignor Ryckmans, one of the world's greatest authorities on the Bible, or that the Free University of Brussels has established an Institute for Jewish Studies. In an epoch when civilization appears to turn men into robots, it is essential to make an inventory of all spiritual and human values in order to safeguard what gives the individual honor and dignity. In this respect Judaism has made a valuable contribution.

That is the reason why the World Jewish Congress stresses the importance of Jewish culture, all the richer because it draws from so many diverse sources. The French Section of the Congress has

organized several extremely interesting colloquia on Jewish consciousness, and a new generation has at various world congresses of Jewish youth discussed the great problems of today and all time. Culture is more than the common heritage of humanity: it is one of its homelands.

Because all men are one and at last recognize this to be so, let me express the wish that the Brussels Assembly will mark a new stage in human brotherhood.

3. ADDRESS OF WELCOME BY THE CHIEF RABBI OF BELGIUM, MR. ROBERT DREYFUS

At this solemn opening of the Fifth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress, I have the honor to convey the cordial and respectful greetings of Belgian Jewry to all the guests and delegates at this distinguished gathering. I do this with mixed feelings of joy and apprehension, for the presence in this hall of representatives of our country's highest civil and religious authorities and some of the most distinguished personalities of the Jewish people makes it an especially moving event that brings to our mind the words of the psalm, "Rejoice with fear...."

My respectful greetings go in the first place to the highest civil and religious authorities of our country who in one way or another have given proof of their sympathy toward the people of Israel in general and the Belgian Jewish community in particular.

My best wishes for success go to the leaders of the World Jewish Congress. They have done the Belgian Consistoire Israélite a great honor in inviting it to take part in their sessions, and I wish to express my gratitude to you in its behalf. But, perhaps our presence on this rostrum has a symbolic meaning as well.

All Jews, no matter what their religious convictions, still are "faithful descendants of the faithful," conscious of the fact that it was their religion that forged the unique identity of the Jewish people, and that it is and will always be the strongest and most legitimate binding force; it was the Torah that God revealed to us on Mount Sinai. It was the Torah that made us *am sgula*, the people described in yesterday's *sidra* as being small in numbers but powerful in spiritual influence; the chosen people, the spiritual root upon which other branches were grafted which also bear fruit.

My fraternal solidarity goes also to our coreligionists — *achenu bnei yisrael* — who came from near and far, from the north and from the south, from east and west, or as *tfutzot* from Israel, and undertook this voyage to Belgium to enhance the power of the people of Israel.

"I have often wanted to do good unto you," said the Lord, according to our Sages, "but by your sins you have weakened the power above.... I have wanted to do good unto you, but you comported yourselves badly for you said to the golden calf: 'See your Gods, O Israel, who have led you out of Egypt,' and thus you have weakened the *gvura*, the Power, the true power."

But we, my brothers and sisters, we shall stress the spiritual character of our people in these our endeavors, for we shall seek to reinforce the true *gvura*, fervently reciting in our thoughts the blessing that we recite every morning: "Blessed be the Lord, He who crowns Israel with power...."

Let us unite, my brothers and sisters, in an ardent prayer to the Lord, and repeat with the Psalmist, "That the good will of our Eternal, God, be with us. Let the work of our hands prosper, may it prosper."

4. ADDRESS BY THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER OF BELGIUM, HIS EXCELLENCY MR. WILLY DE CLERCQ

It is my privilege to bring you the greetings of the Belgian Government and to welcome you to Belgium on the opening of the Fifth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress.

You will be holding your sessions in a country which, like Jewry, has throughout its history engaged in struggle against oppression in all its forms for the defense of the most precious human value: freedom to be oneself. Both of us know that when one does not wish to or cannot oppose force with force, one fights with much superior weapons: those of the spirit, which always triumph in the end.

The Belgian people won its independence only after cruel experiences. For centuries, it suffered under foreign yoke and saw erected on its soil the gallows and the stake. But like the Jews, it did not lose hope or confidence in the future. Our will to resist was incarnated in the legendary figure of Tyl Ulenspiegel and one also finds it expressed in the paintings of Pieter Breughel the Elder. I hope that your labors will allow time to visit our cities and museums. Take a close look at Breughel's paintings. Beyond their anecdotal appearance, you will discover in them rebellion against the forces which enslave mankind.

It is therefore not surprising that the great majority of Belgians, shaped by this tradition, came to the rescue of the Jews from Nazi persecution. In spite of the dangers, they managed to save numbers of adults and above all children from the crematoria.

Mr. President, I thank you for the kind words you have just spoken. I can give you the assurance that in this democratic country you will receive the most sympathetic hospitality. It is with the most lively

interest that we in Belgium will follow the debates of the World Jewish Congress, which you will conduct with the authority which is so widely recognized.

I should also like to greet the numerous personalities who have come from every corner of the globe to take part in this Assembly. One is struck by the realization that today are gathered in Brussels so many men and women who occupy leading roles not only within the Jewish communities but also in public life and in the economic, social, and cultural activities of their countries. I address a special message to His Excellency Mr. Abba Eban, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the State of Israel. Our two nations are linked by fruitful bonds, both on the official and personal plane. Each year hundreds of Belgians, whatever their tendencies and opinions may be, visit Israel. They return impressed by the achievements of a people animated by the courage to withstand every trial, a people with a remarkable spirit of enterprise.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, you will be debating serious problems of interest not only to Jews but to all men who hope for a better future: peace and disarmament, the rights of man, cultural questions. You will approach these problems in a spirit formed by your spiritual precepts and secular traditions, while at the same time facing the actual realities of the day. I hope that your debates will contribute to a better understanding among peoples. I believe in the value of external influences when one has sufficient internal strength to absorb them. You were able to preserve your original character, just as Belgium has preserved hers in spite of all her changing fortunes. In a world of increasing interrelationship, cultural contributions are one of the most precious sources of enrichment, and your contribution will show that today, just as in the past, mankind is in your debt for incomparable teachings.

5. ADDRESS BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF ISRAEL, HIS EXCELLENCY THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS, MR. ABBA EBAN

I am happy that my presence in Europe makes it possible for me to bring the Government of Israel's sincere and fraternal greeting to this Assembly of the World Jewish Congress. We meet in the very heart and center of Europe, on the soil of the valiant Belgian nation, with which Israel maintains solid links of friendship and cooperation.

In thanking the Deputy Prime Minister for his words of greeting, let me express, in Israel's name, a fervent wish for the peace and welfare of Belgium, and for the continued progress of the European community as a whole.

This gathering is an authentic reflection of the Jewish reality of our times. As we look around this hall we see that reality in a dual aspect. We know what we have — and what we lack. On the one hand we see here the broad range and unceasing vitality of Jewish communities across the world, drawn together here in a profound emotion of solidarity. On the other hand we are poignantly aware of the millions who were engulfed in the wave of catastrophe, of other millions who live elsewhere on this continent cut off from the mainstream of Jewish life in the past and the present, and of many in free communities who feel no impulse to associate themselves with the particular and intimate values of Jewish civilization. These are the three organic weaknesses in the Jewish body politic: the havoc wrought by Nazism, the remoteness imposed on Soviet Jewry, and the weakening of Jewish consciousness and responsibility in Western communities.

Tragedy is the difference between what is and what might have been. We cannot bring the past to life. Much of what we have lost is gone forever, beyond consolation or recall. But our other two deficiencies are within the scope of human repair. We do not despair of an affirmative reunion of Soviet Jewry with the other Jewries of Europe and the world. This would symbolize and promote the contemporary tendency towards coexistence and contact. The separation of a large Jewish community from the main body of the Jewish people is historically an organic part of the cold war. It has no place in the emerging concept of a new Europe in which the stream of ideas and commerce will flow between East and West, breaking down the so-called iron curtain, in a new wave of continental solidarity.

Similarly, there is no need for us to be resigned to the corrosion of Jewish identity. As Europe and the Americas advance to higher forms of social organization and technical power, they become increasingly responsive to voices from their past, telling them of the forces and values which shaped their life and thought. The Jewish element is a part of the balance of world culture. Its disappearance would bring nothing but impoverishment. It would be a thoughtless tragedy if Jewish identity were surrendered by those who have every freedom to conserve it. The greatest injuries that nations do to themselves are often self-inflicted. The danger lies close to our door. It requires your Assembly's deepest preoccupation.

But there is no cause for us to dwell uniquely on what we have lost through tragedy and what we stand to lose by inadvertence. Let us recall what it is that we have gained, since the dark years when your organization began its task. We have gained the incomparable pride and opportunity of Israel's sovereignty. By this gain we have transformed the spirit and structure of our nation's life. We have changed the very order of Jewish existence and in so doing we have created a new

dimension in universal history. For Israel's rebirth does not signify a flight from the larger world into an intimate national enclosure. On the contrary, our aim has been to rescue Jewish history from its isolation and cause it to flow into the broader currents of world culture. Recognized statehood within the international family gives the Jewish people not only a national personality but an international opportunity.

Some philosophers of our time have predicted that mankind has a deadline of a few decades, until the end of the century, to choose between a world-state and annihilation. It seems to me that a third path appears. History has more imagination than historians have. It has thus far refused to choose between collective suicide and the abdication of states. It seeks a system of relations which will reconcile national sovereignty with the claims of international order.

Israel's rebirth comes at a time when national freedom has celebrated its greatest triumph. More than fifty states have been added to the organized international community since Israel's admission to membership in the United Nations seventeen years ago. It is vital that world opinion should grasp the truth about Israel's deep roots in the region of which she forms a part. Sometimes our adversaries try to portray us as an expression of colonialism. There is no state in the world to which this definition is more incongruous. No state anywhere in the world expresses the concept of nationhood more intensely than Israel. It is the only state which bears the same name, speaks the same tongue, upholds the same faith, inhabits the same land as it did 3000 years ago. Israel is not alien to the Middle East but an organic part of its texture and memory. Take Israel and all that has emanated from Israel out of Middle Eastern history, and you evacuate that history of its central experience. The Arab political and intellectual leaders have never made a serious effort to understand, even reluctantly, the tenacity and authenticity of Israel as a national reality, deeply rooted in the Middle East. They would surely do well to ponder Ernest Renan's definition of nationhood: "A nation is a soul, a spiritual principle; it means having a common glory in the past, a common will in the present, having done great things together, wanting to do still more. . . ." These are the essential conditions of being a nation.

This assembly of Jewish leaders, drawn from many continents, may well see our state as the supreme expression of Jewish resilience. No people in history has ever emerged from so deep a darkness into a new epoch of vitality. Israel's Jewish aspect is a crucial part of her international identity. The essence of Jewish history can be summed up in a single phrase: the few against the many. Thus it was in the past, so it is today. Yet the few are not as few as Israel's limited population might indicate. Let the word go forth from here that there are millions

of Jews across the world for whom Israel's security, welfare, and honor are goals worthy of every effort, every responsibility, and every sacrifice. Those who do not grasp this fact underestimate the power of the Israeli reality and the Israeli idea in the history of our time. These three national goals — our security, our welfare, and our honor — stand in the center of Israel's foreign relations. They can only be won at the price of constant struggle and in the face of the most unyielding hostility by which any modern nation has ever been beset. The question is whether and when we can bring the Arab world to a rational estimate of Israel's capacity to stand fast, struggle, and endure. It is true that the map reveals a great preponderance of Arab power in relation to Israel. It shows us thirteen sovereign Arab states, with a population of 100,000,000 and an area of 4,000,000 square miles, confronting a single sovereignty established in a small corner of 8000 square miles, with a population of only 2,500,000. Yet the experience of these eighteen years demonstrates that the evidence of the map may not be conclusive. There are manifestly forces at work in the history of our time and in the life of our generation which deny these facts. The first of these is Israel's capacity to deter and contain the regional hostility by maintaining a balance of military strength. The commitment of 2,000,000 Israelis to Israel's defense is more absolute and passionate than the commitment of 100,000,000 Arabs to Israel's destruction. For Israel, survival is the first and ultimate necessity. For the Arab nation, with its own survival assured in thirteen states, Israel's destruction is at best optional. To this crucial issue of morale, we must add the reinforcement of technology. In modern strategy, the value of numbers tends to decline in comparison with the value of technical and scientific skills. As military technology develops, the quantitative element loses its decisive importance, the possibility of a small community holding its own against heavy demographic odds becomes increasingly tangible. This is not to say that it is preferable to be small, but it is at least a tolerable destiny. In Israel's national memory, the victory of David over Goliath was a result not of his smallness but of his compensating agility and talent for improvisation. Whatever has enabled Israel to succeed in deterrence and containment during the past decade seems certain to be operative for the next decade and beyond.

But the maintenance of a local equilibrium of security in the Middle East is not only Israel's concern. It also responds to broad international interests. The crises of the last few years have usually had their origin in small nations which lack either internal stability or a local equilibrium of strength. The present tragic conflict in Vietnam, as well as recent eruptions in Congo, Cyprus, Yemen, and the Caribbean area illustrate this truth. In each case a vacuum or imbalance of security in a small

country draws external forces into perilous involvement. A local tension becomes an international peril. This experience helps to explain why there is more overt and effective support today than formerly for the maintenance of a prudent security equilibrium in the Arab-Israel area. Let Israel's policy on the arms race be clear. We should like to see it halted or slowed down. But, if, through the actions and attitudes of other governments, near and far, the race goes on, then we must be resolved never to lose it; we dare not tempt our adversaries by weakness.

But while we accept the inexorable necessities of increasing our defensive strength, we cannot fail to reflect on the revolution which would come over our region if its resources were consecrated to the peaceful challenge of development. If the Arab states are afflicted by the burdens and anxieties of the Middle Eastern armaments race, then we would willingly take this as the first point in the peaceful and direct dialogue that we seek with them. Let the race in armaments give way to a new race, a race in development, in social progress, and in cultural vitality. Let us exchange commodities and ideas instead of exchanging words of abuse and acts of enmity. Israel's strength, in which we do not conceal our pride, stands in the exclusive service of our security and our peace. Those who respect Israel's independence, integrity, and legitimate interests will find a reciprocal respect from us. My thoughts in this context are riveted on our frontier with Syria, which has lately been the scene of grave events. We wish to see this tension brought to a close. If the Israeli border regions are safe for us, the Syrian border regions will be safe for them. The United Nations' contribution to this cause is more likely to lie in local conciliation than in acrimonious debate. The United Nations, after all, was meant to be an instrument for solving conflicts, not an arena for waging them. The highest international organs do not exhaust their duty by reacting like a Greek chorus — expressing organized consternation at conflicts which they do little to solve.

Israel's reliance on her independent deterrent strength does not mean that we should ignore other factors for the increase of stability. For good or ill the policies of states outside our region will affect the Middle Eastern destiny. There is no such thing as an Arab-Israel map, cut off from the currents of thought and action in the wider world; there is nothing to be gained for Israel by restricting the play of forces to that of the two containing adversaries alone. An active international policy is an important dictate of Israel's national security. Here the central question is whether international policies in favor of respect of existing political and territorial structures and against violence and aggression can be clarified and brought to expression.

I am convinced that all powers with interests in our region — the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and France — are animated in their international policies by opposition to the use of force for the settlement of territorial disputes between sovereign states. And the small nations, which are the bulk of the international community, have a manifest interest in the integrity of existing frontiers everywhere. With 98% of the human race now living for the first time under sovereign flags, the doctrines of territorial expansion have lost their appeal. Every state — and especially those which have primary responsibility for peace and security — can help the Middle East in its torment and contention by expressing, each in its own way and form, an unyielding resistance to any change of the status quo by force. Those who uphold this doctrine in Europe and in the Far East should be the first to apply it rigidly in the Middle East as well. You cannot wish for peace, coexistence, and respect for existing frontiers on this continent of Europe if you allow those principles to be set aside in Europe's Middle Eastern hinterland.

It may be that our neighbors hope that Israel will one day fade away under the pressure of what they call our regional solitude. The effects of Israel's isolation from the Arab environment are regrettable and serious, but they touch the atmosphere of her life rather than her prospect of survival. In the new age of swift communications, nations are less dependent on their regional context than in former times. Israel's markets, friendships, scientific contacts, and intellectual links can, if necessary, be found in Europe, the Western Hemisphere, and amongst the friendly states of Africa, Asia, and the Middle East that lie beyond the Arab fence. The modern world is assuming the character of a close-knit, urban society, whose several parts are mutually accessible. Affinity is now more important than vicinity as the guiding force of international relationships. Moreover, Israel, since the dawn of history, has received and exercised her major influences across the Mediterranean world, in which she is far from being alone.

Israel's network of diplomatic and commercial relations is not yet complete, but it is already of impressive scope. It includes friendly ties with every single one of the governments and peoples of the Western Hemisphere. Our president's arrival in Washington this week, after an enthusiastic welcome in Latin America, testifies to the cordiality of those friendships. In my conversations with President Johnson and his leading associates earlier this year, I felt how far the United States has moved towards a deeper understanding of Israel's security needs. This friendship, so fruitful for Israel in so many ordeals, is enriched by a vigilant and ardent public sympathy. Further south, we find ourselves linked with nations whose revolutionary epoch is not yet ended. But their revolution no longer affects the attainment of sovereignty, which

is everywhere assured. It concerns the pursuit of economic progress against the background of a vast demographic increase, far outstripping the more modest growth of production. It hardly seemed possible a few years ago that Israel's experience could have much to teach to nations so far away and so solidly established in international life. It now appears that there are problems, vital for the Latin American future, in which Israel's achievements are of burning relevance. Our technical cooperation agreements with the Organization of American States and with individual governments assure a friendly and constructive Israeli presence in that distant hemisphere.

As our glance moves eastward, it brings us face-to-face with crucial areas of relationship with Europe. Israel is profoundly impressed by the speed and scope of the European recovery. In all that was said and written about Europe at the end of the Second World War, there is not a single recorded prediction that the European scene twenty years later would be as it is today. An exceptional self-confidence and zest for the future now inflame the energies of the Old World. Yet less than two decades have passed since the most eloquent European voice proclaimed: "But what is Europe now? It is a rubble heap, a charnel house, a breeding ground of pestilence and hate; ancient nationalistic feuds and modern ideological factions distract and infuriate the unhappy, hungry populations." These words were said by Winston Churchill in 1948.

Well, the populations are not unhappy or hungry now. Their progress is expressed in living institutions whose operation closely affects the destiny of all Mediterranean lands. Israel is on the eve of a new attempt, which may be long, to reach a satisfactory association with this developing European community. It is not only a question of safeguarding our export trade, which is adversely affected by the customs provisions of the Treaty of Rome. Beyond this there looms a whole complex of larger issues. How can Israel achieve a high technical standard in production if she is thrown back on herself, cut off from the large markets and expanding skills of European industry? As the influence of the EEC expands southward and eastward, beyond Greece and Turkey to North and West Africa, how can Israel fail to be injured if she is excluded from widening integration? Is there not a special link of history, culture — yes, and of tragic memory — between Europe and the Jewish nation? What was European unity except a reaction, after the war, to the weakness and humiliation bequeathed by the Nazi decade? When we probe the deeper preoccupations of European culture, can we go far without encountering some of the origins of that culture in Hebrew thought? Should not all these affinities of action and thought, of interest and ideals, of material concern and spiritual ambitions, find their proper institutional expression?

These considerations imply an ever closer link of Israel with the European destiny. We seek these closer links with all members of the European community, without exception. Israel and France do not need a common adversary in order that their friendship should flourish. If France and Israel go hand in hand today, it is not because we had a common foe in the past, but because we have common ideals for the present and future. There are other nations of Europe, within and beyond the EEC, whose recent memory comprises a community of experience with the Jewish people in its anguish and renewed hope.

Of course, the somber story of Israel's encounter with Germany in recent history is a special case. In proposing to the Knesset that we respond to the offer of diplomatic relations, I said last year that we did not aim to end the acute and searching dialogue between our two peoples, but to establish a new framework for conducting it. We must somehow manage both to preserve the past and to remain capable of the future. Above all, we must understand that we can do no higher reverence to the memory of our martyred millions than to ensure that Israel shall be strong, so that never, never again shall the Jewish people be afflicted by the weakness and inferiority which made its tragedy possible. We shall not honor our past by renouncing any possibility for strengthening our future, including those possibilities of reinforcement which are latent or implicit in German-Israel relations.

When we speak of Europe, we do not mean Western Europe alone. In 1947 a great power, which had until then refused to acknowledge our national rights, joined with those whom it considered as its adversaries in a concerted international attempt to solve the central problem of Jewish history. That moment of convergence in the policies of the powers was brief. There is no assurance that it will soon come again. But if all the powers — each in its own way — could be brought to give convincing expression of a desire to support the independence and integrity of all Middle Eastern states, a new revolutionary period might be inaugurated, leading perhaps to a prospect of peace. We must at least explore and probe this prospect.

It seems to me that it is Israel's duty to explore all possibilities for revealing common ground in her relations with East European states. On my recent visit to Warsaw I had occasion to make a detailed review of our relations with East European governments. We have diplomatic relations with all, commercial relations with some, cultural relations with most. Our support of the integrity of their existing frontiers is not in doubt. It is vital that we move to consolidate these bonds. Europe will not forever be divided into two ideological camps, hermetically sealed one against the other. Indeed, the search for a unified system of continental relationships has already begun, and it is with all of Europe

— East and West, within and outside the EEC — that Israel seeks a reinforcement of its ties.

Of the ninety-six countries with which Israel has diplomatic relations, nearly one third are African states. Israel's presence in the arena of African development will be steadily expanded, in the measure that African governments continue to attach value to this work. Some people expected that Africa would pass from revolution to stability overnight. History does not tell us that Europe or America made so great a transition in so short a time. The present difficulties affecting many African states cannot eclipse the brilliant success of African emancipation as one of the most positive developments in twentieth century life.

Israel is proud of her intimate association with this process. We do not exaggerate our capacity: we know what we are and what we are not. But when all is said, Israel's role in the great drama of African development is seriously conceived, widely respected, and full of honor.

While we cannot be expected to become involved in Asia's conflicts, we welcome the opportunity of expanding our links with the developing states of the Asian continent.

The special challenge to Israel's diplomacy arises in the Middle East. Something is moving in Arab minds. The old dogmas of Israel's disappearance no longer go unchallenged. There are Arabs who understand that history and geography have brought these two peoples together in a common future and that the call to war and boycott is increasingly discordant with the spirit and necessities of our time. (The number of Arab leaders who believe this is perhaps greater than the number of those who say it.) But whether the Arab nations and Israel can reach an understanding of each other depends on how they conceive the nature and destination of the Middle East. For many Arab thinkers and leaders the dominant theme of the region's destiny is Arab unity. Much of Arab history is concerned with the tension between unity and regionalism. There is, of course, a unifying energy in the Arab world which draws all men of Arab tongue together in a common identity. But there is also a strong tendency of Arab states to conserve their separate sovereignties against a claim to centralized hegemony from Cairo. Baghdad, Beirut, Damascus, and North Africa have never voluntarily acknowledged the political ukase of the Nile Valley.

For twelve years, the efforts to impose a uniform control on the restless, varied stream of Middle Eastern life have led to uninterrupted crises. Nothing has divided the Middle East more than the effort to unite it. Today, diversity, pluralism, and polycentrism are everywhere undermining the pretensions of monolithic blocs — from the Atlantic world to the Communist system, as well as across Africa and Latin America. It is doubtful if the Arab world, with its deep-rooted

diversities, will tolerate a centralized control. I make this point because a Middle East in which separate Arab states could pursue their separate destinies, in a mood of tolerant variety, could more easily accommodate an Arab-Israel understanding than a homogenized Middle East convulsed by a bid for centralized control.

The world has generously come to terms with Arab nationalism. The question is whether Arab nationalism can now come to terms with regional and international concepts broader than itself. And here it seems to me that the most fruitful and natural regional concept is that of Mediterranean cooperation. The Mediterranean spirit, with the currents of thought and action which it has generated or evoked, lies at the origin of the technical and cultural transformation which has largely determined the history of mankind. Egypt, Israel, Lebanon, Syria, Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco are Mediterranean nations, while Jordan is oriented by trade and history toward the Mediterranean world. The Hellenic and Latin worlds, Turkey, and the island republics of Cyprus and Malta are washed by the same Mediterranean waters. Every point in this littoral is swiftly accessible to every other. Three continents — Europe, Africa, and Asia — look out upon it with all their diversity of fate and outlook. Five great civilizations were born here: Judaism, Christianity, Hellenism, Rome, and Islam. It is a central, compact world, congenial to the interaction of commerce and ideas and alien to exclusiveness. In no other part of the globe does a similar variety of conditions exist in such close proximity or in such intensity of mutual influence.

The issue is whether the Arab and Jewish nations, which have been primary agents in the Mediterranean adventure, can transcend their conflict in dedication to a new Mediterranean future, in cooperation with a renascent Europe and an emerging Africa — a new impulse of thought in the Middle East, similar to that which inaugurated the European community fifteen years ago.

I have spoken to you of dangers and opportunities; I believe that the opportunities exceed the dangers. And I have spoken to you, as is inevitable, in the name and service of the Israeli Government alone. It is legitimate to ask ourselves here whether there is such a thing as a Jewish policy, outside the frontiers of a sovereign state. It seems to me that the special memories and impulses of our history give the Jewish people everywhere a unifying shape of thought on central, universal issues. First there is a passion for peace — born of ancient prophecy and recent tragedy. Then there is support of freedom. Only those societies are tolerant which are open to new and conflicting ideas. As Jews we are commanded everywhere to resist every form of discrimination, whether practiced against ourselves or against others. In view of Israel's emergence to freedom, we are all better able to comprehend the

struggles of other peoples for completing their liberation from colonial rule. In the light of our experience, we are particularly sensitive to the need for international action in support of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Our people's cultural history gives it a special understanding of the healing effects of intellectual and scientific cooperation in the service of human welfare. All these elements of Israel's policy reflect the humanistic legacy that we have derived from our specifically Jewish origins. It is imperative that we maintain these links. We must not live within the confines of our small geography, but against the backdrop of our large history and our deep roots in a continuous spiritual tradition. We must banish all Canaanite heresies from Israeli thought. You cannot take Israel out of its universal Jewish context without stunting its image and dwarfing its reality. Similarly, Israel does not aspire to draw strength from Jewish adversity. Whatever weakens the security and dignity of Diaspora Jewry must, in the final resort, weaken Israel as well. We seek the accession to Israel of Jews from other lands — not because they are driven by fear, but because they are drawn by hope and touched by the creative exhilaration of a new society. We cannot maintain our achievement, still less expand it, without an infusion of manpower from the free Jewish communities of the world. If the free Jewish communities of the world do not answer this call, then they condemn Israel to a demographic and cultural smallness which will frustrate our higher hopes.

Twenty years ago, we could hardly have conceived this kind of encounter between a sovereign Israel and Jewish communities of the world. The lesson of this hour is that our proud and ancient people has not exhausted its vocation. The years to come will be turbulent, challenging, restless, with energies flying off in all directions. Our tasks must include efforts to give greater form and effectiveness to the cooperation between Israel and her associates throughout the Jewish world. It is necessary that we stay close together, in consultation and with a sense of common mission. The dialogue between Israel and the Diaspora must be deepened and widened.

I draw attention to two dangers, the first of which is complacency in the free communities of the West — the thought that Israel's destiny is assured and that responsibility can now be shifted to Israel's shoulders alone. This is a fallacy which distorts the geopolitical realities. Much has been achieved, and I firmly believe in Israel's future; there will never be a family of nations without a free and independent Israel in its midst. But whether that freedom and independence shall be again submitted to tragic hostility, whether Israel shall flourish or dwindle — this depends largely on the intensity of our partnership. There is also the danger in Israel to which I have already referred: the danger of regarding Israeli nationhood as something separate and apart from

Jewish nationhood. There is a danger of alienation between Israeli youth and young men and women growing up in free and liberal communities — the lack of a common language both in the literal and in the figurative sense.

These, then, are some of the issues to which your energies and attention are invited. I know better than some of you that much in Israel is still imperfect, lacking in inner form and outer harmony. I do not claim perfection for what we have achieved; if I had any such illusions, a half-hour in our Israeli parliament would set my illusions to rest. But, after all, ours is still a young society, with all its future intact before it. For the first time in two millennia the Jewish people has recaptured an autonomous control of its destiny.

The great forces represented in this room are summoned to a new enactment of the national experience. If we stand together, we may find that a new story, never known or told before, will yet unfold, and that the climax to the great record of Jewish creativity is yet to come.

6. PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS BY DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN.

This Fifth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress is a jubilee Assembly. Thirty years ago, after several preliminary conferences, the Congress was formally established, and it is only fitting, in celebrating this anniversary, to pay tribute to the towering personality of Stephen Wise, its founder and first president.

In these past thirty years our generation has passed through one of the most revolutionary and tragic periods of history. It is a period marked by the Second World War and the annihilation of tens of millions of human beings; by the emergence of dozens of new states; by the development of atomic energy with its limitless positive and negative potentialities; by the tensions and possibilities of conflict which may ruin civilization; and by tremendous unsolved social, economic, and spiritual problems affecting the whole human race. For us Jews this period has witnessed, on the one hand, the destruction of one third of our people — the greatest tragedy in our long history — and, on the other, the realization of the centuries-old dream of a Jewish homeland by the establishment of the State of Israel.

These tremendous changes, both in the world situation and in the specific position of our people, naturally require a courageous self-analysis. Nothing would be more detrimental to the solution of the great problems on which our future as a people depends than to continue with the same aims, the same methods, and the same way of thinking that determined Jewish life thirty years ago and to pursue the same procedures today, after all these revolutionary changes. Above all, an organization like the World Jewish Congress, which is not limited to

any one specific task or particular aspect of Jewish life but seeks to represent the totality of the Jewish people — and this Assembly, with its representatives of the great majority of organized American Jewry and observers from Eastern European Jewish communities, is nearer the ideal of the World Jewish Congress than any previous Assembly — would be derelict in its duty and fail in its historical significance if it did not attempt to draw up a balance sheet of our position today, both external and internal; to compare it with the situation when the Congress was first created; and then to draw the necessary consequences, however difficult the task might be, in revising our scale of priorities and trying to formulate anew the problems facing our generation today in contrast to those of three decades ago.

Let me begin this analysis by tracing the main features of Jewish life as they presented themselves to those of us — many of whom are fortunately with us here tonight — who proclaimed the creation of the World Jewish Congress thirty years ago in Geneva. The central problem at that time — what was called the Jewish problem — was the abnormality of Jewish existence: the lack of a center of Jewish life and the permanent menace to Jewish physical and economic existence by powerful anti-Semitic forces. Three-and-a-half million Jews in Poland at that time were threatened by violent anti-Semitic movements; 1,000,000 Jews in Rumania were in the same position; and, above all else, the Nazi movement had begun its fantastic and unbelievable career, had captured power in Germany, and was openly proclaiming its crusade against the existence of the Jewish people, depriving the German Jews of their rights as equal citizens and openly preaching a policy of destruction and annihilation for the Jewish people as a whole. These anti-Semitic movements, climaxed by the Nazis, represented a danger to the very existence of millions of Jews — not only economically but, in view of the Nazi menace, physically, too. It was clear at that time that the major task of our generation was to fight this danger, to mobilize our forces and world opinion around us, in an effort to avoid the catastrophe inherent in the Nazi menace. The fight against anti-Semitism and economic help in the form of relief to economically deprived Jews were the two major and immediate tasks. Added to them was the growing understanding that without a Jewish homeland the Jewish problem could not be solved, which implied the need for strengthening the fight for the Zionist idea as the solution of the Jewish problem. The World Jewish Congress was primarily created, then, against the background of the Nazi menace and with the task of coordinating the forces of defense of our generation; of uniting the Jewish people, whose unity is in itself a source of strength and the basis of our future; and of forging this unity into an instrument in the fight against the greatest danger ever to threaten our people.

This is not the moment to survey what the World Jewish Congress has achieved in these thirty years, from the viewpoint of its task at the time of its foundation. It certainly succeeded to a large degree in fostering the idea of Jewish unity, in bringing together Jewish organizations and communities from sixty countries, and in making its contribution to the solution of many Jewish problems during these three decades — although we must admit that our whole generation, for the greater part, did not recognize the Nazi danger or succeed in averting the menace and in saving the millions annihilated by the Nazi regime.

When we compare our situation today with that of thirty years ago, we immediately recognize tremendous differences. The Nazi regime was defeated and destroyed, and what is called neo-Nazism, although it is something to be carefully watched and combatted, does not represent a serious danger to our existence. Equality of civil and political rights for Jews has been attained in practically all countries, and the fight for emancipation is no longer an important problem. Parallel with this emancipation, the economic position of the Jewish people has radically improved; although there may still be areas of misery in Jewish life here and there, relief and philanthropy are no longer a central task for our generation. And, climaxing this positive evolution, the ideal of the generations has been implemented: the State of Israel exists, is growing, and is becoming more and more the principal and natural center of the life of our people.

However, in place of the problems which determined Jewish policies thirty years ago and which for the most part have been solved, new ones have arisen, of a quite different character. They are less dramatic and less tragic but, in their implications and in their effect, no less dangerous than those we had to deal with then. Brutal anti-Semitism — especially Nazism — is no longer a decisive force in the world and has been liquidated — although the question of our relationship as a people to the German people after the Nazi period is one of the unsolved questions of our generation, important enough to be dealt with as a special subject on the agenda of this Assembly. Instead of the fight for equality of rights for the Jews as individual human beings and as citizens, a new problem has developed: the fight for the right of the Jewish people to be united and to maintain its specific character as a people; to continue to develop this character, based on thousands of years of its unique history. The problem now is to resist assimilation into the majorities among whom the Jewish people lives in the Diaspora and for the Jewish state of Israel not to assimilate in character to all the other states of our time. The great task of our generation — the right to be equal having been won — is to fight for the right to be different.

Otherwise our equality is meaningless, seen from the point of view of Jewish existence.

We are living in a period of great danger to all minorities, to all nonconformist groups and individuals. It is a period based primarily on tremendous developments in technology and material progress, with means of communication which overcome all differences posed by language, boundaries, and culture. This situation tends to create a conformist image of the human being, with no real respect or appreciation for nonconformist groups, for outsiders, for minorities, who have suffered and fought for centuries to maintain their specific character.

From the point of view of the relations of the various states to their Jewish minorities, the Jewish problem today is no longer a question — as it was for centuries — of denial of equality to the individual Jew. It is rather the denial of the right and facilities in many parts of the world for Jewish minorities to maintain and develop their specifically Jewish forms of life. The outstanding example of this change in the character of the Jewish problem is provided by the position of the 3,000,000 Jews in the Soviet Union. This issue — of highest priority for us — is not only misunderstood but even distorted by viewing it as another of the centuries-old manifestations of anti-Semitism. Despite anti-Semitic tendencies here and there in the Soviet Union, as in many other parts of the world, the individual Soviet Jewish citizen is not persecuted, is not denied his political rights or his economic existence. He is not denied the possibilities of participating in the academic, scientific, cultural, and artistic life of his country — although in certain spheres some discrimination does exist. But there is no doubt that the Jewish minority in the USSR — regarded as a religious and a national minority and as such recognized under the laws of the Soviet Union — is denied, unlike many other minorities, the facilities to live its life as a collective Jewish group. As a result the grave danger exists that we may lose this second largest and culturally so highly creative Jewish community in the course of one or two generations.

This is not the place to discuss in detail the best methods for trying to secure the right of Soviet Jewry to live as Jews, to have contact with world Jewry, to have the right to be morally attached to Israel, to practice its religion, and to cultivate its own literature and art. The discussion which often takes place among Jewish organizations as to the best methods of directing our efforts is highly exaggerated. There is no single method to be followed in such political action. We must continue to place the problem on the agenda of world public opinion, as we have succeeded in doing, succeeded even in getting the support of many friends of the Soviet Union, including important Communist groups. At the same time, we must try to convince the leaders of the Soviet Union,

by contacts and friendly discussions, that the aims of our fight are purely Jewish, that we do not intend to get involved as a people in the conflict between the two world blocs, that we should like to have the same friendly relations with the Soviet Union as with other countries, and that we have only one request to make of them: to allow those Jews in the USSR who wish to remain Jews — religiously, culturally, or nationally — to do so; to allow them to develop the necessary instruments for themselves and permit those who want to be reunited with their families in Israel to emigrate.

But it would be unfair to the Soviet Union and it would show a lack of understanding of the seriousness of the newly developed problem of the right of our people to remain Jewish, if one were to think that this problem existed only in the USSR. At this very Assembly of the World Jewish Congress, some Jewish communities are not represented, not because they would not like to be part of a world Jewish organization, but because the laws and the political climate of their countries make it impossible for them to be here. In large areas of the democratic free world there still prevails a thinking — not new — which represents a distortion of real democracy. According to this outlook, if a Jew becomes emancipated and enjoys equality of rights as a citizen, he has to pay the price of giving up his specific identity — he has to merge completely with the majority and assimilate. This feeling represents a deadly menace to Jewish survival; yet such concepts are widely spread in some of the freest and most democratic countries in the world, where even many Jewish groups and individuals are afraid of stressing too much their specific identity, their different existence as Jews, out of fear of endangering the equality of rights which they have achieved. Instead of fighting against anti-Semitism — without denying the need for vigilance against anti-Semitic movements — we must mobilize our forces to fight for our right to remain Jews. This is the real political problem of our people today and — just as in the past we were among the pioneers of the fight for the right of all minority members to enjoy equality of rights — we must today, together with many other minority groups who are also endangered, be in the forefront of the fight for the right of minorities, despite the equal civil rights of their members, to develop and maintain their specific, different character.

This fight for the right to remain Jews and to continue the great traditions of our history implies two specific rights: first, to be part and parcel of one people; second, to be attached morally and spiritually to the center of Jewish life in Israel and to assume responsibility for its future. It would be erroneous to believe that both rights are self-evident. There are still many non-Jews — and, unfortunately, many Jews, too — who are afraid of the notion of one Jewish people, not only theoretically but also in practical action and common effort. The

danger of Jewish isolationism and of the breakup of the Jewish people in the Diaspora into communities acting separately on common problems is a real one. In a certain way, a paradoxical situation is developing. As Jewish communities become larger and wealthier, they become more dynamic in their own community life. At the same time, they develop tendencies to become independent of other parts of the Jewish people, to take care exclusively of their own institutions and community problems, and to forget the great truth of our history: that no isolated Jewish community, however strong and numerous it may have been, has ever survived, but rather disappeared, once it lost its consciousness of being part of the Jewish people. The fight for a united people, which is the main purpose and main task of the World Jewish Congress, is even more essential today than it was thirty years ago, despite the progress that this idea has made since then.

The same applies to another specific demand which may be unique, but no less essential for our future, namely, the right of Jewish communities in the Diaspora to assume responsibility for Israel, to be attached to it as the center of collective Jewish life. In a world organized, as ours is, in separate sovereign states, this right does not involve, of course, assuming political responsibility or demanding political rights. Without the link between Jewish communities and the new center of Jewish life, the future of these communities — especially after the destruction of the great bastions of Jewish creativeness — would be even more endangered than it is; and without the cooperation and the responsibility of the Jewish communities of the world for the destiny of Israel, its future would be even more endangered, as long as it lives among hostile neighbors with their great numerical superiority.

It may be that our demand to be attached to Israel and to share responsibility for it has no parallel among other peoples. But our structure and history as a people have always been unique, and we are entitled to specific rights even if they do not apply to other groups: a people has the right to be unique in many respects and to be allowed to maintain its uniqueness.

The relationship between Israel and the Diaspora, which we have discussed in many assemblies of the Congress, remains a major problem of Jewish life. The utilization of Israel as the great new cultural, spiritual, and religious center of Jewish life that will have to replace the destroyed centers of Central and Eastern Europe which maintained our existence as a people in the last centuries remains one of the central and yet unsolved problems of our generation. The danger of a cleavage, especially between the younger generation in Israel and in the Diaspora communities, is still very real. It will require a continuous and energetic effort by Jews in Israel and in the Diaspora to build lasting bridges, to link up these two sections of the same people living under such

different conditions. The problem of the unity of the Jewish people has become even more difficult since the emergence of the State of Israel, because it involves not only uniting Jewish communities in the Diaspora, who live more or less under the same conditions, but also retaining Israel Jewry as part and parcel of the united Jewish people.

All this leads me to the last and most far-reaching central problem on which our survival as a people depends: the danger of the erosion of the historical foundation of our existence as a people. The uniqueness of our historical existence lies in the fact that the basis of our survival was never political might, economic wealth, or material power, but rather ideas and ideals. The great tradition of our people, the fact that we became a people through vocation, religious duty, and the fulfilment of a specific mission – and not by reason of political and material reality – determines the character of our whole history. For in this order of ideas, it is of no decisive importance what measure of historical accuracy one attributes to the biblical record of the most ancient period of Jewish history. Even those who regard it as legend cannot deny its great significance. To understand and recognize the character of a people and a civilization, mythology is no less important, and sometimes more meaningful, than historical fact. The outstanding events at the beginning of our march through history – the mission of Abraham, sent by God to Eretz Israel; the laying of the foundation of Jewish existence by the lawgiving on Sinai; and the unique figure of Moses – determined from the outset the meaning and character of our destiny as a people. Even in the period when we had our own state in Palestine, its significance and importance for the destiny of our people was not based on its military strength and victories or on its economic power, but on the ideas which it had originated and developed, the ideals which it handed down to future generations. What upheld our people was not the kings of Israel and Judah, but their Prophets. And certainly, throughout the centuries of Diaspora life, when we had no political power whatsoever, it was this great religious and idealistic tradition – and the type of life created by it – that secured the survival of our people.

The central problem of our life today and tomorrow is that, together with emancipation and the loss during centuries of ghetto existence of our specific frame of life, the majority of our people has lost the particular type of life based on centuries-old traditions and we have not yet created new values and challenges to replace them. Jewish life today is bare and empty of great new ideas. It consists of organizational activity, the fight against the remnants of anti-Semitism, and, above all, fundraising in hundreds of forms; but it is a barren desert from the point of view of spiritual creativeness. Here lies the principal problem of our life. Here lies the danger of losing the larger part of the younger

generation of tomorrow and the day after for lack of challenges and inspiration that might induce those who are not living in a religious frame of life to remain Jewish. The fact that we lose much of our best idealistic youth to other revolutionary movements is the inevitable result of this situation. Nothing would be more disastrous than to be so seduced by the wonderful facade of Jewish life — by the many organizations, imposing budgets, and grandiose conventions — as to overlook the emptiness and boredom of Jewish life for intellectuals, idealists, and young people. Nothing is more essential than for Jewish leadership to recognize the gravity of the problem and the seriousness of the danger.

Our generation of adults is, as I have often said, not typical. We have become better Jews because of the unique shock of the tragic Nazi period, the loss of millions of our friends and relatives, and the great positive and inspiring experience of the emergence of the Jewish state. These events will not suffice — certainly not in the same way as they did for us — for the younger generation, which did not witness the Nazi tragedy and which sees Israel's existence not as a miracle but as a simple, natural fact. Therefore, the main problem of our generation, and thus of the World Jewish Congress, is this new consequence of emancipation. The menace to our survival no longer comes from without, as was the case for thousands of years. It comes from within, and this calls for a radical and fundamental change in the structure and situation of our people. Our main front today — more than in any other period of our history — is internal, no longer external. The dangers to our survival are disintegration and assimilation. If one deeply analyzes our internal situation and does not allow oneself to be misled by the dynamic appearance of our organizational life, one must take note of a terrifying indifference, particularly among the younger generation. The process of assimilation today concerns not only the individual but our collective life as Jews, our character as a specific collective entity. This applies to all aspects of Jewish life. And this is the new outstanding and overriding fact in our situation. In many countries, especially in the United States, which has the most important Jewish community in the world, there is a tendency among some religious leaders and their followers to equate Judaism with other religions; to turn the Jewish religion into another modern church; and to forget the basic fact that the Jewish people never was solely a religious group, but the embodiment of a unique combination of peoplehood, religion, and vanguard of a complete civilization.

For this reason, a word of warning is necessary against the exaggerated zeal of many Jewish religious leaders for so-called dialogues with leaders of other religions. It is perfectly in order and useful to discuss with other religions the common moral obligations of religious

groups, to safeguard peace, and to fight poverty and the exploitation of peoples or classes. But when it comes to discussion of purely religious ideologies and convictions, one should heed the warning of many outstanding religious figures in Jewish life not to try to find common denominators in the purely religious sphere, for this must naturally lead to a weakening and gradual elimination of the specific traits of what one calls Judaism. The World Jewish Congress has tried for years to establish and develop contacts with the Vatican and with leaders of the other Christian churches. But it has limited these contacts and discussions to the defense of human rights, the eradication of anti-Semitism, the struggle against racial and religious prejudice, the fight for the equal rights and dignity of all religions, the war against poverty, and the struggle for the preservation of peace.

If this process of assimilation is not halted by internal action, it may lead in a relatively short time to the loss of a large section — consisting in a certain way of the best part — of the younger generation. If we understand the gravity of this situation, we must conclude that the whole structure and character of our efforts has to be reconsidered: we have to develop new priorities in our life. Our future no longer depends on the fight against anti-Semitism, on defense, on relief and philanthropy, on competition between organizations. It depends on searching for and discovering new values and sources of inspiration. It is vitally important for our survival to bring into the forefront of Jewish life and leadership the tens of thousands of Jewish intellectuals who are today indifferent to Jewish problems. The test for Jewish leadership can no longer be excellence in fundraising and philanthropy, or even in so-called political activities, however necessary these efforts may be. In past periods the Prophets and the rabbis, the scholars and the thinkers were the real shapers of our destiny and the leaders of our people; we have to strive to reestablish a similar situation for today and tomorrow.

Here I wish to say, reluctantly and cautiously, a word about the specific tasks which today face the leaders of Jewish tradition and Orthodoxy. A situation has developed which I view with great anxiety. Because the majority of our people no longer lives within the framework of the principles and laws which regulated Jewish life for centuries, Jewish Orthodoxy tends to develop a psychology of an attacked minority living and fighting within a fortress. It isolates itself; it fights those of the majority, who do not accept its ideology, and labels them heretics; and it often forgets one of the basic principles of Judaism — that a Jew, even if he sins, remains a Jew. In its great periods Jewish traditional Orthodoxy was never static, frozen, and committed to the maintenance of the status quo. In the great periods of Talmudic Judaism and in the Middle Ages, Jewish religious leadership always found ways to adapt itself to the necessities of changing situations,

naturally always remaining faithful to its basic tenets. It is only in our time that Jewish Orthodoxy, aware of its minority position, has lost the daring and the creative courage to find a synthesis between its basic concepts and the needs of the Jewish people in its new conditions of life, both in Israel and the Diaspora. There are few tasks more essential for our future than to try to bridge the growing gap between the majority, which no longer lives by tenets of Orthodoxy, and the Orthodox minority, which has the task and the obligation — together with all other groups — to formulate new challenges and create the inspiration to secure the Jewishness of the non-Orthodox majority. A real dialogue, which may take a long time, must start between these two parts of the Jewish people — and the initiative will have to come primarily from the great leaders of today's Jewish traditionalism.

This new situation necessitates far-reaching shifts in the order of our priorities. The priority accorded yesterday to the fight against anti-Semitism must today be given to Jewish education. The effort invested in the past in relief must be concentrated in the future on cultural creativeness. An important consequence of this analysis is the need to enlarge the scope of the issues and content of Jewish life. Our organizational and communal efforts today are primarily if not exclusively limited to purely Jewish problems; thereby we ignore the revolutionary character of the period in which we live and we lose some of the best elements of our youth — the idealists, who prefer to work and fight for great human ideals and movements, in which they believe Jewish organizations are not interested. In the past, especially in the nineteenth century, the Jewish people was in the ideological and active forefront of all great progressive movements. We were among the pioneers in the fight for human rights, for equality, for progress, and for social justice. Only in recent decades, concentrating on the effort to gain equality for ourselves and to establish and consolidate the Jewish homeland, we have to a large degree abandoned this progressive tradition. We have abandoned this tradition also because of an economic development. For centuries we belonged to the have-nots, and were naturally on the side of the suppressed and the poor; in the postwar period we have joined the haves; we have become prosperous and, in many countries, interested in maintaining the social and political status quo. This tendency distorts the classic image of our people in world history. Perforce it alienates those idealistic Jewish young people and intellectuals for whom it is increasingly essential that we resume our position among the seekers of peace, social justice, and equality for all of humanity.

There are many indications that important groups in Jewish life, especially in the United States, are beginning to recognize this problem. This recognition should be welcomed and encouraged. It is not

necessary that in such questions of general significance all Jewish groups adopt the same position; nor can the Jewish people as a whole — and this also applies to the World Jewish Congress — adopt fixed positions with regard to controversial problems concerning specific countries. The Jewish people in its totality — and the Congress, which attempts to speak for it — must limit itself to the affirmation of very general principles, on such issues as peace, disarmament, and the fight for human rights; it cannot impose by majority decisions demands or positions concerning specific political questions. But within the various Jewish communities, organizations, and groups which are able and willing to take a position, all participation in efforts to protect oppressed minorities or against colonialism and imperialism should be encouraged. These activities would greatly improve the image of Jewish life and might provide one of the important challenges which would bring idealistic young Jews back into the fold.

I know that these goals cannot be achieved by resolutions and formal decisions. But unless Jewish leadership recognizes the complete change in our situation and the new nature of the dangers to our survival, Jewish life — although for a while it may become even more alive and more spectacular in its external appearance — will slowly and inevitably lose its real sources of survival and the real basis of its future.

I conclude with one observation that sums up the main purpose of this analysis. Jewish life in the past few generations invested most of its efforts in doing away with our uniqueness and in becoming equal with others, both as individuals and as a group. We fought for emancipation so that the individual Jew might have the same rights and conditions of life as the non-Jew. We fought as a people to normalize our situation by creating a sovereign state like that of other peoples. Both efforts were justified. In the modern democratic world, it would have been quixotic and hopeless to try to go on living in the ghetto — a minority discriminated against. It would have been disastrous if we had not sought — especially in the light of the Nazi experience — a land of our own, where every Jew menaced in his existence or desiring to live a full Jewish life might emigrate and live by right, and not by sufferance or the goodwill of others.

But it would be a tragic and disastrous error to believe that now that we have achieved these two goals of equality our existence as a people is secure; because fundamentally, and in the essence of its historical existence, the Jewish people was never like other peoples. It was always unique. This does not mean that it was better, but that it was different. There is no people that combines religion and peoplehood in one definition of its collective character. We are more than a people, we are more than a religion, we are more than a civilization; we are all of these together, and there is no other group like this. Our history is unique.

What other people has survived centuries of dispersion, persecution, and annihilation, and yet maintained its identity? In our fight to become equal we have lost sight of this uniqueness of our character as a historical entity. These two tendencies found expression in the history of modern Zionism and the fight for emancipation. There was one school of thought which preached: "Not like other peoples is the people of Israel," and the other school which reacted by preaching: "Let us be like other peoples."

The real solution to our problem of survival lies in the synthesis of these tendencies. To have equal rights but to insist at the same time on our right to be different and secure our specific identity; to have a state like all states but not to be satisfied with having just another small state and not to be content simply with the paraphernalia of all other states, but to use it as the center of new creativity, new values, and new inspirations for a people whose majority has lost, to a large degree, its traditional values.

The more I examine Jewish life and analyze its internal situation, the more I am convinced that our future is more than endangered. A people cannot do away with traditions of thousands of years, on which its character and destiny are based, and start from scratch. We would be a new people, a different people, of no historical significance either to ourselves or to humanity. Our generation, which has suffered so much and made so many sacrifices in its successful fight for individual and national equality, must now begin to recognize that its great new task is based on the obligation to develop the specific character of the Jewish people and, having attained the position of equal citizens and having created a state like other states, to undertake this new and much more difficult struggle: to remain Jews, worthy of our unique history and resolved, by new means and methods, to hand down the heritage of this unique past to the generations to come.

SECOND SESSION

August 1, 1966 (morning)

In the Chair: DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN

1. RULES OF PROCEDURE

Dr. GERHART M. RIEGNER explained that the rules of procedure adopted at the Stockholm Plenary Assembly were being applied to the current Assembly and had been received by the delegates. As the rules had not been contested at Stockholm, it only remained to approve them formally. Dr. Riegner left open the number of people on the Presidium (25 or 30) and suggested that the decision be adapted to the needs of the current Assembly. *Rules adopted.*

2. ELECTION OF CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

Dr. RIEGNER proposed the following composition of the Credentials Committee:

Dr. Moysés Kauffmann (Brazil), Chairman

Mr. Itzhak Artzi (Israel)

Me Robert Sinay (France)

Dr. Georg Guggenheim (Switzerland)

Mr. Will Maslow (USA)

Adopted.

3. NOMINATIONS FOR PRESIDUM

Dr. RIEGNER proposed that membership in the Presidium be determined on the following basis: USA - 4; Israel - 4; Argentina - 2; United Kingdom - 2; France - 2; Canada, Brazil, Australia, Belgium, Rumania, Iran, India, Yugoslavia, Rhodesia, Switzerland, Italy, Netherlands, Chile, Mexico, Scandinavia, Germany, World Union of Jewish Students - 1 each. In addition he proposed the designation *ad personam* of Mrs. Rose Halprin, Minister Mordechai Bentov, Dr. Joachim Prinz, Mrs. Raya Jaglom, and one representative to be named by South Africa (although South Africa was not a full member). *Approved.*

4. AGENDA

Dr. GOLDMANN submitted the agenda to the Assembly for any changes it might wish to make. *Approved.*

5. ADDRESSES BY FRATERNAL DELEGATES

Dr. GOLDMANN announced that the Assembly would now hear addresses by several fraternal delegates and added that the fraternal delegates would be able to participate in the debate as well as in the political and cultural commissions.

Mr. LOUIS A. PINCUS (*Chairman of the Executive, Jewish Agency for Israel*): You will pardon me if I absolve myself from the usual fulsome compliments that are made on such occasions as this, and if I say something I think the World Zionist Organization should say.

Our association with the World Jewish Congress has been close and it has become closer, mainly because we have a common outlook and a common goal. We see Jewish problems substantially in the same way. We have worked out a *modus vivendi* in which, due to the complexities of Jewish life, there is a division of functions.

What I have just said is true in general terms. It is true that in a changing world new priorities must be fixed. It is true that there is no comparison between the situation in the world today and that of 1936. On the other hand, there are areas of the world in which racial tension exists and is increasing, whether it be for economic reasons or because of racialism *per se*. In this kind of atmosphere there is no assurance that the freedom and the equality of the Jew will continue to exist in other areas. Racial tension is the breeding ground of inequality and discrimination, of anti-Semitism; therefore, in the fixing of priorities, we should not lull ourselves into a false sense of security by believing that the fight for the equality of the Jew is over.

A short while ago I heard a group of non-Israelis say that Israel no longer needed practical assistance and that world Jewry could now reduce that assistance to a minimum. Nothing could be further from the truth.

When one talks of fixing new priorities, one is tackling possibly the most difficult of all tasks. We are trying to move from one era into another; but organizational and human inertia make it far more difficult to change priorities than one imagines when one hears it demanded from a platform such as this.

In the Jewish world today there are two main priorities — if one can use that term at all. One is the rights of Soviet Jewry, which the Jews of the entire world have come to regard as their personal concern. The other is Jewish spiritual survival in today's affluent society. This

survival depends to a large degree on the existence of a vibrant and viable State of Israel; and, of course, it depends on a vast improvement in the quantity and quality of Jewish education, an area in which signs of progress have begun to manifest themselves.

A third priority, without which nothing will be achieved, is the need for systematic and permanent coordination of the activities of the many Jewish organizations. The problem of Jewish survival today can no longer be tackled in the haphazard and uncoordinated fashion that has existed until now. We of the World Zionist Organization hold out our hand to any organization willing to work with us toward our common goal.

Before calling upon the Chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations as the next speaker, Dr. GOLDMANN stressed the importance of the developments in the relationship between that body and the World Jewish Congress, a relationship which had been very good in the past and was becoming still closer.

Dr. JOACHIM PRINZ (*Chairman, Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations*): I find myself in a schizophrenic position at this Assembly: although I usually appear as a member of the American delegation, for the first time in my life I am here as the head of a fraternal organization.

I would like to try to define the background against which the Conference of Presidents must be understood. One of the most important features of American democracy is the radical separation of church and state. As a result American Jewry has never been able to establish a central organization comparable to the Board of Deputies or a *kehila*, despite several attempts in this direction.

About ten years ago, in reaction to Israel's extremely precarious situation, a Presidents' Club was formed to voice American Jewry's concern on matters touching Israel. This club has since developed into the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, grouping twenty-one bodies comprising all but one of the major American Jewish groups, and representing American Jewry in international matters affecting Jews.

I cannot predict whether this development will lead to an organization like the Board of Deputies or DAIA. I can tell you, however, that the chaotic situation of American Jewish organizational life — for which we have often been criticized — no longer prevails; American Jewry now has an address. I ask world Jewry to recognize this fact and to use that address when they want to approach the Jews of the United States.

I think that it would have been opportune for young Jews, particularly from the United States, to attend this Assembly. I

understand the concern of Jewish youth and their involvement in general social and political issues, such as the civil rights struggle and the Peace Corps. I hope that they are motivated by the dreams of the Hebrew Prophets, although this motivation may be unconscious. They do not know the Jewish people, and their presence here would have been an education in itself.

The Jews of the United States, in their affluence and in their numbers, are in danger of succumbing to complacency and isolation from the rest of world Jewry. One of the main purposes of the Presidents' Conference is to ensure that American Jewry realizes that it cannot meaningfully survive, in terms of Jewish history, without the conviction that it is part of the Jewish people all over the world.

Mr. SOLOMON TEFF (*President, Board of Deputies of British Jews*): I want to express my pleasure for the opportunity granted to me and my fellow delegates to attend this Assembly.

The Board of Deputies was formed in the eighteenth century by the small British Jewish population, who felt that although they were divided into Sephardim and Ashkenazim they had many common goals and many reasons for making joint approaches to the authorities. In accordance with the purely religious definition of a Jew that prevailed at the time, the Deputies were the representatives of synagogues. Today we have over 400 Deputies, representing practically all the synagogues as well as a number of other Jewish institutions. The Board of Deputies can today claim with justice that it is truly representative of the whole of Jewish life in Britain.

As a voluntary organization, the Board must strive to find the highest factor of agreement among its members. In pursuing its aims to look after the interests of the Jews and protect their good name, it meets every month to discuss the various issues confronting Jews in Britain and abroad. Among its nine committees, which reflect the various major preoccupations of the Board, is the Eretz Israel Committee, headed by Dr. Levenberg.

As a respected institution recognized by British legislation, the Board of Deputies is very jealous of its rights and privileges and has always been opposed to any interference in its domain from any other organization. We are grateful to the British Section of the World Jewish Congress for recognizing our special position. It would be unfounded, however, to charge that the Board prefers to remain aloof: we are members of a number of international organizations, both Jewish and non-Jewish. If there are some international organizations to which we do not belong, it is because of our strong feeling that in cooperating with other communities, we should retain the ultimate right to decide for ourselves, particularly on matters concerning British Jewry. Action taken in our name without our consent could bring about strong

differences of opinion among our members and could result in the diminution of the representative character of the Board in Britain.

However, our delegation of leading members of the Board of Deputies has not come to this Assembly with closed minds. We very much appreciate the fine work of the World Jewish Congress and are indebted to them particularly for their many publications on matters of Jewish interest. In this connection, may we congratulate Dr. Roth, one of our Deputies, on his appointment as Director of the Institute of Jewish Affairs.

Dr. GOLDMANN, in introducing the next speaker, referred to the growing cooperation between the World Jewish Congress and the B'nai B'rith.

Dr. WILLIAM A. WEXLER (*President, B'nai B'rith*): I want to begin by paying deepest respect to Nahum Goldmann for his many years of distinguished service to the Jewish people.

I do not know of any time in Jewish history when the opportunities have been more favorable than they are now for the development of an overall international organization to represent Jewish interests in the world. COJO, which already comprises the B'nai B'rith, the World Jewish Congress, and other principal national and international Jewish bodies, represents a development in this direction, which will enable COJO to do the finest job possible for world Jewry.

Such an organization would mean the renunciation by its members of an element of sovereignty. B'nai B'rith is prepared to do that, although there may be some members of the organization who are less happy about the prospect. The partial renunciation of sovereignty should be one of the least important problems if we are really concerned with the future of Jewry. In this era the problems facing Jewry, wherever they present themselves, are the concern of all Jews everywhere; an international approach is necessary.

I am very pleased with our cooperation with the World Jewish Congress, and I am convinced that it will increase. Only by working together can the Jewish organizations hope to bring about shalom.

Mr. GAD BEN-MEIR (*Administrative Director, World Sephardi Federation*): I want to thank you on behalf of my president, Mr. Denzil Sebag-Montefiore, for the invitation to the World Sephardi Federation to be present; I am glad to have the honor of greeting you on its behalf. Although we are not affiliated to the World Jewish Congress, I am sure we shall need each other's help and close relationship in the future as much as we have in the past.

I would also like to thank Dr. Riegner for helping us to organize a special gathering of the Sephardi delegates and observers at this Assembly; and last, but not least, I wish to thank Dr. Goldmann for his

kind consent to address the sixty-odd Sephardi delegates and observers when we meet here on August 9.

This great Assembly is marked by its guiding motive to institute a revolutionary change in the relations between the Jewish and German peoples. I regret that circumstances made it impossible to include in this discussion relations between the Jewish and Arab peoples as well.

In a world of ever-increasing cooperation and interdependence, the question is not *if* but *how* the existing defensive standpoints held by the peoples concerned — and maintained at the cost of wasteful and perilous struggle — can be transformed into more fruitful relationships. What is needed is a frank and genuine dialogue based on mutual recognition.

This sort of realization led, in 1952, to the Jewish-German Luxembourg Agreement and, last year, to the German initiative to establish diplomatic ties with Israel. A similar move towards a realistic and affirmative coexistence on the part of the Arab countries is awaited with firm anticipation; but such a move will come only when the Arabs realize that it is hopeless to seek victory in terms of Israel's liquidation and that the Middle East is destined to contain countries with different cultures and separate fates, although they may have many vital interests in common.

Israel, too, must try to see some things differently: the cultural wealth and language of the Arabs, a knowledge and an appreciation of which are essential to comprehend the Middle East, should be esteemed at their full worth. History contains enough evidence of Jewish-Arab cooperation and cultural excellence to convince us that the present estrangement can be transformed into thriving affinity. In this process the Sephardi communities of Israel, who speak, read, and write virtually all languages and dialects of the region and who know and understand their former compatriots by virtue of age-old togetherness, are ready to perform a long-awaited mission when peace has been achieved.

In the absence of Dr. VIDAL MODIANO (*President, Conseil Représentatif des Juifs de France (CRIF)*), who was to have addressed the Assembly, his message of greetings was read: I am pleased to represent the Jews of France and to greet you in their name. I am happy and proud to greet you, you who are all deeply Jewish: Israeli and Diaspora Jews — European, American, African, and Asian; Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, and agnostic. You feel and proclaim your Jewishness; you defend your Jewish identity. Jewish belonging consists first of all of memories, more or less hidden in the conscious or the subconscious, diffused and obscure. These memories shape the personality of an individual and, even more, of a community. The continuance of the Jewish community is due to the feeling of belonging, through the centuries, to a group of people who succeeded

in preserving the originality of its spirit in the face of all obstacles. It is this spirit, this community, that you are being asked to maintain and defend. *Chizku ve'imtzu!*

Mrs. SHAMSI HEKMAT (*Vice-President, International Council of Jewish Women*): I take great pride in bringing you the greetings of the International Council of Jewish Women, which represents 500,000 Jewish women on five continents.

Last May, at our most recent meeting, a resolution was unanimously adopted and a petition signed, requesting the rabbinical authorities to alleviate some of the hardships suffered by Jewish women as a result of the misinterpretation of Jewish law with regard to marriage, divorce, inheritance, *agunot*, and *chalitza*. A copy of the petition has been submitted to Dr. Goldmann for the information of the distinguished delegates to this Assembly, with the hope that it will receive the support of the World Jewish Congress. I am pleased to inform you that the Iranian affiliate of our organization, of which I have the honor to be president, has very recently succeeded in obtaining some amelioration along these lines.

6. RESUMPTION OF DEBATE ON APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Dr. GOLDMANN announced that although the greetings of fraternal delegations should be followed directly by the General Debate, a point of order had come up which had to be settled first. A number of delegates were insisting on reopening the debate on the agenda, although it had already been accepted. He read to the meeting Article 24 of the *Rules of Procedure for the Plenary Assembly*, which made it quite clear that a proposal, once adopted, could not be reconsidered except by a two-thirds majority. Dr. Goldmann then called on Mr. Bentov.

Mr. MORDECHAI BENTOV, MK (*Israel*) said that he interpreted the rules of procedure differently and submitted the motion, which was seconded, to reopen the debate. At the same time he suggested that even if there were to be no two-thirds majority for a reopening of the debate, the chairman might announce that he was ready to give the floor to members desiring to speak on the subject.

Dr. GOLDMANN said that a misunderstanding had apparently arisen because so many delegates had not been present when the agenda was accepted. He agreed that it was unfortunate that delegates whose attitude was a negative one — and he assumed that the agenda item in question was the discussion on Germans and Jews — had not been able to make their position clear. He said that even if the motion to reopen the debate were not accepted, he would be glad to give delegates who wished to express their opinion ample opportunity to do so.

The motion to reopen the debate was put before the Assembly and rejected by a show of hands. Several speakers were then given the floor to voice their opinion.

Mrs. CHAIKA GROSMAN-ORKIN (*International Union of Mapam Parties*) explained that she had submitted a written memorandum to the Chair before the opening of the session, in the belief that a statement in writing would be stronger than an oral declaration. This was the source of the misunderstanding to which Dr. Goldmann had referred.

Mrs. Grosman continued: This memorandum, from the central committees of the four organizations of anti-Nazi fighters in Israel — the Partisans and Ghetto Fighters, the Organization of the Disabled in the War Against Nazism, the Anti-Nazi Fighters Organization, and the Veterans of the Allied Armies — contains a strong protest against the holding of a German-Jewish dialogue by an international Jewish organization as important as the World Jewish Congress. Such a dialogue could only signify the wish of the Jewish people to become involved in a drive for pardon. Any discussion of this sort would be detrimental to the memory and the teaching of the holocaust and revolt, and would not truly allow the German people to free itself from the Nazi heritage.

We know that many delegations of the World Jewish Congress were not in favor of organizing such a dialogue. To undertake a dialogue between the Jewish people and the German people twenty-four years after the holocaust and the ghetto revolts casts doubts on the authority of this assembly; it weakens our historical consciousness and our anxiety to preserve the future of the Jewish people. Such a debate has no place at this gathering.

This question is not purely sentimental — although one must not underestimate sentiments when dealing with such subjects. The dialogue will include the participation of an official representative of the German Federal Republic, where a statute of limitations for Nazi crimes has been promulgated; where public and official demonstrations have been held by former members of the SS; where judges, teachers, and scientists have remained at their posts from the Hitler period to this very day; where the leadership of the country dreams of revenge and of a return to the boundaries of Nazi Germany; where Nazi assassins are lightly punished in the most scandalous fashion when they are not simply set free, the objects of a generally indulgent attitude.

I call upon the Assembly to delete this topic from the agenda and to replace it by a discussion on anti-Semitism. We can neither forgive nor forget. If the subject is retained on the agenda, my entire delegation will not attend the session in question; and I call upon all other delegates who feel the same way to follow our example.

Mr. J. BENARI (*Israel*): As the World Jewish Congress is neither a debating society nor a research institute, the symposium with the Germans must have been scheduled with a specific purpose in mind. If that purpose is to find a common language with the German people, then my party and I are opposed to it. We feel that the relations between our people and the German nation cannot be normalized in so short a time; we would not be dealing with a new Germany. To forget this fact is to violate the moral basis on which this Congress, nay, the Jewish people, stands. It would demoralize our nation, especially our youth.

Dr. Goldmann has claimed that if we reject this dialogue we jeopardize the interests of the State of Israel and of tens of thousands of Jews. Whatever negotiations are necessary with the Germans can be carried out by official Jewish authorities, without the need for symposia. Furthermore, with all due respect to this Congress, to which I and my movement belong, the World Jewish Congress does not represent the Jewish people as a whole. The very fact that we have sitting here fraternal delegates, not affiliated with the Congress, indicates that we do not have the right to speak in the name of the entire Jewish people, especially on a subject such as this.

I therefore appeal to the Presidium to remove this question from the agenda. I want to stress that opposition to the inclusion of this subject was raised by many sections of the Congress; indeed, the whole Israeli Section opposed it. If this topic is kept on the agenda, my group will not participate in the discussion. We will consider it our duty to proclaim to the entire world that the discussions and decisions on this issue are not binding on the Jewish people.

Mr. MOSHE EREM, MK (*Israel*): The Israel Executive unanimously appealed to Dr. Goldmann to avoid a matter that had a profound emotional effect on the majority, perhaps the entirety, of the Jewish people. This was not done. As the symposium has been decided upon, and in view of the anti-Nazi background of those who were invited to speak, we suggest that there be not merely a series of monologues but also full and serious discussion on the reemergence of anti-Semitism and fascism in Germany today. It is sufficient to read the material published by the World Jewish Congress and others to realize that the situation in Germany is not all that simple. We should not only worry about the horrors of the past, but about the future.

Dr. NAHUM GOLDMANN: I must make my personal position clear and explain my adamantness in this matter, because many distorted statements have appeared in the press.

The idea to invite German speakers is not a new one. It was approved, with no opposition, by the Governing Council a year-and-a-half ago, with the Strasbourg Executive meeting in mind. As it turned

out, the German speakers who had been invited to Strasbourg could not come. In preparing for this Assembly, I put the question to the Governing Council again; after some discussion I was authorized to invite Jewish and German speakers, which I did.

Then, somehow, some people got the idea that this symposium was intended to be a "feast of reconciliation." I need not be told that we cannot forgive or forget; I would be ashamed to be a Jew if anyone could even dream of forgiving or forgetting.

When I began the preliminary negotiations with the Germans on the indemnification question, many Jews were opposed. I told them that to talk with the Germans was neither to forgive nor forget. I told them that there were two possibilities of dealing with such a problem: either ignore it or take note of the fact that the problem exists and deal with it. For centuries we had a policy of ignoring problems — of being *broiges* — because we were a helpless people. This was what saved us: we were not on speaking terms with the goyim; and it was the right policy for the Jews at that time. But we have become, in the last generation, a people who wants to determine its own policy, its own future. Through the State of Israel and through organizations like the World Jewish Congress, we want to be masters of our own fate. We can no longer be *broiges*.

The Claims Conference has engaged in official dialogue with the Germans; the American Presidents' Conference invited Herr Barzel to talk to them; Israel is inviting them all the time; the Hebrew University has invited Mr. Gerstenmaier to speak. Is the World Jewish Congress to be holier than the other Jewish bodies? I fully understand the feelings of those who are against the inclusion of this subject on the agenda; I am proud that people like Chaika Grosman, with their records, said what they did, and in fact I appreciate the moderation of the tone they used. My own emotional reactions are similar. But it is one thing to understand such protest and quite another for a responsible leadership to act in the interests of the people.

I hope the statement that the purpose of this debate was reconciliation was due to a subconscious distortion. I wanted this subject put on the agenda because the problem of German-Jewish relations was very far from being solved, and *not* because I felt reconciliation was just around the corner. Because of the billions that the Germans have paid and continue to pay, *they* have a tendency to feel that the matter is settled and that they have normalized their relations with the Jewish people. The purpose of the debate here is to tell the Germans that the matter is *not* settled; and I wanted it said from a great tribune of the Jewish people. I wanted great German intellectual and moral figures to bring this message to their people and to warn their people against the danger of neo-Nazism. Two weeks ago

the neo-Nazi *Deutsche National- und Soldaten-Zeitung* attacked me violently, calling this scheduled symposium "*ein genialer Schachzug*" – an ingenious chess move – on my part, intended to remind the German people of the crimes it had committed and to obtain a few more billions. The two German speakers were warned not to come.

For us, then, this dialogue is not a "feast of reconciliation." We have stated it clearly in the printed program: "Germans and Jews: a problem *unresolved*." And we certainly do not think that we will resolve it by this debate. As chairman of the session, I am going to tell them that this generation can certainly not resolve the problem; whether the coming generation will do it, we shall see.

The session will consist not just of a series of monologues but will include a discussion as well. I have tried to invite a resistant or a survivor of Nazi persecution to participate in the discussion, but without success. We would gladly accept such a speaker even today.

If I had been refused authorization by the Governing Council to go ahead with this project I would not have approved of the decision, but I would have abided by it. To perform an about-face at this point, I could not accept. It is not a matter of personal prestige, either for me or the German speakers. At stake are many vital Jewish interests, including Israel and indemnification. My sense of responsibility would not allow me to be party to such a scandal.

To pay reverence to the more than 27,000 Belgian Jews who were deported from Malines, it has been decided that the members of the Presidium of this Assembly and the delegates who wish to join them will go there on Friday afternoon. At the same time this visit will publicly underline the fact that Thursday's symposium does not mean "forgetting" or "forgiving" in any way.

In conclusion, let me say that I wish I were in a position where I could act only from emotional motivations. Believe me, I do not go to Germany five times a year for my *koved*: it is a burden, which I have accepted in order to create better conditions of life for hundreds of thousands of Jews. I understand the emotions that have been expressed here; I respect them and am proud that they exist. But the World Jewish Congress should be strong enough to overcome emotions and act according to what it considers to be best for the Jewish people.

THIRD SESSION

August 1, 1966 (afternoon)

In the Chair: DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN;
later MR. LAVY M. BECKER (*Canada*)

1. COMPOSITION OF PRESIDIUM

The Assembly agreed to elect the following as members of the Presidium:

The Hon. A.E. Abrahamson (*Rhodesia and Zambia*)

Mr. Marc Anisfeld (*Belgium*)

Mr. Lavy M. Becker (*Canada*)

Minister Mordechai Bentov

Judge S. Boas (*Netherlands*)

Rabbi Bezalel Cohn (*Israel*)

Mr. Idov Cohen (*Israel*)

Mr. Menachem Cohen, MK (*Israel*)

Mr. H. Cynowicz (*India*)

Ing. Gregorio Faigon (*Argentina*)

Mr. Herzl Gesang (*Argentina*)

Dr. Georg Guggenheim (*Switzerland*)

Mr. Jacob Halévy (*Great Britain*)

Mrs. Rose Halprin

Mrs. Raya Jaglom

Dr. Lavoslav Kadelburg (*Yugoslavia*)

Mr. Jacob Katzman (*USA*)

Mr. Moussa Kermanian (*Iran*)

Mr. Itzhak Korn (*Israel*)

Mr. Leon Lasky (*Australia*)

Mrs. Runia Lasky (*Mexico*)

Rabbi Arthur J. Lelyveld (*USA*)

Dr. S. Levenberg (*Great Britain*)

Prof. Herbert Lewin (*Germany*)

Prof. André Neher (*France*)

Mr. Bernardo Olesker (*Uruguay*)

Mr. Jacques Orfus (*France*)

Judge Sergio Piperno (*Italy*)

Dr. Joachim Prinz
Mr. Isaac Remba (*Israel*)
Chief Rabbi Dr. M. Rosen (*Rumania*)
Dr. T. Schneider (*South Africa*)
Mr. C. Bezalel Sherman (*USA*)
Dr. Gil Sinay (*Chile*)
Senator Dr. Aarão Steinbruch (*Brazil*)
Mr. Hilel Storch (*Sweden*)
Mr. Jacques Torczyner (*USA*)
Dr. Paúl Warszawski (*World Union of Jewish Students*)

2. GENERAL POLITICAL DEBATE I.

A message was received from Mr. SAMUEL BRONFMAN (*Vice-President, World Jewish Congress, and Chairman of its North American Executive*), who was to have chaired this session but had not been able to attend. After tracing the role of the Congress in developments affecting Jews since 1936, Mr. Bronfman's message continued: Today there is the sorry possibility that the atmosphere of economic security and great freedom in every sphere of human activity may lead to a subtle and disastrous erosion of our people.

That is the challenge that faces the Jewish people today, the challenge that the World Jewish Congress must tackle. These are the specific tasks as I see them:

We must devise and provide a thorough Jewish education for our children, stressing the glories and successes of our past. The emphasis must be on modern teaching. If this requires a pedagogic revolution, let us be courageous enough to initiate it.

We must have a solid foundation for a continuing and ever-growing exchange between the future generations of Israel and Jews in other lands. In the same way, the World Jewish Congress must safeguard and promote the bonds among the different communities themselves.

We must develop our organization and welcome the affiliation of small communities in remote but important areas of the world. We are in a position of trust for many of the sixty-four communities affiliated to the Congress. We must encourage association with other major Jewish bodies dedicated to preserving the Jewish heritage.

We must act with dedication and resolve, with courage and thoughtfulness, whenever the well-being of Jews is threatened, whenever Jewish religion and culture suffer setbacks or discrimination.

Above all, we must restore and take new inspiration from Jewish history and encourage each and every move or action to enhance and safeguard it.

We should take a close, realistic look at our machinery, in recognition of the patent truth that resolutions do not solve problems but only accent them and provide ideas. Only people and skilled committees overcome difficulties and provide solutions. We should be candid enough to examine our structure and bring it to a pitch of such sufficiency as will enable us to get on with the job.

Mr. A. L. EASTERMAN (*Director, International Affairs Department, World Jewish Congress, London*):

In the second half of the twentieth century, the various problems confronting the Jewish people have been and are much more complex in character and much more subtle in impact and therefore much more difficult to solve than in former eras. Today we encounter complexes of political adolescence in terms of the emerging nationalisms of new statehoods, new political and social systems. The very fact that the external attitudes to Jews are far less crude and brutal than in previous periods of Jewish anxiety, the fact that anti-Semitism has discarded the old slogans of Jew-hatred, the fact that pogroms have disappeared, the fact that no government openly admits or pursues attacks on Jewish existence as a national policy — these aspects make our political tasks more difficult and they require that our political methods in dealing with them should be radically changed, as they have been in recent decades. With the intricacies of international relations and the complications caused by international conflicts, we no longer rely for aid on the power or the authority or the influence of this or that government. We cannot rely on them to solve our problems. In a major sense, the Jewish people for the first time in modern times is on its own. Nowhere is this more applicable, nor is this more true, than in the most grievous single Jewish problem of our times. This problem is the obstructions, the frustrations placed in the path of nearly 3,000,000 of our fellow Jews in the Soviet Union, who are prevented from following the traditional religious, cultural, and communal Jewish way of life. Notwithstanding the vast array of deeply disturbing facts of the Jewish situation in the USSR, it would be rash and unwise for anyone bearing political responsibility to assert and certainly to substantiate that those obstructions and frustrations suffered by Russian Jewry are the implementation of a national policy deliberately planned and deliberately decided by the Soviet government in the Kremlin or by the Communist Party in Moscow. It would be rash and unwise to state that such a deliberately planned and decided policy has been taken specifically and directly against the Jews of Russia.

In the discussions which we have had from time to time, and still have, and in the discussions which others have had who raised the Jewish question in high Soviet circles, Soviet spokesmen indignantly

deny any official or semiofficial bias or action against the Jewish national minority in Soviet Russia. Nevertheless the truth of our complaints and the validity of our protests regarding the adverse Jewish situation throughout the Soviet Union are attested by some recent minor concessions. I do not enumerate these concessions because I imagine they are pretty well-known. They are welcome but they touch only a fringe of the problem of Russian Jewry which causes us concern and even anxiety. But wherever we can we take the occasion and the opportunity to emphasize that the Soviet government, wielding as it does indisputable authority, wielding as it does complete control over all the media of public instruction and information throughout the Soviet territory, this Soviet government could overnight – by a stroke of the pen – direct and obtain immediately a fundamental nationwide change in attitude towards the Jewish minority in the Soviet Union. If it did so – and there is nothing to prevent it – such a change in Russian attitude towards Russian Jews and Jewish communal living would remove Jewish anxieties and would gain for the Soviet Union the instant and grateful friendship of 12,000,000 Jews throughout the whole world.

We ought, however, to bear in mind that governments, like individuals, are reluctant to give the impression of being forced to yield to outside pressures; this is especially true in these days of national sensitivities, and the greater the power, the greater the sensitivity. Therefore, responsibility for dealing politically with the Russian Jewish situation requires the exercise of discretion, of balanced judgment, and even of restraint. It is basic to this approach that in our representations we make it abundantly clear to the Soviet government that the Jewish people, with our long history of tragedy and tribulation, with our unforgettable memories of our European catastrophe so fresh and so recent, with all our tenacious sense of solidarity – neither the World Jewish Congress nor any Jewish organization nor the Jewish people as a whole can relinquish or diminish the efforts to convince the government of the USSR that our Russian Jewish brethren have the right to cling to our ancestral faith and traditions and that they are entitled to remain linked with their world Jewish family.

May I now turn to a somewhat different but vital phase of Jewish concern in which the World Jewish Congress has taken conspicuous initiative. On this subject I permit myself to say that I can speak with some authority. Last night Mr. Abba Eban told this Plenary Assembly that leaders of Jewish communities throughout the world share responsibility for Israel's survival, security, peace, and honor. In this context I can say, and my colleagues certainly will say, that the World Jewish Congress has steadily maintained that Israel's relations with the Arab world are unquestionably of supreme importance to the Jewish

people as a collective entity of which the people of Israel is a central element. That is our thesis, but in more precise terms I would like this Plenary Assembly to know that throughout the many discussions which we have had with North African Arab statesmen during the past sixteen years; discussions detailed, elaborate, and forceful with the leaders of the North African nationalist movements before independent Arab states were regarded even as a possibility, far less a probability; we of the Congress have consistently explained to these leaders, later the Arab statesmen of North Africa, the indissoluble relationship between the Jewish people and the Jewish state. I venture to say that these discussions and these many conversations — some formal, some less formal, many informal — during the past sixteen years have had some encouraging results. The impact and the possibilities of these results have not yet, I think, been fully appraised by the Jewish world outside Israel and on occasion within; they are not fully understood in the Jewish world, which is vitally concerned that Israel has been and is surrounded by what has purported to be a solid and unbreakable phalanx of Arab states, united under the banner of Egypt and pledged to a crusade of relentless hostility against the Jewish state and pledged at a propitious moment to engage in a holy war to annihilate the Jewish state. This "Arab unity" in reality has been and is an illusion and a fiction. It is and has been a propaganda device exploited by Nasser to delude the world into accepting his claim to Arab political overlordship in his aim to embroil the leaders of other Arab states in his warlike policies against Israel. Several of these leaders of other Arab states have known this illusion and this fiction, but, with one exception, until recently none has had the courage openly to proclaim the truth and to oppose Nasser's pretensions and policies. That exception is Habib Bourguiba, President of Tunisia. Other Arab leaders are beginning to follow — however cautiously and tentatively — Bourguiba's footsteps in his patent efforts to destroy the image of Nasser's overlordship. Other Arab leaders are taking the view, or are beginning to take the view, that Bourguiba has propounded for some time now. King Hussein of Jordan, during a recent state visit to Great Britain, voiced rather gingerly in London a view which indicated that he was also thinking along Bourguiba's approach to the question of future Arab-Israel relations. King Faisal of Saudi Arabia is not far behind, certainly not in his hostility to Nasser's pretensions to political leadership of the Arab world.

Only a few days ago Bourguiba said publicly in Bonn: "It was Nasser's desire to place himself at the head of all Arab nations. We did not fight for our independence for twenty-five years to abandon our freedom simply because Nasser speaks Arabic." In these words and in all the previous declarations beginning a year ago in the heart of the

Arab world, repeated on a number of occasions since, and repeated vehemently in private conversations, he has spoken not only his own thoughts and his own ideas but he has spoken aloud the thoughts shared by many other leaders in the Arab world. In essence Bourguiba's call for political reality on the question of Israel-Arab relations and his call to the Arab world for an attitude of sanity regarding the State of Israel are an appeal not only to the leaders of other Arab states. They are an appeal to a rising Arab generation, a generation which is beginning — and Bourguiba himself asserts this emphatically — to see its future not in conflict but in social and economic welfare in their countries and peace with their neighbors near and far. Bourguiba's resolute attitude of a "new deal" for the Middle East gives encouragement for the hope that an era of peace may, in due course, begin to dawn in the Middle East. If this assessment is correct — and I venture to think that it is — then Bourguiba merits a noteworthy place in the record of our efforts to achieve the survival in security of the Jewish people as a whole.

In a Brussels newspaper this morning there is a long report of the opening of the session and in the course of it there is a substantial paragraph headed "Homage to Bourguiba." In my judgment Bourguiba is a leader wise in his generation and a man of courageous conviction. He has opened a wide breach in the wall of intransigent Arab hostility against Israel. He has dealt a savage and deadly blow against the pretensions of Abdel Nasser to dominate politically the Arab world. He has given a call to the new generation of the new Arab states to reject the demagogues of enmity against Israel which Nasser has exploited so virulently in the past. If the Belgian description of Habib Bourguiba in this newspaper is correct and justified — and I think it is — then perhaps — and I hope — we may have cause in the not too distant future to pay a similar tribute to this great Arab statesman.

Mr. LAVY M. BECKER read the following letter, which had been addressed to Dr. Goldmann by Ing. FRANTISEK FUCHS (*Acting President, Council of Jewish Communities in Bohemia and Moravia*): After consulting our authorities in charge of religious affairs I beg to inform you that the Council of Jewish Communities in the Czech Regions will not participate in the Fifth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress. This certainly does not mean that our attitude toward the World Jewish Congress is negative. Moreover, we will study the conclusions and resolutions passed on this occasion, and look for ways of cooperating with the World Jewish Congress.

We are in permanent contact with Jewish organizations, and we want to increase these contacts, particularly with the World Jewish Congress. We presume that our absence on this occasion will not be interpreted as disinterest on our part. We would welcome personal

contacts between the representatives of your organization and ours, both in this country and abroad.

I have the pleasure of greeting the Fifth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress in the name of the Jewry of the Czech regions and wish success to the Assembly in the interest of Jews and of peace throughout the world.

Mr. BECKER then read a message from Dr. BENJAMIN EICHLER (*President, Federation of Jewish Communities in Slovakia*), associating himself with the contents of the letter from Prague.

A telegram of greetings and good wishes was read from THE HONORABLE NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER, Governor of the State of New York.

PROFESSOR ARYEH TARTAKOWER (*Israel*): I am sorry that we cannot yet conduct our meetings in the national language of the Jewish people. The day will come; in the meantime, it is nice to speak Yiddish at least.

The Jewish people has never been closer to redemption than it is today, and yet there is a danger that it may miss this historic opportunity. We are going through a revolution of concepts in Jewish life. We are coming back to being a people on its own soil. We are reversing a process of 2000 years.

This presupposes new ideas and new concepts. For example, we are pioneering the idea that man can have more than one loyalty. Non-Jews have borrowed this idea from us, with or without acknowledgment. Once this idea has taken root, we may be nearer the abolition of unlimited sovereignty, a doctrine that hampers human progress. But we have not done enough to propagate this idea and to stress its far-reaching beneficial consequences.

As another example, we are now pioneering the principle of bilingualism. This answers a particular need of today's Jew, who speaks the language of his country and speaks — or should speak if he takes his Jewishness seriously — Hebrew as his second language. This concept is also of great benefit to humanity as a whole, because it does away with barriers and brings nations closer to each other.

Thus we live in great times characterized by great ideas; but I am not sure that we have risen to the occasion. In response to the times we live in, we of the World Jewish Congress must remember three principles: the democratization of Jewish life; Jewish unity, which implies the recognition of a Jewish nationality; and social and human progress, which means choosing carefully those with whom we are prepared to cooperate: I do not believe that we could reach our aim by marching with the devil. Only if we keep these three principles before us will the World Jewish Congress be able to fulfil its task.

Mr. THEODORE BIKEL (*USA*): The questions I wish to raise were hinted at in Dr. Goldmann's opening address last night. They are questions that are of increasingly urgent concern to responsible American Jewry, particularly the American Jewish Congress, of which I have the honor to be vice-president.

Our task with respect to Jewish values cannot be confined solely to their preservation: no such museum-like activity could possibly constitute the entire concern of a vibrant community. Surely the more important part of our mission is the *application* of Jewish values.

Our understanding of Jewishness must, in its application to life, encompass a far larger area than so-called Jewish questions alone. It is therefore no accident that we have turned our attention and energy to focus not only on *yiddishkayt* and on Jewish educational, cultural, and sociopolitical problems; but on questions of equal rights, on safeguards of the general institutions of democracy, on housing, on schools, on employment, and, of course, on world peace.

Our commitment to these causes is a natural, logical extension of specifically Jewish thinking and Jewish organizational activism. We have always fought racism and discrimination, not only as a matter of self-defense and self-preservation but as a matter of principle. Today, when the Jew enjoys relative tranquility, are we to stop fighting for equality because the object of racism and discrimination wears a black face? The Negro revolution must command our attention, as must hunger, poverty, and racial strife wherever they may raise their loathsome heads. Discrimination results from poverty; poverty comes from unemployment and bad housing; inadequate housing and unemployment exist because education lacks scope and direction. And so we are involved in the entire cycle of the human experience.

Ultimately, our overriding concern revolves around the question of world peace. I need not belabor that point, I hope: shalom is a tenet and a commandment to supersede all others.

Dr. MOISES GOLDMAN (*Chairman, South American Executive, World Jewish Congress*): Seven years ago the Stockholm Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress decided to create the South American division of the Executive. The seven years that have passed have shown the necessity of the existence of the South American Executive. I bring you the greetings of this body and its member organizations.

The experience of the last thirty-five years has shown us how ruinous isolation is for Jewish life — both isolation among Jewish communities and isolation of Jewish communities from their surroundings. Therefore, if we want to understand the current realities and the future perspectives of the Latin American communities we must take a look at and interpret the different operative factors and

their possible evolution. In this way we will know where we are, where we are going, and what we can do. I am indebted to Dr. Warszawski for having prepared the following statistical outline.

On their road toward development, the countries of Latin America are confronting a series of difficulties, obstacles, and crises which express themselves in such areas as demography, economy, and social and political developments. With an area of somewhat more than 20,000,000 square kilometers and a population that is approaching 240,000,000 inhabitants, Latin America has the highest rate of demographic growth in the world. The region must provide the necessary means for feeding, employing, housing, and educating 7,000,000 new inhabitants every year. At the same time, almost half of the 240,000,000 have an annual income per capita of not more than 130 dollars. The countryside, which contains a high percentage of the active population, is the hardest-hit by the socioeconomic difficulties and their consequences. As a result there has been and continues to be a mass migration to the cities, where the hope of finding employment in an industry that cannot yet provide enough jobs to go around produces a proliferation of miserable shanty-towns in the large centers of the continent.

More than half the usable land is in the hands of 8% of the landowners while no more than 10% of the land is held by 75% of the landowners. There is also much government-owned land.

Most countries of the region rely on one or two principal exports to obtain hard currency, for example, petroleum in Venezuela, coffee in Brazil, copper in Chile, and wheat and meat in Argentina. These products are exported to developed countries in particular. The value of these exports, however, has been driven down by the emergence of additional sources of such products in the new African states and by the unloading of surplus crops at very low prices by the United States. This situation is reflected in the fact that Latin America's share of exports in the world decreased from 10% in 1950 to 6.3% in 1965. As a result the countries of the area have been forced to seek new world markets without concerning themselves with political ideology; at the same time they have been obliged to restrict their imports of machinery and other items required for the much-needed industrialization of their cities and rural areas.

Inflation and the rising cost of living — which are global phenomena and not restricted to Latin America — are exacerbated by limited productivity and by continuing indebtedness abroad at high interest rates that cannot be met in time. The Alliance for Progress has not yet been able to achieve some of the high hopes and purposes that dictated its creation. Added to all this are the increasingly unbalanced national budgets and a growing bureaucracy that has its origins particularly in

political factors. It is not necessary to go on enumerating examples of the socioeconomic distortion resulting from the gap between the haves and the have-nots.

Some governments of Latin America have already realized that change from within is essential in order to avoid violent upheavals, and they have begun widespread reforms. At the same time the submerged masses are beginning to make their presence felt in the political panorama, not necessarily because their situation has worsened but because they have become more aware of their situation and of their power as a pressure group.

The absence until now of solutions to the many pressing problems has led to impatience, social tensions, revolutions, and coups d'etat; none of these, however, has as yet provided fundamental solutions.

This, then, is the diagnosis of a situation of which we must be aware, especially as the majority of the Jews of Latin America belong to certain traditional economic structures. We must remember that in times of disturbance and instability we can be the objects of great difficulties. We must be prepared for that eventuality: even in the absence of discrimination, thousands of our coreligionists might have to emigrate — and not as political refugees. The fact that a socioeconomic transformation may or may not suit a sector of the population will not deter any people from effecting such a change. In general the Latin American countries, since the period of their colonization, have not been very attentive to the principle of pluralism as far as groups are concerned. While they have made efforts to safeguard individual human rights, they have tried to assimilate the various groups as much as possible; they question the legitimacy of the right to be different. This intrinsic difficulty in the Latin American outlook also explains why it is no easy task to effect full and practical implementation of the resolutions and goals of the Ecumenical Council.

I have given you a very general picture. The delegates from the various Latin American communities will be able to give you more detailed information.

The South American Executive has been the vehicle for bringing international matters to the communities of the continent and has coordinated activities among them; similarly, it has brought the problems of South America to the attention of the World Executive. In addition, we maintain close ties with Mexico and Central America. I will only cite a few of our pursuits. We have synchronized activities for Soviet Jewry, on German indemnification matters, on the prosecution of war criminals, and in commemoration of the Warsaw Ghetto uprising. We have initiated approaches requesting various governments to use their influence to bring the Arab states and Israel together for direct peace negotiations; we have worked toward the improvement of

contacts between the Jewish and Arab communities of Latin America. We have observer status with the Organization of American States and have taken advantage of that position to attend meetings of that body. We try to help our member communities fight anti-Semitism, and we do our best to be present at their important events. We are in permanent contact with them on all questions.

One of our major preoccupations — on our continent and on others, as has been heard here — is to stimulate the youth to participate in our activities and to educate them as to our concerns. We give all possible support to courses and seminars, and a representative of the youth movements is always present at our meetings.

In order to bring home to the public the Jewish contribution to human progress and well-being, we often invite outstanding Jewish scientists, including Nobel laureates, to visit our countries. These visits generate respect for our communities among the general population. Our alert scrutiny of textbooks and dictionaries continues, and we hope to create a central department of publications. On our initiative, a symposium of Latin American Jewish intellectuals on Jewish identity is being organized. We have established an annual Latin American human rights award. Following the example of DAIA, we have stimulated research on public opinion in each of the countries of our region. We continue to organize symposia and other activities on such subjects as Yiddish and the social sciences.

Time does not permit me to speak of other activities in which we are involved. Our fundamental task is to forge strong communities as centers of the noble Jewish tradition, about which there is so much talk but not always real knowledge: the tradition of mutual responsibility and equality without class distinction. Our self-knowledge, combined with the spiritual riches of the nations in our area of the Diaspora and with the brilliance of Israel, will permit us not only to exist but to live productively as individuals and as a community.

Dr. RUGGERO DI SEGNI (*Italy*): The situation of the Jews in Italy is on the whole similar to that of the Jews in the other countries of Western Europe, with, however, some distinguishing characteristics. While our community is modest in size — less than 40,000 — it has a long historical tradition, being the oldest Jewish community in Europe. From the time of its origins — which antedate the common era — to our day it has always been present in the peninsula, experiencing changing fortunes and receiving refugees from other countries; the principal nucleus remains what is called Italian-rite Sephardic.

The events of the recent decades have of course had their repercussions in the Italian community; our two most serious problems — assimilation and anti-Semitism — being common to the other communities of the Diaspora. Due to assimilation, which is manifested

mainly in the high rate of intermarriage, our communities are being impoverished from day to day; indeed, our smaller communities are in danger of disappearing. Even if natural demographic growth and immigration allow the large communities to remain stable in numbers, statistics warn us that many Jewish families are being lost because of the separation of the sons from the religion of their fathers.

In the past few years there have been no considerable outbreaks of anti-Semitism, although some manifestations continue to occur, especially during periods of elections or political tension. On the whole, the relations of the Jews with the general population in Italy have tended to improve, especially as regards the understanding of Jewish rights and cultural and spiritual values. The most recent congress of Italian Jewish communities received favorable public attention — from public authorities, press, and television in particular — to a greater degree than ever before. This increased interest in the Jews is remarkable when one considers that the Jews number 0.8 per mill of the population, which is 99% Roman Catholic.

We feel that the activities of the Union of Jewish Communities of Italy, which is the Italian constituent of the World Jewish Congress, should be carried out in four main directions: intensification of ties with Israel; juridical action on the national and international level in favor of the rights of the individual and of minorities; spreading and strengthening Jewish culture and education; and acquainting the general public with Jewish contributions to the progress of civilization. These efforts fall within the scope of the traditional activities of the World Jewish Congress, on whose help we count in carrying them out.

Ing. GREGORIO FAIGON (*Argentina*): Yesterday Dr. Nahum Goldmann told us that anti-Semitism was no longer the menace it used to be. We must remember, however, that in some parts of the world, notably in Latin America, a new element has appeared: Nazis who escaped retribution. There are also countries where economic problems provide fertile soil for the spread of anti-Semitism. When Nazis arrive in a country of this type, you have all the preconditions necessary for vicious anti-Semitism. I am not sure that a pogrom here and there is impossible in our day and age. I do not want to spread alarm and despondency, but we of the World Jewish Congress must be aware of these dangers.

It is not always easy in the Diaspora to live a full Jewish life and to give a good Jewish education to our children. This requires a collective will and an adequate organizational framework, and here is where the World Jewish Congress can be of help. The main areas in which Jewish communities need assistance are Jewish education and culture and the fight for Jewish security when it is threatened.

Mr. ISI LEIBLER (*Australia*): In his address last night our president rightly stressed the relevance of ensuring Jewish spiritual and cultural continuity in the pluralistic society of the twentieth century. This area, unfortunately, lies outside the structure of the World Jewish Congress. The future of Jewish education in Western countries is going to depend on the energy, dedication, and economic assistance generated in the respective communities. The major area confronting us as the World Jewish Congress is that of Soviet Jewry. Compared to this burning problem, all other political issues fade into insignificance.

Three million Jews are undergoing a process of forced national and spiritual disintegration, as well as being faced with anti-Semitic provocations and individual discrimination. To suggest that the problem is only one of ethnic, cultural, or religious discrimination is incorrect: anti-Semitism as such is involved.

Despite efforts from certain Jewish and non-Jewish quarters to restrict the tempo of the protest movement, Jews in the West have managed to highlight and dramatize the plight of Soviet Jewry, and our campaign in this regard has escalated and widened in recent years. Last night Dr. Goldmann complained that those involved in the protest movements were guilty of exaggeration. Can he name a single responsible Jewish leader who has indulged in exaggerations concerning the plight of Soviet Jewry? On the other hand, it could reasonably be said that there are those who minimize the situation, in the mistaken belief that this will curry favor with the Soviet authorities. This is unsound tactics and dangerous thinking.

This is not the first time I have heard Dr. Goldmann bracket the question of Soviet Jewry with that of discrimination faced by Jews in certain countries of the West. In which Western countries does the state machinery as such deprive Jews of religious and cultural rights and sponsor the publication of anti-Semitic stereotypes? When Western Communists, progressives, or friends of the Soviet Union such as Lord Russell publicly concede that this anti-Semitism emanates from the top Soviet leadership, what good purpose is served by Jewish leadership insisting repeatedly that the Soviet leadership is not responsible? There are those — and I prefer to believe that Dr. Goldmann is not one of them — who maintain that if we play down the culpability of the Soviet authorities, if we avoid confrontation and rely exclusively on appeals, the Soviet authorities will be induced to change their attitude in the long run. Mr. Easterman partly reflected this attitude when he described the plight of Soviet Jewry as “an adverse Jewish situation.”

The Soviet authorities will not remedy the present injustices as a result of moral or ethical motivations. All past appeals based on hopes that they would were proven completely unfounded. A worldwide

protest movement — carried out largely outside the World Jewish Congress — has indeed brought about certain minimal concessions. For example, the protests have resulted in a decline in the production of state- and party-sponsored anti-Semitic publications. And who knows how much worse the situation of Soviet Jewry might have become had not the protest movement in the West brought it to the attention of public opinion.

The Communist world today is not what it was five years ago: it is no longer a monolith. The Chinese-Soviet split, autonomy in East European Communist states, and Togliatti-style polycentrism and liberal-style Communism in Western Communist parties could all have an important positive bearing on the future of Soviet Jewry. Our organizational structure is in a position to take advantage of these developments. Today, more than ever before, the Soviet leadership requires the goodwill of Western Communists, progressives, and liberals. It is our most sacred responsibility to highlight our campaign and place the question of emigration of Soviet Jews high on the agenda. Western Communist parties and progressive groups must find themselves in a political atmosphere where Soviet anti-Jewish discrimination is a liability to them. They must be given a vested interest in making repeated and insistent representations to Moscow regarding Soviet Jewry.

Even if we fail, our protest will play a vital role in ensuring that Jews in the Soviet Union realize that they have not been forgotten by their kinsmen outside. Let not future generations say that we in the prosperous countries of the West did not exert our maximum efforts on behalf of our 3,000,000 brethren. History will not judge leniently those Jews who call for restraint and rely exclusively on a *shtadlanut*-type approach to the Soviet authorities. Silent diplomacy — yes, by all means — but above all combined with a militant, well-organized, worldwide protest movement based on documented evidence. The situation of Soviet Jews requires not exaggeration but dramatization. The facts speak for themselves.

FOURTH SESSION

August 1, 1966 (evening)

In the Chair: DR. ISRAEL GOLDSTEIN

Dr. GERHART M. RIEGNER announced that the Presidium had been unable to map out a concrete plan for the distribution of time for the General Debate because it was not yet known which delegations or representatives of associated or fraternal organizations wanted to take part in the debate. Each country, associated organization, and fraternal organization must make known before 10:00 PM that evening how many speakers it wanted to register for the General Debate.

SPECIAL DISCUSSION: PEACE AND DISARMAMENT

Dr. ISRAEL GOLDSTEIN (*Honorary Vice-President, World Jewish Congress*): It is appropriate that the first of our symposia should be on world peace and disarmament, since all other problems pale in comparison with the peril of war in the nuclear age.

Be it sufficient to remind ourselves that recent technical progress in the field of missiles and nuclear weapons has made it possible to destroy most of mankind in half an hour and to blight the lives of the surviving remnant. Another version has it that there are enough stockpiles of nuclear weapons to kill the human race several times over.

It has therefore been urged again and again that the world, which has risked so much for war, should be willing to risk as much for peace and that the problem for the next decade or more is to make the world safe for disarmament.

Hence today's most important thinking and most fateful efforts are calculated to reduce international tensions, increase international cooperation, and strengthen existing instruments for dealing with international tensions when they arise; to cope with such problems as food shortage and population explosion, which may lead to wars; and to work on proposals for the cessation of all nuclear explosion tests and for general disarmament. No individual can afford to be either unconcerned or ignorant about these matters. A fortiori, no organization, whatever be its special business, can afford not to turn its

mind and heart to this most basic of all human problems and concerns.

The World Jewish Congress has been among the foremost nongovernmental organizations concerned with these matters. It is only natural that our agenda should give an important place to this subject. We are fortunate this evening that the participants in the symposium will be men who have dealt with these matters in high and responsible positions. It will be my privilege to present them to you.

In my introductory remarks I should like to dwell in particular on the Jewish concern with this universal problem.

In a peril of global proportions it hardly makes sense to say that any one people has more at stake than any other people. Yet it is not amiss to recall that in the past the Jewish people, by virtue of its scattered condition, has suffered more than any other people from the curse of war and that as a result of World War II one third of our people perished. Nor is it amiss to remind ourselves that the State of Israel, with its more than 2,000,000 Jews and with more to come, is subject to daily threats of destruction by its neighbors such as do not bedevil any other state, great or small. Israel has repeatedly declared its readiness to support any international agreement of a general or a specific character intended to guarantee peace and security on a worldwide or on a regional basis.

This background has been undoubtedly a contributing factor to the special Jewish awareness and sensitivity on the subject of world peace. There is also a more historic factor, rooted in the historic consciousness of the Jewish people and enshrined in Old Testament prophecy, which not only envisioned the era of universal peace, but stressed disarmament in specific terms: "the beating of swords into plowshares and of spears into pruning hooks." Transposed into modern language, it means the conversion of nuclear energy to peaceful purposes. It is not by chance that Isaiah's text was selected to be inscribed on the wall facing the United Nations headquarters in New York.

Whatever may have been the reasons and motivations, it is a fact that great Jews have figured prominently among the inspired and inspiring leaders in the march toward universal peace; the names are too well-known to require repetition. It is also worth noting that Jewish public bodies — religious and secular, national and international — have given time and thought to the problems of world peace and disarmament. Several of them, notably the World Jewish Congress, are serving among the nongovernmental organizations attached to the United Nations. Their pronouncements are expressions of Jewish public opinion and, in turn, help to mold Jewish public opinion and have a measure of influence on non-Jewish public opinion as well.

This evening, by way of illustration, I would like to cite positions taken by two important Jewish public bodies — one lay and one

religious, one on the world Jewish scene and one on the American Jewish scene — namely, the World Jewish Congress and the Synagogue Council of America.

Discussions and resolutions on world peace and disarmament have had a place at every important meeting of the World Jewish Congress. The last meeting of its Executive Committee, held in Strasbourg a year ago, urged:

1. a ban against all nuclear testing, including underground;
2. an undertaking by the nuclear powers never to be the first to employ nuclear weapons and never in any circumstances to employ them, or threaten to do so, against nonnuclear countries;
3. an undertaking by nuclear powers not to give nuclear weapons to other countries or assist them in producing such weapons, and a corresponding undertaking by nonnuclear countries to refuse such weapons or assistance and not to produce such weapons with their own resources;
4. a determined effort to take significant steps toward conventional disarmament.

