

PROCEEDINGS FOURTH PLENARY ASSEMBLY
STOCKHOLM 1959

PROCEEDINGS
of the
**FOURTH PLENARY
ASSEMBLY**
of the
WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS



360.3
W

STOCKHOLM 1959

WORLD
JEWISH
CONGRESS

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE
Blaustein Library

WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS

Fourth Plenary Assembly

Stockholm 2-12 August, 1959

PROCEEDINGS



**WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS
GENEVA**

CONTENTS

OPENING SESSION

Addresses of Welcome:

DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN <i>President, World Jewish Congress</i> ...	5
MR. TAGE ERLANDER <i>Prime Minister of Sweden</i> ...	8

Addresses by:

DR. PINHAS ROSEN <i>Israel Minister of Justice</i> ...	9
M. PHILIPPE DE SEYNES ...	12

United Nations Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs

FRIHERRE CHRISTER VON STEDINGK ...	15
<i>Representative, International Labour Organization</i>	

MR. CARL-ALBERT ANDERSSON ...	18
<i>President, Stockholm City Council</i>	

MR. HILLEL STORCH ...	19
<i>Swedish Member, World Executive, World Jewish Congress</i>	

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN ...	20
--	----

SECOND SESSION

<i>Addresses by Fraternal Delegates</i> ...	37
---	----

<i>Procedure and Agenda</i> ...	40
---------------------------------	----

<i>General Debate</i> ...	47
---------------------------	----

THIRD SESSION

<i>Composition of Presidium</i> ...	53
-------------------------------------	----

<i>General Debate (continued)</i> ...	54
---------------------------------------	----

FOURTH SESSION

Symposium: Cultural Pluralism in the Modern World

<i>Introduction</i> DR. ISRAEL GOLDSTEIN ...	67
--	----

Chairman, Western Hemisphere Executive, World Jewish Congress

<i>Addresses by</i> DR. MORRIS GINSBERG ...	70
---	----

Emeritus Professor of Sociology, University of London

MR. THOMAS DIOP <i>Society for African Culture</i> ...	78
--	----

FATHER JEAN DANIELOU, S. J. ...	80
---------------------------------	----

Professor, Catholic University of Paris

M. PIERRE LEBAR <i>Representative of UNESCO</i> ...	85
---	----

FIFTH SESSION

Arrangements for Presidium and Commission

<i>General Debate (continued)</i> ...	96
---------------------------------------	----

SIXTH SESSION

<i>General Debate (continued)</i> ...	112
---------------------------------------	-----

SEVENTH SESSION

Symposium: The Jewish State and the Jewish People

<i>Introduction by</i> MR. ISRAEL SIEFF ...	125
---	-----

Chairman, European Executive, World Jewish Congress

<i>Addresses by</i> MR. MOSHE SHARETT, M.K. ...	128
---	-----

former Prime Minister of Israel

DR. SALO W. BARON, <i>Professor of Jewish History, Literature and Institutions, Columbia University, New York</i> ...	148
---	-----

EIGHTH SESSION	
<i>Report of Credentials Committee</i>	165
<i>General Debate (concluded)</i>	167
NINTH SESSION	
<i>Supplementary Report of Credentials Committee</i>	
<i>Debate on Organizational Problems</i>	192
TENTH SESSION	
<i>Message from H.M. KING GUSTAV OF SWEDEN</i>	209
<i>Debate on Organizational Problems (continued)</i>	210
ELEVENTH SESSION	
<i>Debate on Organizational Problems (concluded)</i>	227
<i>Eulogies of the Deceased</i>	239
TWELFTH SESSION	
<i>Symposium: International Co-operation in Jewish Education</i>	
<i>Introduction</i> PROFESSOR ARIEH TARTAKOWER	247
<i>Chairman, Israel Executive, World Jewish Congress</i>	
<i>Addresses by</i> DR. JUDAH PILCH	250
<i>Executive American Association for Jewish Education</i>	
DR. ERNST SIMON	256
<i>Professor of Education, Hebrew University, Jerusalem</i>	
DR. AARON STEINBERG	266
<i>Director, Cultural Department, World Jewish Congress</i>	
THIRTEENTH SESSION	
<i>Debate on Cultural Problems</i>	278
<i>Commemoration of 25th Anniversary of the</i>	
<i>Death of Chaim Nachman Bialik</i>	
<i>Address by</i> MR. ZALMAN SHAZAR	294
<i>Chairman, Jewish Agency, Jerusalem</i>	
FOURTEENTH SESSION	
<i>Debate on Cultural Problems (concluded)</i>	305
<i>Commemoration of Centenary of the Birth of Sholem Aleichem</i>	
<i>Addresses by:</i>	
DR. SHOLOMO BICKEL <i>United States</i>	321
DR. DAVID SFARD <i>Poland</i>	325
FIFTEENTH SESSION	
<i>Situation of Sephardim in Israel</i>	332
<i>Reports and Resolutions: Cultural Commission</i>	337
<i>Organization Commission</i>	345
SIXTEENTH SESSION	
<i>Report and Resolutions: Political Commission</i>	354
CLOSING SESSION	
<i>Tributes</i>	374
<i>Nominations</i>	375
<i>President's Closing Address</i>	382
<i>Resolutions and Decisions</i>	385
APPENDICES	
<i>Constitution of World Jewish Congress</i>	405
<i>Rules of Procedure</i>	410
<i>Composition of Assembly</i>	419

OPENING SESSION AT THE CITY HALL OF STOCKHOLM

August 2, 1959 (Evening)

In the Chair: DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN

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

In opening the Fourth Assembly of the World Jewish Congress, my first welcome is to the delegates who have come here from so many countries, some of them very distant, and have demonstrated by their presence their loyalty and devotion to the World Jewish Congress.

At the outset of our deliberations, I must also express our hearty thanks to the Government and to the Parliament of Sweden as well as to the City Council of Stockholm who have made it possible for us to assemble in this magnificent city and have placed at our disposal the Parliament Building and this splendid hall in which we are assembled tonight. When the Executive Committee decided to convene this Assembly in Stockholm, we did so partly as an expression of recognition of, and appreciation for, the humane attitude of all the Scandinavian lands and of Sweden especially in the war years and its immediate aftermath. Thousands of Jews were rescued from Nazi annihilation by these countries and in the last months of the war many thousands of inmates of concentration camps were saved by Swedish intervention.

Accordingly, I wish to express our deep appreciation for three great Swedish personalities no longer with us, who played an important role in these efforts. First, the late King Gustaf V, whose humane and liberal tradition, shared by the whole royal family, is nobly continued by His Majesty King Gustaf VI Adolf to whom I send on behalf of all of us our respectful greetings; secondly, the late Per Albin Hansson, Swedish Prime Minister during the war, and thirdly, Graf Folke Bernadotte who lost his life in Jerusalem trying to find a way to settle the Arab-Jewish conflict. We all remember how deeply shocked and grieved the Jewish people all

over the world was when this courageous man was assassinated by fanatics. This is all the more reason for us to hold dear the memory of this gallant man, who negotiated with the Nazi regime to prevent the mass murder of the inmates of the camps. He is among the many great non-Jewish humanitarians who did their utmost to save Jews during the Nazi holocaust.

We are very happy to have with us tonight the Prime Minister of Sweden, Mr. Tage Erlander, who continues the great liberal and democratic tradition of this noble country.

I wish also to extend a special welcome to Mr. Carl-Albert Andersson, President of the City Council, who is our host to us tonight and to whom we shall be privileged soon to hear.

It is a great pleasure for me to welcome the representative of the Government and people of Israel, my dear old friend Dr. Pinhas Rosen, Minister of Justice, who will convey to you the greetings of Israel.

I wish also to welcome the Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations, M. Philippe de Seynes. I had hoped to be able to welcome here my good friend, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld who unfortunately was prevented, despite his desire to be here, from coming, but we are happy to have among us one of his most trusted and respected Under-Secretaries. There is no people in the world more attached and loyal to the idea 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 heart of the United Nations.

I should equally like to extend greetings to the representatives of the United Nations' Specialized Agencies. We have the great pleasure of having with us tonight Mr. Christer von Stedingk who brings us a message from the International Labour Organization and M. Pierre Lebar, representing the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) whom we shall hear tomorrow night in a special Symposium session.

I welcome the members of the diplomatic corps who have honoured us tonight with their presence, their Excellencies the Ambassadors of Norway, Denmark, Argentina and the Federal Republic of Germany, as well as the Diplomatic Representatives of Austria, Canada, Costa Rica, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Great Britain, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Mexico, Netherlands, Peru, Poland, the Union of South Africa, the United States of America, Uruguay and Venezuela.

I also welcome the representatives of international non-governmental organisations with which the World Jewish Congress closely co-operates at the United Nations and in the Specialised Agencies. We have among us representatives of the World Federation of the United Nations Associations, the International Council of Women, the International Union for the Protection of Child Welfare, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, and we have received especially warm greetings from the World Council of Churches and the International Committee of the Red Cross.

I welcome the representatives of the Stockholm Jewish community, the Zionist Organisation of Sweden and the Swedish Section of the World Jewish Congress who are here tonight. The Swedish Section, under the leadership of our old friend Hillel Storch has, especially in the war years and immediately after the war, performed an outstanding service in alleviating the sufferings and in saving many of the Jewish victims of Nazi persecution. I have, in this context, to pay tribute to the contribution made to this effort by Mr. Norbert Masur who went, at the request of Mr. Storch and the Swedish Section, to Germany to negotiate with Himmler, thus helping to save thousands of inmates of the camps.

A specially warm word of welcome to the representatives of the various Jewish organisations who have honoured us and accepted our invitation to send fraternal delegates and observers to this Assembly, namely, the Jewish Agency for Israel, the Board of Deputies of British Jews, the B'nai B'rith, the Alliance Israélite Universelle, the Conseil Représentatif des Juives de France, the World Ort Union, the World Sephardi Federation, the Women's International Zionist Organisation (WIZO) and the Jewish Community of Copenhagen. I also welcome observers from the Social and Cultural Association of Jews in Poland.

Finally, a word of welcome to our many guests who have come here, some of them at my own invitation, many others accompanying their delegations and out of their deep interest in the problems which will be discussed at this Assembly and in the work of the World Jewish Congress.

I hope that this Assembly will open a new chapter in the history of the World Jewish Congress and make a contribution to the solution of the many problems on the agenda of Jewish life which it will have to discuss, and that all of us who have come from so many lands to this hospitable city will be glad that they have done so and have participated in the work of this Fourth Assembly which I hereby declare in session.

2. ADDRESS OF WELCOME BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF SWEDEN,
HIS EXCELLENCY MR. TAGE ERLANDER

The Swedish Government is naturally happy to take the opportunity to welcome the World Jewish Congress with its delegates from 45 countries on its first visit to Sweden.

You represent a people which for several thousand years has played an important role in the cultural development of the world. In spite of persecution and oppression, this people has continued to fight for its religious, cultural and moral ideas, which have so enriched Western civilisation.

To the representatives of the Government of Israel I wish to give a special greeting. The peaceful task of reconstructing your country has been undertaken under the most difficult conditions in a manner which must deeply impress all observers. We have followed with admiration your progress and your efforts to create economic and social justice.

At the first session of the World Jewish Congress in 1936, Dr. Nahum Goldmann gave the Congress an analysis of the Jewish situation in the world and said among other things:

"The Jewish situation has always been the result of two main factors. The first is the general character of the times. The second and less decisive factor is the specific existence of the Jewish question. The immeasurable tragedy of our situation in recent years commenced at the moment when the general character of our time manifested itself as a negative factor in our life".

When Dr. Goldmann uttered these judicious words, he was certainly conscious of the dangers that threatened the Jews and humanity in general. Three years later the world war broke out and the cruel persecution of the Jews became a daily tragedy.

We all hoped that at the end of the war it would be possible to create a new and better world in which all people would live together in peace. The international organisation of the United Nations was created to further this development and to enhance the economic, social and cultural standards of the human race.

Unfortunately, the post-war period has brought many disappointments and has shattered many illusions. In vain we have waited for the Great Powers to collaborate and trust each other. The cold war has created an atmosphere that all too easily might deteriorate into something far worse. The production of new and terrible weapons of destruction has given humanity the means to wipe out the whole of our civilisation in a few hours.

Against this background, Dr. Goldmann's words 23 years ago stand out in strong relief. This applies still more to the Jewish

people living in more than ninety different countries. But other people, too, through technical progress, have become more and more dependent on the general development of the world. The situation has changed even for a small country like Sweden with its generally accepted policy of neutrality based on more than 150 years of peace. We are forced to admit that even though we succeed in keeping our neutrality, we cannot be sure of avoiding the dreadful effects of a future atomic war.

All countries and peoples, therefore, now have a far more obvious interest in, and consequently a greater responsibility for, the development of the world than before. It is now not only the aggressors and the attacked who are threatened, but all mankind. Despite disappointments and setbacks that have hitherto been encountered, it is to the United Nations that we look in our struggle to prevent another world war. It is of inestimable value to have an international forum where disputes and problems can be discussed. It is my conviction that the United Nations during the past years have accomplished much that is valuable. If there is sincere desire on the part of the Great Powers, the United Nations can become an organ that can provide a safer existence for the people of the world today. Peaceful collaboration is the only long-term alternative to catastrophe.

The World Jewish Congress in its own sphere can make a valuable contribution to the future welfare of the world by helping to create a world in which all people—irrespective of race, religious belief or political colour — have the opportunity to live a human existence. Differences of speech or culture need not be insurmountable obstacles for understanding and collaboration between the peoples of different countries. The important thing is to be imbued with the will to create such an understanding.

With these words I wish to extend to you a hearty welcome to Sweden. The Stockholm Congress will certainly be strenuous and involve the delegates in considerable discussion. But it would naturally please us Swedes if, during your visit here, you have time to learn something about our country and thus also build up an understanding of Swedish democracy and how it functions.

3. ADDRESS BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF ISRAEL, HIS EXCELLENCY THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE DR. PINHAS ROSEN

It is with deep gratification that I convey the greetings of the Government of Israel to the World Jewish Congress.

There are here assembled delegates of Jewish communities

from many parts of the globe. They bear in their hearts a Jewish consciousness. They proudly proclaim their Jewish cultural heritage, which they desire to preserve and develop, and they include delegates of the Jewish community from its homeland, the State of Israel.

The Jewish community in the State of Israel regards itself not only as an integral part of the Jewish people, as one Jewish community among others, but as the creation of the people, evolved under the leadership of the Zionist Movement. It is a creation for which the entire people, in all its different sections, strove for thousands of years with yearning, tears and bloody sacrifices, and to which it still makes its spiritual and material contribution, each section according to its ability and its particular character and conditions of life.

The State of Israel knows this full well. It has had daily tangible evidence of this from the moment it first came into being until the present hour. It perceives this in the successive waves of immigration, in the throes of immigrant absorption, in its struggle for survival. It is aware, every minute of its existence, of the people's helping hand extended to it, of their hearts anxious for its safety and prosperity, of their love for and pride in it. Whence comes this abundance of devotion and affection of the people for the State of Israel? Is it wholly due to the outward splendour of political sovereignty with all its trappings and paraphernalia? No, not entirely to that. Or even to enthusiasm over the ability of the Jewish people to build a state—an ability which may well arouse admiration. All this does not sufficiently account for the emotional uplift and psychological revolution which the eleven years of the State's existence have progressively, at an increasing rate, produced among the Jewish people. These stem from the fact that with the birth of the State the people realised that the secure haven Zionists had talked about for the last few generations was not only a physical haven for suffering and persecuted Jews, but a secure haven for the spirit and soul of the people, for its own language and specific culture; it was a haven for the people's individuality, for everything that distinguished it from other peoples, for what was best in its traditions and aspirations; only there, in Eretz Israel, could the Jew prove himself in his entirety.

Every Jewish community in the world—if it so desires and exerts itself to that end—may preserve a measure of Jewish culture amidst the civilisation of the nation in which it dwells. It may even—if it so desires and the culture of the nation in which it dwells permits it — objectively attain the heights of cultural creation, as was

shown by the Great Babylonian Diaspora, which long existed side by side with Jewry in Eretz Israel. But never has a Jewish community in the Diaspora been able to live a full life. The very fact of belonging to two cultures, of being committed to two different spheres, does not allow the Jew to live a complete life, in accordance only with his own needs and values.

In the State of Israel, all the dividing walls—economic, cultural, political, social and spiritual—which in the Diaspora stand between the Jew and his world have come down. There alone, a Jewish *individual* arises who knows no dichotomy in his soul due to an alien environment; there alone, a Jew can develop as he is, with his good and bad qualities, his abilities, aspirations and hopes, his tradition, language and literature, free and complete in his Jewishness and his humanity. And there alone can a complete Jewish *people* arise, a fully qualified and fully privileged member of the family of nations. Its standing will always be commensurate with its intrinsic merit, neither higher nor lower.

To our great surprise, having not expected it so soon, our influence already makes itself felt in various parts of the world. What ten years ago seemed a miraculous dream is becoming a solid reality. Slowly, gradually, the attention of mankind turns to that little corner, the creation of the Jewish people, not in curiosity, but in serious anticipation. The first fruits of the State's endeavours, not yet mature may already serve as a model to some, may rouse those who lie dormant, may assist those who lag behind, and may win the respect, if not the favour, of the mighty.

In this lies the source of the influence of the State of Israel over Diaspora Jewry, and of the affection they feel for it. It is not only that the State enhances the prestige and dignity of the Jew, that it changes the attitude of the nations towards the Jew in their midst. The main element of that influence is something of immeasurably greater importance for the future of our people—the jolt which has been given to Jewish complacency, the light which the State sheds on the life of the Jew in the Diaspora, the fact that it sets him enquiring about the content, essence and meaning of his life, and that it points the way to a self-contained, full life of creativeness, of inner freedom and human beauty.

The State of Israel does not flatter itself that it has already become a model nation, either for the world at large or, particularly, for the Diaspora. But it earnestly aspires to become one, and its best sons bend their energies to that purpose. A long road is still ahead. Many obstacles, material, intellectual, and moral, have still to be overcome. It is difficult to maintain the effort amidst a

whirlpool of immigration from so many and so widely different diasporas, and amidst the strains and stresses of the day-to-day struggle for existence. There is, moreover, an evil—the Galut heritage of strife, crime and corruption. But the State will have the strength to uproot these evils and to increase the good and beautiful, which is already amply present in the life of its tens of thousands of wonderful halutzim. The more the State succeeds in this endeavour, the more it will become the great spiritual centre of Jewry and a source of encouragement to the people in the Diaspora. And the more such encouragement is felt, the more will the Jew in the Diaspora be attracted towards that source of strength and light—his brothers in Eretz Israel.

So long as the Jewish people is in the Dispersion—and we do not know how long that will continue—the two segments of the people, Eretz Israel Jewry and Diaspora Jewry must strengthen each other. Each should do what is within its power and let the other do likewise; and continually there should be exchanges of views, joint consultations and a spirit of Jewish brotherhood. The fight for Jewish rights in the Diaspora will doubtless continue to be undertaken by the World Jewish Congress. The opportunities of the State for direct action in this sphere are very limited owing to the international principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of another state. But as far as the State can be of help here, it will not be found wanting.

Diaspora Jewry will continue to strengthen the State, which needs many immigrants for both security and economic reasons. It will help the State to integrate the immigrants who come to its doors, which are wide-open to every Jew. And the State will help the Diaspora, to the best of its ability, to develop and maintain a Hebrew culture, acquaintance with the Hebrew language and a Jewish consciousness. In all this, there will have to be close and permanent co-operation.

May this Assembly succeed in deepening the feeling of brotherhood and solidarity between the two parts of Jewry and in welding all Jewish communities, with all their different groupings, into one Jewish people with one common purpose—to take its place in the family of nations, which strives towards a human society characterised by justice, equality and love of mankind.

4. ADDRESS BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS, M. PHILIPPE DE SEYNES, UNITED NATIONS UNDER-SECRETARY FOR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS

In the course of its history, the Jewish community has been

more exposed than any other to the temptation of exclusivism. The need to safeguard its identity, constantly threatened by dispersion and persecution, naturally induced it to stress, or even to accentuate, its individuality. Moreover, its very existence was essentially based on a concept of the Law, more exacting in its ideal and stricter in its forms than that of most of the societies in which the Jewish community was evolving. And yet, in its most inspired moments, Hebrew thought has produced a universal message of a power and certainty that have rarely been equalled. From its revelation and tradition, which have from time immemorial combined the prophetic instinct with the spirit of rational investigation, it has on more than one occasion derived an original contribution to the formulation of the rights and responsibilities of peoples and to the vision of a universe of Law and Reason.

It is this spirit of universality that we are glad to salute in this Assembly. The World Jewish Congress has, no doubt, never failed to call attention to particular situations affecting the Jewish community; but its action has always been conceived as part of a general struggle for the universal promotion of human rights. In fact, it has raised this attitude into a guiding principle for all its activities. It does not seek for the community for which it feels responsible a privileged situation, or the recognition of rights and advantages that would be refused to others. On the contrary, it has repeatedly proclaimed that the elementary rights of a given group can never be permanently safeguarded, unless the same rights are granted to all without any kind of discrimination. In this respect, the attitude of the World Jewish Congress is based not only on the observance of a moral law or the findings of social science. It has its roots in actual experience, in a tragic history, some of the most cruel chapters of which have been written during the present generation.

When the authors of the Charter decided to associate certain non-governmental organisations with the work of the United Nations, they were moving with the tide of modern political thought. Many governments today feel the need to develop—beyond the constitutional formulas which are the traditional basis of popular representation—the practice of direct contacts with those groups and communities in which some of the living forces of society are expressed. In creating the Consultative Status with the Economic and Social Council, the authors of the Charter aimed at mobilising, for the benefit of the work of the United Nations, a useful body of international experience in some cases of long standing, in others still being acquired. In so doing, they were taking a bold step and

one full of promise. But at the same time, they were accepting a not insignificant risk. By opening the forum of the Economic and Social Council to bodies not vested with governmental responsibilities, they could have opened the door to real abuses. There was a danger that its debates would become encumbered, its perspectives blurred by the consideration of sectional problems, that the Organisations granted the new Status would be more anxious to draw the Council's attention to their own difficulties rather than to make a constructive contribution to the solution of general problems. Such tendencies have always been carefully avoided by the World Jewish Congress and I have no hesitation in saying here that it has always interpreted its relations with the United Nations in the true spirit of the Charter. An enquiry made some years ago by a committee of the Economic and Social Council made special mention of the way in which it had performed its functions within the framework of the Consultative Status.

At your earlier sessions, it was easy to see how natural is the association of the World Jewish Congress with the United Nations. The records of your proceedings and the texts of your resolutions afford eloquent proof, in views they express and problems they cover, of an affinity which, I am quite sure, will again emerge during the present session. Today's meeting, and the ones to follow, may therefore provide an opportunity for further reflection on the activities and programmes of the United Nations in the field of human rights. It is not out of place to recall that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was originally conceived as the first stage of a generous and continuous movement, as a statement of principles which should lead to the conclusion of a covenant and the formulation of measures of implementation to be inserted in international instruments. The slow progress made in this second stage has meant for many a setback in the fulfilment of what were perhaps overhastily conceived hopes. But the members of the Jewish community are less likely than any others to ignore or underestimate the obstacles to be overcome. It is a formidable task under any circumstances—and one made more difficult by the periodic recurrence of political tensions, to adjust legal or constitutional systems, traditions and customs to universal standards, the validity of which is nevertheless recognised by each one of us in his inner heart. Those who might be discouraged should be reminded that the General Assembly has not abandoned its objective, as initially formulated, and that it continues every year to devote the best of its energies to its fulfilment. The establishment of a system of law for the effective promotion of human rights is an ambitious task

that will require further courage, patience and faith.

These virtues have not failed the Jewish community in the course of its tribulations. This Congress may already take pride in some remarkable achievements. It has managed to bring under the wing of its organisation communities in more than 60 countries living under the most diverse economic and social conditions, to build a series of bridges and to establish permanent links between groups which would otherwise have remained isolated. These successes have been achieved in circumstances that were frequently adverse. They are, in my opinion, a presage of future growth, the seed of new international action independent of any government, or group of governments, and the organisation I have the honour to represent here will continue to follow the progress of the Congress's work with interest and sympathy.

I am happy to convey to you the best wishes of the Secretary-General, as well as my own, for the success of your session.

5. ADDRESS BY THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION, FRIHERRE CHRISTER VON STEDINGK

It is with the greatest pleasure that I greet this Assembly on behalf of the Director-General of the International Labour Organisation. Let me at the outset express my admiration for the tireless efforts of your organisation for the benefit of all those whom you represent.

There are several points of contact between the ILO and your organisation. Our relations are now formalised through the special status which the World Jewish Congress enjoys following its inclusion on the so-called Special List of non-governmental organisations. As you know, the ILO has established this List with a view to regularising contacts with some such organisations whose work is of particular interest, in whole or in part, to the ILO, and which are themselves interested in some of the activities of the ILO.

One point of contact is the age of our organisations. The ILO was created by the Versailles Treaty 40 years ago, and is thus celebrating its 40th anniversary this year. I think that the roots of your organisation can be found in the Jewish delegation to the Versailles Peace Conference.

Since the end of the first World War, and even more so after the second war, international collaboration and the creation of international organisations has become more and more intensive. This is a hopeful sign of the spread of new ideas and new concepts

among nations and individuals and for all of us who are working in the international field it is a duty—sometimes gratifying, sometimes frustrating—to strengthen and make more effective this international machinery.

The effectiveness of this machinery depends, I think, on the importance and urgency of the problems that the respective organisations have to deal with. It depends on the activities which it develops. It depends on the degree to which the scope of the organisation is suitable for international action in view of the still rather unfavourable realities in that respect in the world of today.

I think that the World Jewish Congress, when judged by these criteria, has better chances of being effective than many other international organisations. Let me remind you only of its contributions to the solution of the problems of minorities after the first World War, and to the work in favour of human rights, carried out by the United Nations and its specialised agencies, including the ILO.

These two examples represent only a fraction of your activities, but I feel that they are two points of contact between our organisations which are of the utmost importance. The problems and the sufferings of the Jews have made you a most vigorous spokesman for the doctrine of equal rights of everyone, irrespective of race. Discrimination on the basis of race, however, is only one type of discrimination. The ILO Convention concerning discrimination in respect of employment and occupation also speaks about discrimination on the basis of sex, religion, political opinion, national extraction or social origin. When your organisation fights against racial discrimination, especially within the United Nations family, you do so in collaboration with those representing other interests, and the whole complex problem is pushed forward towards a solution.

The ILO is, I believe, the only inter-governmental organisation in which non-governmental interests, notably those of employers and workers, take a direct part not only in deliberations but also in decisions. As a matter of course, the international trade union movements attach the greatest importance to the question of discrimination. This is one of those occasions where your activities and interests in the United Nations family coincide with those of other powerful international forces. Your contribution to the elaboration and adoption by the International Labour Conference, at its forty-second session, in June 1958, of the Convention concerning Discrimination in Employment and Occupation, and of a Recommendation on the same subject, is greatly appreciated. In addi-

tion to sending in material which helped the International Labour Office in making its preliminary study, your organisation was represented by observers in the Committee discussions of the Conference, made statements and submitted reports. The discussions were exhaustive and, under the tripartite structure of the ILO, not only governments, but also representatives of employers and workers contributed to them.

Two countries have now ratified the Convention—Israel in January 1959, and Iraq in June 1959. The Convention will therefore come into force in June 1960—one year after the second ratification. It is known that other countries are also examining the possibility of ratification.

I ought perhaps to explain that an International Labour Convention is not binding upon a Member State of the ILO until it has been ratified by that state. After ratifications, the regulations of the Convention must be fully applied by the ratifying state. There is a special machinery within the ILO for supervising the application of Conventions and for bringing pressure to bear on ratifying Governments who fail to comply fully with the text of the Convention. Non-governmental organisations, such as the World Jewish Congress, can play a significant role in making representations to governments in favour of ratification.

A Convention has a certain impact, however, even though it may not be ratified. The principles laid down in it serve as a basis for the operational activities of the ILO. The standards of the Convention thus give guidance to the ILO's work in the field and serve as a goal to be achieved.

Furthermore, a tendency towards a new emphasis on an educational, promotional type of approach is noticeable within the ILO. Recognising that legislation is not sufficient if the basic understanding of problems is lacking, the ILO, within its fields of activity, is endeavouring increasingly to bring about such understanding. It is acting through such media as workers' education, management development and productivity institutes, to give some examples. I want to mention this tendency, as it seems to leave scope for further contributions from your organisation to the work of the ILO—thus furthering the aims of both organisations.

May I finally express the sincere hope of the Director-General of the International Labour Organisation that this Assembly will achieve its goal and that the World Jewish Congress will continue to develop its activities on behalf of the basic rights of individuals of all nations.

6. ADDRESS OF WELCOME BY MR. CARL-ALBERT ANDERSSON,
PRESIDENT OF THE STOCKHOLM CITY COUNCIL

It is an honour for the Swedish Capital to welcome the World Jewish Congress for its discussions in Stockholm. It also gives me personally an opportunity to combine a civic duty with private pleasure. I hope that this meeting of yours in Stockholm, when the summer is at its peak, will be a great pleasure to you as well.

The Swedish tradition of unbroken peace in a world ravaged by war is by no means unknown to you. This has naturally come to be of importance for Stockholm, too, whose name has been associated with the peace and happiness that a martyred humanity is longing for. Many people fleeing from persecution and war have come to Stockholm. Many were saved in the name of humanitarianism which remained alive in spite of the machinations of the powers of darkness. So Stockholm became a haven of refuge or, perhaps to put it more precisely, more or less a safety station on the first stage to freedom. For many who came here continued later on to Israel. Among the refugees were many Jews, many of whom continued later to Israel; some had relatives in our country. There were the obvious entrants from the neighbouring occupied countries. But all were made to feel welcome as members of a free community. Many Jewish families in Stockholm set an example of solidarity and civic qualities which causes us to look with pride at this small religious community with its traditions of many thousands of years which are such a valuable asset to our society.

A co-ordinating function, then as today, was played by the World Jewish Congress. With their most prominent Swedish representative—a member of your executive and my personal friend, Hillel Storch—I have often had an opportunity to discuss the problems that have beset you. I have been particularly impressed by your faith in the future of which your Congress is a living expression. This faith, I have noticed, is combined with an inflexible expression of will. How many were there who refused to abandon hope for the required visa to the promised land—and left in any case. I was impressed by the tremendous, very often purely personal efforts and self-sacrifice that I came to hear about. I felt that my contacts were doubly valuable at a time when the shades of evil enveloped Europe.