I am confident that meaningful resolutions will be adopted at this Plenary Assembly as well.

The Synagogue Council of America represents both the religious and the lay leadership of Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform Judaism in the United States. Six months ago it held a study conference on world peace, with its focus on Vietnam. The following excerpts from the statement there adopted deserve to be mentioned:

Our religious conscience compels us to exert every influence so that the action in Vietnam can be moved from the battlefield to the negotiating table.

.....
The danger of new pressures for unlimited escalation of the war resulting from impatience and disappointment is grave indeed. Such an escalation would not only fail to achieve our goals, but would ultimately involve the world in a war of virtual destruction.

The statement goes on to recommend that the United States should:

1. request the United Nations to begin negotiations for a cease-fire agreement under United Nations supervision among the governments of the United States and of North and South Vietnam — including representation for the National Liberation Front — and other interested parties; and to convene a peace conference to explore the basis of a settlement of the long-term issues and the means to give such a settlement effective international guarantees;
2. make clear that a primary objective of a settlement of the Vietnam conflict is the independence of South Vietnam from outside

interference, with complete liberty to determine the character of its future government by means of a peaceful, free, and verified choice by its people;

3. declare itself in favor of the phased withdrawal of all its troops and bases from Vietnamese territory, if and when they can be replaced by adequate international peacekeeping forces composed of military contingents capable of maintaining order while the peace settlement is being carried out;

4. make available immediate reconstruction assistance and long-range economic development funds for Southeast Asia, preferably through an effective international organization in which the beneficiary governments fully participate.

We turn from this platform to Jewish organizations everywhere — international, national, and local — to give an important place, in their education and public-relations programs, to the education of their members in a knowledge of the workings of the United Nations and its various agencies, a more discerning understanding of the ongoing proposals for peace and disarmament, and a readiness to make their voices on these issues heard by their own governments and by world opinion. This is an area in which individuals should not hesitate to do their own thinking. It is an area reserved neither for fools nor for angels but where every man has a stake. Who of the experts is so sure of his ground that he can afford to disdain the contribution of anyone? May I cite a personal experience: some years ago, speaking only for myself, I advanced a suggestion for the establishment of a World Academy for Peace composed of the world's twenty or twenty-five acknowledged spiritual and intellectual giants, unshackled by any political office, who would come together for a month every year in a neutral country to consider problems and propose solutions, and whose moral authority would carry its own weight. The reactions of "experts" like Ralph Bunche, Philip Noel Baker, and the late Adlai Stevenson and Eleanor Roosevelt to this "amateur" proposal were a source of encouragement. The plan remains on paper for lack of means to try it out, but one day it may find its sponsor. I mention it here in order to buttress the argument that even in the opinion of the experts, there is a place for amateurs in this field.

May I close with the hope that Jews as a collectivity will become identified with the quest of peace even more than in the past. We point with pride to the identification of Jews — individuals and organizations — with the battles for minority rights and, most recently, in the American Negro's struggle for full equality in fact as well as in law. Would that the Jews be similarly associated in a leading connotation in all that pertains to world peace and disarmament, which is the most

complex and the most baffling of problems but at the same time the most imperious, the most fundamental, and the most fateful.

The Jewish people, because it is a world people — with its three largest constituencies located in the Western Hemisphere, in Eastern Europe, and in the Middle East — has no geographical or political bias or vested interest as a people in the fateful times in which we live, save the bias in favor of its survival and that of *medinat yisrael* — so indispensable to its survival — as part of humanity's survival. Hence the overall Jewish commitment to a world freed from the fear of annihilation. The World Jewish Congress has been true to this broad purpose and will not swerve from it.

Among the great texts from our Bible, there are two which offer guidance even today in the realm of our discussion. One is the fifteenth verse of Psalm Thirty-Four: "Peace must be not only a goal but a pursuit." The other is the seventeenth verse of Chapter Thirty-Two of Isaiah: "The work of righteousness shall be peace and the effect of righteousness, quietness and confidence forever."

Our past qualifies us and our future commands us Jews, everywhere in the world, to throw ourselves with all our intellectual and moral capacity into the battle to abolish war forever.

LORD RITCHIE-CALDER OF BALMASHANNAR (*Sir Montague Burton Professor of International Relations, University of Edinburgh*):

Shalom! At least in the Hebrew greeting one does not have to apologize for using the word "peace." Statesmen use it today with an inflection which implies, "Pardon the expression."

And well they might, because in the past twenty-one years there has not been, since that Second World War which in all its excesses seemed the culmination of man's stupidity, one whole week without a battle going on somewhere in the world.

Only we do not talk about wars but about defense, nor about battles but about incidents. Our language is loaded with hypocrisy and cynical understatement. We fight with slogans but kill people.

You will recall that rehearsal for doomsday, the Cuban missile crisis. I am not going into the manifest circumstances, but would remind you of the terminology. President Kennedy, before he brought it to the Security Council, declared "quarantine" and dispatched a naval task force to isolate the island of Cuba.

The following day, while the issue was before the Security Council, I was picked up by a taxi outside the UN headquarters. The taxi driver obviously thought I was "in the know" and asked, "Do them guys think the United States is going to declare war?" I said, "Now that's an interesting question because last night the president declared war." This startled him. "I didn't hear him do that," he said. "Oh yes, you did," I told him, "he might call it quarantine but it was naval blockade and

that's an act of war." He was a thoughtful chap and ruminated, "If them Russian ships have nothing to hide, why don't they just stop and look-see?" I said, "Now that's another interesting question. There was once a ship called HMS *Leopard* which stopped a ship called the USS *Chesapeake Bay* just to look-see, and one thing led to another and we, the British, burned the White House." This was too much. He stopped the cab and exploded, "The British burned the White House?" "Yes," I said. "Bloody Commies!" said he. I had to explain to him that in the War of 1812 it was "Redcoats," not "Reds."

This playing around with words is serious because gradually it conditions our intentions and attitudes and is certainly corrupting all our attempts at peacekeeping and disarmament.

Take our nuclear gobbledygook, the glossary of annihilation. We have "first strike," "second strike," "counterforce strike," "massive retaliation," "limited nuclear war with tactical weapons," and, the prizewinner of them all, "overkill."

"First strike" assumes that the aggressor — the other fellow — unleashes the nuclear attack. But if *you*, the good guy, opt for "first strike" it is not aggression; it is "preemptive attack." You are forestalling his first strike and seeking to destroy, say, nine tenths of his striking power — and his population. "Second strike" is what is left to hit back with. "Massive retaliation," in the Dulles vocabulary, was something different; it meant that any false move by the other side, nuclear or otherwise, would invoke the full weight of the US nuclear arsenal or "deterrent." This of course is another misnomer, because if it is not used or intended to be used (and everyone protests that they won't be the first to use it), it isn't a deterrent, and if it is used, it hasn't deterred.

"Counterforce strike" is a mad-hatter word in a mad-hatter world. It assumes a gentleman's agreement that nuclear missiles will only be used against each other's military installations and not against cities or civilians. And much the same goes for "limited war with tactical weapons" — the kind which have been deployed in Europe. I have pursued this with generals and with the war-game boys, who dream up computerized versions of all this. "Tactical" assumes a code of rules, rather like a ball game. If the nuclear missiles are contained within the agreed "court," that's "tactical"; if they go outside, that is a foul and will invoke "strategical" countermeasures. I have never been able to get them to tell me who the linesmen are going to be. Anyway, the smallest nuclear warhead on a tactical weapon is equal in TNT to the whole weight of the Luftwaffe raid which destroyed the British city of Coventry. And that does not take into account radiation and fallout. Let us get our language straight: if nuclear weapons are ever used, they won't be tactical or strategical; they will be total.

And that brings us to "overkill." In the arsenals of the nuclear powers today there are more than 320,000 megatons of nuclear destruction. "Megaton" is another thought-diminishing word. You get to orders of magnitude where you run out of zeros; so you talk about "kiloton," which means a thousand tons, and "megaton," which means a million tons. So we are talking about 320,000,000,000 tons of TNT-equivalent. And that means a ration of one hundred tons of TNT-equivalent for every man, woman, and child on earth. Or it means fourteen tons of radioactive poison for every acre of the land-surface.

In other words, Homo sapiens, thinking man — or Homo *insapiens*, unthinking man — has now the absolute power of veto over the evolution of his own species and the capacity to turn his planet into a radioactive desert. And, in the name of mankind, I ask you with all the earnestness at my command, do not let anyone kill you with anesthetic words or computerized theories into ever thinking otherwise. You cannot rationalize the unthinkable, nor can you propound the unspeakable.

Therefore "peace" is not a wish; it is an imperative. Bernard Baruch, at the ill-omened United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, in 1946, said, "The choice is between the quick and the dead." Twenty years later, the coin which was tossed in that choice is still standing on its edge.

Or, as my friend and exemplar H.G. Wells said, "The race is between education and catastrophe." We are still not educated. We still do not understand — refuse to understand — the awesome meaning of it all. Science — the ingenuity of man — has given us immeasurable powers of destruction, released the energy of the atom, and devised the means of its delivery. Science has broken the gravitational fences of our planet and adventured into space. A piece of man-made hardware, in the form of a satellite, can circumnavigate the earth sixteen times a day, diminishing it in time and distance to the minor planet which we refuse to recognize it to be.

There is no place on Earth which is more than a few hours away by jet propulsion, a few minutes by rocket propulsion (in the form of intercontinental ballistic missiles), and a split second by radio. There is no place on Earth where, through communications, the awareness of change has not penetrated. The world has become a neighborhood where neighbors eavesdrop on each other and, with Early Bird and the communications satellites, look in on each other. One would have hoped that such common awareness would have produced a sense of world community.

Alas, it has not. Science, however ingenious, is not wisdom; it is knowledge, to be used for good or for ill. Wisdom is knowledge tempered by judgment; and the history of the past twenty years, in

which science has rushed us into the Atomic Age, the Cybernetic Age, and the Space Age has been one of judgment corrupted by fear.

Thirty-six years ago, Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his first inaugural speech as president of the United States, said, "There is nothing to fear but fear itself." Since then, as now, we are fearful of fear. But it has been said: "Fear knocked at the door. Hope answered and there was nothing outside."

Fear, suspicion, hostility bred of fear and suspicion, hatreds bred of hostility, jealousies bred by hatreds and misunderstanding — ideological slogans which have virtually no substance in the changed world of manifest opportunity have sustained the cold war.

And yet in that culmination of the cold war, when brinkmanship had brought us to the Cuban crisis and the two great nuclear powers were horn-locked on the edge of the abyss of mutual destruction, there was a moment of truth. They disengaged. Khrushchev agreed to withdraw the missiles and Kennedy stopped his task force, about to invade Cuba. And Khrushchev, reproached by his own hawks (and about to be brought down by them), said, "People say: Who won and who lost? I say mankind won; reason won! "

But since then we have reverted to the word game and the numbers game. The blessed word is now "credibility"; President Johnson, having lost his "consensus" (another hallowed word), is now having trouble with "credibility." At least it is an improvement on "credulity," which seems to have prevailed in the United States during the Vietnam war (which, of course, is not a war). If "credibility" replaces "credulity," McNamara is going to have a hard time. How often have we heard him say thuswise, with all the authority of the Pentagon computers: "One hundred and fifty thousand Vietcong against 500,000 South Vietnamese troops, plus 250,000 US combat troops, plus strategical bombers from Guam, plus the Seventh Fleet is an unacceptable disparity." In this, the numbers game, if you repeat it often enough and solemnly enough, you produce a mirror image — people think of it as the other way round! So escalation is justified because it redresses the unsportsmanly advantages of the opposition. Of course, as one who was director of plans of political warfare in the British Foreign Office during the war, I know what he means. He means that to have any hope of reducing a resistance movement, or a guerilla force which disappears not only into the swamps or the maquis but into the population, you have to have at least a ten-to-one superiority. And I would not guarantee success even then, because you have to have more than superior forces; you have to have "credibility" among the population you are involving, not only your home supporters but the people you are professedly liberating. In the simplest of all terms, I can tell you what the people of Vietnam want liberating from. They want liberating

from twenty-six years of death and destruction. Remember that many of the youngsters who are fighting in the paddies were born in the foxholes of the war against the French.

But credibility is not confined to the American debate. Failure of credibility pervades the weary discussions in the United Nations and in the Committee of Eighteen (now seventeen because the French don't take part) discussing disarmament at Geneva. The partisans adopt postures which discredit the rational proposals they are putting forward. Anything the Americans propose is suspect and vice versa, and once the debate is polarized in this way, nothing that the others propose in sense and sincerity has any real chance. For instance, the British delegate, Lord Chalfont, has not only a clear mandate to do absolutely everything to promote disarmament but also has very clear and sincere ideas of his own. But, bogged down in detail, if he queries technical items in the Soviet plan he is an American stooge, and if he disagrees with some factual question in the American proposals he is "disloyal to the Atlantic alliance." So we have not really moved since the test-ban treaty raised hopes of progressive nuclear and general disarmament. We have not got even agreement on underground testing. This is an example of credibility. The Americans want a system of inspection of the USSR to ensure that there are no sneak tests. The Soviet, as always, discourages inspection on the ground, as it were, and the discussions have havered backwards and forwards on remote-control inspection — scientific surveillance which would seismically detect an underground explosion. Even that should not be, and is not, beyond the wit of man. But, of course, it isn't really a question of "black boxes." The headforce was lost over Vietnam and, in nuclear terms, over the questions of NATO, MLF, ANF, Polaris submarines, and the French independent bomb.

So we are still faced with the 320,000,000,000 tons of overkill, with de Gaulle's bomb, with the Chinese developments, and with increasing prospects of proliferation as more and more nations approach the capacity to produce bombs — if they want them.

A false antithesis has been created by suggesting that those who are insisting on nuclear disarmament as a first priority are somehow subverting or delaying the chances of general, or multilateral (whatever that means), disarmament. It can be said, and it is true, that conventional weapons have acquired more devastating potentials in the interval since the war and we have dreamed up other horrors which have become conventionalized — napalm bombs, defoliation chemicals — in the wars we call "incidents." And the worst in biological and biochemical warfare haven't been on display yet.

Why, knowing these things, do some of us still insist that nuclear disarmament is number-one priority in the chess game we call

disarmament? Because the nuclear chess game is too dangerous to play with. It is a threat short of declared war. It may be that there may never be a nuclear war as an act of policy, but there are real dangers of nuclear war by accident. A nuclear bomb could be delivered by accident. A ballistic missile with a nuclear warhead might be unleashed by a faulty transistor in the complicated computer system we call defense. You do not have to heed scaremongers like me, or see films like *Dr. Strangelove* or *Fail-Safe*. You just have to accept the plain fact that there is a hot line — a telephone system — manned day and night between the White House and the Kremlin just so that the one can say to the other, “Sorry, that ICBM which hit you in fifteen minutes was unintentional. . .”

That is the crazy truth of modern life, so the sooner we reduce that overkill and the means of delivery, the better. Some people believe in the nuclear stalemate, the balance of terror, but it is at best an uncertain balance. It is true that each side knows that there is no defense — except threat of retaliation — against nuclear missiles, but they are contriving antimissile missiles and then we will have anti-antimissile missiles.

In the years of so-called peace, in which wars are not called wars but “incidents” or “brushfires,” the burden of armaments has become intolerable. The nations of the world are spending per year on armaments about the equivalent of 10% of the world’s annual output of goods and services, which is equal to the entire national income of all the developing countries put together. And the military budgets are escalating — another double-talk word.

Eighty-five percent of this military expenditure is accounted for by the USA, the USSR, France, mainland China, the United Kingdom, Canada, and the Federal Republic of Germany. The remaining 15% represents a disproportionate burden on the economies of poorer countries.

Britain has been brought to its present economic crisis largely by its military expenditure of over 12,000,000,000 a year. That represents over 7% of the gross national product. In terms of direct employment — armed forces, supply departments, industrial contracts, and research — this represents about 1,200,000 persons or 4.5% of the total working population. This is in a country which depends for its existence on its civilian industries and exports and where there is such a shortage of manpower that we have to have the present drastic measures to produce what the prime minister calls a “shakeout” — another weasel word, which means enough unemployment to compel mobility of labor. The most effective shakeout would be disarmament because the nature of modern arms is such that they absorb some of the best brains and the highest technical skills, all of which are needed in the advanced

industries in which Britain must excel or lose her role as an industrial nation.

The United States spends ten times as much as Britain on its military services, and its defense industries represent 9% of its gross national product. The military installations — apart from the industrial contracts — represent a government military and civilian payroll of 11,000,000,000 dollars a year. This is equal to one-and-a-half times the combined payrolls of the iron-and-steel industry and all the other basic metal industries. It is more than double the payroll of the automobile industry.

If, to use the headline of an American journal, "peace breaks out," this would mean, in America, an enormous reconversion from defense to civil employment. But it could be done not only in terms of the manifest needs of the underprivileged in the Great Society but by going out into the wider world of the developing countries, where unsatisfied needs exist but purchasing power is lacking. The irony is that all armaments are expendable — the greatest form of built-in obsolescence — because all weapons are obsolete before they leave the production line. They are expended in battle or discarded. They are the throwaways of an industrial society. In conversion, the industrial potential they represent could become the giveaways to the needy countries without purchasing power but which, promoted into prosperity, would become the markets for advanced technology.

We can beat our swords into plowshares. We can convert that overkill into energy for the countries hungry for power supplies for industry — energy millions of times greater than Niagara. And footloose at that. Industrial locations have in the past been dictated by accessibility to fossil fuels — coal, oil, and natural gas — or to waterpower for hydroelectric installations; but atomic power — packaged reactors — is not constrained by geological or geographical limitations. We could open up the Arctic, even the Antarctic, and the deserts and the jungles and the remote places. Even in places inaccessible to surface transport we could have industrial oases.

But more than just the wastage of hardware which armaments represent, there is the even more criminal wastage of human ingenuity. Much of our scientific research and more of our technological know-how is directed one way or another into defense. Even that great adventure of man vaulting his gravitational fences into space has become basically a competition between military establishments. Every time there is a new advance it becomes to the other side a new threat, from the first sputnik to the latest walking into space "to intercept and inspect a stranger satellite in case it is being used for military purposes." When the competitors get to the moon it will have military implications. One general has suggested that it is necessary for America

to turn it into a space Gibraltar. Today, between the Russians and the Americans, the space race must be costing about 8,000,000,000 pounds a year — more than enough to put the developing countries into business. But the money is less important than the diversion of brains, which, if applied to the problems of this planet, could solve them within a generation.

As Paul Hoffman keeps reminding us, if one tenth of the money and scientific personnel that was spent on the first atom bomb had been directed to the problems of desalination, we would have had economical processes by now. Then, as Ben-Gurion used to enjoin his scientists, we could “sweeten the sea and harvest the deserts.”

Mr. WILLIAM EPSTEIN (*Deputy Special Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General at the Disarmament Conference in Geneva and Joint Secretary of the United Nations Disarmament Commission*) conveyed the greetings and good wishes of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, U Thant.

Mr. Epstein continued: As you are well aware, the United Nations is an organization of states, and as such it must depend for its effectiveness and its success on the support of governments. But, like all other institutions devised by man, the United Nations, if it is to succeed, must have the understanding and the support of the peoples of the world. One of the important ways in which this understanding and support can be achieved is through the cooperation and the participation of nongovernmental organizations in its work. The World Jewish Congress, which has had consultative status with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations during almost the entire period of our existence, has made a notable contribution to the objectives and work of the United Nations, in particular in the field of human rights. That is as it should be.

This Plenary Assembly is the first one whose agenda includes an item devoted specifically to peace and disarmament. That this assembly of representatives from some fifty countries has turned its attention to this subject is a matter of great satisfaction for me, because peace and disarmament is the primary business of the United Nations and the very essence of its work. That Jews should apply themselves to problems of peace and disarmament is also as it should be. Two of your ancestors and mine, Isaiah and Micah, were the first to define the nature and effect of peace and disarmament, and their prophecies have validity to the present day. It is not just because of the ancient prophecies and not only because of the sufferings Jews have undergone in all wars (where they suffered first and worst), but because of their unique position in the world — as was explained last night by Dr. Goldmann — that the very future, the very survival of the Jewish people — perhaps more than

that of any other people in the world — is inextricably linked with the preservation of peace.

Your Constitution says that the World Jewish Congress strives to cooperate with all people on the basis of common ideals of peace, freedom, and justice. At your last Assembly, in Stockholm seven years ago, your president said, "There is no people in the world more attached and more loyal to the ideal and the institution of the United Nations than we Jews, whose only hope for decent survival is based on the victory of those ideas and principles which are at the very heart of the United Nations." The organization which I have the honor to represent tonight will follow with great interest and warm sympathy the activities of the World Jewish Congress in the field of peace and disarmament.

At the United Nations we have had many committees dealing with disarmament, with as few as two and as many as 117 members — the total membership of the UN. We have had thousands of meetings, with tons of documents and reports, yet without any resulting agreement on disarmament. Very often I have been asked: How can you remain interested in this thing? Don't you get frustrated, going to these meetings and hearing these speeches year after year after year? My answer is: of course I get frustrated! So do those who do research on cancer. So do those who, like yourselves, work to promote the cause of the Jewish people, at times under the most difficult circumstances. My answer is that the goal is such that you dare not for a moment lose sight of it and relax from the work you are doing.

It is not entirely true that *nothing* has been achieved by all these efforts. In 1963/64 we really had a year of achievement, a vintage year for peace and disarmament. The partial test-ban treaty, outlawing all tests in the atmosphere, under water, and in outer space, was really a great and significant advance which put a brake on the armaments race; in addition it reduced the pollution of the atmosphere. That year also saw the conclusion of the hot-line agreement between Moscow and Washington and the adoption by the United Nations General Assembly of the USSR-US-sponsored resolution excluding nuclear weapons from outer space. During the same period there was a cutback in armed forces and military budgets — not a large one, but a beginning — as well as a reduction by the United States, the Soviet Union, and the United Kingdom in the production of fissionable material for military purposes. The measures I have just mentioned are, it is true, only small steps toward the ultimate goal of disarmament. And since 1963/64, of course, the international climate has worsened, due to the hostilities in Vietnam.

Everybody knows that security is not enhanced by the greater development of armaments, conventional or nuclear; yet everybody

goes on developing and collecting these armaments. Every intelligent person realizes that unless man puts an end to the arms race, the arms race will put an end to man; yet the race continues. It has been said that the dangerous economic and social consequences that would result from disarmament constitute one of the important obstacles to taking radical steps toward disarmament. Several years ago the United Nations commissioned a study by ten international experts. These experts, who came from the East, from the West, and from nonaligned countries, submitted a unanimous report saying, in effect, that although disarmament would create some problems of transition and reconversion, it would be "an unqualified blessing for all mankind." And yet there is so little headway being made.

In the eighteen-nation Disarmament Committee we have, in addition to the powers of the West and the East, eight unaligned countries. While the small countries cannot compel the nuclear powers to disarm, they can have a great influence on the great powers. As the great powers compete for the support of the unaligned countries, the unaligned countries can act as a catalyst and a moderating force on their policies.

In the area of general and complete disarmament, two draft treaties have been presented, one by the United States and one by the USSR. They are poles apart as regards the stages and timing of disarmament as well as the kind and degree of control. There is also basic disagreement between the American and Soviet proposals for peacekeeping forces.

Another area, in which work has been going on for years, is nuclear testing. As I mentioned, a great step forward was made in 1963, when the partial test-ban treaty was signed by more than one hundred nations. Two of the largest powers, however, have not become parties to this treaty and they conduct tests in the atmosphere; furthermore, the two superpowers who are bound by the treaty are conducting underground tests, which were not banned by the agreement. At the present time there is an uneasy stability as regards nuclear weapons; there is a mutual deterrent. However, if testing goes on it will not only improve offensive nuclear weapon capabilities but, as Lord Ritchie-Calder pointed out, it will expand in the area of antiballistic missiles, then anti-antiballistic missiles, and so on, without end. This could prefigure a new and a much more dangerous round in the nuclear arms race than anything we have yet seen; it could certainly upset the very precarious balance of mutual terror that we have now.

So the intention is — and I was very glad to hear Dr. Goldstein read in this connection the resolutions of the Strasbourg Executive meeting — to call for an absolute ban on nuclear weapons tests — underground and anywhere else. In Geneva we have reached a deadlock on this goal as well: the Soviet and American views on the means of detection and control are fundamentally opposed to each other. A number of

compromise suggestions have been made, primarily by the nonaligned, nonnuclear countries, and there are real hopes for progress in this field.

There exists also a whole series of collateral disarmament proposals, all of which have real value: reduction of military budgets; declarations of non-first use; establishment of nuclear-free zones in such areas as Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, and Europe; nonaggression pacts — there is no dearth of proposals, but there has not been agreement on any one of them.

One most important collateral measure is the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons: the nuclear powers must not transfer nuclear weapons or know-how to nonnuclear powers, and the nonnuclear powers must undertake not to produce or acquire such weapons. There are five nuclear powers today; there could be a dozen more in a few years. One of the by-products of the nuclear energy that is being used for peaceful purposes is plutonium, which is a fissionable material used in the manufacture of atom bombs. Today several countries are producing plutonium in sufficient quantities to enable them to manufacture nuclear bombs. By 1980 the world's power reactors will produce enough plutonium to manufacture twenty nuclear weapons every single day of the year. If nuclear weapons spread among the countries of Asia, Europe, or the Middle East, the world may be subject to a far greater catastrophe than it has ever known.

It is understandable that countries worried about their security should feel that they need these arms. In fact, however, it would not increase but reduce their security. It is therefore necessary for the nuclear powers to find ways to guarantee the security of the nonnuclear powers so that they do not feel compelled to acquire such weapons themselves. The nuclear powers must reach a compromise; the nonnuclear powers must exercise the self-restraint necessary for their survival.

The world has welcomed Indian Prime Minister Gandhi's statement that her country's atomic capacity will be applied only to peaceful purposes, and Prime Minister Eshkol's declaration that Israel will not be the first nation to introduce nuclear weapons into the Middle East. While these statements are welcome, nothing can be permanent unless a structure is created whereby these weapons will not be necessary.

There is still time; nevertheless, the task is far from easy and the outlook is uncertain. Yet the search must go on. History develops in the most unexpected ways. Some ten years ago no one would have thought that the membership of the United Nations would pass from eighty-one to 117 and keep on increasing. Nobody would have foretold the end of empires and the crumbling of alliances, in the East and in the West; nobody would have foreseen that the enemies of the last war would become friends or allies.

Victor Hugo once said that there was nothing so powerful as an idea whose time had come. Today, on the one hand, we have the great promise of nuclear energy that was alluded to by Lord Ritchie-Calder; on the other hand, the holocaust that would be wrought by a nuclear war is beyond imagination — it would be such that the living would envy the dead. In a period such as ours, when reaching for the moon is no longer a metaphor, surely the time has come for mankind to accept and put into practice the idea of living together on earth.

PROFESSOR HENRI LAUGIER (*former United Nations Assistant Secretary-General in charge of Social Affairs and former Representative of France on the Executive Board of UNESCO*): I gladly accepted the great honor of addressing you this evening, above all because I was glad in this way to pay tribute to the humanity-serving activity you have undertaken for so many years — your work in favor of the equality of all men, the defense of human rights, and the fight against discrimination. You have gathered here from the four corners of the earth to contribute your international civic spirit to the thoughtful, enthusiastic, and concerted effort that is called for by the problems of today's world.

I have been asked to speak on the problems of science and technique in the service of peace as opposed to war. My remarks will be of a somewhat different order than those of the eminent speakers who preceded me, as I am a specialist in the social sciences.

First of all I would urge you to reject all those ill-informed people who blame scientists for having unleashed forces which have now escaped human control and which threaten to lead to the destruction of mankind. These critics evoke only too readily the well-known story of the sorcerer's apprentice, who became the victim of the forces that he had liberated. This is an inadmissible misuse of comparison as a means of information and persuasion. In fact, the sorcerer's apprentice knew nothing about the forces he set free, or about the laws that regulated them and allowed them to be harnessed. This is why the legend has him fall victim to these forces.

The forces and energy brought into play by modern science, on the other hand, exist for man only insofar as he has studied their nature and is acquainted with the laws that govern them. Man is not the sorcerer's apprentice; he is the sorcerer himself. He has awakened these forces, which lay dormant — sheltered by our ignorance — in the atom and in the potentials of chemistry and biology. Awakened by man from their sleep dating from the beginning of time, these forces are today docile slaves in his hands. Domesticated by man, they are incapable of revolt or initiative. If criminal madmen were to use them for the destruction of human civilization, neither science nor scientists as such would be to blame; the responsibility would be borne by man himself,

whose unpardonable — indeed criminal — indifference and whose intellectual sloth would have allowed the great crime to be carried out.

It cannot be repeated often enough — the human species is the only one that can become fully aware of the forces that determine its future, and consequently itself guide the evolution of that future. At the center of all human destiny, therefore, is the responsibility of all men, be they thinkers, men of action, scientists, statesmen, or simply patriotic citizens of their national or international community, as are all of you. And this responsibility can only increase and become more serious as ever-present scientific curiosity produces new knowledge — and therefore new power — available to man for good or for ill. In recent years we have witnessed the monumental human perturbation caused by the liberation of the forces contained in the atom. Imagine what will happen when the forces that determine human evolution, the forces that are now incarcerated in chromosomes and genes, are also liberated and placed at the disposal of man.

If, then, we separate the data provided by an ineluctably expanding science on the one hand from the responsibility for the inferences that man draws from this data on the other; if we transfer the responsibility for determining human destiny to the human mind, to man's reaction to the facts, to the choice he will have to make when faced with the possibilities of good or evil; then we must examine some of the logical inferences, which may surprise and even shock many of you.

The first inference is that the coming centuries will be conditioned not only by the boundless development, desirable and inevitable, of our theoretical scientific knowledge, but first and foremost by the use to which the human mind will decide to put this knowledge. The responsibility that is now foolishly attributed to science will be transferred to politics and the social sciences. Whatever progress is made in mathematical and natural scientific discoveries, the future will be determined by developments in the social sciences.

But there is also a second inference, which we cannot ignore: during the past two millennia of human history the natural and mathematical sciences have progressed enormously and have even surpassed expectations; the social sciences, the human sciences, however, have been far from providing the future of mankind with the fundamental ideas that humanity expected them to provide.

Two examples come to mind of the discrepancy between the natural and mathematical sciences on the one hand and the social sciences on the other: the problems of hunger and of the transmission of information by audiovisual means.

World opinion is just beginning to be moved by the menace posed to mankind by the demographic explosion and the insufficient available sources of food in the world today. The world is faced with the

prospect of famines whose dimensions mankind has never known — war-generating famines that can lead to generalized conflagrations in which all the destructive power of modern science can be brought into play. To fight these dangers — which are already with us — man can undertake two kinds of action: increase food production wherever possible in the world and control population growth. In both of these areas of intervention the exact sciences have contributed a mass of incontrovertibly efficient tools and data; in contrast, we are forced to note regretfully that the contribution made by the social sciences is but scant. The exact sciences already have so much to offer that all that is needed in order to harness these contributions in the service of the future is human will and effort — individuals and governments, moved by a public opinion well informed by the mass media.

The efforts of science have caused us all to lose the capacity and the taste for admiration. If we still had them we would never cease to be amazed by those little machines known as radio and television transmitters and receivers. Hundreds of thousands of experimental scientists had to work to perfect them — engineers, craftsmen, scholars. They created these marvellous machines that can be used without instructions by veritable illiterates and that can be used to fill the sound waves with invaluable literary, scientific, cultural, and political information bearing witness to world unity. Nonetheless, we see man, gifted with this great power over the destiny of civilization, incapable of using it appropriately in the service of progress, culture, justice, and peace. Social scientists have not concerned themselves sufficiently with the application of this gift. I would like to see imaginative social scientists come together in a series of round-table discussions to formulate proposals as to the programs that should be entrusted to the realm of the airwaves. In the absence of this intellectual preparation resulting from imaginative, rigorous, and creative thinking of the social sciences, we have seen governmental administrations abandon the use of this unprecedented tool to the most mediocre news and amusement programs. Prime time slots have been filled by the most insipid little songs and by sports exhibitions that unleash strong nationalistic feelings and the most absurd passions. I hope with all my heart for these mass media — this great and unprecedented power — to be charged with the task of weaving around the entire planet a network of programs on human rights, on great humanitarian leaders from all the continents, on the origins, the principles, and the goals of the United Nations. Yes, let the solemn commitments undertaken by all those who signed the United Nations Charter be repeated in all languages by all the communications satellites until the day when all men understand that if they continue their criminal, crazy armaments race, the destruction of our civilization will follow.

I would now like to make some constructive suggestions, for which I ask the support of the great moral authority which your powerful nongovernmental organization possesses and which you must use.

If I have succeeded — as I ardently hope I have — in convincing you that the future of peace and war, that is, the future of human destiny, depends much more on the behavior of men confronted with scientific knowledge than on this knowledge itself; then you will agree with me that the study of the human brain, sovereign master of man's destiny, is an absolute priority for us. Shortly before his death a few years ago, Gaston Berger said, "We know no more about the human brain than in Plato's time." This was somewhat of an exaggeration, for the work of Pavlov, Charcot, Sherrington, Lombroso, Freud, and others had advanced our knowledge. And the recent invention of "memories," of computers, has furthered still our mediocre knowledge of the brain. However important these recent gains may be, Gaston Berger only barely exaggerated when he deplored our ignorance in this area that is so fundamental for man. I therefore ask you to join the still fledgling struggle — in which some scholars, some citizens of the universe, are engaged — for international institutions to create as soon as possible a major human-brain research institute, enjoying absolute priority on the resources of the human community.

Having convinced you, I hope, that the responsibility for war and peace rests neither on science nor on scientists as such, I want to affirm nonetheless that scientists have the same responsibility as all other citizens of the universe; indeed their burden is greater and more touching, because they are perforce more aware of the possible consequences of the liberation of the forces that their scientific curiosity has placed at their service. I would ask scientists to take the lead among their fellow citizens who, still too little aware of the abyss that is ready to open under their feet, are nevertheless beginning to rise up against the abomination of new wars. Yes, let them rise up against the vile hypocrisy of undeclared wars, in which neither peoples nor their representatives are consulted, and where so-called technical advisers fight against so-called volunteers on the territory of peoples who are the hopeless victims of devastating foreign ambitions. Let them rise up against the intolerable behavior of the great civilized countries who style themselves defenders of truth, greatness, beauty, and justice and who, being the only manufacturers of weapons, give or sell these weapons to all the political factions of fragile, newly independent countries and thus strongly contribute to the transformation of immense territories liberated from colonial servitude into massacre zones.

It is said — and rightly so — that the only real lesson of history is that no one learns from the lessons of history. Faced with the

implacable facts of the past, what man in his right mind can still say that one must wage war in order to have peace? In the history of the world I do not know of a people or a leader who, having prepared a war, did not end up sooner or later by unleashing one.

Before concluding I would like to mention, for the first time before an eminent audience, a campaign that I have been waging for some time, until now by word of mouth. You are aware of the technical assistance that has been furnished to new nations for quite some time now by industrialized countries. At first this assistance was economic, then financial, then administrative, and finally, at the request of many countries, social. Today, in view of the dramatic chaos that seems to be mapping out the fate of these new countries, I think that above all they need technical assistance in policymaking to help them define for themselves their domestic priorities and the objectives of their foreign relations. I am calling, therefore, for a technical assistance program in policymaking. I am aware that this proposition will surprise many men and many of these liberated peoples, to whom I am deeply attached. I hope that they will reflect on the matter and eventually agree with my point of view. It is understood that this advice on domestic and foreign priorities cannot be provided by governments but only by a group of independent thinkers who are not under the orders of any outside government; these advisers would be chosen by the peoples concerned or designated by international bodies on the basis of their proven capacity for thought and action.

I think I have shown that, while our burgeoning scientific development is a powerful element at man's disposal, the future of humanity depends on man's behavior and the use he makes of the scientific knowledge at his command. The fate of humanity is therefore in the hands of man himself and will be determined by the decisions taken by the citizens of the universe, by the decisions you yourselves will take. A race is on between education and catastrophe; humanity's lot will be a peaceful one if the citizens, not the experts, want it to be — if you want it to be.

FIFTH SESSION

August 2, 1966 (morning)

In the Chair: MR. JACQUES TORCZYNER (*USA*)

Mr. LAVY M. BECKER presented to the Assembly the recommendations of the Presidium: there must be a strict allotment of time; the speakers should be chosen by their respective delegations; and the discussions should be scheduled according to subject matter. *Approved.*

GENERAL POLITICAL DEBATE II. (continued)

Mr. S. BOLOTOWSKY (*Finland*): I speak for a small community of 1800 souls divided among Helsinki, Abo, and one or two other towns. We affiliated to the World Jewish Congress early on — thirty years ago we realized that the struggle for Jewish rights must be coordinated internationally.

What is it like for Jews to live in a country bordering on the Soviet Union? I will not go into details for obvious reasons. But we are Zionists and dedicated to Israel, and we occasionally have our problems in this regard. Our main problem, however, is education and in this domain I must urge the World Jewish Congress to pay more attention to small Jewish communities. It is now easier than ever before to be a Jew, as Dr. Goldmann pointed out, but we must provide for the next generation and we look to the World Jewish Congress for help in this respect.

Mr. H. CYNOWICZ (*India*): The Jewish community of India — 20,000 in a total population of 450,000,000 — lives in a secular state, where there is no differentiation based on religion, race, or caste. Despite some difficulties we were granted facilities to attend this Plenary Assembly, with the result that for the first time the whole Jewish community of India is officially and formally represented. It is our great pleasure to be with you and to express our wish to stay with you, to develop the relations between world Jewry and our small community, which has existed uninterruptedly and undisturbed for 2000 years, a link in the chain of world Jewry.

The issue of double loyalty is not a problem for the Indian Jewish community; the Jews of India have remained Jews for 2000 years and at the same time are good citizens of the country where they live. The problem of double loyalty is a product of life in Western Europe; the concept is foreign to Asia.

We used to talk about West and East, iron-curtain countries and countries the other side of the said curtain. Today there is a new definition in international life: developing countries and developed countries. On this basis we also must find an approach to Jewish communities. There are Jews living in recently independent developing countries, where their lives are molded by local conditions. It will be necessary for us to tackle the problem of how to help the Jewish communities, small or big, in those countries which are just coming to life and are in the process of developing; there must be an assistance scheme for them in all fields of Jewish life. While Jewish communities in both developed and developing countries have problems in common — financial, cultural, et cetera — these problems must be solved according to the conditions prevailing in the countries where the respective communities live and act.

I am proud to come from a country where every group, small or large, has the freedom to develop its identity and its own institutions to preserve that identity. Russia is a friend of India; therefore I make a special point to stress that I do not see why the Jews in Russia should not have the same freedom as other citizens of that great country.

RABBI Dr. IMRE BENOSCHOFSKY (*Central Board of Hungarian Jews, Observer*): I am very happy to be here with you after such a long time. Following our tradition we thank God when we meet friends we have not seen for many a day. *Baruch shehecheyanu* — blessed be He who gave us life. And life means peace.

After yesterday's remarkable symposium I should like to make a few remarks — not as an expert but only as a Jew.

At the cost of an awful tuition fee in blood and horror, we have learned in the course of the past thirty years or so that anti-Semitism, racial discrimination, oppression, fascism, and war spring from the same root. You cannot wish to avoid the one while not wanting to avoid the other, as they all go hand in hand. If there is anyone who cannot see this plain truth after Auschwitz, he must have been struck with blindness.

In his youthful days Dürnmatt wrote a play set in a small duchy devastated by war. The ruler of the land, having lost his eyesight in battle, does not see that there is virtually no longer a realm to rule over; nor does he know that his own castle lies in ruins. In his blindness he thinks he is still in command of a flourishing land and still residing in a dazzling palace; he takes for his courtiers the gang of hooligans, robbers, and scoundrels that surrounds him.

My friends, those national leaders who in the thirties thought themselves lords of prosperous lands were indeed eyeless. They were stark blind if they could not see that the unpunished murder of an innocent Jewish girl in Danzig was the precursor of violent death for the youth of many a country. They were blind if they could not see that if a single synagogue could be set afire with impunity, then age-old cathedrals and mighty towns would follow. Blind were the priests of the golden calf, who, in the glaring glitter of business and gold, did not even wish to see that they could crush Nazism without bloodshed by acting in time instead of letting this political monster grow until it demanded an immeasurable sacrifice of blood.

Does everyone see well today, or are there still people who are blind and infatuated with mistaken judgment? Has the maxim that peace is one and indivisible, which impressed itself with such gruesome reality upon our minds, already lost its effectiveness? Our globe is becoming smaller and smaller; it is becoming ever more impossible to set one spot of the earth on fire without making us worry for our own house.

You have heard of the words of the Prophet Isaiah on the subject of peace and disarmament. Allow me to tell you a true story from the life of Budapest Jewry. Professor Ignaz Goldziher, the greatest orientalist of his time, was secretary of the Neolog community in Budapest at the beginning of this century. One day he was called on in his office by a gentleman who introduced himself as the chairman of one or another peace league. "It is already two weeks," said the visitor in a reproachful tone, "since we sent you our manifesto on eternal peace, and we haven't yet received any answer to it." Goldziher opened the Bible that lay on his desk, and read aloud the passage from Isaiah: "And they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks; nation must not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore." "You see, sir," said Goldziher, "it is over 2000 years since we sent out our manifesto on eternal peace, and we haven't received an answer to this day! "

I do believe, however, that the time is come when our voice might find an echo in many places, should we raise it for peace and disarmament. We would find a resonance in the souls of all peoples of the world, in the soul of everyone who walks with seeing eyes.

It is not enough to be told that the man who has his finger on the button would very likely think it over a hundred times before a final, fatal gesture let hell loose. The hand must be removed from the vicinity of the push button and the button taken away, out of the easy reach of the hand. The chance for final destruction must be cut off. And should anyone think that war might be confined to relatively small territories and restricted to so-called traditional armaments, then I could only say no and again no! To morality and truth, to fairness and the standard of the Prophets, a small aggressive war is murder still.

Let our manifesto speak to all our brethren living in whatever part of the world, and let it call out to all men of goodwill everywhere. Our tone cannot be too restrained and more diplomatic than, for instance, that of the Vatican. No, our sufferings have taught us to speak out, to cry aloud, to spare not! Let us forewarn as long as we can talk, as long as it is not too late. And let us speak plainly: we have to call things by their real name; evil is evil, murder is the killing of human beings, and aggressive war is blasphemy. We demand a cease-fire in Vietnam and elsewhere, and we want to see every matter of dispute between nations settled by peaceful negotiations. We demand peace and the transformation of the tools of death into instruments of life.

May God have mercy on man heading for disaster! We must and shall be partisans of life. Life must overcome death and catastrophe.

Mr. YEHUDA TYBERG (*USA*): Although I am a member of the American delegation, I am not speaking now in behalf of that delegation; I am speaking to you as a member of Poale Zion in North America.

Having heard Dr. Goldmann, I agree that for technical and organizational reasons the invitation to the German speakers could not be withdrawn at this time; I still do not understand, however, why Dr. Goldmann found it necessary to invite a German to address us in the first place, even if that German be a good one.

The question of Jews and Germans and the problem of Soviet Jewry are very important; our basic problem now, however, is the continued existence of the Jewish people. The great challenges to this existence are the geopolitical threat to Israel and the danger of assimilation in the *gola*. It is this basic problem that deserves the attention of this Assembly.

Mr. MAURICE PORTER (*South African Jewish Board of Deputies, Fraternal Delegate*): The Jewish community of the Republic of South Africa numbers about 120,000 persons, representing less than 4% of the total white population. Recent demographic statistics reveal that the Jewish population is increasing at only half the rate of the general white population. This is attributable to various causes, but the fact remains that between 1950 and 1960 the Jewish community grew from about 108,000 to only 116,000.

Jews participate in all aspects of the country's life — economic, cultural, social, and political. They are well represented in commerce, industry, the professions, the judiciary, public life, the student body at universities, literature, journalism, and the arts. Indeed, it is our proud boast that while we maintain a well-organized and vigorous Jewish group life, we are fully integrated into the general South African community.

It is the declared policy of the government to strengthen the spirit of unity between all sections of the white population. Happily we have

put long behind us that unfortunate chapter in the country's history when anti-Semitism was a feature of political life. The National Party, which has been in power since 1948, has ever since then honored its pledge to remove the "Jewish issue" from the political life of the country. From time to time, especially in recent years, public discussion and controversy relating to the Jewish community have suddenly flared up, revealing dormant or suppressed tensions. On the whole, however, anti-Semitism has not been a serious problem, and the normally good relationship between the Jewish community and all other sections has remained relatively undisturbed.

Most of our problems in public relations arise directly or indirectly from the overriding problem confronting South Africa: the relations between the white and nonwhite inhabitants. Let me remind you of the statistics, which in themselves dramatically highlight the problem: of a total population of about 18,000,000, whites constitute just under 4,000,000; Bantu (Blacks), 12,000,000; Coloreds, 1,750,000; and Asians, 500,000.

Social and political differentiation between whites and nonwhites has been for many generations the traditional South African policy in regard to race relations. This policy has been given sharper focus and definition under what was formerly described as "apartheid" and now as "separate development." The country is far from unanimous in its attitude to this policy, and vigorous criticism of its principles and of its application is frequently heard. The National Party government, however, is determined to carry out its policy of separate development; there are unmistakable signs of the government's desire to lessen the influence and strength of the opposition.

In this atmosphere, criticism and attacks directed against South Africa — especially at the United Nations — have often been received with strong resentment in the country. The government of South Africa showed itself particularly sensitive when, a few years ago, Israel closely identified itself with the Afro-Asian bloc in these attacks. After a period of confused public discussion, our prime minister made it clear that South African Jewry could not be held accountable for Israel's policies and that Israel's votes at the United Nations should not become the cause of anti-Jewish feeling in South Africa itself. As a result, however, the official policy towards Israel has changed from the former attitude of close friendship and has resulted in the imposition of restrictions on the transfer of funds to Israel. Nevertheless, I believe that there is a growing understanding in South Africa of the factors that have influenced Israeli policy and that neither government wishes to exacerbate relations between the two countries or to embarrass the Jewish community.

Within the Jewish community there has been both support and criticism of the Israeli votes at the United Nations. The South African

Zionist Federation and the Board of Deputies issued a joint statement reaffirming the loyalty and exclusive political allegiance of South African Jewry to South Africa. At the same time the declaration reaffirmed the religious, cultural, and historical ties linking the Jews of South Africa to the Holy Land and proclaimed the fervent desire for the continued association of South African Jews with the work of Jewish redemption and rehabilitation.

Another problem that from time to time has caused us concern is the dissemination of propaganda — open or covert — aimed at smearing Jews as Communists. A good deal of this propaganda, reflecting the ideology of the extreme right, seems to come from abroad. There is a genuine, strong anti-Communist trend in the country, and it is not surprising that anti-Semites should want to take advantage of it for their own purposes. The Jewish community has issued repeated warnings that the anti-Communist campaign should not be used as a cover for anti-Semitic machinations. Our task in this regard has not been made easier by the fact that a number of Jews have indeed been detained or prosecuted under the various laws relating to subversion and the propagation of Communism. While they constitute a mere handful, the proportion of Jews to non-Jews involved in such illegal activities is rather high.

I now come to the attitude of the Jewish community to the racial policies of South Africa. The overwhelming majority of the members of the South African Jewish community — regardless of their own personal views on apartheid — agree that the community as such cannot and should not present a collective viewpoint on the subject. We have always adhered to the principle that on general public issues affecting all citizens — as opposed to specifically Jewish issues — the Jews do not act as a group. We have, however, formally and publicly urged “every Jewish citizen to make his individual contribution in accordance with the teaching and precepts of Judaism towards the promotion of understanding, goodwill, and cooperation between the various races, peoples, and groups in South Africa and towards the achievement of a peaceful and secure future for all the inhabitants of the country, based on the principles of justice and the dignity of the individual.”

We would ask fellow Jews in other parts of the world who may be critical of the situation in South Africa to exercise moderation and restraint and to endeavor to acquaint themselves fully with the factual situation in which the white man in South Africa — and the Jewish community, as an integral part of the white population — find themselves.

I am happy to say that South African Jews continue their efforts to strengthen Jewish life and to preserve a vital Jewish community. We have made great progress in education, with a network of Jewish day schools that bears comparison with any other Western country.

Living in a complex country in this dangerous age, we are trying to play our part worthily both as citizens and as Jews.

Dr. WOLFGANG APT (*Bolivia*): My small community feels privileged and honored to address this Assembly and participate in the analysis of the problems faced by the Jewish people today. It is only logical to consider the present situation and the projectives of the World Jewish Congress, and Dr. Goldmann has shown us that some fundamental changes are necessary. We must inject new ideas and young blood into our activities in order to succeed in our aims.

To attempt to maintain the unity of the Jewish people on the basis of such things as racial persecution is not in keeping with the times. What is called for is an objective analysis of current problems and of indications for the future, without, however, forgetting the past and its lessons.

A number of distinguished speakers among us have referred to the Jewish-German problem. Although it can be said that the new generation, lacking firsthand acquaintance with the Nazi period, is least qualified to speak on this subject, it is precisely for this reason that the new generation might be able to analyze the problems objectively in the light of today's situation. In no way does this mean to forget the Nazi atrocities; but emotions should not allow us to lose sight of higher interests — political, social, and economic — concerning all of Jewry and the State of Israel in particular. Dialogue must constitute the basis of the analysis of any problem. Rather than avoid reality, we should confront it, analyze it, and draw from it the conclusions necessary for pursuing our goals.

Mr. JEAN NORDMANN (*Switzerland*): I have the honor of conveying to the Assembly the cordial greetings and wishes of the Swiss delegation. The Union of Swiss Jewish Communities, firmly convinced of the imperative need of the Jewish people for an address and an official tribune, has always been an ardent supporter of the World Jewish Congress. The World Jewish Congress was founded on democratic principles, in opposition to *shtadlanut* — that benevolent paternalism that made the lives of the poor depend on the intervention of the rich. These democratic principles, by the way, are well known to us, as they are the basis of the Swiss Confederation.

We fervently support a coordination of all vital spiritual and material forces in favor of world peace. But in the forefront of our special concerns we place the struggle against all the reactionary, antidemocratic, and neo-Nazi forces that are appearing just about everywhere, but especially north of our border. We are not in agreement with Dr. Goldmann in this regard; we cannot dismiss these reactionary maneuvers, which express themselves not only in tiny parties or unimportant groups but even in the major parties, which mold and control public opinion.

Every day we read of new proof of this latent anti-Semitism — and it is not only a matter of desecrated cemeteries. A few days ago the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* cited the case of a *Schulrat* in Baden-Württemberg who, at the moment of his promotion to *Oberschulrat*, was discovered to have been an overseer at Auschwitz. He is a typical example of a certain intellectual element in Germany whose members still occupy university chairs and devote their studies to eugenics research. In the cultural field, the *New York Times* several days ago reported that the Oberammergau Passion Play would be continued with the old text — deep-seatedly anti-Semitic — despite the Second Vatican Council's Declaration on the Jews. We hope, by the way, that the principles announced by the Council will be translated into action in the very near future.

On the other hand, we cannot approve an attitude of scorn toward the German language, which, we must not forget, was not only the language of *Mein Kampf* and the *Stürmer* but also of Lessing, Goethe, Heine, Kafka, Buber, and Rosenzweig.

RABBI ARTHUR J. LELYVELD (USA): I would like to share with you some reflections on last night's symposium on peace and disarmament. It seems to me that we had a dramatic demonstration of our dilemma: as the three brilliant speakers were presenting their papers, more and more people left the room until finally only a tiny group was left to hear the experts' dire warnings. If the leadership of the Congress chose this subject and placed it first on the agenda, it was because it is one of the central problems of our time.

I would like to express my deep satisfaction with Dr. Goldmann's statement at the opening session. He told us that in this world of revolutionary change we could not be parochial and that we must engage in rigid and penetrating self-analysis. I have just come from a fruitful dialogue in Rehovot where Israelis and Americans attempted to define the nature of Jewish distinctiveness in our time. During the three days of conversation it became apparent to me that something was lacking in our discussions. We talked about affinities between Jewish culture and segments of contemporary world culture; we talked about confrontation between Israel and the communities in the *tfutza*. But we did not speak sufficiently on how to share with the rest of mankind the situation in which we found ourselves. For better or for worse, we are in the world, and the bomb would fall on Jew and non-Jew alike.

As the three speakers last night made terrifyingly clear, we are living in a world confronted by the ultimate threat: that of the total extinction of mankind. The concept of ultimate threat can be met only by that of ultimate demand, which in Jewish experience has been the demand for *kiddush hachayim*, the demand that all of life be made holy. Life, and not peace, is the supreme value according to Jewish thought. Life is the principal manifestation of all that we call divine.

Whatever depreciates human life depreciates divinity. If you despise your fellowman, know Whom you are despising.

Life can be taken, in our tradition, only in order to preserve life or to protect human dignity. Anything else is *chamas* — cruel violence — which, like the cruelty of Shimon and Levi, is unforgivable. Modern mass warfare is in the category of *chamas*, because it inevitably depreciates life — it destroys truth, it enthrones expediency, it brutalizes the young men who must wage it, and it employs with increasing acceptance such techniques as the use of napalm and obliteration bombing. If this can be said of nonnuclear warfare, then the use of nuclear weapons is certainly the ultimate sacrilege.

With the introduction of new techniques and capacities in warfare that have no precedent in the entire experience of mankind, all of the old terminology is archaic. When Lord Ritchie-Calder spoke of nuclear gobbledygook he might have added that war and peace are words that today have doubtful communication value. A nuclear exchange, which will annihilate almost instantaneously over 200,000,000 people whose only role is that of being there, cannot be called war with any continuity of meaning. And a situation of perpetually poised nuclear threat cannot be called peace. This is an aspect of what David Riesman has called “the discontinuity created by the atom.”

The very first obliteration bombing of an entire community from the air took place in 1937, when the Nazis bombed Guernica. Many of us are old enough to remember the worldwide protest with which that act of *chamas* was received, the public outrage at this action by fascist brutes. During World War Two, obliteration bombing was practiced by the democratic Allied forces and was accepted as expedient and necessary. In 1945 — only eight years after Guernica — the atom bomb was used on Hiroshima and on Nagasaki, and it was received by most of the Western world with relative equanimity.

We Jews must recognize as a people that ultimate demand speaks to us differently than it did to our grandfathers, who were cut off from the larger world. The only task that lay within their competence and capacity as Jews was to be faithful, to observe the 613 mitzvot, and to practice — as far as they could — *kiddush hachayim* and *kiddush hashem* in their relations with the world. They could pray for peace, but in practical terms they could do nothing about it. The quarrels of kings and princes, the violence and the cruelty, the subjection of human beings — this was part of the world of the goyim, to which our grandfathers had no access.

We, in contrast, are part of the larger world. We participate in destiny and in responsibility, along with all other men, and the larger context must be apparent to us in all our discussions as Jews. This is why the organization of which I have the honor to be president, the

American Jewish Congress, has not hesitated to raise its voice in direct and vigorous analysis of America's foreign policy.

The Jewish people, united and aware of its role, can today more than ever contribute to the salvation of mankind. For this reason I hail Dr. Goldmann for having made so trenchantly clear in his opening address the place we occupy in this ever present larger context.

Mr. BERNARDO OLESKER (*Uruguay*): First of all I would like to state from this platform that we owe a debt of thanks to Uruguay for the attitude it has adopted on several matters concerning the Jewish people. The government, press, and people of Uruguay strongly protested against the anti-Israel and anti-Semitic implications of declarations of the Tricontinental Conference in Havana. As a further example of the attitude of my country, I would recall the rousing welcome accorded to the President of the State of Israel, Zalman Shazar, during his state visit to Uruguay.

We in Uruguay are aware of the great changes taking place in Jewish life and we realize that we must adapt ourselves to new concepts and new situations. In our country we have two main problems before us: Jewish education and work in favor of Israel, both of which are closely connected. At present, 20% of our children attend Jewish schools; we do not consider this enough, however, and feel that there is still a long way to go. We must find adequate forms of Jewish education to reach the new generation; we must find appropriate ways and means of making ourselves understood to them.

JUDGE SERGIO PIPERNO (*Italy*): The first of the two problems I would take up as a representative of Italian Jewry is the relations between Jews and Arabs. I do not think that the two peoples can be brought together on political and material grounds alone. We must not forget that Judaism had a very considerable influence on the moral, religious, and juridical concepts of Islam. Similarly, from the tenth to the thirteenth century, under Arab influence, important aspects of Jewish thought, philosophy, law, and religious practice were clearly defined, a notable example being found in the works of Maimonides.

One can discern a trend toward developing the consciousness of these common origins and this historical and cultural identification. This consciousness could well be the key to peace between Arabs and Jews, based on a new understanding of the Middle East makeup.

I have just described the ideal basis for a reconciliation between Jews and Arabs. There is also the question of the appropriate action to take on the political level. In an article published last Friday by the widely read Italian magazine, *Epoca*, an eminent political correspondent, Vittorio Goresio, notes that Nasser seems to be able to get away with anything — including his brazen threats to Israel and his use of poison gas in Yemen — because of the recent oil discoveries in Egypt. Mr. Goresio wonders why the Jews of the United States and Europe

have remained silent in the face of Nasser's excesses instead of bringing pressure to bear by means of their votes or through the fact that many newspaper editors and journalists are Jewish. Nor does he understand why the numerous Jewish members of Western Communist parties, where they often occupy important positions, do not induce their parties to intimate that Moscow stop furnishing arms to Nasser. He points out that today Moscow needs the support of the Western Communist parties and that such an appeal would not go unheeded.

I do not know whether or not this is the best way to proceed. In any event, I can tell you that during the past few days, Italian Jews have sent hundreds of letters dealing with Soviet Jewry to the ambassador of the USSR in Italy, with copy to the secretary of the Italian Communist Party, who has replied with assurances that he has discussed the matter with the Soviet ambassador.

The other matter I want to treat is the Vatican Council's Declaration on the Jews, which for obvious reasons is of particular importance to Italian Jewry. Without judging the vicissitudes that accompanied the preparation of the declaration, we should give credit to all men of goodwill who, surmounting obvious obstacles, worked for the approval of the document.

The Council took important decisions on numerous problems relating to the Roman Catholic Church itself and to its relations with the non-Catholic world. The Declaration on the Jews must be seen in this larger context and in the framework of the far-reaching program of activities that we are sure will ensue from the various declarations. In confronting the problems of the modern world, which are common to all peoples and religions, the Church means to make its contribution to human welfare, physical and spiritual liberty, and peace. In this light the Declaration on the Jews acquires a special meaning and represents a milestone in the relations between the Church and the Jews. These relations have often been painful for the Jews, but we hope that the declarations of the Vatican Council will be an important contribution to mutual understanding and universal peace among all God's children.

Mr. BEINESH EPSTEIN (USA): There are times when one cannot keep silent, and this is one of them. Just as I opposed the indemnification agreements with Germany so do I oppose the German-Jewish symposium at this Assembly. For the heirs of the victims of Auschwitz to sit down, two decades after the holocaust, with the heirs of Hitler is not only an offense against morality but a political mistake. Dr. Goldmann tells us that it is not a question of forgiving or forgetting. Leaving this kind of *pilpul* aside, I will say that anything that can be interpreted — by the world and especially by our children — as reconciliation with the Germans will undermine our political position, which rests on our moral strength. This symposium will be interpreted as a go-ahead to play up to Germany because she is rich and

powerful. How can we ask our children to make sacrifices so that Judaism can continue, when we ourselves engage in such self-defeating activity?

SIR BARNETT JANNER, MP (*Board of Deputies of British Jews, Fraternal Delegate*): On behalf of my delegation I wish to congratulate the World Jewish Congress on its very successful work in the past and on the success of this Assembly. I would like to pay public tribute to Dr. Goldmann for his personal services to the Jewish people and the esteem in which he is held by statesmen throughout the world.

If Israel depends for its survival upon the Jews of the world, the reverse is also true. The prosperity of Israel is one of the most important – if not *the* most important – factors in Jewish life. The achievements and prestige of Israel in the world invaluable reflect on all Jews.

I would like to say a word about Jewish education. One of our complaints against the Soviet Union is that she refuses to allow her young Jews to be educated in Judaism and in Jewishness. What right have we to make this accusation, we who have for many years neglected the proper Jewish education of our youth? If our youth is not Jewish-minded it is not their fault but ours. In Britain we have realized the importance of educating our young people from infancy upwards. In Jewish day schools they are provided with the best secular and Jewish and Zionist education. Why cannot the whole Jewish world direct its thinking sufficiently towards this essential education? I am glad to state that a few weeks ago in Geneva we decided that we must train the requisite number of teachers capable of assisting the rest of the Jewish world to rear the young generation to be Jewish in the true sense of the word.

Let me now turn to another aspect, namely, genocide. In the face of legal difficulties, Britain has not yet acceded to the Genocide Convention; we have, however, now managed to get our government to accept at least that the principles of the convention merit adoption. On a related question, I am told that in connection with the war crimes trials currently taking place in Germany, insufficient funds are provided to cover the costs of more effective legal representation for the Jewish communities. If this is so, we should raise this matter with the Powers.

I want to conclude by thanking the youth of my country – particularly the university students – for their effective efforts in favor of our Russian brethren.

Mr. B.Z. KATZENELBOGEN (*Israel*): The most important issue facing the Jewish people – and therefore the World Jewish Congress – today is that of Soviet Jewry. Our clear and unceasing call to the Soviet rulers must be: let my people go!

We have heard reports of the alarming rate of assimilation in various countries of the Diaspora. The World Jewish Congress must summon all

its forces to deal with this problem and mobilize all the Jewish organizations to stem this assimilation, to which we are losing a third of our people. In this regard I salute all the Jewish schools — be they Zionist, Lubavitcher, or Bundist — for the primary task is to preserve the Jewish spirit.

I have heard Bourguiba spoken of as if he were a tzaddik. Bourguiba, with his so-called moderation, is no less of a threat to the State of Israel than is Nasser — and perhaps even more so.

As for the symposium with the Germans, our youth does not understand subtleties; they will not see the difference between a friendly dialogue and a dialogue whose purpose is not to forget. The example set by the World Jewish Congress in holding such a dialogue will only contribute to the moral corruption of our youth.

We must fight against the revival of Nazism in Germany and Austria and in particular against the shamefully light sentences and acquittals that are being accorded to Nazi criminals in those countries.

Dr. SAMUEL MALAMUD (*Brazil*): I think that in his opening speech Dr. Goldmann presented a fair analysis of the Jewish situation in the world today. Jewish history has always been full of contrasts, with some communities living in peace and others being persecuted; until emancipation they all, however, lived in isolation. The fight for emancipation and equal rights has been successfully fought, and Jewish national independence has been achieved.

The Jews of the Soviet Union are indeed subject to discrimination, and we must continue to fight on their behalf. But, by the very fact of their being singled out, they will remain Jews and someday may even be able to go on *aliya*. As we know only too well, the Jews in the other communities of the Diaspora are faced with the danger of assimilation. Israel, beset by myriad problems relating to her existence as a state, cannot today assure the continuity of Jewish life in the Diaspora; she has not yet become the spiritual center envisaged by Aḥad Ha'am. Nor has Jewish leadership in the Diaspora itself been able to ensure this continuity.

Along with the rest of the world in this technical era, we suffer from a lack of creative leadership. Our Jewish communal structures, relics for the most part from our countries of origin in Eastern Europe, are outmoded. We are losing our youth, which is confused by the many voices claiming to represent the interests of the Jewish community. We sorely need unity in each of our communities, and the World Jewish Congress must see to it that the communal structures are conducive to this unity, both within the communities and on the international level.

The issue of double loyalty can become crucial only during times of unrest. In our loyalty toward the countries where we live and toward the Jewish people, we are firm champions of peace among all peoples.

In the tasks I have referred to, it would be productive for the World

Jewish Congress to work in close cooperation with the World Zionist Organization.

Dr. E. MINKOWSKI (*World OSE Union*): As a delegate of the World OSE Union I would like to reaffirm our active and loyal attachment to the World Jewish Congress.

I feel that we should go ahead with the German-Jewish symposium, not only because the decision to hold the dialogue has already been made, but because we should have confidence in Dr. Goldmann's initiatives. I was deeply moved by Mrs. Grosman's words. Of course it is out of the question to forget the unforgettable or forgive the unforgivable; but to live in permanent rancor is no solution either. Life continues, and commercial, diplomatic, and political factors dress wounds more rapidly than do the heart and the mind. Yet the mind seeks its expression as well. Relations between Germans and Jews should be seen in the broader human context; in this dialogue it is the human element that must make itself felt. From my considerable experience with indemnification matters I can tell you that, while there are Germans who are sorry that we are still around, there are other Germans who have rendered greater service to the cause of indemnification than perhaps we have ourselves. These are men who are motivated by goodwill. Such men exist throughout the world, and we must reach out to them.

Mr. BERNARD HARKAVY (*USA*): This is my first visit to Brussels since the Second World War, when as a member of the American armed forces I witnessed the havoc, murder, and terror wrought by the Nazis. I am sure that all of us, regardless of other differences we may have, are united in the feeling that we will never forgive or forget the Nazis and what they did.

Listening to the discussion on peace and disarmament last night, I was proud that the World Jewish Congress had seen fit to raise this issue. Our active involvement is all the more urgent in the light of increasing right-wing and racist activity. We must take part in the fight for peace, social justice, and equality; this is part of our tradition and it is also necessary in order to win our youth and our intellectuals, and for the very survival of Jewish life.

Dr. SEMTOB D. SEQUERRA (*Portugal*): In the name of the eminent president of our community, Professor Moses Amzalak, I bring you the fraternal greetings of Portuguese Jewry. Today containing a small Jewish community of 650 souls, Portugal during the course of history has played an important role in Jewish life. Jews contributed to the creation of Portugal more than eight centuries ago; later on, the Jews of my country, together with those of Spain, produced a glorious period of Jewish literature and science. During the Second World War Portugal received thousands of Jews fleeing from Nazism, and our

community, with the material assistance of the Joint and HICEM, was able to help them.

We were most pleased to hear Dr. Goldmann's remarks on the particularly dangerous problem of assimilation. We raised this problem as far back as the Montreux Assembly in 1948, when anti-Semitism had long since disappeared in Portugal and the danger of assimilation had already begun to be felt. Anti-Semitism is an open enemy, uniting the Jews in their misfortune. Assimilation is the crafty, attractive enemy; it separates Jews from one another, to the extent of cutting them off from all our problems.

One of the most effective means of fighting assimilation is to develop really Jewish education. Effective Jewish education can even sometimes assure the continuity of Judaism in mixed marriages, unfortunately so widespread. The World Jewish Congress must therefore seriously consider the question of teachers of Judaism.

Mr. SIMHA FLAPAN (*International Union of Mapam Parties*): I would like to congratulate the Congress for including the problem of peace and disarmament on the Assembly's agenda and on the participation of such important speakers, who presented the problem clearly and authoritatively.

The survival and continuity of the Jewish people and its national center, the State of Israel, are directly tied in with the problem of peace in the world. Similarly, Israel's genuine security will not be assured without a peace settlement with her neighbors. The Jewish people, divided between the great-power blocs — with the State of Israel in the center of the region in which these blocs are in conflict — would be the first and surest victim of a new war. Therefore the simple instinct for survival commands us to involve ourselves fully in the struggle for peace.

We must fight for peace in all regions of the world, Vietnam included. Israel must join the states demanding an end to the bombings, for peace is indivisible. Israel must realize that at stake in Vietnam are a number of principles upon which our own struggle is based and that, in opposing the war, she would give the lie to the false charge that she is an imperialist tool. To those who reply that Israel should not take sides, I would say: there is no neutrality between peace and war. Governmental opposition to the war has come from the West as well as from the East, from unaligned countries, and from the American people itself. Jewish involvement in the struggle to halt the war is a reflection of a profound and traditional Jewish feeling.

Our concern for peace must also obligate us to absolute opposition to nuclear armament. Can a people that was a victim of genocide do otherwise than completely reject a genocidal weapon? The balance of nuclear terror employed by the great powers would certainly not be an effective deterrent in the small and volatile region that is the Middle

East. Therefore, the statement of Prime Minister Eshkol and Foreign Minister Eban that Israel will not be the first state to introduce nuclear arms into the region is to be welcomed; a similar attitude on the part of the Arab states is necessary in order to bring about the bilateral denuclearization of the Middle East that is essential for the future of the area. Such an agreement could lead to negotiations to limit or cease the conventional arms race as well.

A denuclearization agreement could be a turning point in Israel-Arab relations, today undergoing important changes. There is reason to believe that a moderate and realistic trend is making itself felt, in varying degrees, in some Arab countries. And in Israel we are in the process of freeing ourselves from a fatalistic attitude that has precluded an active peace policy; furthermore, the Arabs of Israel, viewed in the past as a security danger, are now coming to be regarded as a positive factor in the life of the country and a potential bridge for peace. Of course, as the events on the Syrian frontier and President Nasser's militant speeches show us, the road to peace is long and difficult. Also, the problems to be solved remain complicated and require a new intellectual effort: we must remember that even Bourguiba insists on the rights of the refugees.

It is unfortunate that it was not possible to realize the planned Arab-Jewish dialogue at this time. I can assure you that the idea found a deep echo among Arab intellectuals. The World Jewish Congress, being an independent public body, could contribute a great deal to this undertaking.

Dr. ELIEZER TENEMBAUM (*Argentina*): Listening to Dr. Goldmann's call for new priorities — a call with which I am in full agreement — I was struck by the fact that the majority of the delegates assembled here — whom I respect greatly — have gray hair. Where is the youth; where is the generation from thirty to forty years of age? Where are the young intellectuals, lawyers, engineers? Did they simply not come, or have we pushed them aside? I am sure that there is no such thing as indifference to Jewish problems on the part of youth and intellectuals. These problems, however, must be presented and treated in a positive and modern way, in the spirit of the new generation. And we must teach the new generation through our own example.

Dr. A. SELIKOWITZ (*Norway*): Of the prewar Norwegian Jewish population of 1150, only 400 were able to flee to Sweden and thereby escape death at the hands of the Nazis. Our community today numbers 950, Norway having accepted 700 displaced persons in 1947. We have excellent relations with our government, which contributes financially to a number of international Jewish organizations and has outlawed racial discrimination.

Our community is well-organized, and we contribute to international Jewish causes as far as our means allow. We are in close contact with

the Swedish Section of the World Jewish Congress, which has been very helpful to us in carrying out our work.

Mr. MOSHE EREM, MK (*Israel*): Not for the first time, Dr. Goldmann has expressed to us his optimism on the subjects of anti-Semitism, the revival of fascism, and the economic situation of the Jews.

It is difficult to be optimistic about anti-Semitism when one reads the findings of a sociological study recently carried out by the University of California at Berkeley: the study revealed that not a few American Christians see the Jews as holding too much power and that even more think that enough has been said about the dangers of Nazism and that the Jews should drop the subject. And this is in the United States, not Germany.

In Germany the National Democrats won 2% of the votes in the 1965 general elections. This year they received 10% of the votes in Bavaria. The West German labor movement only two months ago warned against a repetition of 1933. It would seem that the West German labor movement is much less optimistic about these developments than the president of the World Jewish Congress. Germany has in the recent past proven itself to be a danger to world peace; especially in light of the current political developments in that country, the World Jewish Congress should mobilize all its forces lest that danger repeat itself.

As for the economic position of the Jews in the world today, our friends from Argentina can say a thing or two about the transitory nature of this position.

One more comment, if I may — I find it depressing to note the extensive use of English and French at our sessions. While I do not wish to ostracize any language I do feel that we are showing a lack of respect for the basis of our culture, that is, the national languages of the Jewish people.

SIXTH SESSION

August 2, 1966 (afternoon)

In the Chair: ING. GREGORIO FAIGON (*Argentina*)

GENERAL POLITICAL DEBATE III. (continued)

Dr. CARLOS BENARROCH (*Spain*): I bring you the fraternal greetings of the Jewish communities of Spain, a country which has had an indelible influence on Jewish culture. This is the first time that the Jewish communities of Spain, which are in the process of reestablishing and reorganizing themselves, are represented at a Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress; it is a momentous occasion for us. We are an eloquent symbol of the historic destiny of the Jewish people, whose survival, for so long under attack, will never be denied. We are convinced that all of us must fight – individually and collectively – to defend our Jewish identity. This is why we are here.

Ing. GREGORIO FAIGON, CHAIRMAN: The problem of Soviet Jewry, with which the World Jewish Congress has been dealing for some time now, is of great importance. We have asked Dr. Levenberg to introduce the subject, and discussion will follow.

Dr. S. LEVENBERG (*Chairman, International Affairs Commission, World Jewish Congress*): When on Sunday Dr. Goldmann compared the situation of world Jewry thirty years ago with that of today, he did not apply this comparison to the situation of Soviet Jewry then and now. I therefore reread Dr. Goldmann's speech at the 1936 Assembly and found that, unfortunately, his comments on Soviet Jewry are just as applicable today, thirty years later, as they were then.

We must have the courage to admit that, despite some amelioration here and there, very little has been achieved toward improving the lot of Soviet Jewry; the overall picture is just as serious now as it was then. That there are empty seats here where the USSR delegation should be sitting is a symbol and a reminder of that tragic problem. Having lost a third of our people during the Second World War, we now find ourselves cut off from an additional 25%. How then can we speak of ourselves as a normal people? Imagine the difference that the presence of our Russian brethren would have made in this Assembly, in the

development of Israel, indeed in the whole Jewish scene. It is sufficient only to recall the great achievements of Russian Jewry in the past — in the Jewish national movement, in the Jewish workers' movement, in the revival of Hebrew and Yiddish literature — whose impact is felt in every aspect of Jewish development today.

Let us consider the situation objectively. There are over 3,000,000 Jews in the USSR, out of a population of 230,000,000. They are not at home, they do not have a territory of their own, they are dispersed throughout the USSR; in a country which is a union of republics this creates a special problem, not only for the Jews but for the Soviet authorities as well. It is not only a religious problem, as some claim, but also cultural, political, and related to the specific socioeconomic structure of Soviet Jewry. It is a very complicated problem. In addition, Soviet Jewry does not constitute one single entity, but several entities. There is the tragic case of the 300,000–400,000 Jews who were absorbed into the USSR with the annexation of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Moldavia, and western Ukraine and Byelorussia as a result of the war. They had received a Jewish education, spoke Yiddish and Hebrew, had been brought up on Jewish tradition, and felt a bond with the Jewish people and the Land of Israel. There are also over 250,000 Sephardi Jews in the Central Asian Republics and Georgia. These communities have been in existence for 2000 years and they still keep such customs as bar mitzvah and weddings as in the past; but today they have no schools, no yeshivot, and they risk losing their Jewishness.

There have been a number of attempts to solve the Jewish problem in the USSR — all unsuccessful: the territorial experiment in Birobidzhan; the attempt at voluntary assimilation through the Yevsektzia; even the black years of Stalin's terror, culminating in the murder of prominent Jewish writers and leaders. At present there is an attempt at compulsory assimilation, but that too is bound to fail, as it only serves to engender Jewish resistance.

I doubt very much that Jewish life as it existed in the past could be revived. We should nevertheless strive for any improvement, however minimal — even *Sovietish Heymland*, which is widely criticized, is a positive achievement. We should also fight for more Jews to be allowed to leave the USSR for other countries, Israel in particular; for even if some liberalization were to occur in the Soviet Union, one of its by-products might well be increased anti-Semitism.

In the USSR there are great differences between the constitution and laws, between official propaganda and the bitter realities of daily life. Theoretically the Jewish position is not too bad; in fact it is much worse. Other religions in the USSR are allowed contacts with their coreligionists abroad; why, then, are there empty seats where the Soviet delegation to this Assembly should be? Internally the situation is even worse: there is no umbrella organization for the various Jewish

communities, and no cooperation among them is possible. Each Jew is on his own. Jews, as opposed to other nationalities in the USSR, have no official representation on the Soviet of Nationalities; and although some 2,000,000 Soviet Jews were murdered by the Nazis, there are no memorials and no meetings are held in their memory.

Of course, anti-Semitism exists in many countries, not only in the USSR. But in the Soviet Union it is impossible for Jews, as an entity, to fight it. Official Soviet condemnation of anti-Semitism in the country is very rare. In fact, in new official editions of the works of Lenin and Gorki that appeared a few months ago, every speech and article in which they had condemned anti-Semitism was left out.

We must conduct our campaign for Soviet Jewry on a number of levels — diplomatic, parliamentary, and specifically Jewish; for cultural, national, and religious rights and the right to emigrate. We must reject the accusations that our struggle is part of the cold war: neither Bertrand Russell nor the Communist parties in Britain, France, and Italy can be accused of being stooges of imperialism, yet they all have condemned in one way or another the Soviet policy in relation to the Jews.

Mr. SALOMON FRIEDRICH (*World Union of Tnuat HaHerut Hatzohar*): Our position is neither anti-Soviet nor imperialist; it is simply a Jewish position. In fact, if anyone gave the world an example of how to fight imperialism and colonialism, it was the Jews in their struggle to achieve national independence in Israel.

We should not treat Soviet anti-Semitism differently from anti-Semitism in Argentina, Germany, or anywhere else; and Jewish leaders are mistaken in stifling public protest and demonstrations against the USSR on the grounds that this is a delicate diplomatic situation requiring special care.

What is sorely needed in the Soviet Union is Jewish education and culture. And the rights of Soviet Jews to have contacts with Jews abroad and to emigrate to Israel must be insisted on.

It is unfortunate that there is going to be a German-Jewish dialogue under the auspices of the World Jewish Congress. In some circles it is implied that the Jews are out to “rehabilitate” Germany. It is time that we pointed out, especially to the Soviet Union, that there are sixty ex-Nazis in the East German parliament. Mr. Ulbricht made some very strong anti-Israel statements during his visit to Cairo, where there is a marriage of ex-Nazis and Soviet weapons with the aim of annihilating Israel. This we must protest.

We must cooperate with the true enemies of racism and anti-Semitism so that we can combat the two phenomena more effectively, wherever they may occur.

Mr. ITZHAK KORN (*Israel*): We must be clear and realistic in our approach to the Soviet leaders. They must realize that our aim is not to

undermine their rule and they must understand the basic fact that world Jewry considers the 3,500,000 Jews in the USSR as an integral part of the Jewish people. I fail to understand why the Soviet authorities feel the need to obliterate the Jewish identity of our brethren there. Such a policy is certainly not necessary for the existence of a Communist regime, as is shown in the case of Rumania and other Communist countries. Unless Moscow follows their example the national, religious, and cultural survival of Soviet Jewry will continue to be in serious danger.

In the case of the Armenians, the Soviet authorities have applied genuine "Zionist" methods in order to persuade Armenians living abroad to return to the Armenian SSR; they have also sent Armenian emissaries and teachers to Armenian communities abroad. The German minority in the USSR enjoys the full cultural life of a minority, with German-language schools, theater, and press. The Jews are asking for nothing more than to be granted the same rights, to which they are constitutionally entitled.

The Soviet authorities claim that there is no Jewish problem in the USSR; how, then, can they explain why young Jews, born and bred in the Soviet Union, are so emotionally involved with and eager to acquire anything Jewish. The mere fact that every Jew has the word *Yevrey* in his internal passport is not enough — they are culturally, nationally, and religiously part of the Jewish people, and we call upon Moscow to let them remain Jewish.

Mrs. RAYA JAGLOM (*Women's International Zionist Organization (WIZO)*): It is my privilege and pleasure to address you on behalf of the first world WIZO delegation at a Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress.

Dr. Goldmann said that a problem can either be ignored or discussed and dealt with, and I am sure that his motivation has always been to try to solve dangerous problems to which the Jewish people is exposed. Why, then, was the question of Soviet Jewry taken off the agenda of this Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress? Dr. Goldmann certainly cannot naively believe that by removing this vital item from the agenda he can obtain a positive result from the Soviet government. The absence of this subject will certainly please the Soviet authorities, in view of their claim that there is no Jewish problem in the USSR. But what about the Jews in the Soviet Union — will they not feel let down by such an act on the part of the World Jewish Congress?

I respect every ideological system in which human beings believe. If Jews in the USSR subscribe to Communism and are happy with that system, so be it; but why the fear of the Jewish minority having its own Jewish rights, even as Communists? Why deprive those who want to remain Jewish of the possibility to participate in Jewish religious tradition, culture, and education? How can Dr. Goldmann state that

the individual Soviet Jewish citizen is not persecuted, is not denied his political rights, his economic existence, or the possibilities of participating in the academic, scientific, cultural, and artistic life of the country? I most humbly suggest, as I have done previously, that Dr. Goldmann go to Russia and speak to individual Jews and ask *them*, instead of believing the Soviet authorities and their ambassadors, who obviously spread their information through many channels.

The problem of Soviet Jewry having been removed from the agenda of this Assembly, at least there should be a resolution asking the Soviet government in the strongest terms possible to allow those Jews in the USSR who wish to remain Jews — religiously, culturally, or nationally — to do so, and to allow those who want to be reunited with their families in Israel and elsewhere to emigrate and join those from whom they were torn away by the horrors of the last war.

Let this distinguished gathering of world Jewry give the Jewish masses in the Soviet Union the feeling of hope and strength that they so much need and expect of us.

Mr. JOEL CANG (*World Federation of Polish Jews*): If we want to analyze seriously and objectively the problem of Soviet Jewry today, we must first examine the areas where discrimination exists. There are no facilities for Jewish national education, a right enjoyed by all other ethnic groups and guaranteed by the Soviet constitution. Jews are no longer admitted to the training school for Party cadres; almost no Jews are to be found in military colleges or in high posts in the Party, the army, or the navy. Jews are no longer being admitted into the diplomatic corps, and the percentage of Jewish admissions to universities and other institutions of higher education has decreased in recent years and is now even lower than it was in czarist times. There is only one Yiddish monthly, in an edition of 25,000, which does not meet the needs of the nearly 500,000 who declared Yiddish as their mother tongue in the 1959 census. Jews are not allowed any communal life, as opposed to the other national minorities. The number of synagogues has declined from 500 in 1953 to sixty-two today. Soviet Jews are not allowed to declare publicly their affinity with Israel; Zionism and the Hebrew language are forbidden, as are contacts with Jewish political, social, cultural, and religious organizations abroad. And the reunion of families separated during the war is greatly restricted.

These are, I think, the main grievances Jews have against the present Soviet government. Can this Assembly map out a policy that would induce the current rulers to change their attitude? At this very moment Russian leaders are meeting in the Kremlin, planning governmental changes. It might be a propitious moment for us to send a message from here, for, as has been shown by recent minor Soviet concessions and promises on the Jewish question, the USSR is sensitive on some issues

to her external image. And even within Russia, there are many people who are sincerely opposed to anti-Semitism as a blot on the Communist revolution and a shameful legacy of czarist rule.

The last few weeks have witnessed an increasing awareness in the West of the position of the Jews in the USSR, which speaks for the policy of protests, as opposed to a do-nothing attitude. We should not allow this awareness to dissipate. I propose that this Assembly discuss the possibility of sending a fact-finding mission to the Soviet Union. Lest this be regarded as unrealistic, I would remind you that a group of twenty-two American rabbis was able to visit the Soviet Union and even recite *el maleh rachamim* at Babi Yar. Furthermore, the World Jewish Congress was offered the possibility of sending an observer to a trial of war criminals in Riga, which we could not do only because the invitation was conveyed to us too late to send someone.

Another possibility is to try to seek contact with Soviet Jewish writers; most countries have cultural agreements with the USSR, so why can't we? And finally, we could establish a circle of friends of Soviet Jewry.

While these measures may not convince the Soviet authorities, they *will* serve as encouragement to Jews in the Soviet Union. I was in Russia seven years ago, soon after our Stockholm Assembly. As I was leaving Babi Yar a group of Jews surrounded me, wanting to know whether it was true that at some conference somewhere, Jews abroad had appealed to Khrushchev to allow Soviet Jews to emigrate. When I read them part of the Stockholm resolution on Soviet Jewry — which I happened to have with me — one of the Jews came up to me and embraced and kissed me.

Mr. MENDEL N. FISHER (USA): The fundamental problem of the Jews in the USSR is fear — they will not speak to anyone, so don't send any missions.

I have visited the USSR and I can tell you that Jewish life there has not been extinguished. The major concern of those to whom I was able to speak was how to emigrate to Israel. If the doors of Russia were opened, I believe that at least 500,000 Jews would go to Israel.

The situation is not hopeless, but it will become hopeless with time; as long as the problem is not resolved, assimilation will reach alarming proportions in the Soviet Union — not only religious assimilation but total assimilation. On the other hand, the hostility experienced by Soviet Jews has created a will to live.

Now, what shall we do? I am not complaining that Soviet Jewry is not on the agenda of this Assembly — leadership has to be wise and sagacious. We must, however, raise our voices loudly, vigorously, and systematically. I want to declare from this platform that all activity to alleviate the lot of Soviet Jewry has been weak and inadequate. A worldwide movement must be organized under the auspices of the

World Jewish Congress to focus attention on the problems of Soviet Jewry.

Mr. HILEL STORCH (*Sweden*): I was among those who opposed the idea of a German-Jewish symposium within the framework of this Assembly. Now that the decision has been taken to go ahead with it, I must protest against the obstructionist tactics of some delegates here who persist in opposing the dialogue – and I say this as one who has suffered personally because of the Nazi persecutions. We must have a certain amount of discipline. There are many important issues to be discussed at this meeting, and we should not waste valuable time on party politics.

Whatever protests we make in favor of Soviet Jewry, we must keep a sense of proportion; we should not, by our actions, endanger the lives of Jews in the Soviet Union. I fully agree with Dr. Goldmann's policy on the complex question of Soviet Jewry, and I note with satisfaction that there is some understanding of his point of view in Israel. I hope that through diplomatic adeptness we may yet live to see our Soviet brethren among us.

Mr. J. BENARI (*Israel*): It is strange that, at a time when we are trying to mobilize world public opinion on behalf of Soviet Jewry, this burning issue is not accorded first place on the agenda of this first Assembly of the World Jewish Congress in seven years. If we ourselves do not give the problem primary consideration, how can we expect our friends to consider our appeal as an urgent one?

Furthermore, what is needed is the mobilization and coordination of all Jewish efforts on behalf of Soviet Jewry. A piecemeal approach is not only inefficient, but dangerous; we must maintain uninterrupted pressure on the Soviet authorities. To achieve this goal a special body, representing all Jewish organizations, must be created. The Jewish problem in the USSR cannot be solved by another Yiddish paper or even a Jewish school; it is a unique problem and it requires a unique answer: as the Soviets cannot absorb the Jewish minority in their system, we demand that they let the Jews go.

RABBI Dr. BERNARD BERGMAN (*USA*): We are living in a period of great danger – assimilation. The forced assimilation in the USSR has a positive side, in that it germinates a kind of resistance. Far more dangerous is assimilation stemming from ignorance, which can be found throughout the world today. We must therefore fight ignorance and the neglect of our spiritual heritage. Our weapon must be the Jewish education of our youth. In the past, inspired leaders have arisen to bring back to Judaism those who descended into the depths of pagan cultures and who voluntarily assimilated to alien cultures. We can only hope that such people will be found in our time. This Assembly is an encouraging sign that, under the guidance of the World Jewish Congress, we may master the forces necessary to stem voluntary assimilation.

Mr. HENRY BULAWKO (*France*): This Assembly represents the changing of the guard; it also speaks for hope. Two generations are gathered here: those who are witnesses of our past and those who have begun to assume the responsibilities of today. The third generation, however, is missing, and I think that one of our most important duties is together to find the means of reaching this absent generation so as to ensure the survival of the Jewish people. The young generation speaks a language that is not always heard from this platform. They expect us to learn this language, understand their preoccupations, and share their aspirations — it is the only way of renewing contact with them. The young generation's fight against racial segregation and for peace must find an echo not only on this platform but in the resolutions adopted by this Assembly.

I also said that this Assembly represents hope. We hope that peace will triumph not only in the Far East, but in the Middle East as well, for we know that peace is essential for the survival of Israel, and therefore of the Jewish people. Our hope also turns to Eastern Europe, in particular to our brothers in the Soviet Union, with whom we wish one day to renew our ties.

I am sorry to say that some of the speakers here have spoken of this problem in much too negative a way, using this platform as a vehicle of protest. Those who protested most loudly came forth with few concrete proposals. Protests do not mean very much at a meeting of responsible people such as this Assembly. If we try and think, we will realize that only through discussion and dialogue will we be able to renew our ties with the Jews of Eastern Europe so that we can build our future together. And by fighting for peace — in Vietnam in particular — we will encourage the liberalization in the USSR that will allow the Soviet Jews to assume their full identity.

We share with our Soviet brothers not only regrets, but the memory of common suffering under Hitlerian rule. If there were representatives of Soviet Jewry here today, they would evoke Babi Yar just as we recall Drancy, Malines, or Auschwitz. And they would probably agree that, vis-à-vis Germany, Jews should not appear as partners in a dialogue, but as accusers. For what is the real nature of today's Germany, which one would have us believe changed? Behind Adenauer there was Globke, and behind Gerstenmaier there is the Bundestag — the Bundestag that last year voted to prescribe further prosecution of Nazi war crimes. In voting the statute of limitations — the only parliament in the world to do so — the Bundestag dishonored itself! As a former inmate of Auschwitz I must say that it is out of the question for me to enter into a dialogue with a man who — whatever his personal merits — embodies that Bundestag and that Germany which allow Nazism to continue.

Mr. ISAAC MIZRACH (*Argentina*): We in Argentina are particularly sensitive to the plight of Soviet Jewry, for the foundations of our

community were laid by Russian Jews who, with the aid of Baron Hirsch, were able to escape the hardships of czarist Russia and build themselves a new home in our country. The oppression suffered by Soviet Jews today may not be the anti-Semitism of yore, but it is just as bitter.

In Argentina we have been conducting a movement of constant protest to call to the attention of public opinion the plight of our brethren in the USSR; we must continue doing so with all our might until Russian Jewry once again becomes a part of the Jewish people.

Mr. BENJAMIN WEST (*Israel*): The World Jewish Congress, which is the largest Jewish organization in the world, must realize that the situation in the world has changed. The USSR was a great supporter of the Jewish cause before the establishment of Israel, and one of the first to recognize the state; but only a few years later came the Doctors' Trial, which reminded us of many past murders of prominent Jewish writers and leaders. Soviet Jewry is today facing national-cultural annihilation. In the spirit of self-help and self-defense enunciated by Dr. Stephen Wise when this Congress was created thirty years ago, it is our duty to fight for the right of Soviet Jews to emigrate to Israel, where they can lead a full Jewish life and contribute to the building of the national home.

Mr. ZVI BERNSTEIN (*Israel*): May I take this opportunity to express the hope that the Sixth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress will be held in Moscow, uniting the totality of world Jewry without exception.

Listening to Dr. Goldmann outline the situation of world Jewry today, I was disappointed that he did not indicate ways and means of preserving our uniqueness, which, as he recognized, is the secret of our future existence. I was pleased to note Dr. Goldmann's appreciation of the value of the irrational element in the existence of the Jewish people. For that very reason it is unfortunate that he saw fit to criticize the rabbis and to suggest reforms that would not be acceptable to any rabbi. The only solution lies in a true and complete return to the sources of Jewish tradition.

MAITRE MICHEL DREYFUS-SCHMIDT (*France*): I appreciate the right of the new generation to follow its own bent; at the same time, however, I want to continue the work of our predecessors.

While I was glad to hear Dr. Goldmann's optimism regarding achievements in individual human rights, I was astonished at his pessimism concerning the danger of Jewish disintegration as a result of the exodus from the ghetto. As a matter of fact, I think that his optimism is excessive and his pessimism groundless. We all know that the struggle for equal rights is not over and probably never completely will be; there will always be someone who will ask, with an innocence that quickly turns into malice: But how can one be Persian and Jewish at

the same time? And even if anti-Semitism were to disappear entirely, Judaism would continue to flourish.

We should not worry when we see our young people join other revolutionary movements. It is as Jews that they make their contribution to the struggles for freedom, peace, social justice, and equality, wherever these struggles are necessary. French Jewish youth in particular, being a product of both the Jewish tradition and the spirit of 1789, is drawn to these struggles. In their desire to free others, having been freed themselves, our young people are not motivated by assimilation; they are serving Judaism and living it. In the words of Jean Jaurès, "The river remains true to its source by flowing toward the sea."

Dr. PAUL WARSZAWSKI (*World Union of Jewish Students (WUJS)*): I would like to make some observations on the General Debate so far. We have been trying to adapt permanent Jewish values to the particular circumstances of 1966 and to arrive at a practical course of action and a work program for our communities in their day-to-day activities.

However worthy the principles and proposals that are expressed and accepted here, they run the risk of remaining mere words if Jewish leadership throughout the world does not take it upon itself to implement them, with all their consequences. And they run the risk of remaining a dead letter as long as the Jewish masses are not actively involved in their implementation. The World Jewish Congress must overcome this double risk. I know that the search for solutions to the problems raised at this Assembly is not easy, but we must make a greater effort toward finding constructive solutions.

RABBI BEZALEL COHN (*World Mizrahi and Hapoel Hamizrachi*): I am surprised that there has been no reaction to Dr. Goldmann's emphasis on the fact that the strength of the Jewish people does not lie in political, military, or economic force or even in the State of Israel, but rather in our spiritual values. These words are all the more significant because they do not come from a religious leader, but from a seasoned and realistic statesman. We haven't heard such a positive appreciation of religious values from a secular leader since the days of the *haskala*.

Religious Jewry is in full agreement with Dr. Goldmann about the need to be different — while we want to be like all other nations as far as the State of Israel is concerned, we nevertheless want to preserve our particular identity as the Jewish people, an identity for which so many Jews have been martyred throughout the centuries.

It is very painful to see the growing number of intellectuals and young people who are losing their Jewishness; it would be impossible, however, to win them back by superficial means, which could never stop assimilation and mixed marriages. The one solution is religious

education from the earliest possible age. This does not imply backwardness of any kind — there are many prominent scientists, university graduates, and people who occupy important positions who also preserve their Jewishness in the deepest sense of the term. Such a synthesis should be our aim.

Mr. ENRIQUE SHOR (*Mexico*): The main task undertaken by the leaders of Mexican Jewry is to ensure the continuity of Jewish consciousness among our youth. A very high percentage of our children attend Jewish schools, where they are taught Yiddish, Hebrew, and Jewish values. We are most proud of our teachers' seminary, which provides not only teachers but also intellectuals to carry on the tasks of leading the community. I am happy to report that a number of our young people are already active in responsible positions in various aspects of the life of our community.

I would like to mention the Latin American Conference on the Situation of the Jewish Minority in the Soviet Union, which was held last May. This conference of writers and intellectuals found very favorable echoes in the non-Jewish world and was widely reported in the international press.

Mr. IZHAK NATHANI (*Great Britain*): There have been a number of considerable achievements by the World Jewish Congress in the seven years since our Stockholm Assembly. I was particularly gratified at Dr. Prinz' report of the movement toward unification among American Jewry. On the question of Soviet Jewry, we must give credit to Dr. Goldmann for his constructive approach. We are all aware of the very many negative features of the life of Soviet Jewry, but in this instance protests and demonstrations will not produce the desired results. There have been one or two examples of amelioration, which are certainly tied in with the efforts of the World Jewish Congress. In the area of Arab-Jewish relations, if the Bourguiba possibility was not handled as it should have been, it was despite the efforts of the Congress.

But on the fundamental issue of Jewish survival, the World Jewish Congress has not yet found *the* approach. How can we attract our young people, who are our future? Jewish youth has realized that we must concern ourselves with the fate of the world; our young people are actively involved in the struggle for peace and disarmament and against racial discrimination and the Vietnam war. Unless and until these burning issues become an integrated part of our own ideology — beyond the resolution-passing stage — we will never be able to break through to our youth.

Mr. M. LERMAN (*France*): I feel that someone here should speak in the name of youth, so conspicuously absent from this Assembly. There is no need to convince the older generation of the need to preserve the uniqueness of the Jewish people. This appeal should be addressed to the

youngsters, who are more concerned by general problems than by our specifically Jewish ones. It is our task to find the ways and means to reach an understanding with them.

On the subject of our uniqueness, I was surprised that at the opening session we heard, apart from Flemish, only English and French. If we insist on our right to be different, we should start by using our own two languages — Hebrew and Yiddish.

In conclusion, I strongly resent the fact that while Dr. Gerstenmaier, the man who rejected the suspension of the statute of limitations, has been invited to speak from the platform of the World Jewish Congress, no representative of the victims of Nazism has received such an invitation.

SEVENTH SESSION

August 2, 1966 (evening)

In the Chair: MR. LAVY M. BECKER (*Canada*)

1. GENERAL POLITICAL DEBATE IV. (concluded)

Mr. ARIEH HANDLER (*Great Britain*): Reference has been made to the danger of assimilation among Soviet Jews. The Jews of the USSR will remain Jewish if Israel and the rest of the *gola* set an example of positive Jewishness.

Similarly, our youth is in need of an example on the part of Jewish leaders. I do not blame our young generation for their apathy, assimilation, and intermarriage. The Jewish people has always been confronted with these dangers; it is up to the leadership to rise to the occasion and show the right way, and this we have failed to do. In this era of affluence and comparative peace, one of the means of rallying our youth is Israel, which is a greater attraction to our young people than even Zionist leaders realize. The other is to heed Dr. Goldmann's call to change the priorities in our cultural and organizational life and give more support to those who are trying to live as full Jews. And there *are* young Jews who combine their love and study of Judaism with devotion to science and the arts; for an example, it is sufficient to go to that fortress of Marxism, the London School of Economics, and see students learning Talmud and saying *mincha* and *ma'ariv*. The question is whether they will follow us if we continue our obsolete way of conducting Jewish organizational life.

We Jews often lack a sense of proportion. I do not claim that there are no good Germans, nor do I oppose a dialogue with them. But when Jewish leaders from throughout the world come together for the first time in seven years, even Dr. Goldmann cannot convince me that a dialogue between Jews and Germans should be treated as one of the most important imperatives of Jewish life today.

MAITRE HENRI SMOLARSKI (*France*): I agree with Dr. Goldmann that we are summoned to fight for Jewish unity, Jewish education, and the right of the Jewish people to be different.

This calling, however, is authentic only to the extent that the Jewish

people becomes the defender of life, justice, and peace; for Israel is a prophet among the nations. Protest against wanton hatred, murder, and war is the *raison d'être* of the Jewish people, and this includes the abominable war in Vietnam. We, the survivors of Auschwitz, know that the silence of man must be paid for in blood. It is our duty to demand an immediate and just end to the Vietnamese conflict, which could lead to world war.

We must do so for practical as well as moral reasons. A Jewish initiative to end the Vietnam war would have a beneficial effect on Israel's relations with the Third World; peace in Vietnam would contribute to worldwide peaceful coexistence and would facilitate the dialogue with the USSR concerning Soviet Jewry. Continuation of the war, on the other hand, will surely result in an upheaval in American society that will equally hit the Jewish community of the United States.

Dr. LEON KRONITZ (*Canada*): The Canadian Jewish Congress is very active in the field of Soviet Jewry; only a few weeks ago we held a nationwide conference on the subject and called for equal rights for our Soviet brethren. We have an educational and cultural network serving not only children but adults as well. All religious matters concerning Canadian Jewry come within the competence of the Canadian Jewish Congress.

Now I would like to say something as a private individual and not on behalf of the Canadian Jewish Congress. Perhaps the time has come to consider a merger between the World Jewish Congress and the World Zionist Organization. There is a certain amount of overlapping in the work of these two organizations, and a merger would be beneficial on many counts. I propose that the Reorganization Commission put this suggestion on its agenda.

Mr. ITZHAK ARTZI (*Israel*): There are two generations present in this hall: the founding fathers of the World Jewish Congress and the sons of the holocaust. We are also divided into different religious, social, and cultural groups. I do not feel that such divisions result in anarchy; they do, however, need coordinating, and this is a responsibility of the World Jewish Congress, as the organization uniting the Jewish people. We all have a great many things in common; an example is the struggle for Soviet Jewry, which even our young people have taken to their hearts. Dedication to Israel is another unifying factor, and here I would like to state my belief that Israel could not exist without the rest of the Jewish people.

Mr. GERARD ALEXANDRE (*France*): As a world organization with a universalist calling, we must take a clear moral stand on the three most crucial problems in the world today. The problem of racial segregation cannot be divorced from that of the oppression of minorities. It should be of great concern to us as Jews, as was

courageously declared by the chief rabbi of Johannesburg eight years ago. Racial segregation and the situation of the Jews in the USSR should be energetically treated in one single resolution by this Assembly.

Israel's declaration that she would not be the first to introduce atomic weapons into the Middle East should facilitate our task in the adoption of an unequivocal resolution on disarmament and the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons.

The most urgent problem is that of peace, especially in light of the Vietnam war, and our resolution must be more than simply a homily. World Jewry must help the American people extricate itself from Vietnam. We French Jews, having lived through a similar involvement of our country in that region, know that such a disengagement is no easy matter; we are all the more sensitive to the need for it. It is worth noting that it was a French Jew who implemented the French withdrawal from Vietnam.

Ing. ANSELM REISS (*Israel*): I cannot share Dr. Goldmann's relative optimism. When the World Jewish Congress was founded in 1936 — at a meeting I was privileged to attend — we were facing a Europe dominated by reaction and anti-Semitism; but at least we were strong in numbers and in national spirit. All things considered, I wonder if there has been much improvement since then.

We are constantly assured of the dedication of the Jewish people the world over to the State of Israel. How efficient can that protection be, thousands of miles from Israel's borders? We want the dedicated Jews to be on the spot, to help defend and build the Jewish state. The countries of the Diaspora are characterized by an alienated young generation and increasing neo-Nazism. We expect the World Jewish Congress to be very watchful in response to the needs of our time, and in this way fulfil its historic mission.

CHIEF RABBI Dr. MOSES ROSEN (*Federation of Jewish Communities in Rumania, Observer*): I have the great honor to address you on behalf of the Federation of Jewish Communities in Rumania. This is the first Assembly of the World Jewish Congress that I have attended since 1948; there is really no difference here between delegates and observers — the important thing is that we are here. As our sages said, "When the just assemble, it is a boon to the world and a boon to themselves."

Dr. Goldmann described today's Jewry as having shed its spiritual content. He said that the Orthodox minority tended to isolate itself in a kind of fortress, separate from the nonreligious majority of the Jewish people. The majority, then, having abandoned its Jewish traditions, has replaced them with nothing. This is the brutal truth that we must face. As not only a rabbi but also as a Jewish lay leader I say that this baffling problem concerns us all, and we must all confront it. Are we only a racial community?

Dr. Goldmann also noted that the Jews were no longer in the vanguard of the struggle for human progress. It seems to me that indeed, since the holocaust, the Jewish people has lost its perception of these human goals. Today others preach in our stead, using our moral and ethical teachings as their own. In the past, we shed much blood for the sake of justice and humanity; now we take a back seat. I share Dr. Goldmann's anxiety in this regard.

Moreover, even the physical dangers are not yet at an end. We have many enemies, in Germany and elsewhere. And the threatening world war is especially dangerous for the Jews. One cannot say that Vietnam is not our problem because Jews are not directly involved. If we do not worry about the whole of humanity and confine our concern to our problems alone, then we have no right to exist as Jews. We must remember that there would have been no Auschwitz if peace had been saved in the thirties. Now humanity is in danger of being exposed to an atomic Auschwitz; we are part of humanity and therefore in danger of annihilation. We must be in the forefront of the struggle for peace.

I would like to add that we cannot be satisfied with diagnoses. We must find remedies; this is why we have come here. Dr. Goldmann once said that the Jewish problem was too important to be left to the rabbis. I would say that the existence of the Jewish people is too important to be left to the politicians. The Jews have survived for 2000 years, not by the grace of organizations and establishments but through the Torah and our Prophets, scholars, and sages — in a word, by preserving our spiritual values. After the destruction of the Temple by the Romans, Yavneh was created — a spiritual center. This is the way to act today. We should have a Jewish assembly — not one based on party lines, but composed of spiritual leaders. We do not have to look for new values; we must find a way of preserving the old ones, which have lost none of their force. This is the only way to save the Jewish people from the dangers looming ahead.

Talleyrand once said that the secret of politics was to know when, how much, and in what way. I am afraid that many of us do not know the answers to these three questions in the context of Jewish politics. We must never forget the great truth cited by Isaiah: redemption and succor will come when we fight for justice and seek God with all our hearts.

RABBI Dr. JOSEPH KARASICK (*Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America*): I bring you greetings in the name of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, which speaks on behalf of the thousands of Orthodox synagogues and the hundreds of thousands of their affiliated families in the United States.

I am grateful to be with you because an international gathering such as this serves as an important reminder to us American Jews — who tend to become too insular and provincial — of the achievements,

courage, and devotion of those Jews who are scattered throughout the rest of the world. I am also happy to be reunited with many friends whom I met at the World Jewish Congress Executive meeting last year in Strasbourg. I am pleased to report that as a result of our presence as observers in Strasbourg the Presidents' Conference voted unanimously to establish a liaison with the World Jewish Congress.

I think it is clear that today, generally speaking, the Jewish body is no longer in danger, but the Jewish soul is. The World Jewish Congress, in its concern and activity to counter this danger, must operate with the support of the synagogue. The last century witnessed the decline of the synagogue as the source and center of the Jewish community. In America, however, during the last two decades or so, there has been a revival of the role of the synagogue, to which the new vital social and cultural life can be directly traced. In all Jewish circles it is the Torah Jew who has the answers to the problems plaguing world Jewry today. The Torah Jews have remained steadfast in the face of assimilation, and it is the Torah Jews who can provide the personnel so desperately needed throughout the Jewish world.