After all this it is a pleasure for us that in this world of instability you should have chosen the city of Stockholm as your meeting place in 1959. I bid you heartily welcome to the "city on

the water". May the debates which follow serve your purposes and further the progress of the role of the young and successful state of Israel in a peaceful world.

7. ADDRESS OF WELCOME BY MR. HILLEL STORCH, SWEDISH MEMBER OF THE WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS EXECUTIVE

In the name of the World Jewish Congress Swedish Section and as a member of the World Executive residing in Sweden, it gives me a special pleasure to welcome this great and representative conference of the Jewish people in Stockholm. This is the first Jewish conference of a universal character to be held in Sweden and it will give Swedish public opinion its first opportunity to get acquainted with representative Jewish leaders from all over the world. Jewish leaders, on the other hand, will be able to make a close study of the institutions and blessings of Swedish democracy.

Let me express my special gratification at the fact that we are meeting for this Fourth Assembly of the World Jewish Congress in Stockholm, the capital of a country which at a time when the Jewish people was going through its most desperate trials, gave so much proof of brotherly love and the will to be of help and where all our efforts always found the fullest understanding on the part of His Majesty the King, the Government, institutions, press and public.

This is not the place or time to give a detailed account of all the humanitarian efforts and interventions made by Sweden in the course of the Second World War to save Jews from death and persecution. The World Jewish Congress was a direct or indirect participant in many of these actions.

True, measured against the tremendous losses and the overwhelming tragedy suffered by our people, the results may appear modest. But if we remember that it was possible, at the retreat of the German army from occupied territories in 1944, to achieve the cessation of mass shootings and to evacuate Jews—thereby saving tens of thousands who would otherwise have perished; that it was possible to save a large part of Budapest Jewry from the fate suffered by Hungarian Jews in the provinces, that, at the collapse of the Nazi regime, it was possible to prevent the extermination of tens of thousands of concentration camp inmates; that Danish Jewry and a considerable part of Norwegian Jewry were saved from Nazi rule; that at the end of the war some 6,500 Jews could be brought to Sweden, and after the cessation of hostilities some 10,000 seriously ill Jews from concentration camps were received

in Sweden—then we realise that we have to thank for this, largely if not exclusively, the humanitarian spirit and aid of the Swedish people and its leaders who, faithful to their ancient principles and culture and justice, held high the banner of humanity.

Many phases of Sweden's heroic rescue work are not yet generally known. The White Book published by the Swedish Government in 1956, which was devoted only to the last phase of the rescue work performed during the war, laid the foundation for a historical evaluation of the period. Other significant aspects of this rescue work both during the last phase and at earlier periods of the war, still await their appropriate historical appreciation. Much has yet to be amplified or put in its right historical perspective. That is why I am happy that our President agrees on the need for the earliest possible compilation of a well-documented report on that period.

I have spoken of a time in the past which, as you will understand, is particularly close to my heart. But the wheel of history keeps turning. We live in different times and our people is confronted by different, though serious new problems. This Fourth Plenary Assembly will have the opportunity to deal with the important political, spiritual and cultural problems confronting the Jewish world at this time of international tension and insecurity. No other people is so much interested in peace as the Jewish people. One thing unites us all: Ahavat Yisrael (love for Israel). I can see here many of our Swedish friends, Government representatives, representatives of various institutions, of the Press and many others who made valuable efforts and with whom we collaborated. I see here many friends, Jewish leaders and thinkers, many of them old friends. I am filled with emotions impossible to put into words. May this Assembly be held under a propitious star and be inspired by the spirit of our Prophets and other heroic leaders who have preached love of mankind and liberty.

8. PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS BY DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN

Twenty-seven years have passed since I was called upon, at the first World Jewish Conference convened in Geneva in 1932, which preceded the formal establishment of the World Jewish Congress, to make an address surveying the Jewish position in the world. Trying to do the same again today, I cannot think of a better point of departure than a comparison of the Jewish situation as it presented itself to the analyst in 1932 with that he has to deal with today. This comparison, I am sure, will show that there was

rarely a period in the history of our people so rich in drama and revolutionary upheavals, so full of the most radical changes in our situation, as this quarter of a century which has passed since the World Jewish Congress was established. It was certainly the most tragic, and no less certainly one of the most heroic chapters in our history; and it has brought about—as a result of what happened in the world at large and in our Jewish world specifically—more fundamental changes in the position of our people and in the great problems of our life than any previous period of that unique epic called the history of the Jewish people.

A quarter of a century ago, when a Jew or a non-Jew looked at the position of the Jews in the world, his whole attention had to be concentrated on external factors, on dangers and threats to our existence which came from the outside world. It was the period which was dominated both internationally and “Jewishly” by the growing power of Nazi Germany with its threat to world peace, but its still greater and more specific threat to the existence of our people. In the course of the thousands of years of our history we have been threatened by many enemies, in many parts of the world and in various periods of world history, but there never was a threat as fanatically conceived, as ruthlessly implemented, as thoroughly and efficiently organised, as the one represented by Hitler and his regime whose avowed purpose it was either to annihilate the Jewish people or, at least, to reduce it to the status of helots and slaves. As a matter of fact, when Dr. Stephen S. Wise, the unforgettable founder of the World Jewish Congress, and I convoked the first Conference in 1932, the determining motive was the appearance of Hitler on the horizon of Germany and the feeling that a great and formidable challenge to our existence was beginning to develop. All the efforts of our people at that time had to be concentrated on striking back, on overcoming the danger, and trying to save German, European and, maybe, World Jewry. All the problems of our life—at that time and up to the defeat of Nazi Germany in 1945—had to be centred around this threat which overshadowed all other issues. Specifically analysed, the great problems of that period were four-fold:

1. to fight back as much as we could by marshalling our own forces and trying to win the help and co-operation of all liberal elements in the world; in trying to weaken the growing power of the Nazi regime and reducing its terrible influence on many other countries and governments;

2. to organise relief for the tens and hundreds of thousands of

Jews who lost their livelihood and the basis of their existence first in Germany and later wherever Nazi influence itself felt;

3. to look for countries of immigration for the hundreds of thousands who, we knew, could not remain any longer in Germany or in the Central and East European countries, a problem at which we worked for years and years, in which the old League of Nations became involved by creating the High Commission for German Refugees, and for which we found only a very minimal and unsatisfactory solution, and

4. to strive, both because of its immediate importance for immigration and as a final solution of the problem of Jewish homelessness and persecution, for the full implementation of the Zionist programme and the creation of a Jewish homeland in Palestine.

These four central problems formed the main content of Jewish life at that period and obviously determined the main programme of work of the World Jewish Congress.

It is not my purpose tonight to evaluate our achievements with regard to these four tasks. I enumerated them here only as a basis of comparison with the situation prevailing today.

And now, passing to our present position, I am sure that even somebody who has only a superficial knowledge of Jewish life and Jewish problems will realise that tremendous fundamental changes have taken place.

The external danger does not exist any more. Not only have Hitler and his cohorts been defeated. As a result of the terrible losses of the Nazi period, perhaps, which did not only cost us Jews six millions of our sons and daughters, but for which humanity paid with many more millions in the Second World War—a sacrifice which might have been unnecessary if the world had heeded the warnings of some of us, including non-Jews, who had seen the danger of Nazism in time—anti-Semitism in its brutal and physical form has more or less faded away in the world. Jews everywhere, with very few insignificant exceptions, enjoy equality of rights. Even in countries where only twenty or thirty years ago they were deprived of all rights and suffered constant discrimination, Jews are today emancipated not only “de jure”, constitutionally, but also “de facto”, by having been integrated in the political, economic and cultural life of their countries.

Of course, there still is discrimination in many parts of the world and, obviously, it is our task as Jews to fight it, to continue to be watchful, and not to be too sure that even brutal anti-Semi-

tism could not reappear in hectic and unsettled periods. But discrimination against minorities is a universal phenomenon in this imperfect world; and looking back at the anti-Semitism of the Nazi period, or even that of earlier periods such as Tsarist Russia, Dmowski's Poland or Goga's Rumania, we have to admit that anti-Semitism is no longer the central dominating problem in Jewish life. The emancipation for which our people has fought so long has been achieved and even reactionary and dictatorial regimes do not deny their Jewish citizens equality of rights.

One result of this fundamental disappearance of anti-Semitism in its crude form has been a great improvement also in the economic situation of our people. There are still Jewish groups, especially in the under-developed countries of North Africa or Asia who live under poor and often distressing economic conditions, but even in these countries this is not a specifically Jewish problem but one applying to life in general. The large majority of our people, however, is not faced today with the problem of Jewish misery which characterised our life for so many centuries. Jews have made use of the equality of opportunity offered to them by full emancipation, have progressed economically, and Jewish relief work or philanthropy is no longer a central field of Jewish activity.

The main fundamental change applies to the third problem, i.e. Jewish migration. Whereas twenty-five years ago the problem was to find countries of immigration which were ready to admit Jews, the position has changed completely since the establishment of the State of Israel. The problem today is no longer one of immigration but of emigration. There are, in fact, countries in the world where Jews enjoy all rights except that of emigration, and especially of immigration to Israel. Since the first day of Israel's establishment the problem of finding a haven for Jewish immigrants has ceased to exist, because it is the law in Israel to admit every Jew who wants to settle there. None of the State's achievements in its first decade is greater than that of having admitted and saved one million Jews for whom immigration to Israel was the only salvation.

As to the fourth problem, the creation of the Jewish homeland as an end to homelessness, it too has taken on a completely new form. The State of Israel is there; the homeland exists and blossoms, and the great problem of Jewish life in this respect is not to create the homeland, but to consolidate it; to make it secure and to solve the problem of its relationship with the Jewish Diaspora.

This short comparison demonstrates the fundamental change in our position. On the surface these changes are all to the good.

Nazism defeated, anti-Semitism in its old form greatly weakened, Jewish misery no longer characteristic of large parts of our people, no need to beg countries to allow immigration of homeless Jews, and the dream of centuries of a Jewish homeland gloriously implemented. It may seem as if a miracle had happened, as if after the hell of the Nazi decade the millenium of a safe Jewish existence—secure, rich, meaningful—had come.

The purpose of my opening address is to warn against this illusion and to tell this Assembly, and through it the many Jewish communities in the world, that there could be no greater folly and shortsightedness than to see only the outer façade, to take the achievements of this period for granted, and to live under the illusion that we do not have to worry about our future and our survival. This warning is all the more necessary since we are a people inclined to an excess of optimism, with a tendency to believe in the miraculous, to minimise dangers and be mystically convinced of our survival whatever may happen. This specific Jewish optimism, one of the great qualities of our people which partly explains our survival, this miracle of a people which in centuries of hopelessness and persecution refused to give way to despair and remained convinced of future glory, this optimism, like all virtues, has its dangers. It leads to wishful thinking and to a tendency to live under illusions. Were it not for this optimism and escapism, hundreds of thousands if not millions of Jews who became Nazi victims might have survived. And this tendency to refuse to see danger is all the stronger if the danger is not spectacular, not expressed in brutal deeds or crude threats, if the surface seems calm, idyllic and even glorious. Therefore, there is, in my opinion, no more urgent and vital task in Jewish life today than to educate our generation to look beyond the façade and see the deeper forces, the underground elements which determine the life of a people. It is equally urgent to realise the silent, anonymous dangers which operate in the depths and which, in the long run, may turn out to be much more deadly than spectacular outside threats and attacks.

Let me, in order to illustrate this main thesis of my address, elaborate a little more fully on the new specific problems of our changed situation as enumerated earlier.

The fight for equal rights for Jews as citizens, as I have said, has been more or less won. Everywhere Jews are recognised as equal, but this great achievement brings with itself another danger, an internal one: the danger that this emancipation may lead to Jewish disintegration and assimilation. The miracle of Jewish survival in centuries of the Diaspora is partly explained by the fact

that Jews in those centuries lived their own separate life. Jewish life in the Galut was primarily a life of the Ghetto, be it in the form of the mellahs of North Africa, of the medieval ghettos in Europe or the Jewish shtetel (village) in Eastern Europe until the beginning of the twentieth century. In these ghettos the Jews lived territorially in the same countries with their neighbours, but culturally and spiritually their own distinct life. It was dominated by their laws, and was regulated from early morning till late at night by an all-comprehensive code of laws, rules and habits. As Heinrich Heine once said, Jews have lived under the laws of the Torah everywhere in their "portable fatherland". In all their migrations, by taking with them their own laws and manners, they took with them their own spiritual fatherland.

This separate form of life does no longer exist. It is pointless to ask if one should wish it to continue or not. It was part of a way of life and a civilisation which are no more. We have fought, and rightly so, for its abolition. The whole of the nineteenth, and part of the twentieth century of our history, was mainly filled by our fight for equal rights. And it is foolish even to raise the question as to whether we should want to go back. What we must do is to face the new situation which poses quite different problems for our own and future generations as long as Jewish communities spread over the world will live as emancipated Jews.

There is one theoretical answer to this problem: to concentrate all Jews of the world in Israel, where they can unite both tendencies, to be equal with all other peoples and, at the same time, have their own separate life. But it is useless to discuss this thesis here at the World Jewish Congress. All of us, both those who theoretically approve of it and those who reject it, agree that, for a long time to come, certainly for our generation and others after us, this total concentration of the Jewish people in Israel will not come about. The Diaspora is no more ready to move to Israel than Israel would be in a position to absorb the totality of our people. Therefore we have to face a situation when for decades, and may be centuries to come, large parts of our people will live as equal citizens, fully emancipated and integrated in the life of the majorities among whom they live, and, at the same time, try to remain Jews.

There are two parts to this tremendous problem which, in some ways, is more difficult than the fight against anti-Semitism, pogroms and attacks. One concerns the right to live as Jews. There are also two aspects of the problem of emancipation, and the time has come to switch from one aspect to another. In the past

century, our main struggle was for the right of Jews to be equal citizens. This we have achieved. Today we have to fight for the rights of equal citizens born as Jews to remain Jews. This right is not denied expressly in the various constitutions and political set-ups of the various countries, but "de facto" there are many parts of the world where this right is challenged or even denied. There are certain concepts of equality of rights which deny the minorities the right to live a separate life, to be different from the majority of peoples among whom they live—a naive, primitive concept of equality of rights, as old as the French Revolution.

This tendency is especially strong and dangerous in our era of the omnipotence of the state, of the mechanical equalisation of all human beings. We live in a period when, both for a minority group and for the individual, it becomes more and more difficult to be non-conformist, to live a life, not shared by everybody else. This is the great, formidable danger of this period of world history: the mechanisation, the standardisation and the automation not only of industries and economic processes, but of culture and creative life. There is no greater danger, in my opinion, to our civilisation, that this growing power of the state, trying to dominate every sphere of life, establishing rules for everybody and everything and making it more and more difficult for separate groups and separate individuals to retain their distinct identity. For us Jews this is a question of life and death, and we should therefore be in the forefront of those who fight for variety against equalisation, for distinctiveness against standardisation. Equality of rights cannot mean to be equal legally because one is equal in behaviour. Equality of rights properly understood, both morally and culturally, can only mean to be equal in law and to have, at the same time, the right to be distinct in one's way of life. Millions of Jews today are, in practice, either denied the right of living their own Jewish life, or have it curtailed, because of a naive concept of equality which leads the majorities to believe that once Jewish and other minorities are granted equality they have to assimilate completely with this majority. In this respect the fight for Jewish emancipation is not over. We have won it as human beings, now we must win it as Jews and proclaim in all countries of the world and under all regimes, in all forms of society, our indestructible right—together with other minorities, national, racial, religious, or linguistic—to live our own life and remain what we are. The meaning of our tragic and heroic struggle for survival of the sufferings of generations, of the sacrifice of the lives of millions of Jews, cannot be to have achieved recognition as equal human beings and to be

condemned to disappear as Jews. There are countries in the world where this danger is not imaginary but real. This struggle for a proper concept of equality in this new phase of our history must take the place of the old fight for emancipation. There is no more urgent task for our generation of Jews and for the World Jewish Congress, trying to serve this generation, than to conduct this fight, however long it may take, however difficult it may be, and proclaim our right as equal citizens to live a distinct Jewish life.

Although in this address I am not referring to the specific Jewish situation in the various countries I cannot help, at this point, mentioning one great country where this problem of the right of the Jewish community to live a Jewish life is far from being acknowledged and implemented. I speak of the Soviet Union. The World Jewish Congress has often affirmed its complete neutrality and its refusal to take any position speaking for the Jewish people on problems of specific social and political regimes. Our demand to be equal and to live as Jews is addressed to all regimes and to all social systems. As a matter of fact, there are Socialist countries in Eastern Europe which admit Jewish life and allow their communities to have their schools, their theatre, their newspapers, their communal organisations. One of them, Poland, has sent a delegation to this Assembly and we are glad to welcome them here. Another, Hungary, is affiliated with the World Jewish Congress although they are not present, to our regret, at this Assembly. In the Soviet Union, unfortunately, the situation is different. The only form of Jewish life still existent expresses itself in a small number of Synagogues and even this number, very inadequate to the number of Soviet Jews, is diminishing and not increasing. But all other forms of Jewish life, Yiddish or Hebrew literature, theatre, newspapers, schools, any form of communal organisation does not exist and the most paradoxical aspect of this tragic situation is the fact that just in the Soviet Union the Jews are recognised by Constitution and law as a nationality. But in contrast to many other nationalities in the Soviet Union who have their own national and cultural life—and the USSR is rightly proud to have given them these rights—the Jewish minority does not, de facto, enjoy such facilities. Soviet statesmen try to explain this anomaly with two arguments which we cannot accept:

They argue that in order to have the right to its own life, Soviet Jewry should have concentrated in Birobidjan or elsewhere, just as the other nationalities are territorially concentrated. We are ready to admit that the dispersion of the Soviet Jewish community all over the Soviet Union creates certain specific problems which

are easier solved with regard to nationalities territorially concentrated. But can the historical fact of Jewish dispersion, which is the result of an historical development and not an act of their own volition be a legitimate, moral or legal reason to condemn Soviet Jewry to spiritual disintegration as Jews and deny them their elementary right to continue their distinct identity as Jews?

The second argument often mentioned is that the Soviet Jews do not want to have their own cultural life. If this were true, what risk would the Soviet authorities run in offering them this right and in seeing if they want to make use of it or not? We do not ask the Soviet Union to force Jews into a ghetto or to compel them to live as Jews. All we ask them is to give them the same facilities and possibilities which are granted to other national, cultural and religious minorities in the Soviet Union. Soviet Jews are not allowed to establish their own institutions, to have an organisation to represent them or to have their own cultural life.

This is a very serious problem, maybe the number one problem of Jewish Diaspora life. It concerns a Jewry numbering two million Jews or more. This is one of the greatest Jewish communities of the world. Nothing is further from our mind than to engage in a fight with the Soviet Union. If anyone in the world is interested in peace and co-existence, in relaxation of tension, in permanent good relations between the socialist part of the world and its non-socialist part it is the Jewish people. But this cannot make us forget our most sacred duty to claim for every Jewish community in the world the right to live as Jews and to claim that right for every individual Jew who desires it. I know that we do not have the strength to compel the Soviet Union to accept this demand. But we have fought for elementary Jewish rights for centuries when this fight seemed hopeless. The leaders of the Soviet Union should have sufficient understanding of the greatness of Jewish history and respect for the heroism and the stubbornness of our people to survive in order to realise that the Jewish people of the world will not give up this demand. To raise it again and again will require great patience. I cannot say that we have made progress in this respect since our last Assembly, but this is not a minor matter which we can forget. It concerns a substantial part of our people and we will go on fighting for these rights, convinced that the day will come when the leaders of the Soviet Union will accept it. We are all the more hopeful because there is no real reason for the Soviet Union to deny these rights to the Jewish minority. There is no contradiction between its social system and its regime and this right of its Jewish community to live a Jewish life. Best

proof of this is that other socialist countries acknowledge this right and that in the early days the Soviet Union followed a similar policy. We are further encouraged in our efforts by the fact that more and more progressive and liberal leaders, many of them close to Soviet philosophy and concepts are beginning to understand the righteousness of our demands and have come out openly supporting them.

Nothing would be more tragic than if the Jewish people were as a whole forced into an anti-Soviet position. We do not want to become participants in the Cold War. But the Soviet Union cannot expect us to keep silent and to refrain from reiterating our demands. They, who for a long period have fought under the most trying circumstances for their own concepts and ideas should have, at least, understanding and respect for our stubbornness and refusal to give up. Despite the lack of any progress at the moment, we will go on proclaiming this undeniable right and are hopeful enough to believe that with the growing relaxation of tension in the world, with the increasing chances for some system of peaceful co-existence between the two blocs, the day will come when Soviet Jewry will again have the right and possibility to develop its great Jewish tradition and to play its rightful part in the life of the Jewish world community. This day will be a happy day for us, but also a great day for the world at large.

The second aspect of this problem is the internal one—the will of our people to remain Jewish. Here, too, we must not take things for granted. Here, too, the façade is misleading. Jewish life has increased enormously in its vitality and its outward manifestations. There are more Jewish organisations in the world today than in any previous period of our history.

More Jews are active in Jewish life than was the case twenty or thirty years ago. Tremendous budgets are at the disposal of the various branches of Jewish communal life and anyone who looks at this development of the last thirty years may have every reason to be satisfied and proud of the increased interest in Jewish problems and Jewish efforts. But the picture changes if one looks a little further ahead, if one evaluates the situation not from the point of view of our adult generation, but of the generations of tomorrow and after tomorrow. I have often pointed out in the last few years that that deep Jewish interest of our adult generation is motivated primarily by two great psychological experiences, both shattering and overwhelming: the great tragic experience of the Nazi period with the annihilation, before our eyes, of a third of our people, with the deep emotions of guilt and sympathy and

solidarity which it evoked and which have made millions of surviving Jews better and more conscious Jews than they were before. And the second glorious experience of the emergence of the State of Israel, its military victories, its acceptance by the majority of the peoples of the world; the tremendous change in the moral status of the Jewish people it has brought about, and the great challenge to all of us to make Israel secure and flourishing. But both these experiences are temporary and transitory. They are unique experiences which characterise the psychology and the mental and moral attitude of this unique Jewish generation we represent. For our children and grandchildren these experiences will not exist. The Nazi period will be for them a fact of history, and the existence of the State of Israel will be taken for granted. We will have to find new motives and sources of strength to help those coming generations to maintain their Jewishness. The great challenge to our existence, which characterised our life for centuries, the classic challenge: discrimination, persecution, anti-Semitism, in the old sense, does not exist. The challenges of the future will have to be positive, not negative, creative and not defensive: the understanding and the pride of belonging to this unique Jewish people with its unique history; the challenge and the will to participate in the creativeness of Israel and the new civilisation emerging there. These will have to be the new motivations, the new psychological and moral foundations of Jewish existence in the future.

This is a tremendous task because it lacks drama and excitement, elementary provocation and spectacular threats. It requires major change in our internal policies. All the efforts, money and activities which, for decades, have gone into the fight against anti-Semitism, in organising Jewish relief, into Jewish philanthropy, will have to be switched to the great problems of Jewish education and Jewish creativeness, to participation in the upbuilding of Israel. It means a radical change in the orientation, the goals, the basic directives of what may be called the policies of our people and its organised activities. This change will require new methods and new forms of work, and we will not be able to deal with it unless we realise the new character of our situation, the new dangers and new tasks.

I want to say a word about the other problem which has changed fundamentally, that relating to Jewish migration. Our fight is no longer for countries of admission but for the right of Jews to leave. Millions of Jews are denied this right for whatever the reasons may be. In Eastern Europe and North Africa the right

is either challenged or "de facto" denied. More than any other people we must insist on this basic right of every human being to leave a country in which he does not want to remain. It is a fundamental human right and, I am sure, future generations, more humane and liberally-minded than ours, will not understand how in this twentieth century people could have been denied the right to go to other lands ready to admit them. For this right is not just a question of principle; it is of the greatest practical importance. The future and the Jewish destiny of hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of Jews, may depend on this right. The fight for it must occupy a prominent place on the agenda of Jewish life in our time, regardless of how difficult it may be to achieve and how long it may take.

Now let me come to the fourth and last problem, the problem of Israel and the Jewish homeland. As I have said, the problem today is no longer to achieve it but to consolidate it and, above all, to enable it to make its decisive contribution to the solution of the great central problem of Jewish survival. It is clear to me that without the existence of Israel the chances of securing our future are either nil or very small. We have lost, in the last 25 years, the main foundation of Jewish life—Eastern and Central European Jewry—the communities which were the main sources of all the great creative ideas which nourished Jewish life in the last century. No Jewish community in the Diaspora can replace these communities which were destroyed and will never again play the role they played for centuries in our history. The only community which can replace them and contribute even more than they were able to do to Jewish survival, is the Jewish community of Israel. To see Israel through its initial period and help it consolidate itself politically and economically is not just a question of solidarity with Israel, of Jewish generosity and pride, but, properly understood, pure self-interest on the part of Jewish communities outside Israel. Without Israel the survival as Jews is either impossible or a hundred times more difficult. But in order to enable Israel to achieve this, to make this contribution which is her major *raison d'être*, our generation will have to solve a formidable problem, namely, that of developing ties and methods of co-operation in the relationship between Israel and the Diaspora. They do not yet exist today, but will have to be worked out without the guidance of patterns developed by other peoples which do not know of this problem. To maintain the unity of a people, a minority of which lives its full normal life in its homeland, whereas the majority is dispersed all over the world, is a tremendous problem which will

require all the ingenuity and resourcefulness of the genius for self-preservation of our people, to be solved. The relationship of today, consisting of financial and sometimes political help on the part of the Diaspora and an attitude of appreciation for this on the part of Israel, is much too superficial and does not touch the core of the problem. The relationship between these two parts of the people will have to become one of mutual give-and-take, of mutual influences, of making Jewish communities and individuals in the Diaspora share in the achievements and the creativeness of Israel, particularly in the cultural and social sphere; and to make the life of Israel and its civilisation part of Jewish community life all over the world. All this represents great and formidable problems and at least one if not more generations of Jews will have to work towards their solution.

It will depend on two conditions: on the proper attitude of Israel and the proper position of Diaspora Jewry. For Diaspora Jewry it means the right to be attached to Israel, not politically, but culturally, religiously and spiritually. It is part of the largest problem which I have discussed, namely the right of the Jewish minority to remain distinct and to have, side by side with integration into the life of the country in which it lives, a separate sphere of its own, part of which will be the tie with Israel. It is nonsense and immoral to regard this as double loyalty unless one adopts the criminal theory of the omnipotence of the state and its right to claim the total life of its citizens for itself, denying all other spheres of life, be they religious, social, cultural or individual. Only the Nazi concept of the State proclaimed such an exclusive possessiveness of the State vis-à-vis its citizens, and those Jews who speak of double loyalty when we proclaim our right of attachment to Israel involuntarily and subconsciously adopt this Nazi concept of the State which claims the exclusive loyalty of its citizens at the expense of every other loyalty to family, church, religion, class or people. Unless the Jews of the world proclaim their right to a deep attachment and solidarity with Israel, the relationship between the Diaspora and Israel so essential for our survival, cannot develop.

Israel, on the other hand, will also have to do its share. Not only must it regard itself as part and parcel of the undivided Jewish people, be deeply interested in the life and problems of the Jewish communities in the world, and regard itself as an instrument—the main instrument of Jewish survival. But it will also have to draw the consequences of this attitude. It must enable all Jewish communities of the world to be attached to it, to maintain solidarity with it. The interest and destiny of the Jewish people must be

its primary concern and when it has to choose between what may seem its own interest but what is in conflict with the overall interest of the Jewish people, it has to give priority to the people. If it wants to claim the loyalty of the totality of the Jewish people, it must take a position in international affairs enabling all parts of the people to be attached to it. This is not easy, but Israel is not a state like other states, where the majority of the people live within its borders and where the interest of the state is automatically identical with the interest of the people. As long as the majority of the Jewish people lives outside Israel, Israel will be in this difficult, complex and unique position and will have to maintain it in order to be and remain the main and supreme instrument of Jewish survival in this period of our history.

All these tasks pre-suppose one primary condition: the unity of our people. It is the number one condition for our survival. Without Jewish unity in the past there would be no Jewish people today. To have maintained this unity in centuries of dispersion, without any contact between the various parts of the people, was, perhaps, the greatest achievement of our genius for self-preservation. Today, it is technically easier than ever before to maintain contact. But the more Jews become integrated in the life of their countries, the more the differences between their various forms of life grow. They do not any longer live a common life, regulated by the Jewish code of laws. Therefore, the maintenance of our unity becomes increasingly difficult. The main purpose of the World Jewish Congress is to help achieve it. Congress has made no greater contribution during the 25 years of its existence than to have popularised the idea of Jewish unity and to have helped bring about a situation where the large majority of our people accepts this idea in principle and is ready to implement it. This is manifested by the growth of the World Jewish Congress which, today, has affiliates in over sixty countries of the world. It has also expressed itself in growing co-operation between the various Jewish organisations in the U.S.A. and other countries and in attempts made by the Conference of Jewish Organisation to bring together the majority of international Jewish organisations, which are developing in a hopeful and satisfactory way.

But this problem, too, is far from being solved. There are three main aspects to it which I wanted to enumerate before closing the address. The first and most important is the external and international aspect. It has its source in the terrible split prevailing in the world today, in the cold war, in the violent struggle going on between two social and economic systems. This split in the world,

which developed after the Second World War, is, as we all know, the greatest calamity and dominates the international scene. Coupled with the wonderful, but terrible, development of atomic energy and the danger to the physical survival of humanity in case of war, this split represents the most urgent problem for every human being today.

As long as this cold war goes on, no people is suffering more from its results than our people. Other peoples, in their vast majorities, live on one or the other side of the barrier. Our people lives on both sides and is split at its very centre. About eight to nine million Jews inhabit the Western world and Israel—three million (if not more) Eastern Europe. This split is not of our own making and I am afraid that we will not overcome it as long as the cold war goes on and no real co-existence develops between these two parts of the world. If one does not want to despair of humanity, one must hope that a system of co-existence and peaceful competition between the two social systems of society will be achieved, but—at best—it will take a long time; too many issues of a political and social character are involved. We Jews have to do everything to make our modest contribution in bringing this about. Every people is interested in peace, especially in the age of a possible atomic war; but no people is as deeply interested as ours which, more than any other group, would be the first victim of a new war. Whatever we can do as Jews to bring about understanding and co-existence will have to be done. As a people we cannot take sides, and if there is one organisation neutral by definition and trying to avoid taking a position with regard to various regimes and social philosophies, it is the World Jewish Congress which endeavours to be a spokesman for the Jewish people. In this connection, we may have to consider doing more in the future than we have done in the past, especially by establishing and developing contacts with other neutral forces in the world, with the great bloc of non-committed peoples in Asia and Africa which do not want to take sides and will, I am sure, become an increasingly important force in the world of tomorrow. In addition to all this, we have to do everything to overcome the split within our own life and to establish contact between the two parts of our people. We are the only Jewish organisation which may have a chance of doing it, and the fact that we have here observers of the Jewish community of Poland encourages us in this hope. We have not yet succeeded at all with regard to the main Jewish community of Eastern Europe, the Jewry of the USSR. As you know, we have invited to this Assembly ten Jewish communities in the USSR, the only ones we

could invite as there is unfortunately no overall Jewish organisation such as fortunately do exist in other East European countries. None of these communities has accepted our invitation and we are deeply distressed that they could not see their way to being here. The reason, given by nearly all of them, that they are purely religious communities and could not participate in a political assembly such as this, has very little justification. Are Jews in the USSR not recognised as a nationality? For Soviet Jews to claim that they are only religiously interested is, in view of their official status, more paradoxical than for any other Jewish community.

We are distressed and disappointed by their refusal to be here but we will not give up our efforts to establish contacts with them however long it may take. They should know even today that, despite their absence, we think of them and look forward to the happy day when we will be able to have them amongst us, just as we are happy to welcome representatives of other East European Jewish communities among us.

There is a second aspect to the problem—an aspect of an internal character. I referred to it when I discussed Israel-Diaspora relations. We have a new task in securing Jewish unity, i.e., to secure the permanent co-operation between the two parts of our people, to avoid a gap which might develop, and to create an overall framework where the Jewish citizens of the sovereign State of Israel will work together with and be part and parcel, organisationally, of the totality of the Jewish people. Both the World Zionist Organisation and the World Jewish Congress, as well as some other Jewish groups with affiliates both in Israel and the Diaspora—such as B'nai B'rith, are trying to solve this problem. I do not feel that it has, as yet, been solved, and as the situation develops, the time will come when we shall have to create the one overall organisation which will organise the Diaspora for co-operation with Israel and Israel for its tie-up with the Diaspora. This organisation will serve as one overall framework for the totality of our people with the exclusion of some small groups which, for one reason or another, do not accept the basic idea of the unity of our people and want to remain outside.

In order to achieve it, all of us will have to put the main objective above minor considerations of organisational prestige and interests. As one who has been working for the implementation of Jewish unity now for nearly thirty years, I am glad to be able to state that great progress has been made. But much is still to be done. I appeal both to my colleagues in the World Jewish Congress and to the leaders of all the organisations with whom we are

happily co-operating, lately on a permanent basis, to continue to move in this direction with greater speed than hitherto, even at the costs of some of the interests of the respective organisations here and there. There are no important ideological issues which divide us today. What stands in the way of full unity of action and full co-operation are questions of prestige, of position, of vanity and of small interest, but these are unfortunately often more difficult to overcome than great differences of principle where compromises can be worked out. But, my friends, the tasks of this generation, as I have tried to show, are so formidable, so complicated and require such tremendous efforts in manpower, work, funds and organisational skill, that we can only hope to fulfil them by avoiding all waste, overlapping, unnecessary conflicts and childish competition.

We are part of a generation which was threatened by the greatest danger ever to our existence. We were fortunate enough, not primarily—let us be frank—by our own strength, to avoid the danger of complete annihilation. We lost a third of our people but we managed to survive and were blessed, at the same time, by the creation of the State of Israel; thus making an end to the specific Jewish problem of homelessness.

Now we are faced with a new, less appealing, less provocative, less spectacular danger, but one, however paradoxical it may seem, in the long run more dangerous even than the savage assault on us conducted by the Nazi regime: the danger of silent erosion, of moral disintegration, of indifference and the loss of Jewish consciousness for future generations. Our generation will have to face these new threats which require, as I have said, different forms of psychological behaviour and counteraction. I hope that our generation will be blessed with the insight and understanding of these new problems, be ready to face them, organise itself to solve them, and I hope that the World Jewish Congress will be privileged to make a lasting contribution to the solution of these problems.

SECOND SESSION

August 3, 1959 (Morning)

In the Chair: DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN; later DR. ISRAEL GOLDSTEIN

1. ADDRESSES BY FRATERNAL DELEGATES

THE PRESIDENT, DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN, informed the delegates that representatives of Jewish organisations would convey their greetings and the Assembly would have to decide on the full agenda as well as on the rules of procedure. Thereafter, reports and the general debate would follow.

MR. MEIR GROSSMAN, speaking on behalf of the *Jewish Agency for Israel* and the *World Zionist Organization*, wished the Assembly delegates success in their deliberations.

Mr. Grossman pointed out that the World Jewish Congress was the outcome of the Zionist idea and of Zionist activities. It sufficed to look at the history of Zionism in order to see the political and even the organisational ties between the Zionist movement and the World Jewish Congress. The men who headed the former were also the leaders of the latter, to name only Leon Motzkin, Nahum Sokolow and Stephen S. Wise. Today, there also existed a personal union between the leadership of the World Zionist Movement and the World Jewish Congress. This framework permitted activities which the Jewish Agency perhaps could not perform. They hoped that the partnership would continue.

The problem of Jewish national representation had become more complicated after the establishment of Israel. There were three central bodies, each of which dealt with the Jewish problem, though in a limited area: (1) the State of Israel and the Israel Government; (2) the World Zionist Movement and the Jewish Agency; and (3) the World Jewish Congress, not to mention the attempt to set up a new organization with a view to uniting elements outside these three bodies.

Such developments contradicted, in a way, our dream of having a monolithic Jewish movement, of a Jewish State and of one Jewish Movement, undivided, not fragmented. The three bodies mentioned did exist, but they were limited in the scope of their

action: Israel by its territorial boundaries; the World Zionist Organization by its exclusively Zionist adherents; the World Jewish Congress by other factors.

It was necessary to harmonise the work lest the activities of the State of Israel, the largest authoritative body, conflicted with the activities of the Zionist movement, and lest the World Jewish Congress conflicted with both.

The Jewish Agency had departments for cultural work and for certain political activities; the Israel Government had cultural attachés everywhere, interested in Jewish education, and the World Jewish Congress had, as its President pointed out last night, wanted to concentrate on the problems of Jewish education and continuity.

Mr. Grossman concluded by saying that harmonization was one of the serious problems which should be solved at this Assembly. This task could be facilitated by Dr. Goldmann's dual presidency of the World Jewish Congress and of the World Zionist Organization.

MR. GUNNAR JOSEFSSON, *President of the Jewish Community of Stockholm, also representing ORT*, extended greetings from the Jewish congregations in Sweden. He said that Swedish Jews lived somewhat on the fringes of the Jewish world but, due to the holding of this Assembly here, in Stockholm, had now been brought closer to it, being stimulated in their Jewish awareness and kinship.

He praised the humanitarian aims of Sweden, thanks to which the Jewish population had doubled in the past 25 years, which had been so fateful for European Jewry.

He stressed the support given by the Swedish state to the fruitful Jewish work of reconstruction represented by ORT, which operated schools and training courses in 19 countries for over 36,000 students, training them for a productive life in the countries where they lived or where they emigrated.

MR. BARNETT JANNER, *President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews*, conveyed the greetings of the Board and said that his presence showed the importance with which British Jews regarded the Assembly. He pointed out that next year the Board would celebrate its bi-centenary. The Jews of Britain had been fortunate to be able at all times during these 200 years, to speak their mind freely. The Board of Deputies, as their representative, had the ear of the Government of whatever party was in power,

and was thus frequently able to help fellow Jews all over the world, directly or through international bodies such as the United Nations. In many respects many items on the World Jewish Congress agenda were of primary importance not only to the Congress, but to Jews everywhere, and in many respects to humanity at large. These items were those which affected the fate of Jews throughout the world, the State of Israel, and those which concerned the UN in questions of human rights.

MR. EUGENE WEILL, of the *Alliance Israélite Universelle* and of the *Conseil Représentatif Juif de France (CRIF)*, greeted the Assembly on behalf of these organizations and of their respective presidents, M. René Cassin and M. Vidal Modiano. CRIF sent its best wishes for the success of this Assembly. The Alliance Israélite Universelle knew that the Assembly would study such problems as defence of human rights, education and culture, as conditions for the fruitful development of the Jewish community. The Alliance, by educating tens of thousands of Moroccan and Iranian children, in the 100 years of its existence, generally, professionally and through the teaching of agriculture, had changed the face of numerous communities in the Mediterranean area.

Today, as yesterday, the Alliance stood for the defence of Judaism and for the full affirmation of the rights of all Jews. Like this Assembly, the goals of the Alliance included facilitating contacts among Jewish communities, including those of Eastern Europe and using every means to strengthen the ties with Israel and among Jews. The Alliance also rejoiced that eminent experts would examine the situation of mankind in the atomic age, for it was well when Jewish voices stated that nothing human was alien to them.

DR. ISAAC MOYAL, *Secretary-General of the World Sephardi Federation*, conveyed the greetings of his organisation and described its aims and objects which were: to strengthen the unity of Jewry and Judaism by the diffusion of Jewish culture among the Sephardim; to fostering religious and cultural activities among Sephardi communities; to contribute to the general well-being of these communities; and to play an active role in the Jewish renaissance and to assist Sephardim wishing to emigrate to Israel.

Many Sephardi communities were threatened with assimilation and extinction for lack of Jewish education and spiritual and lay leadership, and as a result they were losing many of the

younger generation. They aimed at a unified spiritual revival of all groups of Judaism.

Whereas the ingathering of our people in Israel was quantitatively a difficult task, the integration of the various groups was much more difficult; this was a matter of quality and spirit. They should aim at making the period of integration as short as possible. Because it was clear that the majority of the Sephardim had arrived unprepared, intensive and widespread Jewish education was essential.

MR. FRITZ ROTHENBERG, extended greetings from the *Danish Jewish Community*. He recalled the spirit of brotherhood displayed by the Swedish people as a whole, when during the war all 6,000 Danish Jews had found shelter and a second homeland in Sweden. He also praised the Jewish community of Stockholm and its leader, Mr. Gunnar Josefsson, who had untiringly used his skill and the resources of his community to make the Danish Jews feel at home.

Without entering into any discussion why the Copenhagen Jewish Community was not affiliated to the Congress, he stressed its deep interest in its work. A few months ago a Congress group had been formed in Copenhagen, which had announced its desire to work in close contact with the Board of the Community.

THE PRESIDENT stated that he had received a number of messages from well-wishers, among them Mr. Nehru, the Prime Minister of India; Dr. Heuss, President of the Federal Republic of Germany; and Professor La Pira, former mayor of Florence.

2. PROCEDURE AND AGENDA

THE PRESIDENT announced that Dr. Gerhart M. Riegner would act as the Co-ordinator of the Presidium and all delegates should address inquiries to him.

He said that the election of the Presidium would be postponed until the afternoon session, because one or two delegates were not yet ready with nominations. Should they not be ready in the afternoon, seats would be left open for them in the Presidium. He proposed that a Credentials' Committee be elected at once and suggested that one person be assigned to it by each of the following delegations: Australia, Israel, Switzerland, United States and Uruguay. *Proposal adopted.*

Dr. Goldmann said that the Assembly did not previously have Rules of Procedure. They had, therefore, set up some time ago a commission of parliamentarians and jurists to draft such rules.

The Co-ordinating Committee had also dealt with these matters. The draft resolutions had been distributed in English for the time being, and would be distributed in other languages later. He asked the Assembly to accept the recommendations of the Co-ordination Committee and to adopt the Rules of Procedure, with the reservation that the Presidium be permitted to make necessary changes in the course of the debate. (*For Rules of Procedure see Appendix 1*).

Dr. Goldmann continued: We wished, apart from the natural and normal questions—elections, organizational matters, etc.—to place on the agenda four great problems, to be discussed at special sessions or symposia. The first is international co-operation in the era of atomic energy. I am sure many have asked, ‘What is the connection between that problem and the World Jewish Congress?’ Of course, many of us have asked that question. We nevertheless decided to include it because we are not only Jews, but also human beings. The dangers of the cold war and the greater dangers of a real war for our people, dispersed throughout the world, were touched upon last night. We, therefore, felt it would be good to have some leading Jewish scientists, from different parts of the world, to speak from the platform of the World Jewish Congress and to give warning to the world at large that the scientific development which seems to determine the character of this epoch, may turn out for good or bad, and how great the advantages for mankind may be if peoples and governments make up their minds to use atomic energy only for peaceful purposes. For new sources of power and energy could, in years and decades to come, improve the economic situation to an unimaginable extent. However, if this new power is used in the wrong way, for war and destruction, the result may perhaps be nothing less than the destruction of the whole of civilized mankind.

Jews have played a dominant role in the development of atomic science. One of the greatest scientists in the field once told me that they, the scientists, were almost a Jewish club. This has changed. A great number of non-Jewish scientists are very prominent, but in any event, Jews in all parts of the world have made a great contribution. I do not want to boast but I think it is our moral obligation in the name of the Jewish people, to ask some of the great representatives of this branch of science, that they, in their name and with their great authority, should give a warning to the world.

We wished to invite three scientists: one from America, a Nobel prize winner, a great Jew too, a wonderful Jew, Professor

Rabi. We also wanted to invite a great representative of this branch of science in the Soviet Union, Professor Landau of the Academy of Science in Moscow; and an Israeli representative of the same branch of science. Little Israel has already made important contributions in this field. I am saying this not in my own name. I am an inexperienced layman and "Am Haaretz". I say it because I was told so by experts whom we consulted, among them Professor de Shalit of the Weizmann Institute.

However, we were unlucky. There was no reply from the Russian representative. Professor Rabi accepted, which we appreciated, but unfortunately he fell ill. On this occasion, I send him our best wishes for a speedy recovery. In view of this, we felt that the attendance of the representative of Israel alone would not be sufficient. He agreed.

We have, therefore, decided, hesitantly and regrettably, not to hold the Symposium, because it was impossible to get a substitute for Professor Rabi at such short notice. We tried in England, and France, but in vain. The great scholars in this field are not among the unemployed. They are very busy people with many obligations. It was impossible only one week before the Assembly to get an important personality. The Symposium would have had had no international echo, which was its purpose.

We do not need the warning. Our position is very clear. We have, to our regret, decided to drop the Symposium. I say this in order to eliminate any false interpretation that we have suddenly become afraid of speaking about the problem. I am sure that during the debate there may be colleagues who wish to speak, and perhaps there will be resolutions. At the full Executive Meeting in Geneva, we adopted a resolution on atomic disarmament, the whole problem of world peace and the Jewish people's specific interest in peace, co-existence and the avoidance of the dangers of atomic war.

I am convinced that the viewpoint of the Congress today is the same as expressed in last year's resolution in Geneva. Representatives from Eastern Europe and the Americas, were happy to adopt that resolution unanimously. This is a delicate problem, to speak with caution. It is not easy to achieve agreement among various representatives of different areas of the world. We succeeded in Geneva and that standpoint, I am convinced, remains constant. It is to our interest that the great powers of the world should soon find a way to put an end to atomic armament or to introduce some form of armament control; to put an end to tests; and reach the goal that atomic energy should, through international

co-operation and international control, be used exclusively for peaceful purposes.

I now wish to take up the second of the four problems, namely cultural pluralism. I do not have in mind minority rights in the old sense, as the term was formerly used by Jewish delegations between the first and second World Wars. Minority rights for Jews in Poland and in other countries are unfortunately no longer a problem. The point in question is the difficulty which minorities in various parts of the world experience in their attempts to retain their own character, although they are fully integrated.

This is not just a Jewish problem. It would be very bad for us, were the world to believe that it is only a Jewish problem, and that Jews desire a privileged position. Hundreds of millions of people are interested in it: Catholic minorities in one country and Protestant in another, Communist minorities, Socialist minorities, racial minorities, minorities of every kind. It is a world problem and we Jews are interested in it, naturally, due to our peculiar situation.

We considered, therefore, that others besides Jews should be invited to participate in, or read papers to, a Symposium on this question. The chairman will be Jewish, our friend Dr. Israel Goldstein, and we invited another good friend, a great British sociologist, Professor Morris Ginsberg, to be the Jewish spokesman.

In addition, we tried to obtain a representative from Western and another from Eastern Europe. As to the latter we failed. We tried to invite various non-Jewish sociologists. The names of the persons or the countries do not matter; for one reason or another we did not succeed.

We wanted Muslim representatives for the discussion. I stress the fact in order that the world should know it. We invited two great scholars from North African countries—again names do not matter—to represent their civilization. We were hoping they would come, but they did not, whatever the reason may be.

As I now see it, we are going to have, beside our Jewish participant, Father Jean Danielou, a prominent philosopher and professor at the Catholic Institute in Paris, a friend who has a great understanding of, and interest in, specific Jewish problems. There will also be with us M. Pierre Lebar, representative of the Director-General of UNESCO who expressed his interest in the discussion and his desire to participate in it. UNESCO wishes to develop cultural co-operation in all parts of the world and is doing important work, as one of the most active branches of the United

Nations.

We also invited a representative of the Board of Directors of the Society for African Culture of Madagascar. It is possible that there will be another representative from Senegal who will deliver a brief address. It gives me much satisfaction that we may have two representatives from the African continent, which is becoming more and more important. I mentioned this briefly in my opening address last night, and expect that much will be said about it in the political discussion. I believe that one of the resolutions of the Assembly would call on the World Jewish Congress to develop contacts with the large bloc of non-committed countries which do not want to be drawn into the cold war, although there are no great Jewish problems and few Jewish groups in these countries. However, these countries of the "third bloc", if we can call them that, will play an ever increasing role in the world. It is I think of great Jewish political interest, if I may use this term, to have closer contacts with that part of the world, and we have lately started to do just that. We have specific plans which will be reported on in the Political Commission.

We are, therefore, glad to have with us in the Symposium representatives from the African continent, from the new group of peoples who became independent and began developing their own civilisation. This is something new in our consultations, but I think it is a good decision which the Executive Committee has taken.—We also have two specifically Jewish problems—no justification is needed—which today ought to be on the agenda of every organisation and certainly of an organisation like the World Jewish Congress. One problem is the classic one: relations between the State of Israel and the Jewish people. Our friend Mr. Israel Sieff will chair this Symposium and give us his own point of view. There will be two very competent and prominent speakers, Mr. Moshe Sharett, former Prime Minister of Israel, and Professor Salo Baron of Columbia University in New York, one of the most important Jewish historians, to give us the viewpoint of the Diaspora.

Finally, there will be a special Symposium on Jewish Education, presided over by Dr. A. Tartakower. One of the speakers will be Dr. Y. Pilch, Executive Director of the American Association of Jewish Education. Another speaker is to be the Professor of Pedagogy Ernst Simon of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, to my mind, one of the most interesting thinkers in Israel, and the Director of our Cultural Department Dr. A. Steinberg will, of course, participate.

DR. GOLDMANN then pointed out that in the general debate any subject touching on Jewish problems could be taken up and that delegations were entitled to propose a resolution which would be submitted to the political or another commission. The commission would then report to the Plenary Assembly.

He suggested that if there were any other proposals for the agenda, they should not be discussed here first, but handed to the Presidium. The Presidium would be a body of some 30 members, representing all important delegations. It would have consultations and bring its recommendation on each proposal before the Plenary Meeting, which would make a decision. An exception to the above would be a proposal that a Symposium should not be held, or a question as to the acceptability of a speaker.

MR. YITZHAK RAFAEL, M.K. (*Israel*) referring to the Symposium on Cultural Pluralism said that it was laudable that the religious approach to cultural problems would be presented by a Catholic. The World Jewish Congress has failed however, to understand the importance of also having a Jewish religious leader speak. As for the Symposium on Jewish Education, it should be questioned whether the World Jewish Congress should deal with the problem of education at all. If the decision was in the affirmative, there should be an address by a representative of at least 80 per cent. of the entire Jewish educational system, that is, the orthodox educational system. In order to get the religious point of view, he proposed that a prominent representative of religious Jewry, versed in Torah, be invited to speak on cultural pluralism. Likewise the traditionally religious viewpoints of Jewish education should be expounded by a speaker.

MR. BENJAMIN MINTZ, M.K. (*Israel*) largely agreed with Mr. Rafael, but held that a small committee should meet right away in order to change the agenda as suggested by Mr. Rafael.

MR. MOSHE EREM (*Israel*) said that what Mr. Rafael and Mr. Mintz suggested would introduce a "Kulturkampf" in the World Jewish Congress. Another Symposium on secular culture and religious culture was required. The result of the new Symposium suggested by Mr. Rafael and Mr. Mintz might well be a new version of the debate in the Knesset on the question: "Who was a Jew?" There was no room for such questions and debates in the World Jewish Congress because we were all Jews. He opposed the proposals of the two preceding speakers.

MR. YECHIEL LESZCZ (*Uruguay*) held that the Assembly was convened to deal with specific Jewish problems. Since Russian

Jewry was threatened by spiritual liquidation it was necessary to hold a meeting devoted specially to its problems.

DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN, replying to the previous speakers, said: Our friend from Uruguay should have waited to submit his proposal to the Presidium. It is not correct to begin a debate here in the Plenum. Mr. Rafael's and Mr. Mintz's proposals properly belong to this meeting. If a decision is necessary, it must be made right away. I believe, however, that what they said is based on a grave misunderstanding. We have invited a prominent Catholic philosopher, not a politician, because I am convinced he will speak, among other things, on the right of Jewish minorities to develop their religion and culture. It is self-evident that a Jew speaks this way, you do and I do, but the aim of the Symposium is to get non-Jews from various parts of the world to speak out. I wish we could have obtained a prominent Communist who would say this same thing. The goal is political, the speaker's Catholic religious conviction is of no consequence. Are we to be afraid that the speaker will try to convert us to Catholicism?

It was no simple matter to get a prominent Catholic philosopher. Is it necessary to have a rabbi, too, in order that he says the same thing? To demand the inclusion of a Jewish religious speaker, is to misunderstand the whole matter. Our colleague Rafael should understand that the point is to demonstrate before the world at large. What a speaker from Africa says, what a Catholic speaker, with an important name, says, is important. I wish that many other representative non-Jews would say that every man and every group, including Jews, should have the right to develop their own religion and culture. I therefore ask that the proposed changes be rejected.

As to the Symposium on Jewish Education, two of the three speakers are outspokenly religious Jews. Our friend, Dr. Aaron Steinberg, may not be a member of a religious party, but the Shulchan Aruch does not state that being a pious Jew means belonging to a religious party; and Professor Ernst Simon is a very pious Jew, and I am convinced his piety will be evident in his address.

Furthermore, I want to say that the agenda has been known to all members of the Executive Committee for a long time and one cannot come on the last day and demand a change. Rabbi Mintz is a very active member of the Executive Committee in Israel and the members of Mr. Rafael's group on the Executive have been kept well informed. The agenda has to be prepared well in advance and it is impossible to get speakers at the last moment. It

is not realistic to make proposals now and therefore I ask the delegates to confirm the agenda proposed.

MR. HARRY GOLDSTEIN (*United States*) moved to proceed with the prepared agenda.

There being no objection, Dr. Goldmann announced that the debate on procedure and agenda having been concluded, they would proceed with the prepared agenda. He further announced that the General (or Political) Debate would begin, to be introduced by Dr. M. L. Perlzweig.

3. GENERAL DEBATE

DR. M. L. PERLZWEIG (*Director of the Political Department, New York*) referred to the Report of the Political and International Affairs Departments for the period 1953-59 submitted by Mr. A. L. Easterman and himself. He then drew attention to the report on the Institute of Jewish Affairs and paid high praise to Dr. Nehemiah Robinson (who was absent because of illness), referring to his ability and his contributions in the field of reparations and certain aspects of international legislation. Dr. Perlzweig described Dr. Robinson as a great authority and stressed that he was highly regarded by the experts in the United Nations, in the State Department of the United States and in other countries. His commentary on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was the only commentary in existence and was consulted by all governments of the world and by international institutions.

Dr. Perlzweig continued: the Jewish people is concerned with its survival, but if it is concerned only with its survival, it would not survive. It survives because of its faith and sense of historic destiny. We have inherited a great body of doctrine and this historic deposit of our thinking contains certain elements which unite us all; it contains the belief in justice and the recognition of the obligation to strive for peace in the world. It does not matter whether you are a liberal democrat, communist, orthodox or non-Zionist, this body doctrine, which is Jewish doctrine, is common to us all. I make this point because it is the basis on which the World Jewish Congress has proceeded in its political work and also the United Nations. The survival of the Jewish people can only be part of the survival of the human race.

Certain important Jewish sources have formulated an attitude on the uses of atomic energy, based on error. We are told that we may embarrass our fellow delegates from the United States if we deal with the problem of atomic energy. The American Jewish

Congress adopted a resolution on atomic energy at its last convention in Miami. Our American delegates are as deeply committed to this policy as we are and we cause them no embarrassment. The resolution adopted at our Executive Meeting in Geneva was based on a Jewish conception of international life. The Jewish people is emancipated enough and mature enough to make its Jewish contribution to the solution of international problems, and not permit itself to be accused of spiritual isolationism.

I need say very little about our activity in the United Nations because a member of the international civil service of the highest rank, Mr. Philippe de Seynes, among the observations he made about our work at the UN, said that we had made a big contribution within the spirit of the Charter and that we had given an example of the application of the doctrine of universality. Our policy, which is based on the organised unity of all Jewish communities, irrespective of the regimes under which they live, is an application of the doctrine of universality to the Jewish scene and the World Jewish Congress is an attempt to create a Jewish parallel to the United Nations. Our work deals with day-to-day questions of immediate interest to large numbers of persons in their daily lives. The doctrine which is embodied in the Charter of the United Nations, its principles and purposes, can be traced back to ancient Hebrew roots, but it is also presently important politically. If we are able to secure a response to the approach that we make to Afro-Asian countries, it is due in considerable measure to the work we have done for human rights in the United Nations. In 1947 I was sent by our President to a Negro republic, a few months ahead of the debate in the United Nations on the partition of Palestine. I was received in a friendly manner because I was recognized by the President of that State as a man who, he said, had fought for the rights of Negroes in the United Nations. A great many people said that I had fought for the rights of Jews; they were both right, I fought for human rights and because the World Jewish Congress has that reputation, we will find when we begin establishing closer relationships with the Asian and African nations, that our United Nations' work has more than one justification.

I would now like to say a few words on the principle of universality in its Jewish aspects. We would like to see Soviet Jewry represented here. We have done everything we can to secure it and we shall continue, unless this Assembly decides otherwise, to make every effort along those lines. Under the leadership of Dr. Goldmann we have, for many months, been in consultation with leaders and diplomatic representatives of the Soviet Union at the

United Nations, in Washington, in London, in Paris, in Tel-Aviv and in other places. I am confident that Dr. Goldmann and Mr. Easterman will agree when I say that the results of those consultations are not to be considered as negative. They were long, exhaustive, cordial, there was a sincere attempt to secure a meeting of minds; I learned a great deal and the Soviet representatives understood more clearly our anxieties and hopes. We were told in these discussions that whether the Jews of the Soviet Union accepted our invitation, in whatever form it might be, depended entirely on them. We were not satisfied with that and we asked the Soviet Government to make known to us its views on the whole subject, which, in a formal manner, it has not yet done. The answer of the Jewish religious communities has already been announced to you. I want to make it clear that the invitation was addressed by Dr. Goldmann to the Jewish religious communities, not to individuals. Their answer was that they were religious bodies and it was therefore not appropriate for them to attend a meeting like this, which deals also with political problems. We do not find this a plausible answer, if this is the true answer. How is it that these religious communities and their rabbis have never accepted an invitation to purely religious meetings, when they have been held on an international scale? There are represented in this room great religious organizations, congregations from Italy, Switzerland, Tunisia, congregations organized under the statute law of their countries.

I cannot avoid saying that Jewish religious life in the Soviet Union is beginning to experience difficulties and is under pressure which has evoked from us the deepest concern. The Jewish experience is one of discrimination. We have heard that synagogues have been closed. There is no doubt that the great synagogue in Czernowitz has been closed. I point to what may or may not be a coincidence. While Jewish tourists are welcomed to the Soviet Union, many men who wanted to go on such tours were refused visas; they all happen to be rabbis. I think this is relevant to the answer which was received from the Jewish religious communities of the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, Congress should go on, should not accept defeat. History is dynamic, there is movement of ideas. We must continue because we believe that diplomacy is the alternative to war and we desire not war, but diplomacy. I wish to define our objective as we have defined it in our conversations with the Soviet representatives: we ask for the Jews of the Soviet Union no more than is given to others but we do ask for what others receive: the Jews of the Soviet Union should have restored

to them the facilities for the development of their own Jewish culture, on the same basis as other nationalities; Jewish religious life should be afforded the same facilities as other churches; a national organization, the possibility of publications, the training of the clergy and so forth. The Jewish existence in the Soviet Union consists of isolated synagogues. Lastly, the right to participate in the international life of the Jewish people—not only membership in international organizations—but for those who desire to do so, to participate in the building up of the Jewish State, by emigration or otherwise.

I wish to refer to another kind of relationship—the Arab boycott. The foremost Arab boycotter, the State of Saudi Arabia, through its oil connections, succeeded in exporting its prejudice to other countries, including the United States and principally the State and City of New York. If the rulers of this medieval polity which practises slavery and has a primitive system of jurisprudence, are anti-Jewish, then the rights of the Jews in one of the most progressive cities of the world are in jeopardy. I am glad to say that the American Jewish Congress secured from the highest court of New York State a judgment condemning certain authorities who tolerated the practice of discrimination at the behest of Saudi Arabia.

I would like to say that we have not been quarrelling with all the governments with whom we have contact. We have had very friendly relations with governments of the most diverse character. Because our Polish friends are here, I would like to say that our relations with the Polish Government have been of a friendly co-operative character, which has had practical results. The Polish Government fights anti-Semitism relentlessly whenever it encounters it. The Polish Government recognizes the right of Jews to emigrate to Israel if they desire to do so and gives material aid to the organs of Jewish life working for Jewish culture. One thing we ask from every government, irrespective of its policy, its structure or of its economic theory: wherever there is a Jewish community, it has the inalienable right to create the institutions for the preservation and development of its cultural and religious values. We say that unless the Jew has that right, then he is not free and then that country does not recognize the doctrine which is embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. A man who is not free to be a Jew is not free at all.

We in the International Affairs and Political Department appreciate the help of many of our friends in many parts of the world and I hope we shall expand this co-operation particularly

among our Latin American friends, because if we mobilize the forces which are at our disposal, this organization has influence, this organization has power. Let us mobilize that power, not for Jewish advantage, but for the advancement of humanity and with it the advancement and safeguarding of the Jewish people and Jewish values.