The World Jewish Congress must begin to attract these religious Jews, who are concerned with the Jewish future.

Dr. GEZA SEIFERT (*Central Board of Hungarian Jews, Observer*): As president of the Central Board of Hungarian Jews and leader of the Hungarian delegation here, it is with love and friendship that I greet this Assembly. I also bring you the sincere fraternal sentiments of Hungarian Jewry, so severely tried during the Nazi persecutions and reduced to only 80,000–100,000 souls.

As Joseph sought his brothers, so do I address myself to those Jews who have not let themselves be dazzled by the glitter of the golden calf, but who remain attached to the progressive ideas rooted in our tradition and the teachings of our Prophets.

Hungarian Jewry, which before the war numbered 800,000, never enjoyed full freedom and equality until the liberation of Hungary by the Red Army, a fact which the Jews of Hungary will never forget. With their newfound rights, the Hungarian Jews began to rebuild Jewish life, synagogues, and institutions, uniting the various groups into a nationwide representative body. There are now about seventy *kehilot* in the country, each autonomous and all under the supervision of the Central Board. We have restored our damaged synagogues with partial assistance from the state, which also covers a good deal of the costs in connection with our homes for the aged. Our other activities include institutions for kashrut (in addition to supplying our own needs, we export matzot and kosher meat and wine to other countries), Talmud Torah schools and yeshivas, a secondary school, a rabbinical seminary, and a hospital.

The government of Hungary adheres to Marxist-materialist

philosophy and, in this connection, to atheism. Although the government tries to win adherents to atheism by means of persuasion, it does not wish to force its philosophy upon the citizens of the country.

Our regime is antifascist. It is a known fact that anti-Semitism is the twin brother of fascism; therefore anti-Semitism is impossible in Hungary. It is possible and even probable that anti-Semites are to be found in Hungary; generally speaking, however, we Hungarian Jews are unaware of their existence, as any open manifestation of anti-Semitism is severely prohibited under Hungarian criminal law. In addition, the Hungarian people is admonished in the schools, in the theater, and by the mass media to fight anti-Semitism and fascism.

We can confidently affirm that there is no discrimination against Jews, be it in the economy, science, or the professions. Neofascist manifestations in Hungary would be inconceivable, and recent examples of such activities in West Germany and Latin America give us cause for worry about the danger to which Jews living in the West are exposed in this regard.

We are also concerned and indignant at the American aggression against the people of Vietnam. Our Executive on February 15 held a protest meeting and declared that this aggression was a danger to world peace.

I would like to say a word about indemnification payments. West Germany took upon itself the international obligation to provide indemnification to the victims of Nazi persecution. The West German government, however, excluded from eligibility all citizens of countries with which the Federal Republic had no diplomatic relations. This discrimination constitutes a violation of human rights and the principles of international law, not to mention human decency. In the name of Hungarian Jewry I propose that this Assembly pass a resolution condemning this unjust discrimination.

We Hungarian Jews want to work together with all Jews who — regardless of the social system under which they live — are opposed to fascism, anti-Semitism, and militarism, for the sake of human well-being and peace.

Mr. E.E. JHIRAD (*India*): Ever since the establishment of the Indian Jewish community about 2000 years ago, we have received overwhelmingly kind treatment from our country; we are perhaps the one Jewish community in the world that has not encountered anti-Semitism. Moreover, the Indian government places no obstacles in the way of emigration to Israel. In spite of this good treatment, the Indian Jewish community still looks to Israel as its future.

But this benign treatment that we receive from the people and government of India is in sharp contrast to the official policy vis-à-vis Israel, which is due to lack of understanding of Zionism on the part of the Indian leaders and to India's need for Arab support on the Kashmir

issue. As a result the Arab League has been allowed to open an office and carry out a full-fledged propaganda campaign in the country. The population at large and the press, however, remain favorable to Israel and the Jewish people.

I would ask the World Jewish Congress not to neglect India in its activities. If an Asian office cannot be set up in India, then at least emissaries should be sent to make contact with the Jewish community and with Indian leaders. We identify ourselves fully with world Jewry and with the aims of the World Jewish Congress.

Mr. MORDECHAI BENTOV, MK (*Israel*): It is regrettable that the special session on Jews and Arabs will not take place at this Assembly. For lack of an Arab speaker it was feared that a monologue rather than a dialogue would result. I believe, however, that we are interested in a dialogue on this subject, even if it be a long-distance dialogue; for peace with our Arab neighbors is probably the central problem of Israel's foreign policy and must occupy a central position in the minds of Jews everywhere.

A message of peace must go to the Arab and non-Arab world from this Assembly in order to strengthen the efforts of the Israeli government to change the climate surrounding the Arab-Israeli conflict. There is a large and growing audience interested in knowing what the Jewish people really thinks about Jewish-Arab relations; this audience consists of non-Jews and non-Arabs throughout the world, of Arab statesmen, and of the growing number of young Arab intellectuals.

Behind the ostensibly solid front of hatred of Israel, profound but so far silent changes are taking place in Arab mentality, largely as a consequence of the university education being received by tens of thousands of young Arabs. University graduates can no longer be treated like backward peasants; they are more rationalistic and nonconformist and more impatient with empty slogans. We have seen the same process in the United States and even in the Soviet Union. The young Arab intellectuals are becoming increasingly aware that it is impossible to try to destroy Israel and to improve the standard of living of the Arab peoples at the same time. At the same time the dynamics of modern life are affecting the traditional fatalistic attitude of the simple Arab.

We must address ourselves to this audience — reasonably and patiently, sensibly and dispassionately, in good faith and with all due respect. We must tell them that we sincerely want peace and need it no less than they do; that we need for development the money we are now forced to spend on defense, no less than they need for their development the funds they are so lavishly wasting on arms. We must tell them that as soon as peace is established, armaments drastically reduced, and cooperation effected, we shall start on the road to unprecedented prosperity and development in all countries concerned.

We also must let them know that there is no hatred in Israel or among the Jews toward the Arabs. We must show them that the Arabs in Israel, increasingly loyal to the state, are well on the way to becoming the most prosperous and educated Arab community in the world. I do not claim that there are no problems of coexistence between Jews and Arabs in Israel, but there is a will to solve these problems in a just and intelligent manner.

We are often asked by the Arabs to implement the United Nations resolution on the Palestinian refugees, as a precondition of any peace talks. It should be remembered that this resolution consists of two parts — one regarding refugees who wish to return to their previous homes and the other dealing with those who prefer compensation in order to settle elsewhere. While the first point is incapable of implementation, the second can certainly be implemented. Similarly, the section of the United Nations resolution on the partition of Palestine that recommends an economic union of the Jewish and Arab successor states is still realistic and should be looked into.

Although relations today between Israel and the Arabs are far from satisfactory, they are not as gloomy and hopeless as they may appear to be on the surface.

2. SUMMING-UP OF THE DEBATE

Dr. GERHART M. RIEGNER (*Secretary-General, World Jewish Congress*): Standing here this evening, I can only be proud of the enormous progress the World Jewish Congress has made during the three decades of its existence. Having started with the Congress at its inception thirty years ago, I can compare its atmosphere, attendance, composition, and prestige then and now. I am extremely gratified by the many tributes paid to the administration, and in the name of my colleagues I acknowledge them with thanks. At the same time, as the senior officer of the administration I would like to express my deep appreciation to my past, present, and future co-workers for their devoted work. I know of no other group of people that is as loyal, idealistic, and disinterested in personal economic or financial gain as the so-called staff of the World Jewish Congress.

I would also like to pay tribute to the loyalty and cooperation of our affiliated members. Their adhesion to the Congress is voluntary; yet I cannot recall a single instance when there has not been an immediate response to a request on our part.

Our president, who together with the unforgettable Dr. Stephen Wise was the great architect of the Congress, is shy when it comes to describing his achievements. On this occasion, however, I think we can in all modesty review the accomplishments of the World Jewish Congress over the past thirty years.

We have become a universal body, independent of any government; our members, no matter where they come from, cooperate solely on the basis of their common Jewish interest. Recognition of this status and of the prestige achieved by the Congress on the international scene during the past thirty years has been reflected by the presence here Sunday of representatives from twenty non-Jewish international movements and organizations from all walks of life, religious and secular.

I do not think that there is any other Jewish organization that has shown as much foresight of future world developments as we have. It was from the platform of the World Jewish Congress that went out the first warnings and the first clamor about Hitler's plans to annihilate the Jews. The World Jewish Congress, in the postwar program it elaborated in cooperation with the Institute of Jewish Affairs in Atlantic City in 1944, foresaw as no other organization did the future development of the Jewish people, a prognostic that is valid to this day. It was Dr. Goldmann, the late Dr. Barou, and others of the Congress who were the authors of the concepts of the German reparations agreement and the punishment of war crimes. The Congress made a major contribution toward ensuring the security of the Jews of Tunisia and Morocco when those countries achieved independence. We can also claim credit for our major role in securing international legislation for the protection of human rights: I know of no other organization — Jewish or non-Jewish — that has made so many contributions in the drafting of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as the World Jewish Congress. We have been the pioneers in emphasizing the need for a new order of priorities in Jewish life; at our Stockholm Assembly in 1959 we proclaimed the priority of Jewish education and culture and issued the call for the establishment of an International Council for Jewish Education. The idea of creating the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture came from the Congress.

I do not mean to claim exclusive credit for us for the achievements I have mentioned — in many of these efforts we have cooperated loyally with other organizations, in the Claims Conference and elsewhere. But I do think that in all these new developments we have provided the decisive impetus.

I believe that the debate we have heard here yesterday and today has shown that, on essentials, we are much nearer to each other than we thought. We may disagree about formulations, but the main issues, the aims, are held in common and are not controversial at all. We all agree that our relations with Germany constitute an unsolved problem and that anti-Semitism in Germany, especially in the light of recent developments, requires careful vigilance. In my opinion the opposition to a frank discussion with decent Germans is an artificial one, attributing to people intentions they never had and then proceeding to

attack these fabricated intentions. The central and growing position of Germany in Europe and our own past experience tell us that we must take her seriously. Similarly, the debate on the question of Soviet Jewry has shown that although we may differ on tactics, we are unanimous in our resolve to work for an improvement in the situation. It is this common resolve that should be stressed.

On the matter of our relations with the Christian churches, which I have dealt with together with Mr. Fritz Becker of our Rome office, I think we have shown the Jewish public that one can deal with these questions in a way that preserves Jewish dignity, tradition, and self-respect. In connection with the Vatican Council, we did not lobby, we did not create agencies to publicize our own importance, and we did not try to convey to the world the image that we were running the Council. We stated our case in public and submitted a memorandum to the Church. None of us is entirely satisfied with the Council's Declaration on the Jews, and none of us could have been. We must bear in mind that the Declaration on the Jews, being a Christian document and having value only as such, had to be based on Christian doctrine. For this reason, there are bound to be some points that we, as Jews, cannot accept. If, however, you consider the text in the light of nineteen centuries of Christian teaching and history, and if you compare the text with the texts of the other ecumenical councils that have taken place during these 1900 years, you realize that it is the most positive by far. The decisive question is whether the era initiated by John XXIII will prove to be only an episode or whether it is the beginning of a new chapter in the history of the Church. I believe that we are on the threshold of important new changes. I agree with Dr. Goldmann that we should abstain from theological dialogues and should see what we can do to improve our relations in practical matters. To begin with, the Church should not only be asked to expurgate its books of religious instruction, but Christian and Jewish representatives should sit down together and try to find common areas of discussion. I appeal to the authorities of the Christian churches not to limit themselves to trying to understand the theological differences based on the Old Testament, but also to understand the essence of present-day Judaism.

Unfortunately, there is not enough time now to go into all the problems that were discussed. I would, however, like to express my gratitude to the Indian delegation for having raised the question of the developing countries, which I believe is one of the major problems with which we will have to deal in the future. The Jewish people in today's world cannot secure its future without relating to the hundreds of millions of people living in the Third World.

After thirty years of work, we have to take stock of our achievements and plan as to who will carry on our work. We must

educate our young people to remain Jews and bring to their attention ideals for which they would be ready to fight. So far we have not succeeded, because instead of speaking to the new generation in a language it understands we continue to use terms befitting the nineteenth century. And it is not enough to merely speak to the young generation: we must bring younger people into the inner councils of the Congress itself.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT

Dr. NAHUM GOLDMANN congratulated Mr. Yaacov Zerubavel on his eightieth birthday and expressed the wish that the Congress would have him in its midst for many years to come. Dr. Goldmann recalled that he had admired Mr. Zerubavel since his youth and paid tribute to his dynamic and stimulating personality.

Dr. Goldmann then apologized to Messrs. Weinstein, Klementynowski, and Gross, who had not been able to speak for lack of time, and suggested that Rabbi Dr. Mordecai Kirshblum and Ing. Anselm Reiss be co-opted to the Presidium, which was accepted.

4. REPLY TO THE DEBATE

Dr. GOLDMANN: I agree with those who said that Jews must not limit their activities to the Jewish orbit. We are all for such causes as human rights, tolerance, and minority rights, but the World Jewish Congress must at all times be cautious in dealing with these questions, as our members represent various opinions and live under different social and political systems. Local Jewish organizations and Jews as individuals can and should participate in the life of their countries. Local conditions, however, often require a different approach in each case, something that an organization representing Jews from sixty countries cannot do.

As I listened to the debate, it struck me that some speakers were inventing issues. For example, listening to some speakers one would think that I had forced the discussion with the Germans on the Congress. I want to make it quite clear that the organizers of the Assembly were authorized to include the debate in the agenda and subsequently some members suddenly decided to change their minds. Some participants in the debate claimed that the dialogue with the Germans would have a demoralizing effect on Israeli youth. Well, Israel has been negotiating with Germany for fourteen years and has received billions in compensation, from which the whole country has benefited; I do not find Israeli youth demoralized as a result of that. So how could what amounts to a confession of guilt by two eminent Germans with a perfectly clean record possibly cause such demoralization? Mrs. Jaglom

complained that Soviet Jewry was not on the agenda; yet she was allowed to speak about it for ten minutes, as were a number of other delegates. Does anybody really think that we would have impressed the Soviet authorities by putting an explicit item called "Soviet Jewry" on the agenda? My old-new friend Leibler has mellowed somewhat since the last time we met. Good. But he and I differ mainly on tactics.

There have been many accusations that the World Jewish Congress in general and I in particular have not done enough to fight Soviet anti-Semitism. The Soviet Union will not alter its system for us. But other minorities in the USSR do live as recognizable and viable national groups, and we must demand that Soviet Jews be permitted to live as Jews, as provided for by the Soviet system. We all agree on that but we sometimes differ on tactics, and tactics are a matter of judgment. There is a time for speaking and a time for keeping silent. Sometimes we all have to do unpalatable things, and I would remind my Revisionist friends that Jabotinsky had talks with Petliura, whose hands were stained with Jewish blood. Jabotinsky did so for the good of the Jewish people, and that is the issue now, as it was then. In the days of Stalin we had to keep silent, because the brutal regime was likely to commit further excesses if provoked by vocal protests from outside. There is another aspect: the World Jewish Congress must take care to avoid taking sides in the cold war; our fight is for the rights of Jews no matter where they may live.

I am very much in favor of involving in this struggle eminent non-Jews to whom the Russians might pay attention. I am thinking, among others, of leaders of Communist parties and pro-Soviet personalities. It was for this reason that several years ago I called a conference of non-Jewish intellectuals in Paris to discuss this very problem.

Benari advised us to concentrate our efforts on the right of Soviet Jews to emigrate. Here we must exercise caution: we might succeed in persuading the Soviet authorities to let some Jews leave, but we would lose ground in our fight for those who stay to be able to live as Jews. There are rumors about a spiritual revival within Russian Jewry, particularly among the younger generation, and we must not give the impression of abandoning it.

I am not asking you to forget your opinions. I have never believed in this kind of "unity." What I am appealing for is coordination and attention to methods. I heard during the debate many logical arguments addressed to the Russians; but we have learned from experience that logical arguments do not always bring practical results. If they did, we Jews would be one of the mightiest powers in the world.

While I cannot say whether I am absolutely optimistic or absolutely pessimistic, I can tell you that I am more optimistic than I was two years ago. There are influences working in the world today that the

Russians cannot ignore. In the Soviet Union itself, the situation has changed since the days when the fate of millions depended on the whims of a single dictator. We must continue to treat Soviet Jewry as the most important object of our daily political activity, and we — especially those of us in leading positions — must do so with a sense of responsibility. I believe the day will come when we shall have a delegation from Soviet Jewry at a World Jewish Congress Assembly.

EIGHTH SESSION

August 3, 1966 (morning)

In the Chair: EVA, MARCHIONESS OF READING

1. SPECIAL DISCUSSION: ISRAEL AND THE DIASPORA – MUTUAL RESPONSIBILITIES

LADY READING (*Co-Chairman, European Executive, and President, British Section, World Jewish Congress*): I feel very honored to preside this discussion on the Diaspora and Israel because I have been intimately connected with both for so very many years.

I have always felt that the unity of the Jewish people is of paramount importance. One of the main roles of the World Jewish Congress is to serve as a bridge between Israel and the Diaspora – a bridge which is absolutely necessary for our future as a people, a bridge of which I feel myself to be a part.

RABBI Dr. MAX NUSSBAUM (*Chairman, American Section, World Jewish Congress*): This symposium, as all our deliberations at this Assembly, is based upon the historic concept of Jewish peoplehood. A people, in sociological terms, is a group of human beings whose ancestors lived in one and the same place at one and the same time, and whose descendants succeeded in surviving through some mutual bond. We Jews are a classic example of this definition. We are descendants of Hebrew forefathers who lived long ago in a particular place in the Near East and we, their descendants, have succeeded in surviving through the mutual bond of Judaism, with all the implications of the hundreds of definitions that are possible for this term.

Therefore Israel, as center of Jewish life, and the communities on the periphery of Jewish life are part and parcel of a historic family called the Jewish people. It was Theodor Herzl who enriched our vocabulary with two words: statehood and peoplehood. He believed, as we do, that a state is the best instrumentality for the survival and the unity of the Jewish people. The state is a means toward an end. The state is a high point, but the Jewish people is the ultimate goal in destiny. Great as is the establishment of the state, the greater majesty is the survival and the unity of the Jewish people.

This being the case, the task of our generation – which was singled

out by destiny for the privilege of rebuilding Jewish statehood — is now to rebuild Jewish peoplehood. This is no mean undertaking: in many ways the rebuilding of a people is much more difficult than the building of a state. The building of a state is a matter of a territory, a parliament, a government, a flag, an army, a diplomatic corps, uniforms — it is accompanied by dramatic pageantry, which is very tangible. The building of a people does not have this pageantry, this symbolism, and its success is not so easy to measure. It is a grinding, daily job. And yet, if it wants to secure its position, a mature people must undertake this task.

The first step in this task is for us to be clear on the ideological approach, then the practical application. The two words that must be our guiding star are: identification and commitment. Contrary to what we often believe, we are very far from the identification of all Jews with the whole of the Jewish people. In our generation — whether it be in the United States or in any other part of the world — we have identification of the individual Jew with his synagogue, with his local community, or — at best — with the Jewish community of his country. We are a long way from identification with the State of Israel, let alone the Jewish people as a whole. And yet our tradition emphasizes identification in our approach to great causes. Our rabbis repeated again and again that if someone sits at the seder table and fulfills all the mitzvot but does not understand the one line of *chayav adam lir'ot et atzmo ke'ilu yatza mimitzrayim* — if he does not identify with the story to the point of feeling that he himself came out of Egypt — then he has not even begun to fulfill the mitzvot.

Identification must lead to commitment to involvement in Jewish life. I am convinced that Israel is essential to this identification and commitment leading to involvement. The new fact in Jewish life — the centrality of the Jewish state — must be applied in practical terms, the supreme expression of which is *aliya*. *Aliya*, in American usage, begins with visits to Israel and continues with study periods of varying lengths, kibbutz stays, work stints of two or three years, and, finally, actual settlement. *Aliya* is important, not only because Israel needs it, but from the point of view of Diaspora survival. The constant exposure of Diaspora Jews — especially the young — to Israel must become a habit in our generation. If 5000 American Jews a year were to settle in Israel it would be the most dramatic and positive development for the Diaspora, for it would greatly increase the identification with and the commitment of their families, friends, and communities to the Jewish state, which is the very centrality of Jewish life.

As the theme of this symposium indicates, Israel has as great a job to do as we have from our side. Israelis — especially the youth — must be taught that they belong to a historical and real entity called the Jewish people. Beginnings have been made in Israel — for example, in the

schools — along that line; I do not believe, however, that the job has been fully done yet, just as we have not yet completed ours. Once taught, however, lest this feeling of identification and commitment remain theoretical, it must be translated into practical terms. For example, Israel must fulfill its role of cultural center by sending Israeli teachers to work in the Diaspora as well as by training Diaspora teachers in Israel. Another example is the exchange of students: just as young Diaspora Jews must be exposed to Israel, so should Israeli youth be placed in direct contact with Diaspora communities. It is difficult to expect them to be identified with and committed to a Jewish people which they have never seen or known.

Mr. LOUIS A. PINCUS (*Chairman of the Executive, Jewish Agency for Israel*): In a symposium of this type there are a number of dangers, which I will try to avoid to the best of my ability. These dangers are superficiality, generalization, and repetition. I would also like to say that this constant talk of dialogue between the Diaspora and Israel is in many ways widening the gap between the two, rather than closing it. To make the discussion have real value, there are certain basic assumptions upon which we have to agree.

The concept of Jewish peoplehood is beginning to lose its meaning. In order to demonstrate what it should mean, I will tell you what I think it does *not* mean. It does not mean that we must try to be a nation like all other nations, although originally this was one of the main aims of Zionism. We are not like other peoples, and our return to our homeland is an example among others. Therefore we should not try to fit ourselves into a framework for which we are not built; we should not reject this or that proposal because "it is not done among other peoples." For example, the Israeli ambassador in a country where there is a Jewish community is not only the representative of the State of Israel to the government of that country; by and large, he also plays an informal but vital role in the life of the local Jewish community; and this is as it should be.

The second basic assumption has to do with the meaning of the centrality of Israel. This centrality can exist because Israel is the only geographical area where there is Jewish autonomy, where physical asylum is offered to all Jews who are oppressed elsewhere. By the fact of its Jewish autonomy Israel can be — and to a large extent already is — the source of the cultural and spiritual inspiration essential to Jewish survival. And the centrality of Israel means that there can be no parallel centers as the focus of Jewish peoplehood and survival.

Finally, Israel consciously must accept the purposefulness and the Jewish content of Jewish life in the Diaspora. This means rejecting — for our era, at any rate — the concept of *shlilat hagola*; it means that Israel must see herself and the Diaspora as forming part of the same totality.

There is a mutual lack of understanding and of communication that bedevils many of the relations between the Diaspora and Israel, and in some ways the situation is worsening. Maybe a debate of this kind can help bring about a greater comprehension of the makeup of each of the two and the reasons for certain things. We must avoid making value judgments on one community or the other; we must avoid upbraiding either one or the other. For the moment, it is irrelevant who deserves upbraiding more.

Israeli Jewry, roughly speaking, consists of three demographic elements. The long-established *yishuv* that fought for and built Israeli society before the establishment of the state had an intense understanding of the Diaspora from which it came. Preoccupied by their own grim struggle for existence and for the opening of the country to other Jews who wanted to come, the members of the old *yishuv* became tremendously self-reliant and developed a sense of superiority vital for our survival in Israel. This sense of sturdy independence very often creates a communications gap between Israel and the Diaspora. I want to stress, however, that the members of the old *yishuv* know full well what their duty is vis-à-vis the Diaspora; but lack of understanding and of communication sometimes prevents them from transforming their philosophy into practice.

Fifty percent or more of today's Israeli population either came from Moslem countries or is of Eastern origin. These people come from societies that were cut off from the mainstream of Jewish life for centuries. The *gola* such as it is today, by and large derived from European countries and two-thirds English-speaking, is unknown to them. Even in comparison with Soviet Jewry the Sephardi Jews of Israel, by and large, were out of contact with the mainstream of Jewry. Their situation presents problems to Israel, problems that have their repercussions on the relationship with the Diaspora. Due to their economic and educational background and the insufficiency of the means that the Jewish people and the State of Israel together could provide to bridge the gap between them and other Israelis, there are many stresses and strains. This problem places an enormous burden upon the educational authorities in Israel, who are confronted at one and the same time by the need of the Diaspora for Jewish teachers and the need to hasten the closing of the education gap that exists between segments of the Israeli population. You have to understand this dilemma.

The third element in the Israeli population is, of course, the youth. The real problem that we are discussing today is not the dialogue between Israeli and Diaspora Jews of our own generation — our roots go back and we will carry on; there is no great philosophical problem between us. The real problem is: How does this dialogue continue in the generations to come?

The attitude of Israeli youth derives from the old *yishuv* that I referred to earlier — sturdy, independent, aware of the existence of Jews outside Israel but, in some ways, not understanding them. In fact, I have often heard young Israelis studying abroad say that they often find it easier to associate with non-Jews than with Jews in the Diaspora. This, by the way, is one of the consequences of instant normalization; it is something that can be changed. Israeli youth may criticize the role of the European Jews in defending themselves, but Israeli youth is *aware* of the holocaust. In addition to being surrounded with living reminders among their families and their friends' families, the young people of Israel are constantly exposed to the activities of Yad Vashem; and they have lived through the traumatic experience of the Eichmann trial. Above all, Israeli youth understands its own role when Jews anywhere are in physical danger. Compare the attitude of young Israelis with that of the youth of the *gola* and you will see the growing gap between them — the practical question of language aside. The young people of the Diaspora do not want to hear about the holocaust; they grow up in communities which themselves have forgotten or are trying to forget that great tragic experience. It is a highly educated youth and is beginning to ask the old question: *mi ani?* — Who am I? It is a perplexed youth and seeks its outlets in all sorts of directions, but not within the Jewish fold.

Returning to the Israeli scene, I can tell you with confidence that there are some changes in the air concerning the attitude I have described. More and more young people — for example, in the army and in various aspects of communal life — are beginning to realize that their independent attitude can lead to their isolation and confinement within the tiny world of Israel. The young people of Israel are more aware than their fathers of the need to establish a relationship with the new *gola*. This new attitude can be described by the slogan — already coined — of *panin la'am* — the face of Israel toward the Jewish people. The institution for cultural relations with the Diaspora that has been established by the Jewish Agency and the Israeli government is a manifestation of this new attitude, as are certain subjects taught to Israeli schoolchildren. There is also a growing interest in the Diaspora in our universities.

On the question of Hebrew teachers, the truth of the matter is that if not for the teachers being sent from Israel, the low level of Jewish education in the *gola* would be even lower. Despite its many problems, Israel is trying. What about the Diaspora? Unless the status and dignity of the Jewish teacher in the Diaspora are rehabilitated, you will never get sufficient teachers from Israel, and the Diaspora slowly will be cut off from Jewish content.

Dr. Nussbaum will pardon me if I consider his definition of *aliya* to be much too broad. Real *aliya* is essential for Israel — and for the whole

Jewish people. We in Israel are prepared to go a long way, despite our limitations, to make *aliya* as feasible as possible. But in the Diaspora there is an ambivalence on the subject. Unless *aliya* becomes a matter of pride and joy for the entire community — and not only for the individual *oleh* — it will not take place, and all talk about Jewish survival and the centrality of Israel will become meaningless. Of course, Israel must accept the responsibility of being a state somewhat different from other states, so as to offer a unique challenge capable of attracting Diaspora youth. We have, to some extent, succeeded in doing this, but it is no easy task.

If we accept the fundamentals that I have mentioned, if the controversies of the past, by and large, no longer exist, there is no reason why there should not be unified Jewish action. The people of Israel — the youth in particular — cannot understand the diversification and organizational competition in world Jewish life, which makes our educational task in Israel much more difficult. The Diaspora must bring about a greater measure of unified activity.

Only with the mutual understanding, communication, and coordination that I have referred to will we be able to replace the loss in the holocaust of the vast intellectuals forces that Dr. Goldmann referred to and which we all mourn. It depends on us.

Dr. S. LEVENBERG (*Chairman, International Affairs Commission, World Jewish Congress*): For the last eighteen years, since the founding of the State of Israel, the subject of relations between Israel and the Diaspora has appeared on the agenda of practically every Jewish conference. If it were up to me, this topic would be removed; it leads to misunderstandings and mutual accusations and brings forth no positive results. The division of the Jewish people into two parts, those in Israel and those in the Diaspora, is artificial and dangerous.

It seems to me that non-Jews understand the unity of the Jewish people better than we ourselves. When the Balfour Declaration was formulated almost fifty years ago it did not speak in terms of the *yishuv* and Jewish immigration to Palestine, but simply and clearly of a national home for the Jewish people. When statesmen and parliamentarians address Jewish audiences anywhere in the world, they refer to Israel as “your state,” regardless of the citizenship of their listeners.

The Jewish Diaspora has no parallel or precedent in the history of other peoples. Beginning with Abraham, the notions of *galut* and *yishuv* have been closely tied together in our history. The notion of *galut* already existed during the time of the First Temple; in the period of the Second Temple the majority of our people lived in *galut*. There have been, to be sure, Irish, Polish, Swedish, and other national dispersions; However, within three generation they have completely assimilated into the majorities among whom they live, which is not true of the Jewish people.

Jewish history, as Dubnow pointed out, is a history of geographic centers; it is not static. Neither in historical nor contemporary terms can one speak of relations between the Diaspora on the one hand and Zion on the other, for the Diaspora has undergone geographic and attitudinal changes from one generation to another. Even today, one cannot compare the relationship to Israel of American Jewry and Moroccan Jewry, or of the Jews of Argentina and those of a community of a couple of thousand. One thing, however, is clear: throughout the centuries Jewish leaders, rabbis, and intellectuals generally did not believe in the permanent existence of the Diaspora. Yehuda Halevi in his *Kuzari* wrote that the Jewish people in dispersion was not a body, but scattered bones; and Dubnow — who was certainly no Zionist — wrote that the Jews in *galut* had lived and continued to live in a state of permanent danger.

We have been asked to speak on the mutual responsibilities of Israel and the Diaspora. First of all the Jewish people, in Israel and the Diaspora, bears the historical responsibility for the future of the Jewish national home. Israel and the Diaspora also share the responsibility for the fate and future of the Jewish people wherever it lives, including of course Soviet Jewry, which constitutes a special problem. Both Israel and the Diaspora share the duty of maintaining and furthering Jewish cultural life and spiritual creativity from generation to generation. And, finally, the Jewish people in the Diaspora and Israel have the mutual responsibility of keeping alive the memory of the holocaust among the young generation.

When I speak of the future of the Jewish national home, I mean that the task of the present Jewish generation is to ensure the peace and further development of Israel. This means *aliya*; it means that the Diaspora must complement the Israeli effort toward economic independence by providing Israel with sufficient financial assistance, which it can well afford.

Here I would like to say a word about the young generation. To the Diaspora youth we must present the image of Israel as she really is, not as an idealized fairy tale. And Israeli youth must be made to understand that the Diaspora is not only anti-Semitism and degradation, but is also characterized by Jewish idealism, tenacity, struggle, and courage. The best way to bring Israeli and Diaspora youth closer to each other is through the Hebrew language. I must say that the fact that we cannot conduct our debates here in Hebrew — or even in Yiddish — is a witness to our cultural poverty and to our failure to adopt a common language to facilitate understanding between the people in Israel and those in the *gola*.

As I spoke at length on Soviet Jewry yesterday, I will only say now that if not for the existence of the State of Israel, the spiritual situation of Soviet Jewry would be a hundred times worse than it is today; the

Jews of the USSR are morally sustained by the very existence of a Jewish state and by the solidarity of the Jewish people the world over.

The holocaust must become an integral part of the upbringing we give our youth. We cannot allow this experience to be forgotten.

I mentioned the mutual responsibility for maintaining Jewish continuity and our cultural heritage. It is tragic that, while the intellectual standard of Jewish youth throughout the world is at a high level and still increasing, their Jewish knowledge is very limited indeed. It is not a problem of assimilation, but of passing on to the young generation the achievements of our people, achievements that were produced in the course of centuries and under the most difficult conditions.

As the poet Leivik said, the new Jew is free and is not starving; but, he continued, the new Jew is confused, bewildered as to his position in the world and bewildered about himself. The Jew is still considered a mystery by the world around him, and he does not understand himself. All we can do is try to unravel the mystery a little. In our effort to do so we must keep one thing in mind: *kol yisrael chaverim*. This should be the ever present theme among us, rather than the division into Israel and Diaspora.

Mr. ITZHAK KORN (*Chairman, International Affairs Commission, Israel Executive, World Jewish Congress*): We must realize that we here do not speak in the name of the whole Jewish people but of a minority. The national camp is only a minority in Jewish life. Even in the Latin American communities, with their strong Eastern European traditions, while there is certainly a dynamic Jewish element, the majority of the Jews exists outside Jewish national life and turns its back to us. Moreover, the Congress groups almost the same people it has grouped for the last twenty to thirty years. Our children's generation is missing, and above all that of the youth. We must have the courage to admit openly that we are undergoing a crisis in Jewishness and Jewish values more than at any time in the past. And we must engage in an honest dialogue to realize why.

Mr. Pincus described very well the sociological composition of the population of Israel, in which he mentioned the communities of Eastern origin — the Sephardi Jews. In the Diaspora you will find almost a million and a half Sephardi Jews, but they are hardly represented here or in active Jewish life in general. Just as we have not reached the Sephardim, we have lost the Jewish intellectuals, and all for lack of a national program.

As a politically active Israeli I say to you that one cannot help Israel without being concerned with what is going on in the Diaspora. If the Diaspora communities remain assimilated and disunited, Israel cannot become stronger. One speaks about the problem of *aliya*, but *aliya* is the expression of something deeper — Jewish education. I think that we

in Israel must see the Diaspora differently than we have for decades. In 1920 the Diaspora, pulsating with Jewish life, did not feel the need to worry about remaining Jewish. It was certainly no problem for the millions of Jews in Eastern Europe, who did not have to be told why they were Jews or why they should remain Jews. Today we must educate people who have not the notion of what their uniqueness consists of, who have had no Jewish upbringing. To be sure, in our history we have had *apikorsim* — Jews who have broken with God and Jewish tradition. But they at least knew what they were breaking with. Today many people, including intellectuals, are totally ignorant from the Jewish standpoint — not through their own fault, for no one taught them to be Jews.

As an Israeli and a member of a Zionist socialist labor movement I say quite freely that education in Jewish traditions and values precedes Zionism. *Aliya* will not take place without a strengthening of Jewish education in the Diaspora. The term “love for Israel” can be given deeper meaning only by instilling a knowledge of and respect for Jewish tradition. Jewish tradition is also important for families whose children attend Jewish schools, for if these children come home to parents who show no trace of Jewish tradition, their education becomes a dead letter. The World Jewish Congress must devote much attention to this problem.

I have great respect for and am grateful to every Diaspora Jew who wants to see in Israel something special and different from other countries, for Israel must serve as an example to the entire Jewish people. My ideal is one day to see Israel become such a shining example that every Jew in the Diaspora will deem it a privilege to live there, without the need for propaganda or pushing for *aliya*. As Lord Sieff said recently, when speaking at a function in Tel-Aviv, Israel is not the new hotels but the pioneering spirit in the kibbutzim and moshavim and the schools and yeshivot.

We are very concerned about the question of *aliya*. We are now at a crossroad, and the fateful question is whether the generation which experienced the emotion of the creation of the State of Israel will work with us in an intensive movement to double the population of Israel. Surrounded by a sea of Arabs, we cannot remain at 2,500,000. So far, most Jews came to Israel from countries where they were persecuted, but there are still millions who live in comfort in the free world, and they must realize that *aliya* is, in fact, a mitzva.

I would like to raise one other subject. In certain intellectual circles in the Diaspora — particularly in America — there is a tendency to speak of a Jewish spiritual center in addition to the one in Israel, recalling perhaps Babylonia. If we do not all recognize the centrality of Israel, there is danger of a division into “two peoples” — one in Israel and the other in the Diaspora. This tendency militates against the

concept of Jewish unity. Precisely in this spirit of Jewish unity we should rather concentrate our efforts on finding a way to those Jewish groups who are not with us at this Assembly.

2. DEBATE ON ISRAEL AND THE DIASPORA

Mrs. CHAIKA GROSMAK-ORKIN (*International Union of Mapam Parties*): One of the most serious questions is how the young generation in Israel sees the Diaspora. I do not think that Israeli youth should have a personal superiority complex vis-à-vis the Jewish youth in the Diaspora, but they should have a feeling of collective responsibility and a sense of mission.

There can be no unity of the Jewish people without a fundamental knowledge of its historical continuity. Young Jews must come to understand the uniqueness of Israel in building a new, more just, and progressive society, ideals which in themselves constitute a major challenge. At the same time, the young generation in Israel must understand the importance of defending Jewish life in the Diaspora.

Mr. MOSHE EREM, MK (*Israel*): It seems to me that, while everyone is making passionate pleas on behalf of Soviet Jewry and while so much effort is being concentrated on fundraising, we are actually ignoring the enormous danger threatening the survival of the State of Israel. I have great admiration for the work of the United Jewish Appeal and the Bonds organization, as well as for campaigns on behalf of Jewish education and Soviet Jewry; I feel, however, that one should first of all react to the continuous threats to the actual existence of Israel, threats that are seen and heard on Arab radio and television, in their press, and elsewhere. I do not believe that Soviet Jewry will disappear. I do believe that the threats against Israel are far more serious.

During the fight for the establishment of the State of Israel, Jewish masses in the United States were mobilized under the leadership of the late Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver to put pressure on the American government, and the same was done in Bevin's England. The time has come for world Jewry once more to mobilize public opinion, through professional groupings and all other means, so that the 10,000,000 Jews in the world can proclaim loudly for the world to hear: hands off Israel!

Mr. HARRY WOLL (*USA*): Speaking as a Jewish educator in the United States, I feel that the mere existence of Israel is not sufficient to educate for *aliya*. If we want effective education, we must have the means for it. Only recently it was decided to allocate the sum of 100,000 dollars of Jewish education in the world. This is obviously far from sufficient.

We may be talking to a generation that does not hear us. The young

generation, ignorant in matters Jewish, cannot be impressed by constant appeals for funds and for *aliya*. Israel wants and needs *aliya* but it does not know how to obtain it. If we are to achieve anything through education, we must adapt our methods to the needs of the times. We must find out from the man in the street what is expected of our education, and we must find the right teachers, because without all that we shall never achieve our aims.

Mr. MOSES I. SOCACHEVSKY (*Jewish Nazi Victims Organization in the USA*): In the name of some 100,000 concentration-camp survivors now living in the United States, I would like to tell you that all of us are waiting for an opportunity to go on *aliya*. For us, who have lost everything in the gas chambers, the only hope for the future lies in the Jewish state. We have already begun building a settlement for our members, and we turn to the World Jewish Congress as the only organization capable of helping us realize our dream.

Mr. PERCY S. GOURGEY (*Great Britain*): In the course of his very eloquent address, Mr. Korn said that the Sephardi world seemed to be lost to us. I think that we must concentrate particularly on the aspect of Sephardi culture if we are to try to attract the Sephardim to the general Jewish community and if we are to try to arouse that degree of mutual respect and understanding between the Sephardi and Ashkenazi communities which will enable them to cooperate together, not only in the fields of culture and education but in other communal activities.

Unfortunately, in Israel there seems to be a tendency to judge the Sephardi Jews by the poorest among them. I think this is a great pity, because these communities have long and rich historical and cultural backgrounds, which it would be useful to investigate and explore and which would help to enrich general Jewish culture. I think it important that schools in both Israel and the Diaspora include Sephardi culture in their curricula.

NINTH SESSION

August 3, 1966 (afternoon)

In the Chair: LORD SIEFF OF BRIMPTON

1. REPORT OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

Dr. MOYSES KAUFFMANN (*Brazil*), Chariman of the Credentials Committee, reported that the number of duly appointed representatives at the Assembly was as follows:

From national constituent communities and organizations	235 delegates 54 alternates
From twelve international associate member organizations	45 delegates 15 alternates
Executive members representing national constituents	33
Honorary officers and ex officio members of the Executive	25
Giving a total of	407
In addition, seventeen organizations were represented by observers and fraternal delegates	56
Bringing the total number of participants to	463

representing fifty-four countries from all over the world.

In three cases, complaints had been addressed to the Credentials Committee regarding the appointment of delegates. These complaints were found to be either unjustified, outside the jurisdiction of the Committee, or capable of amicable settlement.

The report was adopted.

2. INTRODUCTION TO THE DEBATE ON CULTURAL PROBLEMS: JEWISH VALUES AND CHALLENGES

LORD SIEFF OF BRIMPTON (*Vice-President, World Jewish Congress, and Chairman of its European Executive*): A chairman can, and indeed must, only deal in his introductory remarks with generalizations. It is the right of our guest speakers to analyze their ideas and to examine in depth the problems they wish to discuss, to make clear to their audience their points of view and the true meaning and significance of their ideas.

The title of this afternoon's discussion in our first cultural session is "Jewish Values and Challenges." It contains the most important elements which will ensure the survival of the Jewish people; it includes also the means whereby a lasting bridge will be built and maintained between Israel and the Diaspora.

The word *values* has a deeper meaning and significance in the context in which we are using it. These are not qualities which reside outside man, but are a summing-up of what has been achieved in inner quality and character of man's mind and spirit. The word *challenge* means the nature of the forces which lie within man's abilities to fight ignorance and hate, which like an iron wall obstruct man's inner freedom and spiritual power to bring nearer the goal of our Prophets, the brotherhood of man.

We Jews are continuously faced by a variety of challenges which may deeply affect our personal and group life and being. I am not only thinking of physical disasters such as the Nazi holocaust that murdered more than 6,000,000 Jews and destroyed intellectual and spiritual centers of Jewish life and tradition. I am also thinking of the erosion of Jewish communities wherever they exist and reside, through assimilation and ignorance of the past. The attrition from which these communities suffer is the main threat to the survival of Diaspora Jewry. This is not merely a cultural problem. I think it finds its roots in the ignorance of what Jews stand for, of the grandeur of Jewish idealism, and of the ideals of Prophetic Judaism.

Now let us look at the meaning of culture and particularly Jewish culture. In the Oxford dictionary, culture is defined as "the training and refinement of mind, tastes, and manners"; and there is added the phrase, "the intellectual side of civilization." This is a dictionary definition, but I believe that for the purposes of the discussion which will take place this afternoon and subsequently, more penetrating ideas about culture will emerge, for as man's knowledge increases, so the ideas which have ruled us in our intellectual and spiritual life also multiply and achieve a broader meaning.

Knowledge is not a luxury. In the Declaration of Human Rights, the acquisition of knowledge is regarded as one of the basic demands for

which man is responsible. I start off with the view that knowledge should be available to all — particularly to those who want to know. It is a truism that “knowledge is not a frill to gracious living, the product of an intellectual exercise to be tossed back and forth between experts, and finally allowed to drop into the tranquil pool of things that do not count because they cannot be measured.”

We Jews in particular have learned that the urge for Jewish knowledge is proportionate to the manner in which it is made available to the Jewish community. The emptiness of a Jewish school is not a reflex action resulting from a lack of interest in that Jewish community. It is due to some outside force which has the means to take away the right of the Jew to use the school to learn and to know. The experience of the Jewish community in England is that wherever we have built an institution for the increase of the spread of Jewish knowledge, the numbers desiring to take advantage of its teaching nearly always exceed the physical capacity of the school to accept them. And in Britain, only the fringe is in action.

The age we live in is known as the scientific era and is noted for the ideas which men study and develop to discover ever more secrets of nature. Mankind is avid to know what is round the corner, to find his way there, to analyze and to measure so that he may know more about the subject matter which, up to that moment, has evaded him. But it is not only in the scientific field that our knowledge is increasing and widening.

All of us here are involved in the survival of the Jewish people with its cultural tradition and background, without which the survival has no real significance either for Jew or non-Jew.

The French Revolution of 1789 — a little less than 200 years ago — excitedly awakened man to a new conception of his rights and privileges in the Western world. Jewish life behind the walls of the ghetto could hear the murmurings of the violent mobs who believed that they were tearing down the outworn forms and institutions. The French revolutionaries killed and sang exulting songs of freedom of thought. Many Jews could not remain unmoved or deny themselves the desire to partake of the fresh and invigorating winds which appeared to be blowing away the clouds of poverty, ill-treatment, and injustice. Some of them even thought that the eternal truths of Judaism might live more perfectly in the new free world and bring lasting peace to the Jewish communities by the establishment of the brotherhood of man.

The Jewish emancipation that emerged from this state of mind was deceptive and did not contain the true answer. It had no tradition, and the slope to assimilation was a slippery one. There were many Jews who were suspicious of the fresh winds of intellectual and scientific discovery, and they continued to protect themselves behind the ghetto walls, many of which still remained. Some Jews who had plunged into

the stream of free thought and action found new interests and a more intense seduction in the new freedoms. In the west of Europe there were genuine attempts on the part of many Jews to translate the eternal Jewish values into modern terms.

In more recent times, the establishment of the State of Israel has presented to the Jewish people two new challenges. Firstly, how can we ensure the character and quality of Jewish culture and life in Israel as expressed in our tradition and spiritual ideals? And secondly, what must we do to keep alive in Diaspora Jewry its identification with the nature, growth, and people of the new state and thus build an indestructible bridge between the Diaspora and Israel, or in other words, between past and future?

It is true that today in the Diaspora many complex problems of environment and social values face the Jewish communities. There are always the attractive pressures of highly developed surrounding cultures. We have to ensure that the Jew in the Diaspora will become at least a bicultural being, so that he is at home equally in the two cultures. In this way, the Jew will achieve a balanced personality. Anti-Semitism will not be able to exercise internal psychological pressure on such a Jew, for he will be mentally and emotionally equipped and know with whom he can naturally identify himself. Indeed, his spiritual and focal point may be Israel, even though he lives in the Diaspora.

In attempting to define Jewish culture we must use as our first premise the idea that Jewish identity is rooted in the fundamental nature of its traditional past as it has been practiced in the social, intellectual, and spiritual aspects of Jewish life. We have no need to seek our identity, for it exists in our historical past and in the vision of our Prophets. If I may venture the observation, I should say that the four main points are the following:

1. What does our tradition offer us to meet our cultural and spiritual needs?
2. What are the special educational and sociological problems which arise out of these needs?
3. What does an analysis of our cultural pattern show? Where are its roots? How strong are they? How can they be best expressed in modern terms?
4. How will they help our survival both in Israel and in the Diaspora?

It is not my task to answer these questions and to go more deeply into their significance and their direction. We have here three prominent Jewish intellectuals residing in the Western world. I know that I have no need to introduce them to you for they are well-known to you both by name and reputation.

PROFESSOR NATHAN ROTENSTREICH (*Rector, Hebrew*

University, Jerusalem): It is by way of the decision of the chairman that I am the first speaker in this debate, though I am not sure — without questioning the authority of the chairman — that this is the wisest choice; for I do not represent in this discussion a comprehensive, full-fledged view about the subject matter before us. I am the son of a perplexed generation and do not believe that perplexity can be tucked away. Perplexity has to be taken very seriously, not only as one of the symptoms of the contemporary world and the Jewish intellectual moral scene but as one of the very serious problems we have to face. It is with this proviso that I am taking the floor.

Let me start with a few short observations about the general background of our discussion. Speaking from the Jewish point of view we have to take into account a very simple though profound fact: we cannot go on by way of inertia; we cannot take things for granted. The fact that these things were imperative to our forefathers, or even to our fathers, does not make these things imperative for us. We are a questioning generation and to one's questioning penetrates the atmosphere it is bound to sustain. We can partially answer questions but we cannot uproot the questioning attitude to the world — the human world, the Jewish world.

We are concerned with the survival of the Jewish people as a part of the world; as a semi-independent part of the world, we have to find our way through our own means. Even when we ultimately affirm Jewish traditional values we have to affirm them from our own position, and not because they are carried over the generations. Now, why is it so? Why can we not be oblivious to the fundamental attitude of questioning? It is because modern Jewish history, which has brought us to this present moment with its partial solutions and problems, has been made by those who wanted to be part of the world, who did not want to stay outside. They did not take the traditional view — a very profound view — that Jewish history has its own past; that while it may be chronologically — in the physical or astronomic sense — included under the common umbrella of world history, it remains a history that has its own past. In this spirit, Jews, living among the gentiles, lived with them geographically or economically, but in their own awareness considered themselves to be apart.

This attitude has changed fundamentally in the last hundred years. All modern Jewish trends — the emancipation movement, Zionism, various attempts at territorial autonomy, Jewish socialism, and so on — have been attempts to find our place in and with the world as it is, and even with the means provided by the world as it is — human and legal rights, the *Rechtsstaat*, nationalism, statehood, revolutionary movements, and revolution itself. All these were aspects or factors prevailing in the world. Some of the Jews tried to establish themselves within the areas of the *Rechtsstaat*, of the liberal movement, of the

socialist movement; some of them tried to adapt to our own aspirations the means provided by the world, such as nationalism – to interpret our historical aspirations through the means provided by the contemporary world.

Thus we live in a world which we did not create. Moreover, we live in a world inside which we try to find our place – without, however, totally losing our identity. The world we live in is marked by several distinctive features, which have a bearing on the Jewish situation or, as it is called in this discussion, Jewish values. This is a secular world, created not by traditional approaches, not by an ongoing reinterpretation of the Scriptures, but by an adventure to decipher the secrets of nature by method, by mathematical tools, by hypotheses. This is a world which in its *Weltanschauung* is nondogmatic. Science has changed and will continue to change; change is inherent in the scientific world view because science is built on observation and on experiments. These cannot be summoned, but are given. They can be interpreted but they are not bound to find their interpretation in already existing patterns.

I am not implying that the secular world view is bound to be antireligious. This may have been the case when the secular view first emerged: usually when new movements come to life they are polemic and consequently antitraditional. But a distinction may be suggested between the inner logic of the modern world view – which is secular – and its historical moods – which are antitraditional. This secular aspect of the modern world view has been a permanent feature until now.

The second distinctive feature that has to be put forward in this context is that we live in a world styled or molded by the *Weltanschauung* of science. It is not only a question of textbooks but of intellectual upbringing, of actual ways of life shaped by the scientific world view, finding their expression in technological innovations, in the technological organization of society. Technologically organized society differs from traditional society in that technology is based on intervention in existence, in reality – letting tools and not customs or traditional loyalties shape our way of life. The technological civilization in which we live creates a uniform style of life, and a uniform style of life is by necessity opposed to a traditional style of life. A traditional style of life is not uniform; it is particular, even peculiar.

The third point I would like to mention in this context is perhaps not of the same magnitude, but is not minor from the point of view of the social issues facing contemporary society and from the point of view of Jewish social issues. We live in a world which is over-organized, which tends to create comprehensive political and economic organizations; and there is a parallelism here between the universal aspect of science and technology and the universal framework of social existence. The stress of an organization tends to repress spontaneous

behavior. Minorities usually behave spontaneously, for otherwise they are bound to be totally immersed in the comprehensive external framework. It is worth noting that spontaneous movements in our own time are mainly protest movements, an example of which is to be found on American university campuses. They are not creative movements with the objective of creating permanent frameworks of behavior and existence; nor do they last. The national movements of a former era were also to some extent spontaneous movements, but their objective was the establishment of a semi-independent framework of social existence. The discrepancy between the over-organization of society at large and the spontaneity expressing itself in protest movements is an extremely important phenomenon of the contemporary scene and has some bearing on the possibility of a given Jewish activity that has to be spontaneous but cannot expose itself to being a protest movement.

I mention these three features to introduce the subject I am dealing with: Jewish values in our time. I believe that any attempt at a Jewish political, social, or cultural renaissance must take into consideration these facts and factors. Not only can we not possibly ignore them, but we must incorporate them into the way we are to live as Jews, the way in which we are to respond to the world as Jews. Any incorporation such as this is bound to be an interpretation; and any interpretation is selective and fragmented and cannot pretend to be dogmatic or universally valid. Any integration of this sort cannot aspire to arrive at a consistent world view in our time. There are groups of Jews who, in a way negating the world outside, believe that they already have a consistent world view as Jews. That is their good right, and theologically they are on very good ground. But those of us who have decided to live in the world cannot pretend to put forward a consistent world view as Jews. And who are we to demand from ourselves that we be consistent as a group? It is the right, or possibly the duty, of an individual thinker to be consistent; but a group cannot, and possibly should not, live in a consistent sort of pattern. A group has to find its own eclectic composition, and I suggest that we could be very satisfied with a sort of Jewish eclecticism, without pretending to put forth a comprehensive consistent Jewish world view.

Eclecticism is not only a deficiency to be found in the nonreligious Jew in our time; I venture to suggest that it is a feature of the religious Jew as well. The religious Jew in our time, when he continues the traditional pattern of Jewish existence — even if he does not do so by way of a personal decision — cannot possibly assume that *other* Jews who want to remain Jews will not take upon themselves the burden of decision. Therefore the traditional Jew has to take into account the faith of the nontraditional Jew, and possibly one of the major problems of the modern halakhic point of view should be how to consider the nontraditional Jew who is not just an ignoramus, not just a sinner, not

just a libertine, but who has his own guiding principles of life and is not afraid of burdens, but adheres to them by way of his own decision.

So far as I can see, any renaissance of halakha in modern times must come from extrahalakhic sources, which will take into consideration both human reality in our day and possibly a philosophical view of what is expressed in halakha. The traditional halakhic view as developed during the last 300 or 400 years did not ask this philosophical question, but saw halakha as a self-contained entity. Such a view leaves aside — consciously or unconsciously — very many fundamental aspects not only of temporary but of permanent human reality. Any halakha that has the right to exist and the right to dignified survival must be based on a world view and the view of man, and not be halakha based on halakha. Speaking as an extrahalakhic but not antihalakhic Jew, I say that this is a time when halakha cannot go on by means of *petitio principii*; it must be sure of its principles.

I venture to suggest that the major philosophical principle underlying halakha is that man is a responsible being, to be judged by the Divine Judge, but also responsible to the world. Man, then, is called upon not to give reality his blessing and fly away from it, but to struggle with and mold reality. These two combined aspects — man as a responsible being who is subject to judgment and man in an active attempt to mold the world — are possibly the two main considerations of halakha. They are more important, certainly more profound, than any given formalities. Halakhic Jewry in our time is faced with the question of finding commandments to express the principles and not artificially to adjust principles to given commandments.

The secular Jew who is consciously a Jew, rooted in Jewish history, cannot be oblivious to the crisis expressed by secularism. Secularism — even if it is an event in historical development and possibly an evolutionary element — is from the viewpoint of Jewish history an event of crisis. It expresses a chasm between our generation and the former Jewish generations. The secular Jew cannot regard Jewish religion — or any religion at all — as a prejudice. He must constantly face the fact that traditional Jewish culture is a religious culture; and he can only interpret for himself his own meaning of Jewish culture that is devoid of the ultimate religious norm.

Paraphrasing William James' search for a moral equivalent of war, it can be said of the secular Jews that they are facing the question of a contemporary secular equivalent of traditional Judaism. This sounds like an impossibility and it is certainly, historically speaking, a totally new phenomenon. But I do not believe that we can talk this phenomenon away; it has to run its course. If it fails, secular Jews will face the fact that they did not succeed. They will not come back by being pushed. If they do not come back as a result of having found their own way, they will present a new variety of Judaism.

What I have said applies to both the Diaspora and Israel and in a way even more to Israel than the Diaspora; for one of the *raison d'être* of Judaism in our time as represented by Israel is to permit Jews to be citizens of the world and Jews at the same time. Israel cannot afford the distinction between that which is human and that which is Jewish. We in Israel are socially, politically, and geopolitically part of the contemporary world and we must shape our society in that world. We can do so by human and by Jewish principles, whichever seem to be appropriate. Diaspora Jewry, since its emancipation, has been living in permanent antinomy, living in the world and trying to preserve its identity. It can do this apparently only by creating islands of Jewish schools or organizations, which are, by the very nature of the situation, not concerned with all the issues facing the modern Jew, but only with those the Jew faces in his limited *dalet amot* of being a Jew. To my mind there does not exist — and possibly cannot exist — Jewish education in the Diaspora that is a comprehensive education, because Jewish education is concerned with fragments directing themselves to the needs of the Jewish community in the limited sense of the term. Thus Jewish education in the Diaspora is by and large concerned with preparation for the Jewish cult, not even for the Jewish religion.

Now, I am not blaming anybody; on the contrary, I think that these features are in a way inevitable. They are part of the Jewish situation; we cannot have it both ways — to create Jewish life which is comprehensive on the one hand and within the world on the other. This is impossible, and unless Diaspora Jewry understands the fundamental antinomy in which it is living, I am afraid that Diaspora Jewry will not find the proper ways and means to create these possible islands of Jewish existence in modern times.

Some of the ideas entertained by American Jewry — the Jew as a lost creature in the world, representing eternal metaphysical exile as opposed to the Christian representing primordial sin — are but rationalizations of the antinomy I have referred to. They have no foundation in the philosophies entertained by Judaism over the centuries, nor do they have any basis whatsoever in the actual situation.

In a way, we in Israel are committing the self-same error as Diaspora Jewry: we rely on organizations. The State of Israel is the outcome of spontaneous effort of the Jews all over the world and the Jews in Israel. We in Israel — perhaps out of a feeling of fulfillment or fatigue — thought that the very establishment of the Jewish state resolved all Jewish problems and that we were no longer called upon to continue our spontaneous effort. We are paying a price for this mistake, because it is clear by now that no organization whatsoever — not even an organization called the Jewish state — can solve all the human problems of the Jews or any other human beings. Diaspora Jews in their personal life live by and large as others do; in their communal life they are Jews.

This is a very strange reversal of the *haskala* watchword, *heyeh yehudi be'ohalekha ve'adam betzetkha* — be a Jew in your tents and a man outside. This antinomy must be understood when we speak about the existential conditions of Jewish culture in our time.

One final word, about loyalty to peoplehood as a principle of our behavior and a principle in our education. I am not speaking about the supremacy of a people; I do not believe in the supremacy of any people, but only in the supremacy of truth. I am speaking about the primacy of people, which is a very simple fact of life that has been transformed into an issue by the tragic and sometimes perverted attitude of Jews. Members of peoples of the world can be citizens of the world and sons and daughters of their peoples. The whole idea that there is a fundamental contradiction between one's primary loyalty and the world is based on misunderstanding, on emotions, on the passions of Jews who have not become the citizens of the world that they pretend to be. This very elementary consideration that we are sons and daughters of a people — without thereby assuming that all our problems are solved and that our people possesses all the possible principles of behavior in the world — must be stressed in Jewish discussions both in Israel and the Diaspora.

Winding up, I would say that what we need is a new Jewish radicalism — radicalism in the proper Latin sense of the word — going to the roots of the human and Jewish situation in our time. We need, if you will permit me, radical Zionism, that is to say, the understanding that Jews have to create their own social framework by their own means; we cannot just be children to other peoples. It is our primary responsibility to live from our own sources or resources; I believe this is the basic presupposition of radical Zionism. This cannot possibly be achieved by a mass movement. What we need is the courage to be a minority.

PROFESSOR ANDRE NEHER (*Chairman, Department of Hebrew Language and Literature, University of Strasbourg; Chairman, Cultural Commission, World Jewish Congress; President, French Section, World Jewish Congress*): Undoubtedly it is trite to speak of *eternal* Jewish values. If one wants to think about the exact meaning of words, eternity covers three dimensions: the past (and it is true that we do not renounce any of the contributions of the past and of tradition); the present (and it is true that without "living in the present" there are no living Jewish values); and the third dimension, which is just as indispensable, that of the future. Now let us analyze these Jewish values in this futuristic dimension.

In fact, is this not what Herzl has already done in his novel *Altneuland*, a work of fiction confirmed by reality — or rather fiction that created reality?

Today science demands that we master a new technique: the science

of perspective, whereby we ourselves invent the year 2000. The men who want to live, who want to participate in history, must necessarily enter into this laboratory where the scientists and sociologists are busy establishing the year 2000.

We see a spectacle of great mutations:

a) social: new cities, large complexes, and television, all representing radical transformations of our conservative society;

b) political: the entry of the Third World and China on the scene of history announces startling political changes;

c) religious: there will be 600,000,000 men who read the Bible, as against 3,000,000,000 men who totally ignore its existence.

These great mutations have three characteristics. They are:

a) universal: they affect us in an unescapable way and nobody can be free from them;

b) all-changing: those who know how to interpret these lines of projection know that the classical boundary lines are already modified, erased, or displaced; for example, the distinctions between leaders and led, between pessimism and optimism, between capitalism and Marxism, are already of a different nature than they were in times gone by;

c) irreversible: so that it is really quixotic to try to ignore them or to imagine that one can stop them. It is not only a question of being realistic in taking these mutations into account; it is a question of choosing life. Basically the choice is not between quixotism and realism but between suicide and life.

"Uvacharta bachayim" — once again we must make the great choice. It is because to be a Jew means to choose life that I would like to analyze the *futuristic* Jewish values; that is to say, those possible in the future.

Presenting the problem from a purely methodological point of view, I suddenly discover that I am in full agreement with history, with existence. What only appeared to me as a method of thinking, I would now like to make you feel, is really the very path of our destiny, the destiny of the Jewish people.

In fact, there is a remarkable coincidence between these external, universal mutations and the internal mutation of Judaism. A real revolution has taken place in the Jewish world in little more than twenty years.

Some fifty years ago, Franz Rosenzweig already had some intuition of this mutation when he devised his motto, *"Neues Denken."* All the old philosophic and cultural antinomies — religion and secularism, Zionism and assimilation, socialism and spiritualism — have been replaced by something new and different. As Jews we are all — and that was Rosenzweig's great intuition — with our many different and often contradictory characteristics, nevertheless part of the same landscape.

What we have learned during these twenty-five years, and what Rosenzweig could not yet know, is that this landscape has a name — a name which is difficult to define because it is dialectical, because we intuit that it is made up of two contradictory and yet inevitably linked themes: Auschwitz and Israel.

I will try, later on, to find a term capable of describing this dialectical combination, but the essential idea is that through Auschwitz and Israel we are all part of the same landscape. Just as the patriarch Abraham was on one side and the rest of the world on the other, the entire Jewish people feels that it is on one side and the rest of the world on the other. Once again, we find ourselves alone, scattered, and abandoned. And yet, if we were to limit our description of the last twenty-five years of Jewish history to that aspect alone, it would betray a total misunderstanding of the great mutation represented by that period of our history. While such a separation confirms Rosenzweig's *Neues Denken*, from a certain aspect it weakens it.

In fact the contiguity of the Jewish landscape and of the world landscape was not static for Franz Rosenzweig. For him it was dynamic, but the rhythm of this dynamism appeared to him as a road coming from the outside world toward Jewry. For us today, this dynamism has changed its direction. Judaism has become a force; Jewish values have become an example, a magnet, a stimulant. It is as if Judaism were brimming and ready to overflow, to give itself to an expectant world that is asking for it. The Marranos, the proselytes, the perplexed, put into motion this centripetal movement, which it is our task to accelerate and intensify. Consciously or unconsciously the world senses that it needs Jewish values.

This reversal of the dynamics of the relationships between Judaism and the world seems to me to be one of the most significant characteristics of our present history, one of the most decisive indications for measuring Jewish values in futuristic terms. The evidence is plentiful, and I cited some examples last year at the Executive Meeting in Strasbourg, when I spoke of *hapanim la'olam*. Instead of repeating them, I prefer to mention a quite recent example, which is almost a caricature but which seems to me to be significant: "It's *in* to be Jewish," declared an advertisement for canned foods by a New York firm; and with all its naiveté, ridiculousness, emptiness, hollowness, and even dangerousness it nevertheless represents a trend. "It's *in* to be Jewish." The Jew is no longer considered a pariah, a scapegoat, a leper, an unhappy creature whose destiny is to be avoided. He is in the vanguard of history, of human society. He is *the* sociological gauge of our time. And this fact, reflected by the advertisement with all its dangerous naiveté, points to a profound reality of which we must become aware. The world awaits us, the world

calls us. There is a cosmic yearning for Judaism among all humanity. The world needs the Jew.

What a contrast with the not too distant past, when the Jew was isolated, exiled in a sort of metahistory. His contemporary situation was presented in a vertical dimension, while the historical Jew — accepted and sought by human society — appeared in a horizontal dimension. This contradiction must be accepted. It is this paradox whereby Jewry is at one and the same time metahistorical and historical, exiled from the world and thrown into the world, that constitutes the prospective foreground — and I mean the *foreground* and not the background — of Jewish values of today and tomorrow.

To make things clearer, I would like to describe this paradox by three terms which constitute the three futuristic themes of today's Judaism. These three themes are: *tel-aviv*, *neshama yetera*, and *amana*. These very simple names might make one smile — Tel-Aviv, the great Jewish metropolis; *neshama yetera*, that is, the *shabbes neshomo*; *amana*, the biblical mountain in the Song of Songs. I have chosen these terms because they are traditional. *Hitkadmud kedem* — there is no progress without faithfulness to the sources. And I would like to show how these terms transcend toward a higher significance.

Tel-Aviv, the great Jewish city of Israel, conceived and constructed entirely by Jews, from its foundations in the sand to the summit of its skyscrapers — that might be enough. But no, there is something else, a matter of the name, of etymology, of what I described earlier in my statement concerning method. When Nahum Sokolow wanted to translate Herzl's prophetic novel, *Altneuland*, into Hebrew, he found that the most difficult part to translate was the title. He looked among the biblical sources and ended up by finding in Ezekiel the expression *tel-aviv* — "spring on the ruins."

That is the Auschwitz-Israel dialectic; that is the secret of our existence, simultaneously historical and metahistorical; that is the secret that mankind today senses in Judaism and demands from us — the world is on the edge of a precipice; a nuclear Auschwitz threatens us; tell us how Tel-Aviv can rise from Auschwitz! It is this secret of survival that we are being asked to explain. It is certainly a prodigious secret, capable of astonishing and interesting the world; but it is inadequate if it is only a question of biological survival. Indeed, in that case it is an illusory secret, for, like Job we have lost our children, and if a new generation is born it is a *different* generation. The fact of the matter is that in this survival there is a deeper secret, a *kodesh kodashim* for which the world yearns and which I would call *neshama yetera*.

Neshama yetera is a decisive futuristic element. We have entered the post-Christian era. Vatican II, with its *aggiornamento*, is not fighting a vanguard but a rearguard battle. This is why, while maintaining toward

Christianity the same minimum of respect and tolerance shown toward us in the Council's Declaration on the Jews, we must dissociate ourselves from Christianity.

We must dissociate ourselves because we are innocent. The Jews offer the world the strategy of innocence. They were not involved in the conflicts of colonialism, of capitalism, and of the secular wars to gain power. That is why Israel's assistance to the Third World is sought after and appears to us to be of great significance. We did not join Christian civilization as executioners, and we do not want to be associated with it as victims.

We must also dissociate ourselves from Christianity for a still deeper reason. *Neshama yetera* is a supplement to the soul. Christianity offers the concept of man divided between body and soul. Judaism is based on the concept of unified man — one unit that is at the same time body and soul, spirit and matter — and it is onto this inextricable whole that the mitzva adds the supplementary soul. It is this supplementary soul that the world needs.

The great Kantian law of treating man as an end and not as a means is not sufficient, because it must be applied to the whole man, to the total man, including the economic and social man. *Neshama yetera* means saying *yes* to economics, to technique, while safeguarding liberty; it means saying *yes* to work while recognizing the imperative necessity of Shabbat for body and soul; it means saying *yes* to civilization while safeguarding justice. This is the point in Judaism that strikes non-Jewish thinkers, particularly Marxists — the practical, social messianism of Judaism. And it is precisely this that makes Judaism a futuristic religion.

Nahum Goldmann has said, "Judaism is too important to be left only to religious Jews. It is the business of the whole Jewish people." I will go even further: Judaism is much too important to be solely the concern of the Jewish people; it is the concern of the whole world. But it would also be a disaster if Judaism became the concern of the whole world and ceased to be that of the Jewish people! What a disaster it would be if the Jewish people, faced with the slogan, "It's *in* to be Jewish," had nothing to offer other than gefillte fish or *tafina*. It is to protect us against that danger that I propose to you the third theme, *amana*.

The word *amana* comes from the same root as the word *amen*, which says *yes*; and in this sense, it summarizes the notion of *neshama yetera* that we have just developed. But we also find it in the title, *Rosh Amana*, the basic work of Isaac Abravanel. A witness to the catastrophe of 1492, he nonetheless said *yes* to historical optimism. It was already a "spring on the ruins," already a summary of *tel-aviv*.

But the word *amana* is above all a replacement, or alternative, for *emuna*. *Emuna* represents something individual, *amana* something

collective. And the collective values of Judaism are religious values. These values are indomitable; it is still in the synagogue that the Jews of the USSR meet. These values singularize us. When President Shazar attended the funeral of Winston Churchill in London, he was the only one to follow the bier on foot, because of Shabbat. We find here again the theme of Abraham, alone on one side, and the whole world on the other.

But these values are also futuristic. More young people yearn for halakha than one imagines. During a recent literary colloquium, some young Israeli writers said to their elders: "You have a secret — tradition. And you have stolen it from us. *Tnu lanu halakha*." Bialik, Rosenzweig, and Buber had a longing for halakha and *limud*. It is also the longing of a great number of the intellectuals whom we meet during the colloquia of Jewish intellectuals organized by the French Section of the World Jewish Congress.

When I hear non-Jews and perplexed Jews, in Israel and in the *gola*, ask for our secret and show us their yearning for halakha and *limud*, I see that we are wasting time in trying to *define* Judaism and the Jews. What must be done is to lead Judaism and the Jews toward the *infinite*; to make Judaism and the Jews leave their finitude and their solitude and realize the unity of the Jewish people with the two cosmic infinities that are the world and God.

TENTH SESSION

August 3, 1966 (evening)

In the Chair: DR. T. SCHNEIDER
(*South African Jewish Board of Deputies*)

1. INTRODUCTION TO THE DEBATE ON CULTURAL PROBLEMS (continued)

PROFESSOR LEON DUJOVNE (*Professor of Philosophy and Law, University of Buenos Aires*): I do not know exactly what the title of our theme – “Jewish Values and Challenges” – was intended to mean. In any case it is a question of the values of Judaism on the one hand, and its challenges on the other. It seems to me that two interpretations are possible as regards the challenges: either a challenge that these values pose to reality, to our contemporary world; or, on the contrary, a challenge that reality poses to these values. In any event it is a matter of a confrontation between the values of Judaism and today’s human reality.

From a theoretical point of view it can be said that there is, on the one hand, what is called Judaism and, on the other, the Jewish people. I should like to say right off that the notion of Judaism is not a purely conceptual construction; although it can be expressed in general or even abstract terms, it is an abstraction based on a proof – the continuity of the existence of the Jewish people throughout the thirty-five centuries of its history. If Judaism is a coherent repository of values, we must bear in mind that these are values that the Jewish people has conceived or discovered – values that the Jewish people has experienced by making them its own dearly-held assets. The challenge is not, therefore, to Judaism as a system of values, but to the Jewish people – the creator, or bearer, or servant of this system of values.

These values are principles and convictions; they constitute guiding thoughts or profound inclinations in the life of the Jewish individual. These challenges to the Jewish people represent concrete situations that the Jewish people must confront in order to remain true to the values that it has discovered or created in a current of genuinely original inspiration.

For the sake of method, during this presentation we will try first of all to determine certain fundamental values of Judaism, leaving some

aside which are not indispensable to our discussion, and commentary on which would lead us too far afield. We will then indicate how the preservation of these values comes up against the difficulties created by the situation of today's world and by the situation of the Jewish people in particular.

What are the values of Judaism? In order to answer this question adequately it would be necessary to establish a methodical definition of Judaism; to determine Jewish points of view on subjects that are essential for man — for the individual, for the group, and for humanity as a whole. Additional research — of a historical and philosophical nature — would be necessary, in order, first of all, to seek out in the long history of the Jewish people the specifically Jewish responses to the questions posed by life to man. This means that we would have to set out the values that the Jewish people has deemed worthy of adoption and practice in order for an existence to be qualified as human. Furthermore we would have to seek out in the literary documents of Judaism the doctrinal expression that was given to these values. And finally, it would be necessary to present these values in their hierarchical order — what the philosophers call a scale of values.

Here and now, however, we can only refer very briefly to some Jewish values, without aspiring to any any sort of discovery on the subject. To indicate some specifically Jewish values, we can use as our point of departure the objections voiced against Judaism and the Jewish people by one of their opponents, Schopenhauer. Schopenhauer reproached Judaism with being optimistic; for him Judaism combined theism, realism, and optimism, all three of which he opposed. He was irritated by the first chapter of Genesis, according to which God was pleased with what He had created.

Schopenhauer was right: Judaism is realistic and optimistic; the world, for Judaism, is not an illusion, and life is worthy of being lived and affirmed. Schopenhauer's metaphysical outlook, based on historical pessimism, had its precursors in the thought of ancient India and Greece. It was opposed to the Jewish vision of history as a process in human life, as a means of knowing the past and projecting toward the future. For Schopenhauer there was no such thing as the history of humanity, in which reality changes in time; for him history was unchanging, that is, nonhistorical. He regarded as an optimistic distortion of reality any attempt to find meaning in history. In his words, "History provides only a long, harsh, and confused dream of mankind."

For Judaism, history offers us not a dream of mankind but the development of a succession of events — often horrible and tragic — in which men are and will continue to be the actors. History has meaning for Judaism because the acts of men in successive generations, oriented toward the future, also have meaning. History, for Judaism, is a value.

That human history has meaning is a conviction that appears in the Bible and has persisted to our day. Judaism has contributed to human history the idea of what history is. In the Jewish vision of history, the future is as important as the present and the past. If we call Judaism the repository of the values conceived, discovered, or elaborated by the Jewish people, we can conclude, in the same spirit whereby Judaism considers that life has a value and deserves to be lived, that history is a value. The intense historical consciousness by which Jewish life has been driven since biblical times consists of remembrance of the past, confrontation of the present, and projection toward the future.

Salo Baron recently said that there are not many Jewish philosophies of history. Still, philosophies of history are to be found in the Bible and the Mishna as well as in the works of Yehuda Halevi, Nachman Krochmal, Moses Hess, Aḥad Ha'am, Martin Buber, André Neher, and Nathan Rotenstreich, not to mention Graetz, Dubnow, and Salo Baron himself. They resemble each other in fundamentals to a greater degree than one would think at first sight; they all contain the philosophy implicit in any lucid presentation of Jewish history.

The words of the Prophets evoked only a few great events of the Jewish past. They pronounced themselves on the present — the Jewish and universal situation and problems of their day — and at the same time announced the human world of the future. This attitude appears — even if not in an implicit way — in all the Jewish philosophies of history and in the works of Graetz, Dubnow, Baron, and other Jewish historians. There is a Jewish conviction whereby each moment of history has meaning and the whole of history has a value.

This is neither the time nor the place to go into a thorough analysis of the subject I have just touched upon. It seems to me, for example, that one could demonstrate that the ancient Greeks, who developed such a wonderful civilization, did not perpetuate their personality throughout the centuries because they lacked a living sense of historical reality; and this despite the fact that the values of their civilization have deeply penetrated Western civilization. To conclude this subject, one could say that the Book of Job only relates the tragedy of a man confronted by implacable adversity and the unfathomable mystery of cosmic forces. But, as André Neher has done in a study of the text of Job, one can also see Job in a historical manner. He tells us that for Franz Rosenzweig the secret of the Book of Job was to be found in its final verses, in that Job had gone through a series of stages; and Professor Neher concludes as follows: "The man who passed through these different stages, who threw himself into the flow of everlasting history, transmuted Satan into the Messiah." The tragedy of an individual confronted by terrible cosmic forces can, we see, be interpreted by applying the concepts of change and of endless history.

Thus we have identified two values of Judaism, one being life and the

other consisting of history as a process of the development of humanity and its different cultural formations. We have just used the word *humanity*, which is also one of the values of Judaism. Ever since biblical times, humanity and the human being considered generically have been a value for Judaism. If we had to define in a concept the value of humanity in Judaism, we would have to include among others two aspects of this concept. They appear to be contradictory, but for Judaism and for the Jew who affirms the value of humanity this contradiction presents no difficulty and is not essential. The two aspects in question are: the unity of mankind, which is tied in with the notion of the unity of creation; and the legitimacy of human diversity. Life and history as I have referred to them have meaning and value to the degree that they are the life of a humanity that is at the same time one and varied. Linked to the value of humanity that is understood in this manner, we find another value, that of *liberty*. This word, which is heard frequently in today's world, has not only a political and social sense but is also used to express a metaphysical concept, in the often debated philosophical question of whether or not human will is characterized by spontaneity.

In Judaism liberty is inherent to human will. In terms of the situation of modern man, this means the possibility, indeed the right, of every individual and every human group to live his or its own spiritual life — the right of man to formulate his own spiritual responses to the situations and problems with which he is confronted. And when we speak of the liberty of every human group to lead its own spiritual life, we find ourselves before yet another value, linked with those we have already cited in the Jewish conception of humanity. As we have said, this conception unites in a single value the notion of the unity of mankind and that of human diversity. For Judaism the individual is inconceivable outside a social framework, outside the concept of a society; and for Judaism the form of this society is not a subject of indifference from a moral viewpoint, but must be characterized by *justice*. It is not a question of the justice provided by Roman law, whereby each individual was assured of what belonged to him; but rather of justice in the living and dynamic structure of communal life.

The idea of human justice, insofar as it expresses a Jewish value, is linked with the Jewish conception of history as an inseparable combination of the past, present, and future. The Jewish idea of values, applied to justice, is tied in with the futuristic conception of a messianic period in human history. The Jewish vision of history seen as a value is inextricably linked with hope in the creation of a just social order.

The unity of humanity and the empirical fact of different societies as its necessary complement bring us to another value — *peace* — which provides the possibility of conciliating human diversity.

We have mentioned several Jewish values: life and history; humanity, at once indivisible and varied; liberty and societal justice; and peace. I have not forgotten that from the point of view of speculative philosophy I have omitted something important — the definition of what we mean by *value*. For Judaism values are not individual caprices; they are not subjective. Nor do they have an absolute character which would justify their imposition on all men. They are objective to the extent that they are adopted by a collective conscience. We have not mentioned other Jewish values, such as knowledge, family, work, and divinity; for we are interested in pointing out those values which constitute a challenge to the world of today. We have tried to show how the Jewish people, wanting to remain true to certain Jewish values, finds itself immediately and directly challenged by circumstantial elements in the contemporary world.

Contrary to the Jewish affirmation of life, to what is called Jewish optimism, we find the despair of so many sectors of contemporary mankind. It would seem that for them the only meaning of life is the meaning provided by the present moment, with no projection that goes beyond the immediate — a hopeless and valueless life. It could be argued that Jewish literature since ancient times contains expressions of pessimism. This pessimism, however, does not constitute a judgment on the intrinsic properties of human life, but rather on the conditions in which men — in contradiction to their own vocation — create their lives. About fifty years ago a Polish Jewish writer, Hillel Zeitlin, who was later murdered by the Nazis in Warsaw, wrote a book in Hebrew on pessimism and optimism among the Jews and the other peoples. After considering the ancient Indians, Greeks, and Jews, Zeitlin analyzed the influence that their respective attitudes had had and continued to have on modern thought. Indian pessimism comes from the conviction that pain is inevitably inherent to all existence; Greek pessimism is provoked by the observation of the limits of human power, the weakness of man. Jewish pessimism, when it exists, is a reaction against the injustices that man endures, injustices that are sometimes inexplicable. Judaism presupposes that it is always possible for men, in their interpersonal and societal relations, to live in justice. Desperation in the face of life, sometimes leading to suicide, is linked in our time to a manner of regarding history as a process devoid of content, a process that develops fatalistically, mechanically, without the conscious participation of human will; or else a simple accumulation of accidental events without direction or goal; or even a process in which success is the only criterion for judging human events.

Mankind today, cruelly divided and capable of monstrous cruelty, is on the road to denying its own unity through acts that it is carrying out or preparing. Respect for human diversity is menaced by tendencies toward monolithic ways of life that do not tolerate differences among

human groups. It is in our time that has appeared Spengler's theory of history, which denies the unity of mankind and affirms only the diversity of cultures, all of which are condemned to perish sooner or later. For Spengler man is an animal of prey, cruel and crafty. Also in our time Toynbee, when he speaks of a possible great society, ends up by denying the legitimacy of human diversity. For Toynbee human differences will be melted into a kind of religion which is only a vague mixture of religions. In our day some people maintain, without even knowing what they are saying, that liberty is a bourgeois preconception that is incompatible with justice; there are also those who act as if liberty included the right to deny all claims to justice.

These philosophies and manifestations are contrary to the values of Judaism that we have mentioned; and it is the value of peace that appears to be most openly menaced. Throughout Jewish history most Jewish values at one time or another have been contravened by the human reality in the midst of which the Jewish people lived. Despotism is not a modern invention, nor is social inequity a discovery of the twentieth century. The image of history as the progressive decay of human societies is not new in the Western world; it has existed for more than 2000 years and within the last century can be found in the writings of Baudelaire, Flaubert, Burckhardt, and Nietzsche, not to mention Spengler and Paul Valéry. Today, in the midst of tremendous technical and scientific progress, we possess the material resources for unifying humanity; at the same time, however, there appear contradictory phenomena that tragically threaten to destroy that same humanity. In these circumstances the values of Judaism are also threatened.

One significant development should, however, be noted: since the Renaissance certain Jewish ideas, and even some Jewish values, have penetrated into some concrete expressions of life in the Western world. Little by little, the value of human life has been affirmed, and it is no longer seen only as the passage through a vale of tears before reaching the world beyond. Since the seventeenth century — first in the writings of Bacon and then in the works of other thinkers — the idea of progress contained in that of hope has been affirmed; but other concepts have always opposed the idea of hope, insisting on the inevitability of the decline of human creations, of civilizations. Despite the sometimes brutal contradiction of events, the concept of the unity of mankind gradually has affirmed itself with the increasing knowledge of the history of humanity.

Curiously enough, this development has sometimes occurred in a way that prejudices the respect due the moral values of Judaism. Voltaire, for example, in his essay on the customs and the spirit of nations, refers to different human races — American Indians, Babylonians, Persians, Phoenicians, Chinese, Greeks — but he goes on to

deny any originality to the Jewish people. He wants to undermine the foundations of Christianity, but at the same time he has inherited medieval Christian prejudices toward the Jewish people; and he even goes to older sources — to ancient Greece and Rome — to show that the Jews were hated by, and themselves hated, the rest of the world.

We live in a world where tendencies to respect Jewish values are in harsh opposition to other tendencies, brutally hostile to these values. To be fully aware of these values, and to be true to them in spite of everything, is the duty of the Jew who does not feel that his Judaism is a fiction or a fatally determined part of his personal life.

Until now we have pursued this discussion as if it were theoretically possible to make a distinction between Judaism seen as a repository of values and the Jewish people, which by its conduct recognizes and affirms the reality of these values. We now come to a stage in the discussion where this distinction is no longer possible. For every Jew who is really Jewish, Judaism as a system of values is itself a value. For the Jewish people — more precisely, for each Jew — it is a question of inseparable values that form one single value. There is no Judaism without Jews, and only those who manifest their loyalty to Judaism are Jews. Nor can we any longer put ourselves in the position of an objective observer who considers, on the one hand, an aggregate of values and, on the other, the way in which these values are challenged by the circumstances of today's world or the way in which these values constitute a challenge to those circumstances.

What is at stake for us now is the survival of the Jewish people, identified with the values of Judaism. The Jewish people lives dispersed among many countries of the world. In this dispersion it is challenged by external and internal factors that operate against its unity and against the full vitality of the values of Judaism. These factors are not new, but now they have new features. In order to enable the Jewish people to attempt to confront these factors opposed to its endurance and its values, the first necessity is a clear and precise knowledge of these values.

Since 1880 the name anti-Semitism has been applied to a phenomenon that existed long before then. Anti-Jewish hostility or contempt varied according to the peoples among whom Jews happened to live. Jules Isaac, in *The Teaching of Contempt* and in other works, has made evident the monstrous and the unjust in anti-Jewish prejudice and hatred. We ourselves know all that, through the painful memory of what this hatred is capable of producing. What is important, for the Jews and for humanity, is a clear awareness of the incipient forms of anti-Semitism in order to prevent it from assuming a tragically savage form, until the day when anti-Semitism disappears entirely.

Anti-Semitism sometimes appears as a product of great minds, thus acquiring the cachet of apparent scientific respectability. For Arnold

Toynbee, for example, Judaism is nothing but the fossil of a supposed Syriac culture; and according to Ernest Renan, the great French nineteenth century writer, Judaism ceased to have a *raison d'être* with the appearance of Jesus, and is now nothing but a dried-out trunk. In both these cases, the Jewish people's right of survival is denied, and its continuance is regarded as an anomaly in the course of humanity.

Besides anti-Semitism there exist factors tending toward disintegration and the loss of the individual Jew's Jewish individuality; this danger is called, perhaps improperly, assimilation. In the face of anti-Semitism and disintegrative elements, one form of weakness is the attitude that consists of denying the unity of the Jewish people. This attitude is part of a deplorable Jewish policy practiced by certain circles which we will not name. It is a policy founded on the absurd thesis that there exist Jewish groups and Jewish processes, but not a single Jewish people. This harmful outlook developed in political circumstances peculiar to the modern Western world. In the Middle Ages and even later, human groups identified themselves by various features; political bodies, however, were constituted essentially on the basis of common religious beliefs. In the modern world religion has become increasingly a question of individual conscience. The Christian churches have been able to survive because the various states remained more or less Christian, even those that declared themselves atheistic. The conditions put to the dispersed Jewish people by the trend toward laicization were different, entailing the disintegration of the Jewish people by, among other things, denying its unity.

In the face of the negative factors we have just mentioned, there arose the State of Israel. Today there is not — nor can there be — any other spiritual center in the world for the Jewish communities of the Diaspora, however large they may be. In today's divided world, given the course of the political, social, and cultural development of mankind, the survival of Judaism cannot be conceived without Israel as the point of reference.

This poses the problem of the interaction between Israel and the Jewish communities of the world, an unresolved problem which is a challenge to both Israel and universal Judaism. Efforts must be made on both sides in order to create an active spiritual community of Judaism, of the Jewish people taken as a whole. If the forms of Jewish life are lost among the Jews of the *gola* due to various circumstances, it is necessary, through the knowledge of what is Jewish, to preserve and reinforce the Jewish content in Jewish life. It must be preserved and reinforced with the hope that it will create new Jewish forms of life. Jews throughout the world are excellent citizens of their respective countries. This in no way prevents them from maintaining a living, profound solidarity with Israel; nor does it prevent Israel from serving, along with Jewish historical tradition, as a stimulant that will lead to

the further intensification of the awareness of the history, religion, thought, literature, and art of the Jews.

Until now, the efforts made toward achieving a concrete and dynamic expression of the cultural unity of the Jewish people have been insufficient. I do not think that great imaginative effort is necessary in order to conceive some initiatives whose implementation could only have happy results for the whole of the Jewish people.

2. TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF DR. A. LEON KUBOVY

Dr. NAHUM GOLDMANN: I apologize for interrupting the Cultural Debate, but I would like to say a few words about a man who was one of the central figures of the World Jewish Congress for many years. As his widow is in the audience and has to leave, I would like now to speak about our late friend, Dr. A. Leon Kubovy, who died last May after a long and grave illness.

There was hardly a sphere in Jewish life in which Dr. Kubovy did not take an active part. He began his career in Belgium, where for years he was a most active figure. He participated in the Comité des Délégations Juives that was set up after the First World War and was one of the founders of the World Jewish Congress, organizing its first Assembly. The Nazi invasion forced him to move the United States, where he became secretary-general of the World Jewish Congress. He published a book that is the greatest source for those who want to know what the Congress did, or tried to do, during the holocaust. He went to Israel in 1948 and entered the diplomatic service, where he served as ambassador in Eastern Europe and then in Argentina. Upon his return to Israel he became chairman of Yad Vashem, the greatest symbol of the holocaust.

It is just as important to know what kind of person he was as what he did. I have known the whole galaxy of Jewish leaders in the last thirty or forty years and I am therefore in a position to testify that Kubovy was one of the most important figures in Jewish public life. He combined in himself a broad Western culture with deep Jewish consciousness and a great knowledge of Jewish tradition and problems — an important combination for any Jewish leader in our generation.

Dr. Kubovy had an extremely strong personality and like all strong personalities frequently provoked adverse reactions. It was therefore sometimes difficult to work with him, because he defended his views so vehemently. He was always full of political and organizational ideas. During his last years, in spite of serious illness, he put much effort into ensuring that the future generations would not forget about the holocaust, and in this he fulfilled a great mitzva. He succeeded in impressing upon Israelis the full impact of the holocaust; I attended a number of commemorative ceremonies on Har Hazikaron on the

memorial day for the Nazi victims, and those were some of the most moving moments I can remember. He left a great heritage to both Jews and non-Jews – the Yad Vashem Institute, one of the most impressive institutions in Israel – and his successor will have the difficult task of continuing in the footsteps of such an inspired man.

In spite of his many and varied interests, the World Jewish Congress, in whose history he had played such a central role, remained his great love.

3. DEBATE ON CULTURAL PROBLEMS I.

Mr. IDOV COHEN (*Israel*): A book by Truman Capote, *In Cold Blood*, recently published in the United States, deals with a murder case as seen from the psychological, social, personal, and public aspects of the event, all a result of thorough research. It seems to me that there is a great need for Jewish initiative – especially by the World Jewish Congress – to inquire not so much into the holocaust as into Nazism. There are many works on the subject of the holocaust as well as the other major event in recent Jewish history, the struggle for Israeli independence. But the world needs a sociopsychological analysis of the Nazi movement – an examination of what Thomas Mann called even before the holocaust *die Psychopathologie der Politik*. There is no doubt that it is our duty and our mission to initiate research into this dangerous and unprecedented social disease. The World Jewish Congress should therefore set up a fund to finance university chairs and individual research as one of the means to combat anti-Semitism and see to it that such a genocide may never recur.

Mr. PAUL G. ANNES (*USA*): As my organization, the American Jewish Congress, has no official position on the cultural situation of American Jewry, I am speaking only for myself.

I am not here to disparage or praise the young American Jewish generation, but only to describe it. We have heard this young generation described on all sides as if it were truant or delinquent, or, in more fashionable words, assimilated or alienated. It is neither; indeed the young generation has some very high merits. The young Jews of the United States, in addition to being an educated generation – 80% of them attend universities – feel themselves to be a part of the American community, in the full knowledge that not everything is perfect; their active involvement in the general issues of the day is, I feel, in the tradition of our Prophetic legacy, if not in the ultimate messianic vision. It cannot be said that they are completely estranged from all things Jewish. If they do not always involve themselves in specifically Jewish problems, vast numbers of them do not try to shy away from their identity as Jews, and many of them are active in Jewish philanthropy and community work. They are still fascinated by and

proud of the achievements of the State of Israel and what it stands for.

There are, of course, negative aspects as well, which must be charged, however, not to the youth but to their elders. For many of them, religious experience is not very meaningful; in that sense they are no different from their elders. In fact they do not care much what their elders say or think, nor do they have much respect for the parochialism of many of their parents' interests. If they lack many of the Jewish interests we would like them to have, it is basically because they have not been brought up with a knowledge of the Jewish past or Jewish thought or a sense of communion, of involvement. The fact of intermarriage, which is not nearly as serious as some claim, is almost inevitable in a free society.

But these negative aspects can be corrected if we, the elders, reconsider the institutionalized way in which we do things. If we only look at the product of the Jewish educational system — the most important aspect of all — we will all realize that the system is ineffective. A system that produces only bar-mitzvah boys and bat-mitzvah girls and then leaves them unfit to participate in Jewish life — such a system speaks for its own ineffectiveness. We must change Jewish education so that young Jews will become what we like to think we were in our own younger days. We must teach our young people at least the elements of Hebrew, and we must get them to go to Israel — whether it be as students, as scholars, or in any other form — so that they may come back and be all the better prepared to be leaders of the Jewish community to come.

Mr. ABA BORNSTEIN (*Great Britain*): In his opening address Dr. Goldmann went a long way to show us that we are wrong. I am of the opinion that his diagnosis was right; however, he lacked either the courage or the ability to tell us what the right way was, something I would have expected after his diagnosis. Where do we go from here?

Dr. Goldmann said that we were now living in a democratic age and that it was much more difficult today to fight for the right to be different. I agree with him, but what does he understand by "to be different"? It is impossible to imagine the continued existence of the Jewish people — either in Israel or the *gola* — without a Jewish way of life. The Hebrew language does not have a word for religion; the word that is used, *dat*, means a way of life, and the Jewish way of life is tradition. It is clear to me that the only thing that cements us together is religion; but neither Dr. Goldmann nor anyone else has told us what they mean by "Jewish way of life."

We complain that the youth is not with us. There is a simple answer to this: we may be able to deceive ourselves but we cannot deceive the youth; they know very well whether or not we mean what we say. How many Zionist leaders send their children to Israel? The youth says, "If one speaks of the need for *aliya* but does not send one's own children,

why should we go?" In order for Jewish schools to be effective they must provide religious education and surroundings; unless we bring up our young people religiously, we will lose them.

We are losing a great many Jews because of mixed marriages; in some European countries the rate of mixed marriage is as high as 80%, and the average for Europe is 30%. This means the loss of 30% of our people within one or two generations. Little if anything has been mentioned about this problem at this meeting. I therefore suggest that we speak about religion, about *dat*. We must go back to our sources, to the ways we have learned from our fathers and grandfathers.

ELEVENTH SESSION

August 4, 1966 (morning)

In the Chair: SENATOR DR. AARAO STEINBRUCH (*Brazil*)

1. DEBATE ON CULTURAL PROBLEMS II. (continued)

Mr. BARUH WEINSTEIN (*World Union of General Zionists*): I submit that delegates from Israel — members of the Knesset, ministers, and above all the rector of the Hebrew University — ought to set a good example by speaking Hebrew at this Assembly, which would have an educational effect on the Diaspora. It is no good simply to preach the need for Hebrew outside Israel — a few personal examples are called for.

As a member of a generation of Prisoners and Exiles of Zion, I have chosen as my theme Soviet Jewry. It will soon be fifty years since the October Revolution. Two generations have grown up since then; and yet I come across many Soviet Jews who, although they hold important positions, are not Communists.

Our relations with the Kremlin during the last fifty years have not taken the form of a dialogue, but rather of unilateral protesting on our part. Not so long ago we were asked not to raise this question, and some of us even had their articles rejected by Zionist publications. This has now changed and some progress is being made. But demonstrations from time to time are not enough — we have to study the problem in depth. If we do so, we will find that anti-Semitism is deeply rooted in the Russian psyche. Even a fine writer like Boris Pilniak, who wrote during the springtime of the revolution, in the days of Lunacharsky, when the Habima was performing in Moscow, descended to produce a book in which, describing the pogroms in the Ukraine, he compared the Jewish victims to dogs barking at the new moon. And in our own day, liberal poets like Yevtushenko are immediately overshadowed by anti-Semitic ones.

Popular anti-Semitism is of course not limited to Russia; it is a plague afflicting the world. But in Russia there is official discrimination against the Jews, who are denied privileges accorded to 108 other minorities in the USSR.

In conclusion I would say that the campaign on behalf of Soviet Jewry must be concentrated; we cannot have numerous bodies competing with each other. And the World Jewish Congress is the most suitable agent to concentrate and coordinate this activity.

Mr. ZVI KLEMENTYNOVSKI (*World Federation of Polish Jews*): I fully agree with every word Baruh Weinstein said about using Hebrew. I want all of you to understand me without translation, so I will speak Yiddish.

It has emerged from our discussions that we are facing three main problems: the preservation of the Jewish people, Soviet Jewry, and the security of Israel. Concerning the first problem, we are now told that we should not speak of exile, but of dispersion. Please remember, however, that even the Babylon that produced the Talmud was referred to as an exile. But it is not a matter of terminology. The sad fact is that the majority of our youth outside Israel receives no worthwhile Jewish education. We must make certain that all the discussions here on Jewish education will lead to practical decisions.

On the question of Soviet Jewry, I cannot add much to what has already been said. As to the security of Israel, I believe that the World Jewish Congress should help Israel in its efforts to explain to the world what it is all about. There is a great deal of Arab propaganda abroad; we must counter it and also try to speak to the Arabs themselves. An attempt to present to the world the Jewish point of view is being made by a group of American and Israeli Jews, who publish a monthly magazine. The magazine is rather small, for lack of means, but we know that it reaches some sixty-five countries and is read even by Arab students and leaders. In the same direction, regular meetings between Jewish and Arab students are being conducted at some large American universities. The World Jewish Congress could make an important contribution to this end.

Mr. SCHACHNA ROTHEN (*World Union of Poale Agudat Israel*): I do not know how many delegates here know that this Assembly opened on the 15th of Ab, which according to Jewish tradition is a holy day. Furthermore, none of the correspondence of the World Jewish Congress bears the Hebrew date. I hope this will be remedied in the future.

Some say that our Torah is out of date. The Torah, however, represents not a mere collection of laws but the life-force of the Jewish people. Chosen by the Almighty to show the world a way of life based on justice and humanity, we do not accept that things happen in the world by accident. There is no contradiction between the teaching of the Torah and modern science. In God's good time the Prophetic vision will become a reality and peace will rule the world.

Mr. DAVID SITTON (*Israel*): Speaking for all the Sephardim in the Israeli delegation, I am glad to see that a beginning has been made in involving the Sephardim in the World Jewish

Congress, representing progress since the Stockholm Assembly.

The Sephardim, too, have changed. Most of the some 500,000 Jews who lived in North Africa have found their home in Israel; some went elsewhere and established Sephardic communities in their new countries. We have witnessed and are continuing to witness great changes within the Jewish community of France. With the arrival of the North African Jews — there are now some 350,000 Jews of Sephardic or Eastern origin among the 500,000-strong French Jewish community — new educational and cultural problems were created in that country. Because of the favorable conditions there, the Sephardim in France face great dangers of assimilation and may well be lost to the Jewish people within twenty or thirty years.

The World Jewish Congress must take note of the great need for spiritual help that exists among these groups. We must do everything in order to prepare new leaders for them. The World Sephardi Federation has established a college in London, and another one is going to be set up in Jerusalem, in order to prepare spiritual leaders for the young generation, both in Israel and the Diaspora.

I would also recommend that the Sephardic communities in South America, France, the Balkan region, and Canada should become affiliated to the World Jewish Congress.

Dr. SAUL LANGNAS (*Israel*): Two aims of the World Jewish Congress when it was established thirty years ago were to be a universal organization of world Jewry and to be the only representative body of the Jewish people. The Congress has not succeeded in achieving either goal. As to the first aim, a number of Jewish communities — including Soviet Jewry, for example, which is certainly not the fault of the Congress — are not members. Regarding the second, the fact that seventeen Jewish organizations — among them a number of very important ones — are here only as observers or guests speaks for itself.

However, all Zionist bodies have become associated with the World Jewish Congress, and that is why Jews — and sometimes non-Jews — ask what the difference is between the World Zionist Organization and the World Jewish Congress. Both of them are proud of the same president, Dr. Nahum Goldmann; we see the same faces at their conferences and assemblies; and both organizations share the same goals. I am not advocating the abolition of either of these two organizations but only saying that the time has come to look into their relationship.

Mr. ABRAM SALOMON (*USA*): We live in a turbulent world. Things develop much more quickly nowadays than before, and we must be more efficient in our endeavors, one of the most important of which concerns the Jewish identity of the Jews of the Diaspora, the youth in particular. The fact that we have recognized this problem and are discussing it — even if we are not able to reach a solution here — is in itself a great step forward.

A week ago I made a personal pilgrimage to Auschwitz, a pilgrimage that I was surprised to see how few Jews undertake. Of course non-Jews ought to do it — and for other reasons — but we should encourage Jews to make the pilgrimage to the sites of our martyrdom and thereby strengthen the link between the past and the present.

The situation today reminds me of the period before the advent of political Zionism, when many Jews expended their efforts and talents for foreign causes. Now we are hearing a call to do the same thing — to take the burdens of the world upon our shoulders. I am not opposed to Jews as individuals occupying themselves with universal matters; I do, however, question whether this is a proper occupation for Jewish organizations.

We have heard references made here to the uniqueness of the Jewish people and of Jewish history. To this I would like to add the uniqueness of our generation — the generation of destruction and rebirth — whose task is to remember and remind.

RABBI Dr. MORDECAI KIRSHBLUM (*USA*): These are difficult times. To describe the Jewish situation, one could say that the head is expanding and the heart shrinking. In other words, we are acquiring more and more worldly knowledge while our spiritual content is fading. Jewish existence is tied in with Jewish faith, which is called "the duty of the heart."

We are told that in order to attract Jewish youth to Jewish life we must adjust ourselves to their secular mentality. This, it seems to me, is the wrong way; for in the end, even while being subconsciously motivated by the teachings of our religion, they would persist in their secular ways and serve mostly others. While we must cooperate with the non-Jewish world to avoid fatal developments, we must always remember to remain good Jews. To be sure, Jews never discouraged secular knowledge; our sages were keen on worldly information. But the right way in Jewish education calls for the acquisition of broad secular knowledge on the sound foundation of a traditional Jewish education. Reared on these principles, our young people will remain Jews for the rest of their lives.

Dr. Goldmann spoke of countries where Jews cannot live as Jews. Our tragic problems is that in free countries, where they can live as Jews, there is a lack of will to do so. With the establishment of the Jewish state, the continuity of the Jewish people is secured, as far as we can foresee it.

Mrs. MATHILDA GUEZ, MK (*Israel*): The mere fact that we are here is of great importance; but I am worried about the next generation. We are all growing older, and we are not preparing the young to take over Jewish responsibilities. I was born in Tunisia and I want to point out that as long as the North African Jews lived in their countries of origin, there was no danger of assimilation. As soon as they

moved to other countries — Israel excluded, of course — assimilation began to prevail. Mixed marriages abound in the Diaspora, and religious requirements are not being observed. When I express my anxiety about this, I am told that Jews in Israel are also not very attached to their faith. People who say this do not seem to realize that the Jewish state itself is a guarantee against assimilation.

I urge all Jewish organizations to regard it as their duty to remind Jews in all walks of life to observe the Jewish religious requirements and also to instruct the women how to rear their young on sound Jewish foundations. They should also encourage Jews to enlarge their families, to make up for the heavy losses we suffered in our generation.

I would also like to say how distressed I am that Hebrew has no place at this Assembly as one of the official languages.

Dr. GOLDMANN intervened at this point to say that he had been informed of dissatisfaction on the part of a number of delegates who had not been given the opportunity to speak. He explained that this was not the fault of the Presidium, but rather due to lack of time, and he announced that, in order to enable more delegates to participate in the Cultural Debate, the Presidium had decided to have an additional plenary session on Sunday evening. Dr. Goldmann also appealed for more discipline on the part of the delegates; their tardiness resulted in time being lost and made it impossible for more speakers to address the Assembly.

2. DEBATE ON CULTURAL PROBLEMS III. SPECIAL DISCUSSION: PROBLEMS OF JEWISH YOUTH

RABBI ARTHUR J. LELYVELD (*President, American Jewish Congress*): Since the opening of this Assembly there has been the expression of an acute sense of need. Many speakers have noted the absence of youth; this absence is a symptom of our situation. Jewish youth is not here in large numbers because, by and large, Jewish youth is not enlisted in our cause in great numbers. If there were Jewish youth for whom the unity of the Jewish people and active solidarity with that people were a primary concern, I warrant that they would be here, either by invitation or by their own initiative. Witness the fact that a few are here — the representatives of the World Union of Jewish Students — and the encouraging youthfulness of spirit and age in several of the delegations.

Working with youth over a period of many decades, I long ago learned that one cannot generalize about youth in general and Jewish youth in particular. We speak about Jewish youth searching for something, but there are Jewish young people who are not searching. We speak about concerned Jewish youth, but there are Jewish youth

who are not concerned. There are Jewish youth who are peaceful citizens of their communities and there are others who are hoodlums or rioters. There are beatniks and conformists. All over the world there are young people for whom there is no place in society — the dropouts, those who cannot go to school or find jobs. I saw them in Geneva; I read in the newspapers that there has been a 900% increase in juvenile delinquency in France over the last ten years; I have seen unemployed youth lounging in the town square of Kiryat Gat.

Seeking confirmation of the stereotype we have created in our minds, we point out rebelliousness and revolt among young people. When this rebelliousness is channeled, however, it can serve the cause of mankind. The dynamism of this rebelliousness that we seek to find in youth served the cause of Zionism and nation-building. Perhaps because the notions of rebelliousness and revolt are associated with and frequently present among young people, the universities are always the first target of those who tend toward totalitarianism.

The characteristic of our time is that the spirit of revolt associated with youth is not being channeled into movements and organizations. As a matter of fact, among young people of the world one detects a profound distrust of structures, of organizations, of so-called movements. In the United States some of us have dubbed this attitude "the mood of privatism." Many young people are saying: "I want to go it alone and play it my own way; I'm tired of the phoniness that I'm finding in the adult generation and I don't want to be serving anyone else's cause or playing anybody else's angles." Large numbers of young Americans have rejected the Peace Corps but have undertaken similar missions on their own throughout the world.

The dynamism that we associate with youth has passed from the possession of our Zionist youth. One of the anomalies that I find on the American scene, which may be true for Jewish youth throughout the world, is that frequently those who are most loyal, who are most fully within the community, are also those who are most placid, whose rebelliousness is least marked. The majority of my own young people in Cleveland will, I am confident, not leave the Jewish community. They will return to their gilded ghettos; they will join the synagogue — and ignore the synagogue — just as their parents do; they will hold a place within the Jewish community, will bear the label "Jew," and will fill it with relatively little content.