DR. S. LEVENBERG (*Great Britain*): I bring the cordial greetings of the many friends in Great Britain associated with the work of the British Section of the World Jewish Congress, which has made tremendous progress since the Geneva Assembly in 1953. We are met here 20 years after the outbreak of World War II and we must make an evaluation of the present position of Jewish life. Three fundamental facts must be remembered: (1) the tragedy of European Jewry; (2) that the State of Israel is not yet secure and that the Jewish people everywhere will stand by the State of Israel, resisting any attack upon Israel; (3) that there are dangers threatening the Jewish people in the Diaspora.

Dr. Goldmann said that anti-Semitism is a minor problem. Of course there is no anti-Semitism as it existed at the time of Hitler. But the question is, what is anti-Semitism? Dr. Goldmann spoke mainly about the cultural aspects of the Jewish problem. I wish to draw attention to the social-economic aspect of the Jewish problem, as Jewish prosperity in the West today is based on the general prosperity. The social-economic structure of the Jews in both East and West is unhealthy, as very few are working in agriculture or in heavy industry, but they concentrate in main urban centres, in a limited number of occupations.

There is a serious Jewish migration problem. During 1957 alone about 100,000 Jews left their former countries and went to new countries. There are two major tasks before the World Jewish Congress: to achieve normalization of Jewish life in respect of those aspects already referred to, apart from the political and cultural aspects, and to pay great attention to the problems of the small Jewish communities. Of 27 countries on the American continents, 20 Jewish communities have a Jewish population of less than 10,000; of 20 Jewish communities in Europe, 18 have a Jewish population of less than 50,000; of 18 Jewish communities in Asia, there are 15 with a Jewish population of less than 3,000. In other words, there are in the world today really only nine large Jewish communities; the other Jewish communities are very small. The World Jewish Congress can influence large Jewish communities, but its task lies in helping to keep up Jewish life in the small communities.

My contribution to this debate is that we should have ten commandments, five general principles and five Jewish principles which should guide the daily work of the Congress. Whoever strives for peace, coexistence and international understanding; whoever supports the principles of the United Nations and international law; whoever supports free democratic regimes, must have our support. We cannot be neutral when we speak about democracy. We are anti-fascist and whoever supports democracy, freedom of worship and freedom of speech and conscience, we are his friend. Whoever fights racial hatred, the colour bar and anti-Semitism, he is our friend. Whoever champions the right of small nations to exist in freedom and to lead their own way of life, we support him.

These are the five Jewish principles: Whoever supports Israel politically, morally or economically; whoever stands for free emigration (Jews and non-Jews); whoever is for immigration, whether of refugees or other wanderers, we support him. Whoever is for religious and cultural self-expression of individuals or groups, Jews or non-Jews, we support him. Lastly, whoever helps to keep up Jewish continuity, whoever helps to continue the "Goldene Keit" (golden chain) of Jewish history and whoever stands for Jewish "Hemshech", he is our friend and we support him. This is what must guide the work of this Assembly and of the World Jewish Congress.

THIRD SESSION

August 3, 1959 (Afternoon)

In the Chair: DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN;
later DR. J. PRINZ (*United States*)

1. COMPOSITION OF PRESIDIUM

DR. GOLDMANN explained the composition of the Presidium by saying that all the larger and some smaller communities were represented. On the list also appeared the chairmen of the commissions, and five officers of the World Jewish Congress: the President, the Chairmen of the three divisions of the Executive Committee, and the Treasurer.

DR. RIEGNER read out the list of those proposed as members of the Presidium:

Mr. Monroe Abbey (Canada)	Dr. Abraham Mibashan
Mr. Marc Anisfeld (Belgium)	(Argentina)
Mr. Samuel Bronfman (Canada)	Dr. M. Nurock (Israel)
Dr. I. Dasberg (Holland)	Dr. Sergio Piperno (Italy)
Me. Pierre Dreyfus-Schmidt	Dr. Joachim Prinz (U.S.A.)
(France)	Mr. Israel Pollak (Chile)
Mr. Leo Fink (Australia)	Judge Justine Polier (U.S.A.)
Mr. Gregorio Fainguersch	Mr. Samuel Rabinowitz
(Argentina)	(Rhodesia)
Mr. Jacobo Frumin (Mexico)	Marchioness of Reading (G.B.)
Dr. Georg Guggenheim	Mrs. Thelma Richman (U.S.A.)
(Switzerland)	Mr. Abram Schwarz (Uruguay)
Mr. Ira Guilden (U.S.A.)	Prof. Yitzhak Sciaky (Israel)
Mr. Jacob Halevy (G.B.)	Mrs. Chaja Slutzky (Israel)
M. Benjamin Heler (Algeria)	Dr. A. Steinbruch (Brazil)
Mr. E. E. Jhirad (India)	Mr. Hillel Storch (Sweden)
Dr. Moyzes Kauffmann (Brazil)	Dr. Albert Vajs (Yugoslavia)
Dr. S. Levenberg (Great Britain)	Prof. Robert Weill (France)
Dr. Emil Maurer (Austria)	Mr. Israel Yeshayahu (Israel)
MR. IDY BORNSTEIN (<i>Scandinavian Jewish Youth Union</i>):	

I do not understand the manner in which this Presidium is elected. Why is there a difference made between the larger

and smaller communities? There is Norway, there is Finland, also Sweden and Denmark. I reserve my right to voice my opinion in the name of the Scandinavian Jewish Youth Union.

DR. GOLDMANN declared the Presidium elected, as there was no opposition. He asked Dr. Prinz, as chairman of the largest delegation, to chair the meeting, and requested that speakers limit themselves to 15 minutes, until the matter of allocation of time was decided.

2. GENERAL DEBATE

MR. HERSH SMOLIAR (*Observer, representing the Social and Cultural Association of Jews in Poland*):

Just a month from now, it will be 20 years since the German armies of destruction swooped down on our cities and towns in Poland and started World War II, with its terrible results for the Jews in Poland, for the Jews everywhere, for all the peoples in Europe. In the past 20 years the wounds have not healed nor has the world calmed down.

As there is socialism in our part of the continent, there can be no more wars between neighbouring countries. A third of the globe strives for peaceful relations and as this is not universal, there is a cold war, which is particularly harmful for the Jewish people.

It is the task of this Assembly to evaluate what the World Jewish Congress has, in the six years after its Third Assembly, done to fight the cold war. In 1955, the Conference of the Four Great Powers took place in Geneva and millions of men of all peoples and races expressed their desire for ending the cold war. Why was the voice of the World Jewish Congress not heard? True, Dr. Goldmann stated the cold war was especially dangerous for the Jews, but a statement calls for action. An attitude expressed in words seems to be one thing for the World Jewish Congress, and acting politically another thing.

In the Jewish communities of the West, and especially where McCarthy's followers are active, there are zealous champions of the cold war. They have set in motion a process of harassing and persecuting Jewish organisations in order to destroy everything in Jewish life that is progressive and orientated toward socialism.

The atmosphere of the cold war in Jewish life has weakened the culturally creative forces and strengthened the reactionary factors. Everything that has outlived its usefulness has become

the mark of Jewishness in the Western countries. This reactionary trend in the Jewish communities in the West creates the danger of cultural impotence or barbarism. The cold war atmosphere has also led to a policy of repressing all information about what has been created with toil and self-sacrifice in the Jewish social and cultural life of Poland. The World Jewish Congress reports, covering events in Jewish life everywhere, can hardly name many Yishuvim like the small one in Poland where during the past 15 years the Jewish population has become economically healthy and creative. Just in Poland, the classic example of Jewish misery and distress with no prospect of amelioration, there no longer exists the problem of unemployment. The healthy social structure of the Jewish population, as the result of the planned policy of the Polish State, certainly deserves to be studied and recorded.

Certain World Jewish Congress offices busy themselves counting the number of Jews who have remained in Poland. The men in those offices, secretly and openly, desire that we disappear from amongst the Jewish communities. These men do not care whether the many thousands of Jews who left Poland are happy or curse the hour when they listened to the false promises of the "Zioniks". Every day thousands of those who left Poland call on us to help them return. This painful fact is hushed up because it does not accord with cold war plans.

The leaders of the World Jewish Congress Cultural Department ignore the Polish Yishuv's cultural activities and achievements, namely: the Jewish elementary and secondary state schools, the Jewish Historical Institute, the popular Jewish art groups, the Yiddish Theatre, maintained by the State, which proudly carries the name of Esther Rachel Kaminska, the popular clubs and libraries, the Yiddish press and literary journals, the 1,300,000 copies of the 277 Yiddish works of our classical and modern writers which were published and circulated by us.

The World Jewish Congress Organisation Department, reporting on the 15th Warsaw Ghetto Memorial rallies, while mentioning meetings which were attended by only a few Minyanin in other countries, ignored Poland, where the anniversary of the Ghetto Uprising, the 19th of April, has become a day of remembrance for all Jews in this country—the country where the largest rallies were held and in which the Polish Army participated.

The same negative attitude of the World Jewish Congress is carried over to the IKUF (Yiddish Kultur Farband) in the U.S., in Argentina and in all South America, to the Jewish Peoples' Order

in Canada, and particularly to the largest Jewish organization in France—the Union—which is politically active today and which has a glorious tradition of Jewish resistance against Hitlerite racists. The World Jewish Congress affiliates in Argentina did not even protest against the Government's dire measures against IKUF and certain Jewish papers. In Israel, World Jewish Congress leaders have set in motion a political action against the Polish People's Republic and the Yishuv in Poland. They want to call a world congress of Polish Jews in order to make material claims against the Polish People's Government, although they know that during the ten years after the war property not taken over by the Government could be claimed in the courts by an heir. All factories have been taken over as State property and surely former Jewish factory owners cannot get better treatment than the Polish. As to property owned by Jewish social and communal organizations before the war, we declare that Jewish social organizations exist in Poland and will not now cede any of their property to others. One must therefore conclude that the men who initiated the Congress of Polish Jews do not hope for material gain, they rather want to maintain the cold war spirit. They want to agitate against the new Poland and to create a negative attitude towards the Jewish social organizations of Poland.

The World Jewish Congress, or maybe it was the American Jewish Congress, intervened with the Department of State asking it to exert pressure on Poland on behalf of the claims just described. Some World Jewish Congress people even attempt theoretically to create a foundation for the cold war between Jews because they maintain the impossibility of any cooperation between the Yishuvim in the West and those in the East.

While this Assembly condemns the cold war policy of those agitating for war, it must also speak up against the protagonists of the cold war within Jewry. Why has nothing been done so far? Is it not because the World Jewish Congress has been silent on the German problem? Everybody knows that the cold war policy is being most vigorously propagated by the Bonn Government, the Hitler generals and the SS murderers of Jews. German militarism is a growing danger for peace in the world and for the safety of the Jewish people. German militarism plans for the 'Drang nach Osten' and for an attack on our Oder-Neisse borders, where thousands of Jews have settled.

Adenauer's War Minister, Franz Josef Strauss, clearly stated that the Wehrmacht is ready to wage atomic war. Alarmed

by this, intellectuals everywhere are thinking how to counteract such a dangerous situation. The Polish People's Republic has come forward with the well-known Rapacki Plan.

While we appreciate that last year the World Jewish Congress Executive made its appeal for peace, we ask why the Congress is silent at the growth of neo-Nazism and the equipping of the German Army with atomic arms. Why did the World Jewish Congress not protest against the arms deal between Israel and the neo-Nazi Wehrmacht? The Hitlerites have always used their arms against us, against Poland and against the Jews in Poland. This Assembly must speak out and warn against German militarists and apostles of revenge. The Assembly must also demand a new meeting of the leaders of the Great Powers. Such demands will contribute to relieving the tension in the world and the tension on the borders of Israel. Only the neutrality of Israel will make possible the peaceful development of the country. That point of view must be expressed by the Assembly.

There is a tendency in the World Jewish Congress not to take seriously the problem of the fight against anti-Semitism. Reaction goes hand in hand with national discrimination and anti-Semitism. Why has the World Jewish Congress never protested against the Bonn Government's tolerance of hooligan anti-Semitism? Why did the Congress not protest against the discrimination meted out to the Austrian Jews? The Congress must undertake effective action against racism and anti-Semitism. Such an undertaking calls first of all for a clearly defined programme to fight for peace, against atomic war and against racism.

DR. MOISES GOLDMAN (*Argentina*): I have the honour to speak to this Assembly in the name of the Argentine Delegation, representing the 450,000 Jews of Argentina. It is 70 years since the first Jewish colonists arrived who laid the foundation for the glorious era of colonization later sponsored by Baron Maurice de Hirsch. Next year (1960), when the Argentine people will celebrate the 150th anniversary of its revolution of liberation, the Jewish population will celebrate the 100th year of the beginning of organised community life. There is a clear connection between these two anniversaries.

All of you who are familiar with the history of the World Jewish Congress know that Argentine Jewry was among the originators of the Congress idea and always participated in its struggles and achievements. I must mention the name of Dr. Jacob Hellman who did so much to strengthen the idea of

Congress in our countries. Our Yishuv was born as the result of solidarity with the persecuted, which motivated Baron Hirsch to help transplant into South America large numbers of Jews from Eastern Europe, and the first Jewish colony bears the name of Moshe Rabenu (Moses our Teacher)—Moisesville.

When urban immigration followed, Argentine developed a colourful Jewish life and it is proud that proportionately it provides the greatest number of Halutzim in Israel. The kibbutz Mefalsim is now celebrating its tenth anniversary. Our democratically organized Kehilla life; our representative body, DAIA, our schools, Jewish banks, economic institutions, our important Yiddish press and publishing houses have all become a byword for Jews everywhere.

Our countries have enjoyed only 150 years of an independent, politically free life and the strong colonial influence of the Church with its missionary tendency is still felt. The Argentine population of 20 million is composed largely of immigrants and sons of immigrants, and in its midst live the Jews whose third and even fourth generation were born in the country. The Jews are fully integrated into the national life of Argentina and take an active part in the cultural, political and economic spheres as they are citizens enjoying full and equal rights.

While we do not intend to deny the existence of certain sporadic anti-Semitic outbreaks, generally condemned by the majority of Argentinians as something imported from abroad, it is up to us to fight the various incidents of discrimination which occur from time to time, because of individual bureaucrats, for example, in the matter of Jewish emigration.

I do not intend to go into the details of all the problems which touch on the dynamic Jewish life in Argentina. This can be done as we deal with the various items on the agenda. I just wanted to bring our Yishuv's greetings to this Assembly and to express the wish that this body may achieve at least a partial solution of our many national Jewish problems.

ING. ANSELM REISS (*Israel*): I had intended to make some remarks on some World Jewish Congress policies; however, I am now prompted to speak on what we have heard from the representative of the Jewish Cultural Association in Poland. As to Congress policy, not always could we agree with the World Jewish Congress attitude towards the North African countries in connection with Aliyah. Nor could we share the illusions of certain Congress people in regard to what the relationship between the Soviet Russia and the World Jewish Congress is likely to

be. The same holds good as to the situation of the Jews in Soviet Russia. It gives us some satisfaction to have heard from the platform that we are not content with the situation.

We are far from wishing to engage in a dispute with the Government of Soviet Russia. Our task is to deal with the question: how do Jews live in Russia. Our President and the heads of the Political Department emphasized that we consider the cold war as a danger not only for Jews but for the whole world. It is necessary to define what this term "cold war" covers. If this is done, it will be clear whether or not we agree with the Polish Delegation. It will become clear to the Jewish and to the general public that we are dealing with a policy which emanates from a certain central point, and words are used which lack meaning. What does it mean, to be against the cold war and arm Arab countries? We hear daily that these countries want to annihilate two million Jews. They say they will annihilate hundreds of thousands of workers who live by their toil and sweat; masses have been killed by arms that came from Soviet Russia. I say to my friend Smoliar, it was unnecessary to speak to us about the good relations between the Polish Government and the Jews in Poland and in the world. I wish the Cultural Association would have learned from the Polish Government what attitude to take regarding the political aspirations of the Jewish people.

Speaking purely in political terms, from a political platform, I wish to remind the esteemed delegation that in the days when they waged a struggle against Israel, the Polish Government supported Israel politically and fought for her in the United Nations in support of our point of view.

I do not know whether my friend Smoliar learned from Izvestia, through the letters which they publish, that the Jews in Israel wish to return. I know of such letters from rich America, from Jews who plead to be taken to another country. Let the facts speak: in 1945, 1946 and 1947 there were about 200,000 Jews in Poland. Eighty to ninety per cent of them went to Israel, and this Aliyah built Beersheba, Hadar Yosef and many rural settlements. Maybe 200 or 300, perhaps 1,000 returned.

My friend Smoliar made an awful accusation here: that offices have been opened in Israel, information recorded, money was paid and people asked for I do not know what—factories. If a man speaks from a platform, he should know the truth of the matter in question, which is: Jews owned property in Poland, but not big factories, only what the Polish Government recognized

as belonging to me or to X. We must approach the Polish Government, which will show more understanding than my friend Smoliar.

The World Jewish Congress has taken great pains to get the Polish Delegation here, which is being given privileges beyond other delegations; you were allowed to talk as long as you liked; for years we negotiated with you to join, but you do not budge from the status of "observer", a very convenient position. I should like to be an "observer" in many organizations, say what I like but take no responsibility.

In spite of all this, you say that we do not understand the cold war well enough, that we have not done enough for peace. I want to clear up the matters in question without indulging in polemics: we in Israel have contributed not a little that delegations from Eastern Europe should join us, there is nothing to keep us from being an organization where we can find a way to communicate and cooperate with one another, if it is a question of working for coexistence and peace against the cold war.

MR. ISAAC NATHANI (*Great Britain*): The Fourth Assembly is proof that we have the right to get enthusiastic over our achievements, proof that since Montreux, the World Jewish Congress walked the path that led to its becoming the best and strongest instrument the Jewish people possesses today in its struggle for its rights. It is important that we should make clear, which are the decisive tasks now facing the World Jewish Congress. It has been said that anti-Semitism is not our greatest danger; but there are still dangers in this area. There are often outbreaks of anti-Semitism based on ideology. In recent years there were incidents of a racial struggle among coloured people, both in America and England. It is the task of the World Jewish Congress to take a position on these incidents of racial struggle which sooner or later will have an influence on the Jews.

The task of fighting assimilation means strengthening our cultural position in various countries. It is a question of better communication and clearer understanding with countries not sufficiently represented in our ranks. It is painful to listen to some of the enunciations made by our friend Smoliar, who comes here with good intentions to help us understand what they do. This being so, it is not right that he comes here as an "observer", to emphasize such matters as the returnees from Israel. If we want to re-create the former understanding between us and if we want the World Jewish Congress to include in its ranks all parts of the Jewish people, we have to be objective in our

evaluations. One cannot come here and belittle the very central current in Jewish life, a process which has been in operation since Montreux, where my friend Smoliar participated as part of a delegation, not as an observer, but as a delegate of Polish Jewry—one cannot ignore the development of Israel during the last eleven years.

It has already been said that hundreds of thousands of Polish Jews have gone to Israel. Another fact is that positions have been created as part of the economy for them there and not for the sake of propagandising their inability to settle in Poland. You cannot bring forward here obsolete theories. Availing ourselves of the presence of our friends from the East, the Congress should try to create a framework for practical cooperation to find a common language, a common approach to the important question in Jewish life which must be solved. The question of peace is very important to us, the Jews in the West and East alike. The World Jewish Congress could do more in this respect than it has done. A call could go out to the Jewish Youth, which could participate to a greater degree in our day-to-day work.

If we wish to expand the World Jewish Congress, our activity should not be limited to theoretical reasoning and analyses. We have not provided the possibility for Jewish youth to participate in our day by day tasks. How is it possible to strengthen the cultural and educational work of the World Jewish Congress? A delegate from Israel has said here that he is not altogether of the opinion that the World Jewish Congress should engage in educational work. This is a question that deals with the very existence of entire Jewish communities, particularly in the small countries. There are isolated communities who do not have spiritual leaders, who lack the facilities for establishing elementary and secondary schools. We must, therefore, ask how can the World Jewish Congress meet the great danger of assimilation and how can we contribute to the daily work of Jewish education? Certain Jewish organisations will be in opposition. Will it be possible for the World Jewish Congress to mobilize resources and have enough faith in its main task, to organise educational and cultural work in the various parts of the Diaspora?

This Assembly must strengthen World Jewish Congress activities in these main areas: the fight against assimilation—fight in a practical way to lessen the dangers of assimilation—the fight for peace, the fight against the arming of Germany, and

the principal task of expanding the framework of the World Jewish Congress so that in the course of time it will be able to include all parts of the Jewish people. Thus, the main thesis, the 'Ani Maamin', the credo of the World Jewish Congress—the unity of the Jewish people—will be established.

MR. SHAD POLIER (*United States*): I felt a great sense of sadness as I listened to comrade Smoliar, my fellow Jew from Poland. My heart became heavy, for as he looked out upon all the lands in which we Jews are scattered, as he assessed our problems, his eyes seemed to look only to the West. I began to feel very unhappy, because I hoped that comrade Smoliar had not turned his back upon the two and a half million Jews who live in the East. I know that brother Smoliar realises that there is one Jewish people, every Jew is the concern of every other Jew, whether he lives in the East or in the West. Perhaps he did not turn his eyes upon the plight of our fellow Jews in the Soviet Union because the sight was too disturbing, too frightening.

I do not utter these words as an American, but as a Jew. There is no American Jew, no Polish Jew, we are all Jews, including our brethren who live in the Soviet Union. I hope, too, that we will turn our eyes upon this phenomenon in Jewish history which is occurring in the Soviet Union. I venture to say that none of us has as yet had the heart to look upon it and to appraise it for what it is; to my way of thinking, there is no parallel to it in Jewish history. What is happening in the Soviet Union is not anti-Semitism; it may indeed be far more dangerous and destructive. So new is what is occurring in the Soviet Union that we have not yet achieved a vocabulary with which to speak of it, to try to find a solution for it. What is occurring in the Soviet Union, and the phrase is utterly inadequate, is anti-Jewishness as distinguished from anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitism is against the Jew, whether in the form of a pogrom or discrimination and there is increasing discrimination, but I pass over it as of less importance. What is happening is a campaign to carve out a part of the Jewish people, as a surgeon carves out a part of the body. That is the significance of the denial of Jewish cultural institutions. We know that in the last few months there has been a campaign increasingly to extirpate Jewish religious life, not only by the closing of synagogues but by the banning even of Minyanim.

What is involved here is to de-Judaize the Jews, it is more than the scientific campaign against Russian Orthodoxy, Protestantism and Mohammedanism. This is not an attempt to convert

the Jews to atheism, but to destroy their bonds with other Jews; but you cannot cut off Russian Jews from the rest of Jewry as long as there is a Torah. What is the significance of the banning of the baking of Matzos? Because it is a symbolical, deeply meaningful expression of the oneness of the Jewish people. The sooner we realise the nature of what is happening to the Jews in the Soviet Union, the sooner we shall be prepared more hopefully and successfully to mobilise the forces that believe in freedom, in human dignity and equality, without whose aid we shall not survive.

Until now, it seems to me, we have been too bemused with phrases, we have been too bemused in thinking that what is happening in the Soviet Union is a by-product of the cold war and as soon as normal human relations are restored, this threat to Jewish survival will be ended. It shows very little knowledge of Russian history, which goes back many centuries, little appreciation of the tremendous revolution in its economic and social forms. What we see here is Russian policy; it has nothing to do with Socialist policy, as is proved by what is happening in other countries in Eastern Europe. They will Russify the Jew, even if they have to remove his Jewishness. If they can create a Jewish sect, God forbid, which would be satisfied to be some phenomenon within Russia itself, with no relationship to its brothers elsewhere, they would give you your Yiddish, your theatre, that kind of Jewish culture. What they want to do is to sever from the body of Jewry two-and-a-half million of our brethren, and we cannot any more stand silently aside than we could when Hitler threatened the Jews with physical destruction. There is a great need today to utter a warning of the first class as to this menace. We shall have an extremely difficult task to enlist the support of mankind on our behalf. And this has nothing to do with the Russians, the Americans or the cold war. We live in a world preoccupied with many problems even beyond the problems of war. Men and women of good will and idealism are preoccupied with problems other than the plight of the Jew. We Jews are a very small part of the world, we have become smaller, not only because Hitler destroyed six millions of us, but because other peoples have emerged into the consciousness of the world. We are a smaller people because the world in which we live for the most part, was a world that was Jewish or Christian or Mohammedan. We now live in a world in which there are hundreds of millions of people who know nothing of any of these religions and of those that do know of them, very

few even know what Judaism is. Incidentally, may I say that in Russia they are writing a history of Christianity, which begins without any Jewish pre-history. It is this world, my friends, which we see in political terms, in an Assembly of the United Nations, completely changed in character in less than ten years. It is in this world that we must plead our cause, that we must make our friends and in which we must find our future and political significance. May I suggest to you that the great work the World Jewish Congress has done for 15 years in seeking to secure a Universal Declaration of Human Rights and a Covenant of Human Rights was one of the most foreseeing moves that any organisation has ever taken, for it is becoming a truism in world affairs, as it has already been recognised in some countries, that freedom, equality and justice are indivisible. These are enjoyed by all people regardless of their race, colour or national origin, or they are enjoyed and possessed by no one. We are growing up to this realisation very rapidly. It is crucially important to the future of the Jewish people that those countries just emerging into their new freedom, into their place in the sun, shall realise the dedication and devotion of the Jewish people to the securing of their rights as well as their own rights. Indeed, if we do not convey that to these nations, why should these persons be concerned about us? They have none of our Western tradition, they have none of our religious heritage. We must find a common basis upon which to achieve freedom for all of us.

And now, speaking of Americans, I give you the life of one man of whom you know a little, to illustrate my point. It is no accident that in 1897 Stephen Wise became the leader of Zionism in America, that he brought into being the American Jewish Congress and that this same great spirit some thirteen years later participated in the founding of the World Jewish Congress. I cite to you this example of that rare person, rare even in America, who realised the oneness not only of the Jewish people, but of mankind. In America it is the American Jewish Congress that has taken the leadership among all Jewish organisations in the fight not merely against anti-Semitism—never in the history of the last one hundred years of the United States, has anti-Semitism had as little meaning, although it is not entirely abolished—but Jews are more concerned with equality for Jewries other than where they themselves live. It is not a problem of anti-Semitism. I cannot sleep well even if I have a good roof over my head and someone else, because of his colour, must sleep in a slum or a ghetto; we have moved beyond that

stage in America.

Some persons have said that the American Jewish Congress has lost in influence and prestige because it has spent so much of its energy on civil rights; nothing could be further from the fact. A leading Jewish paper in America commented that those who said this had no understanding whatsoever of the American scene. Our prestige in the Jewish community has never been higher. But more important than what we have achieved in the way of civil rights for Jews and others in America, the friends and allies we have won in labour and all progressive movements, is that the Jew has grown in his own self-esteem. We in the American Jewish Congress place a high value upon Jewish culture, but we do not regard it as enough that we encourage our fellow Jews to develop and maintain institutions of cultural value. We believe that the Jew, as a whole man, has as part of his culture, the right to stand and to walk with head unbowed, free, equal with all men and concerned with all men in their destiny in this world.

THE CHAIRMAN urged speakers not to exceed the limit of 15 minutes.

MR. JACOB HALEVY (*Great Britain*): It is necessary that we turn again to Haver Smoliar, because his speech will be publicised in Warsaw and we are very much interested that the Jews and non-Jews behind the Iron Curtain should know our point of view. We have no hand in the cold war, in either type of war; that is a fundamental principle of the World Jewish Congress. Any war is catastrophic for the world, but more so to us. We in the West attack Fascism and injustices in our countries; do you do so in Poland? I, like Smoliar, read *Izvestia* and *Pravda* which are shocking in their untrue attacks upon Israel as being undemocratic, and yet extend the hand of friendship to Saudi Arabia. Do you recognise this as the truth? You do not attack it. There is no freedom in Russia for a Jew to live his life quietly as a Jew—you know of the assassination of Jewish writers. We appealed to the Jewish communities in Russia to come to this Assembly, but we had no reply, and you know the reason. Why would you not protest against this? We shall give full publicity to your opinions in the Jewish press in the west, it is for you to give publicity to our opinions behind the Iron Curtain.

Wonderful things have been done by Soviet Russia which have raised the standard of living of its people, but we condemn wrongs. Stalin wrote a booklet stating that there is no such

thing as the Jewish people, there is no Jewish consciousness, and Israel is no proof of the existence of the Jewish nation. You, Smoliar, know of the existence of the Jewish people as a people, you study its culture, you read its literature, Mendele Mocher Seforim, Sholem Aleichem and the rest. How can you deny that the function of the World Jewish Congress is to preserve the Jews as Jews with their tradition of the past and their hope for the future? Since you came, you associate yourself with our aspirations; do not deny what we have in common because certain of your views have no connection with your ideology. You may, to some extent, have to use the language you do, but please understand us, come to us, we want you and bring with you the rest.

MR. D. KASHFI (*Iran*): The Jewish community of Iran is one of the oldest Jewish communities in the world and can be called the preserver of the Galuth. The early history of the Jews of Iran is connected with the destruction of the first Temple by the Assyrians, in the time of Cyrus the Great. Cyrus issued his well-known historic order, the first charter of freedom in favour of the Jews and those that followed him on the throne of Iran followed his tolerant example.

The Jewish community, devoted to its religious faith, has been loyal to our beloved country, has shared its fortunes, participated in its revolutions and has always worked together with all the people in the country. During the last war many Polish Jews with their families, found refuge in this hospitable country. The children of these Polish exiles who now live in Israel, and are properly called "the children of Teheran", never fail to remember Iran with gratitude. When the State of Israel came into being and the Jews of Iraq were forced out of their country, 50,000 of them were able to get to Israel through Iran. Other refugees from Afghanistan and India received similar kindnesses.

There are now 100,000 Jews living in Iran and almost all of them are living in the capital city. There has been much social, educational and public welfare improvement and the Jews, in cooperation with other more educated groups, are carrying the burden of the new Iran. In 1961 magnificent ceremonies in Iran will commemorate the 2,500th anniversary of the glorious reign of Cyrus the Great, the re-building of the Temple and the redemption of the Jews from exile.

FOURTH SESSION

August 3, 1959 (Evening)

SYMPOSIUM: CULTURAL PLURALISM IN THE MODERN WORLD

In the Chair: DR. ISRAEL GOLDSTEIN

DR. ISRAEL GOLDSTEIN, *Chairman, Western Hemisphere Executive, World Jewish Congress.* The subject of the symposium, "Cultural Pluralism in the Modern World", is one of the basic themes in our civilisation. Like the other basic themes which form the broader context of our interest as members of the human family, this theme, too, is of special concern to the Jewish people. For ours is a people which while having its national home in Israel, also has many of its segments widely interspersed among the nations, so that to a considerable degree its cultural viability and vitality in the Diaspora are bound to be affected by endemic cultural climates. It is more than religious freedom which is involved, for Jews are bound together not only by ties of religion in the conventional sense of that term, but also by a community of history and destiny, Hebrew and Yiddish language media, a great culture, unique folkways, a millennial yearning for Zion of the future and now, at last, a spiritual attachment to the living of Zion of the present, as well as other definable and not so easily definable ingredients of a characteristic culture and civilisation. To use Theodor Herzl's phrase, "We are a people, one people". The future of this people and its culture in the Diaspora will depend upon two factors. First and foremost must be its own will and power to cultivate its culture and transmit that culture from generation to generation. This will and power will of course be greatly stimulated by influences radiating from the State of Israel and in turn its fruits should influence the development of Jewish culture in Israel itself. But the outcome will also depend upon the climate of the environment in which the Jews in the Diaspora will live.

Our subject, however, is broader than the interests of the Jewish people. Jews ask for themselves no special privileges but only

those human rights which form the context of a civilised society and which they gladly would extend to others if they were the majority.

The term "cultural pluralism" is a modern one. Indeed it has been claimed as an American patent. One of the foremost exponents of cultural pluralism in the United States is the eminent teacher and philosopher who was one of the founders of the World Jewish Congress and is happily a distinguished member of the American Jewish Congress delegation to this Assembly, Professor Horace Kallen. But the concept that in the civilisation of a nation there should be room for diverse cultures long antedates modern history. To modernists it may come as a sobering lesson that chronological progression is not necessarily a co-sign of human progress. Thus, for example, the internationalists of tomorrow may find more antecedents in the religious community of the Middle Ages than in the chauvinistic nationalism of the 20th century. There have been chapters in ancient Greek civilisation and in medieval Moslem civilisation when side by side with dominant culture there were other cultures, not only tolerated but enriched and enriching by virtue of their vital contact. In both of these instances, ancient Hellenic culture and medieval Moslem culture, Jewish culture was also on the scene in the give and take of cultural interaction, witness Philo of ancient Alexandria and the Golden Age of Jewish literature in medieval Spain.

It may be stated as a general rule that the treatment accorded by the dominant body politic to Jews, Judaism and Jewish culture within its midst is a telling criterion of the quality of its civilisation, for the quality of a majority group is most severely tested by its attitude towards its minorities, especially towards a minority which is both meagre and persistent. Hence, the attitude towards Jewish culture is the touchstone *par excellence*.

It would be reasonable to expect that in the modern world where geographical distances are no longer barriers to communication and where differing cultures are more rapidly exposed to one another than ever before, intra-national cultural pluralism would be the prevalent pattern. Yet such is not the case.

In all fairness it should be said that it is not an easy pattern. The natural impulse of a majority is to impose its way of life upon minorities within its midst. Even where religious differences are respected, the temptation is strong to look askance at neighbours whose *mores* and cultures are different from the norm. It is therefore the responsibility of leaders and moulders of public opinion to educate their people to resist the herd instinct and to appreciate

not only the human right but the human value of cultural diversity within national unity.

In the United States we have stopped talking about the "melting-pot" and we talk more about the "orchestra" as the symbol of what intercultural relations ought to be. Regretfully, there are localities in the United States, too, where the herd instinct, the dislike of the unlike, still obtains, but the intellectual and cultural leaders of the national, the moulders of public opinion hold such manifestations in contempt and try to educate the American people not only to tolerate but to appreciate the diversity of its cultures.

Perhaps the largest field for cultural pluralism is in India where for centuries vast populations of many differing races and cultures have been living side by side, with intermittent frictions but each pursuing its own course, and occasionally influencing one another. To an American visiting the Far East for the first time, as was my experience recently, it makes a rather striking impact to see so many different cultures so contiguous to one another.

In the USSR, if I understand it correctly, every ethnic entity in the huge rich tapestry of the Soviet Union, has its geographical *locus*, its territory where it is not only free to develop its own culture but is encouraged to do so. And if the Soviet Union takes pride in demonstrating before the world the richness of its cultural diversity. As for the Jews of Soviet Russia, while not concentrated in any territory of their own, they are officially identified as a minority group and indeed they are a distinct group. Yet, with regard to the freedom of their cultural self-expression, they are placed at a disadvantage. As a distinctive cultural group their historic means of expression have been Hebrew and Yiddish. Jewish children, however, are not permitted to receive public instruction in Hebrew while Yiddish has suffered intermittently the fate of a *lingua non grata*, though it seems for then once to be temporarily restored to grace as evidenced by the Sholem Aleichem Centenary observances. The prospects for the future, however, are clouded. Thus, Cultural Pluralism, in the form in which it exists in the USSR is subject to limitations so far as the Jewish minority is concerned. It is not enjoying full rights as a cultural minority though there are other countries under communist regimes where there is no ground for complaint on this score. Since Jews form one of the most meagre minorities their case is the more challenging, and for the Jewish people this meagre minority in the USSR is both quantitatively and qualitatively, one of the most important segments.

There are some Moslem countries, fortunately there are ex-

ceptions, where exaggerated nationalism has created an atmosphere in which non-Moslem communities are either not tolerated or are not at ease. Such a policy is not only out of place in the modern world. It is at variance with the best Moslem traditions of the past, a retrogression from the Middle Ages. It is to be hoped that liberal voices in the Moslem world will once again come to the fore and bring to the fore the historic credentials of Moslem culture in its golden age when it was not only a great culture in itself, but one with a capacity for fructifying and being fructified by other cultures.

The emergence in our time of a Jewish State where Jews are the dominant group but where there are Moslem, Christian and Druze minorities, presents an opportunity for Jews to demonstrate how they meet the test of cultural pluralism when they are the majority. This is one of the fascinating sociological and cultural aspects of modern Israel, that every encouragement is given minority groups to cultivate their own cultures which in turn are regarded as desirable contributions to the cultural life of the country as a whole.

Looking at the long-range future of the Jewish people, it is expected, of course, that Israel will become the main source of Jewish culture, and the principal guarantor of its survival. Yet wherever substantial Jewish communities may have their abode, Jewish culture must have a habitat and must be free to flourish, not only for its own sake, but also for the sake of civilisation, a garden where every special kind of flower should have the possibility to grow and flourish and add to the beauty of the garden as a whole.

DR. MORRIS GINSBERG, *Emeritus Professor of Sociology, University of London*: The concept of cultural pluralism seems to have been put forward primarily in the attempt to define American rather than Jewish society. It was formulated as a challenge to the notion widely held towards the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of this century of America as a "melting-pot" in which the various ethnic and cultural groups were supposed to undergo a process of fusion, in the course of which their distinctive characteristics would be merged to form a new type or new types. The pluralists maintained that this was neither true in fact nor desirable as an ideal. The progress of democracy, it was argued, depends upon diversity, spontaneity, originality. Of course, it was necessary to imbue the incoming immigrants with a civic spirit and devotion to the country of their adoption. But the possibility of assuring their

loyalty was not in doubt and it was necessary to carry Americanisation to the point of obliterating everything distinctive in their cultures. The culture that was emerging in America would only be enriched if each ethnic element retained its individuality and was encouraged to develop along lines congenial to it. The notion of cultural pluralism was particularly valuable in its application to the Jewish people. They were a minority group with a distinctive culture of their own, and entitled, as other groups, to retain their individuality and their traditional values.

It is not my object to enquire into the merits of the various attempts that have been made to describe the American ethnic pattern. To do justice to these attempts it would be necessary to analyse the character of the various waves of migration, the degree of local concentration of the various ethnic groups, their distribution in rural and urban areas, the history of their occupational stratification in successive generations, the strength and survival power of the religious and other associations the migrants brought with them and the impact of nationalist movements in the countries of origin. Above all it would be necessary to face what is one aspect of the "American Dilemma", the contrast between the formal acceptance of diversity and the persistence of discriminatory practices. These are not matters that lend themselves to summary discussion. It is, however, not very difficult to see that the factors just mentioned have affected the various ethnic groups in different ways, or in different combinations, and that this accounts in large measure for the observable differences in the tempo and intensity of assimilation. Whether America is now a "melting-pot" or a "nation of nations" is a question on which American commentators are still divided. It has been argued that in recent times there has been an intensification of national consciousness in the U.S.A. But whether this is due to impact of developments in Europe, or to the persistence of discriminatory practices, which make the members of the various ethnic groups feel less than full Americans, it would be very difficult to say. As far as the Jewish community is concerned, there is ample evidence of great vitality. The present mood is, as Dr. Robert Gordon puts it, "incurably survivalist".

Turning now to the wider applications of the concept of pluralism, it is to be noted that, as in the case of the U.S.A., it is intended both to describe a fact and to indicate an ideal. In both senses it raises difficult problems. If the term "culture" stands, as it did for Tylor, for the "complex which includes knowledge, belief, law, morals, customs and all other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society", then all cultures are

pluralist or complex. In other words, all societies contain elements derived from different sources and held together in varying degrees of syncretism, juxtaposition or fusion. As far as ethnic composition is concerned, there are obviously many varieties of plural societies in Europe, Asia and Africa. The difficulty is to sort them out. To describe them in detail would be an encyclopedic task. Supposing the facts to be clarified, the question of values remains. How far is pluralism desirable as an ideal? In other words, what degree of self-determination should be allowed within a state to the various groups within it, and how far are the rights and duties so granted assignable to the groups or cultural entities as such and not only to the individuals entering into them? Historically, the issues involved have been raised in their sharpest form in connection with the claims of religious bodies, national groups, and economic or industrial associations. I propose to consider these movements briefly.

The right to form associations or combinations, though won with difficulty, is now well established in democratic countries. But their precise status or powers of self-determination are still far from clear. In English law the tendency has been to bring associations under the law of contract and, to some extent, trusts. The underlying conception is individualist. Associations are treated as aggregates of individuals and their rights and duties are those which result from contracts between the members. In fact, however, it is easy to see that associations are not just collections of individuals, but entities that come to have characteristics of their own and they often possess coercive powers far greater than any possessed by individuals exercising their rights. The lawyers themselves recognise this by use of such terms as quasi-corporations and the like. The difficulties involved can readily be seen from the history of the controversies concerning the powers and the responsibilities of trade unions in relation to their own members and to the general public. Despite these doubts about their precise status, however, there is in democratic societies wide recognition of the great value of associations as mediating between the individual and the State. It is admitted that associations may become too powerful and exert improper pressure on their members and others. But it is felt at the same time that the freedom of the individual is gravely endangered, if it does not include the right to associate with others for common purposes and to protection in the pursuit of these purposes. In communist societies, as I understand, bodies like trade unions are organs of the State, but I do not know what degree of independence they possess or to what

extent they can be used as checks on other governmental organs. From the pluralist point of view, the important thing is to insist on the rightful claim of associations to a measure of independence, to what might be called "limited sovereignty" within their own domain. The problem is how to avoid giving too much power to the State or to any organised bodies within it. The way societies deal with this problem is a measure of the respect they have for freedom, but it may also result in the multiplication of tyrannies. The balancing of powers is a delicate operation involving the grading of values and the comparison of freedoms in the different spheres of life and these differ greatly at different levels of social development. It is clear that what is important is a sincere respect for freedom on the whole and that no general answer can be given to the problems involved. These are especially acute in communist countries owing to the concentration of economic and political power in the same hands. But there are signs that, as a result of bitter experience, some of them are coming to realise the need to encourage diversity, to avoid bureaucratic over-centralisation and to diffuse power and responsibility over as wide a field as possible.

The acceptance of religious diversity and the recognition that the unity of the State is not endangered by the existence of different religions within its boundaries are perhaps the clearest illustration of cultural pluralism. In European history the granting of religious freedom has been associated with the secularisation of the State and the separation not always complete, of spiritual and temporal powers. It has been plausibly argued that the dynamic quality of the Western peoples was enhanced by the conflicts and rivalries between the secular and spiritual powers, and there are many who would agree with Lord Acton that political liberty owes much to the friction thus generated. While allowing that this friction is one of the sources of the liveliness and fermentation that have characterised the Western peoples, it is pertinent to note that the greatest technical and political development was in fact achieved by those countries which pushed secularisation furthest, and that the countries where clericalism kept the upper hand did not succeed in retaining the lead which at one time they had, while other countries in which religious quarrels still affect politics suffer from an instability hampering their steady growth. But generalisations in this field of historical sociology are precarious. Our own age has its own problems. For the Western societies the question may be raised whether the separation of religion and politics can be maintained in an age when political decisions turn upon issues involving

the whole spiritual life of man. The issues are especially grave for communist countries, since they have reverted to the fusion of spiritual and temporal powers by subjecting art and science to political control. The politicisation of thought is clearly as great a menace to freedom as the politicisation of religion was in former ages. In both types of society the problems involved bristle with unresolved difficulties.

Christian opinion on these matters is very divided. There are those who take the view that the spheres of religion and politics are distinct and should be kept distinct. There are others who hold that in modern conditions the separation cannot be maintained, in view of the fact that political decisions such as those relating to war or to economic conflicts within and between states are not purely technical, but imply fundamental moral and religious assumptions. There is an intermediate position which appears to be widely held. This rests upon the distinction between the functions of the Church as an organised body and the duty of its members in their capacity as citizens. While the Church as such should, on this view, keep out of politics, it is the duty of individuals to decide on the issues that arise in the light of Christian principles. But at this point again divergencies of view reappear. Some would take the view that the principles inculcated by Christianity are of necessity highly general and can afford no guidance on such concrete issues as, say, the nationalisation of private property or the abolition of armaments. On questions such as these Churchmen are as likely to differ as everybody else. Others would say that such a dichotomy is defeatist and call for a modern casuistry applicable to the detail of social life.

The Jewish attitude or attitudes to the questions thus raised have not been, so far as I know, systematically explored. As far as Israel is concerned it is clear that it is in process of grappling with the problems that other societies have had to face in the course of secularisation, with what results it remains to be seen. In the diaspora, Jews tend to support the separation of Church and State, no doubt because it is felt that their freedom on equal terms is likely to be best assured when religion and politics are kept apart. On the wider question of the impact of Jewish conceptions of justice on current political issues there is a general feeling that Jews as Jews ought not to identify themselves with any other particular party. As in the case of Christian ethics the general principles of justice as formulated in ancient Jewish teaching cannot in themselves suffice to decide, say, what forms of property are best under modern conditions or what methods should be adopted to secure world

peace. Not only are complicated questions of fact involved on which Jewish ethics can throw but little light, but the mediating principles are lacking or are insufficiently defined to make it possible to apply the fundamental tenets of Judaic ethics to the complex situations of modern life. Nevertheless, it is clear that a man's deepest convictions are bound to affect his civic conscience, all the more so when, as in the case of Judaism, religion and ethics are so deeply intertwined. It remains that the dangers of politicising religion are obvious, and in practice, Jews are as likely to differ on most political issues as members of other religions or persons committed to no religion.

The concept of nationality is elusive. It is doubtful whether a definition of nation can be devised in the sense of enumerating the qualities common and peculiar to all the entities usually described as nations. It is sometimes said that a nation is a group bound by common sentiments which find expression in an independent state. But historically the relation between state and nation has often been in the reverse direction. It was often the State that created the nation, and it has even been asserted that it takes about five hundred years to create what may be properly called a national character. It is sometimes thought that the word people has a clearer connotation. But this seems very doubtful. Are the British a people? But they include the Scots, the Welsh and the Irish, not to mention members of the Commonwealth, which must also be called peoples. There must be a sense of forming a distinct community, but there may be different levels of community. Thus, both English and Scots have a distinct national sense, but they also feel a common unity as against the rest of the world. This case is of interest because the Scots have retained their own law and their own distinctive institutions. It is clear from this and other cases that the claims of nationality may be and have in fact been, satisfied in very different ways. Where different nationalities inhabit distinct territories, it is generally possible and desirable to adjust claims by granting internal autonomy and agreeing on a basis for the management of common interests. Where the minorities are intermixed with the dominant majority, difficult problems of adjustment arise. But even in such cases various forms of autonomy are available. The method of solution cannot be stated in abstract and general terms. But providing there is a genuine respect for freedom, the difficulties are perhaps no greater than those met in defining the liberty of the individual.

From the point of view thus reached the many attempts to answer the question whether the Jews are a nation, a people, a reli-

gious or cultural group are rather unprofitable. Israel, of course, is both a nation and a state. Outside Israel the Jews are a community within other communities, and the relations to the wider whole of which they are a part differ widely from case to case according to the type of political organisation and the level of cultural development. The problems of adjustment obviously differ similarly. The minimum required is equality of civil rights. Social equality, or more concretely, absence of social discrimination is something that cannot be secured by law alone, but depends upon the growth of habits of toleration and respect for differences. Group rights have again to be considered on their merits. The refusal in communist countries to consider such claims, on the ground that the Jews do not come within some theoretical definition of nationality, can have no justification. Any section of a community with a sense of distinctive common interests ought to have the rights based on such interests, providing they do not conflict with the equal claims of others. It is the merit of the pluralist approach that it emphasises the variety of the possibilities open to men and the need not merely to tolerate but to encourage their unimpeded fulfilment.

The case for cultural and religious freedom does not rest on any theory of the relativity of knowledge and belief. A person may be fully convinced of the truth of his beliefs and at the same time recognise that it would be wrong to impose them on others by force. The ground for this refusal to use force is that thought flourishes best in an atmosphere of freedom and that in the sphere of spiritual development, whether personal or social, nothing of real value can be achieved by suppression or elimination. The extent to which societies resort to coercion seems to me to be the best general index of moral development. Societies of the theocratic type and the totalitarian societies of our own day which seek to regulate every detail of life often claim that in doing so the law is completely moralised. But such a fusion blurs the distinction between inward and outward sanctions and, by diminishing the area of individual choice, is bound to be inimical to the growth of the moral consciousness.

The above brief survey is, I think, sufficient to show the value of the pluralist approach and at the same time to bring out the complexity of the problems it raises. Clearly there are many types of plural societies, differing from one another in the number and strength of the component members, their local distribution, occupational stratification, general level of development and the presence or absence of a dominant culture. Democratic societies, by distinguishing between society and state, have dealt with the dif-

difficulties thus arising in a variety of ways, and they have shown great ingenuity in doing so. They have learnt by experience that toleration of diversity does not endanger overall loyalty and that diffusion of power and delegation of authority are valuable aids to full development, if accompanied by a parallel diffusion of the sense of responsibility. Perhaps the problem that stands most in need of clarification is that of freedom in the sphere of education. As far as religious education is concerned, the difficulties have been met in many societies by secularising the general or public system of education and granting facilities to the various confessional bodies to conduct their own schools in their own way. In other societies the formal granting of religious freedom is rendered nugatory by the abolition or weakening of the institutions necessary to keep religion alive. In totalitarian countries there is the additional problem arising from the fact that the whole educational system is inspired by an ideology which has many of the characteristics of an exclusive religion.

These problems are obviously very complex and it is idle to pretend that pluralistic theories have any clear-cut method of dealing with them. The ends and limits of State action and the relations of the State to the subordinate groups and associations with it, more particularly, the degree of autonomy that may be reasonably claimed for them cannot be defined without reference to time and circumstance. What is best done by the State and what by voluntary organisations depends on the level of social development, the political maturity of the citizens, the efficiency of the administrative machinery, the diffusion of the sense of social responsibility. There are, however, certain elements in the pluralistic approach which are of great importance, namely, the insistence on the values of freedom in the cultural sphere, the conviction that social cohesion need not be endangered by cultural diversity any more than by religious diversity and that competing or conflicting values are best dealt with not by the intimidation or coercion, but by reason and persuasion. This is not to say that there are no limits to toleration. Tolerance does not entitle us to endanger tolerance and in democratic societies a question that presents great difficulty is to decide at what point dissentient opinion becomes a danger to democracy itself. This is a matter requiring insight and judgment and, in certain circumstances, the refusal to constrain may indicate a weakening of faith in the values of freedom. If a society can afford to take risks, it is a sign of high development, though not if taken in an attitude of scepticism or indifference. Cultural pluralism must not be confused with cultural relativism.

MR. THOMAS DIOP, *Representative of the Society for African Culture*: From time immemorial humanity has constantly tried to express itself to the full, adapt itself to the universe and to fashion for itself a way of life corresponding to its highest aspirations.

The practical result of these efforts is seen in the existence of various cultures which present-day peoples have inherited from their ancestors.

If every people is deeply attached to its own culture it is because the culture of a given people is not solely the stamp of that people or the reflection of its soul. It is also one with the whole being of that people. It reacts upon that people and in its turn is influenced by the action of that same people. To say that a culture is one with those who represent it, just as a form is one with the concrete object, is far from being a mere form of speech. Ways of thought, feeling and acting, consecrated by long usage, in the final result determine in people a particular attitude towards men and towards themselves.

Looked at as a whole the most valuable parts of cultural creations of all mankind constitute a remarkable sum of important achievements which are the result of man's genius and have helped men to develop within themselves the supplement of soul that Bergson refers to and which we all need whenever we have to communicate with other existing cultures.

It is therefore desirable that the representatives of the various cultures should enable each other to benefit from a deep knowledge of their respective cultural values. In order to facilitate such exchanges a calm and sustained dialogue should be started between various cultures. Many misunderstandings and prejudices would automatically disappear in this way, leaving room for better understanding and effective co-operation. But here I should explain myself in greater detail. The dialogue I am referring to implies not a confused accumulation of various cultures, but the harmonious synthesis is (1) being creative and (2) going beyond the factors which were used as a starting point for that synthesis.

One of the first good results of such an initiative will be the gradual but sure destruction of what I would call the "sophism of personality".

Let me explain what I mean: each people has its own personality. Now personality, being a complete and independent whole, is so naturally inclined to consider itself the standard of what is valuable in man, it is so naturally inclined to exaggerate its degree of real completeness that it readily over-estimates itself and under-estimates the others. There is only one short step from this to be-

having towards others as a complex whole behaves *vis-à-vis* emptiness. No one people represents the whole of humanity, for no one people has undergone the totality of experiences which fashion the infinite variety of human forms.

If the aberration I have just referred to should disturb the peace of the world when a single people is struck by it, *a fortiori* it endangers the chances of peace when a large number of peoples are thus contaminated. This truth has been so perfectly understood by UNESCO that that international organisation has for years now tried to promote cultural co-operation between all the nations. UNESCO, and I am delighted to see it represented at this important Congress, deserves to be vigorously supported by all men of goodwill, for its programme is directed towards a clear understanding of every human aspect with all that this involves in the way of well-balanced relations between the various cultural families of the world.

However, we should not remain content with supporting UNESCO action as though we felt strangers to the fundamental principles on which this organisation is based. The various cultural families should develop their best cultural values and bring them to the attention of the whole of mankind, so that all men can freely incorporate those values in the common pool of our universal heritage.

The beauty of such a prospect must certainly not blind us to the dangers of failure brought about by human weakness. We must perforce remember wars and the murderous persecutions caused by the unbending intransigence of certain cultures *vis-à-vis* other cultures just as valuable.

But these somewhat gloomy observations must not make us depressed nor make us pessimistic, because the best representatives of any given culture are never those which treat the representatives of other cultures with arrogant disdain.

Conscious of the fact that "the problem of international understanding is a problem of relations between cultures", the Society for African Culture begs all the cultural groups in the world to work for the pooling of their cultural resources as well as the development of their respective cultures. It expresses all its good wishes to the Fourth Plenary Session of this Organisation. It sincerely hopes that this Session will prove a success and be the source of fruitful results both for the present and the future. With my comrades of the Society for African Culture I pay tribute to the Jewish contribution to world civilisation and it is with deep feeling

that I salute the memory of the millions of Jews who were exterminated in the name of a truly intolerant ideology.

It may perhaps be of some interest to note that the Jewish people and the Negroes often have a similar fate and a similar situation. Just as most people with racial prejudices attack the Jews, these same people soon attack the Negroes. On the other hand, these two peoples in the most diverse points of the globe are scattered amongst different nations governed by different systems. Just as Negroes throughout the world are deeply concerned with the welfare of Negroes of whatever nationality and whatever country, in the same way Jews are concerned with the fate of their brothers whatever their country and their nationality may be.

I see in this additional chances for the triumph of international agreement and co-operation, for the brotherly love that Negroes and Jews feel for our Negro and Jewish brothers in all parts of the world coincides with everyone's firm wish to see peace established in all countries where our racial brothers may happen to be.

To my mind real wisdom in the field of cultural relations consists in achieving a sound balance between the particular and the general. This sentiment is entirely shared by all the members of the Society for African Culture. Far from trying to reduce African culture to the narrow framework of parochial particularism, our Society means to co-operate worthily with all peoples of goodwill for the setting-up of a universal humanism which, whilst respecting inevitable diversities, will be constructed on a world scale and placed at the service of man.

FATHER JEAN DANIELOU, S. J., *Professor at the Catholic Institute in Paris*: First I should like to tell you how much I appreciate the honour you do me in addressing this meeting of the World Jewish Congress. In this I see proof of personal sympathy for which I thank you. Doubtless no one could deny that there are certain disputes between us. And indeed history has probably never witnessed a debate of longer duration. But I think we also have in common certain values which today are threatened in the world and which we must defend shoulder to shoulder. There are certain rights and certain liberties which are in accord with our deepest convictions and which we must therefore all defend; and it is the fight for the defence of those values which brings us closer together. That is why I believe that my presence here this evening has a positive significance and is not simply an act of courtesy. Amongst these common values which we must defend together, cultural pluralism is not the least, and that indeed is the subject of this symposium.

I do not hesitate to say that I feel absolutely free to defend that cultural pluralism here, and this in the first place simply as a humanist. I say as a humanist because it is clear for every thinking man that cultural pluralism constitutes an essential factor in the rich heritage of mankind. Languages themselves are varied and each one in its own style expresses a certain way of apprehending reality. Nothing in the world would be more hopeless than a uniform language. It will always be true that there is only one way of penetrating the genius of another people and that is through a knowledge of its language. It is a fact that when one is professionally called, as I am constantly, to compare Greek words and Hebrew words, one cannot but admire the way in which parallel expressions express those different shades of meaning which constitute the very wealth of the culture which is ours.

This is a fact; I shall even say that it is more than a fact, it is part of the very essence of human history. There is an old Jewish tradition according to which there are 70 peoples in the world and each of these peoples has its own angel. In this notion of the 70 peoples which form part of the very structure of humanity and which form in a way its permanent substance, since each one of them has its angel, that is as it were its eternal idea, its *hypostasis*, there is something which shows that that cultural pluralism has a permanent value. Toynbee, in a remarkable work, has asserted that the history of civilisations was like a kind of cemetery and that civilisations disappear by a process of elimination. In my view the experience of history shows the reverse, and it is strange to see how cultures which perhaps for centuries had lain in a kind of slumber, because political oppressions prevented them from flowering, are liable to show the most astonishing development and are still capable of pushing out young shoots after centuries during which they were thought to be dead. Thinking along these lines, it seems to me that there is a perpetual permanence in cultural pluralism, and I think that this is one of the fundamental aspects of mankind.

I say this as a Christian too. And indeed it is clear that for Christianity, which is the universal religion, the diversity of cultural expressions is a fact which represents a fundamental problem. In the past Christianity has had the most varied cultural expressions. And today it is one of the essential problems, for I think it is fascinating to see how that question of cultural pluralism interests the great spiritual families of the world, although they may have different starting points. Christianity in fact had largely identified itself with Western culture, and the outstanding fact of the modern world is this renewal of the great cultures of Africa, the

East and Far East. Hence the necessity of finding new forms of expression within these different countries and these different cultures. This is one of the essential problems which beset Christianity today.

It is therefore clear that this cultural pluralism is a cause which is basic to mankind to an extent which represents one of the essential aspects of its heritage. I believe, and it must also be said that it presents certain problems and even a certain number of dangers in the world in which we find ourselves. For there is no doubt that this diversity can be misunderstood to the extent to which certain cultures can, I think, be despised or disappear; it is also clear that one could exaggerate the original character of these cultures to the extent that different types of humanity could be conceived as being heterogeneous and alien to each other like species which have nothing in common. So I believe that, faced with these diversities of culture, there is a fundamental affirmation which for us is the affirmation of the basic unity of the human mind. Whatever may be man's diversity of expressions, which represent a magnificent variety, man is everywhere essentially the same in his apprehension of truth and his understanding of moral values. And it is extremely grave to start considering that there may be degrees in the manner in which humanity as such is possessed by different peoples. If you reach that stage you stumble on the idea of racial prejudice, that is the idea that there are certain cultural categories which are privileged as against others. In doing this you strike at the very roots of the fundamental unity of human nature.

This is obvious in certain fields. It is only too obvious, for example, that science is universal, and it would be absurd to try and create sciences which have a national character. But the thing which appears more important to me is that this applies, too, to the supreme values on which the life of man is founded. By this I mean that in the field of fundamental values which make up the dignity, the human person, the respect of his fundamental liberties, there is between all men an essential community; whatever may be the colour of his skin, whatever may be the language he speaks, a man is first and foremost a brother to every other man. I remember the remark of a French missionary who, on going to China for the first time, said: "What struck me when I arrived there was less our difference than our similarity". I believe that this is a fundamental experience, because this is what in fact makes us first recognise in each man a brother, and we can even say that civilisation is based on that elementary truth. There are civilisations, but beyond civilisations there is what we must call *Civilisation*. By this

I mean the sum of fundamental values on which the moral life of humanity is founded.

If that is so, how can we reconcile the wealth represented by the diversity of human cultures and the fundamental reality of the unity of the human mind? I believe, and this is a truth which has been referred to several times this evening, that the answer to this problem is precisely the very notion of complementary relationship. That is the fact that each human culture expresses a certain aspect of the complete face of man, and that in this sense a complete humanism requires other cultures. Thus the problem is always that man belonging to a culture must first and foremost be part of that culture. It was André Gide who once wrote that the most universal writers are always at the same time the most national ones. No one is more Italian than Dante, no one is more English than Shakespeare, and yet these writers are at the same time the most universal. In that sense man must therefore be first and foremost fully part of his own culture. Nothing would be more dangerous than some syncretism which would tempt one to try and belong to too many cultures so that one would belong to no culture at all and stop being a cultured man. It is only too obvious, that a language, for example, is something individual which has its own and absolutely rigorous personal character. But at the same time it is clear, and a little while ago Mr. Diop reminded us of this in an admirable way, that this only represents one aspect, and we must at the same time be open to the cultural forms of other peoples and of other nations. Thomas Aquinas used to say that it is the very mark of intelligence to be capable of going outside oneself and it is the mark of foolishness to remain shut within oneself and to be incapable of understanding others. In this sense it may be said that to be open to the "supplementariness" of the great cultures is the very mark of the cultured man, and it is probably in this direction that humanism is moving today. More and more we discover the restricted character of each individual culture and we realise that the humanism of tomorrow will be made up of that understanding of the great cultures as they reflect each other.