On the other hand, some of our most precious young people today are leaving the Jewish community, because of their dissatisfaction with the society in which they live and because of the motivation of Jewish values and ideals. For them there is too great a gap between the best and the worst, too great a gap between protestations and affirmations on the one hand and actual practice on the other. They despise phoniness, as do so many young people, and they turn their backs on

the glitter, on the hypocrisy, and on the innocuousness that they find in structured Jewish life.

I have labored among many such young people in the civil rights struggle in the American South. Innumerable young Jews — a disproportionately large number — who did not hide their Jewish identity and freely labelled themselves as such within the group, expressed to me their profound dissatisfaction with their home communities, with their synagogues, with their rabbinical leadership, with the failure of their communities to make really relevant to the society in which we live the values for which, presumably, they stand. Despite the fact that there were some thirty or forty Jewish young people in the group, I could get only a corporal's guard to attend a Shabbat service I had been requested to conduct among civil rights workers in Harrisburg, Mississippi — those who came were, for the most part, my Protestant minister colleagues and some curious and concerned non-Jewish young people, with maybe two or three of the young Jews.

I can tell you the story of a brilliant young man, deeply motivated by his Jewish education and by Jewish values, who took these values so seriously that some ten years ago he applied for conscientious-objector status, maintaining that, out of his own conception of Judaism, he could not undertake military service. He supported the application he submitted to the government with a profound study of the relevant Jewish sources that displayed a deep understanding of Jewish ideals. Some three years later, the same young man, who had been given the opportunity for alternate service, was laboring within a Unitarian fellowship on a college campus and had decided that his future probably lay outside the Jewish community. He had determined to prepare himself in the field of urban planning, so that he might make a contribution in the emerging African nations, of all places. During the entire period I talked with him about Jewish identity, about Jewish values, about his relationship to that which was best and normative in the Jewish tradition; but he rejected it out of hand.

For me, this young man constitutes a focus of specific problems. He is too precious, too dedicated, too intelligent, to let him leave the community. How shall we make it clear to him and to the host of others like him that the Jewish people provides the natural framework within which ideals can be realized and within which meaningful rebelliousness may be expressed? It seems to me that we can do so only by not allowing our institutions to degenerate into innocuousness, by breaking up the placid backwardness of Jewish life, by reviving our own zeal for the tasks that we confront.

Zionism, in the years of struggle, was primarily a courageous demonstration of Jewish authenticity and the application of Jewish concern to the renaissance of the Jewish people and to the betterment

of the world in which we live – social concerns, both in the state to be built and in the Diaspora. It was that authenticity that attracted young people to the Zionist cause. If we participate as Jews in the solution of the frontier problems of our time, we may recapture some of that authenticity; and if we recapture that authenticity we may enlist our young people in the solution of the frontier problems of the Jewish people, the State of Israel, and mankind.

Sherut La'am – the effort to enlist Jewish young people in a kind of peace corps, is a small beginning in that direction. I am confident that it will grow and that there will be many who come to it because of the fact that it affords opportunity for genuine service on a front line. But above all we must enlist for these young people the participation of their counterparts in Israel – the searching younger generation, young intellectuals who are in many cases *lo dati* by Israeli nomenclature but who, in my book, are deeply religious, deeply concerned, and looking for ideological direction toward new paths.

Let me go back to the young man who went to Africa. Before he left, he came into direct contact with the fact that there were some Jews who were identified with the Jewish community – rabbis and organizational leaders – who had been willing to put their bodies on the line in demonstration of their genuine conviction when they spoke about civil rights. He had come in contact with the fact that some had been injured, some had been jailed, and one – a dedicated young Jew – had even given his life. This disturbed him, and he came to see me, to tell me that he could no longer accept the generalizations that he had been making, and that he was having second thoughts. He was now aware that there was something more to inherited Jewish experience than ritual, sentimentality, or a liking for certain foods – there was evidently something that could be characterized as a stand on Jewish values that would motivate Jews to sacrifice for their ideals. He began to think long and hard about this during his period of service in Africa. No conversion as yet, but I think he may come home to try to find his place within the Jewish community. The question we have to ask ourselves is: Will we afford him a place that will enlist his dedication, his energy, and his brilliance?

How do we win people of this stamp for our organizations, for direct enlistment within the Jewish people? Only by demonstrating that Jewish peoplehood means the service – frequently the sacrificial service – of Jewish ideals. Only by respecting the need of our young people to affirm oneself, by showing them that only when they are able to say “we” can they say “I” meaningfully; that the “we” to which they belong is the Jewish people. We must show them that the best in the Jewish value heritage – compassion, concern for others, openness, and receptivity – are so needed by mankind today that the effort to preserve the group in which these values and ideals are viable is worthy

of the full-time endeavor of our youth. We can say to them that it is easy to run away to Ghana, to Basutoland, to academic ivory towers, or to some private form of nonconformism. We can say to them: stay within the community! Refuse to conform to its mediocrities; find the linkage with those young Israelis who like you are dissatisfied, and then pick up the task of youth — to engage in rebellion — but make it a meaningful rebellion. We should say to them: we will stand with you in that rebellion, and we will strive for that authenticity and integrity that demonstrate our concern to apply the Jewish tradition and the Jewish value heritage to all aspects of the world in which we live!

Toward that end, let there be a World Jewish Congress Commission on Youth and Students, which will give its attention to this entire problem, which will seek — in proper collaboration with other organizations and world bodies — to find the means of bringing back into our deliberations and back into our fold the committed, the searching, the intelligent, who should be at our side.

Mr. AHARON YADLIN (*Deputy Minister of Culture and Education of Israel*): I should like to begin by saying that I am speaking on my own behalf and not in the name of the Israeli government or the Ministry of Culture and Education.

Today's Israeli youth and its problems are totally different from those of the period of the struggle for independence, and still more so from the late 1930s. There are various causes for these great differences: among others we find the impact of the affluent society; the recent revolution in science; and the difference in tension between, on the one hand, the times when the country was battling for national independence and, on the other, the period of daily routine that succeeded that struggle.

The youth of Israel can be said to display three principal characteristics: attachment to nature and the outdoors; a tendency to take national independence for granted for all time; and a sort of obsessional psychosis due to the Arab encirclement and the permanent state of military and political tension. The current young generation has proven itself to be as courageous militarily as its predecessors, and at the same time has freed itself from most of the complexes of its fathers and grandfathers.

Although excessive generalization is dangerous, Israeli youth can be described as rather lacking in general intellectual preoccupations as well as in a feeling of universalism. But the youth of Israel is on the whole a more clean-cut generation than its counterparts in the West. And, whether religious or not, the youth of the kibbutzim remain in the main imbued by the values of their pioneer fathers and grandfathers.

Indeed, one can hardly speak about Israeli youth as such — there is religious and nonreligious youth; there are young people motivated by the pioneering spirit and those who are more attracted to the superficial

aspects of Americanized society — the so-called “espresso” youth. The greatest difference, however, is between young immigrants, who account for over half of Israel’s youth today, and the sons of the older Israeli generations.

The main problem in connection with the young immigrants is to imbue them with the new Israeli values without forfeiting the positive traditional values of their communities of origin; there is a great danger of their losing the latter without acquiring the former. Toward this end, the educational authorities in Israel have adopted two educational principles — encouraging the traditionally strong familial ties that prevailed in Eastern countries and instituting a new teaching of Jewish history so that it is no longer taught solely from the viewpoint of Eastern European Jewry. Israel’s educational system aims at a healthy integration of *olim* from Moslem countries and those from the West, between whom there was a vast difference in standards and traditions.

The longer-established *yishuv* consists of three generations — the pioneers; the fighters for independence, who are by and large the sons of the pioneers; and what is called the generation of the state. The first generation conceived the ideal of the state, which its sons brought into being. The third generation knows the War of Independence mainly from history books, or at best from childhood memories. Of course, these young people know personally members of both older generations, but they do not always admire them. Their attitude toward the older Israelis can be described as “*Les héros sont fatigués.*” For the youth, their elders are too often engaged in amassing material wealth and social distinctions. The result is a growing cynicism among the younger generation.

The new Israeli-born generation, whose parents created the very conditions into which they were born, has a different outlook on and different concepts of statehood; for the young it is not a dream but has always been a reality. Similarly, their attitude toward the Diaspora is more realistic and more selective than that of the older generation.

But it would be inaccurate to state, as many people do, that Israeli youth scorns the values of Zionism. This is simply not true, for these values and achievements form a part of Israel’s daily life. The young people, however, do scorn dogmatic speeches that embody obsolete and therefore meaningless formulations. Israeli youth is seeking new values, relating in particular to Israel’s role as a factor in the unification of world Jewry. This can be called an idealistic conception based on a realistic approach.

Young Israelis — and I *can* say this in a generalized manner — have learned that it is futile to attempt to motivate *aliya* from affluent countries by threats and warnings against the external dangers of anti-Semitism. We are sure that if it is at all possible to encourage serious *aliya*, we shall be able to do so on the basis of the yearning for a

full Jewish life without internal contradictions. If Judaism is a concept of life, where can such a concept be given life if not in a country where the Jews are the majority? Israel affords Jewish gratification. Immigration to Israel must be the result of a personal decision that is reached through complete freedom of choice — a decision for which only the individual concerned is capable of and obligated to assume responsibility. If the young person who comes to Israel is not convinced that he needs Israel more than Israel needs him and if he does not feel that only in Israel will he find personal satisfaction, then it is very doubtful that he will succeed in overcoming the psychological and physical obstacles that necessarily confront every new settler; in the end this young person may emerge from the struggle defeated.

Therefore, Israeli youth puts only two questions to American Jewish youth: If the spiritual and social processes that are developing in Israel arouse wonder and admiration in your heart, why rob yourself of the right to participate in them directly; if the establishment of Israel is the most significant chapter in Jewish history in generations — and maybe one of the most splendid events in the human history of our period — why should you yourself not be one of the heroes of the drama?

The unity and solidarity of the Jewish people — and of Jewish youth — must be based on two fundamental facts. The first is that the Jews — now as always and notwithstanding differences of geographical residence or citizenship — constitute one people, a single unit with a unique character that cuts across frontiers and overcomes differences. The second is that the State of Israel today is the principal factor in unifying and encouraging Jewish life throughout the world. Just as collective responsibility is required for permanent and continuous immigration to Israel, so is collective responsibility necessary for maintaining Jewish experience and Jewish life in the Diaspora. Therefore let us all unite around the common aims of the Jewish people — and, I hope, of all Jewish youth — Jewish unity, creative Jewish existence, and the strengthening and development of the State of Israel.

RABBI Dr. SAMSON R. WEISS (*Executive Vice-President, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America*): The oneness of the Jewish people is not being debated here. However, we must scrutinize here the essence of this oneness, define its integral factors, and assess the elements of its strength so that we may better plan the Jewish tomorrow. Quite naturally, on an agenda of such concerns there must be a discussion of the problems of youth, for those who are possessed of the idea of Jewish peoplehood by whatever definition and dedicated to its continuance recognize that the history of the people cannot bear any interruption. A hiatus of but one generation, or even less, would spell the end of this history and the end of the people. It matters but little whether this interruption be caused by war and physical annihilation or by assimilation — the conscious or unconscious escape

from the bonds of the people, its values, its traditions, and its pattern. History is replete with incidents of such national disappearances affecting peoples of larger numbers and infinitely greater political and economic advantages than those enjoyed by the Jewish people in the last two millennia.

There are those of us — and I humbly count myself among them — who see in the perpetuity of Jewish peoplehood the *nes nistar* — the hidden miracle — of which Nachmanides speaks. This great thinker, discussing in his Bible commentary the exodus from Egypt, postulates that Jewish history ever since, while cloaked in the garb of natural events, continues to be carried by the undercurrent of divine protective intercession.

We have escaped — true, at terrible costs — physical annihilation. This Assembly in itself is testimony to the fact that we have also escaped spiritual annihilation. Even lands where flight from Jewish peoplehood is not blocked by the governing society and its prejudices, the Jewish identity is still being preserved and Jewish life still flourishes. This is the test of freedom and affluence.

The continuation of this identity and of this life demands the readying — in the physical and spiritual sense — of successors, of recipients of our values and visions; it demands the conscious cultivation of future generations of Jews equipped with the knowledge and the will to assume Jewish responsibility. It is quite axiomatic that without the requisite knowledge the will, the desire, and the very ability to accept and to discharge Jewish responsibility cannot possibly be generated. Maimonides states this in classic simplicity: “In proportion to the knowledge will be the love.” Jewish knowledge and love for Judaism and the Jewish people; Jewish knowledge and Jewish loyalty are inexorably interdependent, with the first being the basis on which alone the latter can flourish.

When we speak, then, about youth we must primarily speak of the problem of generating Jewish loyalty and love for the Jewish people. We must consider methods and approaches to create the willingness of consciously sharing in Jewish history. We must explore the way of creating that kind of Jewish pride that will make a young person want to be a carrier of this history and join in the Jewish experience — not as its passive, unwilling object, but as its active participant, shaping it, advancing it, and ultimately handing it over to those who shall be the next link in the chain of Jewish perpetuity.

How Jewish is our youth work? What Jewish consequence will accrue from the multitude of activities our various organizations offer to Jewish youth? In short, how productive are we? Speaking of the North American experience, I must say that tremendous energies and funds are spent rather unproductively, and quite often the publicity surrounding them has become an end in itself. There are, however,

some very promising exceptions, showing that there are groups that have come to grips with the core of the problem. They speak to the young Jew in terms of Jewish knowledge, love, pride, and identity. And they are immensely successful.

They do not promise to entertain, nor do they imitate. They have the courage to say no to much of what fills the life and titillates the fancy of contemporary youth. They postulate a Jewish scale of values, Jewish morals, a Jewish ethos. They are demanding and not permissive. They educate to wisdom rather than to cleverness. They postulate the joy of the good life — good in the moral sense, not the easy life — against the shallow fun-seeking of our hedonistic age. They draw their values from Jewish tradition and history and they base their program on the Torah, calling for observance of the biblical precepts — for chastity and truthfulness, for *chesed* and *tzedaka*, terms so poorly translated by “loving kindness and charity.” They call for a life of service, which is nothing else but a Jewishness that embraces the totality of life, without lacunae. And, paradoxically, the more demanding these programs are, the more successful they have proved to be; for they answer the deep yearning of youth for a life of purpose and challenge.

Small wonder, then, that, for instance, the National Conference of Synagogue Youth, the youth arm of the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, has been so immensely successful with its deeply Jewishly motivated educational, cultural, and spiritual program. The Lubavitcher movement, as well, has attracted a large number of youth through its genuinely Jewish activities.

In our approach to youth, so lost in our cataclysmic age, we must convey to them anew our traditional sense of human worth. We must tell them that they are neither accidental nor superfluous in their existence, but that they are wanted and needed and that existence *per se* is the highest grace.

We must escape the imitative pattern. We must cease to seek assertion of our worth by equating achievements by Jews and positions taken by Jews, with Jewish achievements and Jewish positions. While Jews may excel in science and the arts, it is not this excellence that will guarantee Jewish perpetuity. We have an instrument of our own which we must play in the symphony of nations.

We are the only people that has demonstrated the ability to turn suffering into goodness, to keep faith in and with humanity in the face of all hatred and persecution. We are the people that has discovered the universal harmony behind all the dissonances of our world. We have encountered God and perceive of all existence as maintained by Him. We may stray, and some of us may even get lost and disappear from Jewish life, but as a people we have always found the way back. We have kept the covenant and this is why we may be confident that our

youth of today, if but spoken to in the terms of our Torah and our heritage, will rise to take its proper place among the generations of the eternal people.

Dr. MANFRED GERSTENFELD (*Chairman, World Union of Jewish Students*): A few years ago, when I, together with some other students, asked for representation at gatherings similar to this one, Dr. Goldmann — whom I respect and admire greatly — replied, "To be young is not a privilege." Our answer: "To be old is not a privilege either." Thus, you see that we are a cynical and pragmatic generation, despite the fact that we are Jews and identify with Judaism.

I can only try, in my introductory remarks on the intellectual problems of the young Jew, to analyze the ways in which we can establish a structure for Jewish intellectual life. After all the far-sighted idealistic words that have been spoken here during the past few days, you will excuse me if my words are pragmatic, down-to-earth. I apologize for this, but I cannot speak otherwise than the way my generation thinks.

I am going to speak in Hebrew, for I believe that somebody who can speak Hebrew should do so at a gathering such as this, even if it means that only a limited number of people will understand him.

Changes in society as time passes are a normal thing. They are wrought by pressure from the young, some of the intellectuals, some of the artists, and so on. In Diaspora Jewish society, however, the young have mostly opted out, and so have a great number of intellectuals. Therefore the pressure for change is weak.

The young Jewish intellectual sees himself not only as a member of Jewish society but also of the wider human society, which offers him much broader horizons. Sometimes he is driven back to Jewish society by anti-Semitism, but we cannot rely on that. The fact is that the majority of young Jewish intellectuals do not function within Jewish society. You can see this happening if you look at the lists of elected municipal councillors or members of legislatures in England, France, or other Western countries. In America there are young Jews who fight for the rights of Negroes and for general liberal causes and who are also active as Jews to some extent, but with much less enthusiasm. By and large, however, even there you get the same picture.

I would like to discuss two problems from this platform: Why do so many Jewish intellectuals turn their back on the Jewish community, and how can Jewish organizations fight this situation? I am sorry that the organizers of this Assembly decided to dispense with the original — and, I think, useful — idea of a special session on the alienation of young Jews, in which young people from North and South America, Israel, and Europe were to participate, thus giving us the opportunity to conduct a worldwide investigation of this problem. We will have to make do, then, with this meeting, and I will be obliged to confine my

remarks to Europe, although to some extent what I have to say may go for other areas as well.

If we look at the Jewish intellectual of our day, we see that he differs greatly from the Jewish intellectual of previous generations, who was mostly self-made and had a keen inquiring mind and a wide culture. Today's Jewish intellectual, like his non-Jewish counterpart, is, as a rule, a product of routine university training, which leaves him shallow. Basically he is not an intellectual and not given to having original ideas.

There are hundreds of thousands of Jewish students in the world, but not more than one fifth of them belong to any sort of Jewish organization. Even among those who do belong to Jewish bodies during their studies, 50% cut their ties at the end of their studies. It is clear that the falling-away among the real intellectuals — those capable of thinking — is even greater.

This phenomenon must be analyzed in the light of the development of idealism in our time — idealism in general and Jewish idealism in particular. In the Western world, idealism began fading away in the late 1930s and early 1940s. True, fascism was defeated, but many of the expected ideals never materialized. Among Jews idealism persisted very late into the 1940s, because it was fed by the enthusiasm engendered by the creation of the Jewish state. But after that, it started fading away with a much greater speed than in the non-Jewish world. It persisted a bit longer in the kibbutzim, but also in a diminishing state.

Young people, both Jews and non-Jews, show tendencies toward nihilism. We should not encourage this by opting out of good general causes because they are not specifically Jewish. However, Jewish leaders are deluding themselves if they think that by trying to give Jewish content to a good general cause they will solve our Jewish problems. Jewish leaders are also deluding themselves by thinking that there is an overall solution to the problem of alienation. There is none, and a generation that cannot solve its own problems is not likely to solve those of the coming generation. Furthermore, many present Jewish leaders have no Jewish roots themselves, which in itself is an obstacle to Jewish intellectual development among the youth. The problems of the young intellectual stem not so much from lack of an idealistic mass movement — it is still possible to some extent to stimulate individual idealism — as from the structure and infrastructure of the Jewish communities. We must therefore look into the communities before we can search for a path toward the solution.

The Jewish communities in the countries of the Common Market are small. Generally, intellectualism flourishes in bigger communities, and in fact exists to some extent in the United States and Israel. In the Jewish communities of Europe — with the exception of England — there still remain some traces of an earlier intellectual life. Here and there — including West Germany,

of all places — there are university chairs for Jewish studies.

Very possibly Spengler was right when he said that the West was in a state of decline, but one should not forget that Israel is in the Middle East. It is a young country with many vital problems that are capable of involving and nourishing the Jewish intellectual of the Diaspora. Anti-Semitism is also gathering momentum and will force the Jewish intellectual back to Judaism.

If we want an active Jewish life, we must form an appropriate infrastructure. We need a Jewish university in Europe, professors for Jewish studies, an international Jewish publication, a chair for the Diaspora at the Hebrew University. In short, we ought to provide means for Jewish intellectuals to communicate and to exchange views, so that Jewish creative activity will be encouraged.

TWELFTH SESSION

August 4, 1966 (afternoon)

In the Chair: PROFESSOR ARYEH TARTAKOWER

1. DEBATE ON CULTURAL PROBLEMS IV. SPECIAL DISCUSSION: JEWISH COMMUNITY PROBLEMS

PROFESSOR ARYEH TARTAKOWER (*Chairman, Israel Executive, World Jewish Congress*): After the last two symposia and this morning's Cultural Debate the impression might have been given that while there the subject was the contents of Jewish life — its basic tenets — in the discussion I am introducing we are mainly concerned with the *form* of Jewish life. Such an impression would be totally unjustified. Jewish communal life is very far from being a matter of form only; it concerns contents, and decisively so. This is how it was in the past, this is how it presented itself at the beginning of the present century, and this is how it is, or ought to be, today.

We must never forget the part played by the Jewish community in Jewish history. It was quite different from similar organizations among other nations. First of all, in the Jewish community converged both religious and secular affairs. The religious community was never an administrative body pure and simple; it was an expression of Jewish sovereignty, which did not require outside endorsement. It was based on the assumption that the Jewish people had been chosen to fulfill a special mission on this earth. The community thus embraced a man's total life and gave pride of place to matters spiritual and cultural such as faith, education, and creative work. It took care of each member so that he remained a wholesome man, made in the image of God. In the course of time this unique phenomenon to a large extent faded. It faded not because of outside pressures, for it did not depend greatly on the attitude of the outside world. It faded because of our own attitude. The disappearance of the Jewish community is one of the most tragic — perhaps *the* most tragic — outcome of Jewish assimilation. In the days of the Jewish renaissance, those Jews who proclaimed the idea of a people's community as one of the main instruments of renewed Jewish life knew what they were doing. Herzl understood it very well when he

demanding the conquest of the *kehilot*, and this was one of his strokes of genius. But conquest was not enough. It was necessary to reshape the organization.

This brings me to the present situation, which is our subject today. I hardly need stress that today's situation is in no way comparable with that of a couple of generations back. Even where we have *kehilot* and federations of *kehilot*, these cannot be compared with the communities of old. And let us remember that large sections of Jewry today have no country-wide community organization at all. This is true of American Jewry, numbering 5,000,000, and the 3,000,000 Jews of the USSR. The first never succeeded in building up a country-wide community organization and the latter do not have it for reasons beyond their control. Take these two countries and you have about two thirds of the Jewish people.

As far as the existing *kehilot* are concerned, their scope is inadequate. I do not want to criticize either our friends in Latin America — especially in Argentina — who have succeeded on their own in building up *kehilot* good and true; or our friends in other parts of the world, for example in Europe, who are doing their best. But I am sure that Jewish leaders will agree with me that there is still a lot to do until we have the type of *kehila* necessary to meet the present needs.

And here is where the World Jewish Congress comes in. We should strengthen the existing *kehilot* and broaden their base, and at the same time fight for the right to build new ones where they do not exist due to outside factors. In places where we are free to act we should try and create new *kehilot*. If we dedicate ourselves to this task we will have done a great thing for the future and perhaps even made a step toward a solution of the problem of Jewish existence in the Diaspora.

This symposium is dedicated to the problem of *kehilot*, one of the most vital problems in present-day Jewish life. Let us hope that we will make an impact and awaken Jewish public opinion the world over to consider this issue. Its importance — and the stature of the participants in this discussion — certainly warrant it.

Dr. JUDAH J. SHAPIRO (*Secretary, National Foundation for Jewish Culture, New York*): Rabbi Abraham Heschel, whose influence I think has already made itself felt at this Assembly, has a beautiful anecdote in his book, *The Earth is the Lord's*, which deals with Polish Jewry. He tells about the rabbi in the yeshiva who day after day over a period of time studied with his students the same page of Talmud. Finally one student asked him, "Rabbi, why don't we go further?"; and the rabbi replied, "I am so happy on this page!" I would like, if I may, to turn the page.

I will give Dr. Goldmann the twentieth century that he spoke of, and I will concede that even inertia will suffice to see us through the next third of this century — we will go on with our meetings and cling to

what we have. But we will not confront ourselves with the twenty-first century, which is not really very far away. In the 1960s it is unforgivable not to begin to assess what probably lies ahead.

Many of the changes in the world pose certain challenges to halakha. I am willing to accept the halakhic view of life; but halakha is not up-to-date. I do not mean to be facetious or enter into polemics, but I ask the people of halakha: Can there be strictly Orthodox astronauts? For some of us it may be a joke, but when you go around the world in a spaceship, you barely have time for *shacharit*, *mincha*, and *ma'ariv*. But nobody has dealt with this question or with many others that have been and will continue to be posed by new developments.

All discussions of the Jewish community invariably turn to consideration of the future. Once that occurs we are in the realm of conjecture, admittedly dealing with opinions based on insufficient evidence. In the field of physics, von Heisenberg received a Nobel Prize for his theory of uncertainty, by which he demonstrated the impossibility of fixing knowledge even of the present because of its dynamics, for if one stops the movement of atoms in order to examine their course one has already distorted reality; if one observes the atoms in motion as of any instant their image is blurred by their movement. Though there can be no true analogy drawn from the physical to the human and social, it ought not to escape us that the nature of our society cannot be easily grasped because it is in a state of rapid change, and that the pace of change has been accelerating during the past century and seems to be increasing still. We cannot gather long-lasting data on the current situation and certainly not project the future with any accuracy; and yet, our tendency is to use the past to measure and justify the present, as well as to serve us for a view upon the scene to come.

As an exercise in the futility of forecast it is interesting to reverse our telescope and have a look at the situation one hundred years ago. Let us assume, imaginatively, that it were given to us to relate our situation to our parents' grandparents. Suppose, for example, that I had the opportunity of informing my great-grandparents, in Russia and Galicia, that in the United States of America, the Congress has enacted legislation which enables the federal government to provide financial assistance to Jewish religious schools. You will concede that this would be startling information to my Eastern European ancestors of a century ago. You will probably also agree that when I had startled them with this information, I would shock them to inform them further that *Jewish* organizations in America are combatting this legislation in order to protect the *American* constitutional principle of the separation of church and state.

Would that there were time to list additional items from the extensive inventory of startling current realities; startling, that is, for

our ancestors of the last century. It is also necessary here to engage in this exercise for the many countries from which the delegates have assembled for these sessions of the World Jewish Congress. Let others report that the premier of France, who is not Jewish, came to that office from the Rothschild Bank; that every currency bill in Canada carries the signature of the Jewish director of the Bank of Canada; and so on and on. The simple point is that we ought to be less concerned with our inability to foresee the future because its revelation in reverse causes shock and seems incredible. The corollary is: the fact that the future will be different from anything we can imagine does not necessarily mean that it will be bad.

The real danger to the Jewish community is the failure of its members to accept the reality of change and its increasing tempo. Our bland assumption that we must only do harder what we have always done in the past is fallacious. It is erroneous to assume that we must intensify our efforts with the young in the same terms as in the past. One writer explains: "Within the memory of many living members of even our most modernized societies there existed a view of a society in which virtually every member of the society as far back as could be remembered could count on his children growing up and living under conditions roughly similar to his own. Now virtually no one can. The one thing certain is that the future is going to be different and at a constantly accelerated pace." What we do, however, is "to teach our children what we needed to know for our lives rather than what they will need to know for theirs."

We assume a consistent Jewishness, historically continuous, and eternally relevant to all circumstances. What is more, we always attribute to the past glories and virtues with respect to Jewish affairs which are not always true, while we charge the general circumstances with evil that may be true but is irrelevant. It comes as a shock to the modern scholar to discover that, as J.L. Talmon tells us, "in the second century there were Hebrews who gambled on horses, worshiped Aphrodite, prayed to Greek gods, coveted other men's wives, dodged bill collectors, and concocted ways to become invisible." If the Jewish tradition is godly, noble, and inspired, it does not follow that Jews were always possessed of the same qualities. After all, even the Prophets denounced Jews. Jewish law may have protected Jews with wisdom, justice, and mercy, but most often against fellow-Jews. The moral of Jewish history is not the fact that Jews were consistently attached to the Jewish ethic, but that the Jewish ethic consistently remained the ideal for Jewish behavior; that the thinkers and dreamers left their stamp on Jewishness despite the deviations of Jews in their personal pursuits.

It is intended only to demonstrate that while we understandably do not know the future, we unjustifiably misinterpret the past, whether by

design or ignorance. It is in this misinterpretation that many dangers lie for the Jewish community today, and there is further threat for the future in a rigidity in Jewish activities which derives out of a mistaken notion of Jewish historic consistency. Jewish activity is essentially reactionary, in the linguistic sense, in that the Jewish community mainly engages in activity as a reaction to external forces, real or imagined.

Remove the external forces from the Jewish community hypothetically and consider what substance Jewish life has for the Jew, purely for himself, for his own satisfaction and edification. As a matter of fact, the consistency of Jewish activities makes it appear as though the external circumstances of Jewish life were similar for centuries and millennia, which they are not. We are not only not teaching our children what they will have to know for their adult lives; we are attempting to transmit information which was only meaningful a century and more ago.

The exciting process of modernization which affects every part of the world today throws much light on the interpretation of the history of the past two centuries, with special meaning for the Jewish community as well. The nature of the Jewish community, from the end of the eighteenth century onwards, varied with the degree of modernization of the societies in which it existed. Modernization is not merely an industrial process but a crucial challenge to tradition. To the extent that tradition represented a commitment to doing what one's ancestors had always done in the past, it was an inhibition to progress, experimentation, new knowledge. Modernization needed to be liberated from the ways of the past but, additionally, it altered the basis for the judgment of people. One considered the individual in terms of what he could do rather than by who he was. The participation of Jews in their societies is attributable to these aspects of modernization rather than to any doctrinal position in any society. The entrance into the general society was, however, coupled with the need to overcome tradition.

Throughout the nineteenth century Jewish communities sorted themselves out in accordance with the degree of modernization of their respective societies. In Eastern Europe, the general societies remained nonmodernized and the Jewish communities could remain traditional. Today, with almost perverse misunderstanding of this historical reality, we permit the traditional patterns of nonmodernized Eastern European Jewish communities to be the yardstick of what is good and bad in contemporary Jewish communities. Assuredly, those patterns were more Jewish, but Jews were less modern; the Jews of the modernized societies became more integrated into their societies, but they established no new basis for being Jewish. By bewailing the loss of a traditional past which dissolved in modernization, we ignore the dilemmas of sustaining any justification of Jewish life in modern times.

besieged by Arabs in the south, Hungarians in the east, and Scandinavians in the north. Henri Pirenne tells us: "Through the Phoenicians, the Greeks, and finally the Romans, Western Europe had children as responsible participants of the society. Modernization erases that parental obligation and satisfaction. In many underdeveloped societies in which the modern is being introduced, this is the most startling and shocking experience. The family can no longer teach the child to perform a specialized function in the society by which he may earn his living. The child is no longer dependent upon the family for his economic subsistence. It should also be understood that growing social welfare programs, especially for the sick and the aged, no longer make the parents dependent upon the children. When we send children to school, to college, and to other training programs, we admit that we, the adults in the family, are not competent to train them for their adult lives. It should therefore not surprise us that this very admission also reduces our standing and authority in transmitting any other aspects of adult responsibilities. However much we would wish it, it is hardly possible to maintain a double standard — assigning education to institutions and retaining parental authority — especially when parents display themselves to be incompetent in the fields in which the institutions educate.

The very nature of education has changed and whereas it was, as one writer says, "once regarded as an essentially conservative, culture-preserving, culture-transmitting institution," it is now regarded as "the master determinant of all aspects of change." This is the situation in the general society, and Jewish education seems anachronistic in its attempt to preserve the earlier culture-transmitting definition. There are certainly schizophrenic aspects for the Jew who seeks general education in order to be in tune with the changes of his society and simultaneously engages in Jewish education which is anchored in the past and shuts out the present. Jewish education is even further vulnerable in that it does not even use the most highly developed methodology of our time for its history-oriented teaching. It is also philosophically distorted because of its failure to provide a Jewish political orientation, that is, to know one's Jewish heritage in order to engage in the politics of contemporary Jewish society, which has an entirely different relationship to general society than it had in the past.

We cannot escape returning to the origins of our contemporary dilemma. The Jewish community as a concept is the product of European history, which, in turn, really begins in the medieval and feudal eras. The tendency of historians, Jewish and general, to weave history as though it were an unbroken skein creates serious misconstructions. Medieval Europe from the eighth century onward was isolated and cut off from its past and from the rest of the world. It was

The central fact of the traditional society, examples of which are still extant, is the rearing of the children by the parents within the family. It was the obligation and the joy of the parents to raise their always received the cultural stamp of the East. It had lived, as it were, by virtue of the Mediterranean; now for the first time it was forced to live by its own resources." Not only had the Arabs closed off the Mediterranean, but they had established outposts on the Iberian peninsula, in France, and in Italy, constantly harassing Europe and sometimes penetrating far north. The Hungarians were constantly engaged in raids as far west as France, plundering the traversed territory and returning to their Eastern lands. The Scandinavians roamed freely through Northern Europe, attacked England at will, and sailed up the Seine into Paris. There was no temporal power that could stop these harassments, and Europe was isolated and in turmoil.

A picture of feudal society reveals Europe living in constant and painful insecurity. As one writer concludes, "The ever-present threat was one which lay heavily on each individual. It affected one's possessions and, indeed, one's very life. War, murder, the abuse of power — these have cast their shadow over almost every page of our analysis." This was an epoch of violence which characterized every aspect of man's life. In all this, I have been referring to non-Jews who were the object of violence and disorder. To seek a rational relationship of a Jewish community to that type of society is meaningless, and yet, our Jewish history teachings make it seem as though an ordered general society directed itself violently to a Jewish community. The reality is that no individual lived a secure day in his life at that time, and the record is replete with the murder of Christian populations, the sacking of monasteries, the kidnapping of church authorities, and the breakdown of any form of law and order.

In those circumstances, the Jewish community was perhaps the most orderly society — subject to Jewish law, its members economically interdependent, and individual existence protected by adherence to a Jewish community that attempted to remain outside the general society in self-protection. Only gradually did the church emerge to attempt to establish "the peace and truce of God" — *Gottesfrieden und Landesfrieden* — and, mindful of its enemies from without, proclaim the principle, "let no Christian kill another Christian." Its first efforts were to protect itself, and the Council of Charroux forbade the entering of churches by force, or plundering them, or striking an unarmed cleric. Later, the prohibitions were extended and even attempted to include not only the church's own members but the weak, the *miserabiles personae*, whose guardianship was regarded as entrusted to the church. It is not possible to enumerate in detail the events which brought about some semblance of peace and order in Europe, in which the defeat of the Arabs and the conversion of the Hungarians and the Scandinavians

were an essential part. It was only at the close of the medieval period that a Christian Europe emerged, and whatever strife continued was at least familial in nature and not characterized by external pressure. In such a Christian Europe, the Jewish community was patently no part of the general society. Its existence was recognized and relationships with it as an entity were developed but there were no possibilities for true interaction in the affairs of the society by Jews, either as a communal entity or as individuals. Here is the origin of the "reactionary" Jewish communal heritage — behaving in the Jewish community in terms of a relationship to an external society which was Christian and which could not admit nonbelievers.

A new era began with the French Revolution, which marked the end of Christian Europe. The beginning of the Era of Emancipation, the French Revolution, the Napoleonic Wars, and the breakdown of the ghetto were genuinely confusing to Jew and non-Jew alike. It is certainly clear that Napoleon, in assembling the Consistorial Conference in Paris, was not so much protecting the Jewish religious cult as seeking expressions from the Jewish community of its loyalty and adherence to France. To Napoleon, the Jews did not have merely the right but the obligation to be French. They were expected to intermarry and thereby prove their full participation in French society. To break down the isolation of the Jews imposed from without only to see it continued from within seemed contradictory to many Jews and non-Jews. There remained many non-Jews who preferred to see the continued isolation of the Jew, just as there were many Jews who similarly sought to remain insular and protective of their particularism as Jews. The basic internal Jewish polemic has now gone on for almost 200 years on whether to remain Jewish within the Jewish community or become full-fledged members of the general society, and both positions are essentially colored by the same consideration — What will the non-Jews think and how will they react? All this is not merely the history of the Jewish community but the history of its policy of reaction.

The modernization of most societies in which Jews find themselves, referred to earlier, means that the Jew is regarded in universal rather than in particular terms. It cannot be overlooked that the history of modernization varies among the different countries, and where it has come later, universalism may not yet be prevalent, but the trend is in that direction. Western Europe has a longer history of modernization; Eastern Europe, a briefer one; and Latin America, a confused one because its modernization is urban, while its rural population remains outside that frame. We may also assume that universalism with respect to individuals will prevail because modernization demands it. The health, well-being, and physical survival of the Jew is tied to that universalism.

The particularism of the Jewish community is quite another matter.

It can, however, no longer be sustained by containing the Jews in reaction to the threats or the blandishments of the general society. It must have a rationale which is personally satisfying. What the individual derives from the Jewish community will not relate to his economic, social, and political roles in his society. What he may derive is a sense of human worthwhileness in his ability to justify his existence. Jews as a group, or as a community, can hope to transmit that sense of idealistic human meaning to the societies in which they live. If modernization is universal it will not establish any church or any system of values, and the threat to modern society is not its technological potential but its lack of human purposefulness. "The pursuit of happiness," says one writer, "is exceeding the speed limit." The pursuit of social purpose is being ignored.

The Jewish community thus has a grand new role, similar in purpose to that of the past and yet utterly different from it. It can draw upon its culture, its heritage, for nobility of human purpose for those Jews who adhere to that culture for their own sake and because of their conviction that the world would be a better place if all people adhered to it. There is a missionary quality to this argument but it is revolutionary in its character, being based upon the proposition that Jewish teaching can improve the world and in so doing is not a threat or a challenge to a Christian temporal society.

The limitation in the Jewish community today is the fact that the majority of its members are not Jewishly engaged. Jewish culture is the preoccupation of a small minority of the Jewish population and regarded as an esoteric specialized activity. Jewish culture must become the province over which all who call themselves Jews are masters. Sustaining health and welfare programs in universal societies which do not discriminate against the Jews is a relic of the past of isolation and reaction. Seeking to continue Jewish identification, by whatever definition, is similarly outmoded. In a universal society where people are judged by what they do, there can be no special identification of individuals by particularities such as Jewishness. Only the Jew can define his Jewishness and only a Jewishness which reflects knowledge, commitment, and action on both can be viable.

It is my view that the success of agencies that have cared for poor Jews when they had no recourse to general patterns of assistance is to be noted in the record appropriately; that the success of Jewish agencies who fought for the integration of the Jew into the general society should similarly be recorded, but with some footnotes to explain that such success occurred more by what happened in the modernization of society than by the efforts of the Jews. The future of the Jew belongs solely to the Jews. The Jewish community has been deteriorating for failure to make active forms of being Jewish intellectually and emotionally their *raison d'être*. Knowing and

reinterpreting the Jewish heritage is really the only business of the Jewish community for the time to come.

This special definition and purpose of the Jewish community must also be extended beyond the concept of localism. The Jewish community must become an international community. The modernization and the universalism referred to earlier span the globe, and while they are now unevenly implemented, the trend is to a worldwide community, similarly modernized, technologically and politically. The dilemmas of Jewish communities will become more and more alike. It is already clear that, despite specific historical and cultural contexts, the Jewish communities of North America, Western Europe, and the larger communities of Latin America are more and more alike. This occurs precisely at the time when technology makes possible easy communication through travel, telephone, and transmission of information and documents.

World Jewry is now a possibility and a necessity. A Jewish mission cannot be directed to a municipality or even to a single country. It is a mission to the world and in that mission, modernly conceived and pursued, the Jews have a motivation and a program for their role in the world. An international body such as the World Jewish Congress is an instrument for the realization of such concepts. If its original conception and its earlier efforts have already served Jewry, the potential for the future will justify even more its originators and founders. This prospect depends, however, upon a readiness to make tangential general politics which are being solved by modernization and to make central the concern for the mission of the Jews to their own human purposes and to the grand purpose of mankind.

Dr. TOBIAS KAMENSZAIN (*President, Va'ad Hakehilot of Argentina*): Peoples and statesmen in our day have their eyes set on the world at large as well as on the Jewish world. Let us try to examine the situation of our Jewish world.

Not all Jews see Jewish reality in the same way, nor do all Jews have the same solutions for the same Jewish problems. Anglo-Saxon Jews see the world in different terms from Eastern European or Israeli Jews. In addition, not all Jews speak the same language; indeed, most of them think and speak in non-Jewish languages.

A minority of our people has found its ultimate life-goal in Israel. The majority, still living in *galut*, is divided between those who are trying to clarify their life-goals as part of the Jewish people and those who are not engaged in this quest at all. Despite the efforts of the Jewish people in Israel and the Diaspora to achieve a partnership, the objective contrast between the two is continually widening, while ideological extremes that used to divide Diaspora Jewry have tended to draw closer to each other. There was a time, some seventy-five years ago, when some Jews glorified the Diaspora while others considered it a

curse. Since them both extremes have become mollified: the *galut*-lovers of yore are today sympathetic to Israel, and the old *galut*-haters are now well-disposed toward the Diaspora.

The success of our continuity as a people depends on the balance between our historic cultural tradition and the various outside influences that are brought into our midst. During 2000 years of *galut* life the rich Jewish culture has interacted with surrounding civilizations — Babylon, Alexandria, Sepharad and Ashkenaz, East and West Europe, and the Anglo-Saxon world. We have always had the strength to assimilate these external influences and not to become assimilated by them.

The holocaust broke us physically and morally, and Zion gave us a new lease on life. But there remains one huge question mark: Are we strong enough to resist the outside world and preserve our Jewishness? This is the problem facing our generation. I want to try and put before you the idea of Jewish community life today. The question of Jewish community life is tremendously important, for in the past it shaped the Jewish people and gave it cohesion. I am thinking of such communities — *kehilot* — as Vilna, Prague, Warsaw, and Berlin. The *kehila* can again become an instrument for the preservation of Jewish life.

In Latin America we still have *kehilot* on the pattern of those of Eastern Europe, but the circumstances are different. In olden days each individual Jew took care of his Jewishness; today the *kehila* has to do it for him, to remind him of Jewish festivals and days of mourning. In olden days the *kehila* took care of Jewish charities; today there is no longer a need for them. The main task of the *kehilot* today is Jewish education.

In the twenty-two countries of Latin America there are 200,000,000 people, among whom dwell 850,000 Jews. With the exception of the Marranos, the Jews of Latin America have been in the region for not more than a century.

The largest community, that of Buenos Aires, is the one I want to discuss. Comprising 300,000 Jews — 250,000 Ashkenazim and 50,000 Sephardim — it consists of three *kehilot* formed on the basis of geographical origin. The major Ashkenazic community, with a membership of 50,000 families, is led by a Council and an Executive, elected by direct and secret ballot. All Jewish groups — from the Aguda to the Bund and, of course, all the Zionist parties — are represented on the Council of the *kehila*. Its functions include looking after the religious institutions, maintaining a yeshiva, supervising the cemeteries, and — above all — assuming the responsibility for a network of sixty primary schools, a number of high schools, a teachers' seminary, and an institute for Jewish studies. The *kehila* also organizes lectures, concerts, an annual Jewish book fair, and so on. Through the good offices of the *kehila* some 20,000 Jewish books are sold annually. The annual budget of the *kehila* is 3,000,000 dollars and it is still growing. Every year, one

hundred of our teachers are sent to Israel for refresher courses; and we also send our youth leaders to be trained in Israel.

We have our problems, the most difficult of which is the alienation of young people. I should add, however, that of late there has been a return of young people to the Jewish fold.

We have brought our customs from Eastern Europe, adapting them to the new conditions, and we hope that we will be able to continue in that manner. At the end of the nineteenth century Herzl called upon the Zionists to take over the *kehilot*. Today, it should be the task of the World Jewish Congress to help build and expand the *kehilot* for the good of the whole of the Jewish people.

Dr. ASTORRE MAYER (*Chairman, Standing Conference of European Jewish Community Services*): First of all, I would like to thank Dr. Goldmann in the name of the Standing Conference for all he has done for the reconstruction of the European Jewish communities. Through his intelligent initiative, carried through thanks to the Claims Conference, and through all his efforts during the last twenty years, he has been the principal factor in the reconstruction of our communities.

The name of our organization — the Standing Conference of European Jewish Community Services — is a long one, and some people say it is greater than the organization itself. As our name indicates, we are above all a conference — not a permanent committee or an association; the nature of our body is more spontaneous and elastic than is usually the case in such organizations. The second part of our name — which we arrived at with the help of Mr. Charles Jordan, who, through the Joint, has provided great assistance to the Standing Conference — reflects a way of finding a common denominator in Jewish communal life in Europe.

Examining the situation closely, one finds that in Europe we have communities such as those of Italy and Switzerland, where *all* the activities are grouped within the organized communities and all the organized communities united or federated in a central organization. In France, on the other hand, the organized communities deal with religious and cultural problems, while the Jewish social services are united in a single but separate country-wide association. Regardless of the differences in communal structures in Europe, the Jewish social services — whether they are run by the organized community or not — have very similar characteristics and problems. Indeed, we sometimes find that the Jewish community of a given city in Europe has problems more similar to those of the community of a city in another country than to those in a city in its own country. For example, my community, Milan, in its Jewish problems resembles Zurich more than it does Rome.

Taking the various Jewish social activities on a European scale, we have divided our work among different commissions — care of the aged,

education, general social problems, the question of personnel in community work — and, through the work of these commissions, we have been able to follow and help the development of each community. For example, following the most up-to-date development in the care of the aged, we have encouraged the use of small apartments and medical care at home, rather than the large homes for the aged that were built in the past. Our commission on health is preparing a meeting that will take place in Geneva on the problem of mental illness, which has especially affected a number of survivors of the holocaust and refugees from Egypt. One of the dreams of the Standing Conference is to be able to build a hospital for mental diseases in Switzerland, similar to a model of the kind that already exists in Holland.

The initial period following World War Two — which can be called the period of the Claims Conference — was devoted essentially to the physical reconstruction of the European communities. We repaired what had been partly destroyed and we built new schools, community centers, synagogues, and old-age homes. The problem of finances, which seemed to be very serious, is in fact in the process of being solved. Even the French Jewish community, which in recent years has been second only to Israel in the absorption of immigrants, is showing very encouraging signs of normalization in all its services.

At the most recent meeting of the Standing Conference, in London, there was unanimous agreement that our principal problem was to attract young men and women to join us in the leadership of the European Jewish communities. Here I would like to elaborate on two of the words I have just used.

When I say *leadership*, I use the word in its broadest meaning, for we have observed that during the last few years in Europe, the difference between professionals and lay leaders has become minimal. Collaboration between the two takes place on the basis of equality and comradeship. It is no longer possible to make a distinction between the work of the president of a community and its secretary or director, its rabbi, or the heads of its various services. The old procedure whereby some made the big decisions and others simply carried them out no longer exists; they decide together.

When I said *young* men and women, I was not referring to the category of youth that was discussed this morning, those from 20 to 30 years of age. In the area of communal services, we feel that it is necessary to have as our *Nachwuchs* — our successors — men and women from 30 to 45 years old. We feel that without the massive appearance on the scene of the generation after ours, all the existing organizations — and especially those that have been set up around the institutions constructed in recent years — will not succeed.

During the years of the Claims Conference, when I suggested that all the European communities buy land — for the very possession of a plot

for building would greatly facilitate the decision to build — our American friends said that I wanted to transform the communities into real-estate agencies. After what I am about to say, please do not think that I want to turn them into travel agencies. I consider it extremely necessary for our young leaders to be able to travel in Europe and as a first step become acquainted with the various organizations and institutions. We, the members of the Standing Conference, have made such a tour, and we have learned a great deal. Right here in Brussels, for example, there is a magnificent home for the aged, a school, and first-class social-welfare and cultural organizations; nearby Antwerp has the best Jewish educational system in Europe. It is also essential that any young European Jewish communal leader be well acquainted with Israel and its institutions.

One of the problems that complicates communication among communities is language; Yiddish is no longer the *lingua franca* in most of Europe, and the common language once used among the Sephardic communities is no longer practiced. We would like all those who deal with Jewish communal problems to have a knowledge of Hebrew.

For us in Europe, relations with the great American Jewish organizations could also be very beneficial, especially for the large communities such as those of Paris and London.

In recent years the Standing Conference has provided material assistance to needy Jews in various parts of the Diaspora, which I believe is the first action of this kind on the part of European Jewry. We have raised funds among our members for the Jewish community of Skoplje, following the earthquake there; for the reception and absorption of North African refugees in France; and for the Jewish community of Cuba. While it is traditional and relatively easy to raise funds for Israel, we also feel that it is a matter of honor for the Jews of Europe to place their means at the disposal of all the Jews in the world, as is the practice among our brethren in the United States and Israel. In this connection I think the day will come when the European communities will join together in a sort of United Jewish Appeal on the European level, in order to respond to the material needs of Jews, wherever these needs arise in the world.

Before concluding, I would like to recall the year 1944, when I performed my first communal service of any importance. It was under the direction of Dr. Riegner, who already represented the World Jewish Congress in Geneva, that I learned how to prepare a budget and how to present a project to one's superiors in order to be able to implement it. Together we set up a small school for Italian Jewish refugees in Switzerland, little realizing that we were founding the first Jewish day school in Europe, a day school that has led to others and, we hope, will continue to lead to more. I recall the words of my daughter, who was 7

years old at the time. It was Purim, 1944, and she greeted Dr. Riegner with the words, "Honor to the World Jewish Congress! "

CHIEF RABBI Dr. MOSES ROSEN (*President, Federation of Jewish Communities of Rumania, Observer*): I speak here for one of the sorely tried Jewish communities of Eastern Europe, where the idea of the Jewish community has been represented for centuries and where there remains today only a remnant of the old glory.

Having listened to Dr. Shapiro's presentation I must, with all due respect, strongly protest. It is incomprehensible to me that this platform should be used to make light of the fundamentals of Judaism and of the Jewish community. Our Torah heritage is the basis of our community. I did not imagine that we would be coming here to discuss astronomic problems or to hand down decisions on Jewish law. We have, thank God, sages who deal with these questions; this is how Judaism has remained vibrant over the centuries. In all generations our lifeblood has enabled us to interpret our Torah to meet new facts of life, without worrying whether our Torah was suited to any given civilization. And our Torah is concerned with Jews who, living among other peoples, must preserve their right — as Dr. Goldmann put it so well — to be different from others, to uphold the physical and spiritual continuity of the Jewish people. The community, under the sign of the Torah, constitutes a protective wall, providing protection not only for religious life but for the various other aspects of life as well. Indeed, for us it is very difficult to differentiate between the religious and the general aspects of life; the community, therefore, has served as a source of support for Jews in whatever kind of need.

Of the official prewar Rumanian Jewish population of 800,000, some 400,000 were done to death by the Nazis and their henchmen. Of the remainder, about 100,000 are to be found in the Rumanian Socialist Republic today, most of the others having emigrated to Israel. There were years when we had the so-called iron curtain, and I was one of those who was able to penetrate it, crossing from East to West and back again. At the beginning I had the impression of crossing the Sambatyon; for the Jews in the West I came from the region of the legendary "red Jews," and some of them were even surprised to learn that there were rabbis in Eastern Europe at all.

The Jewish community in a socialist country such as mine has a primarily religious character, and religious freedom is assured. During the eighteen years that I have been chief rabbi of Rumania, I have never come across an attack on our faith, nor do I know of any such attack having been made in the presence of other religious representatives.

We all remember that Rumania was a country of classical anti-Semitism decades before Hitler. Jewish equality was achieved in Rumania for the first time on August 23, 1944, when the remaining Jews were liberated on the eve of their deportation to the fate that had

overtaken so many of their brethren throughout Europe. Along with this emancipation came the cogent argument that now that the Jews are free and equal citizens and no longer in a ghetto, there is no longer cause for specific group treatment on the economic, educational, or social-welfare level.

In Rumania today the seventy Jewish communities throughout the country are organized in a federation. The chief rabbi is also the chairman of the Federation of Jewish Communities, and this is not mere coincidence; the Jewish religion saved the Jewish people during thousands of years, and in recent times it preserved Rumanian Jewry.

There is no religious problem which, when presented to our government, does not meet with its full understanding. And let it be said: ours is a bit more complicated than other faiths; with us it is not only a question of houses of worship, but also of kashrut, the study of the Torah, and so on. Requirements for kashrut are provided in all our communities; full-time Talmud Torah schools are available; and we have a twice-monthly journal published in three languages — Rumanian, Yiddish, and Hebrew — with a circulation of 6000. This is the only publication in Hebrew in a socialist country, and it receives contributions from Jewish writers in the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other lands.

I would like to remark in passing that we have more Torah scrolls than we need, due to the diminishing size of the Jewish community in Rumania. Allowing for the needs of our own synagogues, of which there are twenty-four in Bucharest alone — all of them very well attended — we have, with the authorization of the Rumanian government, now presented a large number of scrolls to religious institutions in Israel, and some more are being prepared for shipment in the near future.

The Rumanian Jewish community at the moment suffers from an acute shortage of social and spiritual leaders. Apart from myself, we have only two rabbis, as opposed to 600 in 1948. We have only twenty-one *shochtim*, and they have to travel hundreds of miles to serve all the seventy communities. We have schools but few teachers. We also have a small social-welfare network benefiting 1300 Jewish families. As we cannot produce enough of our own rabbis and teachers, we have appealed for help in this respect from outside, but for one reason or another it has not been forthcoming.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank Dr. Goldmann for his understanding of our situation and for his sense of political responsibility right from the beginning. I can assure you that his attitude has earned the understanding, appreciation, and respect of the Rumanian government.

This is not the first time in history that Jews have lived under

differing social or political systems. It is our duty to find the way to live as Jews under whatever system we happen to live. I think we have succeeded in Rumania.

2. DEBATE ON CULTURAL PROBLEMS V. (continued)

Dr. JONAS KOVENSKY (*Argentina*): The problem of education and youth has been a subject of discussion at many of our meetings in the past. It is still with us, and in a more acute form. The young generation is becoming increasingly alienated, and it is not a question of mere drifting. This is a result, at least in part, of upbringing at home: it is a fact that children of religious homes acquire and retain deeper roots; when the home is bereft of Jewish tradition, however, the child is more susceptible to outside influences.

The objective conditions are against us, but we are trying to overcome the difficulties. In Argentina we have a Jewish community life and we have a network of Jewish schools. The fact that relatively more young *olim* come to Israel from our country than from others may be a result of our educational network.

But we all have to do more. I was surprised to hear from our British and American friends of Jewish educational systems that do not include the ideal of *medinat yisrael*, for without this ideal we shall not be able to overcome the negative influences on our youth in the Diaspora.

Dr. ALFRED SCHERR (*France*): In his lucid analysis at the opening session Dr. Goldmann described very well the pernicious anemia that is already taking its toll among our people, attacking particularly the youngest cells, which are the most vibrant and the most sensitive and which carry within them the survival of our people. Perhaps it is difficult for us to understand the strange blindness that strikes our dynamic young people and causes them to seek in foreign ideologies the values for which they yearn and which they are no longer able to find in Judaism, or that draws our youth into anarchic and sterile revolt. And yet an intimate understanding of this process could provide us with the elements for therapy.

In our staggering world, where developments occur at a maddening pace, this "de-Judaization" can be seen as a particular example of the immense process of depersonalization — of dehumanization — that has taken hold of all of mankind. How can we not understand the confusion of youth when we ourselves are anguished by the realization that our world is the world of Auschwitz and Hiroshima, of revolt and famine, and of the ever-present and horrible atomic menace? Some members of the middle generation, who knew Auschwitz and then witnessed the creation of the State of Israel, can no doubt subscribe to the future-oriented lines of thought presented yesterday by André Neher. But what can be done so that the following generations, for

whom Auschwitz is only a page of history and Israel no novelty, acknowledge the Jewish past as their own?

As others already have said, the link between the generations is assured by education. In order to transmit values from one generation to the next, it is absolutely necessary to reach the child in his earliest years. But the simple teaching of Jewish values, and even the existence of the State of Israel, are not sufficient guarantees. Jewish schools, colloquia, seminars, and visits to Israel are indispensable, but insufficient. What, then, must be done?

The valid answers to this question can be elaborated only as a result of studies in depth, based on analyses such as the one Dr. Goldmann has provided and on the kind of teaching that Professor Neher offers. It is, however, clear that a drastic revision is necessary — not of the values themselves but of the outdated structures and ways of thinking.

If we want Jewish youth to understand us, we must put in their hands the responsibility for their future — not exclusively in their hands, of course, but they must participate in all the work that concerns them. I propose that the World Jewish Congress set up a commission on youth in which qualified youth representatives would participate. On the basis of preliminary studies carried out through colloquia and seminars, there should be drawn up a plan of action for the coming years, dealing with all aspects of the education of Jewish youth — their integration in dynamic communities as well as the reinforcement of their relations with Israel and the Diaspora. This plan should also deal with the relations of young Jews with the non-Jewish world, with a view toward clarifying Jewish positions on universal problems and on specifically Jewish problems — positions that, as you know, are so often misunderstood.

What I have just said may seem utopian to those who are acquainted with the complexity of the Jewish world. But here is a project that is much more utopian: Could not the World Jewish Congress consider the creation of international Jewish youth brigades to fight hunger in the world and to help underdeveloped countries in general? This would certainly be in the spirit of the opening to the world that is part of our heritage. Would this not be a practical implementation capable of attracting young Jews to whom, too often, are proposed only hollow phrases? This project would also fit in with the work already accomplished by the State of Israel in favor of the Third World, work which has earned the unanimous admiration of the young Jews of the Diaspora.

MAITRE CHARLES HADDAD (*France*): I have the honor of speaking in the name of the French Section of the World Jewish Congress and also as a Sephardic Jew who arrived in France in recent years. My fellow uprooted brethren and I are indebted to the World Jewish Congress and its French Section in particular, for in the face of

the initial difficulties many of us encountered in adapting ourselves to life in France, the Congress was for us a haven of brotherhood in which we found welcome, equality, and democracy.

As Professor Neher has said, it is appropriate at a gathering such as this to speak of the eternal values of Judaism. The presence here of delegates from the entire world indicates that we are all convinced of the permanence of these values. But this meeting is also an appropriate occasion to reaffirm that the upholding of Judaism and its eternal nature lies in the knowledge of an ancient heritage, in study, in Jewish tradition. It is very important for each community to describe what it is doing in this domain and what it intends to do — more important than to say what *should* be done.

I live in Marseilles, where in ten years the Jewish population has grown from 5000 to 65,000. Even before our arrival in that city we knew of the assimilation, mixed marriage, and marginal Jewish existence that characterized many of its native Jews; and we understood that in order to avoid this fate we had to build schools and form leaders.

Only a month ago, we succeeded in getting the united *consistoire* of Marseilles to accept the idea of the creation of a Jewish day school. This may seem like a simple achievement, but for the native Jews of Marseilles such a school represented not so much a vital necessity as a risk of creating or furthering anti-Semitism, because it would separate the Jew from those among whom he lived. For them, the only protection was laicism, even if it meant the loss of Jewish authenticity. We succeeded in convincing them that dignity demanded that laicism could no longer go on at the expense of the Jewish soul. They thought that laicism would preserve them from Christian religious teaching and its excesses; today they realize that in their attempts to avoid the Christian spirit they lost the Jewish spirit and consequently their Judaism. And what is dignity in a Judaism that is lost? Nothing.

The Jewish day school to which I have referred is, of course, voluntary, for the parents must have the right to opt for the teaching of their choice; indeed, this is part of their major responsibility. This non-laic communal education is complemented by the necessary familial education. It is no accident that the Jews from North Africa have preserved their Jewishness throughout the centuries; it is surely because they preserved the right and the duty of receiving from their parents and passing on to their children Jewish teachings. Similarly, if there is to be a renaissance of the Jewish community of France or of the entire world, it is the Jewish spirit that will bring it about.

It was within the framework of Jewish values that took place the Judeo-Moslem interaction which provided a veritable civilization for the Sephardic world from Isfahan to Agadir, with a common language, way of life, song, and literature. This civilization deserves to be studied and

brought to light, to explain centuries with no genocide, centuries which were perhaps not devoid of shadows, but which were more often characterized by light. In our day this civilization has not only provided an important *aliya* for Israel, but it has also given new blood and the last chance for survival to the largest Jewish community of Western Europe — that of France — where the new Sephardic arrivals fill the schools, the synagogues, the youth centers, and the local, regional, and national meeting of the French Section of the World Jewish Congress. This survival of North African Judaism furnishes a lesson whose results must be observed and which must be adapted to the conditions of the Western world.

There is another aspect to this survival. On the one hand, we have the reality of Arab-Israeli hostility; on the other, there is the age-old Judeo-Moslem friendship. The first is a vicissitude that will, I am sure, last for only a certain time; the second is a permanent value that has defied centuries. Perhaps if this permanent value were maintained and cultivated, in contact and then in collaboration with stable circles in Islam and with leaders such as Bourguiba, then Semitic brotherhood would result and there could be peace between Israel and the Arab states. We would then again have Isaac and Ishmael jointly performing their duty to their father Abraham and finding in his teaching and in his heritage the grounds for hope, eternal *tikva*.

THIRTEENTH SESSION

August 4, 1966 (evening)

In the Chair: DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN

SPECIAL DISCUSSION: GERMANS AND JEWS – A PROBLEM UNRESOLVED

Dr. NAHUM GOLDMANN: As is known, delegates belonging to three ideological groups have opposed the inclusion of this problem in the agenda. As the Executive and the Plenary Assembly – both by majority vote – have decided to leave it on the agenda, these delegates will not attend this meeting. They are perfectly entitled to do so: there is no obligation in the Constitution of the World Jewish Congress for any delegate to be present at every session. But these groups have asked – and the Presidium has granted them the right – that one member of each group be permitted to make a short statement at the beginning to explain why they oppose the inclusion of the subject in the agenda and why, the inclusion having been confirmed, they will not attend. I will therefore first of all give the floor to the three representatives.

STATEMENTS BY GROUPS OF DELEGATES

Mr. ISAAC REMBA (*speaking on behalf of Trumat HaHerut Hatzohar*): The German people has destroyed one third of Jewry in our generation, after having accepted and elected Hitler as its leader. This is the generation of Germans that has murdered and burned and done to death in another thousand horrible ways 6,000,000 – *six million!* – Jews. And it is still with us. Apart from individuals, who had been punished in court, the rest went scot-free. Large numbers of murderers are free over the length and breadth of Germany, and their hands are stained in Jewish blood.

In thousands of German homes there are still the Sabbath candlesticks of our mothers; countless German women still wear the jewelry given by Jewish parents to their children on festive occasions. Thousands of Germans still enjoy Jewish possessions without remorse – for otherwise they would have returned them. These are the possessions which their parents or their children took away from millions of Jews when they led them to the gas chambers and crematoria. They planned

and designed the destruction of the *whole* of the Jewish people — all of us. They did not succeed, but one third of us — among them 1,000,000 Jewish children, our pride and our hope for the future — did perish at their hands.

Germany committed numerous crimes against other nations as well. But none of them can be compared with what it has done to the Jews. The remark by Germany's ex-chancellor, Dr. Adenauer, during his visit to Israel, that 5,000,000 Germans also perished in Hitler's war, was a sacrilegious reference to the memory of our martyrs and a crying example of how even the so-called just men of Sodom treat lightly the horrors committed against the Jewish people.

Nor can one compare the millions of Jewish victims with the toll exacted from other nations by German vandalism. With them battle was done, but the millions of Jews in Europe were done to death when they were completely defenseless. Only the ghetto fighters and Jewish partisans in the forests and the Jewish Brigade from Eretz Israel had an opportunity to defend our honor with arms and to repay the murderers for our blood — regrettably only in a small measure.

These horrible crimes, which human language has no words to describe, rest on the whole of the German people. They are all responsible. The mark of Cain is borne on the brow of every German. Not one of them can whitewash himself. Not one of them can say, "My hands have not spilled this blood." It is incredible, but a fact, that there is a prevailing conviction in Germany that they have already settled their account with us. They even feel offended when they are reminded that the book is not yet closed. They act as if they did us a great favor by paying reparations and compensation. They seem to forget that the money paid out by the postwar German government, collectively to Israel and individually to some of the survivors, is *our* money. And it is not even a minuscule part of what they stole from us.

The dark instincts are again exercising the German nation. And they are no longer deep down, but are coming to the surface — the instinctive hatred of the Jews. Neo-Nazism is on the way up. The attitude of the German government to the State of Israel, the heir and successor of the millions of martyrs, is offensive and evokes deep anger among Jews the world over. The German government seems to consider itself cleared of all its sins. The ambassador of Bonn in Israel even had the audacity to state it publicly. It is painful to admit that some of us have helped the Germans to assume that they have been rehabilitated and are free of responsibility. The impression was also created in the world at large that Jewry — and naturally Israel in the first place — had given Germany a certificate of moral rehabilitation. Dr. Adenauer declared this openly during his Israel visit, and his words were like a dagger in our flesh, as he thanked the president of the World Jewish Congress, Dr. Nahum Goldmann, for his contribution to this

"hekhsher" that Germany needed so badly. We want to stress here that the personal record of one or another individual German is irrelevant. Every German is a representative of his people and bears responsibility for its misdeeds. There will never be a reconciliation — there can never be a reconciliation — between us and the German people, at least while the murderers are still with us. Between us and the Germans there rises a high mountain which cannot be scaled — a pile of 6,000,000 martyrs.

In a minute or two a representative of Germany will mount this rostrum, and as he will do so he will be faced with the ghosts of millions of people who died a thousand horrible deaths at the hands of his nation. They will come to bear witness that they cannot forgive. And we who are alive have no right to forgive on their behalf. This platform has no right — especially on this occasion — to speak on behalf of the whole of the Jewish people. The blood of our brothers is crying out: no dialogues, but remember what Amalek did to you. It is incumbent upon us, it is our sacred moral duty, it is vital for the very existence of our people and for our future, to remember this.

We shall obey the injunction to remember Amalek so that it shall never again come to pass.

Mr. AVRAHAM SCHENKER (*speaking on behalf of the Mapam delegates to the Assembly*): The members of Mapam from Israel, the United States, South America, France, England, and other countries who are delegates to the Fifth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress, as well as many other delegates who are partners to our heartfelt concern, have from the very start opposed the proposal to hold a Jewish-German dialogue at this forum.

The World Jewish Congress has placed the problem of the future of the Jewish people at the center of its deliberations at this plenary meeting. There is no doubt that when we speak about the future it is necessary to recall that the survival of the Jewish people depends on its capacity to remember and to learn from the past.

Our generation is the generation of the ghettos and the concentration camps, of the holocaust and the ghetto uprisings. Before us, there still stands the generation which marched to the sounds of the *Horst Wessel Lied*, the generation of the SS and the Gestapo. The time for mutual exchanges has not arrived. Six million Jews are unable to participate in this discussion. Their absence obligates us to forego the attempt to arrange a confrontation which can be interpreted as the beginning of reconciliation.

In order to be faithful to the memory of the Nazi victims and to the lesson which must be drawn from the destruction, it would have been necessary to set up a court of judgment here which would judge the statute of limitation on Nazi war crimes and its legislators. Such a court would surely have nullified the judgments in which the German judges at the Frankfurt trial freed the murderers of Auschwitz.

By boycotting the dialogue with the representative of the German Federal Republic, we wish to warn the German people and the government of the Federal Republic of Germany of the Nazi and neo-Nazi dangers still contained in the Germany of today.

The German people and its government must know of these dangers. They must reject from their midst the Nazis of yesterday and today. They must remove the Nazis from official positions and from the cultural life, economy, civil service, and judiciary. They must give up the dreams of a revanchist, great-power Germany armed with atomic weapons.

Only then will we be able to examine again our position and only then will we be able to open a dialogue and will there no longer hover over us the betrayal of those who were destroyed by the Nazis, those who fell for the honor of Israel and the defense of the life and survival of the Jewish people.

Mr. YERACHMIEL ASSA (*speaking on behalf of Achdut Ha'avoda – Poale Zion*): We deem it our duty to give expression from this platform to our attitude to the symposium which is taking place here with the participation of German representatives. We reject any kind of racial approach dividing people and designating them to higher and lower categories. This was the German conception in the Hitler era, as it was in a veiled form the Nazi-fascist conception before Hitler, when Germany reverberated to the sounds of the arrogant anthem *Deutschland über alles*.

We are against a confrontation with German representatives on a World Jewish Congress platform because we are deeply convinced that it contains in itself the seeds of appeasement even if it is not intended that way, and because it offends against the pain and anger felt by the Jewish people, a sentiment which must never be softened, glossed over, or pushed into oblivion.

The reckoning with Germany concerns not only the past and the horrors of the holocaust. It is an open account, having also to do with what is happening in Germany today – increasing anti-Semitic signs in various movements, increasing neo-Nazism with its dark instincts and its call to renew the cult of Hitlerism, and the policy of pardon exercised by the judges of Bonn in regard to war criminals.

The president of the World Jewish Congress, who planned this confrontation, acted properly when he brought his proposal before Congress organs and obtained majority endorsement. This undertaking is to be regretted, but we must not put the president in an awkward position by going back on commitments already approved. As it was clear that the symposium was going to take place, we therefore suggested to turn it into a free and penetrating discussion about the danger of anti-Semitism and Nazism in Germany, to be held in the presence of German representatives. This could commit them, too, to

the relentless struggle against a policy liable to prepare the ground for a return of fascism in Germany. Our suggestion was not accepted; consequently, we feel unable to be present at this symposium.

Dr. NAHUM GOLDMANN: Although I want to save every minute of this evening, I am forced, in the interests of the World Jewish Congress, to take a few minutes to make it clear — in order to avoid distortions and misunderstandings — why I suggested to the Executive of the Congress to put this subject on the agenda, and why the majority approved it.

The problem of German-Jewish relations exists; it is unresolved. As you will hear from more competent speakers than I, it is both historically and realistically one of the most complex and important problems of our Jewish generation of today. No people in modern Europe has influenced modern Jewish civilization in Eastern and Central Europe as Germany has done. Modern Hebrew and Yiddish literature learned about Western civilization from Schiller and Lessing, and there is no country where Jews occupied a similar position to that of Jews in pre-Nazi Weimar Germany. On the other hand, there is no people which has committed such crimes against us — unspeakable crimes — as the German people in the Nazi period. This constitutes the complexity of the problem.

There are three possibilities of dealing with the problem.

You could try to annihilate Germany, which would be neither in the tradition of Jewish ethics nor in any way a realistic proposal.

You could ignore Germany — and many of my friends took this position fourteen years ago, when I advised the Jewish people to enter into the first dialogue with Germany. Our dialogue today, then, is not the first. The dialogue has been undertaken for fourteen years — day in, day out — by representatives of the Jewish people, by representatives of Israel: delegations from Israel participate in congresses in Germany, teams of Germans come to Israel; Germans are invited to Israel, while rabbis and Jewish leaders from America and other countries visit Germany — not to speak of the formal negotiations that the leaders of the Claims Conference — I among them — and representatives of Israel have been conducting for many years with German representatives. And I say, therefore, that the advice to ignore Germany, which I can understand emotionally — and I understand even the emotions of those who made such statements here — is unrealistic and not practical. It may have been valid for Jews in former centuries living in the ghetto, where they could not determine their own destiny and fate and could only react by being *broiges* — by being angry with people and trying to ignore them; it was a psychological escape of great importance. But today we represent a generation which has created the Jewish state, and which decided even before the Jewish state was established — and the World Jewish Congress is the expression of this decision — to take our

destiny into our hands, not to rely for our future either on the goodwill of our friends or on the ill will of our enemies, but to try – as far as a people can do so in this complex world – to determine our own fate, to be the masters of our destiny. Such a people cannot be dominated by emotions alone, although I am glad that these emotions exist. But it must, finally, be guided by what is best for the interests of the Jewish people. I am sure that the large majority of those who stormily opposed my suggestion fifteen years ago that we should start negotiating with the Germans in order to get indemnification and reparations, are today very happy that this was done and glad that we achieved what we have achieved, thus enabling hundreds of thousands of Jews to start another life – not to speak about what these reparations have done for the upbuilding of the Jewish State of Israel. In the same way, I am convinced that, upon real consideration of the problem and overcoming our emotions – which must exist but which cannot be the determining factor – we cannot allow ourselves to ignore Germany as if it did not exist. It is a big power, and is becoming a bigger power. With regard to many spheres of interest of concern to Israel and the Jewish people, the Germany of today and of tomorrow will play an important role, and we cannot conduct world Jewish policies and ignore Germany.

As the problem exists, I belong to those who believe in an open discussion of it. I do not believe in not allowing complex, delicate emotional problems to be discussed and aired openly. I know there are many Germans who would like to forget that the problem exists, but we will not allow them to do so; and I am sure that the greatest leaders of Germany will not allow them to do so. There are also Jews who would like to forget it. I remember, years ago, when the Claims Conference wanted to spend a lot of money on young Jewish scholars to deal with the period of the Nazi war crimes and we were unable to find the young people, one of the great historians of the Hebrew University told me that our young people did not want to be reminded of this shameful period when Jews were slaughtered without resistance. I do not accept this approach at all. There is, then, a certain tendency to forget this terrible period in Jewish history, but peoples cannot afford the luxury of forgetting any period in their lives – neither their glory nor their shame, neither their heroic periods nor their tragic periods. At that time, when I had the discussion with this great historian, I published an article under the title “*Amor Fati*” – the famous expression of Nietzsche – stating that men and peoples have to accept their whole destiny. Otherwise an individual ends up on a psychoanalyst’s couch and a people ends in frustration, bitterness, and hatred. It is much easier not to acknowledge the existence of this problem; it requires more psychological and moral courage, however, for a people to bring complex and embarrassing problems into the open and discuss them.

We shall not find a solution tonight — I am not so naive as to believe that we will — but I think it is much better that the problem be discussed by people from both sides — by Germans whose record is perfect and who opposed Hitler, and by Jewish historians and scholars who can give us the historical background of this problem. Therefore I suggested this discussion to the Executive of the World Jewish Congress a year-and-a-half ago, and it was approved. Then opposition developed, which is perfectly legitimate — and the three groups whose representatives just spoke had a right to say what they expressed today — but I am glad that the majority of those who belong to the World Jewish Congress felt that my approach was, in the long run, the better one.

One more observation: all these words used in these statements — “reconcile”, “forget”, “forgive” — have nothing to do with this discussion. Our people will never forget what happened in the Hitler period — I said it many years ago and I repeat it; I would be ashamed to be a Jew if Jews could forget it. Which people can forget such tragedies? Do other peoples forget similar tragedies? What is this talk of “forgetting”, and who speaks of “forgiveness”? Such crimes may be forgiven by God, if he wants to. Relations between peoples are not love stories or sentimental relations; they are relations between groups who fight for their existence, who sometimes have alliances and sometimes are opponents, and all this talk of reconciliation is out of place. Who can allow anyone to reconcile or to forgive? It has never entered the mind of anyone of us to do so, and it is a plain distortion of the facts by those opposing the dialogue to make such allegations. They may say the dialogue is premature from their point of view, but they should not distort our motives. The purpose of what is on the agenda here tonight is to find a way of coexistence between Jews and Germans in a world in which the Germans exist and are growing in importance, and in which — thank God — the Jewish people exists despite the Nazi attempt to annihilate it; to find a way of coexistence between two peoples who, in the light of the realities and in spite of whatever happened, must find means of dealing with one another. All the sentiments behind it are a matter for the individual. It is not for the World Jewish Congress or the State of Israel or the Knesset of Israel to determine these emotional and sentimental aspects. We have to deal collectively with the hard realities. For years we have been negotiating with Germany, and I am not thinking only of the billions that Germany has paid, but also of the political position of Germany — in what measure an anti-Semitic Germany could do harm to Israel and to the Jewish people, and how much, on the other hand, a friendly Germany could help us in our fight for survival. That is the only point that is on the agenda, and not these distortions and misstatements, as if I were preparing an orgy of reconciliation.

We have to find ways of coexistence, a very difficult task, especially for this generation, which still has among it hundreds of thousands of survivors of the concentration camps and which has witnessed the destruction of millions of its people. It will require great patience. What is involved is a psychological process. We can sign agreements, as we did in Luxembourg. Israel can sign agreements at any time with Germany, but what we are speaking of now concerns the psychological process which will take I don't know how long. What is necessary is patience, goodwill, and the conscience of collective responsibility on the part of the German people. Not every German is guilty. Young Germans who have not lived in the Nazi period — what guilt could they have? But a people — and this is the basis of peoplehood for every nation — is responsible for its whole history. It may glory in its great days, but it must accept responsibility for its shameful periods. I stress, therefore, that especially the German people must have goodwill and patience. If the Germans get impatient with war-crimes trials and the Jews remind them of their crimes, the Germans must understand that. If anyone has the right to be oversensitive, it is we and not the Germans. We were the sufferers, we were the victims. We may sometimes exaggerate our sensitiveness, and we have a right to do so. It is a very mild reaction to what has been done to our generation, which has lost a third of its sons and daughters.

This I wanted to say here. I think it is useful for the German people that two morally and intellectually important German leaders participate in this debate. Dr. Gerstenmaier does not speak here as president of the German Federal Parliament, but as a man who has fought Nazism, who has helped Israel, and whose position on our common problems I have known for the past fourteen years. Professor Golo Mann is one of the great German intellectual and moral authorities. They will discuss the problem with Jewish representatives in the light of the historical background and the reality of today.

Now one word about the procedure. We will first hear the four speakers. This will take about an hour-and-three-quarters, as they have agreed to shorten their speeches, which will later be distributed in their entirety. Then we will have a short discussion. Two of the participants in the discussion have been listed on the program — Dr. Prinz and Dr. van Dam; a few others have asked for the floor, and if it will be at all possible, I will give it to some of them; however, I cannot promise the floor to all of them. There will also be the possibility to ask questions — practical questions, realistic questions — and I am sure that Dr. Gerstenmaier, who is the most competent to answer them, will be ready to reply to them, as he has told me he would be. I warn you that the meeting will last at least until midnight. I hope that those who are interested will remain, and that those who are tired will leave quietly and not disturb the others.

PROFESSOR GERSHOM SCHOLEM (*Hebrew University, Jerusalem*): To talk about Jews and Germans and their relationship to one another in these last 200 years is, in the year 1966, a melancholy enterprise. The burden of the emotions is still so great that an objective consideration or analysis seems almost impossible, and all of us are still so deeply influenced by the experience of this generation that objectivity can hardly be expected. There are many Jews today who consider the German people a "hopeless case" or, at most, a people with which, after all that has happened, they would not like to have anything more to do. I am not one of them, for I simply do not believe that there ought to be a permanent state of war among nations. I deem it right and even important that Jews talk to Germans as Jews, in full consciousness of what has happened and without any attempt to obliterate the differences between them. To many of us, the German language, our mother tongue, has provided unforgettable experiences which have determined the landscape of our youth, and has given it its own expression. Now that we hear a call from there — out of the realm of history and particularly from a new young generation — although this call is still unsure, undetermined, and even shy, there is something in it from which some of us cannot possibly dare escape.

Of course there are great difficulties in generalization. When we talk about "the Germans" and "the Jews," we frighten the objective observer. In times of conflict, it is easy to manipulate such classifications. However questionable such general categories are, they were used quite vocally and audibly. However, it is necessary to introduce some differentiation here. For the Germans are not all Germans, and the Jews are not all Jews. The one unthinkable exception, of course, was the case of those Germans who, when speaking of the Jews, really meant *all* the Jews, and used this idea as far as they could, once they had the power in their hands, to exterminate all of them. Since that time, those who survived the holocaust — or who by an accident of history were not subjected to it — find it somewhat difficult to differentiate. The traps which render every generalization dangerous are clear: arbitrariness, contradiction, and lack of context; the circumstances are too manifold and individual, so that every generalization could be easily contradicted by an equally valid opposite contention. Nevertheless, aware of all these dangers, I am ready to address myself to this topic, certainly one of the most provocative topics in the Jewish world in more than 150 years.

Alfred Döblin, a Jewish writer who in his older years became a convert to Catholicism, wrote in 1948 to another Jew that he should take great care not to use the word "Jew" when writing for Germans. In Germany, he said, the word "Jew" had remained a derogatory term, and by using it one could only do the bidding of the anti-Semites. For anti-Semitism, he continued, was deeply rooted in the Germans and in

1948 was even more evil than before 1933. As a matter of fact, I myself have experienced that many Germans, in order to dissociate themselves from the Nazis – at times belatedly – still, in 1965, vindicated Döblin's observation by their obvious reluctance to call a Jew a Jew unless he absolutely insisted on it. The Jews, having been murdered as Jews, are now being posthumously and triumphantly proclaimed as Germans, and it is felt that to emphasize their Jewishness would mean to yield to anti-Semitic theories. This perversion in the name of progress evades every possibility of facing facts. And it is exactly this which I consider to be our task; we cannot possibly speak of the Jews emphatically enough when we talk about their fate under the Germans. The atmosphere between the Jews and the Germans can only be cleansed if we approach these conditions with unreserved criticism. This is difficult – for the Germans because the mass murder of the Jews has become the greatest nightmare of their moral existence as a people; for the Jews because such clarification presupposes a critical evaluation of the most important phenomenon of their own history. Where love – insofar as it existed – was suffocated in blood, historical understanding and clarity of concepts are the prerequisites for any productive dialogue between Jews and Germans. Such a dialogue, if it is conducted in earnest, can only be approached beyond the political and economic factors and interests which exist between the State of Israel and the German Federal Republic. I have no competence in this area, and in no way will I refer to them. I am not even certain that, by including such considerations, we gain anything for either the question which is before us or the answer to it. We have all heard a great deal about these considerations, and I must say that, as Jews, we sometimes feel ill at ease when a false junction of ideas is created.

Up to the second half of the eighteenth century and partly even beyond that, the Jews in Germany generally existed as Jews did everywhere. They were clearly discernible as a nation and possessed an unmistakable identity and a history of many thousands of years, whatever they themselves or other people may have thought of it. They had a clearly defined consciousness of themselves and lived under a religious code that permeated their life and their culture in an extremely intensive manner. Insofar as the influences of the surrounding German world penetrated into the *Judengasse* – and such influences existed – it did not occur in a manner of conscious acceptance of such elements but mostly in a hardly conscious process of osmosis. Of course, often enough German cultural values underwent a transformation into Jewish values and linguistically into Yiddish. The conscious relationship between both societies was of a delicate nature and particularly so in the two centuries preceding the period of emancipation. The Jewish religious culture of the leading circles of German Jewry kept to itself and remained foreign to the German

world. But the economically strongest elements — for instance, the “court Jews” — and the socially lowest group — which had communications with the German underworld — had a relationship with the Germans which in both cases endangered their existence. They moved, each in its particular way, among the Germans and paid the price for it when the slightest changes in political and social conditions occurred. Nothing is more foolish than to speak of the Jews in Germany in those centuries as though they had been deeply rooted in Germany; for neither the Jews nor the Germans were prepared in any way for such integration. Everybody knew that the Jews were in exile and, however this exile was seen, there was no doubt of its tremendous importance for the human condition of the Jews.

The overwhelming majority of the Jews, who did not belong to either of the two marginal groups which we mentioned and were therefore less affected by the vicissitudes of general life, had their own traditional image which was determined by their history and spirituality — an image that had been molded during the long centuries of their exile. At the same time it must be admitted that, in the second half of the eighteenth century, there appeared a profound weakness in their Jewish existence. It is as though a phase of their historic existence had reached a low and nobody knew what was coming next. When Moses Mendelssohn began his career as a kind of conservative reformer in German Jewry, this weakness was evident. With him and particularly his followers began the process by which Jews consciously turned toward Germans, a phenomenon that was favored by important historic factors. The propaganda began for the determined attachment of the Jews to German culture, and not long after that even to the German people. There began also the struggle of the Jews for their rights, which was to last three or four generations and which they won — let us not delude ourselves — because there was a decisive and victorious group among the non-Jews who fought for them.

It was with these struggles, which were helped by the German Enlightenment and in no smaller measure by the French Revolution, that an important change took place which had its consequences for the Jews in German society. At first this change was tentative and very uncertain, as indeed their Judaism itself was often unsure. The Jews were still aware of their Jewish peoplehood, although they were often uncertain of its meaning, which they were losing or about to lose. To put it quite clearly, there began that endless yearning for the German historical realm which was supposed to substitute for the Jewish one, a yearning that was so characteristic of the relationship between Jews and Germans for more than a hundred years. Those elements who participated in this process with great hesitation — consisting mainly of the religious Jews of the old school, at the beginning still numerically strong in German Jewry — were almost always strangely silent, and only

rarely do we hear direct warnings from them, as though they were afraid of their own pathos. Until approximately 1820 it was general usage to speak of the Jewish nation and its members in Germany. In the next two generations this usage disappeared almost completely and, favored by both sides, one now spoke in terms of the Jewish persuasion and similar phrases.

The changes and distortions which from the start were the natural consequences of this yearning for the Germans and which later, as they progressed, led to such bitter problems, were considerable. The emancipation brought in its wake the determined denial of Jewish nationality, a renunciation that was as strongly demanded by the Germans as it was deliberately conceded by the avant-garde among the Jews and their spokesmen. The mere yearning for the German historical world became a determined participation in it, and the objects of enlightened toleration sometimes became vociferous prophets who now began to speak in the name of the Germans. The attentive reader of the German reactions to this process and its acrobatics is immediately struck by their tone of amazement and — sometimes benevolent, sometimes malicious — irony. What to many of us today seems to be a false start in the relationship between Germans and Jews, but what, in the conditions of 1800, had an inherent logic, lay in the renunciation of the totality of a Jewish existence in Germany. The most determined fighters for the cause of the Jews among the non-Jews were precisely those who most articulately and most consciously counted on the disappearance of the Jews as Jews. Indeed, the disintegration of the Jewish national group as a group was considered a prerequisite of their advocacy of the cause of the Jews, as in the case of Wilhelm von Humboldt. The liberals hoped for a determined and progressive self-liquidation of the Jews. The conservatives assumed a more reserved attitude toward these new developments; they began to accuse the Jews of an all too great readiness to renounce their own consciousness. The self-renunciation of the Jews was, on the one hand, welcomed, and even demanded; yet at the same time it served as an argument to prove their lack of substance. We have witnesses who confirm that the contempt with which so many Germans looked upon the Jews was stimulated by the easy readiness with which the cultural elite among the Jews denied its own traditions. After all, how valuable could a heritage be if the elite among its designated bearers was so eager to deny it? Thus a weird and dangerous dialectic came into being. Important circles of the German elite demanded of the Jews to renounce their heritage and were ready to reward such a renunciation; but at the same time many expressed their contempt for the Jews for this very readiness of self-denial. The socialists, whose total lack of seriousness and equally total ignorance on the Jewish question was determined by the contemptible invectives in Karl Marx' essay, *On the Jewish Question*, proved to be completely

helpless in view of the new changes. They could only demand the dissolution of the Jewish people and its historical consciousness, which would reach its culmination in the revolt of the masses and the final victory of the revolution. They could not find any meaning in welcoming the Jews as active partners in any kind of dialogue.

I spoke of the dangerous dialectic in this process. The Jews conducted the struggle for their emancipation — and this is the tragedy of that struggle that moves us so deeply today — not in the name of their rights as a people, but on behalf of their assimilation into the peoples among whom they lived. In their readiness to give up their peoplehood or to deny it, they did not end their misery but opened a new source of suffering for themselves. For assimilation in Germany did not eliminate the Jewish problem, as its advocates had hoped, but rather rendered the situation even more acute, albeit from a new angle. The more common areas of communication between the two groups were created, the greater became the possibilities for increased friction. The adventure of assimilation into which they threw themselves so passionately and so understandably was bound to increase the dangers that stemmed from increasing tensions. In addition, something happened to the Jews, now exposed to this new encounter with the Germans, which Arnold Zweig calls “disruption.” And this in a dual sense: in their existence under imposed undignified conditions and the personal and social consequences that these conditions had for the Jews; and also in their own profound sense of insecurity, which became quite visible once they left the ghetto in order to become Germans, the great watchword of the time. This double disruption of the German Jews is one of the factors which, in the process that began at that time, worked as a disturbing and often destructive element. The refusal of so many German Jews to see the operation of these factors and the dialectic that they presaged is one of the most depressing lessons learned by those who read the disputations of the period. The emotional turmoil of the German Jews between 1820 and 1920 is an important stepping-stone for the understanding of *Deutschjudentum*, that “German Jewishness” that we knew in our youth and which, in our own circles, led to so much contradiction.

At the same time this insecurity led to something else: with it some of the long-dormant creativity of the Jews was unexpectedly liberated again. It is true that with the entry into the new and eagerly accepted world, the sense of security, which was once theirs through the Jewish tradition, was lost. But, on the other hand, the Jews who had thrown themselves into this exciting experience developed something which, in the old order, had been hidden or buried. These phenomena are deeply connected with one another. It is important for us to pause briefly in order to clarify the positive elements which became so important in this process, particularly for the Jews, even those outside the borders of

Germany. The intimate character that the relationship between Jews and things German had for the Jews was tied in with the specific historical moment during which it took place. When the Jews, having left their Middle Ages, turned in large numbers toward the new era of enlightenment and revolution, it was the German civilization which they first encountered — in Germany, Austria-Hungary, and the Eastern European countries, which encompassed practically four fifths of the Jewish population of the time. This happened — and this is decisive — at one of its most creative turning points: the zenith of the rise of the bourgeoisie. It can be said that the period in which the newly awakened productivity of the Jews — destined to become so important after 1750 — coincided with the summit of the productivity of the German people, was a happy one. This conjuncture created the image of the Germans which, before 1940, in spite of many bitter experiences, was not shattered among many people. This amalgamation of a great historic hour, characterized for the Jews by the names of Lessing and Schiller, has in its intensity no parallel in the encounter of Jews with any other European nation. It is because of this encounter — the first on the road toward the West — that everything German was considered in the light of this image. Even today, after so much blood and so many tears, it is impossible for us to say that it was only an illusion. It was more than that. It contained elements of great creativity and the beginnings of important developments.

It is difficult to measure the important role that Friedrich Schiller played in the relationship of Jews and Germans. This has very rarely been appreciated by the Germans. Schiller, the spokesman of pure humanitarianism, of the German classics, the proclaimer of the highest ideals of mankind, has for many generations of Jews within and, even more, outside Germany represented that which they considered — or wanted to consider — to be German. This was so even in the last third of the nineteenth century, when in Germany itself Schiller's language was already considered hollow. The encounter with Friedrich Schiller was, for many Jews, more real than the one with the actual Germans. Here they found what they sought most passionately. German romanticism meant something to many Jews, but Schiller meant something for *all* of them. He was a factor in the Jewish belief in humanity. Schiller was the most eloquent, the most impressive, the most resounding cause of their idealistic illusions to which the relationship between the Jews and the Germans led. Here was the program which seemed to promise everything to the new Jew, who had lost his self-assurance as a Jew. Here he found what he sought; for him there was no false note in this music that appealed to his inner being. It was to Schiller, who never spoke to the Jews directly, that the Jews responded. It is in the failure of this dialogue that we might discover one of the secrets of the failure of the whole relationship; because

Schiller, to whom they attached their love with so much passion, was not just anybody. He was really the national poet of the Germans, and in the period between 1800 and 1920 the Germans considered him as such; so that the Jews did not make the mistake — of which they were often guilty — of addressing themselves to the wrong person.

The boundless passion that caused Russian Jews seeking the road to humanity within their own people to adopt the name of Schiller — one of the noblest figures in the Zionist movement, Solomon Schiller, is an example of this — really built a bridge to the Germans. But this bridge-building, alas, was undertaken only by Jews. The enthusiasm of the Jews for Schiller impressed the later Germans as touching but comical. Very rarely was there any feeling that here could have been really, at long last, a common ground for many things.

The first half of the nineteenth century was a period of the most determined approaches. It was at that time that the Jews found amazingly much help among the Germans; many individuals found much understanding of their passionate yearning for education. It cannot be said that there was no goodwill at that time, and whoever reads the biographies of the Jewish elite of that time encounters again and again such understanding — even among devout Christians, such as the Herrenhuter. But the dynamics of this process demanded more than yearning for education. We find here the radical transformation of the Jews from the old traditional attitudes, which were still the way of life of their majority, to a Germanism that proclaimed that “the German national education of the Jews and their participation in the general human and civil institutions is the main essential task to which everyone must dedicate himself,” to quote Moritz Lazarus, a disciple of Herbart. He was a perfect representative of this tendency, which accomplished the transformation from a pure Talmudic Judaism to this new German Jewish way of life within a mere five years. The endless yearning to *come* home soon changed into the ecstatic illusion that they *were* at home. It is well known and understandable that the pace at which the transformation took place, the speed with which the Jews undertook it, provoked no equally rapid reaction on the part of the Germans. They were not aware of the depth of the process of the falling-away of Jewish tradition and Jewish self-respect that they were witnessing, and this process frightened them. However much they would have welcomed the final result of this process — however much it corresponded at least to the liberal and even to the conservative ideology — they were poorly prepared for the rapidity of what was happening. In their eyes it indicated an aggressiveness which called for them to take up a defensive position. All this allied them sooner or later with those who, from the very beginning, had watched this whole process with displeasure, and there has been no lack of articulate spokesmen for this school of thought since the post-Mendelssohn generation.

The term "host-nation" — *Wirtsvolk* — in whose home we were guests, made sense. Even in the best of cases, it was the reception of a guest in the family; and this hospitality could be revoked if the conditions were not properly met. This is often particularly clear in the utterances of the liberals. Nowadays we sometimes hear talk about a process of amalgamation that would have come about between the two groups had it not been interrupted by National Socialism. But this is belatedly wishful thinking. Of course, the complete dedication of so many human beings to the German people — which can be seen in the numerous autobiographies of those who, no longer having anything in common with the Jewish tradition and certainly not with the Jewish people, designated themselves as being "of Jewish descent" — is among the most moving phenomena of this process of estrangement. The list of Jews who were lost among the Germans in this way is infinitely large. It is a list of great and often amazing talent and productivity, offered to the Germans. Who can read their history without being deeply moved? That of Otto Lipmann of Hamburg, for instance, who until the moment when he committed suicide, claimed to be a better German than those who drove him to his death. It is no wonder that now, when everything is past, there are many who would acknowledge his claim as justified. These people made their choice, and we should not deny them to the Germans. Nevertheless, we are often ill at ease about what we feel points to the inner conflict which can be found even in these biographies. Even in their complete estrangement from everything Jewish, we can note in many of them what Germans and Jews alike — but not they themselves — would have considered Jewish substance. This is true of so many important people, from Karl Marx and Lassalle to Karl Kraus, Gustav Mahler, and Georg Simmel. Nobody has described more deeply this process of the exodus of the Jew from himself than Charles Péguy. Very rarely has a non-Jew achieved greater insight into the Jewish situation. It was he who coined the phrase: "*Etre ailleurs — le grand vice de cette race, la grande vertu secrète, la grande vocation de ce peuple.*" It was this "being somewhere else" which was combined with the desperate desire to be at home, a combination which was intense, fruitful, and destructive at the same time. It is the key to understanding the relationship between Jews and Germans. What in those days seemed disquieting and false, therefore provoking opposition, seems today symbolically attractive, deeply moving, and, in an important sense, positive. The Jews in Germany did not profit by what today, under changed circumstances, gives them a particularly positive importance: today the Jew is valued as a classical representative of the phenomenon of man's estrangement in society. The estrangement of the Jew from his home soil; from his history and tradition; and, even more, his estrangement in the middle-class society that was forming itself; caused displeasure. The fact that he was not

really at home — however much and emphatically he insisted that he was — has now sometimes become a symbol of the "*condition humaine*," and now accrues to his credit and glory, while it was an accusation at the time when "estrangement" was still a curseword. It is in keeping with this protracted and complex situation that the Jews in their large majority consciously shared the evaluation of their fellowmen; and they either strove to be rooted, to be at home with the Germans and in Germany, or they maintained that the vast majority of their fellowmen did not really believe them. The phenomenon of the so-called German-nationalist Jews in the 1920s evoked derision and laughter, which is very characteristic.

Thus from the very beginning these conditions contained something which had to lead to a dangerous conflagration. The process of the entry of the Jews into German society had various aspects. The important fact that the Jews lost their own elite during this period, mainly through conversion and mixed marriage — while they themselves were not prepared to accept such radical solutions — points to differentiations of great consequence. Large groups among the German Jews were ready to liquidate their own peoplehood, yet at the same time they wanted to preserve their Judaism — either as a heritage or a religious persuasion or God knows what; at any rate, something intangible, yet clearly discernible in their consciousness. They were — and it is often forgotten — really not ready for total assimilation, while their elite was prepared to pay for its assimilation by disappearing completely. In their emotions they were unsure and confused. But the spectacle of their own avant-garde running away from them was too much for them. This incessant bloodletting, through which the Jews lost the majority of their most advanced people to the Germans, forms an important aspect of the so-called German-Jewish symbiosis, of which many speak so glibly. To the Jews it is a melancholy aspect.

The petit bourgeois, then, constituted the mass of the Jews during their social ascent in the course of the nineteenth century. It was necessary for them to create a brand-new group of leaders in every generation. It is the rare exception to see Jewish descendants in the twentieth century of those Jewish families who after 1800 led the breakaway into German civilization. The lower classes in their near entirety remained steadfastly Jewish, although Judaism itself had become diluted, watered down, and emptied of its old meaning. It had suddenly become a strange mixture of a religion of reason and certain emotions that were often denied but remained highly operative. The attitude of the Jews to their own deserters was a very fluctuating one. A good example of this is the phenomenon of Heinrich Heine. This attitude varies from deep emotional rejection to partly-approving indifference. Of course Heine was a border case; he was able to say of himself that he had not returned to Judaism as he had never left it.

We must not leave unconsidered the inner tensions within Jewish society, which influenced considerably the relationship to its German surroundings. After all, Germany was the stage for the bitter disputations between the pious Jews of the old school – the country Jews and their leaders – and the neologists, who won out socially and politically, if not numerically. The word “assimilation” was at first used by its defenders in the positive terms of an ideal. It was only later, when the Zionists threw the word back at them with scorn and contempt, that the assimilationists resented being called by that name. This tendency to assimilation, which varied greatly, was certainly an important factor. But it is not quite clear to what extent the advocates of this tendency were ready to accept its consequences, and generalizations in this regard are dangerous. At any rate, on the Jewish side itself there was strong criticism of Jews and of the old Judaism, and it is well known that some individuals indulged in such extremism as Jewish anti-Semitism. It is thanks to a German Jew who left Judaism – by his own admission an impossible thing to attempt – that we have the “most merciless exposures” ever written about the Berlin Jewish bourgeoisie. I am referring to Kurt Tucholsky’s essays on “Herr Wendriner,” a weird document of a certain German Jewish reality. The anti-Semites tried to malign the Jews as much as they could, but what they wrote was clearly exaggerated and hollow. There was hatred, to be sure, but no knowledge and no real understanding. Thus it is small wonder that it was one of the most talented and most despicable Jewish anti-Semites who lifted anti-Semitism to a level of which the anti-Semites themselves were hardly capable.

Often we find in the same family representatives of extreme choices. This is true, for instance, of the brothers Jacob and Michael Bernays, whose niece married Sigmund Freud. One of them, a classical philologist of the highest order, remained almost neurotically faithful to the strictest Jewish Orthodoxy. The other left Judaism in order to begin a more glittering career as a German philologist and interpreter of Goethe. The brothers never again spoke to each other. This is equally true for the cousins Georg Hermann and Rudolf Borchardt: the first succeeded in depicting the Berlin Jewish bourgeoisie with as much criticism and irony as love, something unequalled in literature; while the second, his incredibly gifted cousin, who thought to have destroyed everything Jewish within himself, became the most articulate spokesman of a conservative German traditionalism whose sheer paradox frightened everyone but him himself.

The majority, however, was not ready to go to the very end of the road, and many sought a middle ground. The greatest talents among them very rarely benefited the cause of the Jews. Such was the case with such important and at the same time problematical figures as Leopold Zunz, the founder of the “*Wissenschaft des Judentums*”;

Ludwig Steinheim and Hermann Cohen, the best Jewish minds in the philosophy of religion; and Abraham Geiger and Samson Raphael Hirsch, the two most significant – and diametrically opposed – figures of the Jewish rabbinate in Germany. The majority of the most talented Jewish minds, however, have benefited German society to an amazingly great degree in economics, sciences, literature, and art.

The great American sociologist Thorstein Veblen wrote in a well-known essay about the intellectual “preeminence of Jews in modern Europe.” It is precisely this preeminence which spelled the doom of the German Jews. When the Jews had fulfilled their economic function in the development of Germany in the nineteenth century and were no longer needed for that purpose, they still assumed a cultural function, particularly in the twentieth century. From the very beginning, this role aroused anxiety and opposition and it did not benefit them. That the Germans needed the Jews and their intellectual world is being noticed now, when they are no longer there, and many mourn the loss. But when they were in Germany they were willy-nilly an irritant and their preeminence resulted in disaster for them; for the vast majority of the Germans viewed the advance of the Jewish intelligentsia with great reservations, in the same way in which they regarded the very entry of the Jews into German society. We have already said that they were not prepared for the impetuous rapidity of this process, which appeared unnatural to them. Political emancipation, which they had finally consented to in the middle of the nineteenth century, was not paralleled by equal readiness to accept the Jews unreservedly into culturally active society. The Jews, however, with their long intellectual tradition, found that they were particularly well prepared for such an active role. But it was precisely this that aroused the opposition, which became active and virulent, before the process of reception could be completed. Seen as a whole, the love affair of the Jews with the Germans remained one-sided and unrequited, and awakened in the best of cases something like sentimental sympathy – as in the case of Theodor Fontane – or gratitude. It was not rare for the Jews to find gratitude, but they practically never found the love they were looking for.

Among the Jews there were unrecognized geniuses and unpopular prophets. These were people of intellect who fought for justice, and not a few men who fought for the great minds among the Germans. The latter occurred to an amazing degree and needs no documentation. It is no coincidence that almost all the important interpreters of Goethe were Jews. But none among the Germans went out of his way to do something for any of the Jews of this group which we mentioned. Here is a great difference between the French and the Germans. There is nothing in German literature to match the unforgettable pages in which the Catholic Frenchman, Charles Péguy, portrayed Bernard Lazare, a

Jewish anarchist, as one of the true prophets of Israel. And this happened at a time when the French Jews knew no better than to hush up the existence of Lazare — one of their great men — either out of malice or stupidity. At least here was a process of give and take. Here a Frenchman actually *saw* a Jew whom the Jews themselves were incapable of seeing. Would that a single such phenomenon of *seeing* us had ever existed among the Germans! This would have indicated a great deal. But I know of no such case. Would that a single German writer had recognized and acknowledged the greatness of Moses Hess, when the Jews remained silent about him or mocked him. And Moses Hess was the German Jewish equivalent of Bernard Lazare, who was the first Zionist among French Jews. Such a phenomenon would have proven that the Jews had made a dent among the Germans and that the impact was not merely that of the Germans on the Jews. Péguy proved that a French-Jewish dialogue was possible in the truest sense. He understood more about that particular Jew *as a Jew* than any Jew did. This would have been the only justification for the long-sought German-Jewish dialogue that has never taken place. No German recognized Kafka, Simmel, Freud, or Walter Benjamin when they were little known, and certainly did not appreciate them as Jews. The belated activity in this regard does not change this fact.

Only very few Germans — to be sure, some of their noblest spirits — possessed the truly humanitarian objectivity to see the Jew as a Jew, as we find in Johann Peter Hebel. The liberals had particular reservations. Fritz Reuter, one of the most characteristic minds of the North German liberal intelligentsia, delivering his speech in 1870 on the celebration of German unification, had nothing better to do than to attack “those wretched Jew-boys, for example, Heinrich Heine,” who were lacking in patriotism. The feeling that the liberalism of the Jews was of a more radical nature, that it contained elements with subversive tendencies, was widely spread. In fact, the participation of the Jews in the criticism of German public life during the hundred years of their activity as political writers was highly evident. This was not the case with their participation — however real — in the political activities of the opposite tendency, where they were represented — in an impressive way, it is true — almost only by converts such as Friedrich Julius Stahl or Rudolf Borchardt. In reaction to this critical attitude, which was deeply rooted in the history and social situation of the Jews, the phenomenon of anti-Semitism began to grow, totally unheeded by the Jews — an anti-Semitism which, in the increasingly critical relationship between Jews and Germans, assumed an unproductive and even destructive importance. It is not necessary to emphasize that specific social and political conditions finally caused anti-Semitism in its most radical forms to dominate Germany. But nothing is more foolish than the notion that National Socialism came out of the blue sky or was

exclusively a product of conditions following the First World War; that it did become virulent in its most murderous consequences is the result of a long prehistory. Not a few of the anti-Jewish writings of the nineteenth century read like publications of the later Nazis. Nothing makes weirder reading than Bruno Bauer's *Das Judentum in der Fremde*, written in 1869. There one can already read everything that was later preached in the Thousand-Year Reich – and in a formulation no less radical. And this was written by a leader of the onetime Hegelian Left.

Of course, there were more subtle forms of anti-Semitism, for instance the ambivalent formulation hovering between hate and admiration in Hans Blüher's *Secessio Judaica*, which appeared shortly after the First World War. In works like this, already-discredited metaphysics, masquerading as “civilized” anti-Semitism, provided murderous anti-Semitism with its cue. Perhaps nothing is more depressing to us today than the wavering of many Germans during those dark days – among them some of the most important German minds.

Max Brod spoke of “*Distanzliebe*” – love at a distance – which he considered the ideal relationship between Germans and Jews. This is a dialectical concept whereby the consciousness of distance prevents too great an intimacy but also where the sense of distance creates the desire to bridge the gap. If both parties had agreed, this might have been the solution for the period with which we have been dealing here. But Brod himself understood that where there is love, the sense of distance disappears; this was true for the Jews. But where there is distance, love cannot arise; and this was valid for the majority of the Germans. The love of the Jews for Germany was met by the marked distance with which the Germans regarded them. It is true that in this “love at a distance” the two partners could theoretically have mustered more mutual kindness, accessibility, and understanding. But historical hypotheses are always illegitimate. And if this “love at a distance” had been the Zionist response in the face of the inevitably growing crisis between Jews and Germans, this solution of the Zionist avant-garde would have come too late. The German Jews, who had established themselves as critics and had become famous because of it – and were in the same measure getting on the Germans’ nerves – during the generations preceding the catastrophe, showed an astounding lack of critical understanding of their own situation. Their apologetic attitude and their lack of critical frankness vitiated almost everything they could write about the Jewish position in the German intellectual world, literature, politics, and economy.

The readiness of many Jews to invent a theory to justify the sacrifice of their Jewish existence is an astonishing phenomenon, which has expressed itself in a great variety of forms.

Where are we now, after the indescribable horrors of those twelve years? The Jews and the Germans have taken very different roads since the war. The most vital Jewish elements are trying to build their own society in their own country. Nobody can say whether they will succeed, but everybody knows that the cause of Israel is vital to the Jews. The dialectic of their enterprise is evident. They live on a volcano. This great upsurge, based upon the experience of the catastrophe — let us say it bluntly — the mass murder of the Jews by the Germans and the indifference of the world at large, has now given way to deep exhaustion. But they are still motivated by their original insight into their true situation. The Germans have paid for their catastrophe with the partition of their country and, on the other hand, have experienced a material upsurge that overshadows the preceding years. Can there be a bridge between the two mountains which owe their existence to a volcanic eruption?

The abyss that events have created between the two peoples cannot be measured or even understood. I do not believe — contrary to an attitude which is often expressed in Israel — that the complete acceptance of this abyss into our consciousness will in itself make it possible to overcome it. This is a prognosis without comfort which really consists only of words. In reality such a possibility does not exist. We cannot fully understand what has happened, for its incomprehensibility is its distinguishing feature; thus it cannot become part of our consciousness. Whether we can find each other in this abyss, I do not know. As for whether the abyss, created by indescribable and truly unthinkable happenings, can ever be closed — who dares to say?

Abysses are created by events, but bridges are built by sheer willpower. Bridges are necessary to permit us to cross over the abyss, and they are being constructed as the product of conscious thinking and determination. Moral bridges, I repeat, are products of pure willpower. They must be anchored firmly from both sides if they are to endure. Israel had terrible experiences among almost all European nations. The bridges on which we meet other nations are shaky enough, even without the burden of the memory of Auschwitz. But is this memory not really also a chance? Is there not a light in this darkness — the light of soul-searching? To put it differently: productive relations between Jews and Germans — in which a meaningful and horrible past is to be preserved and worked out anew — must be prepared with great care if we expect them to become a reality. In such a new approach lies the only guarantee that the open relations between our nations will not be poisoned by false goals or demands. Where love is no longer possible, a new understanding must be built with different ingredients: distance and respect, candor and open-mindedness, and — above all — sheer will.

A young German wrote to me that it was his hope that the Jews, when thinking of Germany, might remember the words of Isaiah:

“Remember ye not the former things, neither consider the things of old.” Whether the messianic era will enable the Jews to forget, I do not know. It is a delicate point of theology. But for us, who must live without illusions in a time without a Messiah, such a hope demands the impossible. However sublime it may be, we are not able to do it. Only in remembering the past, the meaning of which our minds will never fully be able to perceive, can there grow a new hope for the reestablishment of the dialogue between Germans and Jews – for the reconciliation of those who are today separated.

PROFESSOR GOLO MANN (*Professor of History, Technische Hochschule, Stuttgart*): Let me begin with a brief “confession”: I accepted Dr. Nahum Goldmann’s invitation not lightheartedly, and I speak to you with a sense of shame, doubting whether I may speak at all and whether one may discuss the subject calmly, objectively, and scientifically, as if it were just one historical theme among others. I could perhaps claim that I personally may feel “absolved,” as my mother comes from a Jewish or largely Jewish family; as among the victims of Nazism, there were also relatives of mine; as my father left Germany forever in 1933 in protest; and because I also emigrated as a young man at that time. But I cannot do so. In my view, a German is a German, a German writer is a German writer, and what has been called “collective shame” – but, I am afraid, is not very “collective” in Germany today – also applies to him. This would perhaps also be my position if both my parents had been of Jewish extraction. For – and I shall try to give the reasons for my thesis at a later stage – I have always considered the large majority of German Jews to be Germans, and could not consider them differently, on the basis of my observations and experience.

My second “confession” is the following: I do not know whether I was destined to enjoy life very much; but I do know that the extent of my enjoyment of life was greatly reduced, and will always remain reduced, by the experiences of the 1930s and 1940s, in particular by the murder of the Jews; by other cruel and mad acts as well, perpetrated by others than the Germans and those committed against the Germans – but above all by the murder of the Jews. I will never be able to rid myself of this mortgage on my life. I will never be able fully to trust my compatriots, the Germans; I will never be able fully to trust human beings, for the Germans are also human beings – highly civilized Europeans. Whatever we may do and may strive for, the shadows of Auschwitz, Treblinka, and the Warsaw ghetto are upon us. If we want to be able to act and hope at all and believe in the good and the beautiful, we have to force ourselves to look away from these things as if they had not existed. That is the way one must act, for life claims its rights. It is as though we were to grow fruit at the foot of a volcano which had just had a murderous eruption. But grief will always remain

with us, as well as fear of a new volcanic eruption. Where *that* was possible, anything will always be possible.

But now to the subject matter. I want to make a few basic points which, I know, differ from views that are represented among you.

American Jews are Americans, very good and very typical Americans. Within a century, often within much less than a hundred years, they have acquired American characteristics, physically and psychologically. They have the virtues which one can describe as "specifically American"; they often also have the weaknesses which one describes as "specifically American." French Jews — authors like André Maurois, politicians like Léon Blum or Mendès-France — are Frenchmen. The German Jews were Germans. To what extent they were accepted as such by their non-Jewish compatriots is another question, which I shall have to deal with later. For a start I merely ask: What were they considered to be objectively and what did they feel they were subjectively? To this question there is only one answer: in their overwhelming majority they were Germans and considered themselves to be Germans.

I knew many German Jews in my youth; firstly because, as a student, one could not help knowing many of them; secondly, through my mother's family; thirdly, because my father was a writer, and there were many Jews among his literary friends and colleagues.

A German Jew was the director of my boarding school. He was a fervent patriot and the close collaborator of a German prince who had, for a short time, been the German chancellor. We had many Jewish fellow-pupils, whom we would not have dreamed of considering anything but compatriots. The same applies to the boy-scout group to which I belonged.

When I studied at Heidelberg, one of my teachers was the Germanist Friedrich Gundolf, one of the most respected and most popular figures of the academic community; he was of Jewish origin. Gundolf belonged to the circle around the poet Stefan George, a decidedly conservative, antidemocratic, esoteric, slightly arrogant but nationally minded group, to which also belonged — in addition to such aristocrats as Count Stauffenberg, who in 1944 made the attempt on Hitler's life — such Jews as the poet Wolfskehl and the historian Kantorowicz. The students never showed Gundolf any enmity because of his Jewish origin. It did not surprise me that he had written a book on *Shakespeare and the German Spirit*. I knew enough German Jews with distinctly national, sometimes nationalistic, attitudes. One of them, Peter Cossmann, the editor in chief of the leading daily of my hometown, Munich, had brought into the world — or at least done much to spread — the false thesis of the "stab in the back of the German front," implying the guilt of the left for the German defeat in 1918. Another Jew, Ernst Lissauer, had during the First World War written his *Hymn of Hate* against

England, which the Supreme Army Command had distributed among the soldiers. The generals did not object to the fact that the author of these verses was a Jew.

A distant Jewish relative of mine was secretary of state for the colonies under Wilhelm II. My Jewish grandfather, who was professor of mathematics at the University of Munich, was a highly respected citizen of his city, a patron of the arts, and in his youth a friend of Richard Wagner, whose festival theatre in Bayreuth he had helped to finance. His sons were commissioned officers in the Bavarian army. Like most German Jews, he was a patriot and conservative at heart. Long before the Nazis robbed him of the rest of his fortune, he had already lost much of it by subscribing to patriotic war loans. Like Gundolf, he was a highly popular and successful teacher. To state that he was not a German would have appeared utterly ridiculous to himself as well as to his many non-Jewish friends. For accuracy's sake, I wish to add that he had left the Jewish faith, but had refused baptism, notwithstanding the advice of the academic bureaucracy. This somewhat slowed down his career, without essentially impeding it.

Among the many authors of Jewish background who were regular guests in my father's home, I should like to refer to three in particular: Wassermann, Hofmannsthal, and Bruno Frank. Jakob Wassermann, in former times a highly celebrated, today regrettably forgotten novelist, wrote a personal statement under the title, *My Life as German and as Jew*. He was, therefore, aware of the tensions between these two entities. His early and best novels — *Caspar Hauser* and *The Goose Man* — are, however, closely connected with his home region, Franconia. Later on, he tended to be "fashionable," and attained a powerful position in the United States, but this was not his best period. Hugo von Hofmannsthal's father was an ennobled Jewish banker. I do not know whether his mother was of Jewish origin as well. As he also married a Jewish lady, one may well consider him to be a Jewish figure. But has anybody ever doubted that the poetic works of Hofmannsthal are the late and most exquisite flowering of a specifically Austrian, Hapsburg culture? Who would consider them to be "Jewish"? When, after the collapse of the Hapsburg empire, someone asked the poet what Austrian writers should do now, Hofmannsthal replied: "Die." But he had to and wanted to go on living after all. When the old Austria ceased to exist, Hofmannsthal indeed stressed the German aspect of his work; in 1928, he delivered at the University of Munich a lecture, which was to become famous, entitled "Literature as the Spiritual Area of the Nation" — *"Das Schrifttum als geistiger Raum der Nation."* He now felt that he belonged to the German nation, and no longer to the domain of specifically Hapsburg culture. For whoever knows the nuances of the German language, the title of his address — *"Schrifttum," "geistiger Raum"* — makes one feel ill at ease, as does the

fact that Hofmannsthal coined in his lecture a term which later on was to win an unpleasant popularity — “conservative revolution.” Not the Nazis themselves, but their spiritual and political road-clearers, such as von Papen, created much evil mischief with these two words.

I should like to mention a third very close Jewish friend of my father, the writer Bruno Frank. He came from an old-established Württemberg family. His adopted hometown was Munich. But his love was for Prussia and, to be more precise, for the Prussian King Frederick the Great, to whom he consecrated no fewer than three books: a collection of short stories, a novel, and a play, *Twelve Thousand*, in which the noble king appears as a *deus ex machina* to save 12,000 subjects of a wicked German prince from being sold off to America. The play was a tremendous success, as were Frank’s plays generally, and he personally as well. He was one of the most beloved personalities of Munich and was always made use of when foreign guests were to be honored, particularly Frenchmen, as Frank was a brilliant conversationalist and spoke French well. He had been an officer in the First World War, but had not forgotten the lyre for the sword. He wrote patriotic war poems, very simple ones in the Swabian popular tradition, and they came from his heart. In 1933 he was let go, with regret of course, but a regret that one dared not express openly. Frank was neither happy nor very successful in the United States — a German writer whose soul and art, without his homeland, slowly withered away.

These are personal reminiscences of my youth, from the period of World War One and the 1920s. And I could carry them on far into the Hitler era. I then spent a year in Prague, and again I maintain: the Jews of Prague whose language was German were Germans, felt German, and made an essential contribution to what remained of German culture in Bohemia. I think, for instance, of my old friend, the philosopher of history, Erich von Kahler — who has for many years now been living in Princeton, New Jersey — and of his monumental 800-page work, *The German Character in the History of Europe*. Good God, how German it is, with its bold ambitions, its speculations and meditations, its pride in the uniqueness of the nation — even when he was critical, and he had to be sharply critical in the 1930s. The Prague German-language daily *Bohemia*, a decidedly conservative and distinctly national paper, had a Jewish editor in chief. Sometimes — let me speak frankly — the rich Jews of Prague, who formed a kind of aristocracy, showed a certain arrogance toward Czech democracy. It was not the arrogance of the rich or of the Jews — it was German arrogance. You may doubt this; it may appear unbelievable to you, in the year 1936. But I have no doubts at all about it, for I experienced and observed it.

One could object: all these personal impressions do not prove much. They are impressions from the academic world, the world of higher literature, impressions from a cultured upper-middle-class milieu. There,

German anti-Semitism did not exist, or hardly existed. It existed among "the people"; it was stirred up by those who wanted to bend the masses to their will. I would not dismiss this argument out of hand, but still it is only half true. The world in which the German Jews lived was not a fictitious no-man's land: it consisted not of the whole of Germany, but was a part of it. Not only the high bourgeoisie but also the middle class listened to the symphonies of Gustav Mahler, saw Max Reinhardt's productions, read the historical novels of Lion Feuchtwanger. On the bookshelves of the middle class, too, one could find Heine's *Buch der Lieder* and in its living rooms lay the German newspapers founded or edited by Jews: *Frankfurter Zeitung*, *Vossische*, *Berliner Tageblatt*. The majority of the German Jews themselves belonged to the middle class: they were merchants, doctors, opticians, jewellers, lawyers, and so on, down to the cattle-dealers in the country, who were by no means hated by the peasants. It was a matter of course that their sons volunteered for the army in 1914, in numbers at least in proportion to their share of the population. They were not only Germans, but they were extremely deeply rooted in the soil of their home regions — Munich Jews, Swabian, Franconian, Rhenish, Berlin Jews. It is well known that this deep attachment to their homeland and their belief in the security of their civil rights contributed to their downfall. They simply could not believe what was menacing them — even after Hitler's accession to power — and therefore most of them failed to leave Germany while they still could, even if it was with great difficulties and financial sacrifices. In retrospect this feeling of security was tragic and terrible, but we have no reason to deride it. How could the citizen of a civilized country, a chief medical officer of the Prussian army, an officer who had lost a leg in the war and had been awarded a high military distinction — how could they ever be afraid of ending in Auschwitz?

One will object again: German anti-Semitism had a long prehistory. Of course it had, but the situation was different from that in other countries in which, as one knows, anti-Semitism also existed. I would not dare to decide where it was strongest in the nineteenth or early twentieth century. Such things are difficult to measure, precisely because the situation was different everywhere. Was it stronger in Poland than in Germany? In Russia? In France? I do not know. In 1900 one probably would have concluded that it was strongest in France, where millions shouted: "*Vive l'armée, à bas les Juifs!*" — a shout not then heard in Germany. On the other hand, neither did there exist in Germany millions of idealistic and courageous Dreyfusards. Passionate political struggles inspired by ideas did not exist at all in the empire of the Hohenzollerns, only turgid conflicts of interest.

What were the specific characteristics of German anti-Semitism in the era of Bismarck and the Kaiser? It was no doubt its connection with rumbling protests against the modern world, against

industrialization and urbanization, and against the whole social process that cost much suffering and uprooting. The demagogues maintained that it was the fault of the Jews. The Prussian conservatives, who felt themselves and their outdated privileges threatened, did not refuse from time to time to make use of this slogan. I should, however, warn against exaggerating the importance of the German anti-Semitism of the 1880s and 1890s. We are inclined to such exaggeration because we know the outcome and believe that the end was already part of the plan of German history. This is precisely what I oppose. Nothing falls from heaven, it is true, and Hitler had predecessors, but this does not by any means amount to the inevitability of Hitler's triumph.

As a historian, I know the names of the itinerant preachers of anti-Semitism in the Bismarck era: Böckel and Ahlwardt and Liebermann and whatever their names were. If, however, you ask a German today, even if you asked a German forty years ago, who Böckel, Ahlwardt, and Liebermann were, not one in a thousand could have given you an answer. They had not made an impression on people's minds. They never enjoyed the popularity of the anti-Semitic mayor of Vienna, Lueger; they were never able to organize mass movements or parties. And if no Dreyfusards rose up against them in Germany, there were at least the Social Democrats, who in the 1890s fought a courageous battle against what they called the "cultural disgrace" of anti-Semitism. At a time when they had only a small following themselves, they used to attend anti-Semitic meetings and often succeeded in winning over the audience. One can read about these things in the memoirs of Philipp Scheidemann. The Social Democrats also knew a thing or two about "the people" and demagoguery, and they felt no need to make use of anti-Semitism. From 1912 they were by far the strongest party in Germany, at a time when the "German Social Party" of the anti-Semites Böckel and Liebermann was long forgotten.

I must not give an idealized picture of the past, nor do I want to. There was always anti-Semitism in Germany, partly loud and aggressive and partly of a more discreet and — if the expression may be used in this context — civilized character. German Jews and in particular German patriots of a more sensitive character have always suffered on account of it. As far as I know it did not cause any suffering to the colonial secretary whom I mentioned earlier, because he was of a robust nature. The political writer Maximilian Harden did not suffer either during the period of the Kaiser, or else his views would not have been so bellicose and nationalistic, his style not so aggressive. But it caused bitter suffering to Walther Rathenau, and to Friedrich Nietzsche, who was not a Jew, but felt disgusted and tortured by it. There has never been a lack of tensions, of the experience of loving and wooing and of rejection.

However, that particular German anti-Semitism which we are considering tonight and which ended in the most horrid crimes in European history, started only with the German defeat of 1918. The existence of predecessors does not disprove this thesis. There are always bacilli in the air. The question is: When and why did the body become prone to infection and when did the illness become apparent? It became virulent only in 1919. The colossal moral confusion and brutalization as a symptom of the defeat, the subsequent total pauperization and loss of social status by many millions through the inflation — events that far surpassed the understanding of most people — provided for the first time a powerful sounding board for the slogan, “The Jews are our misfortune.” I would dare to state that anti-Semitic passion in Germany was never more rabid than in the years from 1919 to 1923, much more so than in 1930-1933 or 1933-1945.

It was the time of the first great success of the National Socialists. The movement declined as soon as, with the end of the inflation, new hope for a decent human life arose for the masses. In the Reichstag of 1924, the Nazis were left with only twenty-four seats; in 1928, at the height of the boom, they had only twelve. But already in the following year the big economic crisis started, and a year later, in 1930, they were able to increase their mandates from twelve to 107. One has to be blind not to see the causal connection.

Yet — and this is a question which I consider of utmost importance — do not believe that all these petit-bourgeois and unemployed people, ruined or threatened by ruin, who now voted for Hitler did so primarily because he was an anti-Semite. This played a very small part in the period 1930-1933.

One can distinguish three stages in the history of Hitler's hatred of the Jews, insofar as it came out into the open. As long as he saw no serious possibility of achieving power, he gave full rein to his obscene instincts in his speeches and writings, as he did in his book *Mein Kampf*, written in 1924. When the economic crisis began to drive the masses into his camp, he became much more cautious. He knew that by Jew-baiting one could achieve small-scale political gains, but not the “big deal” that he now saw within his reach. Let us, for instance, have a look at his manifesto for the elections of 1930, which suddenly made the Nazis the leading party. This manifesto, extremely effective from a demagogic point of view, consists of thirteen closely printed pages. How many of these many thousands of words are devoted to the “Jewish question”? Not one. The manifesto enumerates and insults, one after another, the opponents and enemies, scoundrels to be chucked out and traitors to be punished, but says not one word about the Jews. This applies, with a few insignificant exceptions, to all speeches and pronouncements of Hitler between 1930 and 1933. It is truly astonishing that this fact has never been noted, but the

conclusions to be drawn from this silence on the "Jewish question," particularly in the very decisive years of the struggle for power, in the years of perfected mass propaganda, seem clear to me.

German anti-Semitism had its peculiarities when compared with the Polish, Hungarian, or French varieties. But it was not basically different. Basically different, however, was the obscene hatred of Jews which the young Hitler had acquired in Vienna — the only genuine deep emotion in his black heart. It was his one peculiarity and that of his most intimate supporters. This peculiarity materialized to the same extent as Hitler's consolidation of power over the Germans. His dictatorship reached completion only in the summer of 1934. It was not until a year later, in 1935, that he proclaimed the Nuremberg Laws. And when did the first real pogrom, the so-called *Kristallnacht*, occur? Five weeks after the Munich Agreement, that unprecedented triumph which made Hitler complete master of the whole of Central Europe. Only then could he give free rein to his own devilish passion without inhibitions.

But did not the Germans who voted for Hitler — 35% of the electorate in the last free elections — know that he hated the Jews? This they knew indeed, but they did not hold it against him. "This will pass. . . it will not have serious consequences. . ." I was in Germany in 1933; I listened to hundreds of conversations in third-class railway carriages, at the tables in inns reserved for "regulars." The words which I heard most often were the German proverb, "Things are not eaten as hot as they were cooked." Things would calm down again.

The fate of the Jews did not greatly interest most Germans. But they should have been interested in their own destiny. They should have been interested in whether there would be peace or war, and it is well known that they did *not* want Hitler's war. They still remembered too well the experience of the First World War. Yet they must have known that Hitler would wage war. They must have known it from *Mein Kampf*, in which it was explicitly stated; they must have felt it, from the appearance of the monster. But they did not take seriously what they knew — if they knew anything at all, if they had read *Mein Kampf* — and they lacked any perception whatsoever. Believe me, anyone who knew or perceived anything in Germany at that time was very much alone. Hitler was national-minded, as the Germans themselves were; Hitler was only a little too much so. He was anti-Semitic; so were they; Hitler was only a little too much so. But this "too much," this exaggeration that was a remnant of the years of the struggle for power, would diminish and disappear with governmental responsibility. This is what Hitler's voters thought, and the majority of German Jews thought so at the beginning as well.

But nothing diminished or disappeared. The practical application of Jew-hatred went on step by step, as did the nationalistic aggression

against Europe; but both were applied in doses. It is likely that the German army would have intervened, had Hitler's Storm Troops murdered all the German Jews in 1933. But it took no action against the pogrom of 1938, corrupted as it already was by then. Had Hitler attacked Austria in 1933, the French would have intervened. In 1938, this was no longer the case.

The implementation of Hitler's hatred of the Jews was never popular in Germany. It constituted an unpleasant blot on the scene, which appeared to most people to be very bright until 1939 or 1941: the victory over unemployment, the internal order after years on the brink of civil war, the triumphs in foreign policy, the regained national honor, pride, and glory. The Jews? This one had to accept, as the authorities had ordered it. One accepted it still more easily, because many non-Jews profited by it. They could, from the first, move into the positions in government offices from which Jews had been expelled. Later they could take over the "aryanized" businesses, private banks, and so on. This was by no means unpleasant for them. It would have been as little unpleasant if the plundered victims had not been Jews. This I know from personal experience, for the confiscated property of my father, who was not a Jew, was taken over by strangers as gladly as Jewish-owned property.

For the sake of truth I must add that this was the attitude of the majority but not of all. There were also Germans — and it is impossible to count them — who pined away in loneliness and disgust during the years of the Third Reich. In Germany too, Jews were saved by non-Jews who hid them in their homes, endangering their own lives. Of course, in Germany such rescue operations never reached the extent they did in Holland, Denmark, and Italy. There are many reasons for this, which I do not want to go into and which you can guess. One of the reasons is that it is easier, from a moral point of view, to resist a foreign conqueror and oppressor than one's own government, which is backed by the mass of the population.

In pointing this out, I do not want to put up a defense for my compatriots. I only want to tell you the truth as I see it. And this truth would make for a very doubtful defense. It would have been very bad if a wave of barbaric superstition, in the style of the fifteenth century, had swept over Germany in the 1930s and 1940s; but it might have been better than the obtuse obedience, the turncoat opportunism, and the cynicism that actually prevailed. Everything was commanded, and everything was carried out — without spontaneity, without hysterics, without belief or superstition. This was the situation at the beginning, as well as when things reached their climax. One single devil in human form made the overall decisions, and an industrious bureaucracy planned the details as efficiently and precisely as it would have planned the implementation of any other order. The executors, the direct

murderers, were just as easy to find. Sometimes they were actual sadists, but more often brutal mercenaries or rather humdrum people. Rolf Hochhuth gave a terrifyingly lifelike portrait of one of them – the officer who takes the Jews of Rome prisoners – in his play *The Deputy*. Hermann Göring, the second in command of the Nazi state, declared before the Nuremberg Tribunal: “I have never been an anti-Semite – ask Bernheimer.” (Bernheimer was an important art dealer in Munich from whom Göring had bought a great deal.) You may think that Göring was lying. I do not think so. He participated out of sheer opportunism, ranking as the second highest official in the state, just as millions of little people joined in in millions of smaller positions.

One observed the laws, irrespective of their content. I can illustrate this by a sad example out of my own life. In 1936, my Jewish grandfather had his passport revoked. His only daughter, my mother, lived at the time in exile in Switzerland. He would have loved very much to see her once more. He had been told that German citizens could, at the Swiss-German border, obtain a permit valid for one day even without a passport. He therefore travelled to Constance, where the German frontier officials just laughed at him when he put forward his request. All he could do was phone my mother from the border. The poor old man was heartbroken, but he said on the phone: “If these are the orders. . . .” If these are the orders. These sad words, which are terrifying if one thinks more closely about them, could serve as the caption for the whole catastrophe of the German Jews.

When the yellow badge appeared and freight trains to Poland filled up and Jewish neighbors disappeared on all sides, the reaction of the people consisted of some pity, some shame, a little contempt, and a lot of indifference. These were about the same feelings one had for the victims of the German resistance against Hitler of July 20, 1944. Heinrich Himmler decided, in 1943 or 1944, on the murder of all German princes and all members of the former ruling dynasties, because they were just as much “aliens by blood,” just as “international and treacherous,” as the Jews. He had already thought out a plan for their ignominious execution in Berlin. This story has been told by Felix Kersten, Himmler’s private physician, whose memoirs have been proved to be highly reliable. Kersten had influence over Himmler, because he was able to assuage his stomach ailments. He was able to persuade him to postpone the murder of the princes, and as we know, nothing came of it. If, however, fifty or a hundred German princes had been taken through two long lines of SS-men in Berlin, had been spat upon by them, and had been finally hanged, the people would have accepted this just as they accepted what happened to the Jews. Perhaps with a little more pity and shame, maybe with a little less contempt and indifference. But they would have accepted it. And the famous teacher of constitutional law, Carl Schmitt, who discovered in the Jew-baiting

of Gauleiter Streicher a magnificent manifestation of the German spirit, would no doubt also have proved that there was something magnificent in the murder of the princes.

The catastrophe of German Jewry and of European Jewry was not predestined by German history. While the legal emancipation took place somewhat later than in England, Holland, and France; while the anti-Semitism in Germany was perhaps somewhat more intense in the nineteenth century than elsewhere; the relations between Jews and Germans were also closer, and the influence of the Jews on German cultural and economic life stronger than elsewhere. The assimilation of the German Jews was almost completed before 1914, irrespective of whether they remained faithful to their religion or not. In order to bring about the catastrophe, a combination of circumstances was required which could not possibly have been foreseen. Had World War One ended with a peace based on reconciliation instead of the defeat and the breakdown of the old order; had Chancellor Brüning not tried to cure a wild deflation by a super-deflation; had he not conducted at the same time a cold war against France and the Treaty of Versailles, thereby bringing the economic crisis to a climax; the Nazis would not have become a mass party and would never have come to power. Had a few scheming bunglers, a few bankers and Junkers belonging to President Hindenburg's circle not concluded a pact with Hitler at a moment when the Nazi movement was already declining, they would not have come to power in spite of the economic crisis. But Brüning was certainly no anti-Semite; nor were, as far as I know, Herr von Papen, the banker von Schröder, or Colonel von Hindenburg, at least not as a main occupation. They had quite different ideas in their stupid heads. And finally, had there not existed that technician of power, that fascinating demagogue, that devil gifted with immense energy and cunning, that monster Adolf Hitler, something similar to the Nazi Party might have resulted, but not with such success. Of course, Hitler manipulated existing forces and instincts; of course he was not, in this respect, accidental. But it required this one individual to unite these forces and instincts, to mobilize them, to lead them to this end.

The fact that the catastrophe was not inevitable and that it lacked any historical sense does not, in my opinion, make it any better. It would make it even worse, if this were possible. It makes the German people as a whole no less responsible. It makes leading strata of the nation at the time — industry, the universities, the bureaucracy, the judiciary — no less guilty and no less contemptible. Since then, some things have changed in Germany. I would not venture to say how deep this change goes. In the area that I know best, the universities, I consider it to be deep and good. I wish to repeat, in conclusion, what I stated as an introduction: whoever has lived as a German through the 1930s and 1940s can never again fully trust his nation, can have no

greater trust in democracy than in any other form of government, cannot trust men in general; nor can he trust what used to be called by optimists "the meaning of history." He will — however much he may or even should strive — remain in his innermost soul a sad man until he dies.

PROFESSOR SALO W. BARON (*Professor Emeritus of Jewish History, Literature, and Institutions, Columbia University, New York*): Before going into the subject matter, I should like to mention something that is not contained in my paper — something about which I have never spoken publicly or written before, but which I have not forgotten for a moment, especially when I received the invitation to address this meeting. I am referring to a letter I received in 1946 from the forester of my late father, describing how, several years before, my father, my mother, and my older sister had been taken by the Germans — the army and the Gestapo — carried in a wagon to the local cemetery, and shot, together with thousands of other Jews.

Perhaps it is still too early to discuss a normalization of relations between Germans and Jews. The Bible tells us that it took the Israelites forty years of wandering in the desert — forty years may be a biblical round number for a generation — before they could discard their Egyptian experience and start afresh. Nor did they ever really forget it — not only the negative aspects, with respect to their sufferings; but also the positive aspects, in regard to Egypt's "fleshpots" and culture, which long thereafter continued to influence that of Israel. Possibly it will again require forty years for a completely new generation of Jews — not to forget, but to submerge in their consciousness — the tragic experiences of the Nazi era. Similarly, it may take forty years, or the rise of an entirely new generation of Germans, before the last vestiges of the Nazi ideology and methods will be relegated into a corner of German national consciousness. At the moment, no one who lived through that period of great aberration of the human mind can quite approach the consideration of the future relationships between the two peoples without a tinge of horror at the recollection of what happened in so recent a past.

At the same time, one cannot suppress the sense of wonder at how the world has been able to carry on in its customary ways after the stark tragedies of a quarter-century ago. After the First World War a German writer concluded his story of four German soldiers fighting on the western front with the bitter exclamation, "Life proceeds at its usual pace over the 10,000,000 dead bodies!" Yet one cannot help feeling that the murder of 6,000,000 Jews, in addition to millions of non-Jews, as well as the death of other millions of active combatants on the various fronts, left a deep dent in the vast body of humanity which no amount of population explosion, or man's usual desire to return to normalcy, can wholly obliterate. Certainly, in historical reality, as in

the physical world, no energy, particularly of such dimension, is ever totally lost.

It may well be that one of the main explanations of the great tragedy was the peculiar nature of the uninterrupted Judeo-German symbiosis over more than a millennium. A brief recital of some elements of that ancient heritage may, therefore, be in order here. Possibly it was a blessing in disguise for the West European Jews that their ancestors had been eliminated from England in 1290 and from France and the Low Countries in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, so that when the resettlement started in the modern period there was a definitive break with the past. The United States, having itself emerged as a Western nation from recent colonization, naturally had but dim recollections of what had happened in Europe centuries before. True, these medieval animosities and misunderstandings have not completely disappeared from the memories of the Western peoples. In this beautiful city of Brussels, annual church processions have been commemorating for centuries the "Miracle of the Holy Sacrament" at the church of Saint Gudule, a miracle associated with the alleged desecration of the host by Jews in 1370 which ended in the burning of the small Jewish community then living here. Every fifty years thereafter, until 1820, the jubilee of that event was celebrated as a major international festival, attracting hosts of pilgrims from many parts of Europe. Nonetheless, with the nearly total absence of living Jews from Belgian soil for many generations, this event remained as a pale literary reminiscence, rather than as a living reality.

In contrast, a similar celebration in Bavarian Deggendorf ever since 1338 served to inflame popular passions against the few Jews living in the vicinity, whom the populace considered direct heirs of the desecrators of the holy relic, which for several centuries was reputed to have great healing qualities. Constantly shown to pilgrims, it appeared as an unmistakable testimony of the allegedly innate Jewish hostility to the Christian faith and its rituals. Even now, many of the 100,000 annual visitors who come to that small town to admire this vestige of a medieval miracle — incidentally, an important source of revenue to both the church and the town — cannot help viewing the stained glass windows of the small church, which depict in graphic detail the Jewish "crime" purportedly committed more than 600 years ago.

Nor has the German people been able to forget that only a few generations ago all Jews appearing on the streets of any German city wore distinguishing yellow wheels on their garments. Only an informed minority realized that the badge had been first imposed upon the Jews by a decision of an ecumenical council of 1215 only for the purpose of preventing *too intimate* relationships between Jews and Gentiles. More or less effective as an instrument of segregation, which in essence both parties desired, this symbol became in Germany more

than anywhere else also a sign of degradation, and came rightfully to be designated the "badge of shame." The gullible masses were quite ready to believe even such fanciful explanations as that offered by a seventeenth century scholar who stated:

There is, my dear friend, a well-known question: Why does the Jew carry an O on his clothes? It is to serve as a permanent reminder of the painful "O!," for he is rightly subject to eternal sufferings in hell. Also because we thus express "naught" in ciphers, for he ought to consider himself as nothing among men. Perhaps also because he lives from usury and, through the addition of this cipher, every number is multiplied [by ten].

Similarly forgotten was the origin of the ghetto. At first merely a natural growth arising from the religiocultural separation of the Jewish community from the rest of the urban population, it became another instrument of discrimination and degradation. Outside of scholarly circles it was no longer remembered that the bishop of Speyer, the first recorded founder of a German Jewish ghetto, had done it in 1084 as a favor to Jews, in order to attract them to his city and thus to "enhance the dignity" of his bishopric. Few men realized that in most older German localities the original Jewish quarters were living testimonies to the antiquity of Jewish settlement there, because they were as a rule located in the very centers of these cities, that is, in the sectors reaching back to their very foundation. In Cologne, the city council had to pass in 1341 a resolution that, because the city hall was located in the midst of the Jewish quarter, its gates should not be closed at night when the city elders were in session. As time went on, however, Jews were often forcibly relegated to new, less attractive sections. With the increase in their population, even originally desirable quarters turned into regular slums, unsanitary and ugly to behold. To the early modern Germans, these Jewish habitations served as another permanent reminder of Jewish inferiority, and they equated their inhabitants with outcasts from general society.

Even more significantly, behind these ghetto walls Jews seemed to be living an uncanny, mysterious life. The more segregated the Jewish community became, the less knowledge their neighbors had about the daily life in that suspect quarter, and the more readily were people prepared to believe the most incredible rumors about these strange neighbors. Ancient folklore was magnified into a general conviction that, because Jews had repudiated Christ, they must have sided with his counterparts, both the Antichrist and Satan. The old New-Testament phrase of the "synagogue of Satan" seemed to bear out suspicions that the Jews were the permanent allies of the demonic underworld. Even a scholar of some standing like the fifteenth century professor at the University of Vienna, Heinrich von Langenstein, could claim to see in "the rise of Jewry" portents for the advent of the Antichrist and figure out that, with the help of Jewish money, the Antichrist would conquer the world in two-and-a-half years.

If, despite many prohibitions, many a Christian patient repaired to a Jewish doctor because of his reputation as a great healer, the latter's successes were often attributed to the doctor's compact with the devil. Similarly, quick accumulation of riches by Jewish bankers could easily be explained by such an alliance with demons. That the patients and borrowers voluntarily cooperated with the Jewish doctors and moneylenders by no means diminished their sense of guilt. Nor did it prevent them from believing that, out of their innate hostility to all Christians, Jewish physicians often administered their patients deadly poisons, rather than curative medicines. Did not even Martin Luther contend that

if they [the Jews] could kill us all, they would gladly do so; aye, and often do it, especially those who profess to be physicians. They know all that is known about medicine in Germany; they can give poison to a man of which he will die in an hour, or in ten or twenty years; they thoroughly understand this art.

It is small wonder then, that the popular mind was ready to lend credence to the general assumption that the purported Jews' body odor stemmed from their association with the devil. Because of their relationship to goats resembling the devil, moreover, the goat cry of "Hepp" was readily applied to them. This seems to be the origin of the "Hepp Hepp" slogan — rather than the frequently assumed derivation from an abbreviation of *Hierosolyma est perdita* — which resounded through the length and breadth of Germany in 1819 as an accompaniment to the anti-Jewish riots. Similarly, the old Teutonic designation for gnome — *Gütchen* or *Grietel* — could be quickly translated into *Jüdel*. Nor did the populace disbelieve a story like that told by Johann Fischart in his *Wunderzeitung von einer schwangeren Jüdin zu Binswangen*, graphically describing a Jewess purportedly giving birth to two piglets, a story underscored by a woodcut depicting that incredible scene.

Such folkloristic preconceptions, repeated in untold variations over several centuries, deeply sank into the psyche of the German people. They could not readily be eradicated by a few generations of official enlightenment which often failed to reach down to the uneducated masses. It was the very irrationality of these preconceptions which played into the hands of Nazi propagandists claiming to revive the good old days of the Germanic Middle Ages. At first they seemed merely to wish to restore the old ghetto and badge and to resuscitate the numerous discriminatory provisions of the medieval decrees. In fact, to superficial observers the Nuremberg Laws of 1935 appeared merely to exclude Jews from certain occupations, to prohibit them from employing Christian servants, and to reestablish other long-accepted medieval institutions. This system meant, of course, the revocation of Jewish emancipation that anti-Jewish spokesmen had long postulated; partly under the excuse that Jews had not kept their part of the bargain

of becoming fully assimilated to the German people. (This "contract myth" has long since been effectively exploded by a number of writers.) The battle cry that Nazism meant a return to the Middle Ages now resounded among both friends and foes of the new regime.

In fact, however, this comparison was tantamount to maligning medieval civilization. With all their numerous shortcomings the Middle Ages basically represented a system of law and order, seeking within its framework the establishment of some permanent, more or less equitable relationships with the Jewish dissenters. Very rarely indeed did a medieval king, prince, or bishop encourage violent extermination of Jews. For the most part they tried to stave off massacres with all the power at their disposal, taking seriously their primary obligation of maintaining public order. If they wished to eliminate Jews they did it by way of a formal decree of expulsion. In contrast, the Nazis from the outset staged governmentally sponsored attacks on Jews, controverting what even such a racist as Count Ernst von Reventlow had emphasized in 1932, "that separation [of Jews from Germans] will of course be accomplished in humane forms. National Socialism plans no pogrom, nor does it wish to furnish the Jews a fine vehicle for worldwide propaganda." However, the inherent trend in Nazism pointed toward the ultimate sanguinary "final solution." By October 1943, Heinrich Himmler in his well-known address to the SS generals, delivered in Poznan at a time when he must have known that the tide of war had already turned against the Reich, spoke of the mass extermination of European Jews, which to a large extent had already been accomplished, as "a page of glory in our history about which nothing has been written nor is it ever to be written."

This successful Nazi appeal to a return to the hallowed Middle Ages, however distorted the picture of the medieval conditions may have been, was particularly tragic because it brought back the most vivid memories of the medieval persecutions of Jews, although these dated in the main from the time of the breakdown of medieval civilization under the blows of the dissolution of feudalism and its replacement by the nascent capitalistic, secularistic, and particularly nationalistic forces. The fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries were much better remembered than the earlier periods, because they had been perpetuated in a mass of writings still extant and widely read in the subsequent centuries. Unfortunately, those three centuries were the scenes of an unprecedented series of massacres and expulsions -- particularly during the Black Death era -- which eliminated the Jews from most areas of the Holy Roman Empire. What made the developments doubly portentous for modern secular anti-Semitism was their increasingly secular character and their transformation of the earlier religious frenzy into a lay-dominated, primarily socioeconomic hostility. Even the Passion plays, often performed on public squares

during several days before the majority of the local population, now presented the ancient Jews of Jerusalem in medieval garb, talking in impossible gibberish, and bent upon usurious gains. Deep into the modern age did these newer plays help to envenom the outlook of the German peasantry on Jews and Judaism.

All this was a manifestation of the new spirit of nationalism which increasingly dominated the European scene. German nationalism, to be sure, still was far from crystallized; it was subject to a variety of meanings, ranging from tribal and regional solidarity to an all-German unity. Nonetheless, it mattered little to the masses that the accomplishment of the nationalist aims through the modern German states was effectively supported by the presence of Jews. The distinguished historian, Karl Lamprecht, has long ago pointed out, with the example of the archbishopric of Trier, that the capital and know-how placed by several Jewish financiers at the disposal of the archbishop-electoral helped to stem the process of feudal dissolution and to preserve the unity of the territorial state. Later on, according to Werner Sombart's well-known dictum, the German prince (*Landesherr*), marching arm-in-arm with his court Jew, built the modern German territorial state — the nucleus for the nineteenth century German Reich. But to outsiders, particularly those whose vested interests were affected by the great economic and sociopolitical transformations, this alliance of prince and Jew appeared as but a selfish endeavor at self-aggrandizement and profits. The majority of the people shared the opinion of the Hessian clergy which, in trying to persuade Landgrave Philip in 1538 to restrict Jewish rights, argued that the sole reason for the toleration of such infidels in the country had been their usefulness to the Treasury. In this connection, the Hessian churchmen coined a simile, which has ever since been often repeated in polemical and apologetic literature. They contended that Jews had been used by the respective governments "as a sponge. No sooner did they suck up the money [from the population through their usury], than the overlords proceeded to squeeze it out of them into their own pockets."

These spokesmen of the nascent Protestant churches well reflected the impact of the new secularistic and nationalistic forces replacing the old medieval rationales. With all its attempts at sharp segregation of Jews from Christians and at keeping them on a low social level, the Catholic Church has since ancient times insisted on the need of preserving the Jewish people to the end of days or, as it called it, the second coming of Christ. Whether, to speak in Pauline terms, as the "root" from which Christianity sprang, or as the formerly chosen people though subsequently repudiated by God because of its rejection of Christ, or as a living witness to the truth of the Christian tradition attested by the Old Testament "testimonies," or else for the sake of fulfilling the ancient prophecies about Israel's return to its ancestral

land in the messianic age — the Jewish people was to be kept as part and parcel of Christian society for all time.

An ancient legend going back to the second century jurist Tertullian and repeated by Augustine and other Church fathers well described this basic ecclesiastical outlook. With the aid of typical patristic hermeneutics, the biblical narrative of Cain and Abel was transformed into a historic lesson for all future times. The two sons of the first man were supposed to be but an adumbration of the rise of Christianity. Cain, the older brother, stood for ancient Israel; Abel, for Jesus. Reading the Bible in this light one could see that what was foretold was that both Israel and Christianity would ultimately bring their offering to the Lord and that that of the older brother was to be rejected, while that brought by Jesus would be fully accepted. Thereupon Cain-Israel would rise up in arms and slay his younger brother, Abel-Jesus. As a punishment, we are told, Cain was to "be a fugitive and a wanderer on the earth," but at the same time he was to be guarded against hostile assailants. "Therefore whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him sevenfold." This combination of homelessness and perpetual wandering on the one hand, and the safeguarding of life and limb on the other hand, was indeed to remain the keynote of the Church and state policies toward Jews throughout the Middle Ages.

Ultimately, this picture of the wandering Jew likewise underwent secularization. Particularly in the form presented in a German booklet published in 1602, it attracted wide attention and induced even such great poets as Goethe and Shelley to compose poems on that theme. It has been found that between 1774, when Goethe wrote his unfinished fragment on the "Wandering Jew," and 1930 no less than 460 different versions of that tale have appeared in many European languages. While in its modern secularized form this story carried with it many intriguing humanitarian aspects, and even pretenders impersonating Ahasver in practice were often hospitably received by German peasants, its most pervasive effect was to bring home to the German and other peoples the image of the Jew as a perennial outcast and gypsy-like wanderer.

Such "outsiders" began to be increasingly resented by ardent German nationalists. Originally such spokesmen of German nationalism as Herder or Fichte dreamed that their nation, united in one country and pursuing its great cultural role of a nation of poets and thinkers, would become the true *Menschheitsnation*, a nation in the service of humanity at large. In fact, the enthusiastic patriot Fichte saw in the phenomenon of the German people, living without what he considered a political history and without a single state of its own, the great challenge for Germans to build an unprecedented, humanitarian nation. Inescapably, the similarity with the fate of the Jewish people intruded itself to any observer; here was the most typical example of a dispersed

and stateless people without any political history for some 2000 years. Yet it was characteristic that not Fichte or other German nationalist thinkers, but rather the Pole, Adam Mickiewicz, and the Italian, Giuseppe Mazzini, fully drew that parallel between their own and Israel's messianic nations.

With the progress of expansive nationalism, the success of German unification, and the building of the Bismarckian Reich, these humanitarian elements receded into the background, giving way to an increasing emphasis on the drive for unlimited imperial power. To some extremist spokesmen of the new tendencies the presence of a Jewish people adhering to its old messianic traditions, however disguised at times among so-called assimilated Jews, was felt as a serious obstacle. Moreover, the very Judeo-Christian tradition with its stress on the brotherhood of man and ethical behavior in relations with other nations, as well as among individuals, was deeply resented. This was indubitably one of the mainsprings in the rise of the modern variety of anti-Semitism which increasingly assumed racial characteristics. From the 1870s on, there was gradually building up that atmosphere of rejection of all that both Judaism and Christianity had stood for which ultimately paved the way for the Nazi seizure of power. Long before Hitler appeared on the scene, such German voices were heard as that of one Ernst Wachler, who wrote in 1909: "Woe to the nation which behaves in a Christian fashion at a time when a battle is raging over the possession of the globe." Another German publicist, Heinrich von Pudor, combined this imperialist drive with a demand for the annihilation of Jews because "the Christian religion has taught fear to Siegfried the Teuton... all Christianity is Judeo-Christianity and as such the most daring fraud perpetrated upon races and nations in world history." Thus the ground was indeed prepared for a people, later frustrated in its high-strung ambitions by its defeat in World War One and the subsequent economic chaos, to listen to prophets of doom and the promise of regeneration only under the standard of the extreme racist ideology of the Nazi movement.

Not that the German people was unanimous in hating Jews. In all ages there appeared personalities and groups that extended to their Jewish neighbors tolerance, even genuine friendship. Protective decrees issued by the Hohenstaufen emperors or Austrian dukes, effective measures taken by bishops and princes to protect their Jewish wards, the not infrequent actions by individual burghers to hide Jews at their homes in the face of pogromists at a risk to their own lives — all are rays of light moderating the gloom covering Judeo-German relations throughout the ages. Martin Luther's *Von den Juden un ihren Lügen* had its counterpart in Gotthold Ephraim Lessing's *Nathan the Wise*; Eisenmenger, Rühls, and Fries had their opposite numbers in Dehn and the brothers Humboldt; Treitschke, Lagarde, and Chamberlain were

controverted by Mommsen, Franz Delitzsch, and Strack. But among the broad masses of the population the virus of anti-Semitism deeply affected even the workers enrolled in the powerful Socialist Party, whose leader August Bebel had long condemned that ideology as a "religion of fools." It is certainly characteristic that, as Fritz Kynass has pointed out, "there exist no medieval German folk songs revealing a friendly attitude to Jews."

On their part the Jews developed a deep attachment to the German people and its culture. The accusations of Luther and others that Jews were inveterate enemies of all Christians sounded rather hollow; they may have legitimately referred to but a few individuals reacting strongly to the environmental hatreds. But the people as a whole felt an intimate relationship with the German lands, whose Hebrew name *Ashkenaz* they used to designate all coreligionists north of the Alps and Pyrenees. Friedrich Wilhelm Heinz, a former SA officer, despite his twisted interpretation, was not wrong in contending that "the 'metaphysical rejection' by the Germans is answered by no less a 'metaphysical love' from the Jews. It is the pernicious love of the sick blood for the healthy; we see here, in its rational distortion, the operation of the ancient myths of the primitive peoples about the healing and saving powers of the virginal blood." Much more to the point was Hermann Cohen's *Deutschtum und Judentum* which, though inspired by the great patriotic fervor of the First World War, served nevertheless as a sort of testament of one of the greatest modern thinkers to his German and Jewish compatriots.

Centuries ago this metaphysical love induced the Jewish exiles from Germany to transplant with them their German dialect into the vast expanses of Eastern Europe which before long embraced the majority of their people. They lovingly developed their Germanic speech long after the Christian German colonists of the Polish cities had surrendered their identity and adopted the idiom of their environment. East European Jewry gradually transformed this dialect into a new great language which helped express its innermost feelings and which ultimately produced an extraordinarily rich and qualitatively high literature of its own. In the Enlightenment era generations of Jews were raised on poems by Schiller and Heine which became household letters in many homes, rivaling some of their ancient Hebrew classics. Russian and Polish Jewish students studying at German schools of higher learning became bearers of German culture upon their return to their homelands or wherever else they may have settled. Many of us still feel everlastingly grateful to the German-speaking universities which opened up for us vast new horizons and taught us methods of research which we are using for the rest of our lives. In short, the Jewish and the German peoples have become so deeply entwined in their historic careers that, despite all resentments and mutual suspicions, they must

appear to historians as twins, almost inseparable for over 1000 years.

What about the future?

In the first place we must realize that we have before us a problem of great profundity and intensity. It simply will not do glibly to pass over the experiences of the recent past and to declare the Nazi period as a great aberration of the German mind which has been rectified by the subsequent goodwill shown by the German government to both Israel and the Jewish people. Admittedly, as I have been told, confirming my impressions received during the few relatively brief visits I paid to Germany in the postwar era, on the whole the governmental organs, the press, the universities, and the world of creative arts have gone a long way in trying to extirpate the vestiges of Nazism. But the German people at large seems not yet to be quite ready to draw a line over the experiences of the 1930s and 1940s and still less over its deep-rooted millennial tradition, which has sunk deeply into its subconsciousness as well as consciousness.

I do not know how reliable public opinion polls are with respect to such complex attitudes as those relating to anti-Semitic feelings when the same individuals are likely to answer the same questions differently at different times. Nor have I examined carefully any pertinent recent polls. However, it may be characteristic that a poll taken by the West German Institute of Public Opinion within five years after the fall of the Nazi regime showed that fully 13% still admitted to harboring outright anti-Semitic feelings, a majority of 55% claimed either to have certain "reservations" concerning Jews or at best to be "tolerant" toward them, and 15% professed indifference. There is no question, then, that a real problem exists. True, a wise man once told me that difficult problems as a rule are never solved; they disappear. Nonetheless, we cannot simply stand by with complete passivity and let the wheels of history hopefully turn by themselves in the proper direction.

We must also realize that there are again Jews in Germany and that probably there will be more of them in the future. I recall a discussion in May 1946 — within a year after the German surrender — with the late Dr. Maurice Liber, head of the Ecole Rabbinique in Paris. Discussing the outlook for German Jewry, which appeared utterly bleak at that moment, Dr. Liber drew a parallel with the years immediately following the Black Death. "Would anyone have dared to predict then," he asked, "that after the *Judenbrand* in most parts of Germany any Jews would be willing, or permitted, to settle again in that inhospitable country?" Many survivors of World War Two might, indeed, have echoed the following comment by Heinrich von Diessenhofen, a contemporary of the Black Death:

I might have thought that the end of the Hebrews has now come, if the predictions of Elijah and Enoch had been fulfilled. But since they have not

been fulfilled, it is necessary that some [Hebrews] should be preserved so that the Scriptural statement concerning the hearts of the sons turning to the fathers and those of the fathers to the sons be realized. But I do not know where they would be preserved, though I assume that it is more likely that the people and the seed of Abraham will be maintained in regions beyond the sea.

In our postwar era the center of gravity of the Jewish people has, indeed, moved out of Europe to the "oversea" countries of Israel and the Western Hemisphere. Yet it is undeniable that, as Dr. Liber and I agreed in 1946, not only did Jewish communities spring up in various German regions in the generations following 1348, but, even more significantly, that perhaps the greatest flowering of German Jewish culture was yet to come.

It is further remarkable that after the great holocaust of the 1940s no legends have sprung up relating to any oath taken by Jews never to return to the land of their great sufferings, similar to the oath purportedly taken by the Jewish exiles from Spain in 1492. The latter oath, too, is very likely unhistorical, but it is an incontrovertible fact that for centuries thereafter no professing Jew would — or for that matter could — visit Spain without danger, and that not until the twentieth century were small organized Jewish communities formed on Iberian soil. In contrast, there are already now a number of Jewish communities in various parts of Germany, trying to revive their ancestral culture. True, many Jewish individuals in other lands still have an uneasy feeling about visiting Germany. But it stands to reason that, long after the survivors and contemporaries of the holocaust will have died out, new generations of Jews, doubtless in smaller numbers than before, will again partake of the further upbuilding of Germany's flourishing economy and civilization. Hence, the problem of the future symbiosis of the two groups is of most direct relevance to the inhabitants of West and East Germany and other German-speaking lands. In our growingly interdependent world, moreover, some *modus vivendi* between the German nation and world Jewry, including the State of Israel, also is of great significance not only to these two peoples but to humanity at large.

Even today, more than two decades after the holocaust, it may be too early to make any kind of optimistic predictions about their possible genuine rapprochement. Yet there are some hopeful signs on the horizon. From our earlier presentation it must have become manifest that, more than any other factor, extreme nationalism served to envenom all Judeo-German relations. Whether it was the unconscious nationalism of the late Middle Ages, the fully developed nationalism of the nineteenth century, or finally the nationalism run amok in totalitarian Germany, it suspected even the smallest deviation or characterological difference between Jew and Gentile as a sign of "separatism," if not of outright betrayal. Moreover, while the heroic

nationalism of a century-and-a-half ago recognized the supremacy of a moral order in humanity, the subsequent totalitarian nationalism knew no bounds. In fact, this was the great tragedy of the entire Western world — that its early modern period was dominated by the doctrine of national sovereignty as the supreme vehicle of political evolution. If national sovereignty meant anything at all, it was that the state was the ultimate source of law and that it thus had become a law unto itself. In ancient and medieval times even the most powerful rulers were restrained by the possibility of a prophet or a priest reprimanding some of their actions as a breach of a divinely instituted moral order. In the secularized societies of the modern period there were no such restraints, and the ultimate decision rested with might rather than right. Totalitarian nationalism thus was but the logical culmination of an evolution of several centuries.

The Second World War, however, has not only shown how greatly this extreme form of nationalism had overreached itself, but it has also demonstrated to all that national sovereignty often became a hollow principle when the chips were down. Never before had a great country like Holland, backed by a large Southeast Asian empire, been occupied by a foreign enemy within four days. Other great countries like Czechoslovakia or Denmark surrendered without firing a shot. Clearly the national sovereignty of these countries has been made a shambles. Since World War Two it has become even clearer that if mankind is to survive the atomic age, each nation must forego some of its sovereignty and adhere to some supranational order by agreement, and if need be, by the force of a majority will.

Germany, in particular, has learned that its human and natural resources are not equal to those of the superpowers of the United States, the Soviet Union and, before long, possibly Red China; and that only by joining the Common Market, hopefully as a preliminary to a United States of Europe which may also include some or all of the Outer Seven, it has a chance to play the great historic role which its patriots envision. This new situation has indeed created a novel climate of opinion in which recognition of unity within diversity has become a real possibility. Perhaps the time is not too far off for the German nation to hearken to the words of Frederick Barbarossa, one of the heroes most exalted in its legends and poetry, written in his basic privilege for Regensburg Jewry:

It is the duty of Our Imperial Majesty, as well as a requirement of justice and a demand of reason, that We rightly preserve his due to everyone of Our loyal subjects, not only the adherents of the Christian faith, but also to those who differ from Our faith and live in accordance with the rites of their ancestral tradition. We must provide for their persevering in their customs and secure peace for their persons and property. For this reason We announce to all faithful subjects of the Empire, present and future, that, deeply concerned with the welfare of all Jews living in Our Empire who are

know to belong to the imperial Chamber by virtue of a special prerogative of Our dignity, We concede to Our Regensburg Jews and confirm with Our imperial authority their good customs which their ancestors had secured through the grace and favor of Our predecessors until Our time.

The German people, which has long learned to transcend the differences between the Saxon, the Swabian, and the Bayuvar, and which has been able to achieve its national unity despite the great religious diversity between the Catholics and the two Protestant denominations, may indeed in time sincerely accept not only a peaceful but an amicable coexistence with the even more diverse group of Jews.

To bring about such a wholehearted acceptance is by no means an easy task. It will not even suffice merely to adopt a comprehensive educational program and to pursue it relentlessly over years and decades — although, of course, such a program is absolutely indispensable. But beyond all rational approaches one must devise some novel instrumentalities of combating what has essentially been an irrational millennial antagonism. We all realize the perennial dichotomy between the application of means and methods which of necessity are rational to the remedy of ills stemming from irrational impulses. However, mankind and human science have already advanced far enough to recognize these immense difficulties and to try to find some new ways to combine irrationality with rationality in curing deeply rooted ancient evils of this type.

On the Jewish side, too, it will take a long time before the present resentments will subside. In time, however, there probably will emerge something which will neither resemble the “metaphysical love” for the old German heritage, nor its sharp reversal toward the more recent German past, but rather a more subdued, customary spirit of neighborly cooperation. If such “hereditary enemies” as France and Germany could finally bury their hatchets and become friendly members of the European community, economically and culturally as well as politically, one may perhaps look forward to the establishment of more normal — and not only “correct” — relationships between Germans and Jews as well. And our deeply disturbed world can indeed use every ounce of amity among peoples it can possibly secure.

Dr. NAHUM GOLDMANN: Before calling on the next speaker, I consider it my duty to make a brief observation. I have been looking forward for some time for an opportunity to state what I am going to say.

I have been negotiating with leaders of Germany for fourteen years. We have achieved much, but it has not, personally speaking, always been very pleasant. Without the help of a few outstanding German leaders we would never have achieved the unparalleled fact of the payment of billions to victims of Nazism — payments to which they were entitled, as we all know, but nevertheless probably without a precedent in history.

There were and are very few Germans who have done more to help — me personally and all of us — than the next speaker. Due to his decisive position as president of the German Bundestag, he has intervened repeatedly, especially in the last few years when the climate became more difficult, when some Germans felt that they had paid five or six times as much as we originally thought — which was true, for nobody knew the size of the disaster and the size of the justified claims. It was then he who, literally in the last hours, brought party leaders and key representatives of the government together and obtained very far-reaching improvements — at the last minute — between the second and the third reading of bills. Without his intervention, this would have been impossible.

I have been looking for some time for an opportunity to thank him for this help. He has done a lot for the establishment of German relations with Israel, and he has done more, in trying to get as much satisfaction as possible for the justified claims of hundreds of thousands of victims of Nazism. I feel, therefore, that he has a moral credit and justification to take the floor here. It gives me pleasure to call on Dr. Eugen Gerstenmaier.

Dr. EUGEN GERSTENMAIER (*President, Bundestag of the German Federal Republic*): I regard the invitation of the World Jewish Congress to speak here as a special distinction, but I gravely doubt whether it is possible for a German — who speaks not for himself but for his country — to make his voice heard across the abyss which separates Jews from Germans.

I understand quite well those among you who opposed this initiative, and I understand why some of you might close your ears in order not to hear a German voice, whatever it may have to say.

I only wish to suggest with these words that, despite your invitation, I have no illusions about the historic burden and the human consequences of the terrible debt of blood perpetrated in the name of Germany not solely but mostly against Jews. Today, even after more than twenty years, this debt of blood looms inescapably over us. Such a cloud of darkness and aimlessness emanates from it, that many Germans are utterly unable to face it. The curse of the unchangeable is so great, that even the most decided, the most active, and the most goodwilled among us are hard put to escape its paralyzing effect. This is precisely the reason why this hour must have a meaning for us Germans. However great were my hesitations, however earnestly I asked myself whether the World Jewish Congress was not daring too much, I am grateful to your president, Dr. Nahum Goldmann, for the attempt to make human voices audible between Jews and Germans above this terrible abyss, at a meeting of the World Jewish Congress.

I consider this attempt to examine the reality of history to be of primary importance, because we must discover what we have lost, and

because we must know that the racial mania of Hitler, Himmler, and their associates was unfortunately not the craze of a demented gang of criminals. This madness had roots. We must uncover them in order to uproot them.

If I understand this occasion correctly, it should not only consider the past and look into the abyss and what has been lost. It may be that my generation will not be allowed to see a new, free relationship between Germans and Jews. "All this is to no avail! No one will be able to cross this mountain of corpses!" That is the voice that I hear more often from Germans than from Jews. It threatens to paralyze everything, for it leads not only to silence but also to resignation and apathy. One cannot deny that this sterile repentance is not altogether rare in the Germany of today.

At times it is linked with a primitive thoughtlessness, but more often still with an instinctive repressiveness. Not to hear any more of the whole sorry business, not to see any more of the horrors of the abyss. O why can it not at long last finally be finished with! In this way, more or less, is formulated the escape of many Germans from our most recent past.

Reports on the concentration-camp trials are, as far as I can judge, not popular. But it is a thoroughly erroneous interpretation to deduce therefrom any noticeable remnant of National Socialism in Germany. The contrary might be the true conclusion. For in this attitude of defense we also find sensitivity to the greatest shame that Germany ever experienced at German hands. And in it, we find a muted protest against the burden of a cursed past, which no man can overcome.

Today, in any event, there is no Germany that has overcome its past. But there is a Germany which is ashamed of it and which has sworn to itself that nothing similar will ever happen to it again. This is the strongest and greatest Germany — whatever skeptics say. I base this statement on facts. They are not only the consequences of external events, such as the loss of the war, but more because of an inner change in the Germans themselves. What I said about this a few years ago at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem needs no alteration. But may I be allowed a few additional remarks regarding the relationship of Germans to Jews.

For myself and many other Germans of my age and origin, a Jewish problem arose only when Hitler's rise to power was imminent. To us, our Jewish fellow students were quite naturally Germans. In the circle of my friends, there was no change in this attitude even later. But time and again, we reproached ourselves bitterly for having measured Hitler and his entourage too long by the standards of our own world. Hannah Arendt, in her book on Eichmann, coined the concept of the "banality of evil." I cannot follow her in this. It was precisely in the appearance of Hitler, Himmler, Goebbels, Eichmann, and their

accessories that we learned together with innumerable other Germans that it was not evil that was banal but our traditional understanding of the word. Our misfortune began with the fact that most Germans, including the German Jews, assessed Hitler and his people by the standards of their own bourgeois morality and the superficial aspects of National Socialism. That is why, for example, they were naive enough to believe that the Nazis might be removed by the usual parliamentary methods, once their political failure became apparent. That was not evil — that was banal — and the way to catastrophe. In other words: at the emergence of what was really evil in the history of Germany, not only our sense of perception but also our moral sense of orientation failed in general. Golo Mann's story of his grandfather's attempt to cross the border is a touching example of this. Professor Mann is quite right in saying that one might have inscribed the words of the old scholar, "If these are the instructions," as a caption to the whole catastrophe of the German Jews. But one can equally apply it to the catastrophe as a whole, which was, indeed, a catastrophe for the whole of Germany. The expression of the old Jewish professor from Munich reflected a somewhat respectable but nevertheless unthinking sense of order and discipline — as characteristically German as anything could be. These five words negate the abstruse nonsense of Hitler's anti-Semitism about the unbridgeable difference. They also prove — excuse my bitterness — the total, partly touching, partly contemptible insufficiency of conventional morality when faced with evil. With all its qualities it simply did not have the understanding for the infernal power and diabolical force of evil of which man is evidently capable. They did not even have an inkling of it. Golo Mann is right when he says that whoever experienced what we experienced cannot fully trust man again.

But did real evil come into the world only with Hitler? Did not the keen-sighted, the incorruptible, glimpse it even earlier? And what did the Bible tell us about it? Far be it from me to plunge into the depths of metaphysics or theological anthropology in order to conceal the share of responsibility for the catastrophe that falls on the German people. Perhaps we Germans should admit that the catastrophe in this form was possible only among us. And nevertheless Golo Mann is right in his statement that Hitler's rule — contrary to what William Shirer maintains — was not predestined in German history. I may add that it was not anticipated in German thought and feeling either. But just because I agree with Professor Mann I regard his image of a volcano as inapposite. And in his somber phrase, "Where that was possible, everything will always be possible," one word, at least, seems to me wrongly placed. It is the word "always."

Just as German Jewish emigrants to the United States did in their talks with Shirer, so did Professor Mann prove that Hitler could rise to

power only on the crest of a wave of great economic crisis and because of inadequate action on the part of the democratic German governments. I stress this situation — which is as sad as it is pitiful — not as an excuse, but to destroy historical myths, such as those fabricated by Shirer. Only after Hitler came to power, only after the other Germany had been trampled on and terrorized, could there be war and murder of the Jews.

Can it be said that this will *always* be possible? I regard this pessimism as unfounded and the attempts to present it as a reality as having failed. The most recent prophecies of the famous professor from Basel about the future of Germany are equally unfounded, and his analysis as false as the fear roused here and there by the emergence of small groups of the radical right in the Federal Republic. This emergence is worrying and it demands firm control, but it does not indicate that National Socialism is being reborn or that a return to barbarism is “always” possible in Germany.

May I say a word, in this respect, about the heritage of the German resistance. It is not true that it felt an obligation only to its own country. It arose while Hitler's Reich was still at the height of its power, above all as a revolt against the murder of the Jews. There are witnesses and proof for this. This German resistance against Hitler did not prevail. But it achieved something that had not existed in Germany before: it led many individuals to a new orientation of conscience, to a new personal morality, and it led them thereby to break with old taboos and conventions, in the cause of justice and humanity. From the oath to the flag to an attempt on the life of the “highest war lord”—that is a long way for a German to go. German resistance took this road consciously—and this consciousness, the daring of one's inner convictions is what—I believe — is active in Germany above all today. Something of this heritage is alive among the major German parties and is consciously being cultivated by their leadership. Among the happiest experiences of my parliamentary life in the last seventeen years was the spontaneous unanimity of the parties represented in the Bundestag today when the existence of the state based on liberty under law was at issue.

This element of consciousness determines the world political orientation of the German Federal Republic as well. Its positive response to European integration, to its changes of structure and its renunciation of sovereignty, is for us a responsibility that we maintain even against an opposition that is more external than internal. This is why I cannot but subscribe to the sober political outlook of Professor Baron.

Notwithstanding all this I cannot deny — nor do I wish to — that there are many unanswered questions and grave problems in the Germany of today. They originate not only in the abnormal partition of our country and in unsolved issues of our time. They originate too —

and time and again — in our recent past. German national consciousness is blurred and unclear. German historical consciousness is diffuse and problematical.

In contrast, there is little of significance in the remnants of bestial and malignant anti-Semitism and Hitlerism in today's Germany. At the present time I consider the danger of their minimization and underestimation smaller than the danger of their overestimation and exaggerated public reaction. A consequence of this is, for instance, the proven fact that swastika-smearing and even the desecration of cemeteries is a favorite pastime for young rascals who do not even know what anti-Semitism is. But they know well enough that nothing can make the citizens and public opinion of Germany as nervous as provocation that is made to appear anti-Semitic.

As to Döblin's comment of 1948, that the word "Jew" was still a term of abuse, I can only confirm it. The dregs of rotten Nazism will use it as such. But what does this prove? For the overwhelming majority in Germany, Döblin's statement certainly does not apply. It is much more exposed to the danger of turning everything Jewish into taboos. Repentance, contrition, understanding of the terrible extent of the brutal annihilation — all this exists. The will for compensation as well — to the extent that this is at all possible. But what is still missing is that inner balance between Germans and Jews which, as a rule, requires normal human relations. But where should they come from? How can we free ourselves from the traumatic inhibition laid upon us by a past of which we must still say — as Golo Mann so rightly depicted it — that it lies not only behind us, but upon us? Upon all of us, on those, too, who do not wish to think of it and much less talk of it. As long as that is so, our speech and our comportment have bounds that we Germans cannot cross, even when our heart impels us to do so.

A word to Gershom Scholem in this regard: there are also unhappy love affairs between Germans and Jews! I am not referring to the Brotherhood Weeks and similar earnest and insistent efforts, in which not only goodwill but tears of shame, of heartache, and of love bear precious fruit. Nor among these unhappy love affairs do I count our relations with Israel. The difficulties that we encounter here are partly a product simply of the hard facts of politics. They can and must be overcome without dramatizing. The Israeli ambassador in Germany, Mr. Ben-Nathan, has just provided a noble example of this. In the background, however, will also be the reflex reactions of which Mr. van Dam of the Central Council of Jews in Germany spoke soberly and concisely. He said that the new German-Jewish symbiosis had become a "German-Jewish, or at least a German-Israeli *psychosis*, which bears all the neurotic symptoms of exaggerated expectation, unhealthy love, and unhealthy hatred — in other words, an unbalanced relationship to reality."

The danger to which Mr. van Dam referred must be recognized first of all by the young Germans, who are impetuously striving for such a new symbiosis. One must also understand that anti-Semitism cannot be cured by philo-Semitism, however zealous. More is needed, namely, a storm-resistant normalization. It can, in my opinion, be based only on the belief that "the other" — with all due respect to his individuality and the historical uniqueness of his existence — is, after all, "like you."

But perhaps I am already, with this statement, overstepping the limit set me. We Germans may possibly have to accept, for a long time to come, the patient and respectful distance that is probably most adequate to the unforgettable nature of the catastrophe and of the uniqueness of Jewish existence.

Let me say, in conclusion, that this is why, all the more, I thank the World Jewish Congress, and its president, Dr. Nahum Goldmann, for the generosity with which they allowed German voices to be heard here. I do not thank you only personally. The German Bundestag thanks the World Jewish Congress.

Dr. JOACHIM PRINZ (*Chairman, Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations*): I want to indicate certain premises which form the framework in which, as I believe, our conversation has to take place.

A famous German philosopher wrote a book entitled *Beyond Good and Evil*. Our discussion can only be fruitful if it takes place beyond love and hate. Neither love nor hate are at issue.

The experience of the Hitler period, from 1933 to 1945, has become an integral part of the Jewish consciousness. The human condition of the Jew of 1966 cannot be understood unless it includes the experience of that time. It is deeply imbedded into the consciousness of those Jews who are part of Jewish history. Therefore I want to say clearly that a Jew who does not remember, that is, a Jew who does forget what has happened to his people, cannot be considered a Jew. Such a Jew cannot be respected either as a human being or as a Jew. This memory is not merely one of the horror of Auschwitz. I am talking about the period before Auschwitz. To use a Dostoevskian term, I call it the period of degradation and humiliation. It was the period of segregated Jewish schools, of the proclamation by the German government of second-rate Jewish citizenship, of separate Jewish benches in the parks, of the exclusion of the Jews from society, of the exposure of the Jews to mockery and ridicule, not merely by the political leaders but by the German people itself. It was a time during which the Jew, who had lived in Germany for 1600 years, was made an outcast and a pariah. This cannot and must not be forgotten, and no intellectual surgery is going to be able to extricate it from our minds, our bodies, our dreams, and our nightmares.

By the same token, a German who does not remember what his own

people did to the Jewish people does not command my respect. Nor should he be respected by the Germans. A German who does not remember, with genuine contrition and a profound sense of personal involvement and responsibility, has no right to any kind of consideration or respect. We will not, nor can we, talk to a German who does not remember, as we cannot and will not talk to a Jew who has forgotten.

The Germans therefore must understand that the relationship between the Germans and the Jews of our generation can never be normalized. We can talk to each other — and indeed we must — but only for the purpose of clarifying each other's mind. It must be understood that Germany, which was our home for so many centuries, is no longer that, nor can it ever be that. There are Jews who live in Germany today; the Jewish people has recognized the existence and the legitimate rights of the Jewish communities in Germany, but as a totality we shall not return to Germany, as we did not return to Spain after 1492.

It is very difficult to talk about an encounter of Jews and Germans if there are no Jews in Germany. It is fair to say that for all practical purposes there are no Jews in Germany today, because their number is so small and their spiritual influence so limited that the average German rarely meets a Jew. There are hundreds of German communities in which no single Jew exists. Therefore the image of the Jew, both physically and spiritually, has disappeared for Germany and it will remain so for a long time, certainly as long as our generation lives and probably much longer.

It is important that we examine the problem of a possible return of Jews to Germany with all sincerity. I have had two such discussions. One took place during the war, with my old friend the famous theologian, the late Paul Tillich. He said in a public debate with me that the Jews ought to return to Germany, but he qualified his statement by saying that there should be a limited number of Jews to return to Germany. The Germans, he claimed, needed the Jews because they provided the "salt and pepper" which the German people lacked. Such a statement was repeated by Dr. Rainer Barzel during his presence in New York. He also complained that the Germans missed the Jews sorely, because they had provided the sharpness of mind and an attitude of criticism badly needed in the political and literary life of Germany. To them I said that for my people I refused to serve as a condiment for the German nation. It is too bad for the Germans that they cannot produce the salt and pepper which they evidently need. If they cannot do without, I want to be clear in saying that there will be no Jews in Germany who will provide it. I consider this an undignified function for the Jewish people, far beneath its dignity, and we are not going to be the intellectual handmaiden of the German people.

The dialogue between Germans and Jews is possible. It is even necessary. But it will remain a dialogue. It will lead to no concrete consequences either, within the necessary establishment of an attitude of mutual respect. While I repeat that a conversation between the German people and the Jewish people is both necessary and possible, the only area in which such a dialogue can lead to any concrete results is the relationship between Germany and Israel. I emphasize the term *concrete*. For between two nations, each of which is sovereign, and between two governments, the relationship must be different than that between a people scattered over the globe and the German people, residing in its own country. In the relationship between Germany and Israel, the Jew now living in his own country and thus constituting a radically new phenomenon — the Jew freed from the shackles of ghetto and *galut* — will meet the German who lives in the post-Hitler period and will hopefully develop into a new type of German.

I consider it important that we analyze and clarify the place of German restitution and indemnification in their proper historical context and particularly in terms of the topic which we are discussing here. I am not one of those who consider the whole problem a moral question. We have long ago decided that those who have murdered us should not also inherit, according to the biblical admonition. But it has blurred the issue. I believe that Israel and the Jewish people were entitled to the money that was paid. But I also believe that it was much more for the sake of the Germans that the payments should have been made. If I were a German, I would shudder to think what would have happened to the soul of the German people if the Germans had not made the attempt to "make good," while in fact every monetary indemnification must remain a feeble response to the crime of murder. I know that there are Germans who say — and say clearly and officially — that no money can pay for a life lost. But that, I am afraid, is no longer the accepted and deeply acknowledged view of a majority of the German people. But the Germans cannot have it both ways. They cannot say, on the one hand, that money cannot really make restitution for the loss of millions of human beings, and at the same time emphasize again and again how much they have done for the Jewish people. I do not minimize the effect of the German reparations — for the State of Israel, thousands of Jewish individuals, and Jewish life itself. But nobody has the right to be satisfied with what has been done, for not a single murdered life has been revived and resurrected by the millions of dollars which have been paid.

I believe this to be of greater importance for the German people than for the Jews. Any German who really believes that the payment of money to the Jewish people constitutes a proper and sufficient response to the horrors of Auschwitz and Bergen-Belsen does not have my respect. He does not understand the problem. He has no concept of

the moral issue which is one for the German people. He does not understand that the miracle of a new Germany cannot possibly consist of mere prosperity, but that a moral renewal and intellectual honesty are the only acceptable symbols of a new Germany. The relationship of decency and honesty which should exist between Germans and Jews will be forever prevented if this is not clearly understood by the German people and if those in authority do not make a serious attempt of teaching their own people what is the only real lesson of the past.

It is for all these reasons that the relationship between Germany and Israel cannot be normal and must not be normal, and whatever political exigencies and practical considerations there may be, the principle of a unique relationship must not be relinquished. If it is, then the basis even for a discussion and for a collective dialogue is totally removed.

Dr. HENDRIK GEORGE VAN DAM (*Secretary-General, Central Council of Jews in Germany*): The relationship between Germans and Jews cannot be discussed without dealing with the fact that a Jewish community has existed in Germany for nearly 2000 years.

In 1933 the number of Jews living in the German Reich was about 540,000. The German Reich at that time encompassed not only the present Federal Republic and the German Democratic Republic, but also Silesia, which included the traditionally important towns of Breslau and others in Upper Silesia.

The brutal persecution of the Jews under the Third Reich resulted in the reduction of the Jewish population of Germany to a mere fraction of its original size.

After the end of the Second World War and the collapse of the National-Socialist regime, there were in Berlin and the area which afterwards became the Federal Republic almost 200,000 Jews. This estimate is based on figures of 1946. The composition of this Jewish population was, however, very different from that of the Jews who had been living there when the persecution commenced. The survivors in Germany at the end of the war consisted mainly of Jews who had been interned in concentration camps and who had been saved at the very last moment by the Allied armies — American, British, and in particular Russian — when they opened the gates of the camps. By far the greatest number of these Jews had come from the East — from Poland, Russia, Hungary, Rumania, and elsewhere. They also included a number of German Jews, though the percentage of these was relatively small.

In the years immediately following the war, large numbers of emigrants streamed into Western Germany — people who saw no possibility of settling down again in their countries of origin, such as Poland. These people, having searched in vain for their relatives, had no desire to remain in the country where they had first met with persecution. In the succeeding years, up to 1949, all efforts were

concentrated on providing opportunities for emigration for any Jews who were willing.

The pressure that came from this source was one of the factors responsible for the foundation of the State of Israel, because Great Britain, the mandatory power, did not allow unrestricted Jewish immigration into Palestine. It can therefore be stated that the years 1945 to 1948 — roughly up to the date when the Federal Republic was created — were marked by the emigration of Jews from Germany. The period that followed was one of consolidation. In subsequent years, until about 1960, the number of Jews returning to Germany was greater than those leaving the country.

The Jewish communities in the Federal Republic and West Berlin now have about 26,000 registered members. In the Federal Republic there are more than seventy Jewish communities. The community of West Berlin has about 6000 members, Frankfurt am Main and Munich about 4500, Hamburg 1500, Cologne 1250, and Düsseldorf 1500. The remaining Jews are distributed among various other communities, including Stuttgart, Karlsruhe, Essen, Nuremberg, Fürth, Regensburg, Aachen, Bremen, Hannover, and Dortmund.

Ever since 1945, rabbis and teachers have been active among the Jewish communities, and at the present time there are rabbis in Frankfurt, Stuttgart, Düsseldorf, Dortmund, Cologne, Hamburg, Berlin, Regensburg, Münster, Mannheim, Munich, and Aachen; they are associated in a Conference of Rabbis, which has its headquarters in Frankfurt. There are at present about fifty teachers of Jewish religion and history in the Federal Republic and Berlin. In East Berlin a rabbi from Hungary officiates for that city and the entire German Democratic Republic. This rabbi also looks after the large Jewish cemetery in Berlin-Weissensee. In many Jewish communities cantors are employed, some of whom also act as teachers and secretaries of the communities. There is a Jewish popular university in Berlin, and Jewish professors deliver lectures at various universities in the country.

The age distribution has changed in the course of time. At one time the average age was 59; now it has fallen to 45.5, which is still excessively high. This reduction is due partly to the immigration of families with young children and partly to births in Germany. There are various Jewish youth centers, such as the ones in Berlin, Düsseldorf, Cologne, Frankfurt, and Munich, and the Jewish communities are anxious to bring up their children with a knowledge of Jewish history.

The social and economic structure of the community has also completely changed as compared with former times. It is true that — thanks to the effects of restitution, indemnification, and other factors — the number of Jews in want has been reduced. It is no longer possible, however, to say that the Jews in Germany are on the average more prosperous than the population at large. There are, to be sure, a

number of Jews who have become prosperous, but the Jews on the whole have no such outstanding financial influence in Germany as they formerly had. There are certain private banks that are under Jewish influence, but Jews no longer play any part in the control of the leading banks, even though some of them — such as the Deutsche Bank, the Dresdner Bank, and the Berliner Handelsgesellschaft — were founded by Jews. There are no well-known Jewish industrialists today. In the postwar period, Jews achieved some success in the film industry, although this is now suffering from the competition of television. Jews no longer play the important role in the press that they once did, although there are a few Jewish editors.

The Jewish community has in effect derived an indirect advantage from the so-called economic miracle, in the sense that without it Germany would not have been able to pay reparations to the Jews.

Jewish doctors have always been very successful and still enjoy great popularity. Some of them have developed practices whose size can be described as sensational and which leave many of the best-known non-Jewish specialists in the shade. There are also a number of Jewish high officials, especially judges, who have had highly successful careers in postwar Germany, one of the most outstanding of whom was the late Dr. Rudolf Katz, son of a cantor, who was vice-president of the Federal Constitutional Court, the highest of all German courts.

The only Jewish minister currently holding office is Dr. Herbert Weichmann, who is prime minister of the *Land* of Hamburg and a member of the Bundesrat. There have also been a number of Jewish members of the Bundestag, such as the late Jacob Altmeier, who interested himself particularly in Jewish questions, and Mrs. Jeanette Wolff, who is deputy-chairman of the Board of Directors of the Central Council of Jews in Germany. It should also be noted that, for the first time in German history, a trade-union leader of Jewish origin — Ludwig Rosenberg, who lived in England as a refugee from Nazi oppression — has been elected president of the Federation of Trade Unions. There are a number of Jewish professors at German universities, and famous actors like Fritz Kortner, Ernst Deutsch, and others appear on the stage or produce plays. Jewish members of the *Länder* parliaments include one in North Rhine-Westphalia, who belongs to the Board of Directors of our Central Council, and one in the Bavarian Senate.

It is, however, not possible to turn back the clock; for this and other reasons, the Central Council of Jews in Germany has never encouraged Jews to return to Germany.

It is only logical that the existence of a Jewish community in Germany should be a matter of special importance for German democracy. The former American high commissioner, John McCloy, was quite right when he remarked that the attitude of the Germans to their Jewish fellow citizens was the criterion which would show

whether they had turned their backs on the past or not. It may not be a matter of great importance whether Jews will still be living in Germany fifty years from now, but their presence there in the period following the collapse of the Nazi regime is an important factor.

The question arises whether the Jewish community should liquidate itself and thereby ensure the success of the Nazi efforts to make Germany *judenrein*. There is no doubt that Jewish public opinion – and perhaps non-Jewish opinion – outside Germany was opposed to the reestablishment of Jewish communities in Germany. The line of argument, inspired by history, was that, after all that had happened, Jews should not enter into any contact with Germans – or at least that no Jewish communities should be established on German soil. Reference was made to the fact that, following the expulsion of the Jews from Spain, the Spanish empire collapsed. While theories of this sort cannot be proved or disproved, there is something to be said for the view that it would be a great pity to add to the “curtains” that divide mankind – the iron curtain in Europe and the bamboo curtain in East Asia – by establishing yet another dividing line. It is surely better to pull down existing walls than to erect new ones.

History has shown that the Jews are not interested in the isolation of peoples. The world can hardly afford any attempt to isolate the German nation. In 1952 Israel and the Jewish organizations resolved to enter into negotiations with the German Federal Republic on the subject of collective reparations, and the Federal Republic agreed to make such reparations to the State of Israel. Since that date there has been a marked change of opinion. During the last ten years, a great number of Jews have visited the German Federal Republic and many Germans have been invited to visit Israel. In view of these developments it would be inconsistent to adopt a negative attitude with regard to the Jewish community in Germany.

As far as the future of the Jewish community is concerned, it is not easy to foresee what will happen. The fact that the average age of the community is rather high and that there is a tendency for many of the younger Jews to go abroad suggests that there is likely to be a substantial reduction in numbers in the course of the next ten years. It is, however, quite easy to be mistaken in making forecasts of this sort, as is shown by the example of France, where the Jewish population increased, instead of decreasing as expected. The situation of millions of Jews behind the iron curtain and elsewhere suggests that it is by no means impossible that there will be a new wave of immigration to Germany. The Jewish authorities in Germany – as opposed to Adolf Arndt, former Berlin senator for culture, and other politicians – do not encourage any such tendency. In recent years there has in fact been an influx from certain countries into the Jewish communities in Germany. The only thing that is important is that Jews should be able

to live in Germany as Jews. This is not only a matter of importance to the Jewish community, but it is also in accordance with the principles of the modern state based on the rule of law.

The recent legislation of 1964 and 1965 has once again made restitution a topical subject of discussion, which in turn contributes to the revival of ever-present anti-Semitic tensions. Although the Federal Republic has had to bear great financial burdens as a result of the war, these burdens have not endangered the general prosperity. It is the compensation — which is due, as a matter of course, for the wrongs done by the state — which above all causes public controversy and which has played its part in many election speeches.

Diplomatic relations with the State of Israel, however, were hardly ever mentioned during the elections and are generally accepted as an accomplished fact. An unusual amount of public attention is paid to the Israeli ambassador. The explanation for this lies not only in his being the first Israeli ambassador to Germany, but also in the fact that German public opinion, published and unpublished, is particularly sensitive — in both a positive and a negative way — to the complex Jewish question.

We may safely say that in the last few years anti-Semitism has tended to increase rather than to decline. Extremist trends in this area, however, would assume major importance only if the financial crisis were to become acute and result in a severe economic setback. We must, however, bear in mind the possibility of the National Democrats, a radical party of the right, securing seats in the parliaments of the *Länder*, even though at the last election they did not succeed in sending a single deputy to the Bundestag.

The question is often raised whether it is psychologically possible for Jews to live in a German environment. The mind of every Jew in Germany is without doubt influenced by three events in history: the ruthless persecution of the Jews by the Nazi regime; the establishment of the State of Israel, where not only a new state but a new image of the Jew in the twentieth century has been created; and the reorganization — often in opposition to world opinion — of Jewish communities in Germany. There is no escape for this group of people from these facts, which are deeply rooted in its consciousness.

The first of these facts demands a continual watch for any manifestation of a Nazi revival and justifies a critical appraisal of current events. The second affords the psychological and moral support of Israel, disproves numerous prejudices, and is a factor determining a positive attitude. The third fact has invalidated the National-Socialist aim of making Germany *judenrein* and of destroying the Jewish position in Europe forever.

Dr. NAHUM GOLDMANN: I am very sorry that we cannot continue the discussion, nor can I give the floor to the various delegates who

wanted to ask questions, which Dr. Gerstenmaier would have been very glad to answer. He is the one who is probably the least tired among us, but we cannot continue because of the tiredness of the audience. So allow me to try and sum up the discussion in a few minutes.

Before doing so, I want to bring to your notice that Federal Chancellor Erhard and the Presidium of the German Social-Democratic Party have sent messages to this meeting, which will be distributed to the delegates. [*See messages at the end of this session*]. I want to use this opportunity to express my deep appreciation of what the German Social-Democratic Party has done in all these fourteen years by consistently taking a position that has been of the greatest help in our sometimes difficult negotiations with the German authorities. In saying this, I do not want to diminish in any way the merits of the leaders of the majority parties and especially of former Chancellor Dr. Adenauer, without whose decisive support the whole Luxembourg Agreement would probably have been impossible. But, as the Social-Democratic Party sometimes feels that its achievements have not been fully appreciated, I consider it my duty to stress its great contribution to the legislation on indemnification and restitution. The attitude of the Social Democrats has had the invaluable result that most of the legislation was passed unanimously or with an overwhelming majority.

I would also like to call your attention to the substantial and meaningful message which we have received from Professor Karl Jaspers, the great German philosopher, and which has been distributed. We had invited Professor Jaspers to be one of the speakers this evening, but due to his state of health he was unable to be with us. His message constitutes another important contribution to our discussion; we are greatly indebted to him for it, and it will be included in the proceedings. [*See message at the end of this session*].

Ladies and gentlemen, I hope you will feel, as I do, that despite the risk and the unusual theme, it was worthwhile to have this discussion. It was not only important for us: it may have been even more important for the German people. You have heard two great intellectual and moral leaders of the German people take a position which I would advise every German to take note of and study. Though our approaches to the future development of German-Jewish relations may differ — some may be more optimistic, others more pessimistic — everybody will agree that it will be a long process, which requires patience and goodwill and that it is a problem which has to be tackled by both peoples, who have to live in this world of the twentieth century.

I want to add another observation: the initiative for such talks, for doing something about the problem, must come from the German people. They are at the origin of the tragedy which created the abyss of which Dr. Gerstenmaier spoke and which all the other speakers mentioned. In order to find bridges of understanding — not of love, but

of mutual respect, as Joachim Prinz said — it will be necessary for the Germans to take the initiative more and more. I go to Germany quite often, and I have the feeling that large parts of the German people are beginning to get tired of the whole problem. In saying this, I am not referring only to the small neo-Nazi groups. I think their importance is often exaggerated, although it is a sacred task of the German people to watch and control them, as Dr. Gerstenmaier said. The German people should understand that Jews are very sensitive to such new efforts to revive anti-Semitic ideologies in Germany, especially as most of us once underestimated Hitler, too, and regarded the Nazi movement in its early years as being of no great importance. What I am worried about today, however, is not so much these new, relatively small neo-Nazi parties; what is more dangerous and would be more harmful is the mood of larger groups in Germany — an attitude of trying to finish the process of paying indemnification, of being tired of continuing the task of the war-crimes trials, tired of being reminded by Jewish and German leaders — as is being done tonight — of what happened in the Nazi period. This tiredness could become a great calamity. The German people have to understand that at least this generation of Germans and certainly the adult generation, which has lived and gone through the Nazi period, have the primary moral and intellectual duty to find ways of changing the situation, of bridging the abyss. I remember, when I started my first talks with Chancellor Adenauer, he agreed that there should be two kinds of reparations or indemnification — one financial, and one moral, educational, intellectual. Only a few months ago, Dr. Adenauer said to me: “We have done or tried to do our duty in the field of material indemnification, but I am not very happy yet about what we have done in the field of moral indemnification.” There are few Germans who understand this duty as well as he. This applies to education, to present the Nazi period and the crimes against the Jews to the young German generation, which may not know about it or may not want to know about it; this applies to the resistance against any attempts of new anti-Semitic and neo-Nazi movements in Germany; this applies to the necessity to give the conviction to the world and to us that — as Dr. Gerstenmaier believes, and I hope that his optimism and belief are justified — there is a new spirit developing in Germany that will really make impossible, once and forever, any renewal or serious attempt of renewal of this cursed Nazi period.

This is something on which I am sure all of us, Jews and Germans who participated in the debate, will fully agree, too. If this message goes out to the German people from this representative tribune of the Jewish people, then I think it would help in dealing with the problem — the very delicate, difficult, complex problem — that we have discussed tonight. I hope that this debate will be not the end but the beginning of a number of other debates in which we will try to air and clear up and

analyze these very difficult problems with their tragic, emotional background. From this tribune we have the right to tell the German people: it is a primary duty to try to find ways to bridge the abyss and to reestablish and create new conditions for these two peoples, who are bound to live together in one world and are bound to find methods of dealing with problems common to both of them.

I thank the speakers, for whom it was not easy to come. It required a certain courage for Jews and for Germans to participate in this debate. I know that Dr. Gerstenmaier was criticized in some organs of the nationalistic German press, and he will probably be attacked still more after his speech today: I am sure that he knows it and will not mind too much. I also thank you for your patience and for the disciplined and dignified way in which this debate was held.

MESSAGES

The following messages were received and distributed to the delegates:

From the FEDERAL CHANCELLOR OF THE GERMAN FEDERAL REPUBLIC:

During its Assembly in Brussels, the World Jewish Congress will also have a discussion on German-Jewish relations. I sincerely rejoice at this initiative and would like to express the hope that this dialogue may be a further step along the road to better mutual understanding and confidence.

Jewish citizens have rendered great and durable service in the spiritual, political, social, and economic domain in German history. It is therefore with even deeper pain that the German people remembers the unspeakable suffering that the Jews underwent under the rule of the Nazi system of violence and injustice. May the purpose of this exchange of views be to further and to develop the bases for mutual understanding and esteem.

May I express to the World Jewish Congress my sincere wishes for a fruitful Assembly.

Ludwig Erhard

From the PRESIDIUM OF THE GERMAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC PARTY:

The Presidium of the German Social-Democratic Party sends heartfelt greetings to all participants in the Assembly of the World Jewish Congress in Brussels. We particularly welcome the decision of the Congress to discuss in all frankness the problems of German-Jewish relationships and hope that an honest discussion will help to find the proper steps that can be taken together for the future.

Within German Social Democracy Jews and non-Jews have always stood shoulder to shoulder for human rights, democracy, and peace. We wish the World Jewish Congress a successful meeting.

Willy Brandt – Fritz Erler – Herbert Wehner – Alfred Nau

The message from PROFESSOR KARL JASPERS (*Professor of Philosophy, University of Basel*) read as follows: Although the massacre of 6,000,000 Jews, perpetrated in the name of the German Reich, is condemned with horror by nearly all mankind, the questions — What will come of it? How will Jews and Germans coexist after the holocaust? — have not received an unequivocal answer. This event has, by its monstrous nature, suspended the course of history. I cannot see a solution to the problems created. Only as a German, among so many others, can I attempt to set forth my thoughts, without assuming them to be universal in value.

This crime will remain associated with the very name of Germans, just as pyramids of skulls evoke the name of the Mongols. Creations of the mind, important figures in world history, are associated with the name of the Germans. These also will remain. But they cannot wipe out this new, frightful, and shattering event.

There are Germans who reject the accusation of genocide. They say, "We knew nothing of it." In fact, the machinery of murder was kept as secret as possible. The majority of the population had no idea. I myself, living in Heidelberg, only learned of the facts in 1945.

But, all the same, one knew quite a lot. Everybody saw the Jews being taken away. And they did not return. Nothing more was heard of them. From some, one received postcards devoid of meaning; about others, the news that they had died. One knew that this departure implied the danger of death. The victims themselves, when they left in the transports, were by no means without hope. Rumors that the Jews were to be settled in the East, that they would establish a state of their own on Jewish territory, were for a time considered as likely or even true, because the creation of immense ghettos was not understood as being the prelude to extermination.

Many Germans — most of them — deny having been murderers. They say: "I never murdered anyone; I never was an accessory; I did not want it to happen. If, on occasion, I heard of individual cases of murder, I did not approve of them." All this is true. But I must point to two essential considerations.

We witnessed all this, partly conscious of what was going on, without attempting to act. That is why I said in 1945, in my first public speech: "We survivors did not seek death. When our Jewish friends were taken away, we did not go down into the street and cry out until we too were exterminated. We preferred to remain alive, citing the weak if valid reason that our death would not have made any difference. That we are alive is our fault."

By choosing the pope as a striking example, Hochhuth has made not only the Germans, but all of Western humanity aware of the fact that they all merely stood by. *Our* passive attitude, however, has a different meaning from that of the other peoples and states. We were not only

immediately present in space and time, but as citizens of a state, we were responsible for the acts of that state. That is why, in 1945, I distinguished criminal and moral guilt from political responsibility. No German can evade the latter.

The guilt of passive acquiescence and of political responsibility is applicable to all of us Germans, without exception. What has appeared even more clearly in the course of the years is the extent to which leading groups and individuals were aware of what was happening in National-Socialist Germany — particularly the generals, who bear the heaviest responsibility because they disposed of the force of arms and yet waited — even individually collaborated — and acquiesced. Just one example — Kunrat von Hammerstein reports in *Spährtrupp* (page 193):

On January 25, 1944, 250 generals of the Wehrmacht, from the various fronts, were called together in the Poznan Theater to listen to speeches by Himmler and Goebbels. Himmler presented the final solution: all Jews, women and children included, were to be exterminated. After Himmler's speech, General Reinicke took the floor to thank him obsequiously. At the back of the hall, one general tried to make a count: only five failed to applaud.

On the other hand, we know from our own experience of the many Germans who voluntarily gave assistance to Jews, risking much, sometimes their lives.

But there is no getting away from the point: even if one disregards the political guilt and the passive bystanding, the fact that such a large part of the ruling circles was informed is in itself sufficient to associate forever these crimes with the name of the Germans.

What has happened since then? Jews and Germans live on the same planet. After the enormity of the things that have taken place, one may think that Jews and Germans must meet again in some unusual way, unique in history. Compared with relations with other peoples, both have an exceptional position vis-à-vis each other.

First a word about what is impossible. To forgive is a human act which, although it cannot undo what has been done, can nevertheless lay the foundations of a common future, as if the act had not occurred. Forgiveness is more than mere forgetting, which comes with time. It does not kill remembrance, but checks its practical effect on the future. There must be no eternal enmity. A Jew who survived may forgive what has been inflicted upon him personally. But who can forgive the massacre of 6,000,000 people? Only the victims themselves could be entitled to this right. Nobody can speak in their name — neither man nor state nor any religious organization.

And who is to be forgiven? The actual executioners? Their accomplices? The onlookers? They will all soon die out. Does a people remain guilty, even when none of these individuals remain alive? Is

guilt to be transmitted from generation to generation? No doubt there is an enormous difference between the direct participants and subsequent generations. But the principle remains: peoples do not live only on the good that their ancestors accomplished, but must also inherit the evil that they committed. One can turn the problem over and over. I do not see any solution which would be the right one.

Politically, though, a decisive step forward has been taken — without forgiveness, to be sure, but as a kind of reconciliation in the practical sphere: the so-called indemnification.

Adenauer took the path that, on the German side, was the only one possible. We are grateful to him for having done so, undeterred by other German tendencies. He showed understanding for Jewish unforgiveness. He endured their tumultuous rejections. He accepted their declarations with patience. His political good sense made him understand that material assistance was the minimal fulfillment of duty. But this was more than politics. The Germans gave at least an indication of their state of mind.

Weighed down by the fact of the genocide, we can manifestly do nothing else but help the Jews. By helping them, we help ourselves a little in carrying this burden that weighs upon us.

Today there are not only the Jews, but the State of Israel. Israel and the Federal Republic have reciprocal relations. Reparations have not only freed from want many individual Jews who escaped death but were robbed of all their property; the State of Israel, too, has benefited from considerable assistance. But this does not, by any means, solve the fundamental problem.

The individual Jewish survivors of German wrongdoing, as well as the State of Israel, have a valid claim for our assistance. But, notwithstanding all the assistance given, they cannot suppress an elementary aversion against the very name of the nation which exterminated a third of their people. For wide circles of the Jewish population, there still remains something that precludes reconciliation.

The German Federal Republic desires reconciliation. Yet there are Germans — how many, one cannot say for sure — who remain indifferent to this reconciliation and who consider the assistance given to Israel as only a burden.

What difficulties there have been in negotiations between Israel and the Federal Republic! In political and juridical negotiations, moral demands do not figure either as objects of negotiation or as arguments. The moral claim that the Germans have taken upon themselves is a tacit assumption in the negotiations. If it is formally raised by the Israeli side, the moral claim becomes a legal claim. This creates an equivocal atmosphere.

But every moral claim is valid only when it is freely accepted as a debt taken upon oneself. It becomes distorted and powerless when it is

raised against another. The clarity of the cause and the purity of mood are spoiled when morals and right are interwoven. The moral argument, although invalid as a claim against the other party, does influence the course of legal negotiations. But the moral claims expressly raised by Israel against the Federal Republic can only further the hateful reactions of German nationalists.

In order to clarify the meaning of this crime of genocide — not to excuse anything, but to place it in its historic context and assess its consequences — German Jews and Germans have formulated the following distinction: this crime against the Jews is not only a crime against humaneness, but also a crime against mankind.

All the cruelties which men have committed against men since the beginning of time are crimes against humaneness. But it is a crime against mankind to implement the claim to decide on the right of existence of human groups, definable by their nature and origin. Perpetration of this crime could, in theory, be without cruelty, through mild and painless death, although in fact the contrary took place, in a manner unimaginable in its horror.

Every state calls a murderer to justice, even when there is no individual accusation. It is in the state's interest not to allow murder. Mankind does not yet have an institution which, in the name of and in the interest of mankind, will bring to justice the murderer of entire peoples. The motives of murder, enumerated in all penal codes, do not apply in these massacres of peoples, which are of an entirely different nature. Now that such a crime has been perpetrated for the first time in history, the situation demands that it should be recognized as such, and that judgment be leveled through a tribunal of mankind.

The notion of crimes against mankind, it must be admitted, until now has never helped the Jews in the slightest. They were always left to their own resources. The following incident reveals the utopian character which still attaches to this notion. In Berlin, in 1949, during the discussion following a lecture by a German-American Jewish woman, someone referred to the destruction of Dresden by British bombers as a parallel to the murder of the Jews; in her passionate reply, the lecturer said: "But what are you talking about! When every day the trains rolled endlessly on, taking the Jews to the gas chambers, and no one stopped those convoys and murders, the destruction of Dresden and the like were the answer and the appeal for a long-overdue intervention." The horror-struck audience was silent.

But the lecturer was utterly mistaken. Nothing at all had been attempted by the Allies to save the Jews. Protest meetings in America against the atrocities remained totally without effect. No pamphlets were dropped en masse from the air on cities and rural areas to call the attention of the German population to the massacre of the Jews; to warn them that, if they allowed the transports to continue without

interference, bombs would rain down on their cities; to remind them that they were permitting a crime against the Jews which was at the same time a crime against mankind and that mankind would protect the Jews against their murderers with all its strength, as was its duty; to warn them that whoever ordered murder to be done or participated in its execution was a criminal and that all of them shared in the responsibility, including those who looked on without intervening; to demand that they stop the trains; and to announce that the extermination camps must disappear, and would be destroyed, wherever they were found, by Allied bombs.

But this is precisely what did not happen. Nobody had yet thought of the concept of crime against mankind. The term genocide did not contain this notion. And another thing should not be forgotten: the Allied governments did not dare, before the eyes of their own people, to intervene openly in favor of the Jews. Anti-Semitism in a milder form — an apathetic indifference toward the Jews — and a fear of showing themselves too philo-Semitic prevented such an attitude. The Jews learned that, when their overall fate is involved, they can rely only on themselves.

The State of Israel, the unity of world Jewry on a biblical basis, and Jews as individuals, are not the same thing. These three concepts must be kept in mind.

Israel, a national state, has strengthened the pride of all Jews. A disaster for Israel would be a disaster for all Jews. Today, in this worldly world of politics, this would be for Jewry a blow as deadly as the destruction of the Temple in times gone by. On this all agree. But regarding the emergence of nationalism in Israel, Jews and Israelis are by no means in agreement.

Israel is not Jewry. The latter still includes, in the Diaspora, the overwhelming majority of Jews. Jewry created a temporal state in Israel, looking back historically to Bar Kochba, not to the Prophets. If Israel were to perish, Jewry would by no means perish because of that. It has not staked its fate on this single hazardous card.

Individual Jews constitute a marvellous treasure-house of personalities, perhaps unique in numbers for such a small people. But one does not speak of them. They are of no importance in the light of general evolution. In conclusion, I should like to speak of a small group of such individuals, who are on their way to extinction: the German Jews. They concern us Germans most closely.

What occurred in the innermost soul of the individual German Jew — or, as one could formerly say, of the Jewish German — what occurs in it now, and will soon disappear into oblivion along with him, is of but little importance in the march of history. The German Jews play no public role. The steamroller of history passes over them. In the eyes of eternity, however, individuals represent more than history,

which in any case is meaningless as a whole for human comprehension.

German Jews behave toward Germans, and Germans toward the German Jews, in such a different manner that one realizes that there is no solution.

The gradual elimination of the Jews, which finally ended in the massacre, was already a kind of anticipatory spiritual murder. The Jews were despoiled of their homes, their origin, their country, their real and recognized unity with the German spirit. And now they are nowhere at home; they find no place in the world which could replace their homes and origins. "It is terrible to emigrate," the Jew will say, be he ever so successful elsewhere. He retains an insatiable nostalgia for that which will never return. He never ceases being an emigrant. "If my fatherland is taken away from me, I can wish for none other — there is but one," said a Jew who frankly admitted what he really lived on: German language, German thought, German poetry, German music, German philosophy, and German friends remain the basis of his existence, while Germany has rejected him. His wordly existence is ruptured.

If he returns to Germany, he does not recognize it, except for a few surviving friends and the landscape. Already in 1945 it was frightening to see that even then the majority of Germans regarded the Jews with indifference. Having been robbed of their fatherland before by violence, now — if they had emigrated in time or been saved by a stroke of luck on German soil — they lost it again through this indifference. A Jew could hardly bear to stay in Germany then, when he had a free choice. No change in the general state of mind had taken place there. Equivocal situations and conversations of a doubtful nature recurred again and again.

Other German Jews now seem to have found their definite new fatherland in Israel. But for many German Jews, Israel is but an emergency solution, which they accept positively but which does not make up for what was lost. They remain German, but must not do so. Perhaps they do not admit it even to themselves. Only a few among them candidly and movingly say so. Others pretend that they feel no yearning at all: now, they say, they have their own soil; they have no further need of Germany; it does not even interest them.

The Jews speak but little of faithfulness, as the Germans do so often. But in fact, they show proof of this deep, marvellous, and painful faithfulness that never abandons its roots, its origins, its own identity. Such faithfulness, however, has no public or political significance.