It remains true that this problem of cultural pluralism is intertwined in fact with two other problems with which it is closely connected and from which it must at the same time be kept apart. The first of these problems is the problem of States. The problem here is that of the relationship between cultural and political problems. Of course, this problem is complex beyond measure. Yet it seems to me that several remarks can be made in this connection. The first of these, and it greatly impresses me, is that throughout

the vicissitudes of States, throughout history, throughout the political history of the world both tragic and glorious, I am forced to note the permanence of cultural units. Throughout all these vicissitudes, under which a culture sometimes corresponds with political independence whilst at other times it finds expression without political independence, one is surprised to see how these cultures subsist. It is remarkable to see how, sometimes after centuries of oppression and inability to express themselves, great cultures again yield marvellous fruits. In this connection I am thinking, on a parallel plane, of the remark made to me one day by my friend La Pira, the Mayor of Florence. He pointed out that towns have permanent vocations, and that throughout centuries Jerusalem or Florence or Moscow preserved some mysterious and permanent messages addressed to mankind throughout the political vicissitudes of the men who happened to be in power there.

On the other hand, we must observe, and that is why I say the problem is a complex one and why I wish to emphasise this complexity, that there are close links between national revival and cultural revival. Culture is a factor which stimulates peoples, and on the other hand peoples also find in culture a very important factor on which to base their political unity. Therefore it is clear that you cannot ignore the close connection which exists between the two questions. But at the same time I think it is essential, and incidentally this was said a while ago in a remarkable manner, not to identify them; that there are as it were two different fields there which are closely connected and yet cannot be identified.

The danger would be to reach a stage where cultural minorities are oppressed in a state whose majority does not belong to that culture; the danger, too, would be to see those minority cultures assimilated in an attempt to reduce these cultural realities because their political effects might be feared. That is why the purpose of our debate this evening is to show that cultural pluralism is legitimate. On that point we can fully commit ourselves. This problem has political consequences which may be varied. But whatever the political consequence may be, cultural pluralism is an absolute value, a value which we must defend without reserve everywhere.

The other problem quite obviously is the problem of the connection and the differences between the problems of cultural diversity and religious diversity. It is clear here that on the one hand we cannot deny that there is a connection between the religious expressions and the cultural character of peoples. There is a religious genius of peoples, there is a religious genius of India, a religious genius of Israel, a religious genius of Ancient Greece, a religious

genius of Catholic Spain. And this is derived from something which is at the same time very real and very mysterious: the religious experience lived by each people in a way which corresponds to its own genius. But religion is not only religious experience. It is also for Jews and for Christians Revelation and Truth. And here we are in the presence of something very real, very mysterious, very difficult, which derives from something of a different order from the problems of culture. I mean that this is derived from the absolute truth, from that field which is no longer that of the temporary destinies of man in the terrestrial city but that of their eternal destinies, which represents the deepest substance of their existence. Here, too, the connection between the two fields is very close. Yet it is obvious on the other hand, and we clearly feel it, that the two fields cannot be identified. There is a mystery of individual conscience which is something absolutely sacred and on which no human power has the right to lay a hand, otherwise we fall into something that we all hate, that is, spiritual oppression. There is a liberty of conscience in this order of values that we must defend but which we ourselves must respect and which, whilst linked with a subject that we are studying this evening, can certainly not be identified with it.

And this brings me to my conclusion. It seems to me that in the debate which has brought us together this evening two kinds of problems are posed. There is the problem which can certainly bring about unanimity of us all this evening, precisely that claim for every culture under all political systems to be entitled to its free expression as representing a heritage which is irreplaceable in human tradition. And there is something there that must be set down amongst the fundamental rights of man, and I think that here this Congress will have performed an essential task if it proclaims that this must henceforth be regarded as sacred, as something which no people, no civilisation, is entitled to touch. But I think that this is a truth that we can express with a force, a conviction, a fullness which is all the greater if we distinguish with it but which none-the-less concern different spheres of existence and different parts of the human person. Thus, with this clearly in mind, putting the different problems in their proper places and showing how each has its part to play, we can perform the only work which is really valid and final, the work which is founded on truth.

M. PIERRE LEBAR, *Representative of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO)*:
The Director-General of UNESCO, Mr. Vittorino Veronese,

when a few months ago he received letters of invitation to this Assembly of the World Jewish Congress, replied at once in the affirmative, and if a severe illness had not prevented him from pursuing his activities for the past month he would be here himself this evening to tell you in person how interested he is in your work and he would have transmitted to you the warmest wishes for the success of your Congress on behalf of UNESCO. By his presence, UNESCO wished to show the sympathy it feels for a large international non-Governmental organisation which for many years has always closely followed UNESCO's work and on many occasions has given us the benefit of its help and suggestions. This is hardly the place, I think, to draw up a list of the many and important contributions made to UNESCO by the World Jewish Congress. In the field of preparation of the rights to education; in the field of teaching concerning the problem of races; in the field of what we call our Major East-West Project; in the field of social science; we have published the work of Dr. Leon Roth on "Jewish Thought as a Factor in Civilisation", thanks to the manuscript which was transmitted to us by the World Jewish Congress. In many other fields, too, the World Jewish Congress co-operated closely with UNESCO and rendered us the most valuable services. UNESCO is well aware of the fact that it could not fully develop its activities if it were restricted to a simple secretariat located in Paris. It can only truly develop its activities thanks to the support and active help of public opinion on the one hand and the representatives of large international bodies on the other. It is thanks to these organisations that we have a real living link between UNESCO and the different types of activity throughout the world. When you decide to include in your agenda the study of problems raised by cultural plurality in the modern world you are broaching a subject which is of capital importance to UNESCO.

When UNESCO was created in 1945, at the end of a terrible war, its basic Act stressed the fact that an almost complete lack of understanding between peoples was the starting point of suspicion and distrust between the nations of the world.

It is because the dignity of man requires the diffusion of culture and education that ever since its creation UNESCO has done all it could to encourage co-operation between nations in all branches of intellectual activity whilst at the same time not forgetting its respect for the fruitful diversity of cultures. UNESCO's action in the field of culture can be summed up in two words—unity and diversity: mankind's solidarity must not hinder recognition and respect for the diversity and originality of cultures.

One sometimes tends to consider cultural values as a venerable relic of the past. And yet twentieth-century man, perhaps even more than his predecessors, feels the need of spiritual values. At a time when his balance is threatened by the rapid changes imposed on individual and collective life by the terror which man feels when faced with a new technical force of his own invention, modern man must try as best he can to recover his balance. He must mobilise all moral, spiritual and cultural forces so as to contribute to the advent of a new humanism placed at the service of man. In a divided world, man's common cultural heritage, to which every people brings its original and irreplaceable contribution, constitutes a valuable factor of mutual understanding and must contribute to fundamental unity.

For cultures are deeply rooted in the past, in the beliefs, in the way of life and in the language of every people. But even if each people has its personality and its distinctive characteristics, it is through their mutual relations that peoples can enrich themselves and adapt themselves to the needs of a world subjected to the law of quickening historical progress. Their interdependence is therefore the example best fitted to strengthen the sense of solidarity, just as their inestimable value arouses mutual understanding and respect between the different peoples. We see this diversity of cultures as a fact. UNESCO takes great care not to take sides on the subject of theories of certain philosophers who opposed the old idea of civilisation against a concept of cultural pluralism according to which different cultures would, like living organisms, constitute so many separate spheres which, so they aver, appear, develop or die out in accordance with their own generic development. According to these thinkers, cultures are a certain reaction of man to the Universe; each one of them evolves its own destiny like individuals and, despite appearances, do not and cannot have any direct relationship between them.

UNESCO tries to maintain a neutral attitude, strictly impartial and serene, in respect of all philosophies, political systems and religions. But it cannot remain alien, blind or deaf to the highest expressions of human thought. Neutrality does not mean indifference. The destiny of an organisation like ours is to live and develop in the very midst of manifold requirements. It is not UNESCO's task to destroy the complexity of reality.

Nevertheless, the phenomenon of the diversity of cultures calls for certain observations. That diversity is not made up of a lifeless sampling or soulless index. It is less akin to the apartness of different human groups than to the relations which bind them to-

gether. Cultural diversity, which is a natural phenomenon, too often appears in the garb of a scandalous monstrosity. Our forefathers were inclined to dub as barbarous everything which was not involved in Greek, and later Greco-Roman, culture. Nowadays simple-minded people often tend to exclude from culture all that does not conform with their own standards, their ways of life, their beliefs and their way of thought which is alien to them. Let us remember that for thousands of years man failed to comprehend the very concept of humanity, including within itself every form of human life without distinction of race or civilisation. The great philosophical and religious systems of humanity have always protested against that profound error according to which humanity stopped at the frontiers of the tribe, the language group, sometimes even the village.

It has become commonplace to say that the tremendous technical developments of our modern world tend to narrow a bit more each day the dimension of the planet on which we live; but if physical distances become more and more restricted one is compelled to recognise that people too often tend to neglect the fact that in the course of history cultures have not developed in water-tight compartments. And yet the most highly developed nations are sometimes guilty of that simple-minded vanity which consists in thinking that their customs represent the only way of life worthy of man and that their beliefs are the only valid expression of truth. And yet, little by little, journeys, explorations and the development of human science have given us a less fragmentary idea of the place held in the history of mankind by civilisations which yesterday were still unknown or of which we knew hardly more than the names alone. I am not referring only to Empires, such as the Inca Empire of Peru, or the Aztec Empire of Mexico, which the discovery of the New World was to reveal; but what did Europeans know of China before Marco Polo? And what did the West know of India before the Arab explorers?

It is our civilisation which was the first to become aware of practically all the others, takes account of them and their riches. We do not fully realise the importance of this phenomenon. By putting an end to the ignorance of other cultures, our civilisation created new possibilities for future development.

UNESCO has, in the course of its activities, endeavoured to present this variety of cultures in all their diversity and originality.

A group of experts met in Paris in 1952 at UNESCO's request to examine the various aspects of the human right "to freely participate in the community's cultural life". They came to the fol-

lowing conclusion: "If it is true that the values which are expressed in culture are universal and constitute the common heritage of the human race, it follows that each culture can develop freely only if its roots are in a particular community for a better understanding between men cannot imply a standardisation of cultures of different human groups so as to reduce them to a universal culture; the reverse is the case, for better understanding must be based on increased exchanges between culture which all keep their own characteristic nature—a pre-requisite of harmony in abundance and understanding in mutual respect".

UNESCO is committed to the idea of international co-operation, but that ideal would be endangered if we failed to recognise the intellectual, moral or spiritual values which are the mark of each individual culture. I would go further and say that the most meritorious activities might well involve grave errors and lead to irreparable disasters. Two basic principles have governed our work, respect for the genius of each people and help in expressing it freely; spreading throughout the world knowledge of the treasures of every culture, thus improving the mutual understanding of peoples.

Obviously UNESCO would certainly not propose to the world its own conception of culture, nor would it spread any particular culture. Our task, as we see it, is to encourage better mutual understanding of the cultures of various peoples by promoting fruitful comparison of the different cultures; exchange of experiences might lead to better understanding and mutual appreciation.

UNESCO's methods in this field have been guided by the very nature of things; the methods of promoting a knowledge of various cultures are not boundless, and in the first place we must look to national initiative both public and private. It is only when that initiative fails or appears inadequate that UNESCO assumes certain activities and asks the Member State or recognised International non-Governmental Organisations to associate themselves with that work.

I should now like to give you a few specific examples with the object of showing the action of UNESCO in a field of that kind. As early as 1947 UNESCO started a series of studies on different cultures and their mutual relations. The outcome of these studies was the publication of a work "The Originality of Cultures" which gives the public at large a first series of studies devoted in particular to Chinese, Japanese, Mexican, Hindu, Latin-American and African cultures.

After that UNESCO proposed as a subject for study relations

between European cultures on the one hand and cultures of the New World on the other; but it was considered preferable to entrust the preparation, of that study to the Geneva International Meetings, the Paulist Authors' Society and the Matarazzo Foundation of Brazil. These two Seminars were held in Geneva and San Paola respectively and the results were published in French, English and Spanish.

Subsequently, with the aid of UNESCO, other Seminars dealing with problems of the same order were organised in different parts of the world by the European Cultural Society, the Indian Philosophical Congress and the Australian Society of Psychology and Philosophy, etc.

UNESCO is now in the course of organising a Seminar devoted to African cultures; it will take place in 1960 in one of the countries of the African continent. Such international Seminars organised by UNESCO or by International Non-Governmental Organisations with the aid of UNESCO have given distinguished persons of the most varied backgrounds and the most varied opinions the opportunity of comparing their points of view, thus contributing to some considerable extent to the work of international co-operation. The subjects of these Seminars, which were selected so as to take account of the subject of the greatest interest in our era, were well received by the public at large, and the press and radio both contributed to the wide circulation of the results. UNESCO, which is anxious to promote both bilateral and multi-lateral cultural exchanges, also organised meetings of the directors of national cultural relations services in 1956 and 1958. These meetings led to the fruitful exchanges of opinions and must necessarily permit better co-ordination of national efforts in this field. UNESCO publishes a handbook of cultural agreements in force as well as a list of services for cultural relations. Finally, at the request of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, UNESCO is to set on foot a study on relations and international exchange in the field of education, science and culture. This will enable it to draw up a certain number of recommendations.

Parallel to this work UNESCO was preparing certain methods for the international diffusion of the arts and literatures of different peoples. In the field of painting, UNESCO, after having drawn up a complete list of the best coloured reproductions of works of art, published two catalogues of coloured reproductions of paintings, one previous to 1860 and the other from 1860 until the present day. These catalogues are brought up to date and brought out in new editions from time to time. UNESCO has further prepared

travelling exhibitions of colour reproductions which will make treasures of pictorial art better known throughout the world; 180 collections have thus been presented to the public.

Finally, UNESCO has undertaken the publication of a series of art albums devoted to masterpieces of painting not yet sufficiently known to the public interested in the arts. These albums were devoted successively to Australian aboriginal paintings, Yugoslav medieval frescoes, paintings from tombs and temples of ancient Egypt, Persian miniatures, Norwegian Stavkirker painting, old Russian icons, etc.

In a further attempt to contribute to a better understanding between peoples by making known masterpieces of other literatures, UNESCO has also prepared a programme of translation of works representing the genius of different cultures into the widely known languages.

In a world which is getting smaller and smaller every day, no man of culture can rest content with the sole knowledge of the history and heritage of his own civilization. True, there have been translations from time immemorial and there are more and more translations, but this effort is far from keeping abreast of the demand. Practically all translations are only produced within a small group of languages which are the main world languages. If we just look at Europe and simply think of the most restricted languages, we see that translations are usually done one way only from the better known to the lesser known languages. Exchanges between countries of the East and the West are frequent, and yet, despite great efforts, they remain at a very low level. It is with a view to filling these gaps that UNESCO has created a collection of representative works which from year to year is being enriched with translations of works which drawn from the literatures of South America, the Arab World, Persia, India, China and Japan and in the very near future, works and anthologies of literatures belonging to the little known linguistic areas of Central Asia and Africa. Among the works already translated into French or into English I shall merely mention an anthology of Spanish American poetry, poetry which is still practically unknown outside the New World. The new "Science of Vico", one of the first treatises of Sociology, Avicenna's "Book of Science", a real encyclopaedia of medieval knowledge, the "Speculative Hymns" of Rig-Veda, where we have a collection of the main religious songs of one of the world's oldest religions, "Tales of Rain and Moon", a Japanese fantasy, etc.

This same collection also includes translations into Persian of

Corneille's "Le Cid" and the first part of Nietzsche's "Will to Power". There have also been translated into Arabic Aristotle's "Politics", Descartes' "Discourse on Method", Montesquieu's "Spirit of the Laws", Jean-Jacques Rousseau's "Social Contract" and Durckheim's "Division of Social Work." You will readily see that this is a tremendous task which for a very long time will have to be continued, extended and completed. Thanks to this effort and to the help given by international institutions, we nevertheless think that publishers will do their utmost to satisfy the growing needs of the public in this craving for a better knowledge of the universal literary heritage of mankind. Finally, since 1954, UNESCO has each year taken on the task of having translated into the better known languages a certain number of contemporary works written in the lesser known languages which are difficult of access. These works are selected by UNESCO Secretariat from a list drawn up and submitted by the International Pen Club after consultation with the local Pen Club centres.

It is to satisfy a need for information in this field that UNESCO publishes a catalogue of translations published throughout the world in all subjects. This catalogue takes the form of an *Index Translationum*. Each year this index gives a list of more than 150,000 translations published throughout the world.

That is why I should now like to talk to you in some detail of a project undertaken by UNESCO with a view to drawing closer the links between peoples, thanks to better knowledge of their past, their traditions and their respective contributions to the common heritage of mankind. I am referring to the "History of the Scientific and Cultural Development of Humanity", the preparation of which has been entrusted to a group of scientists who meet as an international committee. This history is intended in particular to stress the interdependence of peoples and cultures on a world scale. I need hardly add that this is a collective enterprise, for as that great historian Lucian Febvre has so aptly said: : "The one real history which can only be made by mutual help is universal history". The success of numerous recent publications, the tendency of the most modern scientific schools (helped incidentally by progress in all the sciences of man ranging from biology to sociology) clearly bring out a new requirement of human consciousness. Around historians interested in these, UNESCO has tried to create a favourable atmosphere by guiding University research and public discussions towards the study of scientific and cultural development of humanity, in a widespread movement of mutual emulation.

The introduction to each volume will include a brief account

of a specific period considered as one phase of universal history. We shall show the situation of different peoples as well as their mutual relations during that period; the relationships created between the peoples through trade, wars, journeys, migrations will only be studied in so far as these have exerted an influence on cultural exchanges; the contribution of the different cultures and their reciprocal influence will be set out in the body of each volume.

The whole of this work will attempt to stress the way of life of different peoples and the changes which take place during a given period. Thus, taken as a whole, the work will set out in a methodical and coherent manner the development of peoples, their scientific, artistic, literary, religious, philosophical, legal and technological progress, etc. and it will explain the way in which human life was accordingly shaped.

This history of the scientific and cultural development of mankind, fruit of international collaboration, will reflect the problems which have been the concern of qualified representatives of all philosophical and religious trends. It is hoped that the first volume of this work can be published in the course of 1960.

It is to enlarge and at the same time to concentrate these different efforts that a General Conference of UNESCO which was held in New Delhi in 1956 decided to implement a major project on the subject of mutual appreciation of the cultural values of the East and the West.

Why should it be so clear that UNESCO must grapple with this problem? Because more than ever history demands that nations should co-exist in a unified world and because today, men no longer having the right to ignore each other, are bound to choose between conflict and concord.

In the next ten years or so UNESCO intends to concentrate its efforts on the promotion of harmonious relations between peoples of the East and the West.

UNESCO issued an appeal not only to men of goodwill but also to each one of its Member States, to their National Commissions, to public and private institutions as well as international non-governmental organisations who actively associate themselves with its programmes: associations of scientists and intellectuals, professional associations of teachers, of information officers, a vast group of experts in various fields but who are all bound by a common ideal closely related to that of UNESCO.

UNESCO in order to obtain help in defining and implementing this long-term programme has made use of the advice of an inter-

national consultative committee on which the different cultures of the East and the West are represented.

Of all problems involved in peaceful co-operation between peoples and interpenetration of cultures and mutual understanding between East and West is without a doubt the one which is nearest to UNESCO. Too often, at the cost of artificial oversimplification, the East and the West have been represented as two facets of civilisation, always supplementary but for ever separated. Political relations between the peoples of the East and the West, by undergoing radical changes during the last few decades, have only too often given rise to attitudes of suspicion and resentment on both sides. The great Eastern civilisations bear witness to human genius in an overwhelmingly convincing manner and yet the West—with the exception of restricted circles of experts—too often continues to regard these great civilisations as simple objects of curiosity. Too often, too, the West appears to the peoples of the East in the garb of a materialist who is prepared to forget the wealth of the spirit.

Real peaceful co-operation between the peoples can only be based on deep knowledge and appreciation by each people for the civilisation of other peoples. That is why ignorance in a field of this kind may well become daily more dangerous at a time when peace, general progress and the prosperity of the world can *also* depend on the development of decisions and work of the Eastern countries. Thus by multiplying direct human contacts, by organising meetings, discussions, Seminars, by granting study- and travelling scholarships UNESCO enables experts and educationists to acquire direct experience of Eastern civilisations. We cannot expect a complete revolution of man's feelings overnight but we are entitled at least to hope that at the end of the ten years that UNESCO has given itself to develop what is called a major project new habits will be born, new links will have been established and the best opportunities will have been created for the setting up of a renewed and broadened humanism within which original cultures will co-exist and collaborate, whilst remaining wide open to each other.

When you try to explain the cultural values of the East and the West, when you try and perceive their origins and foundations, when you perceive their full significance for the men of these two great areas, you cannot but meet religion at every turn.

The Jewish tradition and the message of Christianity have powerfully contributed to the fashioning of Western civilisation. China cannot be understood without referring to the ethics of Confucius, the mysticism of Tao and Buddhism, nor India without

metaphysics and the Vedanta of religious mysticism, nor the Arab world, Iran and Pakistan without the message of the Koran and the Sufi mysticism.

UNESCO is certainly not expected to concern itself with relations between religions, even less with relations between the Churches.

For that reason it can certainly not intervene on questions of faith which concern the intimate beliefs of the individual and the principles which govern his belonging to a church.

In this field UNESCO therefore maintains strict neutrality, but it cannot fail to encourage man to cultivate feelings of mutual understanding and mutual respect. Therefore it must surely have the unanimous acceptance of the great religions.

It is in that spirit that UNESCO has contributed to the organisation of the discussions which took place in Tokyo in 1958 on the occasion of the International Congress of Religions on the subject "Religions and Thought in the East and West", trying in this manner to promote a realisation of the cultural role of the different religions.

Thus, as it puts this major project into effect UNESCO shows how interested it is in the spiritual components of civilisations.

In such a field religious communities are in a position to give a particularly valuable and irreplaceable contribution towards the development and understanding between the East and the West.

UNESCO therefore intends to maintain the diversity of culture in a world threatened with monotony and uniformity, but it knows full well that to achieve this aim it is not enough to nurture local traditions or prolong age-worn concepts. Let me by way of conclusion quote a text of M. Claude Lévi-Strauss, the great French ethnologist, who in a few lines expresses far better than I could ever do it myself the purpose of UNESCO efforts. This is what M. Lévi-Strauss writes:

"It is the fact of diversity which must be saved, not the historical content that each period has given it and that none can perpetuate beyond itself. Tolerance is not a contemplative position handing our Indulgences to what was and what is. It is a dynamic state of mind which consists in forecasting, understanding and promoting what must be. The diversity of human cultures is behind us, around us and before us. The only demand which we can make of that diversity, which for each individual creates corresponding duties, is that it should be achieved in forms each one of which represents a contribution to the greatest generosity of others."

FIFTH SESSION

August 4, 1959 (Morning)

In the Chair: THE MARCHIONESS OF READING (*Great Britain*)

1. ARRANGEMENTS CONCERNING PRESIDIUM AND COMMISSIONS

DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN: First, it is proposed that the following be added to the Presidium: Dr. Hendrik van Dam, Mr. Michael Radzinski and Mr. Jacques Nahmias. There are several delegations which are entitled to be represented but were overlooked in the negotiations. There being no opposition, these three are now members of the Presidium.

Second, the delegations have agreed on the chairman of the three large commissions. If there are subcommittees, the commissions will choose the chairman for them. The Political Commission is to be presided over by our colleague S. Levenberg, the Cultural Commission by Mrs. Thelma Richman and the Commission on Organisation by Yitzhak Rafael.

Third, those delegates who are not full members of a commission may be appointed as alternates and take part in the commission meetings. The chairman of the Commissions will decide if there is enough time to let an alternate speak.

DR. GERHART RIEGNER reported on the decision of the Presidium regarding the distribution of time for the Political or General Debate: The time is allocated to the delegations and it is for them to apportion it to as many speakers as they see fit. The head of each delegation is to notify the Presidium or the Secretariat how the time has been apportioned among its speakers. *The proposals of the Presidium were accepted.*

2. GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)

MR. BERNARDO BORUCHOWICZ (*Costa Rica*): I am here both as the representative of the Costa Rica Kehilla and as an observer of the Costa Rica Government. Having submitted my credentials, I wish to assure the Presidium of the deep interest the Ministry for

Foreign Affairs of Costa Rica takes in Jewish and Israel problems.

The Yishuv of Costa Rica, numbering 1,400, is no more than 30 years old; its members come mostly from Polish Shtetels. We strive to maintain Jewish traditions and to participate in international Jewish activities as well as to support Israel. The Government of Costa Rica has maintained friendly relations with Israel during its politically difficult period, from 1947 to the Sinai Campaign, and the Jews in Costa Rica are grateful to the Government for this friendly attitude.

It is important that the Jews of other countries know how our small democratic people proudly took its part in the struggle for justice and for the Jewish people. The State of Israel and the World Jewish Congress must help the small Yishuvim and guide them to foster Jewish national consciousness. Future generations should not be strangers to each other; unfortunately the Israeli Jew holds wrong opinions and looks down on the Diaspora Jew. Youth in Israel must be educated to good will and understanding for their brothers in the Diaspora.

If world Jewry does not save the Soviet Jews from loss of identity, it may be too late, for the youth becomes assimilated quickly and even the existence of a group of orthodox Jews cannot prevent this danger. Soviet Jewry can and must be saved by those who are in a position to get in touch with Soviet leaders.

We Jews are a peace-loving people. Addressing myself to the Polish Delegation, they should seek Jewish unity, rather than spread propaganda. Perhaps Polish Jewry can become the bridge between the Jews of the world and the Russian Jews and in this way the goal of Ahdut Yisrael (Unity of Israel) may be achieved.

MR. BENZION KATZENELLENBOGEN (*Israel*): First I shall touch on the fact that a large gathering of Jewish representatives were forced to welcome and to be seated with an Ambassador of Germany, which even today is swarming with millions of men who participated directly in the extermination of our people. I say this was not done in the name of the Jewish people. Although even in Israel we were asked to talk about this problem without emotion, it is not possible as long as before our eyes is the picture of the murder of our people. I call upon the World Jewish Congress to adopt an unambiguous resolution against the arming of Germany and there is just one Germany, not two Germanies, there is just one in its destruction of the Jewish people. The Germans did not distinguish between a good Jew and a bad Jew. For us therefore there are no good Germans, even if they humble themselves before us. We humble ourselves before them more than they before us.

Congress should rebuke those responsible for this horrible incident. This precedent should never have been set: for the German flag to appear at a meeting of Jews.

Now permit me to pass to a second subject, the Jews in Russia, about whom we must be single-minded. At our meeting in London, after an evening's discussion, no decision was taken against Russia's attitude towards the Jews living in that country. Russia is not impressed by the manner of our speech, whether harsh or flattering. We must be single-minded in our position, no matter what the situation of the Jews in Russia is. Our one demand is: Let my people go! This is the only claim of the World Jewish Congress: Russia should open her gates and permit all the Jews to leave.

MR. HARRY RAJAK (*South Africa*): I bring you greetings from the South African Jewish Board of Deputies. In South Africa we have a multi-racial society, sharply divided between white and non-white. The white section contains the English-speaking group, in which the Jews are largely included, as differentiated from the Afrikaans-speaking section. There are divergencies of viewpoints which are mainly based on colour. The South African Jewish Board expresses its views only on the rights or status of Jews as citizens. There is a diversity of opinions within the Jewish community on all political matters. The Board has always stressed the responsibility of individual Jews to mitigate racial prejudice and to promote co-operation between all sections.

Jews play their part in all spheres of political, civic, economic and social activities in the country. They hold many important public offices, including that of Mayor and Deputy Mayor; in addition a number are members of the Central Parliament and some are Supreme Court Judges. The few signs of anti-Semitism are mostly from the lunatic fringe—the propaganda is all imported. The Jewish population of some 115,000 is about 4 per cent. of the white population while there are 11 million, coloured, black and Asians. Ours is a homogeneous Jewish community established more than a century ago, composed mainly of Litvaks although we had a valuable Aliyah of German immigrants during the 'thirties. We are a middle-class community engaged in commercial, industrial and professional occupations; a small number are in agriculture and very few are artisans. Now immigration has virtually dried up and we miss the cultural and spiritual infusion that immigrants from Eastern Europe used to inspire. We pursue energetically the integration into the Jewish communal scene of our youth, especially University students. Every Jewish institution is

affiliated, Zionist or not, cultural, educational, sports, philanthropic, social, fraternal or welfare bodies. Thus the South African Jewish Board of Deputies is the umbrella organization. It meets in national congress every two years and holds regional conferences from time to time. Our problem is to secure Jewish ministers, teachers and shochem. The women are superbly organised both through the Union of Jewish Women on the communal front and through the Women's Zionist Council on the Zionist front.

Our United Communal Fund, now about ten years old, not only finances the activities of the Board of Deputies, but also educational programming, the central synagogue organization, Yiddish and Hebrew cultural projects and so on. We observe Jewish Book Month and have country-wide observances on the 27th of Nissan in honour of the heroes of the Warsaw Ghetto. A severe problem is satisfying the spiritual and educational needs of sparsely populated outlying villages whose numbers have dwindled as growing children leave for larger educational centres. In some cases defunct communities have left synagogue and other buildings and even cemeteries, which the Board of Deputies has to care for.

We are an intensely Zionist community and are very proud of the some 2,000 young men and women who went to fight in Israel during its War of Independence—some were killed and most remained there as part of the Aliyah. Our South African Zionist Federation is a model territorial Federation co-ordinating all branches of Zionist and Israel oriented activities in the country. Our Prime Minister at the time, General Smuts, was among the first to recognize Israel.

On the international level, together with the British Board of Deputies and the American B'nai B'rith, the South African Jewish Board of Deputies forms the Co-ordinating Board of Jewish Organizations with consultative status at the United Nations. We are members of the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany, we are associated with the new Conference of Jewish Organizations and we are also pleased to be associated fraternally with the World Jewish Congress which recognizes us as the sole territorial representative of Jewish life in South Africa.