There is no all-embracing answer to the question: Can Jews and Germans talk to one another? It is as difficult to talk with nationalistic Jews as with German nationalists. Between individual Jews and individual Germans, each true to himself, each aware of his Judaism or his Germanism, a conversation is possible, a sincere colloquy can take place. One should stop speaking of Jews and Germans as collective

entities. Sterile nationalism — harmful to peace, to reason, and to the human condition — should disappear on both sides. Nowadays a state's worth is measured by its ability to grant justice and political liberty to its citizens. National traditions are precious, but politically out of date.

I said, in my introduction, that the problems between Jews and Germans are insoluble. I did not say that they are hopeless.

Judaism has a 3000-year-old continuity. In this great stream, the question of German-Jewish relations is but a ripple. Everything comes to an end in history, even those phenomena in which Judaism lived in a political society with whose culture it united as an effective factor without melting into it completely. Such was the case in Spain; such was the situation during a century-and-a-half in Germany. The outcome, however, lies not only in the permanent effect of these great phenomena on the Western world, but also in the changes caused by the terrible ordeals connected with its failure.

History does not repeat itself. But it can provide encouragement: not everything was totally in vain. The new life which follows decline cannot be foreseen. It has its source in the evolution of the ethos of the nations, who yearn for a pure, statesmanlike policy, for justice and liberty for man; these longed-for virtues become reality in unforeseen circumstances through the action of unforeseen statesmen who will simultaneously educate their peoples. This new evolution progresses by bounds, to creations of faith, poetry, and thought, which come to men as inspirations.

That is why our inexplicable state of mind maintains the hope in realities, which will materialize in this world. No knowledge, no direct action, can lead to them. Hope is justified if, here and now, each one in his own sphere, we do everything possible according to the highest standards. I am one of those who hope that between Jews and Germans, who only recently almost merged into Jewish Germans, a new, still unimaginable, deep, and intimate relationship will arise again.

FOURTEENTH SESSION

August 5, 1966 (morning)

In the Chair: DR. MOISES GOLDMAN

1. DECLARATION BY MAITRE ALEXIS GOLDSCHMIDT, HEAD OF THE BELGIAN DELEGATION

At this moment, when a debate on respect for human rights is being opened and following an evening session devoted to a difficult and courageous confrontation between Jews and Germans, I want to make a brief statement concerning the acts of vandalism which were perpetrated last night.

You have seen the painted swastikas and the hostile inscriptions evoking, alas, memories that moved me deeply — all this in our country, where I had hoped that a democratic climate would prevail.

I can assure this Assembly that no intervention on our side will be needed, as the Belgian authorities will open an inquiry and will take all necessary measures to unmask the vandals, who will have to answer for their deeds.

I should also like to say that, in my opinion, there is no reason to be worried too much about these few extremists, well known in this country, who, by the way, have been silenced in other areas. There is no reason to believe that these extremists themselves think that this is a way to impress anyone. The cowardly methods they use, particularly during the night, cannot possibly impress us when we in this Assembly express ourselves with so much frankness and in broad daylight.

It is my heartfelt wish that the message of truth should continue to spread forth — the message which is expressed here with all its fruitful contradictions, with all its lights and shades, and which will bring to Belgium and to the world the true message of responsible Jews.

2. SPECIAL DISCUSSION: HUMAN RIGHTS

Dr. MOISES GOLDMAN (*Chairman, South American Executive, World Jewish Congress*): There is a banner, my friends, which displays all the colors of the rainbow and embraces all the peoples, races, and

faiths of the world. There is a mission of biblical fervor, which sounds like an echo of the call from Mount Sinai, and it is a mission to humanity as a whole and it never fades. There is a fortress behind which the weak feel secure and the strong are tamed so that they do not misuse their power. These three between them comprise the spiritual basis and the structure of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, proclaimed to the world on December 10, 1948. It is a pact for social justice between individuals and groups, whether nations or communities.

The Declaration enjoins us to read it and to teach its contents and spirit in the schools and other educational institutions everywhere. It is thus recognized that education is the method by which the spirit of the Declaration of Human Rights is imparted. Only by education can we transform base instincts into impulses animating the soul to do good. Like a mother, the Declaration takes care of all and treats everybody alike. It curbs the *Homo lupus* in all of us.

Masses are turned into peoples by the impact of this mission. It calls upon us to build a world in which our energies are dedicated to the struggle against ignorance, disease, and hunger and all the other afflictions of the twentieth century.

The Declaration was promulgated at a time when the millions of martyrs — men, women, and children — were not yet buried and the smoke of the crematoria was still lingering, when the ruins of cities razed to the ground were still smoldering and fields were still bare and covered with the junk of war.

This Declaration is an ode to human dignity, which must never be violated and must remain unsullied in all circumstances. The Declaration deals with all aspects of human existence — material and moral, physical and spiritual. All are accorded their rights and invited to do their duty. One can often discern in the Declaration the echoes of the Psalms, and so it ought to be a new prayer which man is to repeat every morning before embarking on his daily work. We ought to treat it like the duties man assumed in days of old, of which he is reminded every day by repeating them. The world paid dearly for not observing the injunctions on human dignity and tolerance, and because of its silence human beings were trampled to death. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is therefore also an act of repentance and of admission of past sins.

The Jewish people has a noble tradition in the field of human rights. It goes back to the Ten Commandments, to the Bible, which was and still is addressed to the nations and not only to the Jews. It goes back to the day of rest, the Sabbath, and to the abolition of slavery, to the call of the Prophets for social justice. Yet the Jewish people, which first proclaimed the ethics and principles of human rights, was itself throughout the centuries a victim of the neglect of these rights by

others. This negation of human rights culminated in the concentration camps and crematoria. I absolve no one, not even ourselves, of responsibility for this negation. I remember our pilgrimage to Auschwitz and Treblinka. We were shaken to the depths of our souls.

The World Jewish Congress was established primarily for the defense of human rights in general as well as for the defense of the rights of Jews. This is why it took such an active part in various deliberations at the United Nations on the punishment of genocide, the promotion of tolerance, and the abolition of racial persecution. No other nongovernmental organization did so much in this field, and this is generally acknowledged. The WJC will continue to fight for the idea of a universal human rights court on the European pattern.

It is painful to realize that the struggle for human rights is vitiated here and there by political considerations.

The abiding interest of the World Jewish Congress in human rights is demonstrated here by this special symposium — of which I am honored to be the chairman — as part of the Fifth Plenary Assembly. I would like to tell you in conclusion, speaking this time as the chairman of the South American Executive, that our organization in Latin America belongs to the freedom movements of the continent. This year the anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights will be dedicated to the victims of persecution. I would like to conclude in the words of the president of Argentina: "Let human beings be sacred."

Mr. DAVID A. MORSE, (*Director-General, International Labor Organization*). You have asked me to make a statement in this symposium on the present state of international policy and action in the field of human rights. I am conscious of the responsibility to ensure that the discussion is set upon a proper course, and this, for a symposium on human rights, is no easy task. For while the concept of fundamental human rights applicable to all mankind is commonly recognized, the reality and form of these rights has been a continuing subject of controversy.

History has shown that out of the morass of political contention, mankind has striven to establish systems of morality and law which guarantee a basic element of dignity and security in the lives of all human beings. Good and intelligent men have been quick to abstract the recurring ideals of these laws and rights which all men have appeared to desire, and to model these concepts into declarations upon which political structures have been built. The declarations thus drawn up have been remarkable in their constancy of purpose, in the hopes they have expressed in the future, and in their rejection of the tyranny and strife that has so often preceded their formulation. We find the culmination of this process in the Charter of the United Nations, whose framers declared in its preamble their determination "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our

lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to reaffirm *faith* in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of persons, in the equal rights of men and women, and in nations large and small. . . .” But the framers of the Charter were not content to leave the mark of their faith in human rights simply as a phrase in the preamble. The Charter itself provided for the establishment of a Commission on Human Rights, the first task of which was to draw up the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. After much deliberation, this Declaration was completed and adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations at the close of 1948.

The Declaration proclaims “the inherent dignity and the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family.” It is thus an affirmation of the rights of the *individual* within the framework of the brotherhood of man. It is an instrument that clearly reflects the aspirations of the generation that drafted it — a generation which had suffered heinous crimes committed against individuals in the name of the nation-state, the political ideology, and the racist theory. This Declaration, therefore, represents not a stage in the development of a particular nation, society, or culture, but rather the recognition by the entire community of nations of the protection and guarantees due to man as an individual.

Let us briefly recall some of the principles of the Declaration. In the first place, we would do well to bear in mind the clear and unequivocal language of those parts of the Declaration which deal with the fundamental right to life, liberty, and security; with equality before the law; with abolition of slavery; and with the prohibition of cruel, inhuman, or degrading forms of treatment or punishment. Particular importance must be attached also to the provisions protecting every person from arbitrary arrest, detention, or exile, and those sections which call for freedom of movement, thought, conscience, religion, opinion, and expression.

Side by side with these basic freedoms and constitutional rights, the Universal Declaration proclaims a wide-ranging scheme of social and economic rights, realizing that political rights can only assume their full significance for men who are freed from the crippling burden of poverty and economic servitude, and from uncertainty about what the next day will hold for them and their families. Several articles of the Declaration touch upon the very core of the aims and activities of the specialized agencies, including the International Labor Organization. In this spirit, the Declaration lays down that every person has the right to social security and to those economic, social, and cultural rights without which there can be no free development of his personality. Everyone, under the Declaration, has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to protection against unemployment, to decent working conditions, adequate remuneration, rest and leisure, and to

freedom of association. We cannot, under its very terms, regard the Declaration as being fully implemented until everyone has achieved a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family — including proper food, clothing, housing, and medical care — and until there is education for all, so that the full development of the human personality may be achieved.

Such, then, are the objectives that the Declaration sets before the world community. Our task, for which all of us have both a special and a collective responsibility, is to translate these ideals into positive achievements. We must make these fundamental rights and freedoms the common law of all mankind.

We can already point to signal progress in this direction. Regionally — in Europe and the Americas, for example — institutions for the protection of human rights have been established under international instruments. International conventions have been formulated and opened for ratification on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination, on the political rights of women, and on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide. Still to be concluded are the Draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Draft Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights, the Draft International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Religious Intolerance, and the Draft Convention on Freedom of Information. Several organizations of the United Nations family have taken the initiative in this regard and have adopted such instruments as the UNESCO Convention on Discrimination in Education and, of course, a large number of ILO instruments, including the Conventions on Freedom of Association, Abolition of Forced Labor, and the Elimination of Discrimination in Employment and Occupation.

It is to these ILO instruments and the work of the International Labor Organization in the field of human rights that I would now like to turn. The idea, spelled out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, that basic civil and political rights are liable to remain empty symbols unless accompanied by the enjoyment of economic, social, and cultural rights, has been the cornerstone of the ILO's program for almost half a century. It is therefore only fitting for this symposium to examine ILO action to achieve the aim, proclaimed in its Constitution, of attaining "conditions in which all human beings, irrespective of race, creed, or sex, are able to pursue their material well-being and their spiritual development in conditions of freedom and dignity, of economic security and equal opportunity."

ILO action has been a three-pronged effort: the definition of standards, the development of procedures to secure their implementation, and practical assistance in creating the necessary conditions for their implementation. This effort has as its goal the quest for the freedoms to which the ILO has always attached particular

importance in its efforts to promote and protect human rights, which are: freedom from discrimination, freedom of labor, and freedom of association and the right to organize.

The first objective, that of formulating standards to regulate conditions of labor, was central to the creation of the ILO in 1919. Procedures were written into its Constitution which have made it possible for the ILO Conference to build up an international labor code of 126 conventions and 127 recommendations. The conventions are intended, upon their ratification by the free decision of each state, to create binding legal obligations, while recommendations are intended to provide guidance to the development of policy, legislation, and practice. This standing machinery for the continuing adoption of international standards can be regarded as the first distinctive contribution of the ILO to the international protection of human rights.

A second unique feature of the ILO system is that its conventions and recommendations are adopted by a Conference which consists of the representatives not only of governments, but also of those most directly affected by the outcome of its deliberations, that is, employers and workers. This tripartite principle is basic to the organization's structure, and permeates the whole of the ILO's activities. With regard to international labor standards, it involves the direct participation of employers and workers both in setting the standards and in supervising their implementation.

While this standard-setting work of the International Labor Conference has made an important contribution to the clearer definition of certain basic human rights, the ILO has always recognized that providing remedies for the enforcement of rights is as important as the declaration of such rights. This question of international supervisory machinery is receiving increasing attention from the world community, and the experience of the ILO over almost half a century is therefore of particular interest.

In the first place, when a convention or recommendation has been adopted by the International Labor Conference, it must be submitted within a limited time to the national legislative authorities for consideration of implementing action. This provides an opportunity to bring the matter before public opinion and for nongovernmental organizations, particularly trade unions and employers' associations, to submit their views to their governments.

Once favorable action is taken by the national legislative authority, two further supervision procedures come into play. First, there is routine supervision of the implementation of ratified conventions on the basis of reports which governments are required to submit at one- or two-year intervals. Secondly, special procedures can be set in motion on the basis of complaints or representations alleging nonobservance of ILO conventions.

Under the routine supervision procedure, governments must submit reports drawn up in accordance with detailed questionnaires. Copies of these governmental reports must be sent to the representative organizations of employers and workers, which are able to submit observations either on the reports themselves or, more generally, on the manner in which the standards in question are being applied. As well, a summary of the reports is presented to the International Labor Conference for international scrutiny; the reports are also examined by a committee of independent experts drawn from all over the world, but appointed in their personal capacity. Finally, the manner in which governments discharge their obligations in regard to ILO standards is examined each year — mainly on the basis of the conclusions of the committee of experts — by a standing committee of the Conference, grouping representatives of governments, employers, and workers on a footing of complete equality. The presence of the nongovernmental representatives in this committee is of vital importance in initiating discussion of outstanding issues with government representatives who appear before the committee and in opening the way to the adoption of measures to eliminate shortcomings. Thus, ultimate responsibility for watching over the effect given to the instruments adopted by the tripartite Conference lies with that Conference itself.

These procedures rely for their success on the willing cooperation of governments and their desire to be in good international standing by ratifying the largest number of conventions which national conditions permit and by observing the obligations so accepted. These moral pressures operate prior to ratification to influence the shaping of social legislation and policy. Subsequent to ratification, governmental accountability takes the form of periodic reports and the knowledge that these reports will be subjected both to expert, technical scrutiny and to public, tripartite discussion. Although certain economic, administrative, technical — and sometimes also political — difficulties may arise in implementing ILO standards, experience shows that in the large majority of cases, compliance with ratified conventions is either ensured prior to ratification or is secured as a consequence of measures taken subsequently, to eliminate discrepancies pointed out by the supervisory bodies. In the last three years, the Committee of Experts has noted over 200 cases in which action has been taken to meet comments previously made by it. This year it noted action in twelve countries to secure closer compliance with the conventions dealing with forced labor.

The general effectiveness of this system of regular, routine supervision on the basis of governments' reports goes some way to explain why relatively little use has been made of the alternative: contentious procedures based on representations and complaints provided for in the ILO Constitution. For, since 1919, only eight representations, which

may be made by an employers' or workers' organization and which are to be given a detailed examination by the Governing Body, have been lodged, one of which is currently under consideration.

A complaint of nonobservance of a ratified convention may be made by another state which has ratified the convention or by a delegate at the Conference, whatever his country, and whether he represents a government, employers, or workers. The procedure may also be initiated by the Governing Body itself. The Governing Body may refer a complaint to a commission of inquiry. There have been only three complaints, two of which — lodged in 1961 and making allegations of forced labor in Portuguese African territories and in Liberia — were referred to commissions of inquiry composed of independent persons of the highest standing. These commissions proceeded to the hearing of witnesses, and in one case the commission travelled extensively through Angola and Mozambique to make on-the-spot inquiries. It is significant that the recommendations of both these commissions were accepted by the parties to the complaints.

In addition to these various forms of supervision and enforcement of general application, certain additional procedures and programs have been developed to reinforce ILO action in the human rights field. Thus, special machinery has been established, in agreement with the United Nations, for examination of complaints of infringements of trade-union rights. A preliminary examination of such complaints is made by a tripartite committee of the Governing Body itself, which may result in recommendations for remedial action. With the consent, or at the request, of the government concerned, the complaint may be referred to a fact-finding and conciliation commission for detailed investigation and settlement. A striking feature of these procedures is that the submission and investigation of complaints is not dependent on the ratification of the ILO's freedom-of-association conventions by the country involved. The Governing Body committee has examined over 450 cases, and has in many instances been able to secure improvements in trade-union laws or the situation of individual trade unionists or organizations. In a recent case, the Governing Body decided to draw the attention of the UN Human Rights Commission to the allegations made. The government concerned thereupon sent a delegation to discuss with me the issues which had been raised and to give me certain assurances designed to lead to their settlement. The Fact-Finding and Conciliation Commission completed consideration of its first case, relating to Japan, last year, after having heard evidence in Geneva and visiting Japan. Its recommendations have been accepted as the basis for the future development of industrial relations in Japan. The commission has recently concluded its proceedings in a second case, concerning the trade-union situation in Greece, and I have forwarded its report to the Greek government and the complainant.

In the field of discrimination, the ILO has a special constitutional responsibility. And our organization, more than any other, is aware of the deeply rooted and intensely powerful emotional forces which lie behind this problem. In spite of the practical effect of the ILO's convention concerning discrimination in employment and occupation, we all know that the elimination of discriminatory legal procedures can be but a first step in any policy directed at the elimination of discrimination. A far more difficult and more fundamental task is to eliminate ingrained prejudices and habits of thought — the “instincts of discrimination” — and to establish a real equality of opportunity and treatment through positive measures which are aimed at nullifying the disadvantages which result for particular population groups from past discrimination and inequalities. The ILO is seeking to complement the impact of its international standards in this field through a promotional program designed to stimulate and assist positive action for effective equality through research, the provision of a clearinghouse for information relating to discrimination in employment and occupation, information meetings, seminars, and the consultation of experts.

I cannot leave the question of discrimination without mentioning ILO action on the question of apartheid. Although South Africa has not ratified ILO standards for the elimination of discrimination, the International Labor Conference — acting under the principle of human equality proclaimed in the ILO Constitution and as spokesman for the social conscience of mankind — unanimously adopted, in 1964, a declaration calling upon the government of South Africa to renounce its policy of apartheid and to take the necessary measures to eliminate discrimination in employment and occupation. In special reports on the development of apartheid in labor matters which I have presented to the ILO Conference at its request each year since then, I have sought to draw public attention to the dangers and inherent contradictions of apartheid, to the need for change, and to some of the positive alternative social policies which would have to be pursued in transforming a race-divided society into a community wherein equal opportunity and treatment prevails. Apartheid represents the most conspicuous challenge to the concept of human rights in the world today. As a moral issue and as a matter affecting the peace of the world of tomorrow, it is of concern to each one of us, just as a generation ago the fate of the condemned and the persecuted in Europe was — or should have been — of concern to all humanity. It underlines the involvement of the entire world community in the struggle to foster and safeguard basic rights and freedom.

What then are the main lessons to be drawn from the ILO's almost fifty years spent in developing a comprehensive code of international labor law that has placed a floor on the conditions of life and work throughout the world and has provided a shield to protect man from exploitation?

Our experience shows the feasibility of laying down, in a series of international obligation-creating instruments, more precise definitions of human rights and the positive measures necessary for their realization.

Our experience shows the value of systematic international arrangements for the elaboration and adoption of such international instruments. In turn, systematic arrangements for supervising the implementation of international standards are an indispensable concomitant of the standards themselves. The ILO has in this respect shown considerable versatility and responsiveness to changing needs.

I also feel that ILO procedures have obtained wide acceptance because of the interplay between the quasi-judicial aspects of supervision and the consideration of the resulting conclusions by bodies responsible for matters of policy, such as the tripartite Conference committees.

One final lesson, which I consider to be among the most hopeful for future development, is the growing recognition of the individual and the nongovernmental group under international law that has been fostered within the tripartite fabric of the ILO in the economic and social field. This is a point which I described earlier as the direction toward which the Universal Declaration of Human Rights beckons and in which the world community is challenged to stride boldly. Individuals and nongovernmental groups should have fora in which they can present their position as effectively as the nation-state.

But in spite of the progress that we have made at the ILO in the economic and social field, and in spite of the impact of the Declaration of Human Rights and the international conventions, can we say, as the Human Rights Year of 1968 approaches, that the world has fully accepted the principles or made adequate provision for the vindication of rights these bodies and instruments stand for? Have the invisible barriers within nations, the forces of hatred, prejudice, and selfishness, the deadweight of inertia, the manifold and subtle forms of discrimination which elude the legislator, been eliminated? Are the principles enshrined in the Declaration really engraved on the hearts of mankind everywhere as deeply as the basic instincts of human existence?

We know the answers to these questions only too well. And this, in my view, is what this symposium must discuss, and for which it must propose solutions. We in the international community need ideas and plans for *action*; we need inspiration and we need the breath of hope and determination. The World Jewish Congress is uniquely capable of providing such initiative and stimulus. The Jewish people know from their history the indignity and suffering which follow the disregard of human rights. They also know how to face and overcome these problems, how to seek practical means to advance their cause and how

to apply patience and persistence in this effort. Knowing that emancipation alone is not enough, nor even freedom itself, but rather that liberty of thought and spirit must be won, the Jewish people have contributed outstandingly to the universal quest for social justice. I therefore look to this gathering to provide both the inspiration and guidance which we must have in order to increase the number of human beings who enjoy in reality the rights provided for in the Declaration of Human Rights.

There is one cardinal ground for hope. It is that the world has shrunk to proportions where it is no longer possible for any human being to be indifferent to the lot of his fellowman. In ages past, the gulf of physical remoteness separating different societies made it possible for individuals in those societies to shelter inside a parochial perspective that ignored what took place beyond its narrow horizons. Today, the whole world has become our tribe. No man can plead the excuse of being unaware that in other parts of the globe fellowmen are lingering in chains, dying of starvation, or being denied their most elementary rights. Just as the potential effects of violence and evil have multiplied, so have the means at our disposal for combating them become infinitely more powerful. There is no more heartening witness to this than the response evoked by the disasters of flood, earthquake, famine, and disease; the reaching out of hands to help each other. Let us channel these generous impulses into an all-out effort to combat the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself. Let all mankind be encouraged to be friends to one another.

In conclusion, I must sound a word of caution. We are faced in the world today not only with the fact of extensive human suffering but also with a fragile political equilibrium. For while we must never compromise on the substance of basic human rights, we must acknowledge the perils involved in adopting inflexible postures in international affairs. We must therefore seek to determine the points upon which we must not compromise — for to weaken on these points would indicate that our belief in these rights is shallow. We must, at the same time, seek out those points upon which a bridge of understanding can be built and across which a flow of liberal ideas can be established. We must also try to relate the problems of human rights which confront the one third of mankind which consumes over 80% of the world's production to the burdens of the two thirds which have to survive on what is left. I would commend this latter problem in particular to the attention of this Congress.

The cause of human freedom and dignity has many milestones, many achievements. It has also known many false dawns, many setbacks, and suffered many martyrs. Yet the desire for freedom and dignity has never failed to bloom afresh from the deserts of destitution left by centuries of human malfeasance. Let us therefore commit

ourselves to advance. Let us find means of action and persuasion to make the Universal Declaration of Human Rights the code of law and practice of the world we live in and not merely a statement of hope for distant generations. For we all recognize that it is not by power, nor by might, but it is by the spirit of right that the world is to be governed.

PROFESSOR RENE CASSIN (*President, European Court of Human Rights; former Chairman, Commission on Human Rights of the United Nations; President, Alliance Israélite Universelle*): Last night's debate, which was a moving and vitally significant one, will form the basis of what I have to say; we are bound to agree with and to sum up what was said yesterday: that it was a fundamental aim of Hitlerism to stamp out the Jews, but their destruction was also part of an attack on all that the French Revolution stood for: liberty, equality, fraternity, and human rights. Hitler's racialism was essentially an attempt to destroy the principles of the French Revolution.

The Jews began their struggle for emancipation in their respective countries during the nineteenth century, inspired by the ideals of the rights of man. There is a direct link between the issue of human rights and the destruction of the results of Hitlerism. Yesterday we discussed at length the practical measures which we hope will prevent the new Germany from returning to a racist policy. In my view, equal importance should have been attached to the punishment of war criminals for their past deeds, alongside the question of material reparations — for which we are indebted, among others, to Dr. Goldmann, a man who has always had my firmest support. I believe that the question of the nonapplicability of statutes of limitation to the punishment of crimes against humanity is at present a paramount objective for Jewish organizations everywhere. I am stressing this point because a booklet on World Jewish Congress activities that was issued fifteen or eighteen months ago is in this respect already out of date. Since its publication we at the United Nations Human Rights Commission have been able to take, so to speak, the bull by the horns; instead of making vague declarations of principle, we asked the United Nations services for a study on the subject. This study was prepared and made public last April. Its very purpose is to show that an international agreement proclaiming the nonapplicability of statutes of limitation to crimes against humanity is a perfectly acceptable proposition. As you will understand at once, an effective step will be taken not only relating to the past but also to the future, and very useful for other nations as well, if the new Germany is requested to sign, together with the other nations of the world, an international convention upholding the principle of the nonapplicability of statutes of limitation to crimes against humanity, instead of imposing upon her a specific undertaking in this respect.

We have thus laid the first solid foundation for the future, and if

asked what nongovernmental organizations can most usefully do at the present time, I would reply: one of our foremost objectives for next year is to do our best in our respective countries to get the convention passed by the General Assembly of United Nations and also to ensure that it is ratified by all the nations — including Germany before its statute of limitation takes effect in 1969.

The defense of human rights by means of penal law could be extended by a better application of the Genocide Convention, which does not provide for any international jurisdiction and is therefore ineffective for the time being. We do not, however, live in the penal sphere all the time. We live a normal everyday life, and Mr. Morse, the distinguished director-general of the International Labor Organization, has shown you just now how workers' rights can be safeguarded in the course of everyday life. Personally and plainly speaking, I think it is vitally important for the Jews to defend human rights generally. Just as their emancipation began in the nineteenth century only because the Declaration of the Rights of Man had been proclaimed in France in 1789, they have now no chance of escaping fresh persecutions in the future if they do not support human rights for all men. The solidarity which exists between the Jews and the rest of the oppressed or merely underprivileged world is obvious.

We know that building for the future is a very difficult thing to do; we cannot hope to finish it in one generation; all the more reason to begin at once. And we must of course work hardest at education. In order to reform attitudes of mind we must train educationalists who will themselves have a new mentality. In every country where Jews are scattered, they must concentrate on the thought that education is the key to the future.

Of course, education is only one thing, and we must remember that the developing countries need aid; technical, financial, and economic cooperation is vitally necessary to them. It is idle to talk about human rights to people who have nothing to eat; nor, on the other hand, can the well-fed but ill-educated and ignorant hope to have any conception of what "human rights" means.

Today, however, I want to speak about the defense of human rights from a legal point of view. This is not by any means the most important aspect; education and technical aid come first, as we have seen. But the legal side is enormously important, though it cannot show results overnight. We are proud of and rather appalled by the discoveries of science; we are watching the world changing at an unprecedented pace. Hitler was well aware of this when he suppressed human rights while using scientific research to murder more efficiently. But we must acknowledge that social evolution cannot keep abreast of scientific discovery; societies progress slowly, and I would even go so far as to say that part of the process of world evolution is hindering our own efforts.

For example, one of the great stumbling blocks in the way of human rights is the question of national sovereignty. I was at the League of Nations in 1933 in connection with the Bernheim case. Bernheim, a Jew, had been the victim of a violation of the treaty for the protection of minorities in Upper Silesia. How did Germany, how did Hitler and Goebbels, justify that violation? Germany's defense was: "Every man is master in his own house. You have no business to inquire what we do with our socialists, our pacifists, or our Jews. You have no right to pry into our affairs. This is a sovereign state." That was the situation which led to the Second World War. The same is true today; the big powers are still saying: "Every man is master in his own house. You have no right to know what I am doing with my own citizens."

You can see how difficult it is to uproot a principle which derives undeniably from practical reality, for the independence of states is in itself a desirable thing, something people will fight for. The right of nations to govern themselves is accepted as the natural order of things. Why should we then fear a country's protecting its interests too vigorously? Our anxiety is justified because there comes a moment when the state says: "For the purpose of my development, I propose to set my own rules, as I see fit, and if I destroy men in the process, that is no concern of yours! "

It is, however, very much our concern. World progress must not be built on human suffering. That is the aim of human rights. We must acknowledge at this point that resistance to an international system of controls is very strong. It is evident everywhere; various issues, such as apartheid, have not been fully dealt with at the United Nations. But we must not lose heart because of it; and I would suggest that we ought always to proceed in two stages, beginning with the United Nations Charter, which grants the United Nations certain rights — inspection rights — through the Human Rights Commission. We have the Universal Declaration and such specialized agencies as the International Labor Organization and UNESCO, which have the right to supervise the implementation of those agreements which concern them. This is one possible channel, whose purpose is to prompt states to take action. In general they accept this kind of approach, as I can tell you, speaking as the senior member of the Human Rights Commission, for example in the case of the periodic reports by states. Originally, when we attempted to introduce this measure, some states objected that it was in violation of their right of independence, but they have come to accept it.

If applied with tenacity, methods based on consultation, lobbying, and persuasion will succeed up to a point. Can we go a step further and go as far as censure? I believe we are approaching that stage. First, there is the regional approach. In Europe, the seventeen states that signed the Treaty of Rome authorized the enactment of certain

principles of the Universal Declaration as articles of the treaty, and by means of additional protocols they are adding to the list. They have agreed to a form of European control over the manner in which the treaty and the protocols are administered. In the first instance, they accord a hearing only to complaints brought by states, but eleven of the seventeen signatory states have already given their consent to jurisdiction by the European Commission over complaints brought by private persons or nongovernmental organizations. Out of 2500 complaints received and judged by the European Human Rights Commission, all but three have come from individuals. The great majority were declared inadmissible, but eventually about thirty were declared admissible. Some of these thirty reached the Committee of Ministers, and a few even reached the European Court of Human Rights. This is an example of how states sharing a common civilization and belonging to a common regional or economic group can achieve real accord allowing confidence in international jurisdiction.

We ought now to think of applying the European system to Latin America. Until now there have been difficulties because it was hoped to cover the whole of America — North *and* South. I am, however, of the opinion that an agreement will be achieved, at any rate as far as Latin America is concerned. We may expect that one day Eastern Europe and even Southeast Asia will have their treaties. This would give us a number of satisfactory regional systems. There are nevertheless still formidable difficulties and we must not think that the regional system is the perfect answer. As human rights are universal, there must be a corresponding universal sanction; we cannot talk about European human rights, American human rights, and so on. That would be to divide humanity and there would consequently be no universal human rights. We can counter this danger by improving our inspection methods concerning the administration of international treaties.

Now we come to the question of the Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, which is a question for the World Jewish Congress first and foremost, together with the Convention, now in preparation, on the Elimination of Discrimination on Religious Grounds. Some states who had always been opposed to the idea of a commission of experts nevertheless voted in favor when the issue was racial discrimination. The Convention against Racial Discrimination adopted by the UN in 1965 has provided for a committee of experts and even a system of optional petitions which, although very tentative, does testify to some progress and to the fact that the methods followed by the International Labor Organization — in my view the most effective — are beginning to gain ground.

At UNESCO, when preparing the Convention on Discrimination in Education, we succeeded in agreeing on a committee empowered to conciliate, to intervene, and to check facts. This committee has not

acted so far, but the convention is comparatively new and the machinery is there.

We must not despair, but, on the contrary, call on all our reserves of courage, patience, and tenacity. It took 2000 years for the State of Israel to be reborn; far less time will be necessary before the Declaration of Human Rights – which was national at the beginning of the nineteenth century and became international in the mid-twentieth century – is at last effectively put into operation and becomes a reality. It would be a splendid thing if the Jews, after having suffered more massacre, persecution, and misery than any other race, helped oppressed people of every race, country, and social class achieve human dignity whereby man enjoys the protection of law, of the economy, of culture, and, indeed, of the whole of humanity.

PROFESSOR MILAN BARTOS (*Vice-President, Serbian Academy of Science and Arts*): When the drafts of the treaties concerning human rights were formulated in a special committee of the Third Commission of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the question arose whether the right of national self-determination belonged in the category of human rights. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt remarked that this right was not a human right, in view of the fact that it could not be exercised by an individual alone but only together with other members of a group. On the other hand, Mrs. Roosevelt was a fervent supporter of the right of religious liberty and maintained that freedom of belief was a personal human right. Those who believed that the right to national self-determination was a human right referred to the analogy between these two rights, and the Third Commission took the view that there were human rights belonging to every individual but exercised by groups composed of individuals with identical or similar tendencies. Consequently, when we speak about a multinational state we are confronted with two complex problems which cannot be separated from each other in this type of state. On the one hand, there is the personal right of every individual to his own national determination and to the enjoyment of national rights, and on the other hand, there is the question as to which form of organization should be assumed by a state of that type from the point of view of public law.

It would be a mistake to believe that every state composed of people with differing national aspirations, origins, and national feelings is a multinational state. At the start, it is necessary to eliminate from the concept of a multinational state the state in which the ruling stratum imposes a nationality, fully aware that the inhabitants of the state in question either do not belong to that nationality or do not wish to belong to it. Likewise, a multinational state is not a state composed of several nationalities, in which these nationalities do not have equal rights; nor is it a state in which certain rights exist in certain sections of its territory, provided for the benefit of certain national groups to

whom no decisive influence regarding the running of the affairs of the state or its organization is accorded.

The definition of nationality has been the subject of long discussions. Even the Sub-Commission of the Commission on Human Rights entrusted with the study of the problem of national minorities was not able to arrive at an agreement on the meaning of the terms "national" and "minority". Some claimed that the dominant nationality was the one which was exercising power even if it was a minority nationality, in which case the majority which was deprived of rights should be protected against the other nationality as if it were a national minority.

There are so-called unitary states which absorb all citizens, but leave intact certain national groups with rights of their own; these groups enjoy equality of rights throughout the land and have, within certain geographical areas, their own exclusive rights, thus ensuring a minimum of guarantees vis-à-vis other nationalities who are part of the unitary state. Switzerland is an example of such a state. It is a federation of cantons, and within the federation there is one Swiss nationality which embraces all the separate national groups. The latter predominate in one canton or another, although there are cantons with more than one major national population, such as Bern and Valais. Nor is a state multinational in which, although the presence of inhabitants from different national milieux is felt, the political climate and economic life create conditions leading toward ever-increasing national integration and the perfection of a completely unitary state. During the discussions in the various organs of the United Nations on the protection of minorities, the United States of America was mentioned as an example of a unitary state of this type, a state in which important guarantees have been provided to ensure the development of particular national groups on the local level, but which in itself has no special multinational traits. The concept of Americanization excludes narrower notions of nationality, and everything is reduced to the existence of the states comprising the American Union and local oases of national groupings. For this reason the United States represents the uninational melting-pot state.

Certain writers considered old Austria-Hungary as the typical multinational state, for it was officially recognized that it was composed of populations belonging to different nationalities. The symbol of this multinational character was the fact that the denominations of Austro-Hungarian banknotes appeared in eleven languages. Yet this state tended toward a hegemony of specific nationalities, with the German nation enjoying the first place, followed by the Hungarian. It was not a modern type of multinational state, for the equality of national rights was lacking.

Socialist theory started from the principle that nationalism was a

bourgeois prejudice, exploiting men in favor of the nation exercising hegemony after having gained a dominant position within the state. For this reason, and in the belief that the economic life and the common will of the people of a given state are the guarantee of the existence of the state as a whole — which is not an end in itself, but only a means of bringing about a better life for the nations within it — socialist theory gives nationalities the right not only to self-determination and union, but also to secession. This concept had to be put into practice in socialist states by special forms of organization. We will mention here some of the forms which guarantee to the state and to its nationally heterogeneous population the possibility of achieving a multinational state.

Such a state must be based on the tenets of absolute equality of rights of all the nationalities within the state. For instance, in the Constitution of the Federal Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia it is asserted, in the introduction to Section I of the Fundamental Principles, that multinational states can only be founded on the principle of the free consent of all the participating nations. It reads:

The peoples of Yugoslavia, believing in the right of every nation to self-determination, including the right of secession; basing themselves on the common struggle and desire, freely expressed in the war of national liberation and the socialist revolution and in keeping with their historical aspirations; aware that the final consolidation of their brotherhood and their unity is in their common interest; have joined in a federal republic of free peoples and nationalities and equal rights, and have created a federated socialist community of workers. . . within which they achieve and assure, in the interests of each nationality and of all the people together

that which is essential for living together.

In this same section of the Constitution are listed the essentials: socialist conduct and the protection of the socialist system; national liberty and independence; fraternity and unity of the peoples and the solidarity of the workers; the chance and the freedom of complete development of the individual personally and of drawing together individuals and peoples according to their interests and leanings, toward the increasingly rich culture and civilization of socialist society; the unification and coordination of efforts aimed at the development of the economic base of the social community and human well-being; the association of its own aspirations with similar tendencies among mankind; and the special foundations of the economic and political system with a view to achieving common interests and equality of rights among people and individuals.

This concept of the multinational state, as expressed in the Yugoslav Constitution, is mentioned because it represents in substance the synthesis of the whole problem. On analysis, one arrives at the following conclusions:

The multinational state demands federal organization in order to be effective. This idea is given expression in the Yugoslav Constitution, which provides that "the workers and the nations of Yugoslavia achieve their sovereign rights in the Federation when this is in the common interest, and in all other relations in the socialist republics," which are member states of the Federation. However, it would be mistaken to assume that it is possible in multinational states to make a purely geometric division of the federal territory among the member states so that each division corresponds to a definite national group. Even in Yugoslavia, where there was a tendency to assign to each national group its own socialist republic, this was not possible. Slovenia and Montenegro are by and large — though not entirely — such republics; Macedonia is patterned with strong national minority groups, or, as they are called in Yugoslavia, nationalities; Serbia consists of three provinces, the first of which has a purely Serbian population, the second — the autonomous province of Vojvodina — a relative majority of Serbs, and the third — the autonomous province of Kosovo and Metohija — a mixed population, mainly of Shiptars (Albanians), Serbs, and Montenegrins; Croatia is mainly Croatian, with a Serbian minority. The socialist republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina has a special place in this connection: by and large her population consists of Serbs and Croats, among whom lives a population — Moslem by religion and speaking Serbo-Croatian — many of whose members have not declared themselves as being of either Serbian or Croatian nationality, so that these Moslems constitute the third national group in Bosnia-Herzegovina, and all three form a geo-anthropological whole. Consequently, the multinational state demands a federal form, but this requirement does not settle relations between the nationalities, for they are often unsettled even within the territories of the individual member states.

In order that the multinational state be effective and not just include different nations in one state with the predominance or hegemony of one or another nation, the participating peoples should be psychologically prepared to live together and should show their desire to belong to such a community. Theory and practice prove that such a desire is not evidenced by instantaneous decisions. It presupposes a certain path of historical development and is definitely confirmed by serious historic events; it has to remain a firm and predominant sociological factor despite the various crises that may arise during such a communal existence.

We are not concerned only with sociological and historical facts, but also with legal principles of the greatest importance. The main juridical bases are the right of each nation to self-determination, by virtue of which that nation enters the community; the equal rights of the peoples of that community; and, of equal importance, the right of peoples

having opted for the community to leave it. A nation which becomes a member of such a community, but whose people decide to leave the community, without having the right of secession, would be a prisoner within such a community.

As to the existence of a common interest among the peoples and individuals forming the nations, it would be erroneous to assume such an interest automatically and to assume that it is present everywhere and always harmonious. This common interest must be judged *grosso modo*, for its equilibrium is maintained by mutual concessions by the different peoples and the member states of such a federation. This equilibrium is based on the elements of the complementary character of these interests.

The necessity of jointly exercising the sovereign rights of the Federation vis-à-vis other countries and in the state itself, with a view to achieving common goals, demands a strict separation of powers between the federal organs and the individual republics. We cannot enter here into long discussions on the nature of these limits and their extent. It is extremely important for us to know that there exists a category of interests which are determined in common and recognized as common. Such interests are achieved through and by the Federation. Other interests, which are not indispensable to the Federation, are treated as belonging to the individual nations and the Federation may not interpose its authority.

However, even where limits are set to protect the liberty of the peoples and the various nationalities, the Federation is not and should not be indifferent to the use of these rights in the relations between the states and between the nationalities, but should ensure these rights. We believe that the Yugoslav Constitution includes certain rules, probably not yet sufficiently developed, which impose on the Federation a series of duties of this nature. For example: national liberty and independence; the brotherhood and unity of the peoples in Yugoslavia; the guarantee of the freedom to assert one's nationality and culture; the equality of the languages of the Yugoslav peoples, their literature, and the freedom to use their languages; the freedom of national determination, the citizen not being forced to declare his nationality or to opt for one of the nationalities; the prohibition, under threat of criminal prosecution, of all propaganda for, or practice of, inequality of rights between the nations, as well as incitement to national, racial, or religious disaffection or intolerance; freedom to use one's own language, to foster one's own culture, to demonstrate one's nationality and culture, guaranteed not only to the Yugoslav people, but also to nationalities and national minorities.

With regard to these points, the Federation retains only one right: the use of the Serbo-Croatian language in the Yugoslav army, as required by the Constitution. The Federation does not have the

immediate authority to settle these matters, but it acts as guarantor to assure that the provisions will be observed in the entire Federation in accord with the national interest and will be developed within the individual member states of the Federation. That is the reason for the presence of the rule in the Constitution of Yugoslavia that "the Federation protects the sovereign rights and the equality of the rights of the peoples as well as the socialist and political organization of the republics." There is, however, no primacy of the Federation with regard to regulating juridical and social relations; it has only the powers granted to it by the Constitution. On the other hand the republics, as sovereign communities based on the power of the peoples and on self-government, have authority in all matters which the Constitution has not assigned to the Federation. Thus it is assumed that sovereignty belongs to the socialist republics and the Federation has only those sovereign rights specifically granted to it by the Constitution.

One soon realizes, however, that there is no true equality between the nationalities unless one grants to the Yugoslav national units and to the socialist republics certain economic rights, reflecting the economic life of the whole Federation as regulated by federal legislation. The guarantees of national rights have been granted in this respect to the nationalities and republics within Yugoslavia by means of self-management by enterprises, institutions, and industrial organizations. All such organizations belonging to one commune or republic are under the control and care of the law of that republic, so that in this way the full possibility of leading a national life is given to the individual member states of the Federation.

It would be arbitrary to reduce the question of national rights to the development of culture and national education. National culture is, on the one hand, the driving force behind national economic life; on the other hand, the economy is the basis of the national life of any state, of its population, and thus of the entire nation.

The Yugoslav Constitution is based on the insight that the multinational state needs a complex legal system to protect national rights and to fight the hegemony which results when a certain nation imposes its own solutions on member republics of the Federation because of its numerical superiority. For that reason there exists, apart from five Chambers of the Federal Assembly, a sixth — the Council of Nations. The assemblies of the individual republics and autonomous provinces delegate their members to the Federal Assembly, who take part in the decisions on problems which come before the Assembly, together with directly elected deputies, forming the Council of Nations, to which the Constitution has given the task of protecting the equality of rights of the Yugoslav nations and of the socialist republics that are members of the Federation — the rights guaranteed by the Constitution. This Council is designed to exclude the possibility of

hegemony by any republic; thus questions in which certain republics have a special interest are decided by the Council of Nations on the request of a majority of the delegates of one of the republics quite apart from the Federal Council. In this way, hegemonic decisions are prevented.

Moreover, the legal relations between the Federation and the member states may be the subject of a special judicial procedure before the Constitutional Court of Yugoslavia in case certain practices give cause for such a procedure. The Court decides on cases of this nature — on conflicts caused by rulings of federal organs and those of republics, in the event of a conflict of competence between these organs, or when such conflicts arise between republics.

In this brief description of the Yugoslav example, we have wanted to show that the national composition of any particular state does not in itself provide the conditions for the existence of a multinational state. In public law, the multinational state is a state wherein national groups have the right to take part, in a special way, in the government of the state. There cannot exist any superstate authority which could, without the consent of national groups, and especially against their will, set up any supreme laws which would elevate the Federation above the interests of the nations which constitute it.

The Yugoslav system is very complex. It is based on the unity of social, political, and particularly economic action within the framework of the state, rather than on any rigid organizational power structure with a machinery issuing orders. We must realize that the functioning of this type of complex multinational state involves much maneuvering, discussions, permanent agreements, excitement, and constant reforms. Such a mechanism presupposes a real determination on the part of the peoples that join together to live in a multinational state. Without this will, the mechanism is menaced by constant conflicts. We believe in the correctness of the watchwords of the Yugoslav leaders that the essence of the united will to live together is provided by the working masses who achieve socialism through their economic production, and that there is no need to search for that essence in some grand intellectualization. It is clear that the multinational state presupposes as a prerequisite for its existence the attainment of the conditions favoring unobstructed national cultural development and guarantees for that development for the nationalities, whether they constitute the majority or a minority in the socialist republics in which they live. The multinational state cannot function unless these conditions exist. The need for federal organs, federal legislation, and common interests emerges in the course of the communal life, but it is always put to the test and verified in the light of the everyday interests of the various national groups. In such a system the Federation, if it is to be stable and strong, should not interfere in local affairs or neglect its duty to

ensure the freedom and independence of the national groups. The member states, as far as their national character is concerned, need the assurance that they will not be threatened in their development and in their daily affairs by any harassment from the central power.

For those living outside Yugoslavia, it is somewhat difficult to understand the Yugoslav system, the Yugoslav experiment. In spite of the state's tendency to decline, it has not yet withered away in this system. Its armed forces exist as a guarantee of international and internal security. But in a state of this type, this guarantee has a latent nature and is not able to demonstrate its prompt action unless put to the test. Moreover, sociological instead of bureaucratic forces have a preponderant influence. Foremost are the social forces, implicit in the economic aspirations; the connection between production and distribution of goods throughout the whole Federation and through the economic regions; the unity of the workers' movement (formed by the trade unions of Yugoslavia, which are affiliated throughout the Federation, embracing all professional activities); the political actions of the fundamental social organization — the Socialist Alliance of Yugoslav Workers, organized throughout the land, but with much local autonomy; and finally the governing political force — the League of Yugoslav Communists, which is also organized on a decentralized base and in which unity of thought is essential. In many cases in this multinational state, the administrative mechanism cannot solve questions between states, but adopts solutions which follow from the interplay of socialist economic, social, and political forces.

The existence of the socialist system in a multinational state has special interest for us. Without this character it is hard to visualize the functioning of relations between the nationalities without serious complications and setbacks. We are convinced that man can enjoy his national rights vis-à-vis the state if he lives in a multinational state, but only when these rights are implemented under socialism and when he is enabled to use, at each stage of achievement, the rights of self-determination and self-management. We are quite sure that a multinational state that is not based on these rights would not be in a position to weld life together for different nations; this ability is founded not only on solidarity and on legal security, but even more on a mature political situation and on the knowledge that chauvinism and exclusive nationalism cannot contribute to the progress of multinational environments.

Dr. MAURICE L. PERLZWEIG (*Director, International Affairs Department, World Jewish Congress, New York*): I have to convey a message of regret of one of the speakers scheduled to appear here today, Mr. Gabriel d'Arboussier, the distinguished under-secretary of the UN, head of the UN Institute for Training and Research, and former minister of justice of Senegal. I talked to him about a week ago

in Geneva and it was obvious from what he told me about a medical report that it would be impossible for him to be here, and he asked me to convey his genuine regrets.

We regret his absence, not only because of the reason for it, but because he represents one of the elements in the world of great importance in the struggle for human rights. I think it would be an affectation to deny that there are certain feelings of concern about the situation of human rights in the Third World. If we are fair about it, we will recall that these countries are confronted by difficulties of the gravest character, and that they also have to cope with a heritage from the colonial period. The frontiers in Africa are in no relation to the ethnic realities and each of these states is inhabited by numerous ethnic groups, very often without a common language and certainly without common tradition. It is very important that Jews should understand the distinctive nature of the problems which confront the statesmen in the Third World and particularly in Africa.

I have participated in a United Nations seminar in Dakar; there I learned something about the real nature of the problem, especially from a Jewish point of view. We Jews are familiar with the process which begins with a nation, or a people, which then creates a state. This is what happened in Israel. There were national traditions, culture, aspirations — and after a long struggle, the state was created. In Africa, the process runs in reverse. At Dakar, one leading spokesman for an African nation said, "We have achieved a state with sovereignty; now we have to create a nation." This, in a nutshell, puts the nature of their problems. Before we criticize their achievement or lack of achievement in the field of human rights, of which you can obtain evidence in the newspapers almost every day, we must bear in mind the nature and the magnitude of their task. If Mr. d'Arboussier had been here, he would have dealt with this problem from his own knowledge and experience.

The three statements that we have been privileged to hear and the introduction of the chairman have fully covered the ground. Dr. Moisés Goldman reminded you of the religious origins of the Jewish doctrine on human rights. I only want to add to that, for the sake of the record, that the Jewish people is committed by its scripture, its tradition, and a unique historical experience to unequivocal support of human rights for all men without discrimination. The obligation to defend such rights, whenever they are threatened or attacked, is part of the substance of its faith. It is not some historical accident which has engrafted it on the body of Judaism; it is part of its substance.

The roots of this doctrine go back to the origins of Judaism, when the Hebrew lawgivers and Prophets proclaimed the divine origin of these rights, while their Greek contemporaries created a brilliant society on the basis of a slave economy in which some men were born free and others considered as "by nature slaves."

In the Jewish, as also the Christian, conviction *human rights are the birthright of the human personality*. They are not granted or conferred by any human authority. It is the duty of governments, and the justification of their authority, to safeguard and protect these rights and to create conditions in which they may be freely exercised.

The United Nations have great and historic achievements to their credit in the formulation and definition of human rights, particularly the Universal Declaration, one of whose principal architects, Maître Cassin — the teacher of all of us — has done us the honor to be here today. Nothing of what I am going to say detracts from the greatness of that historic achievement. But I am a Jew and I have acquired a little skepticism about the value of documents and even the value of constitutions. We have learned, in our experience, that it is possible to have not merely a declaration, but a constitution, which is satisfactory and maybe well-nigh perfect, but which makes no difference in the treatment of minorities in the country in which that constitution is said to prevail. Before the war, there were countries in Eastern Europe, and I can mention two of them — Poland and Rumania — which had excellent democratic constitutions, but which nevertheless afforded no protection to minorities, or indeed to anybody from the point of view of human rights.

Without wanting to enter into any polemics at this moment, I would like to say that one of our chief preoccupations now — namely the situation of the Jews in the Soviet Union — is another example of the way in which a constitution or any other document in itself is not adequate unless there is both the machinery and the will to implement it. And this is one of our complaints to the Soviet Union: your Constitution is very good, and is always quoted to us; but the machinery to implement it and the will — as far as the Jews are concerned — are not there.

Mr. David Morse, in his most illuminating speech, made the point about the importance of implementation. He explained how his organization had devised a method of securing implementation of conventions and of recommendations which have been adopted. At the present moment, we have to admit with sorrow that the principles of the Universal Declaration are not even shown elementary respect in many member states of the United Nations. During the past years, not only has there been a lack of respect for the most elementary human rights, but there have been political executions, intertribal butchery, and large-scale massacres that make a mockery of the standards proclaimed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. We ought, if we are realists, take notice of that fact.

There are estimates which put the number of those killed for political or ethnic reasons by their fellow citizens during the past year as higher than those killed in the same period in military conflict waged

with the heavy armaments of modern war. The United Nations has found itself impotent in the face of this situation, and its authority has been further undermined by the failure of governments — among them advanced countries with great libertarian traditions — to ratify human rights conventions which they themselves had supported or sponsored in the General Assembly.

It is symptomatic of the weakness of the international community in the field of human rights that it recoils from any serious effort to eradicate slavery. It is only a few days since a United Nations body postponed for two years the consideration of modest proposals made by its own rapporteur to encourage the twenty countries in which slavery, in one form or another, is said to exist to take the necessary measures to abolish it.

There must be a sustained effort to give the United Nations the means and instruments to enable them to discharge the Charter obligation to promote universal respect for human rights. We must press on the governments to ratify the Genocide Convention and to ratify the European Convention on Human Rights. We have no right to criticize countries with a history of only two or three years, if great powers with democratic traditions hold back ratification. And we must look for something else: the beginning of the concentration of responsibility in the international community for the implementation of human rights.

I would like to refer to the proposal that there should be established a High Commissioner for Human Rights. There is opposition to it from some countries, opposition that was voiced in Geneva only a couple of days ago by very powerful countries. But behind this proposal there are scores of international nongovernmental organizations and there are powerful governments. The government of Israel is one of those who is supporting this proposal; the government of the United States gave a couple of weeks ago through Mr. Arthur Goldberg its enthusiastic support to this proposal; and the government of Great Britain has given more than public support to it. Some of us would like to believe that if the office of High Commissioner for Human Rights is endowed with sufficient authority, if the man who occupies it is a man of high integrity, it might mark a turning point in the history of the struggle for human rights.

A special importance attaches to the rights of religious freedom. In this field the churches have themselves made a notable contribution in promoting mutual tolerance and understanding and in the reciprocal recognition of the right of each of them to full religious freedom. A notable example is the adoption of its historic Declaration on Religious Freedom by the Ecumenical Council. It was during the discussions which preceded the adoption of this Declaration that, in a remarkable address that will have a permanent place in the history of religious freedom, the eloquent and learned bishop of Bruges, Monsignor de

Smedt, affirmed that if a man is true to his conscience, even though he be in error he is faithful to the will of God. In so saying, he asserted the *right of man to be himself, to be different, even to be wrong*. The recognition of this right is one of the indispensable foundations of any real system of human rights. We must hope that the United Nations will not delay to enter the path which religious leadership has opened.

Several years have elapsed since the General Assembly announced its intention to formulate a convention to eradicate religious intolerance and thereby give needed support to religious liberty. This work must be completed with a minimum of delay. It is no less urgent than the work already done to outlaw racial discrimination. And when the text is completed and adopted, it will be the opportunity and obligation of all the great religious communities to ensure that it is ratified by the governments and faithfully implemented in their own legislation and administration.

I have been, both explicitly and by implication, somewhat critical of the situation as it exists today. I do not want to leave you with the impression that we are about to be defeated. I am firmly convinced, and I think you had the evidence today, that there are forces working in the international community that can achieve, if supported by large bodies of opinion, a condition in which, throughout the world, men will live without fear — and more than that — will have the freedom to exercise the gifts which they have. But that depends not only upon the United Nations which, after all, depend upon the governments. The governments, however, depend on people like you and me, who may not have great positions in the world but have the power to press them to move forward.

FIFTEENTH SESSION

August 5, 1966 (afternoon)

In the Chair: MR. LEON LASKY (*Australia*)

1. EULOGIES OF THE DECEASED

Dr. NAHUM GOLDMANN: One of the saddest duties a president has to perform is to commemorate at all Assemblies those who have not lived to come to the present one. When I examined the list of those who had died since the Stockholm Assembly, I was shocked not only by the magnitude of the list but by the quality of the leaders the Congress has lost in the intervening years. I had the occasion to speak about many of them immediately after their death, but it is right that I should recall their memory here again, for an organization is often judged by those who lead it, and the Congress has a proud record in its leadership.

First, two great figures in Jewish life. *Izhak Ben-Zvi*, president of Israel and a founder of the World Jewish Congress, where for many years he represented the Va'ad Le'umi. He personified all that was chalutzic in a Jew. He was a man of great humility and simplicity, and these qualities, which endeared him to Jew and non-Jew alike, were at the same time coupled with great knowledge. *Moshe Sharett* was never formally connected with the Congress, but took a great interest in it and indeed gave a magnificent address at the Stockholm Assembly. He was my best friend, which makes it even more difficult for me to speak of him. He was, in turn, a member of the Zionist Executive, Israel's first foreign minister, and chairman of the Zionist Executive — a personality unmatched in the Jewish people. In his last years he personified the moral conscience of both Israel and the Jewish people.

Six founders of the World Jewish Congress died during these years. *André Spire*, who passed away this week at the age of 98, was a rare synthesis of a great French poet and a good and proud Jew. He was a founder of the Congress and worked most actively until Hitler expelled him from France, where he later returned and worked in full freshness until his death. *Rabbi Mordechai Nurock* was one of the most lovable personalities in the Congress. A member of the Latvian parliament and

a close friend of Motzkin, he undertook important and dangerous missions for the Congress. He mercifully survived the Nazi occupation and went to Israel, where he became a leader of the Mizrachi and a minister in the government. He was at all times a loyal colleague. *Dr. Joseph Tenenbaum*, also one of Motzkin's circle, before the foundation of the World Jewish Congress participated in the work of the Comité des Délégations Juives in the fight for minority rights at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919. With the advent of Nazism, he was the foremost organizer of the anti-Nazi boycott. During the war he was active in the rescue work of the World Jewish Congress; he was a proud and courageous Jew. *Eli Gozlan* of Algeria, a Sephardi Jew, a founder and faithful co-worker of the Congress, had lived to a high age when he died in Israel. *Markus Krämer*, formerly a leader of Rumanian Jewry, together with Mayer Ebner fought for Jewish minority rights in Rumania; he eventually settled in Israel, where he died. *Meir Grossman* was one of the most courageous fighters for Jewish rights, who set an example with his absolute integrity.

Three heads of departments died during these years. *Dr. Isaac Schwarzbart*, an eminent Polish Jewish leader, upon settling in the United States took over the World Jewish Congress Organization Department. He had a special love for the small Jewish communities, and his efforts have indeed borne fruit. *Dr. Nehemiah Robinson* was a unique man, whose encyclopedic knowledge commanded the highest respect of Jews and non-Jews alike. His immense knowledge was coupled with a great capacity for work and with great humility. He is indeed irreplaceable. *Dr. F.R. Bienenfeld*, who worked in our London office, was not only a jurist of great imagination but one of the foremost fighters for human rights. His contributions to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Draft Covenants on Human Rights remain a permanent memorial to his ideas.

Many members of the Executive died during the last seven years. In Israel: *Meir Argov*, a member of the Knesset and for many years chairman of its Foreign Affairs Commission; *Herzl Berger*, journalist and author; *Benjamin Minz*, a dynamic member of the Knesset, who brought the Poale Agudat Israel within the fold of the Congress; and *Shimshon Juniczman*, a man of great integrity and a personal friend of mine.

In France: *Edmond Fleg*, president of the French Section, a great figure, combining ideas and poetry, who gave the French Section enormous prestige. His passing was shortly followed by the sudden death of *Maitre Pierre Dreyfus-Schmidt*, his successor as president of the French Section, an outspoken and courageous man who was loved by Jews and non-Jews alike; and *Léon Meiss*, who was not as active in the World Jewish Congress as others, but who as president of CRIF demonstrated his friendship to the Congress.

In Great Britain: *Rebecca Sieff*, a woman with a brilliant mind, president of WIZO and a founder of the British Section of the World Jewish Congress; *Rabbi Kopul Rosen*, who died at an early age, before he could fulfill the promise that the Jewish people envisaged for him. His knowledge and ability destined him to become a great Jewish leader.

In the United States, *Louis Segal*, a leader of Poale Zion and an author of great temperament, always bubbling over with ideas, died after a long illness. In Latin America: *Dr. Abraham Mibashán*, author and Hebraist, publisher of many important works and for years president of the DAIA; and *Abram Schwarz*, a dear friend in Uruguay. In Yugoslavia: *Dr. Albert Vajs*, a lawyer of great ability who represented Yugoslav Jewry in the Congress with great tact and dignity and who, had he not died so young, would have taken on permanent responsibilities in the European Executive. In Belgium: *Maître Marcel Marinower*, leader of the World Jewish Congress Belgian Section and secretary-general of the Belgian Consistoire, who died at the age of 45 of an illness contracted in a concentration camp.

Among the leading workers and supporters of the Congress, we have lost in Argentina *Marcus Regalsky*; *Alejandro Levín*, who at one time was Jacob Hellman's closest collaborator; *Dr. Alejandro Lutzky*, a former secretary of the DAIA; and his brother, *José Lutzky*, one of the founders of the Zionist movement in Argentina. In Uruguay: *Mauricio Veiroj*, for many years chairman of the World Jewish Congress branch in his country; in Brazil: *Aharon Raw*, secretary-general of the São Paulo Jewish Federation, who, although he was only 32 when he died, had already played a leading role in Brazil; in Chile: *Isaac Drapkin* and *Dr. Siegfried Landau*, a leader of German-speaking Jewry in that country. In South Africa: *Judge Cooper*, who had no formal links with the Congress, but as president of the South African Jewish Board of Deputies demonstrated his friendship for the World Jewish Congress.

In Great Britain: *Lord Marks*, a great friend of the Congress and my personal friend, who revolutionized English life with the Marks and Spencer stores. Although he himself played no active role in the Congress, he made an indelible impression on Jewish life as a devoted friend of Zionism, and indeed of the late Dr. Weizmann, and it was through him that Lord Sieff became active in the life of the Congress. *Ruth Shaerf*, a dynamic woman and a founder of the British Section; and her brother, *Michael Wix*, who on many occasions demonstrated his friendship to the Congress, also passed away.

I also want to speak about the devoted men and women who belonged to the Congress staff and who, although not in the limelight, at all times contributed all their efforts and devotion to the work of the organization, thereby ensuring its smooth operation. To be a worker in the World Jewish Congress needs a great deal of idealism, for this

organization does not offer the financial security that other organizations do. Of these loyal servants we have lost *Käte Knopfmacher*, the oldest worker in the Congress, who worked with me in the early days in Berlin and later in Paris, then going to Mexico and finally to New York, where she died only a year ago; *Dr. Gerhard Jacoby*, one of the best collaborators in our New York office; *Dr. Saul Sokal*, a member of the Institute of Jewish Affairs under both Jacob and Nehemiah Robinson; *Rabbi Robert Serebrenik*, a member of the Organization Department in New York; *Maurice Vanikoff* in Paris, who performed signal service in the fight against the Nazis; *Henry Grossman* of our New York office; and, finally, *Gerta Bindermann*, one of the principal secretaries in our London office for eighteen years, who died suddenly only a week before this Assembly.

I want to add the name of my personal friend *Jacques Salmanowitz* of Geneva, who, without any formal ties with the Congress, at all times demonstrated his readiness to help; and last, but not least, *Jacob Lestschinsky*, the dean of Jewish statisticians, who published many important works for the Institute of Jewish Affairs.

This list leaves us with a terrible impression, but we must feel gratified that we had such distinguished and loyal leaders and workers in our organization. The idea and character of the organization determines the people it attracts. Conversely, its leaders reflect upon its character, and the organization is often judged by them. The losses we have suffered can be replaced, but with great difficulty. Our problem today is not lack of money but lack of leadership. Indeed, money sometimes is only a curse. The loss of a single friend is hard enough to bear, but when such a large number of friends leave us, their loss leaves a void which is difficult to fill and even more difficult to bear.

2. DEBATE ON CULTURAL PROBLEMS VI. (continued)

Dr. JACOBO BENTATA (*Venezuela*): I bring you greetings from the Jews of Venezuela in general and of Caracas in particular.

I came here hoping to learn about practical matters. I have heard a great deal of inspiring speeches about many personages of history — all of which I could have found in an encyclopedia — while I was eagerly expecting to hear from my fellow delegates how they have been resolving the eternal problems.

We have really three problems: assimilation, mixed marriages, and the de-Judaization of the youth; they can all be grouped in one single heading — education and culture. Were Jewish youth educated in Jewish culture, Jewish spirit, and Jewish heart, then all these problems would be of no importance whatsoever.

Venezuela's Jewish community, though not large in numbers, makes the largest per capita contribution to Israel. We have solved the problem of education by means of a Jewish school that starts with kindergarten and goes right through to the B.A. The current enrollment is 1200 students, and we are enlarging it to 1500. The school has such a good reputation that the Venezuelan minister of education sends his own son there; and when the young Jews went to Israel, the minister's son went along with them.

We cannot consider the Jewish student as a kind of synthetic person. I have heard a lot of pieces put together, from which resulted some sort of imaginary student, to whom everyone referred. But students are people with bones and flesh and blood. I have been in fifty-six countries, where I lectured at universities and approached Jewish students and tried to see what their problems were.

The anguish, the spirit of the ghetto, still lingers on among them, no matter what we say. We must bear in mind the situation of this youth, which finds, all of a sudden, that it is emancipated, that all doors of Occidental culture are open, and gets a bit dizzy about it.

What is the solution? We have the remedy in our own national treasures. I have been fighting for twenty-five years for complete harmony and fusion between the Sephardi culture and all other parts of Judaism — a goal that we have obtained in Venezuela. There is hardly a Jewish family in Venezuela that does not have both Sephardi and Ashkenazi members, and that is the real solution.

We have treasures of literature, which are genuinely universal literature. From the literary and philosophical viewpoints it is magnificent, but it is sad — and our youth do not want any more sadness. They have wept enough, suffered enough; they want something more open. We should rediscover some of our classical authors, and there are many of them — Maimonides, Ibn Gabirol, Ibn Shaprut, Zacuto, Ibn Ezra, just to mention a few. This is a literature that is most topical for our time. You can read these authors and find today's problems considered in their writings. If our youth gets the opportunity to read them, they will surely appreciate them.

There is a magnificent job for the Congress to do. If we try to popularize these treasures — I imagine the Congress publishing short books with biographies and extracts from the authors' writings — and make them available to youth, they will surely find out that these writers are not inferior to the authors of other peoples. Let them know that the people who said for the first time, "Love thy neighbor as thyself," were the Jews. Even the great philosopher John Stuart Mill was surprised when he was told that this precept was contained in the Bible in Leviticus 19:18. As an experiment, I asked twenty persons at Columbia University in New York, and the majority answered that it was a saying of Jesus.

We should tell our youth that the three characteristics of Jewish culture are universality, culture, and peace, which have now become the treasure of humanity at large. After so many centuries, here we are, back to our own themes. Let them know that when King Solomon inaugurated the Temple, he said: "If any strangers, belonging to other faiths, come to pray with a clean heart, may their prayer be accepted by God." Let them remember that the High Priest in Israel sacrificed seventy oxen, one for each of the peoples of the world. Peace is a concept created by Judaism.

Let the Congress sponsor the idea of having a few of these books published; I am prepared to contribute — materially and in any other way — to implementing such a project. Surprisingly, in Spain, non-Jews are now editing such books. They are very well done, with a perfect understanding of Hebrew. Why not get in touch with the Spanish Institute of Sephardic Studies? We should popularize these publications and thus solve some of our problems.

Mr. RICHARD GELVAN (*Jewish Community of Copenhagen*): I bring you greetings from the 6000 Jews of Denmark, one of the purest democracies in the world. The saving of the Jews of Denmark is now part of history, and I want to use this opportunity to acknowledge the many manifestations of appreciation shown to Denmark by Jews the world over.

The highest law official in Denmark, elected by Parliament, is a Jewish professor who affirms his Judaism and is a member of the Zionist Federation. Our minister of finance is a Jew, and a number of other distinguished Jews play a prominent part in the professional and academic life of the country.

Assimilation is easy and we are very worried about it. Our community is shrinking. As against the approximately one hundred members we lose each year, there are only about fifty births annually. On the other hand, our Jewish youth receives in its education a sound Jewish background with a deep interest in Israel, and this gives us cause for optimism. We have a Jewish day school, founded in 1805, two kindergartens, and two primary schools, one of them also over a hundred years old. Our community is 300 years old; we feel a part of the Jewish people and we are very much involved in the life of Israel. We have a Danish-Israel Society, and there is an Association of Danish Friends of the Kibbutz, which was organized by non-Jews. Every year, between 700 and 1000 non-Jewish Danish students enthusiastically spend a working holiday in Israel. This Assembly is a most stimulating experience, and I shall give a full report of it to my community.

Dr. JOACHIM PRINZ (*Chairman, Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations*): It has come to my attention that the delegation of Spain feels that yesterday evening I spoke disparagingly about the Jewish community now living in Spain, and I feel chagrined

about this. For the purpose of clarification I want to read the sentence in question: "There are Jews who live in Germany today; the Jewish people has recognized the existence and the legitimate rights of the Jewish community in Germany, but as a totality we shall not return to Germany, as we did not return to Spain after 1492." I want to make clear that I spoke about the Jewish community now living in Germany as a legitimate community, living rightfully in Germany because they have chosen to live there. The comparison with the Jewish community living in Spain today is certainly not even possible. The first pogroms in Spain took place on March 4, 1391, in the city of Seville. For more than 400 years following 1492, there was no Jewish community in Spain. If there is a Jewish community in Spain now, the Jews who live in Spain have the right to live in Spain as a Jewish community recognized by the Jewish people in the world. You will understand that the Jewish community living in Spain today, almost 500 years after 1492, does not compare with the Jewish community living in Germany twenty years after the war. If I have in any way insulted the Jewish community of Spain, I want publicly to apologize.

Dr. CARLOS BENARROCH (*Spain*): First of all, I wish to express my gratitude to Dr. Prinz for his clarification today. Indeed, as he said, his statement of yesterday — which was not well understood by us, as unfortunately we do not know English, and which was not well conveyed — could have given rise to some confusion. As a matter of fact, other delegates, who do not belong to the Spanish delegation, interpreted Dr. Prinz' words as we did. Therefore, it is well that the issue should be cleared up.

I do not mean to say that we Jews who live in Spain today justify or applaud the expulsion of 1492. But we believe that it is totally unjustified to compare that unfortunate event in our history — one of the many unfortunate events that has befallen our people — with what has happened in our day to our families.

It is well known that not only Spain expelled Jews; they were expelled from other countries, too. Not only the Spaniards persecuted the Jews; they were unfortunately persecuted everywhere else as well. The expulsion of the Jews from Spain has one characteristic which does not admit any comparison with the German slaughter: the Jews were expelled from Spain after having been given an option — either to convert to a religion which they did not want, or to go into exile. They were not forced, they were not killed; persecuted and killed were those who remained and secretly tried to be faithful to their beloved Judaism. There is, you will understand, a big difference between the two situations. The correct comparison would be one that Professor Baron made yesterday. To describe the persecution and the expulsion of the Spanish Jews, it was not necessary to invent the word "genocide," which our century

had to invent to describe what happened under the Germans.

Concerning the alleged oath that the Jews made never to return to Spain, we have consulted various rabbinical authorities, who have told us — as the eminent historian, Professor Baron, has also affirmed — that there is no documentary evidence to that effect. The question of the existence of such a *cherem*, therefore, does not worry the Jews living in Spain today. I want to stress that my words should not be interpreted as a defense of the persecutors of Jews in centuries past, but as a clarification of a point in its real historical significance.

Mr. IZHAK GROSS (*Israel*): For the last six days we have been listening to diagnoses but we have heard very little about remedies. Our generation is the lucky one, having witnessed the return to Zion; but we also witnessed the great catastrophe. According to all the speakers, assimilation is our biggest danger now, be it forced, as in Soviet Russia, or voluntary, which Dr. Goldmann thinks is even more dangerous.

It is incumbent upon us to be different from other nations. If we are not, it must be emphasized that we will not succeed in bringing our youth back to the Jewish people; they will join other peoples. Young people are asking, Why be a Jew? and I must admit that symptoms of alienation exist in Israel, too. There is but one way: a return not only to Zion, but to original Jewishness in all its aspects. We have to return to Jewish tradition, to teach our young the fundamentals of the Jewish religion; we have to make an effort to do it in a way acceptable to them, and they will respond accordingly. In Israel the religious kibbutzim have shown that it is possible to lead a modern existence within the framework of religion. The survival of our Jewish people is at stake, and we have to dedicate ourselves to this work.

Mr. MARK UVEELER (*Executive Director, Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture*): I am grateful for the rare opportunity to listen to representatives of fifty Jewish communities and exchange with them my own views and experiences, connected with my day-to-day activities.

As you know, for the last two years I have been responsible for the technical conduct of a Jewish cultural institution, most of whose member organizations are affiliated to the World Jewish Congress. The Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture was established about two years ago in the wake of the Conference on Jewish Material Claims against Germany. In Hebrew it is called Keren Hazikaron. The term *zikaron* implies the perpetuation of the memory of the martyrs. I beg of you to remember the full name, which includes the concepts of remembrance as well as culture. The Claims Conference, understanding its moral responsibility toward Jewish history, realized that it could not merely be satisfied with the activities it had undertaken in the eleven years between 1954 and 1964. During that period, over 84,000,000 dollars were spent on material aid: the reconstruction of ravaged Jewish

communal institutions and support of about 225,000 survivors of the holocaust in Europe and other regions in the Diaspora. Only 22,000,000 dollars were spent on cultural and educational purposes. With the total of 106,000,000 dollars we built over 150 schools, yeshivot, rabbinical seminaries, and teachers' seminaries, 65 houses of prayer, 107 communal centers, 56 old-age homes, and so on and on. These figures speak for themselves.

Despite the achievements of the Claims Conference in terms of immediate reconstruction, it is incumbent upon us to take a long-range view. Jews have always lived for the future rather than only for the present. It is noteworthy, and it should be recorded for the future historian, that when the Claims Conference, in its twelfth year, announced the program of cultural activity instead of welfare, none of the organizations who were direct beneficiaries objected. But that again is in the time-hallowed Jewish tradition: spiritual needs were put before material ones. While talking about the history of the Memorial Foundation, I must mention one more point. The State of Israel, despite its own financial difficulties, put at our disposal 1,000,000 dollars to help us out in the first four years of our existence. This money was very useful to us, as the income of the Memorial Foundation is comparatively small. But we are optimistic — more important, Dr. Goldmann is optimistic — and this gives us confidence in the future.

The Memorial Foundation is working in five areas. The first, and most important, is the documentation of the holocaust. Our generation will never forget it, but we must make sure that the coming generations, as well as the non-Jewish world, know it and remember it. This important task must be carried out systematically and at all levels, from the highly academic to the elementary educational. The Memorial Foundation cannot do it single-handed. Many other institutions will have to tackle this work, and we believe that we shall be able to encourage and help them.

The second area is allied to the first and bears an educational character. We say that it is not enough to remember. We must find ways and means to hand down to coming generations our spiritual inheritance. They should know what European Jewry has created through its lifetime, and that this tremendous spiritual treasure is feeding future generations in the Diaspora as well as in Israel. How to do it is a matter for universities and intellectual leaders, but we are prepared to help within our abilities.

The third area is the preparation of rabbis and teachers, as well as communal leaders, the world over. Here again, I speak not of doing it but of helping and encouraging those engaged in these tasks. Jewish communities are crying out for spiritual leaders and teachers, and the Jewish education of our children is being badly neglected.

The fourth area, about which we speak very little at our meetings, is the education of the young. Many Jewish communities accept the idea that Jewish education ends with bar mitzvah. But even those who support day schools limit their aspirations to secondary education. In that case, where will the communities obtain their qualified teachers and professional workers, without a Jewish intelligentsia? Do not forget that this is 1966, and an increasing majority of our children are university graduates.

How can we reach this academic youth? I know that you are all aware of this problem and that you have expended considerable efforts toward its solution. You will agree with me that the results of these efforts have not met your expectations.

Many American universities have departments for Jewish studies, with a fair number of students — some non-Jewish — and now we are out to encourage European universities to establish such departments. The University of London has accepted our offer, and last year a department for Jewish studies was established there. In the first year it had over thirty students, who were working for a B.A. degree in Jewish history or Hebrew language and literature. We hope that other universities will follow London. This would result, in about a decade, in the emergence of a generation of Jewish intellectuals in possession of Jewish knowledge. Through them Jewish intellectual atmosphere will be brought into Jewish homes.

The fifth area of our concern is Jewish research and Jewish publications. We have had some excellent results with the French Section of the World Jewish Congress, and we would like other affiliates to follow this example and initiate research programs to attract the participation of Jewish scholars. If I am right, we might in due course be able to win back alienated Jewish intellectuals to fill chairs in Jewish studies.

The Claims Conference has already helped in the publication of over 500 books in a dozen languages, and the Memorial Foundation will continue to encourage this work, although we shall only be able to provide limited assistance because of our limited resources.

We have not entered the field of primary and secondary education — not because we do not consider it important, but because we have not the means to cover the whole range.

I want to permit myself a few personal remarks. I do not see the situation as black as some others see it, judging from the speeches I heard here. It is not true that we must use non-Jewish values in order to keep our Jewish youth with us. We do not understand today's young Jews; we do not know them at all. Do you expect our Jewish youth of 1966 to behave as we did fifty years ago? We are in the habit of applying a bureaucratic approach; we ought to exercise more *ahavat yisrael* — love of Jews — which really means tolerance toward all Jews,

religious and secular. We should not despair of any Jew. This is the philosophy that guides our work in the Memorial Foundation.

Mr. JACOB HALEVY (*Great Britain*): The *raison d'être* of the World Jewish Congress is the preservation of the Jewish people. It has no other purpose. It was founded to preserve physically the Jewish people by way of political and diplomatic action. It has rightly been stated by many, including Dr. Goldmann, that today the emphasis is not so much on this physical danger. It is not that anti-Semitism is not lurking, but rather that it is not so acute. It must be pointed out, however, that the establishment of the State of Israel and the renaissance of the Arab countries have made the Arabs not only anti-Zionist, but also anti-Jewish; this force is very great and increasing.

The paramount problem, however, which has always existed but is now becoming more acute, is the question of preserving the Jews *qua* Jews, not only in the physical sense, but in the spiritual sense. I need not draw your attention to the danger of assimilation. The danger is not only active assimilation — namely, an attempt of certain sections to assimilate with the peoples among whom they live — but the passive, almost unconscious assimilation of our youth.

The situation is really serious. I will give you one illustration from practical experience. I am interested in a movement, *Shnat Sherut*, which started in the United Kingdom, of sending youth to Israel for a year of service. I am glad to say that this experiment has been emulated in different countries. In connection with this movement, I have interviewed during the last few years over 1000 boys and girls. In the interviews, we try, within the limited period of half-an-hour, to find out what is their background. I do not think I exaggerate when I state that 80 to 85% had hardly any Jewish education of any kind. Among those interviewed were boys who had not even been *bar mitzvah*ed. I am not taking *bar mitzvah* as a criterion of Jewish education. But in Jewish life it is considered a very important factor: even those who are not inclined to give their children a systematic Jewish education consider that it is both sufficient and very important.

If I were asked, *al regel achat*, to define in one word the characteristic of the Jewish people, I would say: uniqueness. Our people has no parallel in the history of all the other peoples of the world. By any definition of the word, we are the people that has carried with it the definition of nationhood. Even though we were driven from Israel by king and pope, we carried Israel with us wherever we went. Part of it is the monotheistic conception of the universe. Judaism is absolute monotheism; there is nothing comparable in other monotheistic conceptions of the universe. Out of that absolute and abstract conception of monotheism derived Jewish ethics, based on the belief of the universality of man and the brotherhood of mankind.

We are also unique in the unbreakable attachment of our religious

ritual and traditions to the territory of Israel; our religion is a religion of the nation, and there is no separation between the state and the religion. I believe that the Jews survived because they possessed the nation-making factors; even though they were dispersed, they retained their attachment to their country of origin. Attachment is a psychological concept. You can be in a place but not be attached to it; you can be away from another place and have the nostalgia for it, which is more real than the fact of physical presence elsewhere.

Connected with this attachment was the ultimate faith in the return to that country, and that that return would carry with it a messianic vision for the whole world. This faith permeated our people.

Therefore, when one speaks about Jewish culture and preservation of the youth, one stresses the Hebrew language as an important factor. One of the speakers here said that Hebrew was not sufficient. I say so too, although Hebrew is my native language. Just to teach Hebrew in order that it may be spoken fluently is not sufficient. Hebrew is a very important medium with a specific connotation, but there is a danger of complacency once we get the boys speaking Hebrew. Communists, opposed to the conception of Zionism, can also speak Hebrew.

In the debate speakers have referred to the problem of youth. In Judaism, we find all the things that will give sufficient satisfaction, provided the child is educated in matters Jewish from the very beginning. I believe that there is no other means for Jewish education than the Jewish day school, from the elementary level to the secondary level. Then, I am sure — and I speak from experience — that university students thus educated will go to Israel. One cannot get 100% results, but one can push them in that direction. We in the United Kingdom believe in day schools. Despite the greatest difficulties, we have succeeded in having nearly 2000 pupils in day schools, and we hope that the movement will expand.

What is the function of the World Jewish Congress in this respect? To establish schools? Certainly not. The function of the World Jewish Congress is to tell Jewish leaders throughout the world what they can do, what they should do — to act as a catalyst and help them with ideas. The World Jewish Congress can act as the stimulus to convince people that in Judaism there are sources for the youth, for inspiration, and for work for humanity.

Mr. TOFIC NIGRI (*Brazil*): In the name of the Jewish Confederation of Brazil, I am honored and gratified to greet this Assembly.

I am pleased to recall the determining role taken by Brazil — thanks to the great Osvaldo Aranha — in the vote that led to the independence of the State of Israel. We are also proud of the warm welcome accorded last month by Brazil — in the person of our president, His Excellency Marshal Castelo Branco — to the President of the State of Israel and Mrs. Zalman Shazar.

I am very pleased to note the presence at this Assembly of numerous Sephardic personalities, delegates, and observers. I would like to thank my colleagues in the Brazilian delegation for allowing me the time to take up some Sephardic problems, and I would like to draw the attention of the Congress to some of the most important points.

We all know that the Sephardic community of Israel, which represents half — or perhaps more — of the total population, is confronted with difficult problems that have to do with the objective conditions of its composition: generally large families; inadequate housing; and the difficulties faced by the parents in paying for the costly secondary education for all their children and the practical difficulty of pushing them on to university studies.

The result is a perceptible difference between the two communities on the educational, economic, and social levels, a difference that endangers the unity of the people of Israel.

From this platform, where so many appeals have been made for the unity of the Jewish people, I would like first of all to address myself to all the leaders of the Sephardic communities, who for many years, in their countries of origin in the Orient or in North Africa, were inspired by love for Zion and were never divorced from Jewish life. I would ask them to devote their undivided attention to this serious problem and with a sense of responsibility to aid our brothers in Israel, in this way reinforcing the authority of the World Sephardi Federation.

Without underestimating or being unaware of the important efforts made by the government of Israel and other Jewish institutions, I ask this Assembly of the World Jewish Congress to adopt an urgent resolution to ensure for the Sephardim of Israel even more democratic means for putting themselves on the same level as the other communities; a policy that would assure education, assistance to large families, economic and social advancement, and a proper role in the running of the country — and all this in a fraternal climate devoid of any feeling of differences, which constitutes the reconstruction of the Jewish nation.

These problems do not belong to the Sephardic community alone, but are the responsibility of the entire Jewish people.

PROFESSOR AURELIO ASCOLI (*Italy*): I am taking the floor in this debate as the member of the Executive of the Union of Italian Jewish Communities who is responsible for cultural activities. I have heard during the debates in the past days many general statements about what has to be done and what must not be done. I might observe that, as good Jews, we all agree about what should not occur. I would like to stress only two technical details on how to realize these general aims: the preparation of Jewish cultural leaders and the methods of spreading knowledge about Jewish culture — not only among Jews, but also among non-Jews. This is important too.

Jewish culture is conveyed mainly by rabbis. I am concerned about the preparation of good rabbis in smaller Jewish communities, such as Italy. Let me make a technical comparison: in my work, I study the physics of small agglomerates of atoms and molecules. In this branch of physics exists a well-known problem, that of the critical size for small agglomerates to hold together. It is very difficult to hold the agglomerates together with agglomerates of lesser size. I think that this notion is applicable to small communities.

Another phenomenon, also well-known in this branch of physics, applies to Jewish populations too: the critical size is not only strongly dependent on outside conditions — temperature, chemical environment, et cetera — but also on dilution; the percentage of a given kind of atoms and molecules in the parent matter. This, too, is a kind of problem that applies to Jews.

As to the education of rabbis to serve future generations, Italian Jewry makes a tremendous effort to maintain its own rabbinical college. Everything is difficult because of our small size. First of all, among 32,000 Jews, it is difficult to find not only good teachers, but also new pupils. I will not touch upon the problem of raising funds for that purpose. Finding new pupils is strictly interdependent on finding good teachers. Many well-intentioned pupils would be attracted by the magnificent lectures and lessons of good teachers. I would like to suggest that through the World Jewish Congress it should be possible to arrange that renowned rabbis who teach in rabbinical colleges in heavily populated Jewish surroundings should have some kind of sabbatical leave — just like professors in American universities — to enable them to teach in smaller Jewish communities during that period. This would also be good for the rabbis, who would thus broaden their views on general Jewish problems, and not only be exposed to the problems of the Jewish communities in their own countries. I have in mind a relationship between rabbinical colleges in various countries. I am not touching upon the problem of Jewish schools. We have a large Jewish school in Milan; this is good for maintaining the Jewish spirit among the youth, but not for the preparation of rabbis.

The dissemination of knowledge about Jewish culture among non-Jews is a very delicate problem. There are some texts that are particularly suitable for reading by non-Jews, for example, Dante Lattes' *Apologia dell'Ebraismo*. This is "a rare flower." I would suggest that the World Jewish Congress or some other responsible Jewish forum see to the translation of such attractive texts into as many languages as possible. I would point out in this connection that *The Last of the Just*, by André Schwarz-Bart, did more to convey knowledge about Judaism than many sermons.

Mr. LEON LASKY (*Australia*): Before concluding the session, I would like to place on record the Australian delegation's appre-

ciation to the Presidium for asking us to chair this afternoon's session.

Australia, a country of 11,000,000 inhabitants, has today some 70,000 Jews. Some thirty years ago, it had only 20,000 Jewish inhabitants; as a result of the very liberal immigration policy of the Australian government, we have been able to treble our Jewish population. Our Jewish community enjoys the utmost freedom, as well as very cordial relations with the Australian government. The Australian government has, indeed, a very cordial relationship with the State of Israel. We are very pleased to be here and to participate in the World Jewish Congress.

SIXTEENTH SESSION

August 7, 1966 (evening)

In the Chair: PROFESSOR ARYEH TARTAKOWER

DEBATE ON CULTURAL PROBLEMS VII. (concluded)

Mr. MOISES CUENCA SASSON (*Uruguay*): I greet you in the name of the Jewish Central Committee of Uruguay and the Sephardic community of my country, which appointed me as its delegate to this Assembly.

It is our opinion that the educational and cultural problem constitutes the nucleus of Jewish problems, a need on which the continuation of Judaism depends and which we must meet through effective support of Jewish schools for children and teenagers. I wish to stress in this regard the progress made in Jewish education in my country, where there are three types of educational establishments: day schools on the primary and secondary levels, complementary religious schools, and complementary non-Orthodox schools.

These schools have been praised by Jewish and non-Jewish personalities for their organization and system of teaching, particularly by leaders of the Jewish Agency who visited them. It is important to point out that both the full-time schools and the complementary schools function every day and are not merely Sunday schools.

We believe that the problem cannot be settled through symposia or with theoretical resolutions, but through financial aid, for which world Jewish organizations should make important sums available.

With regard to both the members of the second generation and the small children, we believe that the effective way to fight assimilation is through culture and, added to that, the active participation of young people in the leadership of local and world Jewish institutions, so that they may come to live, vibrate, and deeply understand the Jewish problems which we face today — the Jewish problem in the USSR, the Arab-Jewish conflict, the issues surrounding relations between Germans and Jews, and many other questions.

As a representative of the Sephardic community of my country, I am of the opinion that we must once and for all abolish all differences

between Ashkenazim and Sephardim, German Jews and Hungarian Jews, and so on. These are archaic distinctions. We must achieve total unity, because the Jewish people is one single people, and I firmly believe that this unity will be achieved through education in common.

Before closing, I would like to demand that the Congress give greater attention to the Latin American countries. A Jewish community should not be considered as a function of the geographic area of the country in which it lives. I say this because my country, Uruguay, although it is small in size, contains a Jewish community which is great in quantity and quality and which plays an important role in the Jewish world.

Mr. SHIMON AVIZEMER (*Israel*): Before I left Israel for this Assembly I was asked what it was all about. I would like to repeat here my answer: it is about the problems of Jewish life today. In other words, it is about securing the Jewish future. This Assembly has to provide the answer as to how we achieve this goal. Various aspects of Jewish life have been thoroughly discussed, and the debate on Germany was a particularly valuable and impressive experience.

It has already been stated that the dangers from within are greater than the dangers from without. Assimilation, the acceptance of anti-Semitism without a struggle, intermarriage, and lack of Jewish roots are some of the internal dangers. Of course, the best solution, the ultimate one, would be *aliya*, but I realize that we have not reached that stage. You will recall the question posed by Yehuda Halevi in his *Kuzari*: "You pray every day for the return to Zion; why don't you go there?" He answers: "This is the weakness of my argument, my shame and my disgrace."

However, we must accept things as they are. But even in the present situation we can all still learn Hebrew, and I do not mean just a superficial knowledge of the language that even non-Jews can attain. We could also pay much more attention to the young. At least we could tell them what we are doing. Finally, we could make more use in our educational programs of the existence of the State of Israel. It is said that Zion will be a light unto the nations; we must make sure in the first place that it is a light to the Jews in the Diaspora.

Dr. BRUNO KAPLAN (*Sweden*): In the course of the last few days, we have listened to highly intellectual lessons on cultural issues. We have also listened to a cultural discussion in very abstract terms. I am going to deal with three problems from a very practical point of view: education of the majority about minority groups and of minority groups about other minority groups; finances; and language.

I live in Sweden, a country with about 7,000,000 citizens, of whom about 500,000 people, coming from other countries, belong to various minority groups. There are only 14,000 Jews. It is quite clear to us that the Jews will continue to exist as the typical minority group, whatever

changes may occur in the economic, social, or political situation in Sweden.

We in the Swedish Section of the World Jewish Congress contacted the Swedish Board of Education and discussed with them what could be done in the educational field regarding the question of minorities. A committee was set up, consisting of five members of the Board of Education and myself as the Jewish representative. In connection with our work, articles on minority issues have been published in newspapers and teachers' periodicals, and discussions have been held with authors of textbooks on history, biology, sociology, and other subjects. In view of the importance of the question of minorities, we have started education on the subject in Jewish schools.

Every community leader concerned with culture knows that finances are a big problem. We came to the conclusion that new ways had to be found to finance our education. As citizens of a democratic state, we started negotiations with the political parties, with the state, and with the municipalities. We have tried to explain to them that the Jewish day school and complementary schools are not only concerned with educating the young in religious matters, but also help them find their identity as Jews, and that they will not feel at home in Swedish society and will not become suitable and valuable citizens if they do not feel at home in their Jewish group. We have to some extent been successful: the state and municipal authorities are now supporting our day school, a special committee on minority schools has been created, and we hope to obtain support for our complementary schools as well.

With regard to the language problem, much has been said here about Hebrew and Yiddish. It was emphasized that all community leaders should know and speak Hebrew. Most of us here are community leaders, elected not on account of our knowledge of languages, but for other reasons. I, who am in charge of our school, have to be satisfied if our children are taught to read Hebrew and the siddur and to understand some of it. One of the speakers in the debate remarked that thousands of Jewish intellectuals in America, France, Britain, and elsewhere had to be enlightened on Jewish matters. These intellectuals have to know at least two foreign languages, in addition to their mother tongue, in order to communicate with other intellectuals. Although it would be very good if they could also speak Hebrew and Yiddish, it is not realistic to demand it of them. I would conclude by pointing out that the language in which something is said is not as important as the message itself.

Mr. SAMUEL SCHWARZ (*Switzerland*): I was disappointed to find nothing in the agenda on the report of World Jewish Congress activities, and no discussion on its adoption by the Assembly. As a result, the debates have been rather unrestricted. I feel that such a procedure is necessary if the World Jewish Congress wants to be a parliament of

Jewry. If we do not do this, then we are a debating club, not a parliament. I hope that the Commission on Organization will make the necessary preparations on this question for the next Assembly.

I am also disappointed by the many discussions that have taken place on such subjects as peace, disarmament, human rights, and Vietnam. With King Solomon, I would like to say that by exerting ourselves in order to talk about everything possible, we are putting aside the consideration of our own worries. It does not make any sense, if we have come together from fifty countries, to spend most of our time on problems which are important but which certainly are not for us to solve, and thereby neglect our own problems.

You should also be aware that you will not entice the young generation by arranging symposia which are very interesting, but which offer them the same subjects that are available — and perhaps even better — at the universities. In this case, why should the youth come to us?

And now, some positive observations. I was deeply impressed by the statements of our president, Dr. Goldmann, and particularly by the speech of Mr. Itzhak Korn. As Mr. Korn rightly said, we need an education that is consistent with a Jewish home. In my eyes, the fact that this was said *here*, and by *him*, is somewhat revolutionary.

Dr. Goldmann remarked that religion must not be the private reserve of Orthodoxy. This is very true, and no adherent of Orthodoxy ever would deny it. But if one wants to carry on Jewish religion, it must be *the* Jewish religion. There exists no Jewish religion of the World Jewish Congress or of Dr. Nahum Goldmann, but only the religion of the Torah. One must be clear about it if one includes discussions on Jewish religion in the deliberations of the Congress.

The heart of the matter is that we must provide for Jewish education in the home, and this can be achieved only through day-to-day work. It has become the fashion today "to be a Jew outside, but not at home." One should be a Jew at home as well as abroad. One can only participate in the World Jewish Congress if one draws the appropriate consequences at home and does not send one's children to non-Jewish schools. If we follow the consequences of our Jewish involvement, then we shall produce a new generation for future Assemblies. If we do not, then things will not change and next time we will have more graybeards instead of young people.

RABBI Dr. S.Z. KAHANA (*Israel*): As I was listening to the debate here, I came to the conclusion that there is really no dialogue between Israel and the Diaspora, but a monologue, with each side saying the same thing. It is like the story about the five cantors who simultaneously recited Kol Nidre on Mount Zion, each of them using his own *nigun*. But the people heard one single voice; it was the same Kol Nidre. Similarly, there is absolute identity — at least in this

generation — between Israel and the Diaspora. This common identity exists throughout Jewry, and my recent successful experience in Iran — an Israeli Ashkenazic rabbi, originally from Warsaw, working with one of the oldest Sephardic communities in the world — is further testimony to this fact.

This common identity would become even more evident if the forms of Jewish community life were similar the world over. It would be an idea for the World Jewish Congress, together with the Jewish Agency and appropriate ministries of the Israeli government, to undertake this work, using Israeli communal organization as a model; the sooner this task is undertaken, the better. In this connection, I approve of the suggestion made by a previous speaker to have rabbis and leaders go from community to community to organize Jewish life.

We have great spiritual treasures but they are locked up, as it were. It is time we took them out and used them to inspire Jews and to guide them into the future.

Dr. LAVOSLAV KADELBURG (*Yugoslavia*): Cultural activities comprise the main task that we in Yugoslavia have undertaken in order to keep the Jewish character of our life. In the last few years our program of cultural activities has developed in all aspects.

In the work concerning children and youth, great efforts have been made and results achieved in kindergartens and youth clubs. Most important is the intensification of activities in the youth clubs, which exist in ten of the larger communities. Numerous meetings and lectures are arranged, and a continuous cultural program carried out in these clubs. Frequent meetings between youth clubs and seminars for club leaders have contributed to the appearance of new active young people. This is of particular importance for some smaller communities that have not had youth clubs up to now.

The results of this intensified youth work have also been evident in our yearly summer camps, with an exceptionally high number of young people engaged as instructors and youth leaders working with children. In addition, our regularly published youth magazine, *Kadimah*, has an increasing number of collaborators from all clubs. This year we had a sports competition, the Maccabiad, in which all the clubs participated with great enthusiasm.

One of our most serious tasks is the preparation of cultural programs for the summer camps. As the camps are divided into three groups according to age, a cultural program must be prepared for each age-group and adjusted to the wishes and suggestions of the youth. The participation of *madrichim* from Israel and of young Jewish people from a number of other countries constitutes a valuable contribution to the cultural activities.

Great care is devoted to further improve our youth work. We have only one trained teacher who works directly with the

clubs, helping them to plan and carry out their programs.

Every year we send a number of young people from all the clubs to attend a summer seminar at Kibbutz Gat in Israel. Before leaving Yugoslavia, they get some basic knowledge of Hebrew, in order to make their first contacts easier.

The libraries in our communities are regularly supplied with new editions of publications of Jewish interest. In this effort they have the full support of the Federation of Jewish Communities in Yugoslavia. The Federation also gets copies of all new publications for its library and regularly supplies the other libraries with Jewish periodicals. We have two Jewish choirs, one in Belgrade and the other in Zagreb. Thanks to their frequent concerts, Jewish music and folklore are becoming popular throughout Yugoslavia. These choirs also take part in the Zimriya in Israel and in festivals and concerts in various European countries.

The Jewish Historical Museum in Belgrade is now under reconstruction and, for the moment, no exhibits are on display there. However, it continues to collect and work on historical material at an undiminished pace.

The publication of cultural material is a very important part of our work. Our journal, the *Jewish Review*, appears regularly. I have already mentioned our youth magazine *Kadimah*. We also publish a *luach* every year. Our main publication is the *Jewish Almanac*, which appears every other year and has a rich Jewish content. Besides these regular publications, we publish books in the language of the country on Jewish history, literature, et cetera.

The everyday work of the Federation has shown the need for the preparation of a Jewish Guidebook for Yugoslavia, which will contain, in addition to general data on the communities, a survey of the historical and cultural monuments. The preparations are already in an advanced stage and the actual composition of the text will be started soon.

This year we are preparing two important Jewish celebrations, the first of which is the inauguration of the new Jewish center in Skopje, dedicated to the memory of the late Professor Albert Vajs. This cultural center for Macedonian Jewry was rebuilt with the support of the Standing Conference and of the Macedonian authorities after the tragic earthquake of 1963, as a sign of general brotherhood and the equality of the Jews with other nationalities in our country. Another big celebration is to be held in Sarajevo to commemorate the 400th anniversary of the settlement of Jews in Bosnia.

Jewish organizations and communities from all over the world are invited to attend these celebrations; we hope to have with us on those occasions many Jews from West and East. I am very glad to have the opportunity to invite the members of this Assembly to take part in

these meetings, which will offer a particularly good occasion for talks with brothers from all over the world.

In the last few months, we have established good and fraternal cultural collaboration with Jewish organizations in such socialist countries as Rumania, Hungary, Poland, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia.

We do not have enough trained people for our cultural work, but we hope that we shall have the possibility to train some of our youngsters as professionals in Jewish educational work.

Thanks to the support received from the World Jewish Congress, the Memorial Foundation, the Standing Conference of European Jewish Community Services, the Jewish Agency, and the Joint, our work will continue to be fruitful and prosperous.

PROFESSOR RAPHAEL MAHLER (*Israel*): I do not think it necessary for me to explain why I have chosen to speak in Yiddish. We must keep and cherish the Yiddish language, for it is one of the factors of Jewish existence in the world today.

The very fact that a large part of the debates at this Assembly of world Jewry is devoted to the question of the nature of Judaism — its ideas, ideals, and values — is an indication that we Jews have not yet achieved normalcy in our national existence. I envy nations such as the French, for although it would never occur to anyone to deliberate on the nature of “Frenchdom” or “Frenchism,” nobody would deny the enormous role of the French people in universal culture. No nation possesses its own ideals. Ideals and values are universal; and national culture is the prism through which they are reflected, in accordance with the historical development, national character, and psychology of the nation. The same holds true for the Jewish people.

Some sixty years ago, Simon Dubnow — in contrast to Aḥad Ha’am — described the nation or the religious group as the antithesis of mankind. It is time that we did away with this dilemma concerning Jewishness and mankind.

If we cherish Jewish achievements, it is not because they reflect any exclusively Jewish ideas, but only because they are Jewish accomplishments and because we are Jews and love our people and culture. The heroic struggle of the sons and daughters of the Jewish people in our War of Liberation in Israel has, like Alexander’s sword, cut the Gordian knot of speculation and debate concerning Jews and Jewishness. Today we can say that we are a nation among nations, with our home in the old-new land of Israel. This is a tremendous historical achievement. Our abnormality with regard to other peoples is today essentially a quantitative one, as long as the large majority of our people is to be found outside the homeland. The more we continue with the historical process of *aliya* and the ingathering of the exiles, the more we will succeed in our efforts to complete the normalization of our people.

The tendency to set Judaism apart on the basis of unique ideas and ideals is basically a mystification that impedes our great historical task of gathering in the exiles; such a metaphysical theory can only lead to the theory of the Jewish "mission," which — consciously or not — serves as a justification for *galut* and provides the best Jewish young people with an argument for separating themselves from their own people. Of course Jewishness means concern for such causes as peace and human rights, because Jewishness is at the same time humanitarianism. But Jewishness and Judaism are something more: they comprehend the national character of the Jewish people. The visions of the Prophets portrayed the Jewish people as a light unto the nations, but only when it returned to its own land, and not as a wandering missionary among other peoples. The Jewish religion is a national religion par excellence; and it is an absurd contradiction to try to use it today as a substitute for the national content in Jewish life.

Far be it from me to agitate against religion: those who are religious by conviction should by all means keep it. But religion should not be seen as the safeguard for Jewish existence. Quite the contrary, for Jewish religion in the Diaspora is today going through the severest of crises, precisely because we are living in the historic period of the realization of the dreams of generations. How paradoxical and hollow it is to hear Jews pray to be taken back to their land, when the gates of Israel are open and the voyage only a matter of hours.

The valid task of preserving Jewish culture and preventing assimilation cannot be viewed in isolation from all the other aspects of the Jewish question, including the socioeconomic and political. The socioeconomic situation of Diaspora Jewry has never been more abnormal, nor its political situation more insecure, than now. Just as the Jewish question is a single one in all its aspects, so is the solution a single one: the territorial concentration of the Jewish people in its own state. Our future can be secured only if we take our destiny in our own hands, and this is possible only in our own sovereign land. The Psalmist promised the Jewish people eternity not in Stockholm or Los Angeles, but in Zion.

Unquestionably, the only task at the moment is to strengthen Jewish culture in the Diaspora; this cultural work will have meaning and success, however, only if it is permeated with a national outlook. The great tragedy of Jewish culture in the Soviet Union, even in its heyday, was that it was devoid of such an outlook. We will not win the students, the youth, and the intellectuals with formulas about the Jewish content of Judaism, but rather by showing them that assimilation is illusory, opportunistic, and absurd, as well as a denial of oneself and a desertion of one's problem-beset people. Assimilation must be contrasted with the positive ideal of the necessary upbuilding of one's people and land. It goes without saying, of course, that we will attract our youth

to the extent that the State of Israel develops in a progressive way.

There is no doubt that the most effective instrument for assuring Jewish existence in the Diaspora is Jewish education, and this area must receive the greatest attention of the communities. Jewish education must take place on all the levels covered by general education — from kindergarten to university. Otherwise a feeling may result that Judaism is inferior. Emphasis should not be placed on language — however important we may consider it to be — but on knowledge of the Jewish people and its culture in our day and in the past. The point of departure, however, should be the present, as we want to carry on the *goldene keyt* of the past and we also want to prepare the child for his role in today's human society. The goal of Jewish education should be emotionally and spiritually to prepare the child to fulfill his duty to his people, that is, to undertake *aliya*.

The effort for Jewish culture and education represents a struggle for our very existence. The more aware we are of this great historical responsibility, the better able we will be to overcome the great difficulties that lie ahead.

Mr. ISAAC POUATCH (*France*): I am somewhat of a phenomenon: there has been talk here of youth and graybeards, of Israel and the *gola*, of Sephardim and Ashkenazim, of Hebrew and Yiddish — well, I belong to all of them together. All of them are very dear to me. You have no idea how much the simple fact of hearing all this discussed among Jews warms my heart.

I am involved in cultural work in French and Yiddish in France. It is a veritable crime to say that our entire youth is leaving us. In my work, I encounter them everywhere, and I can tell you that it is sufficient, if we want to reach them and have them with us, to speak to them in their own language when passing on our tradition to them. At this Assembly as well, one can see the enthusiasm with which the young people approach their responsibilities; we must encourage them, for the spark is there.

When asked to define Judaism, a Hassidic rabbi once said: "Judaism is when a Jew somewhere suffers, and, across the sea, another Jew feels this suffering." Having come here from fifty different countries, but all with the same aspirations, we are a reflection of that Judaism.

Mr. A. LEON GELLMAN (*World Mizrachi and Hapoel Hamizrachi Organization*): I would like to react very briefly to what Professor Nathan Rotenstreich said here. He deserves a more thorough reply, which he will receive from us on another occasion.

First of all, the dragging in of the cultural problem here is a clear breach of the agreement we had with the leaders of the American Jewish Congress and the leaders of the World Jewish Congress. The reason for the agreement was that cultural problems are liable to cause a split. Dr. Rotenstreich's speech is a good example of what I mean,

because what he said is painful to religious Jews, and even to national-minded Jews.

The task of the World Jewish Congress was to abolish political anarchy among Jews, such as private delegations to the pope on the eve of Yom Kippur. Such anarchy is harmful to the Jewish people. We came here to discuss how to abolish it in order to preserve Jewish unity, and not to have a cultural discussion for which the Congress is quite unsuited.

Dr. Rotenstreich said — I am commenting on it only in passing — that a secular Jew cannot accept halakha as the basis of Jewish life. The basis of halakha is absolute rectitude and justice, and even secular Jews have to accept this fact. I would like to recall an essay by Bialik called "Halakha and Agada," in which he says that halakha is the crown of civilization. It seems some professors of the Hebrew University have never read this essay.

The World Jewish Congress was founded to protect Jewish rights. The Congress is essential, and we support it fully. Let us not endanger our unity by bringing secularism and foreign ideas to this platform.

Mr. PAUL GOLDMAN (*USA*): We have had this sort of debate at our meetings for at least two decades, and I regret to say that neither side has managed to convince the other. In fact we have all lost: both the religious sector and the secular sector have lost the youth.

The Congress having decided to deal with the cultural side of Jewish existence, we should approach the matter sensibly and not fight among ourselves. In the United States, where almost half of our people lives, we encourage the various elements to deal with the problem in their own way. The question should be dealt with by a special commission of the Congress. Our principal interest should be how to keep our young people with us.

Jewish youth in America is capable of idealism, as can be seen by the fact that the overwhelming majority of applicants for the Peace Corps is Jewish. Indeed, it reached a point where the number of Jews accepted had to be limited, so as to allow other elements a chance as well. The question is: Why does American Jewish youth not identify with *our* ideals? Perhaps it is because we are too complacent.

Rabbi Prinz' description of the Presidents' Conference encourages such feelings of self-satisfaction among Jews. I wish his description were true. I am not saying that he was trying to mislead us; I am only saying that the Presidents' Conference is a name with no substance. Similarly, the American Section of the World Jewish Congress is not a proper instrument for our important cultural work; for, despite the impressive size of the American delegation here, the American Section is, in fact, nonexistent. This should not be so.

Dr. MOSES CYRUS WEILER (*Israel*): We have heard many pessimistic views about the position of Jewish culture and the future of

the Jewish people. The only answer is pure and simple study. Study will result in Jewish consciousness and unity. Of course, we cannot all achieve the same level of knowledge, and this was recognized by Maimonides, among others. I am convinced that only those who study and go to our sources can be true leaders of the Jewish people. Dr. Goldmann remarked in his eulogies for the departed that they were irreplaceable. Only Jewish learning can answer this problem.

As to the ecumenical conference, I see no reason why we should not attend it, for things have changed in the world. But only those Jews who possess a deep Jewish knowledge are qualified to treat with the non-Jews on these matters.

We have the Jewish state and we are proud of it, but we must realize that not all Jews want to come to Israel. The least they can do is to foster Jewish learning in the Diaspora. In the last sixty or seventy years we have had too much listening to lectures, and not enough real study.

Mr. PERCY S. GOURGEY (*Great Britain*): As Lord Sieff said in his address in the cultural debate, Jewish education, although slow and unspectacular, is a vital ingredient of Jewish survival. It is most important to transmit these cultural values, through religious ideas and practices. Jewish religious and cultural values represent the quintessence of Jewish nationalism. Indeed, they form Jewish nationalism in all its pristine glory, free from alien interference of any kind.

It is imperative that there should be an exchange of information on the Jewish cultures, folklore, and customs of the different sections of world Jewry. This is most essential for national integration. Thus, in Israel, immigrants from Oriental countries bring with them their respective cultures, particularly the immigrants who come from countries like Morocco, Iraq, and Iran. By virtue of the fact that they have lived with the Arabs for so many generations, they are well prepared to deal with the Arabs when there will be a possibility of peace between Israel and the Arab states.

About two weeks ago, King Hussein of Jordan addressed a public meeting in London, and I asked him a question relating to Jewish refugees from Arab countries and Arab refugees who are in Jordan. He gave a constructive and moderate reply, saying that the problem of the refugees was not only a Jordanian problem, although they were trying to settle them as best as they could. It was a world problem, he said, and it was necessary for public opinion to make its influence felt in order to try and get a just and honorable solution for all sides. I think that we should take serious note of this attitude and try to make use of the cultural background of the Oriental immigrants in Israel to improve our relations with the Arab world.

There is, however, no doubt that as far as Jews are concerned, the most important thing is that they get to know each other, to get to

know the various communities, and in this way achieve the essential ideal of *mizug ha'edot*.

Mr. MOSHE EREM, MK (*Israel*): During the past week a great deal of pain-ridden discussion has taken place about assimilation and the dangers attending it. Perhaps we should start the fight against assimilation right here. We have two national languages — Hebrew and Yiddish — but most speeches have been delivered in English. Self-esteem should have dictated a different attitude to our two languages.

Concerning the oft-cited danger of assimilation, I think that actually you are more worried about the yearning for assimilation than about assimilation itself. There is a limit to assimilation — a limit that is imposed by the non-Jews in one way or another. But there is no limit to the illusion of some Jews that they can fully assimilate.

One of the remedies that is proposed to us is what is called "Jewishness" — a bit of tradition. Such a remedy is valid for a believing Jew. But mere lip service to tradition is no remedy at all. We are told that Alexander Yannai pointed out to his wife Salome Alexandra: "Never fear the Pharisees and never fear the Sadducees, but beware of the hypocrites." Dr. Goldmann spoke of a "way back." But does he practice it himself? Will anyone practice it? There exists no greater danger for us than hypocrisy in Jewish life.

I see only one remedy: the all-permeative influence of Israel. *Aliya* is the ideal solution; I do not, however, expect the millions of Jews throughout the world to pick themselves up and come to Israel. But at least send us your young people for a year or two. Let them come for Sherut La'am; let them spend a year at one of our universities. A year spent in Israel will stay with the student for life. There are between 300,000 and 400,000 Jewish students in the United States. Give us 4000 or 5000 of them for a year in Israel and you will make a breakthrough in the battle against the yearning for assimilation.

Of course, this step will not by itself solve the entire problem; it is only one of the aspects of the general problem of Jewish education. But I want to stress that the child, from elementary school onward, must be inculcated with the ideal of *aliya*, however unhappy this may make his parents. Only thus shall we assure Jewish continuity.

RABBI YEHUDA ELINSON (*USA*): I would like to tell my friend Erem that the problem is not the grown-ups — people like us here — but the children. How do we ensure that they remain Jews? In the countries of the Western world we have neglected Jewish education to a lamentable degree. Today, large numbers of Jewish children receive no Jewish education and the figures for mixed marriage tell their own story. Take France, for instance, where more than 300,000 Jews have immigrated in recent years. Not even 5% of the Jewish children there receive a proper Jewish education. Unless our children start to receive

a Jewish education in kindergarten and continue up to the age of 15, we shall not be doing our duty. You are here today as a result of the Jewish education you received as children.

I too would like to see our young people come to Israel for a year, for two years, and remain there; but we cannot bring them all. If the World Jewish Congress does not realize the primary importance of a thorough Jewish education, I am afraid that — year in, year out — we will lose generations of Jews.

SEVENTEENTH SESSION

August 9, 1966 (morning)

In the Chair: MR. JACQUES ORFUS (*France*)

Dr. GERHART M. RIEGNER: I would like to make an announcement on today's proceedings. We will first take up the report of the Organization Commission, whose resolutions we will discuss and then adopt or reject. We will then adjourn and resume at 3:00 PM, when we will consider the report and the draft resolutions of the Cultural Commission. We hope that, in the second half of the afternoon, we will reach the point where the political resolutions can also be taken up. As there will not be time enough for all of them, we will start with some, leaving the most important ones for the evening session. In the evening, after having taken up the most important political resolutions, we will proceed to the elections.

REPORT AND RESOLUTIONS OF THE ORGANIZATION COMMISSION

Mr. SHAD POLIER (*USA*): I am appearing before you as the rapporteur for the Organization Commission. I would like to advise you that the chairman of the commission was Dr. Kadelburg (*Yugoslavia*); Mr. Burstein (*Israel*) and Mr. Orfus (*France*) were the vice-chairmen. We had the benefit of consultations with Dr. Levenberg, who appeared before the commission on two occasions.

Before presenting the resolutions to you, I want to tell you that there are several other subjects on which there were internal resolutions; the Organization Commission thought it would be more appropriate to refer them to the incoming Executive Committee for its action, and that nothing would be gained by the adoption of these resolutions by this Assembly. One of them deals with the eternal problem of youth and its greater involvement in Jewish affairs; another has to do with a procedure to assure even more opportunity for all delegates at future Assemblies to participate in the discussions; the others consist of similar procedural motions.

I am now going to present to you a series of resolutions calling for action by the Assembly, and I will start with the one on the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations. In the United States, over a period of years, has developed a Conference of American Jewish organizations concerned with international Jewish problems. Its members include all the major Jewish organizations in America except one, which prefers to continue its splendid isolation. There were at this Plenary Assembly several representatives of this Conference, as observers and fraternal delegates. The resolution proposed by the Organization Commission reads as follows:

**RESOLUTION ON THE CONFERENCE OF PRESIDENTS
OF MAJOR AMERICAN JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS**

The Fifth Plenary Assembly notes with great satisfaction developments within American Jewry which have led to the creation of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations as a conference of organizations representing the overwhelming majority of American Jewry concerned with international Jewish problems. An instrument has thus been established which augurs well for the future relationship between the World Jewish Congress and the largest Jewry in the world. The World Jewish Congress heartily welcomes the representative group of observers that attended the meetings of its Assembly.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

Mr. POLIER then read the

**RESOLUTION ON COOPERATION WITH THE
WORLD ZIONIST ORGANIZATION**

The Fifth Plenary Assembly notes with deep satisfaction the decision of the 26th Zionist Congress regarding close cooperation between the two world organizations without affecting the complete autonomy of either.

The Assembly sees in this decision of the Zionist Congress an important opportunity for joint activity for the unity and advancement of the Jewish people.

The Executive Committee of the World Jewish Congress is hereby urged to establish the necessary machinery in order to implement such cooperative efforts.

The Assembly welcomes the presence of representatives of the World Zionist Organization as observers on various bodies of the Congress and their participation in Congress activities.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

Mr. POLIER submitted the

RESOLUTION ON THE JEWISH COMMUNITIES OF EASTERN EUROPE

The Fifth Plenary Assembly warmly welcomes the participation in its deliberations of representatives of several Eastern European Jewish communities as well as increased contact and cooperation between the World Jewish Congress and these communities.

The Assembly requests the Executive Committee to ensure that these contacts shall be maintained, strengthened, and extended to all Eastern European Jewish communities.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

Mr. POLIER then presented the

RESOLUTION ON THE UNITY OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE

The Fifth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress, assembled in Brussels, with the participation of representatives of fifty-four Jewish communities from all continents, on the thirtieth anniversary of its foundation, proclaims that the unity of the Jewish people within the framework of one organized body remains a vital necessity for the security of Jewry, now and in the future.

The Assembly considers that Jewish existence and the effectiveness of the struggle for the rights and for the security of the Jewish people depend essentially on the internal organization of individual Jewish communities and on their efforts to deepen Jewish consciousness.

It calls upon the leaders of all Jewish communities in the world where kehilot exist to strengthen these vital organs of democratic Jewish life. The Assembly urges that where Jewish community life is organized on any other basis, every effort be made to promote the establishment of central representative Jewish bodies.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

Mr. POLIER: I turn now to proposed changes in the Constitution of the World Jewish Congress and I will deal first with the matters that are not merely changes in language, but in structure.

The present Constitution, in Article 8, states that "the Executive Committee conducts the affairs and acts on behalf of the World Jewish Congress, in accordance with the decisions of the Plenary Assembly, through the officers of the World Jewish Congress and such committees and other subsidiary organs as the Executive Committee may establish from time to time."

As you know, the 1948 Plenary Assembly in Montreux authorized

the Executive Committee to conduct the affairs of what was then known as the branches. The Israeli, North American, and European branches were authorized to carry on the work between the annual meetings of the Executive Committee. Experience proved that some coordination was necessary between these branches during the yearly intervals. Therefore an informal Coordinating Committee was set up, consisting of one representative of each branch, to meet together more frequently. As time went on and particularly as the Latin American community became more organized, more strongly bound to the World Jewish Congress, and more active, a fourth section of the World Jewish Congress was created — the Latin American Branch. This made it all the more necessary that there be, between the annual or twice-yearly meetings of the Executive Committee, some machinery so that the representatives of these various branches should meet together and work upon problems that could not wait for the meeting of the Executive. Thus the Coordinating Committee evolved into what was called the Administrative Committee. Time again proved that something stronger was needed, and during the past year a body called the Governing Council was created.

In effect, the Governing Council has for a year been a subcommittee of the Executive Committee, plus the important key members of the staff of the organization, who have met together at least every three or four months for the purpose, not merely of discussing, but of carrying on the work of the Executive Committee. In my opinion, in the opinion of the Organization Commission and, I believe, in the opinion of the leaders of the Congress, this has been a very welcome development. It means that the Executive Committee is in operation continuously, or as continuously as is possible in an organization of this size. One might say that this is a great deal of power to give to a subcommittee. As a matter of fact, if you do not give this power to a subcommittee that is broadly representative of the Executive Committee, then you give the power to the officers or to the staff.

We thought — and experience has proved us right — that this would be an effective instrumentality, both for the purpose of arriving at decisions on important matters and of creating a representative body, acting between sessions of the Executive Committee. All this has been done quite legally, under the authority of the provision that I quoted to you. However, it was felt that, in view of the significance of the organ called the Governing Council, it was only fair that the matter be brought before this body for approval. It is quite sound, in our opinion, that a committee or council of this character should have its authority spelled out in the Constitution itself. Therefore, the Organization Commission proposes to add to Article 8 a section which will read as follows:

"The Executive Committee is authorized to establish a Governing

Council, to designate its members, and to empower it to conduct the affairs and act on behalf of the Executive Committee between sessions of the Executive."

This means that the Executive Committee at its meeting will determine the composition of the Governing Council for the following year, or until the Executive Committee meets again. It further means, in practice, that certain representatives, officers, branch people, heads of commissions, et cetera will constitute the Governing Council, together with the heads of key departments. The Executive Committee will have the authority at any meeting to change the composition if it finds that the Governing Council would work better with a different composition or that it should have less authority. The power will remain in the hands of the Executive Committee, which comprises almost 150 members, consisting largely of representatives elected in the local communities. The business will be carried on by the Governing Council, responsible to the Executive Committee.

The amendment was adopted unanimously.

Mr. POLIER: I now turn to Article 11 of the Constitution, in which the Organization Commission is recommending certain changes. These changes, as you will see, provide for an increased number of officers, less than half of whom would be elected by the Plenary Assembly, and the others by the Executive Committee. In dealing with such delicate matters, the Organization Commission has been in consultation not only with the president of the World Jewish Congress, but also with the Presidium; both of them have approved the recommendations.

The amended version of Article 11 reads as follows [*amended portions in italics*]:

"1. The officers of the World Jewish Congress shall be the president; *one or more honorary vice-presidents; one or more vice-presidents; the chairmen of the branches of the Executive Committee; one or more vice-chairmen of each branch of the Executive Committee; the chairman of the Governing Council; the chairmen of the Commission on International Affairs, of the Cultural Commission, and of the Budget and Finance Commission, and the chairmen of such other standing commissions as the Executive Committee may establish; the treasurer and one or more co-treasurers; and the secretary-general.*

2. *The Plenary Assembly shall elect the president, the honorary vice-presidents, the vice-presidents, the chairmen of the branches of the Executive Committee, and the secretary-general.*

3. *The Executive Committee shall elect the chairman of the Governing Council, the chairmen of the standing commissions, the treasurer and the co-treasurers, and, on the recommendation of the branches, the vice-chairmen of the branches of the Executive Committee.*

4. A vacancy in any office shall be filled by the Executive Committee."

By way of explanation, the provisions for one or more honorary vice-presidents and vice-presidents are intended to adapt the Constitution to current practice in the Congress. The addition of the chairman of the Governing Council as an officer of the Congress follows from the decision, which the Assembly just adopted, constitutionally to establish the Governing Council to carry on the business of the Executive Committee between sessions. Heretofore, the only commission chairman to be an officer was the chairman of the Budget and Finance Commission. It is now proposed that he be joined by the chairmen of the Commission on International Affairs and the Cultural Commission. As we cannot foresee what developments will occur between now and the next Assembly, it is proposed to authorize the Executive Committee to establish other commissions, whose chairmen would also be officers of the Congress. Finally, there is the new office of secretary-general. The secretary-general, unlike the other persons I have mentioned, devotes himself full time to the work of the Congress. It is the feeling of the Commission — a feeling shared by the Presidium — that not only the current secretary-general, but whoever in the future occupies this important position of coordination between the branches, between the staff and the officers, and between the Executive Committee and the Governing Council, should have the status and the authority of being an elected officer.

Mr. A. L. EASTERMAN (*Director, International Affairs Department, World Jewish Congress, London*): I had no knowledge whatsoever of these changes in the Constitution, which I regard as an omission, considering the fact that I and my immediate colleagues have been intimately connected with Congress work and development for the past thirty years. I would have regarded it as a matter of simple courtesy if we had had the opportunity of expressing an opinion — which need not necessarily have been accepted — on these changes.

Until now, heads of departments have been elected by the Executive Committee and became members of the Executive Committee. I note that the heads of departments are eliminated in these new changes. As head of a department, I therefore do not know where I stand — whether I am now to be elected, selected, or appointed, and by whom.

Mr. POLIER: I am sorry that, in concentrating on the changes in Article 11, I neglected to refer to Article 9, paragraph 2, which describes the full members of the Executive Committee. Article 9, paragraph 2(a), in order to accord with the changes in Article 11, would read as follows: "*the officers elected under Article 11.*" Paragraph 2(b) of Article 9, however, remains entirely unchanged, and continues to describe, as full members of the Executive Committee, "holders of other offices so designated by the Plenary Assembly or the Executive Committee." The Executive Committee has for many years designated department heads — by virtue of their office, and not *ad personam* — as

members of the Executive Committee. The proposed constitutional changes would in no way affect their status as full members of the Executive Committee; this was confirmed during the Presidium's review of these proposed changes last night. The one and only change was the unanimous recommendation of the Organization Commission that the position of secretary-general be filled by the Plenary Assembly.

Mr. EASTERMAN: I am much obliged to Mr. Polier for his explanation, but I cannot say that I am particularly satisfied with it. The proposed change results in considerable differences in what I will call hierarchy. It is one thing to be an elected member of the Executive Committee; it is quite another thing to be excluded from the officers of the World Jewish Congress — and that is what this new clause does. The officers referred to in the proposed new version of Article 11, paragraph 1 — that is, the hierarchy of the World Jewish Congress — consist of what is known in Britain as honorary officers, with one exception. I do not object to that, except that it would seem to me rather to complicate unduly the machinery of the Congress; it has functioned quite well in the past, and I see no reason why it should not do so in the future. An unnecessary distinction has been created as regards heads of departments, a distinction which has implications that are undesirable and unsatisfactory.

Mr. POLIER: The possibility of the argument that was just advanced was fully considered by the Organization Commission and the Presidium. It was felt that the function of the secretary-general was not that of a department head. For better or for worse, the secretary-general has the responsibility of being, among other things, the aide-de-camp of the president; and he has the responsibility of keeping all the branches fully informed. When one has had, and still has, so many distinguished people, it is very difficult to make such a departure; but it was felt that it was necessary for the secretary-general's role within the Congress and in connection with other Jewish organizations.

Mr. JACQUES ORFUS, CHAIRMAN: I am somewhat surprised at Mr. Easterman's statement: to my knowledge, he was fully informed about these proposed changes; they were in preparation for over two years before their unanimous adoption by the Organization Commission without any *vetum separatum*.

In reply to a question raised by Ing. GREGORIO FAIGON (*Argentina*), Mr. POLIER stated that there was no real difference between "co-chairman" and "vice-chairman"; the appellation of vice-chairman had been introduced at the suggestion of Dr. Moisés Goldman, as the prefix "co" might be interpreted to imply "equal." The vice-chairmen, Mr. Polier added, would be members of the Executive Committee.

LADY READING (*Great Britain*): I do not like the singling out of

one member of our extremely able and devoted staff. Nothing at all against my friend Dr. Riegner, but, on principle, I feel it is entirely wrong. What happens if the post of secretary-general becomes vacant for some reason? It seems to me quite unrealistic to appoint a very important officer at the Plenary Assembly, and I think it is a fundamental mistake, from the point of view of the whole ideological setup of the Congress.

Mr. POLIER: Once the matter had been clarified, there was not the slightest doubt among the members of the Organization Commission, including the representatives of the British Section, that the secretary-general should be elected to his position. If the position should become vacant for any reason, there is no problem, as the Executive Committee is empowered by Article 11 to fill any vacancy among the officers. As I see it, the real question is whether the secretary-general is an officer who should be elected by the Plenary Assembly or by the Executive Committee.

On behalf of the Organization Commission and the Presidium, I move the adoption of the proposed changes in the Constitution, relating to officers of the Congress.

The motion was put to a vote and adopted.

Mr. POLIER: There are several stylistic changes on which I do not consider it necessary to go into detail. In some places in the Constitution, the word "affiliate" is used, rather than "member"; I assume that we can make the appropriate stylistic changes without going into discussion.

I have another substantive change to submit regarding the Constitution. Article 9, paragraph 4, states: "Honorary members of the Executive Committee shall be such persons as may be elected by the Plenary Assembly." In the past there were eight such honorary members, consisting of Congress veterans or of people of outstanding distinction in their communities or in the world; four of them are still living. The Organization Commission proposes that the power to elect honorary members of the Executive Committee not be suspended for five to seven years at a time, that is, from one Plenary Assembly to the next, and that this power should also be given to the Executive Committee. I therefore move that Article 9, paragraph 4, be amended to read "... elected by the Plenary Assembly *or the Executive Committee.*"

The amendment was adopted unanimously.

Mr. POLIER: I further propose on behalf of the Organization Commission the following resolution:

RESOLUTION ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The present members of the Executive Committee chosen by member organizations shall continue to act as members of the Executive Committee until their successors are appointed.

The vast majority of the members of the Executive Committee are designated by their respective organizations. Unless we adopt the resolution that I have just read to you, the Executive Committee will not be able to meet tomorrow and carry on its necessary business, but will have to wait for months until it receives the mandates from the various organizations, thus resulting in the loss of a year, or until the Executive Committee next meets. I therefore move the adoption of this resolution.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

Mr. POLIER: on the subject of the Governing Council, the Organization Commission proposes the following resolution:

RESOLUTION ON THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

The Fifth Plenary Assembly expresses its satisfaction with the work of the Governing Council during the past year and recommends that it be continued as an effective means of conducting the work of the Executive Committee between sessions of that body.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

Mr. POLIER: I also want to bring to the attention of the Assembly the following matter, of which the Organization Commission was advised by the secretary-general, and which was confirmed by the Presidium.

When the Governing Council meets on a problem concerning a particular country, and no member of the Executive Committee from that country is on the Governing Council, then it will be assured that a representative on the Executive Committee from the country concerned will be invited to participate in the deliberations of that session of the Governing Council.

Mr. ORFUS, as chairman of the session, expressed the Assembly's thanks to Dr. Kadelburg, Mr. Burstein, and Mr. Polier for their hard work.

EIGHTEENTH SESSION

August 9, 1966 (afternoon)

In the Chair: RABBI DR. MORDECAI KIRSHBLUM (*USA*)

1. REPORT AND RESOLUTIONS OF THE CULTURAL COMMISSION

Mr. MOSHE EREM, MK (*Israel*): Mr. Halévy, the rapporteur of the Assembly's Cultural Commission, will present the resolutions to you. As chairman of the commission, I would like to introduce them in general within the context of our deliberations.

The first issue was the danger of assimilation: What are the ways and means to fight it as well as to ensure the continued existence of the Jew as a man and as a proud member of his people? We then went on to examine the relation between Jewish education and the Jewish home. The third problem, a very important one, was the place of our two national languages, Hebrew and Yiddish, within the framework of Jewish life. It is unfortunate that only the Israel Executive publishes material in Hebrew, and we hope that one day we can all conduct our business in Hebrew.

One of the main problems in our cultural work has been the small budget allocated to cultural work, which does not permit us to implement the important cultural resolutions adopted by all our Assemblies. Even though the last Assembly called on the World Jewish Congress to allocate 20% of its budget to cultural work, this has, in fact, not been implemented. We therefore call upon the coming leadership to see to it that sufficient funds are allocated to all the regional branches for cultural purposes.

After a long discussion, we have unanimously decided to recommend that the headquarters of the Cultural Department be transferred to Israel. We realize that this cannot be done rapidly, but we nevertheless feel that the time has come to recognize the fact that Israel is the spiritual center of world Jewry and that, with the assistance of the Israeli government and the Jewish Agency, the department could further develop there.

And finally, realizing the importance of youth and students for our

future and knowing that although they do not stress their Jewishness to the outside world they are nevertheless thirsty for knowledge on matters Jewish, we should strengthen our efforts and work with youth and students.

Mr. JACOB HALEVY (*Great Britain*): It would have been much preferable were I to speak to you in Hebrew. However, I am afraid that, things being as they are, my speaking Hebrew would have only demonstrative value. Therefore, I am compelled to speak in English.

First of all, I wish to express on behalf of our commission our thanks to our chairman, Mr. Erem. I would like also to thank Professor Neher, and I am deliberately singling him out because he expressed very strongly — as reflected in the Appeal to the Jewish People and the Resolution on Jewish Education — the fact that in the spiritual values of Judaism, there is no place for pessimism, but for optimism; and that there is room for dynamic and revolutionary expression. I would like to thank him for preparing these resolutions entirely in his own words, although with our full approval.

Mr. HALEVY read the

APPEAL TO THE JEWISH PEOPLE

The Fifth Plenary Assembly calls upon the Jewish people to adopt the following fundamental principles in the field of cultural endeavors.

HAPANIM LA'AM — FACE-TO-FACE WITH THE PEOPLE

Deeply concerned by the continuous grave dangers which assimilation and apathy signify for the Jewish people and at the same time profoundly conscious of the numerous signs of revival and reconstruction of Jewish life throughout the dispersion and of the stimulating spiritual forces liberated by the existence and development of the State of Israel, the Assembly calls upon the Jewish people to mobilize all its material and spiritual resources to realize its ideals and preserve its values.

The Assembly, in response to the appeal of the young generation eager for Jewish knowledge and in quest of Jewish orientation, calls on the Jewish people to join in a cultural offensive to meet all the problems the diversity of which constitutes a stimulating challenge for the Jewish people of today.

HAPANIM LA'OLAM — FACE-TO-FACE WITH THE WORLD

In this critical period, when humanity is in search of creative values, the Assembly solemnly declares that the universal content of

traditional, moral, religious, and spiritual Jewish values offers a strong and dynamic impulse in the fight for freedom and human equality.

The Appeal was adopted.

Mr. HALEVY then presented the

RESOLUTION ON JEWISH EDUCATION

The Fifth Plenary Assembly declares that, in order to stem the tide of assimilation and to combat the drift away from Jewish life resulting from ignorance, it is vital that the Congress, the institutions in which it participates, and its member communities and organizations should strengthen their cultural activities.

The Assembly expresses its conviction that only by a comprehensive educational program, including Jewish religious and secular kindergartens, day schools, secondary schools, and supplementary schools, will it be possible to ensure the continuation of Jewishness in the coming generation.

An expanded understanding and use of Hebrew, the language of the Jewish cultural heritage, of the Jewish state, and of the Jewish future, must be a major educational aim. Where the use of Yiddish prevails, it too should be fortified as one of the bastions of Jewish culture.

Educational programs for children and young people must be imbued with a sense of responsibility toward the Jewish people, love of Israel and the Jewish heritage, and personal dedication to the upbuilding and development of the Jewish state.

The rise of the Jewish state gave Jews everywhere a new national dignity. Similarly, Israel's struggle to create a new and just society out of the masses of its new citizens will attract large numbers of young Jews and bring them closer to the orbit of Jewish life.

In reply to a suggestion by CAPTAIN F. ASHE LINCOLN (*Great Britain*) that a reference to Ladino be included in the resolution, Mr. HALEVY declared that, in the context of the resolution, Ladino could not be compared to Hebrew and Yiddish.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. HALEVY put forth the

RESOLUTION ON THE JEWISH HOME AND THE JEWISH SCHOOL

The Fifth Plenary Assembly declares that efforts expended on Jewish education of the young and on building of Jewish schools and other institutions for Jewish studies can have no lasting effect unless they are fully backed by genuinely Jewish home life.

A campaign should be initiated everywhere and on the widest

possible scale to educate the Jewish public to the fact that a Jewish child without a truly Jewish home life is, in the present circumstances of the Diaspora, exposed to assimilation and the danger of losing Jewish identity.

RABBI Dr. MORDECAI KIRSHBLUM, CHAIRMAN, replying to an observation by Mr. SHIMSHON HELLER (USA) that particular types of Jewish education should have been specified in the resolution, explained that although many people had felt just as keenly about the problem as Mr. Heller, a compromise had been necessary. It had been felt, continued Rabbi Kirshblum, that the purpose would be served much better if the resolution spoke in all-inclusive language, rather than particularize.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. HALEVY then presented the

RESOLUTION ON A YOUTH AND STUDENTS COMMISSION

The Fifth Plenary Assembly, conscious of the need to prepare future generations for the responsibilities of Jewish life, urges the member communities and organizations of the Congress to devote their efforts to the education of Jewish youth, and in particular of Jewish students, and at the same time to offer greater opportunities for the active participation of young people in their councils.

The Assembly requests the Cultural Department to assist the cultural work of Jewish youth and student organizations with the aid of a special subcommission to be set up for this purpose and, wherever practicable, in cooperation with the Jewish Agency.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. HALEVY read the

RESOLUTION ON CONFERENCES OF JEWISH INTELLECTUALS

The Fifth Plenary Assembly, concerned by the aloofness of many Jewish intellectuals from the community, notes with satisfaction the activities among Jewish intellectuals through colloquia dealing with their place in the community and with other Jewish issues.

Such colloquia organized under the auspices of the Congress in France, Britain, Argentina, and Israel have attracted many scholars, writers, and university teachers to the community and particularly to the study of lasting Jewish values and contemporary Jewish problems.

The Assembly urges, therefore, the constituent communities and organizations of the Congress to initiate such conferences of intellectuals in their respective countries.

Mr. HALEVY: As the chairman of the British Section, I am very happy to say that we followed France by calling such conferences in the United Kingdom, too, thanks to the efforts of Dr. Roth and Dr. Eppler. The importance of these colloquia cannot be exaggerated. If such conferences could be organized in each country, it might be possible subsequently to have an all-European colloquium. It would be of utmost importance, in order to attract that part of our Jewish intelligentsia which keeps aloof.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. HALEVY read the

RESOLUTION ON YIDDISH CULTURAL ACTIVITIES

The Fifth Plenary Assembly, considering that Yiddish is an invaluable part of the spiritual treasure of the Jewish people, acknowledges the assistance which the Cultural Department has given to cultural work based on the Yiddish language.

The Assembly urges that this work be continued and expanded, and that the department should establish suitable machinery to stimulate and coordinate Yiddish cultural activities.

Following a proposal by PROFESSOR ARYEH TARTAKOWER (Israel) that a reference to Hebrew and the Congress' support of the Brit Ivrit Olamit be added after the words, "... cultural work based on the Yiddish language," it was decided to incorporate such a phrase in the Resolution on the Use of Hebrew and Yiddish in the World Jewish Congress [see below].

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. HALEVY submitted the

RESOLUTION ON THE SEPHARDI COMMUNITIES

The Fifth Plenary Assembly urges member organizations throughout the world to involve and integrate Sephardi and Oriental communities in their cultural and educational activities.

The Assembly notes with satisfaction the development of the Great Metivta in Jerusalem – the institution for the preparation of spiritual guides for Sephardi and Oriental communities in the Diaspora – and urges the Executive Committee to give its full support to this place of learning.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. HALEVY then presented the

RESOLUTION ON DIASPORA WEEKS

The Fifth Plenary Assembly notes with satisfaction the success of the special weeks devoted to various Jewish communities that have been arranged by the Israel Executive. It is of the opinion that the organization of similar "weeks" in other countries could be an important factor in spreading knowledge about Jewish life in other lands and the work of the Congress.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. HALEVY read the

RESOLUTION ON THE WORLD COUNCIL ON JEWISH EDUCATION

The Fifth Plenary Assembly reaffirms the support of the World Jewish Congress for the World Council on Jewish Education and expresses the hope that the recent establishment of administrative machinery will soon enable the Council to implement its aim of promoting, assisting, and coordinating Jewish educational efforts throughout the world.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

Mr. HALEVY read the

RESOLUTION ON THE MEMORIAL FOUNDATION FOR JEWISH CULTURE

The Fifth Plenary Assembly expresses its satisfaction at the establishment of the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture and hopes that the Foundation will become a decisive instrument in strengthening Jewish cultural life and learning.

Taking note of its present activities, the Assembly urges that the Foundation should concentrate on projects of major Jewish cultural importance, among them fostering the training of rabbis and teachers, research, advanced studies, and publication of books of basic importance.

RABBI KIRSHBLUM: We have before us resolutions in regard to the Memorial Foundation and the World Council on Jewish Education. I can understand why, because both of these bodies appeared with reports before the Assembly's Cultural Commission.

I called the attention of the Cultural Commission to the following

facts, and I want to make my observations part of the record by restating them before this plenary session.

We have adopted a resolution, proposed by the Organization Commission, favoring cooperation with the World Zionist Organization. A similar resolution was adopted by the 26th Zionist Congress, about two years ago. Our resolution states that the Plenary Assembly hopes that machinery will be created for such cooperation. I want to say that there is a certain machinery which is already in existence: *hasekhel hayashar*. I also believe that the Cultural Department of the Jewish Agency, which is at present a major factor in the global educational program of the Jewish people, should have been invited to this Assembly to present a report on its activities, in the same way as the World Council on Jewish Education and the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture were invited. This cannot be corrected any longer for this Plenary Assembly, but I would like to call the attention of the leaders of the Congress to correct this oversight in the future.

Replying to a suggestion by Mr. I. NATHANI (*Great Britain*) that the possibility of the Memorial Foundation subsidizing day schools should not be excluded, RABBI KIRSHBLUM said: I think the reply to that is a very simple one: we should not decide what the program of activity of the Keren Hazikaron should be. They have certain bylaws, rules, and regulations.

Mr. HALEVY: The executive director of the Keren Hazikaron/Memorial Foundation gave a very interesting and quite comprehensive review of the work accomplished last year and the possible activities in the future. Its funds are limited to about 800,000 or 900,000 dollars, which is a very, very small sum for worldwide activity.

Prima facie, the Foundation will not support day schools. That is not in its program, and it was realized from the very beginning that it would not be its function. Support of day schools is not precluded for the future, but it is excluded deliberately from the present program of the Foundation.

The resolution was adopted.

A draft resolution on visits to Auschwitz was read; Dr. GOLDMANN informed the Assembly that a similar resolution had been prepared by the Political Commission, whereupon RABBI KIRSHBLUM ruled that it therefore be dropped from the cultural resolutions.

Mr. HALEVY then submitted the

RESOLUTION ON COOPERATION WITH UNESCO

The Fifth Plenary Assembly notes with deep satisfaction the fruitful cooperation between the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and

Cultural Organization and the World Jewish Congress in the period 1959-1966.

This period was marked by the adoption of the Convention against Discrimination in Education, to the initiation and preparation of which the World Jewish Congress Cultural Department made a substantial contribution and which has already been ratified by a considerable number of members of UNESCO.

The World Jewish Congress hopes that the cooperation with UNESCO will be further deepened and intensified for the benefit of both organizations.

The Assembly expresses its gratitude to Dr. A. Steinberg for his invaluable work on behalf of the World Jewish Congress in conjunction with UNESCO.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

Mr. HALEVY next read the

RESOLUTION ON THE CULTURAL DEPARTMENT OF THE CONGRESS

The Fifth Plenary Assembly records its great appreciation of the work performed by the Cultural Department, reaffirms the resolution of the Fourth Plenary Assembly regarding an allocation of 20% of the Congress budget to cultural and educational work, and urges the Executive Committee to take steps toward the earliest possible implementation of this resolution.

The Assembly recommends to the Executive Committee to give full attention to the advisability and practicability of transferring the Cultural Department to Israel.

Mr. HALEVY: I need not remind you that Dr. Goldmann several years ago gave the tone to the emphasis on the educational and cultural work of the World Jewish Congress. This does not mean, of course, that we should drop political activity; indeed, at this Assembly Dr. Goldmann said that we might reemphasize political work. Still, the gravamen of our work is above all cultural and educational renaissance. While realizing the paucity of funds available in the Congress, we in the Cultural Commission felt that every effort should be made to give the maximum possible for cultural work. The Stockholm Assembly mentioned the figure of 20%. There will be no quibbling if it will be 19.9%; the question is the emphasis on the greatest sum possible. The suggestion of transferring the Cultural Department to Israel is, of course, no reflection on any incumbent who may not be residing in Israel.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

Mr. HALEVY presented the

**RESOLUTION ON THE USE OF HEBREW AND YIDDISH
IN THE WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS**

The Fifth Plenary Assembly calls upon all Jews to learn to speak and read Hebrew, asks the Congress to introduce Hebrew as a major language of its activity in all countries, and advocates an increase in the use of both Hebrew and Yiddish as official languages of the Congress. The Assembly invites the various Congress offices, local and central, to prepare a suitable program for the implementation of this resolution.

The Assembly also notes with satisfaction the assistance rendered by the World Jewish Congress to the Brit Ivrit Olamit as the body responsible for the expanded use of Hebrew in the Diaspora.

Mr. HALEVY: the chairman of our commission remarked that if this resolution were to be implemented overnight, all the Congress offices would have to close. Certainly the goals of the resolution are utopian; but precisely because we realize the difficulties, we should emphasize the importance of using every possible means to approach the goals.

The resolution was adopted.

RABBI KIRSHBLUM, as chairman of the session and a member of the Cultural Commission, thanked Mr. Erem for the effective and fair manner in which he had conducted the work of the commission, and Mr. Halévy for his eloquent reporting.

2. REPORT AND RESOLUTIONS OF THE POLITICAL COMMISSION

RABBI Dr. MAX NUSSBAUM (USA), chairman of the Political Commission, explained that he and Mr. Isi Leibler (Australia), the commission's rapporteur, would begin with the noncontroversial resolutions and leave for the evening session those that might provoke discussion. Rabbi Nussbaum began with the

**RESOLUTION ON THE INTERNATIONAL YEAR
FOR HUMAN RIGHTS**

The Fifth Plenary Assembly warmly welcomes the decision of the United Nations General Assembly to designate 1968 as International Year for Human Rights, and requests the officers and member organizations of the Congress, in response to the invitation of the United Nations, to cooperate in the observance of that year on both national and international levels.

The Assembly notes with appreciation that the United Nations General Assembly at its last session invited member states to ratify

conventions already concluded in the field of human rights and decided at the same time to accelerate the adoption of the Draft Covenants on Human Rights and other draft conventions on the elimination of religious intolerance and on freedom of information, in preparation for the International Year for Human Rights.

The Assembly endorses the proposal, unanimously adopted in July by the Tenth General Conference of Nongovernmental Organizations with consultative status with the United Nations Economic and Social Council, on the motion of a number of international NGOs, including the World Jewish Congress, that an ad hoc committee be established to facilitate collaboration among NGOs in the observance of the International Year.

The Assembly expresses the hope that this committee will secure acceptance of the proposal to appoint a United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights as one of the objectives of the International Year, and that it will urge appropriate representation for nongovernmental organizations at the international conference of member states which will be held in 1968 to review achievements in the human rights field since the adoption of the Universal Declaration.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

RABBI NUSSBAUM then read the

RESOLUTION ON THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

The Fifth Plenary Assembly notes with satisfaction the continuing efforts of the Council of Europe to extend the range of application of its Convention on Human Rights and the machinery it has established for the implementation of the rights and freedoms embodied therein.

It earnestly calls on those member governments of the Council of Europe who have not yet done so to ratify without delay the Convention and its protocols and to accept the optional clauses relating to individual petition and to the jurisdiction of the European Court of Human Rights.

The Assembly also records its appreciation that the Council of Europe, during the past two years, in furthering its work for human rights and freedoms has adopted resolutions and recommendations on the following subjects:

- a) the nonapplication of statutory limitations to crimes committed for political, racial, and religious motives before and during the Second World War and, more generally, crimes against humanity;*
- b) the situation of Soviet Jewry;*
- c) legislation against incitement to racial, national, and religious hatred and violence.*

The Assembly appeals to all member governments to support the above resolutions and recommendations and to take early steps to bring them into effect. It urges member organizations to make, where appropriate, further representation to their governments in regard to these resolutions.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

Mr. LEIBLER presented the

RESOLUTION ON ANTI-SEMITISM

The Fifth Plenary Assembly draws attention to the resurgence of anti-Semitic activity in various parts of the world and the development of international organizations, some public and some clandestine, which seek to coordinate the agitation of national groups and to disseminate racist and anti-Semitic material throughout the world.

The Assembly expresses the hope that the governments of the countries in which this racist material is either produced or received will cooperate in preventing this traffic which encourages the subversion of democracy.

The Assembly calls upon all member communities and organizations to maintain a vigilant watch on anti-Semitic groups in their countries, and to keep the headquarters of the Congress informed on such movements and their activities in order that appropriate international action may be taken.

The Assembly also expresses the hope that governments will ratify without delay the convention adopted by the United Nations on the elimination of racial discrimination and, under the provisions of this instrument, will take the necessary steps to curb and outlaw the efforts of anti-Semitic organizations to incite to racist and religious hatred.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

Mr. LEIBLER then submitted the

RESOLUTION ON ENCOUNTERS BETWEEN JEWS AND ARABS

The Fifth Plenary Assembly endorses the proposal that in any country or region where there are both Jews and Arabs, appropriate steps should be taken to facilitate discussions and encounters designed to combat and correct efforts by anti-Jewish groups and movements seeking to undermine Arab-Jewish relations.

The Assembly deplores the activity of certain Arab groups, often working in the closest relationship with blatantly anti-Semitic organizations, to destroy the friendly relations which have for long existed between Jewish and Arab communities in various parts of the

world. It expresses the conviction that frank and informed discussions between representatives of both peoples will contribute to the development of an atmosphere of understanding, and will ultimately be beneficial to the interest of both groups and to the communities in which they live.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. LEIBLER read the

RESOLUTION ON THE 2500TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REIGN OF CYRUS

The Fifth Plenary Assembly has received with great satisfaction a report from the Iranian delegation on the celebration of the 2500th anniversary of the reign of Cyrus and the commemoration of his memorable contribution to human welfare and to the restoration of Jewish life in its historic homeland.

The Assembly calls upon all member communities and organizations to participate in these celebrations in the spirit of the resolution adopted at the last Plenary Assembly in Stockholm.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. LEIBLER then read the draft resolution on the Day of Remembrance. Dr. GOLDMANN suggested that a paragraph be added, stating that the Assembly appreciated what the Polish government had done to memorialize concentration camps. The Assembly also ought to note with satisfaction the decision of the Polish government to erect a Jewish pavilion in Auschwitz.

In the light of Dr. Goldmann's suggestion, the resolution was amended to read:

RESOLUTION ON THE DAY OF REMEMBRANCE

The Fifth Plenary Assembly calls on Jewish communities the world over to hold commemoration meetings in memory of the 6,000,000 Jewish martyrs and in tribute to the heroic ghetto fighters on the 27th of Nissan, proclaimed by the Knesset of Israel as the "Day of Remembrance of the Holocaust and of Heroism" (yom hazikaron lasho'a velagvura).

It also calls upon Jews the world over to organize group visits to former concentration camps which have now become Jewish sanctuaries.

The Assembly places on record its sense of deep appreciation of the action of the Polish government in establishing a Jewish memorial pavilion in the former extermination camp at Auschwitz as well as of its

arrangements to memorialize Jewish victims of the Nazi terror in other camps. This act of homage to the martyred Jews of Europe is deeply appreciated by Jews everywhere. The Assembly hopes that this memorial pavilion and other places of remembrance in the camps will become places of pilgrimage for Jews of all countries, and calls on all member communities and organizations to make appropriate arrangements to encourage such pilgrimages.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

Mr. LEIBLER presented the

RESOLUTION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

The Fifth Plenary Assembly warmly welcomes the renewed efforts of the international community to create instruments for the protection of human rights and the eradication of racist ideologies and religious prejudice.

It regards the unanimous adoption by the United Nations General Assembly of a Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination as marking an important step forward in the struggle to secure universal and effective protection for human rights; and it is gratified that this instrument outlaws incitement to racial hatred and organizations seeking to foment it, and at the same time makes available to the signatory governments effective means of international implementation.

The Assembly welcomes the development and extension of the human rights activity of the Council of Europe, which, by adopting a Convention on and by establishing a Court of Human Rights, has opened up new perspectives for the whole of the international community. The Assembly hopes the precedents set by the Council of Europe will stimulate the creation of similar systems for the protection of human rights in other regions.

The Assembly also welcomes the adoption by the Ecumenical Council of the Roman Catholic Church of a Declaration on Religious Liberty. The implementation of this historic declaration, particularly on the local level, could bring about a radical transformation in the climate of religious opinion and in particular help to eradicate the misuse and degradation of theological doctrine as a justification for discrimination and group hatred.

While those and like measures adopted by international bodies are unreservedly welcomed by the Assembly because of the objectives they embody, their real value must depend on their implementation under international scrutiny, and their faithful application by governments to their domestic situations. The Assembly notes with disquiet that many states have failed to ratify one or other of the human rights conventions

adopted by the United Nations or the Council of Europe. Some have ratified none at all. The United Nations Convention on Genocide, which was adopted in 1948, remains unratified by nearly half the member states, among them not only states with great libertarian traditions but original sponsors and signatories of the convention.

The failure of these powers to ratify conventions which they sponsored or voted for raises some grave questions. The Assembly notes that these states are committed by the Charter to help "to achieve international cooperation in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all." Failure to discharge this Charter obligation not only weakens the system that seeks to safeguard human rights through international conventions, but is an encouragement to governments that try to evade international obligations to which they are indifferent or hostile.

Accordingly, the Assembly addresses an earnest appeal to all the governments that have not yet done so to ratify all the human rights conventions. It urges them at the same time to give full support to the proposal, now under study in the United Nations, to establish an Office of a High Commissioner for Human Rights, among whose duties will be the encouragement of both the ratification and implementation of these conventions.

The Assembly affirms that the strengthening of the machinery for the protection of human rights has become all the more urgent because of the rise of reactionary and extreme nationalistic movements in various parts of the world. Even when such movements disclaim anti-Semitic tendencies, the Assembly, mindful of the tragic lessons of the past, sees in them a threat to democratic institutions and principles and the breeding ground of racist and anti-Semitic ideologies.

The Assembly calls upon all Jewish communities and organizations, working in cooperation with democratic movements everywhere, to combat these evil forces with every lawful means and expresses the hope that all governments will, within the framework of their constitutional powers and obligations, take the necessary steps to protect society from this menace.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

Mr. LEIBLER next read the

RESOLUTION ON CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY AND STATUTES OF LIMITATION

The Fifth Plenary Assembly welcomes the legislative and administrative measures taken by a number of governments, as well as decisions by the United Nations and the Council of Europe, designed to prevent the application of statutory limitations to war crimes and

crimes against humanity. It wholeheartedly shares the view, upon which these measures and decisions are based, that the very nature of these crimes makes it indefensible that their perpetrators should remain immune from prosecution and punishment.

It records with concern that in a number of countries in Europe, Africa, and the Western Hemisphere, local statutes of limitation, and political and administrative decisions with the same effect, have already resulted in the denial of the extradition to Germany and other countries of persons accused of the gravest crimes against humanity; and that elsewhere such statutes of limitation will be applied within the next few years.

The Assembly calls on its member communities and organizations to draw the attention of the governments of their countries, wherever appropriate, to the resolution adopted by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights which

“urges all states to take any measures necessary to prevent the application of statutory limitations to war crimes and crimes against humanity, and to continue their efforts to ensure the arrest, extradition, and punishment of persons responsible for war crimes and crimes against humanity, and to make available to other states any documents in their possession relating to such crimes.”

While the Assembly supports on general grounds the proposal to formulate and adopt an international convention forbidding the application of statutes of limitation to these crimes, it must emphasize that there is no assurance that it will have any relevance to the case of Second World War criminals who have so far escaped prosecution or have secured immunity. On the basis of past experience, the process of formulation, adoption by the United Nations, and ratification by member states will take an unforeseeable period of years; nor can there be any assurance that the states most closely affected will ratify such a convention and amend their legislation accordingly.

The Assembly is concerned that the mere prospect of the adoption of a convention may be used as a justification for the continued validity of statutes of limitation enacted before its coming into force. It urges that every precaution be taken both in the text itself and otherwise to avoid this possibility.

The Assembly reaffirms that in the meantime it is the responsibility of every government to ensure that persons under its jurisdiction who are accused of crimes against humanity but have evaded trial shall be brought to justice.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

RABBI NUSSBAUM then read the

RESOLUTION ON CHRISTIANS AND JEWS

The Fifth Plenary Assembly notes with satisfaction that since the last Assembly, the Christian churches have begun to reshape their thinking concerning the Jewish people and have, through pronouncements made in recent times, urged their adherents to eliminate the age-old prejudices contained in Christian teaching concerning the Jews, and have thus established a basis for better understanding between Christians and Jews.

The Assembly regards the pronouncements made by the New Delhi Conference of the World Council of Churches and by the Ecumenical Council in Rome as evidence of the goodwill of many Christian clerical and lay leaders from all countries. The World Jewish Congress looks forward to the practical implementation, at all levels and by all Christian communities, of these new teachings and welcomes such initial practical steps and initiatives as have already been taken, both on the international and local levels.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

RABBI NUSSBAUM submitted the

RESOLUTION ON INDEMNIFICATION BY GERMANY

The Fifth Plenary Assembly reaffirms its desire to secure proper indemnification from Germany to all victims of Nazi persecution.

While acknowledging the achievements of the present indemnification program, the Assembly expresses its concern at the inadequacy of some of the existing arrangements and in particular at some recent developments which have led to the whittling away or curtailing of previously accorded indemnification rights or to the postponement of their realization. The Assembly regretfully sees in these developments an apparent weakening of the spirit in which indemnification was conceived by its originators.

In this connection, the Assembly strongly protests against the recent restriction of indemnification payments through the budgetary economy measures introduced in the German Federal Republic and recalls the repeated declarations of leading ministers of the German government that indemnification to Nazi victims is a debt of honor which must be treated as a matter of highest priority.

The Assembly urges the speeding up of the processing and satisfaction of indemnification claims and draws special attention to the great number of aged and infirm victims whose claims have not yet been met.

The Assembly requests that the deadline be reopened for registration of claims relating to assets in formerly occupied countries, particularly since the present legal situation is prejudicial to the interests of Jews who suffered persecution in Eastern Europe. As far as the Hardship Fund for confiscated household goods and personal effects, set up within the framework of the Federal Restitution Law, is concerned, the Assembly considers it indefensible that even the small payments from this fund may take many years because of the totally insufficient personnel of the indemnification agency concerned, and urges the increase of this personnel so that victims may receive indemnification during their lifetime.

The Assembly is also concerned at the delay in issuing the implementary order listing the places of detention in regard to which a presumption of damage to health has been stipulated in the Final Indemnification Law and urges that ghettos, forced labor camps, and similar detention places in which conditions were equivalent to those of concentration camps should be included in the list.

In regard to the Special Fund established by the Final Compensation Law for the benefit of victims who emigrated from Eastern Europe after October 1, 1953, the Assembly considers that a much fairer system of distribution than at present provided could be arrived at without any additional financial expenditure and urges therefore that the present system be revised in consultation with the competent Jewish organizations.

The Assembly expresses its regret that the present indemnification arrangements completely bar from receiving indemnification those victims who reside in countries in Eastern Europe which have no diplomatic relationship with the Federal Republic. Having regard to the fact that this affects those Jewries who suffered most at the hands of the Nazis, the Assembly urges that this situation be speedily remedied.

The Assembly is also greatly disturbed at the unwillingness of the German Democratic Republic to make any contribution to the indemnification of Jewish victims of Nazi persecution and expresses the hope that this attitude will be changed and that the German Democratic Republic will fulfill its moral obligations to the victims of Nazism.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

RABBI NUSSBAUM then presented the

RESOLUTION ON ISRAEL

The Fifth Plenary Assembly sends its fraternal greetings to the government and people of the State of Israel. It sees in the State of

Israel both the fulfillment of an immemorial Jewish aspiration and one of the great accomplishments of our time.

The Assembly expresses its admiration for the impressive achievements attained by the State of Israel in its eighteen years of existence, in immigration, absorption, culture, education, economic and social development, and international relations. It reaffirms the hope that Israel will continue to build a progressive and creative society where newcomers from all over the world will find their national home and will be able to unite in the renewal of Jewish national life.

The Assembly expresses the hope that Jews, and particularly young Jews, from all parts of the world will in increasing numbers decide to settle in Israel, participate personally in its upbuilding, and find there the fulfillment of a full Jewish life.

The Assembly is proud to record the increasingly significant role that Israel is playing in the international field and the fruitful cooperation which Israel is extending to developing nations with which she is sharing her technical, scientific, and social knowledge.

The Assembly records with pride the achievements of the State of Israel in its historic aim of ingathering the exiles into a united and cohesive nation. It is conscious of the gigantic task that still lies ahead and calls upon the Jewish people, all over the world, to lend their full support to the efforts of the Israel government and the Jewish Agency to absorb the new immigrants, to integrate them culturally and socially, and to create for all sections of the population dignified conditions of life.

The Assembly urges all governments, irrespective of their social systems or political alignments, to facilitate the immigration of those Jews who desire to participate in the reconstitution of Jewish national life in its ancient homeland. In this context, it recalls that the right of immigration to Israel is implicit in the resolution of the United Nations sanctioning the reestablishment of the State of Israel, and is reinforced by the right of everyone to leave any country, embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

CLOSING SESSION

August 9, 1966 (evening)

In the Chair: DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN

1. REPORT AND RESOLUTIONS OF THE POLITICAL COMMISSION (concluded)

Continuing the report of the Political Commission, RABBI Dr. MAX NUSSBAUM (USA), chairman of the commission, read the

RESOLUTION ON THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

The Fifth Plenary Assembly records its alarm that the international community has not yet been able to provide the resources and develop a policy designed to place developing countries on the road toward self-sustaining economies and adequate living standards for their populations. Two thirds of the world's population live at or below subsistence level; and the gap between affluent societies and the developing countries, instead of being closed, is actually widening.

The Assembly does not doubt that, given the will, the developed countries possess the resources and the technical capacity to deal effectively with these problems. But astronomical sums are being poured into the making of the means of mass destruction and the building up of military establishments, and technical ability is being mobilized in ever increasing measure to devise and organize more effective ways of killing man, instead of overcoming his real enemies: illiteracy, disease, hunger, and poverty.

The Assembly warmly commends the secretary-general of the United Nations, who, with consistent courage and unwavering devotion to the highest interests of humanity, has warned the affluent nations that a continuation of the present situation is fraught with the gravest danger. It pledges full support to his efforts to secure those far-reaching and imaginative changes which alone can restore hope in the future of the international community.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

RABBI NUSSBAUM then presented the

RESOLUTION ON GERMANY

The Fifth Plenary Assembly declares that the Jewish people cannot forget the appalling tragedies, sufferings, and losses inflicted by the Nazi Third Reich upon the Jewish people through the annihilation of 6,000,000 Jews. This iniquity imposes upon the German people and its government responsibilities which have not yet been fully acknowledged.

This Assembly is particularly disturbed by the tendency increasingly evident of the desire to forget the past instead of to overcome it. The appearance of public manifestations and assemblies of men who belong to organizations condemned as criminal by international public opinion is an example of these remains of the Nazi system.

The impatience of many among the German people with the trials of Nazi war criminals and the leniency of some of the verdicts handed down by some German courts are disturbing symptoms.

The Assembly acknowledges that many religious, political, and intellectual German leaders and, indeed, the responsible German press, have often warned their own people against these dangers.

In expressing its profound concern, the Assembly also voices the hope that the young German generation will understand its moral obligation not to forget the past, and resolve never to allow a revival of the ideology which brought calamity to the Jewish people and disaster to the world and to Germany herself.

The Assembly calls upon the German authorities, federal and state, to intensify and extend the range of educational measures to counteract these dangerous tendencies and to use and review existing legislation so as to make it more effective against incitement to racial and religious hatred.

Mr. SALOMON FRIEDRICH (*World Union of Tnuat HaHerut Hatzohar*): I make the following declaration in the name of my movement, which is not participating in the vote on the resolutions concerning Germany:

In the absence of any confidence in the German people — author of the most appalling crimes in the history of mankind against the Jewish people — it should be the duty of all Jewish organizations and institutions to put mankind on its guard against new dangers that can arise from Germany.

The governments of West and East Germany are doing all they can to make the world forget the atrocious crimes committed by their people in Europe, and they want to become equal partners in the family of peoples of the civilized world. As a result of the cold war, the

two blocs have rearmed West and East Germany, and there is already talk about the Germans sharing in atomic armament. This constitutes a grave danger for all mankind. In both Germanies, East and West, there are Nazis in key positions. It is sufficient to point out the West German secretary of state for development, Mr. Friedrich Karl Vialon, the sadly famous Nazi who ordered the transfer of the Jews from the ghettos to the extermination camps.

We judge it necessary to alert the entire world that Germany is witnessing a vast Nazi renaissance and growth of revanchism. The Germans want to establish the statute of limitation to spare their criminals; in this way they wish to close the tragic chapter of the sacrifices inflicted upon our Jewish people. At the same time this would permit the former Nazis to reoccupy the leading positions in aggressive pan-Germanism.

The declarations of Mr. Ulbricht, president of East Germany, during his visit to the Arab countries; as well as the attitude of Mr. Schröder, foreign minister of West Germany, during his pourparlers with the Arab states at the time of the establishment of German-Israeli diplomatic relations; clearly demonstrate that today's Germany is the bearer of the spirit of the Third Reich.

For this reason, from the platform of this Assembly, we call upon the Jews of the entire world to fight the rebirth of Nazism and militarism in Germany. We call for intensified action against German access to atomic weapons. Let us unite our forces, let us seek out all the German war criminals, and let us oppose any law that might impede their being brought to judgment. We call on all the Jewish communities in the world to undertake an increasingly intensive propaganda campaign to put mankind on its guard against all the dangers of a Nazi and militaristic Germany that menace world peace. The main victim of Nazi barbarism, the Jewish people, is duty-bound to warn the world against the dangers that are threatening it.

The resolution was adopted by a large majority.

RABBI NUSSBAUM then read the following draft of a resolution on Trials of Nazi Criminals, prepared by the Political Commission:

The Fifth Plenary Assembly, while appreciating the action of the German government in extending the period of limitation in regard to Nazi war criminals, considers it to be only a preliminary measure. It reiterates the demand of the Jewish people, fortified as it has been by the deliberations in the United Nations and the resolution of the Council of Europe, that war crimes and crimes against humanity must not remain unpunished for reasons of statutory limitations.

The Assembly urges the German Federal government to initiate as early as possible the necessary legal and administrative measures to remove any legislative hindrance to the initiation of new trials of Nazi criminals after 1969.

MAITRE MICHEL DREYFUS-SCHMIDT (*France*): What I am about to say expresses the unanimous thinking of the French delegation.

Being realists, we accept the idea of encouraging the progressive forces in Germany that are fighting against Nazism. We are not among those who think that Germany must be anathematized for generations and generations. We do not think that the collective responsibility of the descendants is a Jewish concept, for we would be in a poor position indeed to harbor such a notion.

We know all that, but we feel that there is an enormous and inadmissible contradiction between the resolution that has just been proposed and the acts and attitudes of this Assembly. The other day we heard Professor Cassin tell us that it was natural for the new Germany to dissociate itself from these crimes against humanity by adhering, in an international convention, to the principle of their imprescriptibility; and we unanimously applauded Professor Cassin. The resolution that we unanimously adopted on Crimes against Humanity and Statutes of Limitation calls for the nonapplicability of statutory limitations to war crimes and crimes against humanity and cites the resolution of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in this regard.

It is not possible, then, for us to express appreciation for, to recognize, to point out, or even to take note of the Bundestag's decision to postpone the application of the prescription as a positive effort. It is a question of principle. We cannot ask that all countries proclaim the imprescriptibility of these crimes, and at the same time regard as positive the Bundestag's postponement of the application of the prescription. Why? Because to postpone the prescription is to deny the imprescriptibility.

We propose to replace the first sentence of the resolution by the following: "The Fifth Plenary Assembly protests the vote of the Bundestag that likens genocide to ordinary crimes and contents itself with delaying the application of the statute of limitation, thus rejecting the principle of the imprescriptibility of genocide." For the last sentence we would substitute: "The Assembly asks that all measures be taken to prevent the impunity of murderers of millions of men, among whom were 6,000,000 Jews."

I repeat what I said earlier: it is not a matter of anathematizing Germany. It is not a question of the descendants of the war criminals, but of the war criminals themselves.

Dr. GOLDMANN: I would like to avoid, if possible, a vote between two resolutions on this question, for many reasons which you will all realize. I would like to ask Maître Dreyfus-Schmidt and his friends whether the following form of resolution would not satisfy everyone:

RESOLUTION ON TRIALS OF NAZI CRIMINALS

The Fifth Plenary Assembly regrets that the parliament of the German Federal Republic has only extended, in regard to the prosecution of Nazi war criminals, the period before which the statute of limitation will apply, instead of eliminating entirely the application of this principle to war crimes and crimes against humanity. It reiterates the demand of the Jewish people, fortified as it has been by the resolutions both by the United Nations and the Council of Europe, that war crimes and crimes against humanity must not remain unpunished for reasons of statutory limitations.

The Assembly urges the Federal government to take the necessary measures to remove any obstacles to the initiation of new trials of Nazi criminals after 1969.

Dr. GOLDMANN: The resolution in this form does not express appreciation or acknowledgment, but regret that the entry into force of the statute of limitation was only delayed instead of the principle of prescriptibility being eliminated entirely; it then reiterates the imprescriptibility of such crimes and urges the German government to act in accordance with this principle. This, in my opinion, reflects a proper compromise.

The resolution in the form suggested by Dr. Goldmann was accepted by Maître Dreyfus-Schmidt and Rabbi Nussbaum and was adopted by the Assembly.

RABBI NUSSBAUM then read the

RESOLUTION ON SOVIET JEWRY

The Fifth Plenary Assembly deeply regrets the absence of representatives of Soviet Jewry from its deliberations. It expresses the hope that the conditions responsible for this absence will be speedily corrected and the World Jewish Congress will have the joy of welcoming the return of this great community to active fellowship in world Jewry.

The Assembly again records its distress at the continuing religious and cultural discrimination experienced by Soviet Jewry, and urges the Soviet government to reexamine its policies and administrative practices with a view to ensuring to the Jewish minority the same rights and facilities as are enjoyed by other groups, religious and cultural.

The Assembly notes with appreciation that Jewish concern with this situation has increasingly been shared by wide sections of world public opinion, including longtime friends of the Soviet Union, and that they have publicly called for a just application of Soviet laws and a firm implementation of the principle of equality for all religious and cultural

groups, in order to redress the inequities which have militated against the effort to maintain a distinctive Jewish life in the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union has promoted the cultural progress of the more than a hundred national groups that inhabit its territories, among them ethnic communities both small in numbers and widely dispersed, which enjoy extensive facilities and rights designed to enable them to develop every aspect of their cultural heritage.

The Assembly finds it impossible to believe that in such a system the Jewish minority, with its rich cultural heritage, will be permanently relegated to the anomalous position of being denied religious and cultural facilities and so exposed to involuntary assimilation.

Minor ameliorations in this area, which are welcome in themselves, are limited in their scope and leave the central problem of Soviet Jewry unresolved. That problem will remain until the Jews of the Soviet Union are afforded the same facilities for self-expression and the exercise of the right of association as are granted to other groups in the Soviet Union.

The Assembly also draws attention to the burden of avoidable suffering which is borne by numerous Jews in the Soviet Union who, after the lapse of twenty years and more, remain separated from their families as a result of the war and the unspeakable horrors which the Nazi invaders visited on the Jewish population. The international community has in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights recognized that "the family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and state." We renew our appeal that facilities should be made available to all those who for so many years have yearned for reunion with their families in Israel and elsewhere.

Accordingly, the Assembly urges the Soviet authorities to redress the inequities of the existing situation by the following measures:

- 1) facilitating and safeguarding the exercise of the national and cultural rights of the Jews in the Soviet Union on a basis of full equality with other groups;
- 2) safeguarding the unhampered practice of their religion by Jewish religious communities, including both the establishment of a country-wide representation and other essential religious institutions;
- 3) granting the same facilities and rights to Soviet Jews to participate in Jewish international meetings and organizations, comparable with those enjoyed by members of other groups;
- 4) intensifying educational and administrative measures to eradicate anti-Semitism wherever in the Soviet Union it may persist, and whatever form it may take;
- 5) facilitating the reunion in Israel and elsewhere of separated families.

The resolution was adopted unanimously, the participants in the Assembly signifying their sentiments of solidarity with and concern for Soviet Jewry by rising from their seats.

RABBI NUSSBAUM then read the next resolution and explained that, like the one on Germany and Soviet Jewry, this resolution was the result of numerous redrafts.

RESOLUTION ON ISRAEL AND THE ARAB STATES

The Fifth Plenary Assembly deplores the continued refusal of the neighboring Arab states to negotiate peace with Israel. It regards this as a threat to peace and an obstacle to the social progress of the whole Middle East. It urges all enlightened sectors of the Arab peoples to support and strengthen those sober voices in the Arab world that have courageously called for an effort to achieve an understanding between Israel and the Arab states leading to the establishment of peace.

The Assembly is convinced that agreement among the great powers, with a view to preventing aggression and to halting the arms race resulting from belligerent policies directed against Israel by certain Arab states, is essential for the development of an atmosphere in which the attainment of peace will be possible.

Taking note of Israel's continuing readiness to enter into negotiations that will lead to peace, the Assembly addresses a most earnest appeal to the great powers to take joint or parallel action which will ensure that neither an imbalance of arms nor the promise or prospect of new arms deliveries will encourage military aggression.

In the interests both of the social progress of all the countries in the region which are burdened by heavy expenditures for arms, and of establishing stability in an area crucial for the maintenance of peace in the world, the Assembly urges the great powers to take appropriate action with a view to safeguarding the territorial integrity and vital national interests of all the states in the region.

Mr. AVRAHAM SCHENKER (USA): On behalf of delegates in the United States, French, British, and Argentine delegations who are members of the International Union of Mapam Parties, as well as on behalf of a number of other delegates who hold similar views, I would like to state the following.

We shall abstain from voting on the resolution on Israel and the Arab States, not because of what it contains, but because of what has been omitted. In the existing circumstances, which demand a bold initiative and an active policy for peace, the resolution is unsatisfactory, both in style and in content.

Together with the movers of the resolution, we are deeply concerned about the security of the State of Israel and the threat to peace

resulting from the belligerency maintained by certain Arab states and from the disastrous arms race going on in the Middle East. But the present situation is marked by the fact — stated in the resolution itself — that side by side with threats of aggression, there are courageous voices in the Arab world calling for realism and peace negotiations with Israel. An indication of this atmosphere is the fact that a dialogue on Jewish-Arab relations was supposed to have taken place at this Assembly, with the participation of a prominent Arab personality. While this dialogue unfortunately did not materialize, it is known that the very idea of holding it had met with considerable interest in certain Arab circles, who looked forward to this Assembly with the hope that here, too, courageous voices would be heard to clear the way for mutual understanding.

The resolution which was just read to you does not satisfy those expectations. I am afraid that after reading it, those Arabs who were in favor of the Jewish-Arab dialogue will come to the conclusion that we are not ready for it either; for the resolution is more concerned with assigning blame for the absence of peace than with the promotion of peace efforts. The resolution calls upon the great powers to halt the arms race; but it does not mention the problem with which the great powers as well as the peoples in the Middle East are deeply concerned: the danger of an atomic escalation of the arms race which, in Middle East conditions, threatens total destruction without serving any purpose of defense or deterrence. The resolution calls upon progressive Arab forces to continue the struggle for peace; but it omits any mention of a just and constructive solution of the tragic problem of the Arab refugees, which is for them a *sine qua non* of a peaceful settlement.

In the Political Commission we submitted proposals dealing with the denuclearization of the Middle East and the Arab refugees, in line with the declared statements of Israel, and in line with the genuine desire for peace on the part of progressive Arab opinion. These proposals were, to our regret, rejected. However, we did not want to split the Congress with a *votum separatum* on such a vital issue, because we know that the desire for peace is common to all and that there are many who, like us, are in search of new initiatives for Jewish-Arab understanding. We are therefore abstaining from the vote and we hope that the resolution favoring a Jewish-Arab dialogue will make possible a more serious discussion of these problems in the future.

The resolution was then adopted.

RABBI NUSSBAUM: As chairman of the Political Commission, may I express to Mapam, to Herut, and to the French delegation my gratitude for the dignified way in which you put forth your views.

RABBI NUSSBAUM then read the

RESOLUTION ON PEACE AND DISARMAMENT

The Fifth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress records its profound disquiet that, more than two decades after the conclusion of the Second World War and the establishment of the United Nations, men continue to die in battle and uncounted thousands of defenseless civilians – men, women, and children – continue to be sacrificed on the altar of war.

The Assembly expresses its deep sorrow at this avoidable destruction of human life and the incalculable suffering which accompanies it. To remain silent in the face of this tragedy would be to evade the solemn obligations we have inherited from the teachings of our lawgivers and Prophets and to be false to Jewish teachings of the supreme value of human life and the inalienable rights of every human being.

Every international military conflict in this age of nuclear weapons carries the threat of catastrophe for all mankind.

The suffering and destruction caused by wars such as those now being waged in Vietnam, Yemen, and elsewhere demonstrate the failure of international statesmanship to create a world order under the rule of law in which the promise written into the Charter of the United Nations “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war” would be fulfilled. The Assembly regrets that the resolution adopted last year by the United Nations General Assembly, with the support of seventy nations, calling for an international conference on disarmament to which all nations – whether members of the United Nations or not – would be invited, remains no more than the expression of a remote hope. It is clear that the war in Vietnam causes incalculable suffering and destruction. Accordingly, the Assembly calls upon all parties engaged in military conflict in Vietnam and elsewhere to enter into negotiations with a view to ending these wars.

The Assembly considers that the search for agreements on disarmament within the framework of the United Nations should not only continue but be pressed forward with renewed determination. It urges that the following objectives should be sought in the discussions now taking place under United Nations auspices:

- 1) an agreement to prevent proliferation of nuclear armament, including an undertaking by the nuclear powers not to make available, directly or indirectly, nuclear weapons to other countries, or to help them to produce such weapons; and to provide appropriate guarantees to nonnuclear powers which undertake not to manufacture or acquire nuclear armaments;*
- 2) a ban against all nuclear tests, including those carried out underground;*

- 3) a treaty to reserve outer space for peaceful purposes only, including a firm prohibition of claims to national sovereignty or the introduction of military armaments of any form;
- 4) a determined effort to begin the reduction of existing armaments – conventional and nuclear – and, in any event, to secure agreement to halt the growth of armaments, whether for national purposes or for supply to other countries.

The Assembly draws particular attention to the desirability, pending the adoption of any scheme of comprehensive disarmament, of regional disarmament agreements. Such agreements would not only lift the burden of expenditure from countries which find it increasingly intolerable, but would lead to a relaxation of international tensions and in turn facilitate the movement toward the creation of a structure of international relations based on peace, justice, and equality among nations.

The resolution was adopted.

Dr. GOLDMANN thanked Rabbi Nussbaum and the Political Commission for their successful effort. Having participated in a large part of the commission's discussions, Dr. Goldmann knew what a difficult task they had accomplished.

2. MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL, MR. ZALMAN SHAZAR

Dr. GOLDMANN conveyed the following message to the Assembly:

It gives me great pleasure, a few hours before my return home after my long, extensive, and encouraging visit to the Diaspora Jewish communities of North and South America, to be given the privilege of concluding my journey by sending my warmest greetings to your Assembly of our Jewish communities of all countries.

I was moved by the expression of our people's love for our state and the respect shown for our commonwealth by world statesmen. May you too share in this gratifying emotion as your important gathering nears its close. Bear in mind that the fraternal and effective unity of the nation in dispersion is the indispensable condition for the peace of Israel – in its sovereign homeland as well as in the Diaspora. All of you, collectively and individually, should cooperate in the development and intensification of Jewish education and the wider utilization of the Hebrew language and literature in each and every Jewish community.

Be steadfast in support of those elements of the Jewish nation which are threatened by internal or external dangers, directly or indirectly, and seek to discover effective means for the economic stability of our state, and for increased immigration from all countries.

I send our blessings to you and all whom you represent. May the spirit of Zion pervade all your decisions today and your future acts.

May we meet again, with a joyful heart, in Jerusalem, your capital in heart and soul.

Zalman Shazar

3. ELECTIONS

Dr. GOLDMANN: Mr. Torczyner has been asked by the Presidium to present the proposals of the Steering Committee with regard to nominations. He will submit some nominations and I will then submit additional ones.

Mr. JACQUES TORCZYNER (*USA*): I belong to a small group of delegates at this Assembly whose fathers were present at the founding of the Congress in 1936. I believe that this is an indication of the continuity of the Congress and also of the belief in its future.

In presenting to you the name of the man who is slated to be the president of the Congress, I am mentioning the name of a man I have known for over forty years and who is today the outstanding leader of our generation. He has many qualities. He is a man with many revolutionary ideas, which create controversy. At the same time, he has the great gift of being a conciliator and achieving compromise with honor, whenever he feels that compromise is demanded by the hour and by the problem. He will be remembered in history for many achievements, one of the most important of which is his contribution to the fact that Germany paid reparations to the Jewish people and to the State of Israel. When in Israel, he has the courage to bring before the public the great problems that it faces. He has given Israel good advice and great devotion and rendered tremendous service to its government and to its people. But what dominates his life is his love for and his devotion to the Jewish people.

The World Jewish Congress was founded by an immortal figure of American Jewry, the late Rabbi Stephen S. Wise. The greatest achievement of Dr. Nahum Goldmann is to have maintained this institution and to have made of it what it is today: the voice of the Jewish people. He has given it guidance, inspiration, and leadership. More than that, he is present at the sessions, he participates in the discussions, and he is the soul and the spirit of a great organization and of a great movement. I admire Dr. Goldmann for his personal qualities: he is a man who understands art, literature, and music; and I admire him most for the personal interest and affection he shows to political friend and foe alike, and for the human interest he has always taken in those with whom he works.

Therefore, when I put before you his name, to be again the leader of the World Jewish Congress for the years ahead, I do it with the fervent hope and prayer that he will be able to lead it to further heights and to further success for many, many years to come!

LORD SIEFF OF BRIMPTON: It did not occur to me that our president needed a vote. He is acknowledged by all of us, and even outside this hall, to be a great Jewish leader. It is our good fortune that

such a man of intellect, of spirit, and of life should remain our president. I have great pleasure in asking you to agree by standing up that our president for the forthcoming period be Dr. Nahum Goldmann.

Dr. Goldmann was elected unanimously.

Mr. TORCZYNER: We propose for the positions of vice-presidents a most distinguished leader of Canadian Jewry, a great industrialist, Mr. Samuel Bronfman; and a man who is known all over the world as a leader of British Jewry for more than a generation, the distinguished Lord Sieff of Brimpton.

Dr. GOLDMANN: Before we vote on this proposal, I would like to say a few words about my friend Samuel Bronfman, who unfortunately could not be with us and whom we elected at the last Assembly as one of the vice-presidents. He has done a lot during these years, despite being a more than normally busy man, in trying to help the Congress by travels and by visits, by calling groups together in order to get their help; and I think appreciation should be expressed for what he has done.

I would like to add another word from the bottom of my heart about my friend Israel — it is hard for me to say “Lord Sieff.” He had been a friend of the ideology and the ideals of the World Jewish Congress all of his life, but when I tried to induce him actively to join its leadership, I knew it was not easy for him. Being busy in so many fields and — like myself and others — no longer a youngster, he thought it over; but I insisted very much, because I felt that I could not have a better colleague than Israel Sieff, both as a friend and as a man of great moral authority, which is, perhaps, the decisive form of authority. During the years he has served in the World Jewish Congress, all of us in the leadership of the Congress have learned not only to appreciate and to admire, but to love this man who is a human being of the finest kind. It is an honor for any organization to have him in its leadership; for the Congress he is of invaluable importance. I am delighted and very grateful to him that, despite his burdens, he has agreed to continue to serve.

The nominations were carried unanimously.

Mr. TORCZYNER: We propose as honorary vice-presidents the distinguished spiritual leader and member of the Jewish Agency Executive, Dr. Israel Goldstein, and a lady who symbolizes everything that is noble in British Jewry, Eva, Marchioness of Reading.

Dr. GOLDMANN: I would also like to say a few words about my good friend Eva, who has been serving the Congress. . . she being a lady, I should not say for how many years. She belongs to the original family of the Congress in Britain; knowing where she comes from and the way

she was educated, you can well imagine that it was a revolutionary act on her part to embrace the idea of the Jewish people and the idea of the World Jewish Congress. Her membership in the leadership of the Congress, especially in Great Britain, contributed much to its standing and prestige, even in those sectors of British Jewry who by their ideology and by their approach to Jewish problems were opposed to the Congress. She has given great service, not only by what she is and represents — I do not mean her title, but her personality — but also by real, active work, taking care of many details of the work of the London office for many, many years. Now when she, on her own wish, has retired to the position of an honorary vice-president, I want, on behalf of all of us, to express to her our gratitude for what she has done. She still remains president of the British Section, and we hope that she will remain one of the most beloved and loyal members of the Congress family.

The nominations were accepted unanimously.

Mr. TORCZYNER: We present to you as chairmen of the branches of the Executive Committee the names of Mr. Samuel Bronfman (*North America*), Lord Sieff of Brimpton (*Europe*), Dr. Moisés Goldman (*South America*), and Professor Aryeh Tartakower (*Israel*).

Dr. GOLDMANN: My old friend Moisés Goldman, whom I have known for decades, was one of the founders of the World Jewish Congress Section in Argentina and Latin America. He has been serving the Congress for a long time and is also a very busy man, as a physician and in many other positions. I am very pleased that he is again ready to serve as chairman of the South American Branch of the Executive, which he conducts with his great moral and intellectual authority. I express my deep-felt thanks to my friend Aryeh Tartakower, who has become almost identical with the idea of the World Jewish Congress, having served it in New York and now for many years in Israel. If one man has devoted his life to the World Jewish Congress, it is certainly Aryeh Tartakower.

The nominations were carried unanimously.

Mr. TORCZYNER: An organization is only as strong as its civil service. The World Jewish Congress is particularly lucky in having a wonderful group of men as its civil servants. None symbolizes more its value, its character, and its nature than the secretary-general, Dr. Gerhart Riegner.

Dr. GOLDMANN: My friend Riegner came to the World Jewish Congress thirty years ago, and he thus celebrates something like a personal jubilee. He came to us on the recommendation of a good friend of ours, a non-Jew, the great international sociologist, Professor Rappard, one of the great friends of the Zionist movement and at that

time director of the Institut de Hautes Etudes Internationales in Geneva.

Since then Dr. Riegner has gone through all the phases of the development of the Congress. He was responsible for the Geneva office of the World Jewish Congress during the most terrible time in Jewish history, the period of World War Two. You know how he got the news about the decision on the so-called final solution; he was the first to transmit it to us in America. Since then he has carried the burden of the work of the Congress. He is intimate with all phases of the very complex Congress organization. I think the Executive Committee did very well when it named him secretary-general a year ago.

The Assembly elected Dr. Riegner unanimously as secretary-general.

Dr. GOLDMANN: The greatest asset of the family of the Congress is its morale. As I have said already, people are not attracted to the World Jewish Congress by high salaries; we have probably the most underpaid officialdom in the Jewish world, especially by American standards. Most of those whose names I will read have served the Congress for years and decades, because of devotion to the idea of the Congress. Some of them have given up brilliant careers and potentialities of brilliant careers. It is not an easy job to work in an organization which tries to unite Jews from so many parts of the world, with differences of upbringing, language, culture, and thinking.

In order to remove any kind of feeling that there is a top category and a second category of Congress leaders — and I include myself — the Presidium wisely decided to present to the Plenary Assembly the nominations for the ex officio members of the Executive Committee rather than to wait for them to be named by the Executive Committee when it meets tomorrow.

I want to add that the approval of their election to the Executive Committee does not take away the right of the Executive Committee to make changes in the course of the years till the next Assembly.

The following officeholders are proposed as ex officio members of the Executive Committee with full voting rights:

The director of the International Affairs Department in London, my old friend Alex Easternman, one of the veterans of the World Jewish Congress. One of the most brilliant stylists I know of, he was a journalist and writer of great standing in Great Britain, when he gave up a brilliant journalistic career in order to serve the World Jewish Congress. He began with us in a very modest position and then became one of the major political representatives of the Congress. I will not recount all his achievements; you know he established relations of cordial trust with important people with whom very few Jewish leaders could have established such contacts and he has achieved many very important things in Jewish political life in the last decades. I am glad

that he is continuing this responsible job and I am sure you all share this feeling.

The director of the International Affairs Department in New York, our friend Maurice Perlzweig, who has, over many years of service, established himself as an authority with the United Nations, and many of us have had the opportunity to hear United Nations officials express their deep appreciation of his understanding of international problems. He has many international connections through his work in the United Nations. He has travelled for us widely, this year in Eastern Europe and in Africa, and he is one of the outstanding spokesmen and representatives of the Congress.

The director of the Cultural Department, our saintly friend Dr. Aaron Steinberg, who unfortunately is not here because of illness. All of you appreciate his wonderful personality; there are no longer many like him in Jewish life, symbolizing Jewish tradition and Jewish character at their best.

The director of the Institute of Jewish Affairs, our friend Dr. S.J. Roth, who is at the same time executive director of the European Branch of the Executive, thus combining two important jobs. He has rendered great and valuable services to the Congress in many spheres of its work.

The director of the Paris office, who has in fact created the French Section, one of the greatest organizational achievements in the history of the World Jewish Congress. I would never have believed that one day we would have a French delegation of the kind we had at this Assembly and that we would have a French Section like the one we now have, which has brought most of the local *consistoires* into the Congress. This is to the greatest degree the work of our friend Armand Kaplan. We have asked him to continue, not only as director of the French Section, but at the same time to be the deputy director of the International Affairs Department. He has, in the last few years, devoted a lot of his time, under my personal guidance, to very delicate negotiations, especially in Eastern Europe — work that requires a tremendous amount of tact, understanding, and responsibility.

The consultant on International Affairs in London, our friend J.I. Linton. He was for years director of the Jewish Agency in London and political secretary to the late Chaim Weizmann; he joined the diplomatic service of Israel and was ambassador in Japan, Switzerland, and elsewhere. At our request he obtained leave from the Israeli foreign office and he is now serving as our consultant on International Affairs in London. One of his most important achievements is the fact that we obtained consultative status with the Council of Europe, and he is engaged in many other spheres of political work as well.

Next are the executive director of the North American Branch of the Executive, Mr. Monty Jacobs; the executive director of the South

American Branch, Mr. Marc Turkow; and the executive director of the Israel Branch, Dr. Leon Bernstein. They all will have the status of full members of the Executive Committee, as long, of course, as they occupy their present positions.

The Assembly unanimously approved the nominations for ex officio members of the Executive Committee with full rights.

Dr. GOLDMANN: The following will have, by their offices, the status of directors with Executive status on special questions:

The director of International Affairs in Israel, Dr. Natan Lerner, who joined us on leaving an important position in Buenos Aires. He worked for years in the New York office, where he directed our Latin American Desk. We wanted to keep him there longer, but, being a good Zionist, he felt he had to go to Israel, where he is now in charge of our Department of International Affairs.

The director of the North African Department in France, Jacques Lazarus, who had the same status before as director of our Algerian office. He came to France and brought with him 100,000 Algerian Jews. Algerian Jewry has been reduced to 5000, and the former Algerian office of the World Jewish Congress is now operating from Paris. Those who know the situation in France, with the influx of many Jews from North Africa, including many from Tunisia and Morocco, know what an efficient job he does and what authority he possesses among these elements, who are slowly changing the character and image of French Jewry.

The director of our office in Uruguay, Dr. Nella Rost-Hollander, daughter of a great father and herself a great and dynamic personality; and the director of our office in Brazil, a great friend of mine from European days, Dr. V. Winterstein, one of the key figures in Brazilian Jewry.

The Assembly agreed unanimously with the election of the nominated directors with Executive status in special questions.

Dr. GOLDMANN: Now I will read the list of those who are proposed for ex officio associate membership on the Executive Committee. They have not had this status until now, but we felt that, considering what they have done and are doing, they deserve it:

I begin with the one who has been in the service of the Congress for the longest period, the legal adviser of the European Branch of the Executive, Dr. F.L. Brassloff, who worked for many years in London and has now been transferred to Geneva, dealing with legal and international aspects.

The consultant on International and Interorganizational Affairs in New York, Mr. Max Melamet, a newcomer to the Congress. I want to welcome him here at his first Assembly. He was a leader of South African Jewry for many years and then held important positions in Jewish life in Canada. A year ago we induced him to join the staff of

the World Jewish Congress in New York. In this period he has already shown his ability, and I am sure that his addition to our team will mean very much for the work of our New York office.

The director of our office in Italy, my good friend, Fritz Becker, one of our longest-serving officials, who has done an outstanding job in the difficult years of the Vatican Council.

The director of Information, Mr. Jack Winocour in London, a brilliant journalist who has been serving for a number of years, with excellent results.

The Assembly agreed unanimously to elect these officers as associate members of the Executive Committee.

Dr. GOLDMANN: Now I would like to make a few more suggestions; then I will ask Mr. Torczyner to continue the proposals regarding the composition of the Executive Committee.

The Presidium and the Steering Committee propose that we elect Dr. Astorre Mayer, one of the outstanding European Jewish leaders, vice-chairman of the European Executive. More than anyone else, Dr. Mayer has built up in Milan what is today — maybe together with Strasbourg — the best Jewish community in Europe, with a wonderful school and all institutions of a Jewish community in the best sense of the word. He has been for years the chairman of the Standing Conference of European Jewish Community Services. He has lately become a member of the Jewish Agency Executive, and this alone would justify my characterizing him as one of the outstanding leaders of European Jewry. We have tried for over a year to get him to accept a responsible position in the World Jewish Congress, and we finally “quasi-succeeded” in inducing him.

Next, it is proposed that there be two vice-chairmen of the South American Branch of the Executive, namely, the president of the DAIA of Argentina and the president of the Jewish Confederation of Brazil, who are now Dr. Isaac Goldenberg and Dr. Moysés Kauffmann.

I now present to you the Steering Committee’s nomination of Rabbi Dr. Joachim Prinz as chairman of the Governing Council. I do not need to tell you much about him, for you know him very well. He is one of the few European leaders who succeeded in creating for himself a great position in American Jewry. He is now the chairman of the Presidents’ Conference. Until a few months ago he was the president of the American Jewish Congress. He is one of the most articulate and convinced believers in the idea of the World Jewish Congress.

I now turn to the chairmen of the permanent commissions. You know that the organizational changes recommended at Strasbourg — and on this occasion I want to thank Dr. Levenberg for his great effort during many months in connection with the change of the organizational setup of the Congress — included the establishment, in addition to the Budget and Finance Commission, of two new

permanent commissions, one for Culture and one for International Affairs. We were happy and lucky to get as the chairman of the Cultural Commission Professor André Neher, who has also been chairman of the French Section since the untimely death of our lamented friend, Maître Pierre Dreyfus-Schmidt. I do not need to tell you much about him; he is one of the outstanding spiritual leaders of world Jewry today and combines in a most unusual form a splendid style and a very important content. I am a speaker of old standing, and for me to be impressed by a speech – including my own – is not so easy any more. I can tell you, however, that whenever I listen to an address by Professor Neher I am very deeply impressed, even when I do not agree with him.

As chairman of the new Commission on International Affairs, we have Dr. S. Levenberg, a man who knows Jewish political problems as intimately as few do, and who has given a lot of his time and energy to work for the World Jewish Congress.

The man proposed as the chairman of the Budget and Finance Commission is not a newcomer in this area, having served for years as chairman of the Budget Committee. I am referring to our friend Shad Polier, one of the most vigorous spokesmen and defenders of the ideal of the World Jewish Congress in American Jewry, one of the leaders of the American Jewish Congress, a personal friend of mine, the son-in-law of Stephen Wise and a colleague for many years in the Claims Conference and now the Memorial Foundation.

Finally, it is proposed that we have two co-treasurers: Dr. Joseph Sagall of London, who has held this position for some time; and Dr. Tibor Rosenbaum of Geneva.

The proposals were approved unanimously.

Dr. GOLDMANN: I will ask Mr. Torczyner to read the list of the proposed honorary members of the Executive Committee and the key of representation for those members of the Executive Committee who are appointed by member organizations of the Congress. You know that we have two types of Executive members: full and associate.

When the delegations go home, then their respective communities and organizations will designate their members of the Executive Committee. This morning the Assembly passed a resolution which states that for as long as new members are not designated, the old members, that is, those who belong today to the Executive Committee, continue to serve. Therefore, at tomorrow morning's meeting of the Executive Committee, all current members who are still in Brussels have the right to participate. We have decided, on principle, that every country and member organization should have at least one associate member on the Executive Committee, so that even the smallest communities have the possibility to participate in the meetings of the Executive between the Assemblies.

Mr. TORCZYNER presented the following to be elected as honorary members of the Executive Committee:

Mr. Raffaele Cantoni
 Professor Fritz Feigl
 Mr. Marc Jarblum
 Professor Horace M. Kallen
 Mr. Sydney S. Silverman, MP
 Mr. Yaakov Zerubavel
 Mr. Baruch Zuckerman

The proposal was unanimously approved.

Mr. TORCZYNER then read the following key of representation on the Executive Committee, proposed by the Steering Committee:

Members of the Executive Committee to be appointed by constituent member organizations:

Country	Full Members	Associate Members
EUROPE		
Austria	1	1
Belgium	2	—
Eire	1	—
Finland	—	1
France	6	5
Germany	2	—
Great Britain	6	5
Greece	1	—
Italy	2	—
Luxembourg	—	1
Netherlands	1	1
Norway	—	1
Portugal	—	1
Rumania	2	1
Spain	1	—
Sweden	1	1
Switzerland	1	1
Yugoslavia	1	—
THE AMERICAS		
Argentina	6	5
Bolivia	1	—

Brazil	3	2
Canada	4	2
Chile	2	1
Colombia	1	—
Costa Rica	—	1
Cuba	—	1
Dominican Republic	—	1
Ecuador	—	1
El Salvador	—	1
Guatemala	—	1
Jamaica	—	1
Mexico	2	1
Panama	—	1
Paraguay	—	1
Peru	1	—
USA	18	8
Uruguay	2	1
Venezuela	1	1

ASIA

India	1	1
Iran	2	1
Israel	18	4
Japan	—	1
Philippines	—	1

AFRICA

Algeria	—	1
Congo	—	1
Ethiopia	—	1
Kenya	—	1
Rhodesia and Zambia	1	—
Tunisia	1	1
Morocco	2	—

AUSTRALASIA

Australia	3	1
New Zealand	1	—

Members of the Executive Committee to be appointed by associate member organizations:

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

WIZO	1	—
World OSE Union	1	—
World Union of Jewish Students (WUJS)	1	—
World Confederation of General Zionists	1	—
World Union of General Zionists	1	—
World Mizrahi and Hapoel Hamizrachi Organization	1	—
World Union of Tnuat HaHerut Hatzohar	1	—
Ichud Olami	1	—
International Union of Mapam Parties	1	—
World Union of Poale Agudat Israel	1	—
World Union of Achdut Ha'avoda — Poale Zion	1	—
World Federation of Polish Jews	1	—

REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Federation of Jewish Communities of Central America and Panama (FEDECO)	1	—
Scandinavian Jewish Youth Federation (SJUF)	1	—
	112	63

The proposal was unanimously adopted.

Mr. TORCZYNER then read the proposal of the Steering Committee concerning the composition of the Governing Council:

The chairman of the Governing Council;
the president of the World Jewish Congress;
the vice-presidents;
the chairmen of the four branches of the Executive Committee;
the chairman of the Commission on International Affairs;

the chairman of the Cultural Commission;
the chairman of the Budget and Finance Commission;
the co-treasurers;
two permanent representatives of each branch of the Executive Committee, with the right to nominate substitutes;
the secretary-general;
the heads of departments;
such Executive officials as the president may name;
the president may invite other members of the Executive Committee to serve with full rights; he may also invite other persons to participate in meetings of the Governing Council.

The proposal was unanimously adopted.

4. MEMORIAL ADDRESS ON THE OCCASION OF SHOLEM ALEICHEM YEAR

Dr. GOLDMANN: Before making my closing remarks, I have asked our good friend Zerubavel to speak on the occasion of the Sholem Aleichem Year. I think there is no better man than he to speak about this important event in Jewish cultural life.

Mr. YAAKOV ZERUBAVEL (*Israel*): I would like, first of all, to take this occasion to thank Dr. Goldmann for the friendly, comradely, and elegant birthday greetings he addressed to me the other day.

I recall that fifty years ago, on May 13, I had the sad privilege of standing at Sholem Aleichem's bedside when he shut his eyes forever. The newspapers of the day announced: "Jewish laughter has died." This is not altogether true, for Sholem Aleichem never had simply laughter in mind. He distinguished himself from all other writers in that he did not mock, deride, or ridicule — in this lay his kindheartedness, his simplicity, his humaneness. The poet of Kasrilevke never left Kasrilevke, but took it with him wherever he went. No other writer has so well described the Jew in all his aspects. Taken together, Tevye, Menachem Mendl, and Motl represent all Jews.

In his will, Sholem Aleichem asked to be put to rest among ordinary Jews. He also asked that on the anniversary of his death people should not mourn or be sad, but gather together to read one of his most humorous stories. "I should be remembered with laughter and not with sadness."

Fifty years have passed, and Kasrilevke has spread out over the entire world. In the spring of this year I had the privilege of attending the opening of the Sholem Aleichem House in Israel and hearing President Shazar proclaim Sholem Aleichem Year. What should be the purpose of this Year? It is not only a matter of reading Sholem Aleichem's stories, for they are already widely read and enjoyed by many people in many

languages. In the Sholem Aleichem Year we should try to penetrate into the deeper meaning of his writings and consider its application to our own situation today. We should learn from the naive, but at the same time very profound philosophy of his heroes, whose difficulties and sufferings can so obviously be compared to the tribulations of the whole Jewish people.

I ask your indulgence for a few more minutes, so that I can conclude by noting that this year we will also see the opening of a Leivik House in Israel. I do not want to go into an evaluation of the works of this great poet, but simply to recall a comparison he once made between the near-sacrifice of Isaac by Abraham and the holocaust. While the angel of God arrived in time to save Isaac, he said, the angel arrived too late to save the 6,000,000. From this bitter experience we learned that, while an angel can sometimes be late, a Jew must never tarry.

At this Assembly I have heard that fires and sacrificial altars are being prepared and knives honed on all sides. When we return home we should not simply be satisfied with the resolutions we have passed here; we should remember that we must not and cannot tarry.

5. PRESIDENT'S CLOSING REMARKS

Dr. GOLDMANN: I want to express our thanks to the Belgian Government and the Belgian people; the Deputy Prime Minister of Belgium, Mr. Willy de Clercq, and the Foreign Minister of Israel, Mr. Abba Eban, for their addresses at the opening session; the Mayor of Brussels, for his kind reception; all diplomatic representatives who attended the opening session; and the members of the press who so assiduously attended the various sessions.

Our gratitude also goes to the Belgian Section of the World Jewish Congress and the other Jewish organizations in Belgium for their hospitality and friendship; in particular, Maître Alexis Goldschmidt, president of the Section, and Mr. Marc Anisfeld, secretary of the Section, for their devoted work and cooperation in the preparations of the Assembly and their help during the sessions; the administration and the staff of the Palais des Congrès, for their work during day and night sessions and the sacrifices they made during their vacation period.

I want to voice our appreciation to the devoted staff of the World Jewish Congress from the offices in New York, London, Paris, Geneva, Tel-Aviv, and Jerusalem, under the direction of Dr. Riegner and Dr. Roth; to Mr. Armand Kaplan, who traveled several times to Brussels in the preparatory stages of the Assembly; to Dr. Elizabeth Eppler, who had a major task in the preparations and carried a heavy burden of work during the sessions; to Mr. Fritz Becker, responsible for the accommodation and documentation section; to Miss Myra Becker, responsible for the financial management; to Messrs. Jack Winocour and

Monty Jacobs, responsible for the press department; and to the whole team of the press and summary-record services.

Our thanks also go to Dr. Natan Lerner, who served as secretary of the Presidium; Mr. Lavy Becker, who had the unenviable task of allocating time for speakers; and all the secretaries of the commissions: Mr. Melamet, Dr. Brassloff, Dr. Beigel, Miss Cohen, Mrs. Marquet, and Dr. Eppler; Mr. Norman Lourie, head of the Service d'Ordre; Mr. Jack Barnett, responsible for the mimeographing service, which produced hundreds of documents in the space of a few days; all the secretaries and collaborators; the students and voluntary workers who helped with such devotion and kindness in the work of the Assembly; and the team of interpreters and translators.

This was, by far, the most representative Assembly, with delegates coming from fifty-four countries. Practically the totality of the Diaspora was here. This Assembly was distinguished by the presence of fraternal delegates and observers representing important Jewish bodies and organizations, who participated actively in the plenary sessions and in commissions. I would also like to mention the participation of delegates representing the communities of Rumania and of Hungary, the two largest Eastern European Jewish communities, next to that of the Soviet Union.

This Assembly has received more attention and publicity than previous ones, partly because of the subjects which were discussed, partly because of its very representative character. We can say, without exaggeration, that the World Jewish Congress has definitely established itself as the most representative address of the Jewish people in the world. The presence of the diplomats and of the representatives of great international organizations was an indication of the position achieved by the Congress.

Even more important is the fact that, having brought together nearly 500 delegates from fifty-four countries, with all the differences of language, culture, thinking, and approaches to problems, we succeeded in getting almost all the important resolutions adopted unanimously. This is a proof that, despite the curse of the Jewish dispersion it is possible for Jews of all groups, of all countries, of all civilizations, of all religious approaches, to speak together, to decide together, and, based on these common decisions, to act together. This is probably the greatest achievement of the World Jewish Congress. It has proved what many people doubted — and even many of us doubted it, in the beginning or in the preparatory years of the Congress: that it is possible for such a unique people to be spread all over the world, with quite different, contradictory, and opposing traditions, and yet, with a certain amount of tolerance, understanding, and mutual goodwill, to bridge the unavoidable gaps and to work and act together. We have dealt at this Assembly with very delicate problems: the German

problem, Soviet Jewry, problems of peace and the international situation, on which there are wide differences of approach. It was very good that especially in the Political Commission these differences were aired and discussed on the same very high level that characterized its deliberations in general. But the fact that, after all these differences, Dr. Nussbaum could present here unanimous proposals is, for me, possibly the greatest sign of maturity, of responsibility, and of the will of the large majority of the Jewish people to work together.

Let me now say something, in all frankness and friendship. This Congress and its leadership are beginning to be overage, and I include myself first of all. It is not good if an organization is too identified with one of its leaders. I am not an arrogant person; I am not a falsely modest person; I know what I can do and what I can achieve. The slogan that has been created, that it is Nahum Goldmann's Congress, and the excessively central position that I occupy, are not healthy for the Congress, and certainly not for me. There are biological facts and nobody knows how long he can go on. The same applies to my intimate colleagues, Israel Sieff and some others. I say this not in order to escape responsibility, but in order to make it clear to you that you must, in the coming years, build up a Congress for which I am no longer indispensable. I once had the daring to tell a greater Jewish leader than I am, to Chaim Weizmann, at a Zionist Congress: "No leader, Dr. Weizmann, is indispensable." Many people were very angry with me at that time, but nevertheless I later became a very intimate friend and follower of his. I still believe that what I said is right. It is very bad for an organization if any one of its leaders, whoever it may be, becomes indispensable. An organization must be greater than all its leadership taken together. It is the main task of the delegates and of the leaders in the various countries to fortify the Congress.

The idea of the Congress has gained great strength. The principle of Jewish unity is accepted today by that part of the Jewish people which fought and ridiculed the Congress, thought it a utopia, and maintained that it was impossible for representatives of dozens of Jewish communities to work together on a long-term basis. We managed to survive thirty years, some of which were the worst years in Jewish history, and to remain together. So, when you go home, strengthen the Congress! Do not rely on Israel Sieff, on myself, or on others! Regard yourselves as coresponsible for the future of the Congress.

I am afraid that the World Jewish Congress may become even more indispensable to the Jewish people in the years to come than it was in the seven years between Stockholm and Brussels. We are living in an unstable world, and it is becoming ever more unstable; a world full of tension and unrest, full of social problems of astronomical magnitude. This situation constitutes a great potential danger for the Jewish

communities. This is not in contradiction to what I said about the diminishing importance of pure anti-Semitism. The danger to the Jewish communities consists not so much of outspoken anti-Semitism or anti-Jewish movements, but of the tension and unrest in the world. What has happened in many countries of Latin America, for example, had nothing to do with the Jews or with anti-Jewishness. But Jews may become the victims, not necessarily because the regimes are anti-Jewish but because in this social unrest, in these struggles and revolutionary processes, Jewish communities are threatened.

The growing tension that finds its expression in the Vietnam war, which also has nothing to do with Jewish issues, is a disaster for us. It reflects indirectly on the problem of Soviet Jewry; it reflects on the position of Israel. There is one world today, in which each problem reflects on the other. The Jewish people dispersed over the world, including that part which lives in its own country, in the State of Israel, can only develop and prosper and feel safe in a secure and safe world. International conflicts threaten us more than any other community or any other minority or people in the world — that is an iron law of Jewish history in the Diaspora. I am therefore afraid that this instrument that we have forged over the past thirty years and more — this instrument which in the last few years may have seemed not so necessary, as the Nazis no longer exist and anti-Semitism is no longer so fashionable and threatening — may become more necessary to the Jewish people as a whole and to some communities in particular. Therefore, we should return to our homes with the strong will to strengthen the Congress.

I am frank enough to say that the external prestige of the World Jewish Congress is much greater than its internal solidity and strength. Non-Jews often exaggerate and overestimate the strength of the Jewish people. I remember a talk with the late Pope Pius XII when he was still the Vatican's secretary of state. He wanted to prove to me that the Jewish people was stronger than the Catholic Church. I remember a talk with Litvinov, who wanted to tell me that — if only the Jewish people wanted it — the democracies would have to do what the Jewish people wanted them to do. I have experienced many examples of this overestimation of the strength of the Jewish people.

Sometimes the non-Jewish world also overestimates the strength, the prestige, and the authority of the World Jewish Congress; but I appeal to you not to take the Congress for granted. We have succeeded in growing, we have established ourselves in many parts of the world, we have succeeded in bringing the overwhelming majority of American Jewry nearer to us, and we are on the point of bringing back Eastern European Jewry; nevertheless, despite all these successes, we ought to worry about the future of the World Jewish Congress and not leave it to the leadership to take care of and, once in five years, come

to applaud or criticize. Feel yourselves responsible, because no external image of a people or of an organization can substitute for a strong internal front. We have to strengthen the internal front of the World Jewish Congress, to defend its ideal and its existence. Tell your communities that this instrument exists, that it has gained greatly in prestige and authority in the Jewish and the non-Jewish world, that it is available for communities that need it — we never deal with problems of communities unless they ask us to do so — but strengthen the Congress in your communities. And, above all, bring in younger people.

Nothing has brought me greater satisfaction than to see, in many delegations, young faces, people I did not know; because all Jewish organizations — this applies to the Zionist movement as well as to the World Jewish Congress — are beginning to become “closed shops,” and this is becoming an intolerable worry, especially for the future. You know in advance what this one will say, because you have heard him say it for the last twenty years. Bring in unknown faces, unknown people; if they criticize the older leadership, if they are more violent, or if they have less sense of responsibility — very well. When I was young, I belonged to the same category. I enjoyed far more being in the opposition and being critical than holding the power in this or in that organization and being a symbol of the Jewish Establishment. Therefore, go back and bring young people into the leadership, even if they are not absolutely right. They will learn to swim only by plunging into the water. If they make mistakes and we sometimes react violently, I ask the young people not to get frightened, for the future is theirs, not ours. Unless a younger generation of leadership comes into the Congress, I am worried for its future.

I hope, however, that peace in the world will be maintained, for nobody is more vitally interested therein than we are. I hope that the security of Israel will be strengthened in the coming few years. What I said about worrying about our future applies to Israel, too. We are too easily fooled by momentarily quiet situations. We are a people for whom one of the greatest dangers is what the anti-Semite Schopenhauer once called “*der verruchte jüdische Optimismus*.” If you disregard the adjective *verruht* — sacrilegious — there is something in what he said. We have survived because of our optimism; we have paid with millions of Jews because of our optimism. It is better to worry about one’s future than to live in an illusion about one’s security. This applies to Israel and certainly to the Diaspora.

We will certainly undertake a critical analysis before we call the next Assembly, and even prior to our next Executive Committee meeting — which, with almost 200 participants, is a near Assembly — and learn something from the experience of this Assembly.

Let us be resolved to develop this valuable, difficult, and complex instrument which we have created over decades of hard work, and make it more and more available and creative for securing the Jewish future, both in Israel and in the countries of the world.

APPENDIX I.

RESOLUTIONS AND DECISIONS OF THE FIFTH PLENARY ASSEMBLY OF THE WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS

A. POLITICAL RESOLUTIONS

1. PEACE AND DISARMAMENT

The Fifth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress records its profound disquiet that, more than two decades after the conclusion of the Second World War and the establishment of the United Nations, men continue to die in battle and uncounted thousands of defenseless civilians — men, women, and children — continue to be sacrificed on the altar of war.

The Assembly expresses its deep sorrow at this avoidable destruction of human life and the incalculable suffering which accompanies it. To remain silent in the face of this tragedy would be to evade the solemn obligations we have inherited from the teachings of our law-givers and Prophets and to be false to Jewish teachings of the supreme value of human life and the inalienable rights of every human being.

Every international military conflict in this age of nuclear weapons carries the threat of catastrophe for all mankind.