DR. MORDECHAI NUROCK (*Israel*): I deem it my duty to recall the founders of the World Jewish Congress Dr. Stephen S. Wise and Mr. Leo Motzkin. I wish to emphasize that ten years ago the Swedish Parliament honoured the young State of Israel. We must thank the Swedish people and Government for admitting within their borders Jewish refugees and orphans and for the humanitarian feelings displayed toward them.

I wish to touch on the problem of our brothers behind the Iron Curtain. We are grateful to the Soviet Union for her support of the establishment of the State of Israel. Although we do not interfere in the individual affairs of any country, we view with apprehension the situation of our brothers in the Soviet Union, for unfortunately there is no freedom of conscience in the country, synagogues have been closed and minyanim forbidden. Last year private minyanim could still be held in the home of a mourner but now they, too, have been prohibited. In many places it was not possible to bake Matzot for Pesach. It is against the law to print Sidurim and Luchot, and therefore Jews do not know when Yom Kippur falls. We demand that the Jews in Russia have the same rights that other peoples have, including the Kirghiz, Kalmucks, Bashkirs and Uzbeks. Our culture is not inferior to theirs. Between the two world wars when the Union of National Minorities existed, we in the Union defended the rights of the Russian minority in Poland and other countries. We also demand schools in our language, newspapers and theatres like all other peoples. We are told the Jews want to assimilate and do not want these things, but this is untrue. There is also the question of uniting families; old parents in Russia are not permitted to join their children, who want to take care of them in Israel. Let my people go!

The news from Rumania is not good. An old rabbi, Rabbi Portugal, a man who risked his life to rescue Jewish children from the Nazis, has been arrested, and I call on the Assembly to adopt a resolution asking for his release.

MR. MONROE ABBEY (*Canada*): I bring you greetings from the Canadian Jewish Congress and from the 250,000 Canadian Jews, whom we represent almost 100 per cent. Our community is celebrating this year its bi-centenary anniversary with a convention sponsored by the Prime Minister of Canada and the ten Premiers of the ten Provinces in Canada. Canadian Jewry will celebrate this occasion by recalling its early trials and the many significant military, religious, civic and economic events of its history. It will recall the early settlers who pioneered in shipping, industrial developments and trading and the relief and rehabilitation given the victims of the two wars of this century. We are a group dedicated to the advancement of Israel. Canada was the first country where a representative of the Jewish faith was elected to a Parliament by a vote in a constituency that probably did not have a handful of Jews.

The Canadian Jewish Congress sponsors day schools and other schools and has set up teachers' seminaries in Montreal.

Toronto and Winnipeg. The Canadian Government recognizes the Canadian Jewish Congress as representative of Canadian Jewry and has been a constant friend of Jewry in the councils of the world. We are doing our best to bring into Canada persons not wanting to go to Israel; they are aided in the early period by our various organizations. We are affiliated to the World Jewish Congress and support it, but we also support and are co-ordinated with other groups. We are concerned not only with the welfare of the Jews in Canada but throughout the world.

Our ties with Israel are very close and we support it, but there has been no exodus, although some of our young men have gone there. We are Canadians of the Jewish faith, and that is the feeling of the great majority of the Jews in Canada. Yet we help Israel through bonds, investments and through the United Israel Appeal. Our statesmen have supported Israel in the councils of the world. We feel that many things must be done on a Jewish basis rather than on a national basis.

We are happy to see here representatives of the Polish people but are sorry to have heard them speak on a line based not entirely on the welfare of Jewry, but rather on one that might be otherwise dictated. We would be most happy to welcome here representatives of other nations in the East, but not as mouthpieces of ideologies inconsistent with Jewish thinking. We are the inheritors of a great tradition and wish to associate with others who feel likewise, and we trust that other sister organizations will join us in our 200th anniversary celebration.

MR. HERSH CYNOWICZ (*India*): It gives me great pleasure to speak to this Assembly on behalf of the Jewish community in India, a country of 400 million people. The Jewish community, which has adopted me, has not suffered as Jews in its 2,000 years' history and yet it has successfully preserved its identity. After many centuries of isolation from Jewish contact, this community is now taking an active part in Jewish national and Zionist activities and is actively interested in the World Jewish Congress. I am glad to state that our Prime Minister has sent a message of congratulations to our President, Dr. Nahum Goldmann, and I am sure all will agree that we send best wishes to the Indian Prime Minister and to the Indian Government for the economic and political stability for which they are now striving.

I have been devoting much of my time and interest to the World Jewish Congress and I am satisfied that since our last meeting, the utmost has been done to cement relations between the parts of Jewries whether in the East or West. The World Jewish

Congress could draw up a minimum programme, the principles of which Jews, as Jews, could adhere to, no matter under what political or economic regime they live. There is no other organization in Jewish life which has done as much to help the Jews of Poland and Hungary to re-enter the stream of Jewish life. As Mr. Smoliar has said, Jewish cultural life is progressing in Poland. I wish the World Jewish Congress success in helping the Jews of both East and West to go the way of Jews, as they have for the past 2,000 years.

MR. YITZHAK RAFAEL (*Israel*): The very fact that Jewish communities meet from time to time, expressing the oneness of our people, justifies the existence of the World Jewish Congress, even if there were no daily tasks to be performed. I do not think we should argue with the representatives from Poland. I welcome them with brotherly affection and I thank the Polish Government which made their coming here possible, and for permitting those who desire, to go to Israel.

The Jews in Poland do not constitute a problem. Those who so desire, are permitted to emigrate to Israel and those who wish to, may remain to live as Jews without let or hindrance. While there are now Jewish prayer houses, Yiddish schools and press and a Yiddish theatre, historical experience teaches us that regrettably, the fate of such a small Jewish community is assimilation and spiritual death. There is almost no doubt the same fate will overtake the several thousand Jews in Czechoslovakia. There are about 300,000 Jews in Hungary and Rumania and it is hoped that they will be allowed to go to Israel, since relatives from Rumania have already been permitted to be reunited with their families.

The real problem is the case of the 2,500,000 Jews in Russia—this problem will not be solved by emigration in the near future. Since the Jews will have to live there for many years more, the question is, how can they live there as Jews? I have two accounts to settle with the USSR, as a citizen of Israel and as a Jew. I ask: How is it possible for Russia, whose slogan is truth, freedom and justice, to support states that are ruled by fanatic, backward kings who traffic in slaves and to take sides against the progressive, democratic State of Israel? Israel's account with the USSR is long and serious. But this account cannot be treated on this platform.

The Jewish account with the USSR must be dealt with here. Even if the Jews have assimilated linguistically and there is no great demand for Yiddish theatre or literature, there are still hundreds of thousands who need synagogues, Torah scrolls, Sidurim, Machzorim, a Luach, Matzot for Pesach, Etrogim for

Succoth, rabbis, shochtim and cantors. Thousands ask for Talmud Torahs for their children, for higher schools of learning and for Yeshivot.

MR. MOYSES KAUFFMANN (*Brazil*): I greet you in the name of the Confederation of the Jewish Communities in Brazil, comprising about 150,000 Jews. These communities are very active in the fields of culture, education and social welfare and also are actively engaged in giving aid to Israel and to our brothers in other countries.

In Brazil, where the Jews have helped to build up the country ever since it was discovered, friendship for our people is traditional, and it was from Recife that Jews in the 17th century went to settle in New Amsterdam, now New York. The Jews in our country live in peace, are socially unimpeded and participate in the progress of Brazil, which enjoys security in her natural wealth and the intelligence and energy of her people.

We have 35 Jewish schools where 6,000 children get instruction. We have five Yiddish weeklies and three in Portuguese. We have whatever Jewish institutions we need to satisfy our various needs. Aided by the liberal immigration policy of the Brazilian President, Dr. Juscelino Kubitschek, we were able to take care of more than 5,000 Jewish refugees from Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Morocco and Egypt during the last three years. I hope the Assembly's deliberations will aid the People of Israel and the State of Israel.

MR. A. L. EASTERMAN (*Director, Political Department, London*): As officers responsible for the political and international affairs of the Congress, Dr. Perlzweig and I have presented a written report covering our work since 1953. I am going to discuss North African Jewry. Prior to the establishment of the State of Israel, world Jewry was not concerned with Jewish communities in Moslem lands except in the limited areas of philanthropy, social welfare and elementary education, which was natural, as attention was concentrated on Europe.

With the needs of the State of Israel, world Jewry has been forced to become aware of first, the meaning, extent and rapidity of Arab nationalism in the Middle East and second, of the resulting effects of Arab nationalism on the security and political welfare of the Jewish communities which have come under the authority of the Middle East Arab States.

The march of Middle East Arab nationalism into the modern political world brought with it a very heavy toll in the suppression of the liberties and the persecution of Jews by the new

independent States in that area. This heavy toll increased, as we all know to our cost and our pain, with the Arab conflict against Israel. Happily, these Jews have been saved from further destruction by their almost complete evacuation to the State of Israel. The Arab nationalist movement spread to North Africa where anti-Jewish violence was fomented and broke out in 1950 and 1951 in Tripoli and elsewhere.

When we last met in Plenary Assembly in 1953, although there were signs that the Arab nationalist movements in Tunisia and Morocco were making headway, the Jewish communities in North Africa were not yet aware of the extent and aims of the Movement, nor were we conscious that these aims were so near realization. Consequently there was no examination of the likely effects for Jewish rights, liberties and security in the North African countries about to come under the jurisdiction of these national movements. At the beginning of 1954 we established contact and eventually close relations with the Tunisian and Moroccan leaders, both in their countries and outside, sometimes when these leaders were in exile or under detention. With the approval of the French Government we pursued these contacts until Tunisia and Morocco achieved their independence in 1955.

On his return from Madagascar, we were received by the Sultan, now the King of Morocco, and I myself had many talks with Habib Bourguiba, the Tunisian leader, when he was living in unusual conditions in a foreign country. We have been able to maintain those contacts until this day.

When we first encountered them, the North African nationalist leadership differed from its counterparts in the Middle East. Their outlook was largely European and Western nor were they influenced by the anti-Israel pressures of the Arab League States. In the course of our discussions with the now independent states of Tunisia and Morocco, we were given assurances that there would be complete freedom and equality of rights and citizenship for their Jewish inhabitants. They agreed to accept the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, with emphasis on freedom of emigration, especially to Israel. Equality of citizenship and freedom to maintain Jewish life and institutions have been respected and there is no cause for complaint on that score.

Unexpectedly, in May 1956, six months after the establishment of the newly independent State of Morocco, during which about 3,000 Jews a month emigrated, there was imposed an embargo on the emigration of Moroccan Jews to Israel. This emigration,

under the French Protectorate, from 1949 until this embargo, amounted to something like 100,000 Jews who had found homes in Israel; this sudden embargo therefore, caused us considerable anxiety.

The responsibility fell upon us, the World Jewish Congress, to seek the removal of the embargo and after four months of negotiations with the Moroccan Government we succeeded in having the embargo lifted and the 8,000 who were waiting in a camp near Casablanca, were able to depart and are now in Israel. Since then, and despite further assurances and statements to the contrary, the emigration of Moroccan Jews has come to a standstill and Jews do not receive passports to emigrate to Israel and to join their families there. There are still some 200,000 Jews in Morocco, virtually immobilized.

This Moroccan problem of Jewish emigration must be considered against the background of certain political and economic factors. The process of State building has brought with it grave difficulties which have produced economic crisis after economic crisis resulting in serious political conflict in the country. The various political parties formerly united in the nationalist movement to achieve independence are now engaged in a fierce inter-party struggle to exercise political power through government.

Exploiting the political conflict and economic chaos are the Middle East Arab States who have induced Morocco to join the Arab League, which prevents the effective implementation of the right of freedom of emigration. As a consequence of the conflict and confusion, Morocco is politically and economically unstable at this time and there is no authority able or willing to approve of Jewish emigration, particularly to Israel.

The additional obstacle which we face in the matter of Jewish emigration from Morocco is one which obstructs us in other areas, notably those under the influence of the Soviet Union. This obstacle is the assertion that, as fully integrated free and equal citizens, Jews should and must remain in their country to contribute their skills and resources in developing the State. Here we have the latest phase of the Jewish problem. In former times there was the phenomenon of the unwanted Jew, driven hither and thither in search of a livelihood, peace and the freedom to pursue his own way of life. Now we have the phenomenon of the too-much-wanted Jew, politically and economically prevented from choosing his own destiny.

In Tunisia there is an infinitely better understanding of Jewish needs. This new State is under the leadership of Habib

Bourguiba, who is a courageous reformer gifted with vision and progressive ideas of modern liberal government. Under his guidance Tunisia maintains a healthy independence and relying on his authority and good will, of which I have personal experience and to which I would like to pay personal tribute, there is little to cause us apprehension that the Jewish Community will not be able to maintain its traditional life.

In discussing the future of our North African Communities, I feel sure that this great Jewish Assembly will approach their problems with responsibility, for these problems are delicate and the communities are sensitive and nervous. Our concern for their welfare sustains and encourages them. Their position in relation to their Governments is often extremely delicate and we must not allow our rightful anxiety to obstruct our efforts on their behalf. Fortunately we, the World Jewish Congress, have still the opportunity of access to, and of discussion with, their Governments. Our work must be one of explanation and persuasion, rather than of accusation. We have to explain to the authorities in those countries the meaning of Jewish tradition, of Jewish continuity, and the purpose of Jewish life generally in any state based upon a different traditional background and system of living.

We will not cease to urge the Moroccan Government to implement their undertakings to us and so, in pursuing our efforts on behalf of our North African brethren, I hope we can count on your understanding, on your approval, and I hope, on your support.

CHIEF RABBI E. BERLINGER (*Netherlands*): I listened with much pleasure to the words of Dr. Goldmann, who told us that the task of the World Jewish Congress has to be changed—the Jews in the Golah must find a solution for their Jewish questions. Thus it will be a pleasure to devote more time to cultural, spiritual and educational tasks than to political tasks. There is also a change in the political field. If we ask for our Jewish rights in any country, we no longer do it only as Jews but we do it together with all groups which are struggling for human rights, we do it in collaboration with the ideas of the United Nations. For example, when we are engaged in a struggle against the activity of Einar Aberg, we do it not only to help Jews, but as the Swedish Ambassador in the Hague made known to me as a delegate to this Assembly, the Swedish authorities are also grateful for our efforts. This is the change—what we do as the World Jewish Congress we do as collaborators with all men who are struggling for good in the world. If the human rights of a coloured group are menaced in America or in

Africa, even though not one Jew is involved, we must help and we do it to work for human rights and thus for our own aims and the Jewish future.

We are proud that we are living in an age when we can work in this way for our people, with this changed method, the inspiration for which we get from our own country and from Israel.

DR. EMIL MAURER (*Austria*): I cannot say that anti-Semitism is as strong in Austria now when there are about 10,000 Jews in Vienna, as when there were 200,000 before Hitler. As we understand how to get along with the Government, anti-Semitism is not overt and we manage to get for the Jews what is necessary; for example we obtained a statement from the Government that we would receive some indemnification.

Apart from the Nazis, communism is the greatest enemy of Jewry, but as far as the Jewish community in Vienna is concerned, the Communists are played out. We in Vienna, the city of important anti-Semites and also the city of Theodor Herzl, are obligated to work for the continuity of the Jewish people, in the spirit of Herzl. The Kibbutz Givat Haim is ours, we support it and want it to be the Vienna Kibbutz. We have come here to tell you that we remain faithful to the Jewish people and to the World Jewish Congress.

MR. ISRAEL YESHAYAHU (*Israel*): The Zionist movement, one of the first to be concerned with the destiny of the Jewish people, has always firmly believed that with the Ingathering of the Exiles, the return of Jews to their historic motherland, all the ills of the Jewish people will be cured. One can see in the continuation of the Ingathering of the Exiles, the most tried and tested remedy for all the problems of the Jewish people in our days.

It is not by chance that the unity of Jewish destiny found its strongest expression, which has no comparison in the history of the world, in the great help our people extends to Jewish groups in distress, that they may be enabled to go to Israel. Those who came to Israel, gave and continue to give the best of their wealth and strength in order to establish themselves and to establish the State of Israel. The fraternity of Jewish destiny is such that it sees anyone who obstructs Jews who want to go to Israel, as someone who tries to cut off part of a living body.

Although the Jews escaped from the Arab States in the Middle East, they were plundered and their possessions were confiscated. Only a handful of Jews were left in Arabia, Yemen, Iraq, Syria and Egypt and they suffer much until today and deserve the help of world Jewry. Thus we were privileged to see the Aliyah

of hundreds of thousands of Jews to Israel not only from the Arab lands but also from the lands of Asia and Africa. The majority of the Sephardic Jews are already to be found in Israel. If it were not for the artificial difficulties which stood in the way of the Jewish community in the countries of North Africa, of which Mr. Easterman also spoke, we would today have already behind us the complete and full redemption of the Jews of Asia and Africa.

But after the Jews left the Middle East States, the governments of these Arab States, intervening with other states, tried to prevent the emigration of Jews who wanted to go. When a World Jewish Congress meeting is in session, it is not possible not to revive the cry which comes from the depths of the heart, to cry to the ruler of the Soviet Union and its allies; and to the leaders of the lands in North Africa: Let my people go! This cry is, to our way of thinking, comparable to the aspiration for world peace. The Jewish people seeks peace with all its heart—peace amongst the nations is the elixir of life for the Jewish people.

Since Arab countries respect only the strong and the successful, to the degree that the State of Israel grows strong and to the degree that the number of Jews who emigrate in order to settle increases, her prestige will increase in the eyes of the Arabs. Therefore, everyone who helps to remove obstructions from the path of those going to Israel also increases the chances for peace between Israel and her neighbours.

It is clear to us that hundreds of years of being amongst different peoples of the world set their seal on each group of Jews to such an extent that we speak in 70 languages and there is not one language which binds us all. In Israel we overcome this stumbling block, first of all by the revival of the Hebrew language and its use by all the Jews. The State of Israel recently has taken important educational measures in order to deepen the Jewish consciousness in the hearts of her sons and citizens. She wants her sons bound mind and soul in a tie of love with the Jews who are dispersed, in every place where they reside. But also the dispersed Jewish people need to take steps on their part to deepen the Jewish consciousness, not only by means of the offer of material and moral help to Israel, but also through ever-growing spiritual and traditional bonds.

DR. HENDRIK VAN DAM (*Germany*): I speak for the Central Council of the Jews in Germany which is the central organization of the Jewish communities. On the Executive of the Central Council are people from Auschwitz and Belsen; they were in

forced labour camps and they fought against Germany, like members of the present delegation.

I believe the years since 1945 have proved that we are not opportunists. The Jews in Germany are anti-Fascist and they fight Fascism, which is contrary to the Jewish mentality, in Germany and everywhere else.

The Union of the Jewish Communities in the German Democratic Republic, that is, in East Germany, belongs formally to our Central Council. Regarding Russia, we should try to negotiate, to wait, because policies in Russia may change and big demonstrations make no sense.

There is anti-Semitism in Germany: it would be a miracle if there were none; it is a German political problem and less of a Jewish problem. We render no service to the Jewish cause if we exaggerate. We refuse to be used as instruments in the cold war and took no part when certain anti-Semitic acts were ascribed to Communists. We have warned against re-militarization. On the other hand it cannot be said that there is great danger in Germany at this moment, but it may change tomorrow to a difficult problem, a Jewish problem.

Our Jewish community is small like the Jewish communities in Holland, Belgium, and Austria and can exist only by maintaining ties with Jewish communities abroad and with Israel. Regardless of the attitude taken towards us by the Jewish communities of the world, we shall seek ties with Jewries abroad in the World Jewish Congress and outside it, for we wish to, and shall exist, as a Jewish community.

M. JACQUES ORFUS (*France*): No representatives have come from the People's Democracies, although invitations were sent, but we are happy to welcome the delegates who came as observers from Poland, since it is not possible, under the present regimes, to have more official representation. However, two years ago, at the unveiling of the Unknown Jewish Martyr in Paris, we were happy to see there delegations from the People's Democracies and from the Soviet Union.

We could have done without Mr. Smoliar's statement from this platform which we realize was made so that he could make use of it later. We met Mr. Smoliar at the Zionist Conference in Carlsbad in 1947. There, another delegate from Poland, not Mr. Smoliar, also read a statement given to him in printed form, which declared that the Jews are happy in new democratic Poland—there is no need to emigrate. But as soon as the gates were opened, Jews left. Mr. Smoliar dares to say that the Jews who left

were disappointed and that the Jewish community in Poland will help them to return.

We agree with Mr. Smoliar that the fate of peoples cannot be decided by brutal force. We look forward to the freedom of nations to be settled not by brutal force and to the time when this larger freedom will be tied up with the freedom of the Jewish people. Does Mr. Smoliar want to give us lectures about peace? Israel needs peace, the Jewish people needs peace—this was expounded in scores of speeches by Dr. Goldmann. The only danger to Israel is a third world war, said the former French Premier Guy Mollet.

There may be anti-Semitism in West Germany, but what about East Germany? We are happy that there is some Yiddish culture in Poland, but what about the Soviet Union, its great neighbour?

However, despite the faults and published sermons, we want the Polish observers to be among us and I am sure that this is the opinion of this Assembly. Do your part in carrying out the duties of the Jewish people and their rights and speak out against our enemies and Israel's enemies. It is some kind of satisfaction for us that the Folkshtimme (appearing in Poland) cannot be circulated in the Soviet Union, just as our Yiddish papers cannot.

Let me say to our friends from Poland, that although I am a member of the French delegation, I am a Polish Jew from Warsaw. I know full well what Warsaw once meant to Polish Jews. We wish to believe and hope that when the world is safe for peace, freedom and democracy and for the security of the Jewish people and the State of Israel, our World Jewish Congress Assembly will meet there, with Jewish representatives from the Soviet Union and all the People's Democracies participating.

RABBI MAX KIRSBLUM (*United States*): I am grateful to our President, Dr. Goldmann, who amongst other problems, touched upon the most painful of them all, the situation of our brothers in the Soviet Union and their forced separation from Klal Yisrael. Dr. Goldmann treated the problem tactfully, lucidly and candidly. If we had gathered here from the four corners of the world just to speak out clearly and vigorously on behalf of our brothers in Russia, it would have been worth our while.

Too many Jewish leaders have lately been asking what we can achieve against a great power, when stronger forces than we are, have been helpless. I wish to remind these sceptics that the Chofets Chayim said: 'Achieving is up to God, but doing is man's obligation.' We must not cease to talk on this subject until the

Soviet Union changes its attitude to our brothers there. This is certainly justified from the viewpoint of our historical responsibility. As Jews we are not troubled by the economic-political system in Russia. We are frightened because Jewish life is being actively discouraged by the Government while other religious and national minorities are being aided and encouraged. This is the Jewish situation, when there is more vigorous interest in Jewishness in Russia than there has been at any time since the Bolshevik Revolution.

There is something strange about the relation of the Soviet Government to rabbis and Jewish spiritual leaders from abroad. At the same time that Russia gives visas to bankers, industrialists and other capitalistic spokesmen, no permission has been given even for one rabbi or spiritual leader to visit Russia, as far as I know. Does this not mean that the Soviet Government is not anxious for clergymen from the outside world to view the religious life in Russia?

It is the main task of the World Jewish Congress to fight against everything that is bad for Jews. We are a universally minded people, for as our sages said, those problems which concern both the Jews and the world are the true problems. However, the solution of world problems does not automatically solve the Jewish problems, and we therefore must be grateful for the establishment of the State of Israel, which is the solution of the Jewish problem. I am sorry for what a certain delegate said about Polish Jews who emigrated to Israel, for we know that they are happy to be in the land of their ancestors.

Jewish education, which our leaders have lately discovered to be the key to our future, needs an atmosphere of tradition; it must be rooted in Torah. The World Jewish Congress can help by encouraging every Jewish father and mother to educate their children in the spirit of Judaism and we also have to call on Jewish leaders everywhere to assist educational institutions and religious Kehillot.

It is not the task of the World Jewish Congress to engage directly in the work of education, but it should support Jewish life, the foundation of which is Jewish education. It is our task not only to protect the Jew physically, but also to strengthen the soul and mind of the Jew against indifference and ignorance of Jewish values.

SIXTH SESSION

August 4, 1959 (Afternoon)

In the Chair: ME. PIERRE DREYFUS-SCHMIDT (*France*)

GENERAL DEBATE (*continued*)

DR. ABRAHAM MIBASHAN (*Argentina*): The allegation made by Mr. Smoliar that IKUF is brutally persecuted by Argentine Jewry must be repudiated. The IKUF has sometimes pursued policies which, in the opinion of many, were anti-Jewish. It has always been anti-Israel and it can therefore not play any role in Argentine Jewry, which has always been pro-Israel and has always worked together with world Jewry.

MR. ALFREDO ROSENZWEIG (*Dominican Republic*): The Dominican Republic has offered every facility for immigration and has pursued this policy ever since. During the war General Trujillo admitted some 4,000 Jews. From these facts it can be readily seen that there is no discrimination or prejudice in the Dominican Republic.

MR. MAURICE ORBACH (*Great Britain*): The original conception of this conference, to preserve the identity of the Jewish people, to demonstrate the close bond between the Diaspora and Israel as well as our awareness of the great world issues, demands a contribution from each of us, however inadequate.

The World Jewish Congress has worked in co-operation with the United Nations, and in my own field as General Secretary to the Trades Advisory Council of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, I was asked to prepare a paper on Employment Discrimination. In 1957 Dr. Riegner and I attended the sessions of the International Labour Office in Geneva when a convention decrying employment discrimination was adopted. Dr. Goldmann wisely said that the old type of discrimination was now secondary to our other main tasks. Of course it is, but the problem still exists.

We have other important tasks, but wherever a minority does not enjoy all the rights of the majority among which they live, wherever a Jew, Negro or Puerto Rican experiences prejudice, there is a job for us to do. As spiritual and moral sights are raised, the

problem of living together in harmony will be solved. Higher material and ethical standards must be accepted by legal or educational means, and thus peoples of other countries, other religions and other colours must be accepted too. This can be made a reality in your own country by approaching your Governments.

Let this conference move a step forward to removing intolerance and injustice, which is one of the historical tasks of the Jewish people.

DR. WOLFGANG VON WEISL (*Israel*): I am worried about the way in which this general debate is conducted. Our President gave an outline of his idea of the way of the World Jewish Congress for the future and Dr. Levenberg, among several others, reacted by stating his 'Ten Commandments of Jewish policy'. Since I believe that these Ten Commandments are a model of what our policy should *not* be, I shall discuss a few of them.

Dr. Goldmann said that the Congress can be neither fascist nor anti-fascist, and Dr. Levenberg disagrees; he says Jews can be only anti-fascist. First of all, a fascist must be defined and according to the communist definition, everyone in the Congress could be called fascist. However, in the more usual terminology of today, only Spain and Portugal are fascist, and surely no one would be in favour of embittering relations with these two countries. Another point: Dr. Levenberg would have the Congress stand everywhere against non-democratic views. How will this work out in practice? Should Congress enter into open warfare with totalitarian Russia or with Poland and China? Regarding the point that we should be friends with every friend of Israel—supposing this friend is regarded by some as undemocratic, shall we attack him?

By sober reckoning, we shall find that the only line which the Congress is able to follow, as in the past, is the defence of the Jewish rights and interests in general and of Israel's existence in particular. Nothing else is possible and practical.

My friend Katzenellenbogen, in the name of the Herut Delegation, spoke against Dr. Goldmann's policy of inviting the German Ambassador to this Conference and of hoisting the German colours among the other flags. From the point of view of a realistic policy which looks at the world as it is today, we cannot indulge in a purely negative and sentimental line of conduct. Dr. Goldmann was right in this case.

I disagree with Dr. Goldmann and still more, with the Polish delegate, Mr. Smoliar, regarding the Jewish fight against the cold war. It seems to me, Mr. Smoliar thinks that if Israel incited fewer Polish Jews to emigrate and if the Polish immigrants in Israel were

better treated, this would make the cold war less formidable. But I do not want to enter this discussion. I simply want to intimate there are more Polish Jews on the Central Committee of the Israeli Communist Party than on that of the Polish Communist Party and even more Jewish Communist members of the Israel Parliament than of the Polish one.

To return to the attitude of Dr. Goldmann towards the cold war: Shall we Jews demand from the giants of the world to make peace? We cannot mediate between Russia and America, between the Soviets and the Western world; let us therefore be realistic. We should stick to our business and promote hope, safety and security for our own people, for Israel. That is the task of our Congress as I see it.

DR. ALBERT VAJS (*Yugoslavia*): In the opinion of the Federation of Jewish Communities of Yugoslavia, the World Jewish Congress sincerely tried to find a solution to the problems with which it was faced. My community has no internal political problems and enjoys full equality with all other citizens and is free to collaborate with international Jewish organizations. Even financially, my community's problems are not serious thanks to the efforts of the Yugoslav Jews, the Government, and the Claims Conference. The Jews have the right to emigrate freely to Israel, anti-Semitism does not exist and relations with the authorities are good. The main problem is that of culture and education—how to attract the coming generation towards Judaism.

I can say that Israel is the greatest historic fact in Jewish history and the life of small Jewish communities would be unthinkable in the absence of Israel. The Federation is grateful to the World Jewish Congress and to the American Jewish Congress for the moral and material support of Yugoslavia's demand for the extradition of two Yugoslav war criminals who sought refuge in the United States.

MR. PERCY S. GOURGEY (*India*): Our President, Dr. Goldmann, said in his address that since anti-Semitism is no longer the problem for many Jewish communities, the sense of urgency is lost. This situation is certainly so with India and we shall have to watch it with the utmost attention. I consider that an important step was taken by the World Jewish Congress when at the Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations at Geneva, dealing with problems of discrimination, I was included in the delegation of the World Jewish Congress as an Asian.

We have heard much about the necessity of the World Jewish Congress pursuing a neutral policy between the two power blocks;

I should like rather to call this an independent policy. It is a question of deciding every issue on its merits. Like India, we cannot remain neutral or silent in any case where justice is denied. Let us remember the attitude taken by India in the Tibetan crisis, the Asian Hungary.

Let me urge that the World Jewish Congress strengthen its organizational links with India—possibly *via* our British Section—so that India may be world Jewry's window on the Asian world.

MR. LEO FINK (*Australia*): Dr. Goldmann in his Presidential Address has spoken of the dangers of assimilation and disintegration. In the Australian Jewish community, a community that enjoys complete freedom and lives in prosperity, this causes great concern. Freedom and prosperity for us Jews are erosive influences. It is not enough to talk about this matter; we need concrete remedies. This is the principal task of the World Jewish Congress and I feel that it is necessary to establish a committee which would study in a scientific manner which remedies ought to be proposed in order to combat these dangers.