The suffering and destruction caused by wars such as those now being waged in Vietnam, Yemen, and elsewhere demonstrate the failure of international statesmanship to create a world order under the rule of law in which the promise written into the Charter of the United Nations “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war” would be fulfilled. The Assembly regrets that the resolution adopted last year by the United Nations General Assembly, with the support of seventy nations, calling for an international conference on disarmament to which all nations — whether members of the United Nations or not — would be invited, remains no more than the expression of a remote hope. It is clear that the war in Vietnam causes

incalculable suffering and destruction. Accordingly, the Assembly calls upon all parties engaged in military conflict in Vietnam and elsewhere to enter into negotiations with a view to ending these wars.

The Assembly considers that the search for agreements on disarmament within the framework of the United Nations should not only continue but be pressed forward with renewed determination. It urges that the following objectives should be sought in the discussions now taking place under United Nations auspices:

1. an agreement to prevent proliferation of nuclear armament, including an undertaking by the nuclear powers not to make available, directly or indirectly, nuclear weapons to other countries, or to help them to produce such weapons; and to provide appropriate guarantees to nonnuclear powers which undertake not to manufacture or acquire nuclear armaments;
2. a ban against all nuclear tests, including those carried out underground;
3. a treaty to reserve outer space for peaceful purposes only, including a firm prohibition of claims to national sovereignty or the introduction of military armaments of any form;
4. a determined effort to begin the reduction of existing armaments — conventional and nuclear — and, in any event, to secure agreement to halt the growth of armaments, whether for national purposes or for supply to other countries.

The Assembly draws particular attention to the desirability, pending the adoption of any scheme of comprehensive disarmament, of regional disarmament agreements. Such agreements would not only lift the burden of expenditure from countries which find it increasingly intolerable, but would lead to a relaxation of international tensions and in turn facilitate the movement toward the creation of a structure of international relations based on peace, justice, and equality among nations.

2. HUMAN RIGHTS

The Fifth Plenary Assembly warmly welcomes the renewed efforts of the international community to create instruments for the protection of human rights and the eradication of racist ideologies and religious prejudice.

It regards the unanimous adoption by the United Nations General Assembly of a Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination as marking an important step forward in the struggle to secure universal and effective protection for human rights; and it is gratified that this instrument outlaws incitement to racial hatred and organizations seeking to foment it, and at the

same time makes available to the signatory governments effective means of international implementation.

The Assembly welcomes the development and extension of the human rights activities of the Council of Europe, which, by adopting a Convention on and by establishing a Court of Human Rights, has opened up new perspectives for the whole of the international community. The Assembly hopes that the precedents set by the Council of Europe will stimulate the creation of similar systems for the protection of human rights in other regions.

The Assembly also welcomes the adoption by the Ecumenical Council of the Roman Catholic Church of a Declaration on Religious Liberty. The implementation of this historic declaration, particularly on the local level, could bring about a radical transformation in the climate of religious opinion and in particular help to eradicate the misuse and degradation of theological doctrine as a justification for discrimination and group hatred.

While those and like measures adopted by international bodies are unreservedly welcomed by the Assembly because of the objectives they embody, their real value must depend on their implementation under international scrutiny, and their faithful application by governments to their domestic situations. The Assembly notes with disquiet that many states have failed to ratify one or other of the human rights conventions adopted by the United Nations or the Council of Europe. Some have ratified none at all. The United Nations Convention on Genocide, which was adopted in 1948, remains unratified by nearly half the member states, among them not only states with great libertarian traditions but original sponsors and signatories of the convention.

The failure of these powers to ratify conventions which they sponsored or voted for raises some grave questions. The Assembly notes that these states are committed by the Charter to help "to achieve international cooperation in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all." Failure to discharge this Charter obligation not only weakens the system that seeks to safeguard human rights through international conventions, but is an encouragement to governments that try to evade international obligations to which they are indifferent or hostile.

Accordingly, the Assembly addresses an earnest appeal to all the governments that have not yet done so to ratify all the human rights conventions. It urges them at the same time to give full support to the proposal, now under study in the United Nations, to establish an Office of a High Commissioner for Human Rights, among whose duties will be the encouragement of both the ratification and implementation of these conventions.

The Assembly affirms that the strengthening of the machinery

for the protection of human rights has become all the more urgent because of the rise of reactionary and extreme nationalistic movements in various parts of the world. Even when such movements disclaim anti-Semitic tendencies, the Assembly, mindful of the tragic lessons of the past, sees in them a threat to democratic institutions and principles and the breeding ground of racist and anti-Semitic ideologies.

The Assembly calls upon all Jewish communities and organizations, working in cooperation with democratic movements everywhere, to combat these evil forces with every lawful means and expresses the hope that all governments will, within the framework of their constitutional powers and obligations, take the necessary steps to protect society from this menace.

3. INTERNATIONAL YEAR FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

The Fifth Plenary Assembly warmly welcomes the decision of the United Nations General Assembly to designate 1968 as International Year for Human Rights, and requests the officers and member organizations of the Congress, in response to the invitation of the United Nations, to cooperate in the observance of that year on both national and international levels.

The Assembly notes with appreciation that the United Nations General Assembly at its last session invited member states to ratify conventions already concluded in the field of human rights and decided at the same time to accelerate the adoption of the Draft Covenants on Human Rights and other draft conventions on the elimination of religious intolerance and on freedom of information, in preparation for the International Year for Human Rights.

The Assembly endorses the proposal, unanimously adopted in July by the Tenth General Conference of Nongovernmental Organizations with consultative status with the United Nations Economic and Social Council, on the motion of a number of international NGOs, including the World Jewish Congress, that an ad hoc committee be established to facilitate collaboration among NGOs in the observance of the International Year.

The Assembly expresses the hope that this committee will secure acceptance of the proposal to appoint a United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights as one of the objectives of the International Year, and that it will urge appropriate representation for nongovernmental organizations at the international conference of member states which will be held in 1968 to review achievements in the human rights field since the adoption of the Universal Declaration.

4. THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

The Fifth Plenary Assembly records its alarm that the international community has not yet been able to provide the resources and develop a policy designed to place developing countries on the road toward self-sustaining economies and adequate living standards for their populations. Two thirds of the world's population live at or below subsistence level; and the gap between affluent societies and the developing countries, instead of being closed, is actually widening.

The Assembly does not doubt that, given the will, the developed countries possess the resources and the technical capacity to deal effectively with these problems. But astronomical sums are being poured into the making of the means of mass destruction and the building up of military establishments, and technical ability is being mobilized in ever increasing measure to devise and organize more effective ways of killing man, instead of overcoming his real enemies: illiteracy, disease, hunger, and poverty.

The Assembly warmly commends the secretary-general of the United Nations, who, with consistent courage and unwavering devotion to the highest interests of humanity, has warned the affluent nations that a continuation of the present situation is fraught with the gravest danger. It pledges full support to his efforts to secure those far-reaching and imaginative changes which alone can restore hope in the future of the international community.

5. ISRAEL

The Fifth Plenary Assembly sends its fraternal greetings to the government and people of the State of Israel. It sees in the State of Israel both the fulfillment of an immemorial Jewish aspiration and one of the great accomplishments of our time.

The Assembly expresses its admiration for the impressive achievements attained by the State of Israel in its eighteen years of existence, in immigration, absorption, culture, education, economic and social development, and international relations. It reaffirms the hope that Israel will continue to build a progressive and creative society where newcomers from all over the world will find their national home and will be able to unite in the renewal of Jewish national life.

The Assembly expresses the hope that Jews, and particularly young Jews, from all parts of the world will in increasing numbers decide to settle in Israel, participate personally in its upbuilding, and find there the fulfillment of a full Jewish life.

The Assembly is proud to record the increasingly significant role that Israel is playing in the international field and the fruitful coopera-

tion which Israel is extending to developing nations with which she is sharing her technical, scientific, and social knowledge.

The Assembly records with pride the achievements of the State of Israel in its historic aim of ingathering the exiles into a united and cohesive nation. It is conscious of the gigantic task that still lies ahead and calls upon the Jewish people, all over the world, to lend their full support to the efforts of the Israel government and the Jewish Agency to absorb the new immigrants, to integrate them culturally and socially, and to create for all sections of the population dignified conditions of life.

The Assembly urges all governments, irrespective of their social systems or political alignments, to facilitate the immigration of those Jews who desire to participate in the reconstitution of Jewish national life in its ancient homeland. In this context, it recalls that the right of immigration to Israel is implicit in the resolution of the United Nations sanctioning the reestablishment of the State of Israel, and is reinforced by the right of everyone to leave any country, embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

6. ISRAEL AND THE ARAB STATES

The Fifth Plenary Assembly deplores the continued refusal of the neighboring Arab states to negotiate peace with Israel. It regards this as a threat to peace and an obstacle to the social progress of the whole Middle East. It urges all enlightened sectors of the Arab peoples to support and strengthen those sober voices in the Arab world that have courageously called for an effort to achieve an understanding between Israel and the Arab states leading to the establishment of peace.

The Assembly is convinced that agreement among the great powers, with a view to preventing aggression and to halting the arms race resulting from belligerent policies directed against Israel by certain Arab states, is essential for the development of an atmosphere in which the attainment of peace will be possible.

Taking note of Israel's continuing readiness to enter into negotiations that will lead to peace, the Assembly addresses a most earnest appeal to the great powers to take joint or parallel action which will ensure that neither an imbalance of arms nor the promise or prospect of new arms deliveries will encourage military aggression.

In the interests both of the social progress of all the countries in the region which are burdened by heavy expenditures for arms, and of establishing stability in an area crucial for the maintenance of peace in the world, the Assembly urges the great powers to take appropriate action with a view to safeguarding the territorial integrity and vital national interests of all the states in the region.

7. ENCOUNTERS BETWEEN JEWS AND ARABS

The Fifth Plenary Assembly endorses the proposal that in any country or region where there are both Jews and Arabs, appropriate steps should be taken to facilitate discussions and encounters designed to combat and correct efforts by anti-Jewish groups and movements seeking to undermine Arab-Jewish relations.

The Assembly deplores the activity of certain Arab groups, often working in the closest relationship with blatantly anti-Semitic organizations, to destroy the friendly relations which have for long existed between Jewish and Arab communities in various parts of the world. It expresses the conviction that frank and informed discussions between representatives of both peoples will contribute to the development of an atmosphere of understanding, and will ultimately be beneficial to the interest of both groups and to the communities in which they live.

8. SOVIET JEWRY

The Fifth Plenary Assembly deeply regrets the absence of representatives of Soviet Jewry from its deliberations. It expresses the hope that the conditions responsible for this absence will be speedily corrected and the World Jewish Congress will have the joy of welcoming the return of this great community to active fellowship in world Jewry.

The Assembly again records its distress at the continuing religious and cultural discrimination experienced by Soviet Jewry, and urges the Soviet government to reexamine its policies and administrative practices with a view to ensuring to the Jewish minority the same rights and facilities as are enjoyed by other groups, religious and cultural.

The Assembly notes with appreciation that Jewish concern with this situation has increasingly been shared by wide sections of world public opinion, including longtime friends of the Soviet Union, and that they have publicly called for a just application of Soviet laws and a firm implementation of the principle of equality for all religious and cultural groups, in order to redress the inequities which have militated against the effort to maintain a distinctive Jewish life in the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union has promoted the cultural progress of the more than a hundred national groups that inhabit its territories, among them ethnic communities both small in numbers and widely dispersed, which enjoy extensive facilities and rights designed to enable them to develop every aspect of their cultural heritage.

The Assembly finds it impossible to believe that in such a system the Jewish minority, with its rich cultural heritage, will be permanently relegated to the anomalous position of being denied religious and cultural facilities and so exposed to involuntary assimilation.

Minor ameliorations in this area, which are welcome in themselves, are limited in their scope and leave the central problem of Soviet Jewry unresolved. That problem will remain until the Jews of the Soviet Union are afforded the same facilities for self-expression and the exercise of the right of association as are granted to other groups in the Soviet Union.

The Assembly also draws attention to the burden of avoidable suffering which is borne by numerous Jews in the Soviet Union who, after the lapse of twenty years and more, remain separated from their families as a result of the war and the unspeakable horrors which the Nazi invaders visited on the Jewish population. The international community has in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights recognized that "the family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and state." We renew our appeal that facilities should be made available to all those who for so many years have yearned for reunion with their families in Israel and elsewhere.

Accordingly, the Assembly urges the Soviet authorities to redress the inequities of the existing situation by the following measures:

1. facilitating and safeguarding the exercise of the national and cultural rights of the Jews in the Soviet Union on a basis of full equality with other groups;
2. safeguarding the unhampered practice of their religion by Jewish religious communities, including both the establishment of a country-wide representation and other essential religious institutions;
3. granting the same facilities and rights to Soviet Jews to participate in Jewish international meetings and organizations, comparable with those enjoyed by members of other groups;
4. intensifying educational and administrative measures to eradicate anti-Semitism wherever in the Soviet Union it may persist, and whatever form it may take;
5. facilitating the reunion in Israel and elsewhere of separated families.

9. CHRISTIANS AND JEWS

The Fifth Plenary Assembly notes with satisfaction that since the last Assembly, the Christian churches have begun to reshape their thinking concerning the Jewish people and have, through pronouncements made in recent times, urged their adherents to eliminate the age-old prejudices contained in Christian teaching concerning the Jews, and have thus established a basis for better understanding between Christians and Jews.

The Assembly regards the pronouncements made by the New

Delhi Conference of the World Council of Churches and by the Ecumenical Council in Rome as evidence of the goodwill of many Christian clerical and lay leaders from all countries. The World Jewish Congress looks forward to the practical implementation, at all levels and by all Christian communities, of these new teachings and welcomes such initial practical steps and initiatives as have already been taken, both on the international and local levels.

10. GERMANY

The Fifth Plenary Assembly declares that the Jewish people cannot forget the appalling tragedies, sufferings, and losses inflicted by the Nazi Third Reich upon the Jewish people through the annihilation of 6,000,000 Jews. This iniquity imposes upon the German people and its government responsibilities which have not yet been fully acknowledged.

This Assembly is particularly disturbed by the tendency increasingly evident of the desire to forget the past instead of to overcome it. The appearance of public manifestations and assemblies of men who belong to organizations condemned as criminal by international public opinion is an example of these remains of the Nazi system.

The impatience of many among the German people with the trials of Nazi war criminals and the leniency of some of the verdicts handed down by some German courts are disturbing symptoms.

The Assembly acknowledges that many religious, political, and intellectual German leaders and, indeed, the responsible German press, have often warned their own people against these dangers.

In expressing its profound concern, the Assembly also voices the hope that the young German generation will understand its moral obligation not to forget the past, and resolve never to allow a revival of the ideology which brought calamity to the Jewish people and disaster to the world and to Germany herself.

The Assembly calls upon the German authorities, fédéral and state, to intensify and extend the range of educational measures to counteract these dangerous tendencies and to use and review existing legislation so as to make it more effective against incitement to racial and religious hatred.

11. INDEMNIFICATION BY GERMANY

The Fifth Plenary Assembly reaffirms its desire to secure proper indemnification from Germany to all victims of Nazi persecution.

While acknowledging the achievements of the present indemnification program, the Assembly expresses its concern at the inadequacy of some of the existing arrangements and in particular at some recent developments which have led to the whittling away or curtailing of previously accorded indemnification rights or to the postponement of their realization. The Assembly regretfully sees in these developments an apparent weakening of the spirit in which indemnification was conceived by its originators.

In this connection, the Assembly strongly protests against the recent restriction of indemnification payments through the budgetary economy measures introduced in the German Federal Republic and recalls the repeated declarations of leading ministers of the German government that indemnification to Nazi victims is a debt of honor which must be treated as a matter of highest priority.

The Assembly urges the speeding up of the processing and satisfaction of indemnification claims and draws special attention to the great number of aged and infirm victims whose claims have not yet been met.

The Assembly requests that the deadline be reopened for registration of claims relating to assets in formerly occupied countries, particularly since the present legal situation is prejudicial to the interests of Jews who suffered persecution in Eastern Europe. As far as the Hardship Fund for confiscated household goods and personal effects, set up within the framework of the Federal Restitution Law, is concerned, the Assembly considers it indefensible that even the small payments from this fund may take many years because of the totally insufficient personnel of the indemnification agency concerned, and urges the increase of this personnel so that victims may receive indemnification during their lifetime.

The Assembly is also concerned at the delay in issuing the implementary order listing the places of detention in regard to which a presumption of damage to health has been stipulated in the Final Indemnification Law and urges that ghettos, forced labor camps, and similar detention places in which conditions were equivalent to those of concentration camps should be included in the list.

In regard to the Special Fund established by the Final Compensation Law for the benefit of victims who emigrated from Eastern Europe after October 1, 1953, the Assembly considers that a much fairer system of distribution than at present provided could be arrived at without any additional financial expenditure and urges therefore that the present system be revised in consultation with the competent Jewish organizations.

The Assembly expresses its regret that the present indemnification arrangements completely bar from receiving indemnification those victims who reside in countries in Eastern Europe which have no diplo-

matic relationship with the Federal Republic. Having regard to the fact that this affects those Jewries who suffered most at the hands of the Nazis, the Assembly urges that this situation be speedily remedied.

The Assembly is also greatly disturbed at the unwillingness of the German Democratic Republic to make any contribution to the indemnification of Jewish victims of Nazi persecution and expresses the hope that this attitude will be changed and that the German Democratic Republic will fulfill its moral obligations to the victims of Nazism.

12. TRIALS OF NAZI CRIMINALS

The Fifth Plenary Assembly regrets that the parliament of the German Federal Republic has only extended, in regard to the prosecution of Nazi war criminals, the period before which the statute of limitation will apply, instead of eliminating entirely the application of this principle to war crimes and crimes against humanity. It reiterates the demand of the Jewish people, fortified as it has been by the resolutions both by the United Nations and the Council of Europe, that war crimes and crimes against humanity must not remain unpunished for reasons of statutory limitations.

The Assembly urges the Federal government to take the necessary measures to remove any obstacles to the initiation of new trials of Nazi criminals after 1969.

13. CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY AND STATUTES OF LIMITATION

The Fifth Plenary Assembly welcomes the legislative and administrative measures taken by a number of governments, as well as decisions by the United Nations and the Council of Europe, designed to prevent the application of statutory limitations to war crimes and crimes against humanity. It wholeheartedly shares the view, upon which these measures and decisions are based, that the very nature of these crimes makes it indefensible that their perpetrators should remain immune from prosecution and punishment.

It records with concern that in a number of countries in Europe, Africa, and the Western Hemisphere, local statutes of limitation, and political and administrative decisions with the same effect, have already resulted in the denial of the extradition to Germany and other countries of persons accused of the gravest crimes against humanity; and that elsewhere such statutes of limitation will be applied within the next few years.

The Assembly calls on its member communities and organizations to draw the attention of the governments of their coun-

tries, wherever appropriate, to the resolution adopted by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights which

“urges all states to take any measures necessary to prevent the application of statutory limitations to war crimes and crimes against humanity, and to continue their efforts to ensure the arrest, extradition, and punishment of persons responsible for war crimes and crimes against humanity, and to make available to other states any documents in their possession relating to such crimes.”

While the Assembly supports on general grounds the proposal to formulate and adopt an international convention forbidding the application of statutes of limitation to these crimes, it must emphasize that there is no assurance that it will have any relevance to the cases of Second World War criminals who have so far escaped prosecution or have secured immunity. On the basis of past experience, the process of formulation, adoption by the United Nations, and ratification by member states will take an unforeseeable period of years; nor can there be any assurance that the states most closely affected will ratify such a convention and amend their legislation accordingly.

The Assembly is concerned that the mere prospect of the adoption of a convention may be used as a justification for the continued validity of statutes of limitation enacted before its coming into force. It urges that every precaution be taken both in the text itself and otherwise to avoid this possibility.

The Assembly reaffirms that in the meantime it is the responsibility of every government to ensure that persons under its jurisdiction who are accused of crimes against humanity but have evaded trial shall be brought to justice.

14. COUNCIL OF EUROPE

The Fifth Plenary Assembly notes with satisfaction the continuing efforts of the Council of Europe to extend the range of application of its Convention on Human Rights and the machinery it has established for the implementation of the rights and freedoms embodied therein.

It earnestly calls on those member governments of the Council of Europe who have not yet done so to ratify without delay the Convention and its protocols and to accept the optional clauses relating to individual petition and to the jurisdiction of the European Court of Human Rights.

The Assembly also records its appreciation that the Council of Europe, during the past two years, in furthering its work for human rights and freedoms has adopted resolutions and recommendations on the following subjects:

- (a) the nonapplication of statutory limitations to crimes committed for political, racial, and religious motives before and during the Second World War and, more generally, crimes against humanity;
- (b) the situation of Soviet Jewry;
- (c) legislation against incitement to racial, national, and religious hatred and violence.

The Assembly appeals to all member governments to support the above resolutions and recommendations and to take early steps to bring them into effect. It urges member organizations to make, where appropriate, further representation to their governments in regard to these resolutions.

15. ANTI-SEMITISM

The Fifth Plenary Assembly draws attention to the resurgence of anti-Semitic activity in various parts of the world and the development of international organizations, some public and some clandestine, which seek to coordinate the agitation of national groups and to disseminate racist and anti-Semitic material throughout the world.

The Assembly expresses the hope that the governments of the countries in which this racist material is either produced or received will cooperate in preventing this traffic, which encourages the subversion of democracy.

The Assembly calls upon all member communities and organizations to maintain a vigilant watch on anti-Semitic groups in their countries, and to keep the headquarters of the Congress informed on such movements and their activities in order that appropriate international action may be taken.

The Assembly also expresses the hope that governments will ratify without delay the convention adopted by the United Nations on the elimination of racial discrimination and, under the provisions of this instrument, will take the necessary steps to curb and outlaw the efforts of anti-Semitic organizations to incite to racist and religious hatred.

16. DAY OF REMEMBRANCE

The Fifth Plenary Assembly calls on Jewish communities the world over to hold commemoration meetings in memory of the 6,000,000 Jewish martyrs and in tribute to the heroic ghetto fighters on the 27th of Nissan, proclaimed by the Knesset of Israel as the "Day of Remembrance of the Holocaust and of Heroism" (*yom hazikaron lasho'a velagvura*).

It also calls upon Jews the world over to organize group visits to

former concentration camps which have now become Jewish sanctuaries.

The Assembly places on record its sense of deep appreciation of the action of the Polish government in establishing a Jewish memorial pavilion in the former extermination camp at Auschwitz as well as of its arrangements to memorialize Jewish victims of the Nazi terror in other camps. This act of homage to the martyred Jews of Europe is deeply appreciated by Jews everywhere. The Assembly hopes that this memorial pavilion and other places of remembrance in the camps will become places of pilgrimage for Jews of all countries, and calls on all member communities and organizations to make appropriate arrangements to encourage such pilgrimages.

17. THE 2500th ANNIVERSARY OF THE REIGN OF CYRUS

The Fifth Plenary Assembly has received with great satisfaction a report from the Iranian delegation on the celebration of the 2500th anniversary of the reign of Cyrus and the commemoration of his memorable contribution to human welfare and to the restoration of Jewish life in its historic homeland.

The Assembly calls upon all member communities and organizations to participate in these celebrations in the spirit of the resolution adopted at the last Plenary Assembly in Stockholm.

B. CULTURAL RESOLUTIONS

1. APPEAL TO THE JEWISH PEOPLE

The Fifth Plenary Assembly calls upon the Jewish people to adopt the following fundamental principles in the field of cultural endeavors:

HAPANIM LA'AM — FACE TO FACE WITH THE PEOPLE

Deeply concerned by the continuous grave dangers which assimilation and apathy signify for the Jewish people and at the same time profoundly conscious of the numerous signs of revival and reconstruction of Jewish life throughout the dispersion and of the stimulating spiritual forces liberated by the existence and development of the State of Israel, the Assembly calls upon the Jewish people to mobilize all its material and spiritual resources to realize its ideals and preserve its values.

The Assembly, in response to the appeal of the young generation eager for Jewish knowledge and in quest of Jewish orientation, calls on the Jewish people to join in a cultural offensive to meet all the problems the diversity of which constitutes a stimulating challenge for the Jewish people of today.

HAPANIM LA'OLAM — FACE TO FACE WITH THE WORLD

In this critical period, when humanity is in search of creative values, the Assembly solemnly declares that the universal content of traditional, moral, religious, and spiritual Jewish values offers a strong and dynamic impulse in the fight for freedom and human equality.

2. JEWISH EDUCATION

The Fifth Plenary Assembly declares that, in order to stem the tide of assimilation and to combat the drift away from Jewish life resulting from ignorance, it is vital that the Congress, the institutions in which it participates, and its member communities and organizations should strengthen their cultural activities.

The Assembly expresses its conviction that only by a comprehensive educational program, including Jewish religious and secular kindergartens, day schools, secondary schools, and supplementary schools, will it be possible to ensure the continuation of Jewishness in the coming generation.

An expanded understanding and use of Hebrew, the language of the Jewish cultural heritage, of the Jewish state, and of the Jewish future, must be a major educational aim. Where the use of Yiddish prevails, it too should be fortified as one of the bastions of Jewish culture.

Educational programs for children and young people must be imbued with a sense of responsibility toward the Jewish people, love of Israel and the Jewish heritage, and personal dedication to the upbuilding and development of the Jewish state.

The rise of the Jewish state gave Jews everywhere a new national dignity. Similarly, Israel's struggle to create a new and just society out of the masses of its new citizens will attract large numbers of young Jews and bring them closer to the orbit of Jewish life.

3. THE JEWISH HOME AND THE JEWISH SCHOOL

The Fifth Plenary Assembly declares that efforts expended on Jewish education of the young and on building of Jewish schools and other institutions for Jewish studies can have no lasting effect unless they are fully backed by genuinely Jewish home life.

A campaign should be initiated everywhere and on the widest possible scale to educate the Jewish public to the fact that a Jewish child without a truly Jewish home life is, in the present circumstances of the

Diaspora, exposed to assimilation and the danger of losing Jewish identity.

4. YOUTH AND STUDENTS COMMISSION

The Fifth Plenary Assembly, conscious of the need to prepare future generations for the responsibilities of Jewish life, urges the member communities and organizations of the Congress to devote their efforts to the education of Jewish youth, and in particular of Jewish students, and the same time to offer greater opportunities for the active participation of young people in their councils.

The Assembly requests the Cultural Department to assist the cultural work of Jewish youth and student organizations with the aid of a special subcommission to be set up for this purpose and, wherever practicable, in cooperation with the Jewish Agency.

5. CONFERENCES OF JEWISH INTELLECTUALS

The Fifth Plenary Assembly, concerned by the aloofness of many Jewish intellectuals from the community, notes with satisfaction the activities among Jewish intellectuals through colloquia dealing with their place in the community and with other Jewish issues.

Such colloquia organized under the auspices of the Congress in France, Britain, Argentina, and Israel have attracted many scholars, writers, and university teachers to the community and particularly to the study of lasting Jewish values and contemporary Jewish problems.

The Assembly urges, therefore, the constituent communities and organizations of the Congress to initiate such conferences of intellectuals in their respective countries.

6. YIDDISH CULTURAL ACTIVITIES

The Fifth Plenary Assembly, considering that Yiddish is an invaluable part of the spiritual treasure of the Jewish people, acknowledges the assistance which the Cultural Department has given to cultural work based on the Yiddish language.

The Assembly urges that this work be continued and expanded, and that the Department should establish suitable machinery to stimulate and coordinate Yiddish cultural activities.

7. THE SEPHARDI COMMUNITIES

The Fifth Plenary Assembly urges member organizations throughout the world to involve and integrate Sephardi and Oriental communities in their cultural and educational activities.

The Assembly notes with satisfaction the development of the Great Metivta in Jerusalem—the institution for the preparation of spiritual guides for Sephardi and Oriental communities in the Diaspora—and urges the Executive Committee to give its full support to this place of learning.

8. DIASPORA WEEKS

The Fifth Plenary Assembly notes with satisfaction the success of the special weeks devoted to various Jewish communities that have been arranged by the Israel Executive. It is of the opinion that the organization of similar “weeks” in other countries could be an important factor in spreading knowledge about Jewish life in other lands and the work of the Congress.

9. WORLD COUNCIL ON JEWISH EDUCATION

The Fifth Plenary Assembly reaffirms the support of the World Jewish Congress for the World Council on Jewish Education and expresses the hope that the recent establishment of administrative machinery will soon enable the Council to implement its aim of promoting, assisting, and coordinating Jewish educational efforts throughout the world.

10. MEMORIAL FOUNDATION FOR JEWISH CULTURE

The Fifth Plenary Assembly expresses its satisfaction at the establishment of the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture and hopes that the Foundation will become a decisive instrument in strengthening Jewish cultural life and learning.

Taking note of its present activities, the Assembly urges that the Foundation should concentrate on projects of major Jewish cultural importance, among them fostering the training of rabbis and teachers, research, advanced studies, and publication of books of basic importance.

11. COOPERATION WITH UNESCO

The Fifth Plenary Assembly notes with deep satisfaction the fruitful cooperation between the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization and the World Jewish Congress in the period 1959-1966.

This period was marked by the adoption of the Convention against

Discrimination in Education, to the initiation and preparation of which the World Jewish Congress Cultural Department made a substantial contribution and which has already been ratified by a considerable number of members of UNESCO.

The World Jewish Congress hopes that the cooperation with UNESCO will be further deepened and intensified for the benefit of both organizations.

The Assembly expresses its gratitude to Dr. A. Steinberg for his invaluable work on behalf of the World Jewish Congress in conjunction with UNESCO.

12. CULTURAL DEPARTMENT OF THE CONGRESS

The Fifth Plenary Assembly records its great appreciation of the work performed by the Cultural Department, reaffirms the resolution of the Fourth Plenary Assembly regarding an allocation of 20% of the Congress budget to cultural and educational work, and urges the Executive Committee to take steps toward the earliest possible implementation of this resolution. The Assembly recommends to the Executive Committee to give full attention to the advisability and practicability of transferring the Cultural Department to Israel.

13. USE OF HEBREW AND YIDDISH IN THE WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS

The Fifth Plenary Assembly calls upon all Jews to learn to speak and read Hebrew, asks the Congress to introduce Hebrew as a major language of its activity in all countries, and advocates an increase in the use of both Hebrew and Yiddish as official languages of the Congress. The Assembly invites the various Congress offices, local and central, to prepare a suitable program for the implementation of this resolution.

The Assembly also notes with satisfaction the assistance rendered by the World Jewish Congress to the Brit Ivrit Olamit as the body responsible for the expanded use of Hebrew in the Diaspora.

C. ORGANIZATIONAL RESOLUTIONS

1. THE UNITY OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE

The Fifth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress, assembled in Brussels, with the participation of representatives of fifty-four Jewish communities from all continents, on the thirtieth anniver-

sary of its foundation, proclaims that the unity of the Jewish people within the framework of one organized body remains a vital necessity for the security of Jewry, now and in the future.

The Assembly considers that Jewish existence and the effectiveness of the struggle for the rights and for the security of the Jewish people depend essentially on the internal organization of individual Jewish communities and on their efforts to deepen Jewish consciousness.

It calls upon the leaders of all Jewish communities in the world where *kehillot* exist to strengthen these vital organs of democratic Jewish life.

The Assembly urges that where Jewish community life is organized on any other basis, every effort be made to promote the establishment of central representative Jewish bodies.

2. THE JEWISH COMMUNITIES OF EASTERN EUROPE

The Fifth Plenary Assembly warmly welcomes the participation in its deliberations of representatives of several Eastern European Jewish communities as well as increased contact and cooperation between the World Jewish Congress and these communities.

The Assembly requests the Executive Committee to ensure that these contacts shall be maintained, strengthened, and extended to all Eastern European Jewish communities.

3. CONFERENCE OF PRESIDENTS OF MAJOR AMERICAN JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS

The Fifth Plenary Assembly notes with great satisfaction developments within American Jewry which have led to the creation of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations as a conference of organizations representing the overwhelming majority of American Jewry concerned with international Jewish problems. An instrument has thus been established which augurs well for the future relationship between the World Jewish Congress and the largest Jewry in the world. The Congress heartily welcomes the representative group of observers that attended the meetings of the Assembly.

4. COOPERATION WITH THE WORLD ZIONIST ORGANIZATION

The Fifth Plenary Assembly notes with deep satisfaction the decision of the 26th Zionist Congress regarding close cooperation be-

tween the two world organizations without affecting the complete autonomy of either.

The Assembly sees in this decision of the Zionist Congress an important opportunity for joint activity for the unity and advancement of the Jewish people.

The Executive Committee of the World Jewish Congress is hereby urged to establish the necessary machinery in order to implement such cooperative efforts.

The Assembly welcomes the presence of representatives of the World Zionist Organization as observers on various bodies of the Congress and their participation in Congress activities.

5. GOVERNING COUNCIL

The Fifth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress expresses its satisfaction with the work of the Governing Council during the past year and recommends that it be continued as an effective means of conducting the work of the Executive Committee between sessions of that body.

6. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The present members of the Executive Committee chosen by member organizations shall continue to act as members of the Executive Committee until their successors are appointed.

D. CONSTITUTION OF THE WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS

The Fifth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress resolves to amend the Constitution of the World Jewish Congress to read as follows:

Article 1

The World Jewish Congress is a voluntary association of representative Jewish bodies, communities, and organizations throughout the world, which become members under this Constitution.

Article 2

The World Jewish Congress is organized to assure the survival and to foster the unity of the Jewish people; and to that end

- (a) to coordinate the efforts of its member organizations with respect to the political, economic, social, and cultural problems of the Jewish people;
- (b) to secure the rights, status, and interests of Jews and Jewish communities and to defend them wherever they are denied, violated, or imperiled;
- (c) to encourage and assist the creative development of Jewish social and cultural life throughout the world;
- (d) to represent and act on behalf of its member organizations before governmental, intergovernmental, and other international authorities with respect to matters which concern the Jewish people as a whole.

The World Jewish Congress strives to cooperate with all peoples on the basis of universal ideals of peace, freedom, and justice.

Article 3

Membership of the World Jewish Congress shall in no way affect the autonomy of member organizations with regard to the internal and religious affairs of their respective Jewish communities or imply any authorization to the World Jewish Congress to intervene in the domestic political affairs of that country.

Article 4

1. Jewish bodies, communities, and organizations, formed and acting in accordance with democratic principles, which subscribe to the purposes of the World Jewish Congress and agree to abide by the provisions of this Constitution may become constituent or associate members upon approval by the Executive Committee.
2. (a) Constituent membership shall be granted to only one national Jewish body, community, or organization in any country.
- (b) The constituent member shall be the generally recognized or acknowledged representative Jewish body of the country. In the absence of any such body, or the failure of any such body to apply for membership, or its disqualification, the Executive Committee may accept as the constituent member for such country that body which in its view best qualifies for membership.
- (c) Under special circumstances the Executive Committee may, by a two-thirds vote of its members, grant constituent membership to such other body or bodies upon such terms and conditions as the Executive Committee may prescribe.
3. Associate membership may be granted to international orga-

nizations by a two-thirds vote of the Executive Committee on such terms and conditions as the Executive Committee may find appropriate.

Article 5

1. The Plenary Assembly is the supreme authority of the World Jewish Congress.
2. The Executive Committee shall summon the Plenary Assembly to an ordinary session every fourth year.
3. When extraordinary circumstances render it necessary, the Executive Committee may, by a vote of two thirds of its members, postpone the ordinary session of the Plenary Assembly not more than one year, except that a further postponement may be directed by a vote of three fourths of the members of the Executive Committee.
4. The Executive Committee shall, upon request of three fourths of its members, summon an extraordinary session of the Plenary Assembly. The business of such session shall be limited to those matters proposed by the Executive Committee.

Article 6

1. The Plenary Assembly shall consist of delegates elected by member organizations so as truly to reflect the composition of the respective community.
2. The number of delegates allotted to each constituent member shall be determined by the Executive Committee with due regard to the Jewish population of the respective country. No country shall be entitled to more than two fifths of the total of the number of delegates.
3. The number of delegates allotted to associate members shall be fixed by the Executive Committee, but shall not exceed five for any associate member.
4. The validity of the election or designation of the delegates shall be subject to confirmation by the Plenary Assembly.
5. The members of the Executive Committee shall have the right to take full part in the proceedings of the Plenary Assembly, but without voting rights, unless they are elected delegates.

Article 7

1. The proceedings of the Plenary Assembly shall be conducted by a Presidium elected by it for the duration of the session.
2. The proceedings of the Plenary Assembly shall be conducted in accordance with rules of procedure to be proposed by the Executive Committee and approved by the Plenary Assembly.
3. Every delegate shall have one vote in the Plenary Assembly.

4. Decisions of the Plenary Assembly shall be by a simple majority of those present and voting unless otherwise provided in this Constitution.

Article 8

1. The Executive Committee conducts the affairs and acts on behalf of the World Jewish Congress, in accordance with the decisions of the Plenary Assembly, through the officers of the World Jewish Congress and such committees and other subsidiary organs as the Executive Committee may establish from time to time.
2. The Executive Committee shall meet in ordinary session annually unless the Plenary Assembly shall meet in such year.
3. An extraordinary session of the Executive Committee may be summoned at any time by the president and shall be summoned by him upon the request of two thirds of its members.
4. The Executive Committee is authorized
 - (a) to establish a Governing Council, to designate its members, and to empower it to conduct the affairs and act on behalf of the Executive Committee between sessions of the Executive;
 - (b) to empower parts of the Executive Committee to function as regional branches and to exercise such responsibilities as may be designated by the Plenary Assembly or the Executive Committee.

Article 9

1. There shall be three categories of members of the Executive Committee: full, associate, and honorary officers and members.
2. Full members of the Executive Committee shall be:
 - (a) the officers elected under Article 11;
 - (b) holders of other offices so designated by the Plenary Assembly or the Executive Committee;
 - (c) members so nominated as its representatives by a constituent organization, within the key fixed in accordance with Article 10.
3. Associate members of the Executive Committee shall be:
 - (a) holders of offices so designated by the Plenary Assembly or the Executive Committee;
 - (b) members so nominated as its representatives by a constituent organization, within the key fixed in accordance with Article 10.
4. Honorary members of the Executive Committee shall be such persons as may be elected by the Plenary Assembly or the Executive Committee.

5. Associate and honorary members shall have the right to take full part in meetings of the Executive Committee, but without the right of voting.
6. Members of the Executive Committee nominated by a constituent organization shall serve at the pleasure of such constituent organization but only so long as such member shall be a resident of the country whose Jewish community is represented by such constituent.

Article 10

1. The key for the election of full and associate members of the Executive Committee by constituent organizations shall be fixed with due regard to the Jewish population of the respective country; and no country shall be entitled to more than two fifths of the total number of such members of the Executive Committee.
2. The Plenary Assembly shall fix the key for the election of members of the Executive Committee by constituent organizations with the right on the part of the Executive Committee, by a two-thirds vote, to increase the total number of full members and associate members by one fifth and to designate the constituent organizations entitled to elect them.

Article 11

1. The officers of the World Jewish Congress shall be the president; one or more honorary vice-presidents; one or more vice-presidents; the chairmen of the branches of the Executive Committee; one or more vice-chairmen of each branch of the Executive Committee; the chairman of the Governing Council; the chairmen of the Commission on International Affairs, of the Cultural Commission, and of the Budget and Finance Commission, and the chairmen of such other standing commissions as the Executive Committee may establish; the treasurer and one or more co-treasurers; and the secretary-general.
2. The Plenary Assembly shall elect the president, the honorary vice-presidents, the vice-presidents, the chairmen of the branches of the Executive Committee, and the secretary-general.
3. The Executive Committee shall elect the chairman of the Governing Council, the chairmen of the standing commissions, the treasurer and the co-treasurers, and, on the recommendation of the branches, the vice-chairmen of the branches of the Executive Committee.
4. A vacancy in any office shall be filled by the Executive Committee.

Article 12

The revenue of the World Jewish Congress shall consist of:

- (a) contributions of member organizations, to be determined in accordance with a key to be adopted by the Plenary Assembly and/or the Executive Committee;
- (b) other voluntary contributions of organizations or individuals.

Article 13

This Constitution may be amended only upon a decision of a Plenary Assembly at which no less than two thirds of the constituent member organizations are represented. Amendments require a two-thirds majority of delegates present and voting.

Article 14

If necessary for the effective operation and conduct of the World Jewish Congress and its affairs, the Executive Committee is empowered to take all the appropriate measures for registration or incorporation in any country or countries and with any authority or organization.

Article 15

The present Constitution shall come into force immediately.

E. ELECTIONS

1. *Officers*

President:	Dr. NAHUM GOLDMANN
Honorary Vice-Presidents:	Dr. ISRAEL GOLDSTEIN EVA, MARCHIONESS OF READING, CBE
Vice-Presidents:	Mr. SAMUEL BRONFMAN LORD SIEFF OF BRIMPTON
Chairmen of the Executive Committee:	
European Branch:	LORD SIEFF OF BRIMPTON
North American Branch:	Mr. SAMUEL BRONFMAN
South American Branch:	Dr. MOISES GOLDMAN
Israel Branch:	Prof. ARYEH TARTAKOWER
Vice-Chairmen:	
European Branch:	Dr. ASTORRE MAYER
South American Branch:	The President of DAIA Dr. ISAAC GOLDENBERG The President of the Jewish Confederation of Brazil Dr. MOYSES KAUFFMANN

Chairman of the Governing Council:	Dr. JOACHIM PRINZ
Chairman of the Commission on International Affairs:	Dr. S. LEVENBERG
Chairman of the Cultural Commission:	Prof. ANDRE NEHER
Chairman of the Budget and Finance Commission:	Mr. SHAD POLIER
Co-Treasurers:	Dr. JOSEPH SAGALL Dr. TIBOR P. ROSENBAUM
Secretary-General:	Dr. GERHART M. RIEGNER

2. *Ex Officio Members of the Executive Committee*

(a) *Ex Officio members with full rights*

The Director of the International Affairs Department in London:	Mr. A.L. EASTERMAN
The Director of the International Affairs Department in New York:	Dr. MAURICE L. PERLZWEIG
The Director of the Cultural Department:	Dr. AARON STEINBERG
The Director of the Institute of Jewish Affairs:	Dr. S.J. ROTH
The Deputy Director of the International Affairs Department:	Mr. ARMAND KAPLAN
The Consultant on International Affairs in London:	Mr. J.I. LINTON
The Executive Director of the European Branch of the Executive:	Dr. S.J. ROTH
The Executive Director of the North American Branch of the Executive:	Mr. MONTY JACOBS
The Executive Director of the South American Branch of the Executive:	Mr. MARC TURKOW
The Executive Director of the Israel Branch of the Executive:	Dr. LEON BERNSTEIN

(b) *Directors with Executive status in special questions*

The Director of International Affairs in Israel:	Dr. NATAN LERNER
The Director of the North African Department in France:	Mr. JACQUES LAZARUS
The Director of the Office in Brazil:	Dr. V. WINTERSTEIN
The Director of the Office in Uruguay:	Dr. N. ROST-HOLLANDER

(c) *Ex Officio associate members*

The Consultant on International and Interorganizational
Affairs, New York: Mr. MAX MELAMET
The Legal Adviser of the European Branch of the
Executive: Dr. F.L. BRASSLOFF
The Director of the Office in Italy: Mr. FRITZ BECKER
The Director of Information: Mr. JACK WINOCOUR

3. *Honorary members of the Executive Committee*

Mr. RAFFAELE CANTONI
Prof. FRITZ FEIGL
Mr. MARC JARBLUM
Prof. HORACE M. KALLEN
Mr. SYDNEY S. SILVERMAN, MP
Mr. YAAKOV ZERUBAVEL
Mr. BARUCH ZUCKERMAN

F. COMPOSITION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

1. The officers
2. The ex officio members of the Executive Committee
3. The honorary members of the Executive Committee
4. Members to be appointed by

(a) *Constituent Member Organizations*

Country	EUROPE	Full Members	Associate Members
Austria		1	1
Belgium		2	—
Eire		1	—
Finland		—	1
France		6	5
Germany		2	—
Great Britain		6	5
Greece		1	—
Italy		2	—

Luxembourg	—	1
Netherlands	1	1
Norway	—	1
Portugal	—	1
Rumania	2	1
Spain	1	—
Sweden	1	1
Switzerland	1	1
Yugoslavia	1	—

THE AMERICAS

Argentina	6	5
Bolivia	1	—
Brazil	3	2
Canada	4	2
Chile	2	1
Colombia	1	—
Costa Rica	—	1
Cuba	—	1
Dominican Republic	—	1
Ecuador	—	1
El Salvador	—	1
Guatemala	—	1
Jamaica	—	1
Mexico	2	1
Panama	—	1
Paraguay	—	1
Peru	1	—
USA	18	8
Uruguay	2	1
Venezuela	1	1

ASIA

India	1	1
Iran	2	1
Israel	18	4
Japan	—	1
Philippines	—	1

AFRICA

Algeria	—	1
Congo	—	1
Ethiopia	—	1
Kenya	—	1
Rhodesia and Zambia	1	—
Tunisia	1	1
Morocco	2	—

AUSTRALASIA

Australia	3	1
New Zealand	1	—

(b) *Associate Member Organizations*

International		
WIZO	1	—
World OSE Union	1	—
World Union of Jewish Students (WUJS)	1	—
World Confederation of General Zionists	1	—
World Union of General Zionists	1	—
World Mizrachi and Hapoel Hamizrachi Organization	1	—
World Union of Tnuat HaHerut Hatzohar	1	—
Ichud Olami	1	—
International Union of Mapam Parties	1	—
World Union of Poale Agudat Israel	1	—
World Union of Achdut Ha'avoda-Poale Zion	1	—
World Federation of Polish Jews	1	—
Regional		
Federation of Jewish Communities of Central America and Panama (FEDECO)	1	—
Scandinavian Jewish Youth Federation (SJUF)	1	—
	112	63

G. COMPOSITION OF THE GOVERNING COUNCIL

- (a) The chairman of the Governing Council;
- (b) The president;
- (c) The vice-presidents;
- (d) The chairmen of the four branches of the Executive Committee;
- (e) The chairman of the Commission on International Affairs;
- (f) The chairman of the Cultural Commission;
- (g) The chairman of the Budget and Finance Commission;

- (h) The co-treasurers;
- (i) Two permanent representatives of each branch of the Executive Committee, with the right to nominate substitutes;
- (j) The secretary-general;
- (k) The heads of departments;
- (l) Such Executive officials as the president may name;
- (m) The president may invite other members of the Executive Committee to serve with full rights; he may also invite other persons to participate in meetings of the Governing Council.

APPENDIX II.

COMPOSITION OF THE ASSEMBLY

I. OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE MEMBERS EX-OFFICIO

Honorary Officers

GOLDMANN, Dr. NAHUM	. President.
LORD SIEFF OF BRIMPTON	. Vice-President; Chairman, European Executive.
GOLDSTEIN, Dr. ISRAEL	. Honorary Vice-President.
GOLDMAN, Dr. MOISES	. Chairman, South American Executive.
TARTAKOWER, Prof. ARYEH	. Chairman, Israel Executive.
READING, EVA.	. Co-Chairman, European Executive;
MARCHIONESS OF, CBE	President, British Section.
LEVENBERG, Dr. SCHNEIER	. Chairman, International Affairs Commission.
NEHER, Prof. ANDRE	. Chairman, Cultural Commission;
POLIER, Mr. SHAD	President, French Section.
SAGALL, Dr. JOSEPH	. Chairman, Budget and Finance Commission.
	. Co-Treasurer.

Heads of Departments and Principal Officers

BERNSTEIN, Dr. LEON	. Executive Director, Israel Branch.
EASTERMAN, Mr. ALEX L.	. Director, International Affairs Department, London.
JACOBS, Mr. MONTY	. Executive Director, North American Branch
KAPLAN, Mr. ARMAND	. Executive Director, Paris Office;
LAZARUS, Mr. JACQUES	General Secretary, French Section.
LERNER, Dr. NATAN	. Assistant Director, Paris Office.
	. Consultant, International Affairs, Tel-Aviv.

LINTON, Mr. JOSEPH I.	• Consultant, International Affairs, London.
MELAMET, Mr. MAX	• Consultant, International and Interorganizational Affairs, New York.
PERLZWEIG, Dr. MAURICE L.	• Director, International Affairs Department, New York.
RIEGNER, Dr. GERHART M.	• Secretary-General.
ROST-HOLLANDER, Dr. NELLA	• Director, Montevideo Office.
ROTH, Dr. STEPHEN J.	• Director, Institute of Jewish Affairs; Executive Director, European Branch.
TURKOW, Mr. MARC	• Executive Director, Buenos Aires Office; Secretary, South American Branch.
WINTERSTEIN, Dr. VOJTECH	• Director, Rio de Janeiro Office; Executive Director, Jewish Confederation of Brazil.

II. DELEGATES

A. Constituent Member Organizations

ARGENTINA: DAIA (DELEGATION OF JEWISH ASSOCIATIONS OF ARGENTINA)

Executive

KAMENSZAIN, Dr. TOBIAS • President, Va'ad Hakehilot, Argentina.

Delegates

BURSTEIN, Mr. MOISES • President, DAIA Branch, Mendoza.
 DAVIDOVICH, Dr. NOE • Honorary Deputy Secretary-General, DAIA.

FAIGON, Ing. GREGORIO • Senior Vice-President, DAIA.
 FISCH, Mr. ABRAHAM • President, Jewish Community, Cordoba.

GESANG, Mr. HERZL • Honorary Secretary-General, DAIA.
 GUBKIN, Mr. TOWIA • Member, Buenos Aires Va'ad Hakehilot.

KESTELMAN, Dr. JOSE • Honorary Deputy Secretary-General, DAIA.

KLIMOVSKY, Mr. DAVID • Former Vice-President, Kehila, Buenos Aires.

KOVENSKY, Dr. JONAS • Representative, DAIA.
 MIZRACH, Mr. ISAAC • Member, Va'ad Hekehilot, Argentina.

SWARSENSKY, Dr. HARDI

- President, Theodor Herzl Society, Buenos Aires; Editor, *La Semana Israelita*.

TENEMBAUM, Dr. ELIEZER

- President, DAIA Branch, Rosario.

ZIMS, Mr. ENRIQUE J.

- Representative, Jewish Youth Council, Argentina.

AUSTRALIA:

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF AUSTRALIAN JEWRY

Delegates

ALLEN, Mr. MAURICE

- Member, Management Committee, Executive Council; Chairman, Standing Committee on Overseas Jewry.

FALK, Mr. GERALD

- Member, Management Committee, Executive Council; Chairman, Standing Committee on Public Relations; Secretary, New South Wales Jewish Board of Deputies.

LASKY, Mr. LEON

- Vice-President, Executive Council; President, Victorian Jewish Board of Deputies.

LEIBLER, Mr. ISI J.

- Councillor, Executive Council; Chairman, Public Relations Committee, Victorian Jewish Board of Deputies.

SLONIM, Mr. MAURICE

- Councillor, Executive Council; Honorary Secretary, Victorian Jewish Board of Deputies.

AUSTRIA:

FEDERATION OF JEWISH COMMUNITIES OF AUSTRIA

Executive

FELDSBERG, Dr. ERNST

- President, Federation of Jewish Communities.

Delegates

LAZAR, Mr. KARL

- Executive Member, Jewish Community, Vienna.

PICK, Dr. ANTON

- Executive Member, Jewish Community, Vienna.

BELGIUM:

WJC BELGIAN SECTION

Executive

GOLDSCHMIDT, Me. ALEXIS

- President, WJC Belgian Section.

Delegates

ANISFELD, Mr. MARC

BIBROWSKI, Mr. HENRI

DOMB, Mr. ABRAM

KATZ, Ing. ROGER

- Honorary Secretary, WJC Belgian Section; Executive Member, Zionist Federation.
- General Secretary, Mapai, Belgium.
- President, Keren Kayemet; General Secretary, Achdut Ha'avoda, Belgium.
- President, National Federation of Belgian War Veterans and Resistance Fighters.

Alternates

BILICKI, Mr. ELIJAS

FRANCO, Mr. CONRAD

PIORO, Mr. MAURICE

SCHNEK, Mr. A. GEORGES

- Vice-President, Orthodox Jewish Community, Brussels; President, Mizrahi, Belgium.
- President, Sephardi Community.
- President, Union of Jewish Deportees.
- Representative, Federation of Jewish Youth, Belgium.

BOLIVIA:

**CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF
JEWS IN BOLIVIA**

Delegate

APT, Dr. WOLFGANG

- Representative, Central Committee.

BRAZIL:

**JEWISH CONFEDERATION
OF BRAZIL**

Executive

KAUFFMANN, Dr. MOYSES

MARKMAN, Dr. RAPHAEL

STEINBRUCH, Senator

Dr. AARÃO

- President, Confederation; President of Council, Federation of Jewish Societies, São Paulo.
- Vice-President, Confederation; President, Jewish Federation, São Paulo.
- Senator; Honorary President, Confederation; Honorary President, Jewish Federation, Rio de Janeiro.

Alternate Executive Member

NIGRI, Mr. TOFIC

- Vice-President, Confederation; Executive Member, Jewish Federation, Rio de Janeiro; Honorary President, Sephardi Community, Rio de Janeiro.

Delegates

GOTTSCHALK, Mr. HERBERT

KON, Mr. GODEL

- Co-President, Magbit, São Paulo.
- Executive Member, Confederation; Representative of Mapai.

KOOGAN, Mr. ABRAHAO
MALAMUD, Dr. SAMUEL

MISRAHY, Dr. JOSE

PRISKULNIK, Mr. SIMON

PIKMAN, Mr. REUVEN

SAUER, Mr. JULES R.
ZIPPIN, General RAFAEL

Alternates

FELMANAS, Dr. ARNALDO

STERLING, Dr. GUEZEL

CANADA:

Delegates

BECKER, Mr. LAVY M.

BARBER, Dr. STEPHEN

CHERNIACK, Mr. SAUL M.

FEDERMAN, Mr. MAX

GASNER, Mr. MEYER

KRONITZ, Dr. LEON

ZAMBROWSKY, Rabbi
ZEMACH M.

CENTRAL AMERICA:

COSTA RICA, EL SALVADOR,
GUATEMALA, HONDURAS,
NICARAGUA, PANAMA.

- Treasurer, Confederation.
- General Secretary, Confederation; former President, Zionist Organization, Brazil.
- Representative, Jewish Confederation of Brazil.
- President, Organization of Jewish Students, São Paulo.
- Executive Member, Jewish Federation, São Paulo.
- Treasurer, Confederation.
- President, General Council, Jewish Federation, Porto Alegre.

- President, Brazil-Israel Chamber of Commerce.
- Representative, Mapam; Executive Member, Jewish Federation, São Paulo.

**CANADIAN JEWISH
CONGRESS**

- Chairman, National Executive, Canadian Jewish Congress; Head of Delegation.
- Secretary, Canada-Israel Chamber of Commerce.
- National Vice-President, Canadian Jewish Congress; Member, Legislative Assembly, Manitoba.
- Representative, Canadian Jewish Congress.
- Chairman, Central Region, Canadian Jewish Congress, Toronto.
- Chairman, Eastern Region, Canadian Jewish Congress, Montreal.
- Chairman, National Religious Welfare Committee, Canadian Jewish Congress.

**FEDERATION OF JEWISH
COMMUNITIES OF CENTRAL
AMERICA AND PANAMA
(FEDECO)**

Delegate

SALOMON, Dr. GEORGES

. Representative of Federation;
Vice-President, Jewish Community,
San Salvador.

CHILE:

**JEWISH REPRESENTATIVE
COMMITTEE OF CHILE**

Delegates

ARENSBURG, Mr. ISIDORO

. Executive Member, Representative
Committee; Vice-President, Zionist
Federation.

SINAY, Dr. GIL

**TESTA ARUESTE, Prof.
ENRIQUE**

. President, Representative Committee.
. Vice-President, Representative Com-
mittee; Vice-President, Sephardi
Community, Santiago.

**CONGO, DEMOCRATIC
REPUBLIC OF:**

**JEWISH COMMUNITY
OF KATANGA**

Delegate

HASSON, Mr. SAMUEL M.

. Former President, Jewish Community,
Katanga.

COSTA RICA:

See under Central America.

CUBA:

**COORDINATING COMMITTEE
OF JEWISH SOCIETIES OF CUBA**

Delegate

BALDAS, Mr. MOISES

. Representative, Coordinating Com-
mittee; Chairman, Zionist Union of
Cuba.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC:

**JEWISH COMMUNITY OF
THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC**

Delegate

PHILIPP, Mr. BRUNO

. President, Jewish Community;
Honorary Consul.

EL SALVADOR:

See under Central America.

ETHIOPIA:

**JEWISH COMMUNITY
OF ERITREA**

Delegate

GWIRZMAN, Mrs. LEAH B.

. Representative, Jewish Community.

FINLAND:

**CENTRAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH
COMMUNITIES OF FINLAND**

Delegate

BOLOTOWSKY, Mr. SCHOLEM

. Chairman, Central Council.

Alternate

KAHAN, Mr. JOSEF

FRANCE:

Executive

BULAWKO, Mr. HENRY

HADDAD, Me. CHARLES

MODIANO, Dr. VIDAL

NEHER, Prof. ANDRE

ORFUS, Mr. JACQUES

REICH, Dr. JOSEPH

SINAY, Me. ROBERT

TOUATI, Mr. EMILE

Delegates

ALEXANDRE, Mr. GERARD

CARCASSONNE, Me. ROGER

DREYFUS-SCHMIDT,
Me. MICHEL

ERLICH, Me. SASIA

FINK, Mr. ISAAC

GHERTENSTEIN, Dr. GEORGES
GINSBOURG, Dr. BENJAMIN

GRYNFOGEL, Mr. CHIBOLZ

GUTWIRTH, Mr. CHARLES

HASSID, Me. SIMON

. Chairman, Helsinki Synagogue.

WJC FRENCH SECTION

. General Secretary, Association of Former Jewish Deportees.

. Vice-President, Consistoire Israélite, Marseilles.

. President, Representative Council of Jews in France (CRIF).

. President, WJC French Section; Professor of Humanities, Strasbourg University; Member, Central Committee, Alliance Israélite Universelle.

. President, Association of Jewish Ex-Servicemen.

. Vice-President, Consistoire Israélite, Lyons.

. Bâtonnier of Colmar.

. Executive Member, Association of Jews of Algerian Origin.

. Member of Board, Consistoire Israélite de la Moselle.

. Senator; Vice-President, Zionist Federation, Marseilles.

. Deputy-Mayor of Belfort; Member, Conseil General, Belfort District; Representative, Jewish Community, Belfort.

. Chairman, Cultural Department, WIZO France.

. Executive Member, Federation of Jewish Societies of France; Executive Member, General Zionists of France; Director General, COJASOR.

. Chairman, WJC Branch, Limoges.

. President, Cercle Bernard Lazare; Chairman, Association of Jewish Physicians in France.

. Chairman, Jewish Community, Toulouse.

. Vice-President, Representative of Council of Traditional Jews in France; Member of the Board, Consistoire Central Israélite de France.

. General Secretary, WJC Branch, Lyons.

LAZARE, Mr. LUCIEN

LERMAN, Mr. MORDEHAI

MARX, Dr. JEAN

POUGATCH, Mr. ISAAC

SAMUEL, Prof. ROBERT

SZEJNER, Mr. SENDER

Alternates

ABRAHAM, Mr. PIERRE

BERNHEIM-NEHER, Dr. RENEE

DJIAN, Mrs. ELLEN

GRUMBACH, Mrs. SARAH

HADAS-LABEL, Mr. RAPHAEL

HALIMI, Me. ROLLAND

JAKUBOWICZ, Mr. JACQUES

MOHA, Prof. CHRISTIAN

RAICH, Mrs. LEA

SCHERR, Dr. ALFRED

SMOLARSKI, Me. HENRI

• General Secretary, Jewish Community Center, Strasbourg; Representative, Consistoire Israélite du Bas-Rhin.

• Secretary-General, Achdut Ha'avoda, France.

• President, Jewish Community, Avignon.

• Chairman, Cultural Committee, Yiddish Department, WJC French Section.

• Executive Member, Consistoire Israélite du Haut-Rhin.

• Executive Member, Ichud Olami; Executive Member, Federation of Jewish Societies of France.

• President, Jewish Community, Bayonne.

• Professeur agrégé; Member, National Council, WIZO, France.

• Executive Member, Association of Jews of Algerian Origin; Vice-President, WIZO, France.

• Chairman, WIZO, Nîmes; Representative, Jewish Community, Nîmes.

• Member, Committee of *Colloques* of Jewish Intellectuals in France.

• President, Jewish Community, Perpignan.

• Member, Bureau Elargi, WJC French Section.

• Head, Youth Department, Jewish Community, Nantes.

• General Secretary, WIZO, France.

• Chairman, Committee of *Colloques* of Jewish Youth in France.

• Member, Consistoire Israélite du Bas-Rhin.

GERMANY:

Executive

GALINSKI, Mr. HEINZ

VAN DAM, Dr. HENDRIK G.

CENTRAL COUNCIL OF
JEWS IN GERMANY

• Chairman, Jewish Community, Berlin.

• General Secretary, Central Council of Jews in Germany.

Delegates

GINSBURG, Mr. ALEXANDER	• Chairman, Jewish Community, Cologne.
LEWIN, Prof. HERBERT	• Chairman, Executive, Central Council of Jews in Germany; Chairman, Federation of Jewish Communities, Hessen.
MEHRER, Dr. OSWALD	• Executive Member, Central Council; Chairman, Jewish Community, Aachen.
NEUBERGER, Dr. JOSEF	• Executive Member, Central Council; Member, Board of Jewish Community, Düsseldorf.

Alternates

BERKAL, Mr. TOBIAS	• Director, Federation of Jewish Communities, Bavaria.
ROGOZINSKI, Mr. LUCIAN	• Member, Board of Jewish Community, Frankfurt.

GREAT BRITAIN:

Executive

BAKSTANSKY, Mr. LAVY	• General Secretary, Zionist Federation of Great Britain; Member, Board of Deputies.
BORNSTEIN, Mr. ABA	• Chairman, Mizrachi Federation of Great Britain; Member, Board of Deputies.
HALEVY, Mr. JACOB	• Chairman, WJC British Section; Member, Board of Deputies; Honorary Vice-President, Zionist Federation of Great Britain.
LEDERMAN, Mr. MOSHE	• President, Federation of Synagogues; Member, Board of Deputies.
LEVENBERG, Dr. SCHNEIER	• Head, Zionist Information Office, London; Chairman, Eretz Israel Committee, Board of Deputies; Chairman, WJC International Affairs Commission.
MILLER, Dr. SAMUEL A.	• Member, Board of Deputies; Vice-President, Zionist Federation; Vice-President, Poale Zion.
NATHANI, Mr. IZHAK	• Chairman, Mapam, Great Britain; Vice-President, Zionist Federation of Great Britain.
READING, EVA, MARCHIONESS OF, CBE	• President, WJC British Section; Co-Chairman, WJC European Executive.

WJC BRITISH SECTION

Delegates

CHANAN, Mr. ELCHANAN

GAYER, Mr. LEWIS

GOLD, Mr. SIDNEY W.

GOLDBERG, Mr. SIDNEY

GOTTLIEB, Rabbi WOLF

GOURGEY, Mr. PERCY S., MBE

HANDLER, Mr. ARIEH L.

KLINGER, Mr. CHARLES S.

KOPELOWITZ, Cllr.

Dr. LIONEL, JP

LEVENE, Mr. MORDECAI

MILLER, Mr. HAROLD

MINDEL, Mr. BARRY

SANDLER, Mr. ISIDORE

SHIPTON, Mr. SIDNEY L.

SILK, Mr. DONALD

WILKES, Mr. DEREK L.

- Vice-President, Federation of Synagogues; Member, Board of Deputies.
- Member, Board of Deputies; Honorary Officer, Federation of Synagogues.
- Member, Board of Deputies; Provincial Director, Joint Palestine Appeal, Zionist Federation; Chairman, Organization Committee, WJC British Section.
- General Secretary, Poale Zion.
- Communal Rabbi, Glasgow.
- Chairman, Poale Zion; Vice-President, Zionist Federation; Member, Board of Deputies.
- Vice-Chairman, Mizrahi Federation; Member, Board of Deputies.
- Cultural Secretary, Poale Zion.
- Senior Vice-President, Representative Council, Newcastle Jewry; Member, Board of Deputies.
- Chairman, Brit Ivrit Olamit, Great Britain.
- Chairman, Zionist Federation, Great Britain; Vice-President, Poale Zion; Member, Board of Deputies.
- General Secretary, Mizrahi Federation; Member, Board of Deputies.
- Former President, Representative Council, Manchester & Salford Jews; Member, Board of Deputies; Chairman, WJC Manchester Branch.
- Honorary Treasurer, Zionist Federation; Member, Board of Deputies.
- Vice-President, Zionist Federation; Member, Board of Deputies.
- Executive Member, Mapam.

Alternates

BRAUDE, Dr. JACOB

COHEN, Mr. JANUS

FELDMAN, Mr. I. N.

- Vice-President, Mizrahi Federation; Member, Board of Deputies.
- Member, Board of Deputies; Member, Council, United Synagogue; Honorary Vice-President, Zionist Federation.
- Chairman, Poale Zion, Edgware Branch.

GERTNER, Dr. MEIR

- Lecturer of Modern Hebrew, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London; Chairman, Cultural Committee, WJC British Section.

HYMANSON, Mr. H.

- Member, Council of Federation of Synagogues.

LINCOLN, Captain F. ASHE,
QC, RNVR

- Vice-President, Association of Jewish Ex-Servicemen and Women; Chairman, Political Committee, WJC British Section.

MILLER, Mrs. JEANETTE
REID, Mr. J.

- Executive Member, Poale Zion.
- Honorary Officer, Mizrahi Federation.

GREECE:

CENTRAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH COMMUNITIES OF GREECE

Delegates

CARASSO, Mr. LAZARE

- Executive Member, Central Council; President, Jewish Community, Salonika.

LOVINGER, Mr. JOSEPH

- Vice-President, Central Council.

GUATEMALA:

See under Central America.

HONDURAS:

See under Central America.

INDIA:

CENTRAL JEWISH BOARD OF INDIA

Delegates

CYNOWICZ, Mr. HERSH

- President, Central Jewish Board.

JHIRAD, Mr. ELIJAH E.

- President, Jewish Community, New Delhi.

TALEGAWKER, Mr. ISAAC A.

- Honorary Secretary, Central Jewish Board.

IRAN:

CENTRAL JEWISH COMMIT- TEE OF IRAN

Delegates

HEKMAT, Mrs. SHAMSI

- President, Jewish Women's Organization, Iran.

KERMANIAN, Mr. MOUSSA

- Secretary, WJC Committee.

OMIDVAR, Mr. MANOUCHEHR

- Member, Central Jewish Committee.

IRELAND:

Delegates

ISAACSON, Mr. JULIUS

NEWMAN, Mr. ERNEST

JEWISH REPRESENTATIVE COUNCIL OF IRELAND

- General Secretary, Jewish Representative Council.
- Chairman, Jewish Representative Council.

ISRAEL:

Delegates

ARTZI, Mr. ITZHAK

AVIZEMER, Mr. SHIMON

BENARI, Mr. JEHUDA

BENTOV, Mr. MORDECHAI, MK

BERNSTEIN, Mr. ZVI

BURSTEIN, Mr. JOSEPH

COHEN, Mr. IDOV

COHEN, Mr. MENACHEM, MK

ELKAYAM, Mr. MORDECHAI

EREM, Mr. MOSHE, MK

GROSS, Mr. IZHAK

GUEZ, Mrs. MATHILDA, MK

ISH-SHALOM, Mr. MORDECHAI

KAHANA, Dr. SHMUEL Z.

KATZENELNBOGEN,

Mr. BEN-ZION

KORN, Mr. ITZHAK

LANGNAS, Dr. SAUL

REISS, Ing. ANSELM

REMBA, Mr. ISAAC

SHEM-TOV, Mr. VICTOR, MK

SITTON, Mr. DAVID

SOFFER, Mr. YEHESEKEL

TARTAKOWER, Prof. ARYEH

WEILER, Dr. MOSES CYRUS

WJC ISRAEL SECTION

- Executive Member, Jewish Agency.
- Executive Member, Histadrut.
- Chairman, Jabotinsky Museum.
- Minister of Housing.
- Member, Central Committee, National Religious Party; Member, Municipal Council, Tel-Aviv.
- Deputy Mayor, Tel-Aviv; Head of Information Department, Histadrut.
- Member, City Council of Tel-Aviv.
- Member of Knesset; Sephardi representative.
- Sephardi representative.
- Member of Knesset.
- Member, Central Committee, Poale Agudat Israel.
- Member of Knesset.
- Member, Municipal Council, and former Mayor, Jerusalem.
- Director-General, Ministry of Religions.
- Member, Central Committee, Herut Party.
- Secretary-General, Ichud Olami; Chairman, Federation of Immigrants from Rumania.
- Member, Council of Liberal Party; Economic Adviser, Jewish Agency.
- President, World Federation of Polish Jews.
- Member, Council of Herut Party.
- Member of Knesset; Sephardi representative.
- Sephardi representative.
- Sephardi representative.
- Chairman, WJC Israel Executive; Chairman, Brit Ivrit Olamit.
- Member, Central Committee, Brit Ivrit Olamit.

WEST, Mr. BENJAMIN

• Chairman, Federation of Immigrants from Russia.

Alternates

BEN-AMITHAI, Mr. I.
JAKIMOWSKY, Prof. AMNON

- Member of WJC Advisory Council.
- President, Natural Science Association of Israel; Professor, University of Tel-Aviv.
- Professor, University of Tel-Aviv.
- Professor, University of Tel-Aviv.
- Member of WJC Advisory Council.
- Member of WJC Advisory Council.
- Member of Knesset.

MAHLER, Prof. RAPHAEL
MUSHKAT, Prof. MARION
NORNBERG, Mr. SIMCHA
ROITMAN, Mr. M.
STERN, Mr. MORDECAI, MK

ITALY:

UNION OF JEWISH
COMMUNITIES OF ITALY

Delegates

ASCOLI, Prof. AURELIO

DI SEGNI, Dr. RUGGERO

PIPERNO, Judge SERGIO

VITERBO, Adv. CARLO A.

LUXEMBOURG:

- Executive Member, Union of Jewish Communities.
- Vice-President, Union of Jewish Communities.
- President, Union of Jewish Communities.
- Editor, *Israel*.

Delegate

BULZ, Dr. EMMANUEL

CONSISTOIRE ISRAELITE DE
LUXEMBOURG

- Chief Rabbi of Luxembourg; Representative of the Consistoire Israélite.

MEXICO:

JEWISH CENTRAL
COMMITTEE OF MEXICO

Delegates

KOSTOV, Mrs. BUSIA

LASKY, Mrs. RUNIA

SHOR, Mr. ENRIQUE

- Executive Member, Central Committee; Member, Council of Jewish Women of Mexico.
- Executive Member, Central Council; Member, Council of Jewish Women of Mexico.
- Executive Member, Central Committee.

MONACO:

ASSOCIATION CULTUELLE
ISRAELITE DE MONACO

Delegate

ABITBOL, Mr. J-P. MEYER

- President, Association Cultuelle Israélite de Monaco.

NETHERLANDS:

Delegates

BOAS, Judge S.

DASBERG, Dr. I.

EISENMANN, Mr. D.

SCHUSTER, Rabbi ARON

NEDERLANDS- ISRAELIETISCH KERKGENOOTSCHAP

- Member, Permanent Commission, Kerkgenootschap.
- President, Permanent Commission, Kerkgenootschap.
- Member, Permanent Commission, Kerkgenootschap.
- Ashkenazi Chief Rabbi of the Netherlands.

NEW ZEALAND:

Delegate

MANNING, Mr. LEON A.

UNITED SYNAGOGUES OF NEW ZEALAND

- Representative of the United Synagogues; Deputy Chairman, Auckland Regional Authority; Mayor, Borough of Onehunga.

NICARAGUA:

See under Central America.

NORWAY:

Delegate

SELIKOWITZ, Dr. ARNOLD

FEDERATION OF JEWISH COMMUNITIES

- Vice-President, Jewish Community, Oslo.

PANAMA:

See under Central America.

PERU:

Delegate

GOMBEROFF, Mr. JACOBO

ASSOCIATION OF JEWISH SOCIETIES OF PERU

- General Secretary, Association of Jewish Societies.

PORTUGAL:

Delegate

AMZALAK, Prof. MOSES B.

Alternate

SEQUERRA, Dr. SEMTOB D.

JEWISH COMMUNITY OF LISBON

- President, Jewish Community of Lisbon.
- Honorary Secretary, Jewish Community of Lisbon.

RHODESIA AND ZAMBIA:

CENTRAL AFRICAN JEWISH BOARD OF DEPUTIES

Delegates

ABRAHAMSON, The Hon.
ABRAHAM E.
WAGNER, Mr. MAURICE

- President, Central African Jewish Board of Deputies.
- General Secretary, Central African Jewish Board of Deputies.

RUMANIA:

FEDERATION OF JEWISH COMMUNITIES OF RUMANIA

Observer

ROSEN, Chief Rabbi Dr. MOSES

- Chief Rabbi of Rumania; President, Federation of Jewish Communities.

SPAIN:

COUNCIL OF JEWISH COMMUNITIES OF SPAIN

Delegates

BENARROCH, Dr. CARLOS

- Secretary General, Council of Jewish Communities.

TOLEDANO, Mr. SAMUEL

- Executive Member, Council of Jewish Communities.

Alternate

GABIZON BENHAMU, Mr.
MENAHEM

- Secretary, Jewish Community of Ceuta.

SWEDEN:

WJC SWEDISH SECTION

Executive

STORCH, Mr. HILEL

- Member, WJC Executive.

Delegates

BERMAN, Mr. KARL

- Executive Member, WJC Swedish Section.

GLUCK, Mr. DAVID

- Board Member, Stockholm Jewish Community.

KAPLAN, Dr. BRUNO

- Chairman, Education Department, Stockholm Jewish Community.

Alternates

KAPLAN, Mrs. DAGNY
SCHÄCHTER, Mr. CHASKEL

- Vice-President, WIZO
- Executive Member, Jewish Refugee Organization, Malmö.

TRUS, Mr. ALTER

- Executive Member, Federation of Jewish Nazi Victims in Sweden.

ZYLBERBERG, Mr. ABRAHAM

- Executive Member, Association of Polish Jews in Sweden.

SWITZERLAND:

Delegates

GUGGENHEIM, Dr. GEORG

NORDMANN, Mr. JEAN

SCHWARZ, Mr. SAMUEL

UNION OF SWISS JEWISH COMMUNITIES

- Executive Member, Union of Jewish Communities.
- Executive Member, Union of Jewish Communities.
- Executive Member, Union of Jewish Communities.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

Executive

BAUM, Mr. PHIL

LELYVELD, Rabbi ARTHUR J.
MASLOW, Mr. WILL

POLIER, Mr. SHAD

PRINZ, Rabbi Dr. JOACHIM

WJC AMERICAN SECTION

- Director, Commission on International Affairs, American Jewish Congress.
- President, American Jewish Congress.
- Executive Director, American Jewish Congress.
- Chairman, Governing Council, American Jewish Congress; Chairman, Budget and Finance Committee, WJC.
- Chairman, Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations; former President, AJC; Chairman, Commission on International Affairs, AJC.

Delegates

ANNES, Mr. PAUL G.

BERGMAN, Rabbi Dr.
BERNARD

BERKE, Mr. SAM

BERRIN, Mr. MERVYN
BIKEL, Mr. THEODORE

BIDERMAN, Dr. ISRAEL M.

CARMELY, Mr. HAROLD W.

COPLIN, Mr. MARK D.

- Vice-President, American Jewish Congress.
- Honorary President, Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamizrachi; Chairman, National Council for Torah Education.
- Representative, Farband — Labor Zionist Order.
- Member, Executive Board, Bnai Zion.
- Vice-President, American Jewish Congress.
- Representative, Farband — Labor Zionist Order.
- Chairman, National Administrative Board, Zionist Organization of America; Executive Member, World Union of General Zionists.
- Member, Governing Council, American Jewish Congress.

DRUCKMAN, Mr. ABRAHAM M.	•Member, Executive Board, Mizrahi-Hapoel Hamizrachi; Vice-President, WJC American Section.
EISENBERG, Mr. CHARLES	•Member, Administrative Committee, Americans for Progressive Israel.
ELINSON, Rabbi YEHUDA	•Representative, Mizrahi — Hapoel Hamizrachi of America.
EPSTEIN, Mr. BEINESH	•Executive Vice-Chairman, United Zionists Revisionists.
FISHER, Mr. MENDEL N.	•Past Executive Director, Jewish National Fund; Member, National Executive Committee, Zionist Organization of America; Deputy Member, Zionist Actions Committee.
FOX, Mr. MORRIS	•Member, Governing Council, American Jewish Congress.
FRAM, Rabbi LEON	•Member, Governing Council, American Jewish Congress.
GOLD, Mr. MILTON	•National Vice-President, Zionist Organization of America; President, Mid-Atlantic Region, ZOA.
GOLDMAN, Mr. PAUL L.	•National Secretary, United Labor Zionist Party; Secretary, American Zionist Council.
GOLDMAN, Mrs. RUTH	•Representative, Women's Division, United Labor Zionist Party.
GOLDSTEIN, Mr. HAROLD K.	•Member, Governing Council, American Jewish Congress.
GOLDSTEIN, Mrs. BERT	•Representative, Pioneer Women.
GORDON, Rabbi HAROLD H.	•Executive Vice-President, New York Board of Rabbis.
HARKAVY, Mr. BERNARD	•Chairman, Community Relations Committee, American Zionist Council; Chairman, Administrative Committee, Americans for Progressive Israel.
HEIMOWITZ, Mr. IRWIN	•National Secretary, United Zionists Revisionists.
HELLER, Mr. SHIMSHON	•Executive Director, Poale Agudat Israel of America.
HIRSCHSPRUNG, Mr. ABRAHAM J.	•Representative, Zionist Organization of America.
KAGAN, Mr. MOSHE	•National Vice-Chairman, Americans for Progressive Israel.
KATZMAN, Mrs. HINDA	•Representative, Pioneer Women.
KATZMAN, Mr. JACOB	•General Secretary, Farband — Labor Zionist Order.
KAUFMAN, Mrs. ROSE	•President, Pioneer Women.

KIRSHBLUM, Rabbi Dr.
MORDECAI

KRUMBEIN, Mr. ABRAHAM

LUBRAN, Mrs. RITA

MAY, Mr. MORTIMER

MAY, Mrs. GERTRUDE

METZENBAUM, Mr.
HOWARD M.

MEYERS, Mrs. ANNA
BRENNER

MICHELSON, Mr. MORRIS

MITCHELL, Mr. SAMUEL

MOWSHOWITZ, Rabbi ISRAEL

NUSSBAUM, Rabbi Dr. MAX

POLIER, Mrs. JUSTINE WISE

ROTHMAN, Mr. MAX

SAGE, Dr. MAURICE S.

SALOMON, Mr. ABRAM

SCHENKER, Mr. AVRAHAM

•Honorary Chairman, Mizrachi — Hapoel Hamizrachi; Member, Jewish Agency Executive.

•Member, National Administrative Board, Zionist Organization of America.

•Representative, Farband — Labor Zionist Order.

•Past President, Zionist Organization of America; National Chairman, ZOA Committee on Community Relations; Executive Member, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

•Representative, Zionist Organization of America.

•Vice-President, American Jewish Congress.

•Former Member, Miami Board of Education; Member, Governing Council, American Jewish Congress.

•Representative, American Jewish Congress.

•Member, Governing Council, American Jewish Congress.

•Past President, New York Board of Rabbis.

•Chairman, American Section, World Jewish Congress; Past President, Zionist Organization of America; Chairman, American Zionist Council.

•Vice-President, American Jewish Congress; Judge, Domestic Relations Court, N.Y.

•Representative, Farband-Labor Zionist Order.

•Member, Presidium, Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamizrachi; Treasurer, Presidents' Conference.

•President, Manhattan Region, Zionist Organization of America; Director, Organization Department, Jewish National Fund; Member, National Executive Committee, ZOA.

•Deputy Member, Executive, Jewish Agency for Israel; National Chairman, Americans for Progressive Israel.

SCHWARZSCHILD, Rabbi STEVEN S.	• Representative, American Jewish Congress.
SHEAR, Mr. DANIEL H.	• Member, Governing Council, American Jewish Congress.
SHERMAN, Mr. C. BEZALEL	• Chairman, Administrative Committee, American Section, WJC; Representative, Labor Zionist Organization of America.
SHERMAN, Mrs. MINNA T.	• Representative, Labor Zionist Organization of America.
SLOMOVITZ, Mr. PHILIP	• Representative, Zionist Organization of America; Editor, <i>Jewish News</i> , Detroit.
SOBELSOHN, Mr. JACOB	• Member, Governing Council, American Jewish Congress.
TORCZYNER, Mr. JACQUES	• President, Zionist Organization of America; Member, Presidium, Zionist Actions Committee; Executive Member, World Union of General Zionists.
TYBERG, Mr. YEHUDA	• Member, Central Committee, United Labor Zionist Party; Alternate Member, Zionist Actions Committee.
WOLL, Mr. HARRY L.	• Past President, National Council for Jewish Education; Representative, Labor Zionist Organization of America.
<i>Alternates</i>	
ANNES, Mrs. ADASIA	• Representative, American Jewish Congress.
BLANKOFF, Mrs. ROSALIND	• Treasurer, Manhattan Division, American Jewish Congress.
CAPLAN, Mr. I. J.	• Member, Governing Council, American Jewish Congress.
EISENBERG, Mrs. MATILDA	• Representative, American Jewish Congress.
ELKIN, Mrs. LILIAN	• Writer and Instructor, Hunter College, New York; Representative, American Jewish Congress.
GREENBAUM, Mrs. FLORA	• Vice-Chairman, Administrative Committee, Americans for Progressive Israel.
HARKAVY, Mrs. JUDITH	• Representative, Americans for Progressive Israel.

KERTZER, Rabbi Dr. MORRIS N.	• Former Member, Governing Council, American Jewish Congress.
KIRSHBLUM, Mrs. MIRIAM	• Vice-President, Mizrahi Women of America.
LELYVELD, Mrs. TEELA	• Representative, American Jewish Congress.
MEYERS, Mr. BENJAMIN	• Representative, American Jewish Congress.
SHERMAN, Mrs. FLORENCE K.	• Member, Governing Council, American Jewish Congress.
SHERMAN, Mr. MORRIS	• Representative, American Jewish Congress.
SMIGEL, Dr. GEORGE B.	• Representative, American Jewish Congress.
SPIGELMAN, Rabbi WILLIAM	• Representative, American Jewish Congress.

URUGUAY:

JEWISH CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF URUGUAY

Delegates

CUENCA SASSON, Mr. MOISES	• Executive Member, Central Committee.
HENDEL, Mr. SAMUEL	• Representative, Central Committee.
OLESKER, Mr. BERNARDO	• General Secretary, Central Committee.
ROZEN, Dr. VICTOR	• Executive Member, Central Committee.
TREITEL, Mr. HERBERT	• Hon. President, Central Committee.

VENEZUELA:

FEDERATION OF JEWISH ASSOCIATIONS OF VENEZUELA

Delegates

BENTATA, Dr. JACOBO	• Representative, Federation of Jewish Associations.
ROSENBLAT, Mr. SAMUEL C.	• Executive Member and former President, Unión Israelita de Caracas.

Alternate

WIESENFELD, Mr. LEON	• Vice-President, Unión Israelita de Caracas.

YUGOSLAVIA:

FEDERATION OF JEWISH COMMUNITIES OF YUGOSLAVIA

Executive

KADELBURG, Dr. LAVOSLAV	• President, Federation of Jewish Communities.

Delegates

CENTNER, Judge Dr. OTO

.Executive Member, Federation of Jewish Communities; Vice-President, Jewish Community, Zagreb.

KAMHI, Dr. HAJIM

.Vice-President, Federation of Jewish Communities; President, Jewish Community, Sarajevo.

B. Associated International Organizations

ICHUD OLAMI

Delegates

BARIACH, Mr. EPHRAIM

.Member, Ichud Olami, Israel.

DROR, Mr. NATHAN

.Member, Ichud Olami, Israel.

KUBOWITZKI, Mr. SIMON
(Belgium)

.President, Zionist Federation of Belgium.

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF MAPAM PARTIES

Delegates

ALTMAN, Mrs. SIMA (USA)

.Educational Director, Americans for Progressive Israel.

FLAPAN, Mr. SIMHA (Israel)

.Member, Mapam Executive.

GROSMAN-ORKIN, Mrs.

.General Secretary, International Union, Mapam.

CHAIKA (Israel)

**WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL ZIONIST ORGANIZATION
(WIZO)**

Delegates

JAGLOM, Mrs. RAYA

.Chairman, World WIZO Executive; Head of Delegation.

BAUM, Mrs. RACHAEL

.Chairman, Executive Committee, WIZO, Belgium.

BERNARD-KAHN, Mrs. DENISE

.President, WIZO Federation, France.

NORDMANN, Mrs. BLUETTE

.President, WIZO, Switzerland.

SIEFF, Mrs. DAPHNE

.President, WIZO Federation, Great Britain.

Alternate

FISCHER, Mrs. EVA

.President, WIZO, Belgium.

WORLD CONFEDERATION OF GENERAL ZIONISTS

Delegates

HALPRIN, Mrs. ROSE L. (USA)	. Chairman, Jewish Agency, New York Executive; Co-Chairman World Confederation.
JACOBSON, Mrs. CHARLOTTE (USA)	. President, Hadassah Women's Zionist Organization.
PERRY, Mr. WOOLF (Israel)	. Member, Jewish Agency Executive.
SULTANIK, Mr. KALMAN (USA)	. Executive Director, World Confederation.
TOPIOL, Mr. MELECH (France)	. President of the Executive, Paris.

Alternates

KAHAN, Mr. S. (France)	. Treasurer and European Executive Member, World Confederation.
ROZENBLATT, Mr. A. (France)	. European Executive Member, World Confederation.
TORONCZYK, Mr. WULF (France)	. European Executive Member, World Confederation.
WARSZAWSKI, Mr. IZAK (France)	. Secretary-General, European Executive; Member, World Confederation

WORLD FEDERATION OF POLISH JEWS

Delegates

BIDERMAN, Dr. ISRAEL M. (USA)	. Representative, World Federation.
CANG, Mr. JOEL (Gt. Britain)	. Editor, <i>Focus on Soviet Jewry</i> .
GAL, Mr. S. (Israel)	. Executive Member.
KLEMENTYNOVSKI, Mr. ZVI (Israel)	. Executive Member; Deputy Mayor of Tel-Aviv.
ROSTAL, Dr. EDOUARD (Israel)	. Executive Member.

Alternate

ZYLBERBERG, Mr. ABRAHAM (Sweden)	. Executive Member, Association of Polish Jews in Sweden.

WORLD MIZRACHI AND HAPOEL HAMIZRACHI ORGANIZATION

Delegates

COHN, Rabbi BEZALEL (Israel)	. Acting Chairman, World Mizrachi and Hapoel Hamizrachi Organization.
GELLMAN, Mr. A. LEON (Israel)	. Chairman, World Center, Mizrachi-Hapoel Hamizrachi.

KNELLER, Mr. MORIS (Belgium)	• Vice-President, Mizrachi and Hapoel Hamizrachi, Belgium.
ROSENBAUM, Dr. TIBOR P. (Switzerland)	• Executive Member.

WORLD UNION OF ACHDUT HA'AVODA-POALE ZION

Delegates

ASSA, Mr. YERACHMIEL	• Israel Executive Member, Achdut-Ha'avoda.
ZERUBAVEL, Mr. YAAKOV	• Director, Labor Archives of Israel.

WORLD UNION OF GENERAL ZIONISTS

Delegates

TORCZYNER, Mr. JACQUES (USA)	• President, Zionist Organization of America; Chairman, World Union, Head Office.
MUCHNIK, Dr. MEIR (Argentina)	• Executive Member, World Union.
TORY, Mr. AVRAHAM (Israel)	• Executive Member, World Union.
WEINSTEIN, Mr. BARUH (Israel)	• Director, World Union, Tel-Aviv.
WOHLMANN, Dr. LEON	• President, World Union (Switzerland).

Alternates

BRUCKNER, Mr. S.	• Member, World Union (Belgium).
EDELMAN, Mr. I.	• Member, World Union (France).
REITER, Mr. A.	• Member, World Union (France).
ROSENBLUM, Mr. R.	• Hon. President, World Union (France)
WEICHSELBAUM, Mr. ALFRED	• Member, World Union (Germany).

WORLD UNION OF JEWISH STUDENTS (WUJS)

Delegates

GERSTENFELD, Dr. MANFRED (France)	• Chairman, World Union.
SCHIRMAN, Mr. SCHALOM (Belgium)	• Joint General Secretary, Belgian Union of Jewish Students.
VISOCEKAS, Mr. RAPHAEL (France)	• President, Union of Jewish Students of France.
WARSZAWSKI, Dr. PAUL (Argentina)	• Vice-President, South American Union of Jewish Students.
ZAUDY, Mr. BERTIL (Sweden)	• Secretary, European Region, World Union.

Alternates

ELKAIM, Mr. M. (Belgium)	• Joint General Secretary, Belgian Union of Jewish Students.
HAUSMANN, Mr. GORDON (Great Britain)	• Foreign Officer, Inter-University Jewish Federation.
HUNTER, Mr. MICHAEL H. (Great Britain)	• Senior Vice-President, World Union.

WORLD OSE UNION

Delegates

KLOPMANN, Mr. MAX (Switzerland)	• Member, World Union.
MINKOWSKI, Dr. EUGENE (France)	• Member, World Union.
WOLF, Dr. NISEN-LEIB (Israel)	• Director, OSE - Israel.

WORLD UNION OF POALE AGUDAT ISRAEL

Delegates

ABRAMCZYK, Mrs. ROZALIA (USA)	• Chairman, Women's Division, PAI in America.
AUERBACH, Mr. JACOB (Great Britain)	• Director, PAI in Great Britain.
BRAUN, Mr. FALIK (Belgium)	• Executive Member, PAI in Belgium.

Alternate

ROTHEM, Mr. SCHACHNA (Israel)	• Deputy Director, Ministry of Interior, Israel.

WORLD UNION OF TNUAT HAHERUT HATZOHAR

Delegates

FRIEDRICH, Mr. SALOMON (France)	• Member, World Executive, Herut.
REMBA, Mr. ISAAC (Israel)	• Member, World Executive, Herut.

III. FRATERNAL DELEGATES AND OBSERVERS

JEWISH AGENCY FOR ISRAEL

PINCUS, Mr. LOUIS A. (Israel)	• Chairman, Executive, Jewish Agency.
LEVANON, Mr. CHAIM (Israel)	• Member, Executive; Head, Public Relations Department, Jewish Agency.
LURIE, Mr. ZVI (Israel)	• Member, Executive; Head, Organization Department, Jewish Agency.

B'NAI B'RITH

WEXLER, Dr. WILLIAM A. (USA)	• President, B'nai B'rith.

BRIT IVRIT OLAMIT

ROSENFELD, Dr. ALEXANDER (Israel)	• Member of Council.

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN

FISCHER, Mrs. EVA (Belgium)	•Representative, International Council.
HEKMAT, Mrs. SHAMSI	•Vice-President, International Council; President, Council of Jewish Women, Iran.

MEMORIAL FOUNDATION FOR JEWISH CULTURE

UVEELER, Mr. MARK	•Executive Director.

WORLD SEPHARDI FEDERATION

AELION, Mr. LEON	•Member, U.K. Advisory Committee.
BEN-MEIR, Mr. GAD (Great Britain)	•Administrative Director.
LASKI, Judge NEVILLE, QC (Great Britain)	•Vice-President.
LEVY, Dr. HENRI (France)	•President, Orthodox Community, Marseilles.
NESSIM, Mr. SIMON S. (USA)	•Vice-President.

WORLD ORT UNION

BLOCH, Mr. JEAN (Belgium)	•President, ORT Committee, Belgium.
FARHI, Mr. ANDRE (Belgium)	•Representative of World ORT Union.
SCHRAGER, Mr. FAJWEL (France)	•Director, Paris Office.

ALLIANCE ISRAELITE UNIVERSELLE

CASSIN, Prof. RENE (France)	•President, Alliance Israélite Universelle
MODIANO, Dr. VIDAL (France)	•Member, Central Committee, Alliance Israélite Universelle.
NEHER, Prof. ANDRE (France)	•Member, Central Committee, Alliance Israélite Universelle.

BOARD OF DEPUTIES OF BRITISH JEWS

TEFF, Mr. SOLOMON	•President, Board of Deputies.
BROTMAN, Mr. ADOLPH G.	•Secretary, Board of Deputies.
COHEN, Mr. PERCY, CBE	•Member, Executive Committee, Board of Deputies.
DIGHT, Mr. JOHN	•Chairman, Jewish Defense Committee, Board of Deputies.
JANNER, SIR BARNETT, MP	•Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee, Board of Deputies.
LASKI, Judge NEVILLE, QC	•Member, Executive Committee, Board of Deputies.

CENTRAL BOARD OF HUNGARIAN JEWS

BENOSCHOFSKY, Dr. IMRE
SEIFERT, Dr. GEZA

•Deputy Chief Rabbi, Hungary.
•President, Central Board.

CENTRAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH COMMUNITIES OF SWEDEN

KAPLAN, Dr. BRUNO

•Member, Board, Jewish Community
of Stockholm.

CONFERENCE OF PRESIDENTS OF MAJOR AMERICAN JEWISH ORGANIZATIONS

PRINZ, Dr. JOACHIM
BRICKNER, Rabbi BALFOUR
FEUEREISEN, Mr. CHARLES
HELLMAN, Mr. YEHUDA
HILL, Rabbi DAVID H.
JACOBSON, Mrs. CHARLOTTE
KARASICK, Rabbi JOSEPH
LAUB, Mr. MORRIS
LEVI, Rabbi S. GERSHON
LEVOVITZ, Rabbi PAUL Z.
WEISMAN, Dr. SEYMOUR S.

•Chairman.

•Executive Director.

CONSEIL REPRESENTATIF DES JUIFS DE FRANCE (CRIF)

MODIANO, Dr. VIDAL

•President, CRIF.

CONSISTOIRE CENTRAL ISRAELITE DE BELGIQUE

LEWKOWICZ, Mr. NESANEL
MAHLER, Mr. GEORGES
MILLER, Mr. SALOMON
ZALCMAN, Mr. JANKEL

•Executive Member, Consistoire.
•Executive Member, Consistoire.
•Executive Member, Consistoire.
•President, Orthodox Jewish Community of Belgium.

JEWISH COMMUNITY OF COPENHAGEN, DENMARK

GELVAN, Mr. RICHARD

•Member, Board, Jewish Community.

SOUTH AFRICAN JEWISH BOARD OF DEPUTIES

HODES, Mr. LIONEL H.	•Public Relations Officer, South African Jewish Board of Deputies.
PORTER, Mr. MAURICE	•Chairman, Executive Committee, South African Jewish Board of Deputies.
SCHNEIDER, Dr. TEDDY	•President, South African Board of Deputies.

UNION OF ORTHODOX JEWISH CONGREGATIONS OF AMERICA

KARASICK, Rabbi Dr. JOSEPH	•Vice-President, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America.
WEISS, Rabbi Dr. SAMSON R.	•Executive Vice-President, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America.

JEWISH NAZI VICTIMS' ORGANIZATION IN THE USA

SOCACHEVSKY, Mr. MOSES I.	•President
LASKY, Mr. FELIX	•Secretary

IV. SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS

BARNETT, Mr. JACK H.	•Acting General Secretary, British Section.
BECKER, Mr. FRITZ	•Director, Rome Office.
BECKER, Miss MYRA	•Assistant, Geneva Office.
BEIGEL, Dr. GRETA	•Executive Secretary, American Section.
BRASSLOFF, Dr. FRIEDRICH L.	•Legal Adviser, European Executive.
COHEN, Miss ROBERTA	•Assistant, International Affairs Department, New York.
EPPLER, Dr. ELIZABETH E.	•Senior Research Officer, Institute of Jewish Affairs, London.
FRAENKEL, Mr. JOSEF	•Assistant, Information Department, London.
KRAFSOFF, Miss NORA	•Secretary, London Office.
MARQUET, Mrs. ANNETTE	•Secretary, Paris Office.
PULVERMAN, Mr. WOLFGANG	•Comptroller.
WINOCOUR, Mr. JACK	•Director, Information Department, London.

V. REPRESENTATIVES OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, GOVERNMENTS, AND NONGOVERNMENTAL BODIES

A. International Organizations

The following International Organizations were represented:

UNITED NATIONS
INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION
COUNCIL OF EUROPE
EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

B. Governments

The Governments of the following countries were represented by diplomatic observers:

AUSTRALIA, AUSTRIA, BELGIUM, BOLIVIA, BRAZIL, CANADA, DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO, DENMARK, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY, FINLAND, FRANCE, GREAT BRITAIN, HUNGARY, INDIA, ISRAEL, ITALY, LUXEMBOURG, NETHERLANDS, NEW ZEALAND, NORWAY, POLAND, SOUTH AFRICA, SWEDEN, SWITZERLAND, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, URUGUAY, VENEZUELA.

C. Nongovernmental Organizations

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC ORGANIZATIONS
INTERNATIONAL CONFEDERATION OF FREE TRADE UNIONS
WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES
COMMISSION OF THE CHURCHES ON INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS
INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF WOMEN
INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR THE RIGHTS OF MAN
INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION OF JURISTS
INTERNATIONAL LAW ASSOCIATION
PAX ROMANA
WORLD UNION OF CATHOLIC WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS
INTERNATIONAL CATHOLIC UNION FOR SOCIAL SERVICE
WORLD YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION
WORLD ASSEMBLY OF YOUTH
INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SERVICE
INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF DEPORTEES AND RESISTANCE
INTERNEES
INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF RESISTANCE MOVEMENTS
INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN

INDEX

- Alexandre, Mr. Gérard, 111
 Annes, Mr. Paul G., 158
 Apt, Dr. Wolfgang, 87
 Artzi, Mr. Itzhak, 111
 Ascoli, Prof. Aurelio, 305
 Assa, Mr. Yerachmiel, 200
 Avizemer, Mr. Shimon, 309
- Baron, Prof. Salo W., 230
 Bartos, Prof. Milan, 281
 Baudouin, King of the Belgians
 (*message*), 7
 Becker, Mr. Lavy M., 52, 81
 Benari, Mr. Jehuda, 44, 104
 Benarroch, Dr. Carlos, 98, 299
 Ben-Meir, Mr. Gad, 40
 Benoschofsky, Rabbi Dr. Imre, 82
 Bentata, Dr. Jacobo, 296
 Bentov, Mr. Mordechai, MK, 42,
 116
 Bergman, Rabbi Dr. Bernard, 104
 Bernstein, Mr. Zvi, 106
 Bikel, Mr. Theodore, 54
 Bolotowsky, Mr. Scholem, 81
 Bornstein, Mr. Aba, 159
 Bronfman, Mr. Samuel (*message*),
 48
 Bulawko, Mr. Henry, 105
- Cang, Mr. Joel, 102
 Cassin, Prof. René, 277
 de Clercq, Mr. Willy, 12
 Cohen, Mr. Idov, 158
 Cohn, Rabbi Bezalel, 107
 Cuenca Sasson, Mr. Moisés, 308
 Cynowicz, Mr. Hersh, 81
- van Dam, Dr. Hendrik George, 251
 Di Segni, Dr. Ruggero, 57
 Dreyfus, Chief Rabbi Robert, 11
 Dreyfus-Schmidt, Me Michel, 106,
 351
 Dujovne, Prof. León, 149
- Easterman, Mr. Alex L., 49, 326,
 327
 Eban, Mr. Abba, 13
 Eichler, Dr. Benjamin (*message*),
 53
 Elinson, Rabbi Yehuda, 319
 Epstein, Mr. Beinesh, 91
 Epstein, Mr. William, 72
 Erem, Mr. Moshe, MK, 44, 97,
 132, 319, 330
 Erhard, Prof. Ludwig (*message*),
 258
- Faigon, Ing. Gregorio, 58, 98, 327
 Fisher, Mr. Mendel N., 103
 Flapan, Mr. Simha, 95
 Friedrich, Mr. Salomon, 100, 349
 Fuchs, Ing. Frantisek (*message*),
 52
- Gellman, Mr. A. Leon, 316
 Gelvan, Mr. Richard, 298
 German Social-Democratic Party,
 Presidium (*message*), 258
 Gerstenfeld, Dr. Manfred, 174
 Gerstenmaier, Dr. Eugen, 243
 Goldman, Dr. Moisés, 54, 266
 Goldman, Mr. Paul L., 317

- Goldmann, Dr. Nahum, 7, 24, 37
42, 44, 120, 157, 165, 197, 201,
242, 255, 293, 336, 341, 351,
357ff.
- Goldschmidt, Me Alexis, 9, 266
- Goldstein, Dr. Israel, 61
- Gourgey, Mr. Percy S., MBE, 133,
318
- Grosman-Orkin, Mrs. Chaika, 43,
132
- Gross, Mr. Izhak, 300
- Guez, Mrs. Mathilda, MK, 164
- Haddad, Me Charles, 194
- Halévy, Mr. Jacob, 303, 331ff.
- Handler, Mr. Arie L., 110
- Harkavy, Mr. Bernard, 94
- Hekmat, Mrs. Shamsi, 42
- Heller, Mr. Shimshon, 333
- Jaglom, Mrs. Raya, 101
- Janner, Sir Barnett, MP, 92
- Jaspers, Prof. Karl (*message*), 259
- Jhirad, Mr. Elijah E., 115
- Kadelburg, Dr. Lavoslav, 312
- Kahana, Rabbi Dr. Shmuel Z., 311
- Kamenzain, Dr. Tobias, 186
- Kaplan, Dr. Bruno, 309
- Karasick, Rabbi Dr. Joseph, 113
- Katzenelenbogen, Mr. Ben-Zion, 92
- Kauffmann, Dr. Moysés, 134
- Kirshblum, Rabbi Dr. Mordecai,
164, 333, 335, 336, 338
- Klementynovski, Mr. Zvi, 162
- Korn, Mr. Itzhak, 100, 130
- Kovensky, Dr. Jonas, 193
- Kronitz, Dr. Leon, 111
- Langnas, Dr. Saul, 163
- Lasky, Mr. Leon, 306
- Laugier, Prof. Henri, 76
- Leibler, Mr. Isi J., 59, 340ff.
- Lelyveld, Rabbi Arthur J., 88, 165
- Lerman, Mr. Mordehai, 108
- Levenberg, Dr. Schneier, 98, 128
- Lincoln, Capt. F. Ashe, 332
- Mahler, Prof. Raphael, 314
- Malamud, Dr. Samuel, 93
- Mann, Prof. Golo, 219
- Mayer, Dr. Astorre, 188
- Minkowski, Dr. Eugène, 94
- Mizrach, Mr. Isaac, 105
- Modiano, Dr. Vidal (*message*), 41
- Morse, Mr. David A., 268
- Nathani, Mr. Izhak, 108, 336
- Neher, Prof. André, 143
- Nigri, Mr. Tofic, 304
- Nordmann, Mr. Jean, 87
- Nussbaum, Rabbi Dr. Max, 123,
338ff.
- Olesker, Mr. Bernardo, 90
- Orfus, Mr. Jacques, 327, 329
- Perlzweig, Dr. Maurice L., 288
- Pincus, Mr. Louis A., 37, 125
- Piperno, Judge Sergio, 90
- Polier, Mr. Shad, 321ff.
- Porter, Mr. Maurice, 84
- Pougatch, Mr. Isaac, 316
- Prinz, Dr. Joachim, 38, 248, 298
- Reading, Eva, Marchioness of,
CBE, 123, 327
- Reiss, Ing. Anselm, 112
- Remba, Mr. Isaac, 197
- Riegner, Dr. Gerhart M., 36, 61,
117, 321
- Ritchie-Calder of Balmashannar,
Lord, 65
- Rosen, Chief Rabbi Dr. Moses,
112, 191
- Rotenstreich, Prof. Nathan, 137
- Rothem, Mr. Schachna, 162
- Salomon, Mr. Abram, 163
- Schenker, Mr. Avraham, 199, 354
- Scherr, Dr. Alfred, 193
- Scholem, Prof. Gershom, 205
- Schwarz, Mr. Samuel, 310
- Seifert, Dr. Géza, 114
- Selikowitz, Dr. Arnold, 96
- Sequerra, Dr. Semtob D., 94
- Shapiro, Dr. Judah J., 178
- Shazar, Mr. Zalman (*message*), 357
- Shor, Mr. Enrique, 108

Sieff of Brimpton, Lord, 135, 358
Sitton, Mr. David, 162
Smolarski, Me Henri, 110
Socachevsky, Mr. Moses I., 133
Storch, Mr. Hilel, 104

Tartakower, Prof. Aryeh, 53, 177,
334
Teff, Mr. Solomon, 39
Tenenbaum, Dr. Eliezer, 96
Torczyner, Mr. Jacques, 358ff.
Tyberg, Mr. Yehuda, 84

Uveeler, Mr. Mark, 300

Warszawski, Dr. Paul, 107
Weiler, Dr. Moses Cyrus, 317
Weinstein, Mr. Baruh, 161
Weiss, Rabbi Dr. Samson R., 171
West, Mr. Benjamin, 106
Wexler, Dr. William A., 40
Woll, Mr. Harry L., 132

Yadlin, Mr. Aharon, MK, 169

Zerubavel, Mr. Yaakov, 369

*Achevé d'imprimer en août 1974
sur les presses de
l'Imprimerie Avenir S.A.,
10, rue de l'Avenir,
1207 Genève (Suisse)*