In Australia, we are trying to take positive steps in this respect; our Executive represents the *entire* community; we have embarked upon a programme of immigration to strengthen our small community. Recently, more than 2,000 Jews from Hungary and 2,000 from Poland have come to our country. We are engaged in a programme of building community facilities to cater for the needs of our expanding community. Important Jewish personalities have visited us in the course of the last years, a factor of importance in the stimulation of Jewish consciousness, making us realize that we are not merely a far-off and isolated part of the Jewish People. I extend you our heartiest greetings.

ME. ANDRE BLUMEL (*France*): The World Jewish Congress is a body which makes Jewish policy, and consequently it is necessary for us to react in a political manner. How shall we react to the events which are taking place in the world today? I believe that we find ourselves at a turning point in modern history. We may well see, now that Mr. Khrushchev has decided to accept President Eisenhower's invitation, that the cold war is turning into a lukewarm peace. We must try to understand the Soviet system, and although each of us has the right to be an anti-communist as an individual, we must be on guard that Congress, as such, will not be turned into an anti-communist body. We must be very careful and circumspect in our handling of issues which cut across the East-West division.

Let us hope that in the near future the World Jewish Congress

will become really the *World Jewish Congress*, for just as the French Section of the World Jewish Congress represents only part of French Jewry, other countries are either also only partially represented, or not represented at all, but I am convinced that with perseverance we shall succeed.

MR. YITZHAK TABENKIN (*Israel*): I come as a representative of workers of every description who live in Israel and who build the Jewish State. I am optimistic about Israel's future and I take it as a good sign that Israel, after absorbing so many hundreds of thousands of immigrants in so short a time, has been able to maintain a balanced social structure. The prophecy that a healthy Jewish society can be built only in Israel has come true.

However, I am pessimistic about the Jews who live everywhere in prosperity and comparative freedom. I call on Jewish communities and their leaders to exercise more caution in dealing with those who are ready to arm the aggressors. It is equally dangerous to arm the Germans and the Arabs because both present a danger to peace and the Jewish people will be the first victim of any war. An armed Germany still remains a potential aggressor and no Jew should support the policy of arming Germany. The only country where Jews can feel secure is Israel and therefore Jews in their masses should come to settle in Israel which will be able to take many millions within the next decade.

DR. GEORG GUGGENHEIM (*Switzerland*): I bring you greetings from the Swiss Federation of Jewish Communities representing 24 congregations of all shades, consisting of 4,000 families or 12-14,000 Jews. In addition there are some 8-10,000 Jews living in Switzerland who do not belong to the organized community.

The main concerns of the Swiss Jewish Community are: (1) to educate Jewish youth and to keep it Jewish; (2) cultural work in which I am grateful for the assistance received from Dr. Steinberg and the World Jewish Congress Cultural Department; (3) defence against anti-Semitism and discrimination; and (4) care of refugees. In this last, we were assisted by the American Joint Distribution Committee. I am happy to report that recently the Swiss Government adopted a new policy which means that today refugees from racial persecution are recognized as political refugees which unfortunately was not the case when large numbers of Jews fled from Germany. I am also happy to inform you that Swiss Jewry is faithful to Israel and this attachment is manifested by the large contributions that are made to the Magbit and the Israel Bond Drive.

As citizens of Switzerland and as Jews we have a deep

understanding for the problem of cultural pluralism as it is called now; for centuries we called it Federalism. It is tantamount to the subject that was discussed here at the wonderful symposium last night. It is self-evident that we should demand cultural pluralism in order to preserve the tradition of our forefathers and to make life worth living. It is also self-evident that we should ask the State to protect this development.

DR. JOACHIM PRINZ (*United States*): I wish to thank Dr. Riegner, who was mainly responsible for the new pattern of proceedings of the World Jewish Congress meetings, for the wonderful experience of the symposium held last night. It was a refreshing experience to listen, in the course of our debate, to people who dealt with complex and complicated problems in a manner commensurate with the dignity of human beings and the depth of human thinking.

I do not argue with the representative of the Polish Delegation. I believe he approaches Jewish problems seriously but his seriousness and honesty are determined by the social and political environments in which he lives. Perhaps the time has come to say that our attempt during the last eleven years to understand each other has failed. Our cautious approach to the Jewish problems of the Eastern world has come to very little. We must continue to hope, but we are too mature to permit ourselves to live in a political fools' paradise. We have not criticized those governments which have given the Jewish communities an opportunity to use their own concept of freedom for the purpose of developing their cultural Jewish life. We have not criticized Poland or Hungary.

But the time has come to speak up against the Government of the Soviet Union and its relationship to the Jewish community there. We will submit in writing a summary of the disabilities suffered by the Soviet Jewish community both religiously and secularly. They are clearly authentic cases. We shall make them known to the world, not to malign the Government, but to let the world know the Jews of the Soviet Union are the victims of dual deprivation. Their claim to a Jewish identity, including the right to develop their own culture, is denied and they are the victims of discrimination solely because they are Jews. The Jews of the Soviet Union are isolated and defenceless. Their only hope is that world-wide public opinion will compel Soviet authorities to abandon their anti-Jewish policies, and to restore minimum opportunities for the preservation of Jewish cultural and religious identity. This is not a static world—Mr. Khrushchev's visit has been welcomed to the United States, and he has welcomed the

visit of the President of the United States to Russia, to take place shortly.

Some of us in America have expressed concern with the rise of anti-Semitism in Germany, and we have good reason to take this seriously. I heard Germans point out that there is discrimination against Jews and Negroes in the United States. But there is a slight difference between discrimination in the West Side Tennis Club and the gas chambers of Auschwitz. In order to investigate this matter, I went to Germany and had a very satisfactory talk with the President of the West German Republic and with the man who is to succeed him. But I was not satisfied with the reassuring declarations of these two honest men. I spoke to a great number of people in all walks of life in and out of government and these are my conclusions: German anti-Semitism is today no organized political force, but there is some dormant anti-Semitism, not merely a hangover from the Nazi period, but something for many centuries inherent in the German political tradition. I have been convinced that never before have so many Christian people been so aware of the problem and never has there been such real fear of the re-awakening of anti-Semitism and new Nazi forces. I am speaking of moral indemnification, another renaissance, which could make of Germany a democracy in the fullest sense of the word. Democracy is not merely a form of government but an attitude towards all human problems of society. There are a great many people who are moulders of public opinion; the press, radio, and television, the Protestant and Catholic clergy and the very articulate writers, who will watch this situation. The small German Jewish communities cannot be expected to do it alone. Education of a nation cannot be imposed by outsiders. German prosperity has outstripped the moral responsibility of the German people.

We, of the World Jewish Congress, are mindful and watchful of the tragic role of Germany and of the history of our people in anti-Semitic thought. I am aware of the apprehension of people about any dealings with Germany, their sensibilities about arms in the hands of the Germans. When this question is raised among ourselves I hope it will be debated with honesty and with respect for the feelings of the Jewish people. But the Communists have no moral right to debate it. When they raise the issue they ought to remember that in her struggle for independence, Israel is confronted with the Arab world, armed to the teeth by the Soviet Union and her satellites. We cannot understand why the Arab nations, who under the Mufti made common cause with Hitler, should not be recognized for what they are by the Jewish people

and the people of Israel. There should be more honesty and less hypocrisy in the discussion of this very complicated and touchy issue.

In conclusion, I wish to say that Jewish history can be understood only as a response to the catastrophes that have befallen our people. Jewish history in the last two and a half thousand years is a creative response to catastrophes in many countries throughout the world.

Although I do not believe in automatic survival, I cannot live as a Jew without the kind of hope that has caused our people to turn misery into joy and tragedy into triumph. I regard the Jews of the Soviet Union as the Marranos of the 20th Century. I hope for the return of the Marranos of the 20th Century to the fold of the Jewish people.

MR. ABRAM SCHWARTZ (*Uruguay*): This Assembly, in dealing with the problems of Jewish continuity and Jewish rights, has not paid sufficient attention to Latin America. Changes have recently taken place and although not manifest in anti-Semitic deeds, we know that an offensive was recently started by the United Arab Republic in Latin American countries. Its diplomatic representatives have substantial funds, they hold press conferences and free tickets are issued to journalists to visit Egypt. Recently some journalists were taken on a conducted tour through Arab refugee camps in Gaza and subsequently long articles creating anti-Jewish feeling appeared in the Uruguayan newspapers.

Another problem is this: the Latin American countries wonder how long we are going to exist as a Jewish group, as they are aware of the assimilation and dissolution of other ethnic groups. I therefore call upon this Assembly to pay attention to the Latin American countries which are not familiar with the Jewish question as are the old European countries.

M. BENJAMIN HELER (*Algeria*): I do not intend to tell you the story of Jewish life in Algeria. I simply want to make some declaration of principles in order to clarify things. Our friend Easterman defined what the position of certain Jewish communities should be in relation to other communities, especially when impetuous intervention carries with it the risk of aggravating the situation.

The position of our community has already been defined regarding the events since November 1954. In November 1956, the Algerian Jewish Committee of Social Studies published this summary: the Jewish community of Algeria does not constitute a political entity. Neither the Consistory, a strictly cultural organism,

the Rabbinate, nor any organization or Jewish leader can pretend to speak on behalf of a community which comprises a whole spectrum of opinions. The great majority of the Jews of Algeria have always affirmed that they are French but this has in no way affected the traditional friendship and the close ties which bind them to the Algerian Moslems. The Jews of Algeria have always made every effort to live in close co-operation with all ethnic and religious elements of the population. They ardently hope that a just solution will be found which will preserve the ties which unite them with France and with Algeria, where a prosperous Jewish community has lived for thousands of years; a solution which will also preserve the ties which unite them with Israel and which will permit them to reaffirm in liberty, dignity and equality their Judaism and the integrity of their Jewish personality.

MR. TOFIC NIGRI (*Brazil*): We live in a country where there is no racial discrimination and where the members of the most different religions live peacefully together.

The Union of Jewish Philanthropy (Magen David) of which I have the honour to be the President, supports a primary school, the only Sephardic school in Brazil, an integrated day-school, where the children are taught, in addition to the general curriculum, Hebrew, Jewish history and religion.

Because of the poverty of the Sephardim in Israel, parents are unable to pay for the secondary or higher education which would guarantee that their youth would take their place in the cultural and economic balance of Israel. It is therefore up to the World Jewish Congress in co-operation with the World Sephardic Federation, to contribute their share to the Sephardic masses in Israel and in the Diaspora in order to transform them into people able to work for, and contribute to, the greatness of the whole Jewish people and of the State of Israel.

MR. REUVEN ARZI (*Israel*): The Jewish people and the State of Israel are confronted with three chief tasks: to contribute to world peace and the co-existence of rival regimes; to strive for the co-existence of the State of Israel and the neighbouring Arab States; to unite Diaspora Jewry and Israel. Both the Jewish people and the State of Israel must try to relax cold war tensions. Germany is re-arming and is again a danger to world peace and the Jewish people must be sensitive to this militaristic tendency of the German people. We cannot forget the loss of one-third of our people. The World Jewish Congress should appeal to all the nations lest they forget what an armed Germany did to the world and to the Jewish people in particular, to avoid a repetition of the catastrophe.

Inasmuch as the Arab rulers threaten Israel, Israel must arm, but at the same time strive for peace with its neighbours. We must call on the nations both East and West to neutralize the Middle East and stop the arms race there. The Socialist countries can contribute to world peace by refusing to give arms to the rulers of Iraq and Egypt.

The two dangers which have always threatened the Jewish people are assimilation and physical destruction. Under Hitler we experienced the greatest physical destruction and now we are facing a galloping assimilation process in the East and West alike. We categorically reject the policy pursued in the Socialist countries of solving the Jewish problem through assimilation.

We are pleased to know that the small Yishuv in Poland has a national cultural life but it is incorrect to say that the Yishuv's social structure is sound. The Jewish proletariat can create a national and social renaissance of the Jewish people only if it enjoys national independence on a territorial basis and Borochoy's Marxist doctrine has been proved true.

The World Jewish Congress is faced with the problems of Jewish culture, of fighting anti-Semitism everywhere and of fighting for Aliyah for all who desire it and for the right of Jews everywhere to keep in touch with the whole of the Jewish people and its voluntary organizations.

We welcome the Polish delegation and hope that a way will be found for the representatives of other socialist countries to meet here. Good will and tolerance are called for on our part, too.

The spiritual tie with Israel has now become the most distinctive characteristic of Jewish nationality. It is therefore necessary to strengthen the mutual contact between Israel and the Jewish people.

MR. YECHIEL LESZCZ (*Uruguay*): Dr. Goldmann expressed his satisfaction over the presence of the Polish delegates but I, as a Polish Jew, declare they are not representative of Polish Jewry. If the Polish Government has deserved well of the Jewish people for permitting Jewish emigration, it is not because of these delegates but in spite of them.

Now another problem: Dr. Goldmann had the courage to admit that Jewry in the free world did not rise to the need when millions of men, women and children were burnt to death. I could prove that if American Jewry had understood our tragedy, hundreds of thousands of Jews could have been saved. Today we are confronted with the problem of millions of Jews in Russia. I propose that a special session be devoted to Russian Jewry. We

do not want war with Soviet Russia, but if we are hurt we have a right to cry out. Let our cry be heard in the four corners of the world.

MR. DAVID HIRSCH (*Argentina*): In spite of the fact that the Jews in Argentina are uneasy about the situation of Jews in other continents, there is no reason for uneasiness about our South American Yishuvim and the Argentine Yishuv in particular. Political regimes changed in recent years and even under a dictatorial administration, the Jews lived in peace. For the past three decades the Jews in Argentina have not only developed Jewish social institutions and Jewish life generally, but they also helped to develop the economy of the country.

We have here a representative from Poland, but there is no Jewish problem in Poland, which was not the case when three million Jews lived there. Now there is no need to be concerned about the question of the Polish Jews.

There is, however, a problem which should be taken up—peace for the State of Israel. I think the World Jewish Congress is more important in this respect than the Zionist Congress or the Government of Israel because the World Jewish Congress has the right to cry out that the Jewish people has a right to its own life in its own country.

The great democratic powers did nothing to save Jews when our people were being slaughtered. Has democratic America now done anything to stop the arming of the Arab countries? The Jewish future is Israel and the Argentine Jews look there.

M. SALOMON SCHWEIZER (*France*): I come from France, a country of about 300,000 Jews, which makes it numerically the most important Yishuv on the European continent today. We are convinced that the role of the World Jewish Congress is increasing in importance in our community and in other countries too. At the time the World Jewish Congress was founded our work was against discrimination and oppression; after the war, threatened with national extinction, our internal problems became most important. Hemshech, continuity, is what we must strive for. Some people mistakenly think that the mere existence of Israel guarantees the continued existence of all Yishuvim. The national Jewish will to continue living has always played the most important role in our history. Dangers lurk everywhere, the Jewish people is smaller now than 25 years ago and much more widely dispersed.

I want to mention particularly that it is the World Jewish Congress only which makes it possible for the 15 or 20 Jewish families, living in small provincial towns, to know that they are

Jewish and for their children to get some Jewish education. Reborn Israel and national activities in communities both large and small will guarantee the continued existence of the Jewish people.

DR. EMMANUEL BULZ (*Luxembourg*): I wish to convey greetings from the Jewish community of Leuxembourg and to express my satisfaction that such an Assembly as this exists. I come from one of the small communities, severely tried during the war, which like other small communities are encouraged by knowing that they are part of an indivisible totality. If there be discordant notes in the symphony of our meeting, we will have to attribute them to the divided world in which we live.

In view of the new tasks of the World Jewish Congress—a confrontation with the dangers of moral disintegration and indifference to loss of Jewish consciousness—I am astonished that only two sessions have been set aside for the cultural debate. Our fate is tied up with the struggle of the Jew for emancipation and also with our integration into the society in which we live. The more we advance in our emancipation, the more we lose touch with our Jewish existence. This is basic to the structure of modern society and we cannot march against history but we must mobilize all our strength to make the unique existence of the Jew a reality. I believe that cultural activity will contribute to cement the cohesion of the Jewish people and our small community is very much in need of this activity. We have brought to the world the message of the unity of God and the unity of man. So it should be given to our generation to restore first the unity of the Jewish people as an essential contribution toward the restoration of the unity of the world.

M. MOISE KELLER (*France*): This meeting of Jews from so many countries is bound to reinforce the feeling that only the unity of the Jewish people can safeguard our survival. It is in this spirit that I would like the Plenary Assembly to greet the delegates of the Jews of Poland. This Jewish community, once the largest but now one of the smallest, is nevertheless vigorous and strong in its will to live on as a people, to maintain its institutions, and in its Aliyah of 100,000. If the renaissance of the Jewish community of Poland is the work of the Polish Jews themselves, we must also recognise that without the support of the Polish Government, it would not have been possible. The Gomulka Government which gave the Jews the possibility to resolve their problems according to their own choice, entertains friendly relations with the State of Israel and also normal relations with the Arab States.

It is wrong to believe, Comrade Smoliar, that voices in this

Assembly could be raised against the Government of your country. It is also wrong to burden the Polish delegates with mistakes committed by other countries. The unity of the Jewish people is the number one condition of our survival. This is true, but it does not mean that we do not have the right to criticize certain practices.

At the national conference of the World Jewish Congress in Paris, a resolution was voted about the re-awakening of anti-Semitism in Germany. Other Jewish circles have expressed their disquiet on the re-armament of Germany. The Jewish people, indissolubly attached to peace, will do everything in their power to safeguard their unity and to fight for peace.

MR. YITZHAK KORN (*Israel*): In the few minutes allotted to me, I wish to discuss the problem of thousands of Jews from Rumania who live in Israel but who cannot become united with their families still in Rumania. We have been witnessing such tragedies for the last ten years—mothers and fathers who do not know if they will live to see their children. Some six weeks ago there was a strange demonstration. Some 200-300 older women, mothers whose children are in Bucharest, Jassy and Galatz, stood in front of a Jewish institution, with tears in their eyes, demanding. 'Bring us our children!' In August, 1958, the Rumanian Government permitted the reunion of some parents and children in Israel. However, today the process of reunion has again been interrupted. The representatives of the Rumanian Government have said that permitting such family reunions would be a humanitarian deed—let the World Jewish Congress Assembly therefore demand reunion on this basis.

Lately, there have been other difficulties in Rumania. Rabbi Portugal of Skouven, an old man in his seventies, who rescued several hundred children deserted in Christian homes, was arrested. About 120 former leaders of the Zionist movement (Assiray Zion), although released from prison, are not permitted to go to Israel, even though they are considered undesirable citizens in Rumania.

I therefore hold it to be the wish of the Congress that the Rumanian Government should not yield to Arab pressure, but follow humanitarian demands and open the gates for those who want to be united with their children. To the fathers and mothers who wait in Israel for their children, we say. We are with you.

SEVENTH SESSION

August 4, 1959 (Evening)

In the Chair: MR. ISRAEL M. SIEFF, *Chairman, European Executive World Jewish Congress.*

SYMPOSIUM: THE JEWISH STATE AND THE STATE OF ISRAEL

MR. ISRAEL SIEFF:

Those of us who are considering the post-war problems are aware that we face many crises in the world. Great changes in all spheres of man's activities are taking place. The period of the 19th century now seems an age when world affairs were relatively simple as compared with the magnitude and complexities of the political, social, economic and scientific problems of today. It may be said that man is lifting his tents and habitations from his traditional soil, and is beginning spiritually and intellectually a new exodus towards another historic ambit, another manner of existence. The modern age is coming to an end and our feet are already moving away from it. The new age is affecting Jewish life and communal group behaviour. The Jewish hope must be that the storms of the new age will not break the thread that runs straight and true to the original sources of our spirit and tradition which have given the Jew a special quality and character—a quality of facing the facts of life and a purposeful determination to fulfil what he regards as his destiny.

In this vision of the Jews' historic destiny is found the mortar which binds all Jews into an indivisible unity.

A great deal has been said and written, during the past year, about the relationship between the Jewish State and the Jewish People. Much that has been discussed has been irrelevant and sensational. Attitudes of mind on basic emotional matters are not the product of an overnight reaction. They have their roots or main motivations in thoughts and practices of the past. They express a combination very often of the rational and irrational. Such an espousal frequently leads to exaggeration of expression and distortion of ideas. We are all brought up to believe that the unity and indivisibility of the Jewish people is eternal, and that the Messianic urge binds us together as no material or physical bond could possibly do. To those of us who have been Zionists all our

lives, the establishment of the State of Israel was the fulfilment of one of the ideals which Zionism taught. We saw in it the future focal point for all Jewish thought and endeavour, both in Israel and the Diaspora. And, indeed, since 1948, so it has been. But, in a decade in Israel, a new Jew has been fashioned by environment, pioneering, incredible hazards and difficulties, as well as successes. We are looking at the Jew who, once again, builds with one hand and keeps the sword in the other to defend himself against the enemies who surround him. We in the Diaspora are ready for Israel to play a special role in our lives, for we see in the State a sort of guarantee of survival, physical, spiritual and cultural. Indeed, is it possible in our day to prepare any programme or plan of action unless, in some way or other, we bring Israel into relation with our projects? In all our communities, we look to Israel eventually to set for us the standards which will fit into the new freedom which the Jews have attained.

Still, it has to be admitted that in Israel, as well as in the Diaspora, certain groups have lost a spiritual contact; and that the special relationship of the old Yishuv with the Diaspora seems to be thinning out. Why is this? Who is responsible? Are our fears exaggerated? Are they merely the troubles or the birth pangs of a new nation? Are we in the Diaspora too complacent about the achievements of the State in the first decade of its existence? Are we thinking of Israel only in terms of contributions? Have we fallen down in understanding the pride of the Israelis as they contemplate their achievements?

These are questions which are asked, and for which replies are needed. Perhaps it is all much exaggerated.

But in the many discussions I have had with Israelis, I have been struck by the phenomenon that many of them are anxious to skip about two thousand years of our history, most of it in the ghetto. They see in the new State opportunities to justify their right to live independently in their own land and to validate their claim that their people are as good as, and—in the pioneering of new ideas and new ventures—better than many of the larger and longer established nations.

The Sabras I have spoken to often pass over Galuth history as something which should be forgotten. They want to escape from the shame and degradation of the oppressed and vilified Jew. They forget that, during the ghetto history, the Jew evolved traditional ideas on nature, the universe and God, and gave the Jewish culture the pattern seen today in Israel and the Diaspora. They refuse to suffer vicariously the agony of Hitler's evil against their kinsmen.

They do not want to live through the pain and anguish of the Jewish martyrdom. They now believe that they have shown that they possess an indomitable will to be masters of their fate and to bend their environment—and, indeed, the many obstacles which bar their progress—to their will and benefit.

What is interesting is that they believe that knowledge, skill and will-power are all that are needed for them to conquer. Herzl's dictum, 'If you wish it, it is no fairy tale' seems, unconsciously, to lie at the root of their strength and perseverance. The attempt to achieve the conquest of the Negev is a striking illustration of their will-power to meet and conquer nature in her worst mood. They believe that the Negev is vital to the existence of Israel. In the Sabra's vision, the Negev is not a desert and a waste, but a part of Israel which must enrich the State. He is convinced that the history of the Middle East has shown that deserts are the product of decadent and indolent people who have not cared for their land or their future, and so their rich and populous habitations have turned into arid wastes and desert lands.

On the other hand, when they have united together in their will and determination to transform the land into fields of corn and fruitful orchards, the deserts and wastes have been pushed back and a settled and self-supporting people have found life, sustenance and prosperity.

They clearly explained that they turned to their history prior to the Roman conquest and which, for them, re-started in 1948. The stigma of the ghetto was too much for them to bear and to ponder over; their fathers' fate was fruitless and led them nowhere. The exile was ended in 1948. There was no looking back. Those Jews who did not join the ingathering of the exiles were to be 'the forgotten people'. The remnant of Israel lived in Israel, and their Judaism took on a deeper Messianic character. Orthodoxy came from the Galuth. Messianic Judaism was the product of the free Israel, as of the prophets of old.

Is it surprising then that these pioneers, formed in heroic mould, should look with a feeling that perhaps borders on something very near contempt upon those who remain to enjoy the fleshpots of the free world outside? The young Israelis are swept forward by the flood of their idealism, and not only the Negev but other areas of Israel will be watered by it.

I have stressed this, and indeed, I may be accused of overstatement. I feel, however, that we Jews who live in the Diaspora must be aware of this attitude of mind, whether it is found in a few or in many. Whilst we may disagree with its nature, we are

compelled to take cognisance of it, if we are to avoid the disruption which will result.

It is not my present task to elaborate this problem. Yet we of the World Jewish Congress have the task of creating the bridge between Israel and the Diaspora on which a two-way traffic of spiritual, cultural, educational and material influences and trends can play both upon Israelis and Diaspora Jewry. If the theory is true that the Jewish people, wherever they live, is one and indivisible, then we must find means whereby a two-way traffic can inform, teach and equate the spiritual and moral qualities of each to the other, so that the Jewish people remains. We must be careful that Jewish statesmen and publicists, both in Israel and the Diaspora, do not add to the fuel which might burn the bridge uniting both sections of Israel.

We welcome to this discussion two distinguished Jews, one of whom is a proved Israeli statesman and of scholarly erudition, and the other a distinguished Jewish historian. It is for them to expound the problems, to define them and to make suggestions for their successful solution.

The first is Mr. Moshe Sharett, now one of the most distinguished Elder Statesmen in modern Jewish History; the first foreign Minister of the State of Israel, and the colleague and friend of Dr. Weizmann, who laid the political foundations in the inter-war years which made the State of Israel possible in our generation. I am privileged to consider myself his friend of many years. His views on the problem of the Jewish State and the Jewish people will help to guide us in our discussions, for he is both Israeli and a world Jewish scholar.

The second is Professor Salo Baron of New York. He is a man of scholarly achievement and reputation, and of great erudition. His horizon of knowledge stretches far and wide. Two of his books, "The Jewish Community—Its History and Structure to the American Revolution" and "Modern Nationalism and Religion", not to mention his great work, his *magnum opus*, "Social and Religious History of the Jews", show him to be one of the great authorities on the matter before us. As professor of Jewish history, literature and institutions, lecturing at Columbia University, large numbers of men and women have come under the influence of his mind and knowledge.

MR. MOSHE SHARETT, M.K., *Former Prime Minister of Israel*: It is my privilege and responsibility to discuss before this Assembly the question of the relationship between the State of Israel and the world-wide Jewish Dispersion. This relationship is

a unique phenomenon in the present-day world and in all past history. The fact must be stated boldly and, at the same time, in all humility—with the full realization both of its perfect legitimacy and of the complexity of the situations which it is liable to create. The uniqueness of this relationship is the direct and natural result, on the one hand, of the seemingly miraculous survival of the Jewish people over millennia, and, on the other hand, of the spectacular rise of independent Israel in our time. The case of the Jewish people in the annals of mankind is unique. Equally unprecedented and unparalleled is the way Israel emerged to sovereign statehood, as compared with the processes which enabled other peoples to attain their independence either recently or at any time in the past. The very nature of the two poles of the relationship indicates that its distinctiveness and vitality spring both from deep historical roots reaching to remote antiquity and from the operation in our time of compelling political and psychological forces.

Formulated from the tribune of the World Jewish Congress, these postulates, with all their implications, can be accepted as axiomatic. There is no need here to prove and rationalize afresh the elementary facts of Jewish consciousness—and, for that matter, of world consciousness concerning the Jews—which certain elements in Jewry, belonging to different and divergent schools of thought, still try so unprofitably and ingloriously to dispute. The first of these cardinal facts is that, irrespective of geographical location or state allegiance, the Jews constitute one people—a world-wide entity cutting across frontiers and braving distances. The second, that Israel is today the supreme unifying and galvanizing force of Jewish life everywhere.

These two facts are organically linked together. Theoretically, it is quite possible to conceive of a continued existence of the Jewish people, scattered throughout the world, even without there being a State of Israel to serve as its creative focus. Conversely, and again in abstract thinking, Israel can be imagined to exist without that sustenance, in means, manpower and moral support, which it constantly derives from the Diaspora. But in the light of past history and contemporary realities, such assumptions must be dismissed at idle speculation.

What is important to realize is that these historic concepts and their inherent unity—for all their divergence from the normal pattern of the life of nations—have by no means remained confined to the mere realm of consciousness. At a certain momentous turn in Jewish as well as in world history, they received an authoritative international expression—they were, in fact, accorded full and

formal international acknowledgement.

By the terms of the Palestine Mandate, which incorporated the Balfour Declaration and provided for its fulfilment, the international community, as organized at the time in the League of Nations, with the express approval of the United States which had remained outside the League, adopted a truly revolutionary dispensation concerning the status of the Jewish people and the future of the Land of Israel—Palestine, as it was then called. That dispensation comprised a whole series of fundamental provisions, each of which was most far-reaching.

First and foremost, the Jewish people as a world-wide entity was officially recognized and accorded a status in international law. The powers of the world recognized the existence of "the Jewish people"—"*le peuple juif*"—without awaiting the outcome of the internal dispute which at the time went on sporadically amongst the Jews themselves as to whether they were a people or merely a religious community. And they formally acknowledged its existence not as a mere ethnic unit or historic concept but as a body collectively possessed of certain political rights of dynamic nature, which it was entitled actively to exercise. Secondly, recognition was given to the historic connection between the Jewish people and Palestine as a basis for the people's rights in that country; the heritage of an ancient past was thus accepted as a determining factor for the policy of the future. Thirdly, by obvious implication and the resulting territorial settlement, the political identity of the country of Palestine was re-established; the country did indeed re-emerge as a distinct territorial and administrative unit, which it had ceased to be for centuries past, and, as a separate unit, it was singled out for the application of a new creative policy. Fourthly, that policy, the pivot of the revolutionary departure, was to be the reconstitution in Palestine of a Jewish National Home, acknowledged as a fundamental right of the Jewish people. Fifthly, this right was spelled out in more concrete terms by a provision which entitled Jews to settle in that country in unlimited numbers, provided only they did not do so at the expense of its existing inhabitants; it signified, in effect, the right of the Jews to constitute the majority of Palestine's population and turn it eventually into a Jewish State. Sixthly and lastly, the right was conferred on all Jews, irrespective of country of residence or state allegiance, to join together in forming a representative body of independent status, entitled to promote and uphold the stake of the Jewish people in the future of its National Home; thereby the right was recognized of Jews who were citizens of other lands to join an extraterritorial

organization, and, through its instrumentality, collectively and independently, to adopt attitudes and express views on the subject of Palestine' future which might conceivably differ from, and be even contrary to, those of their respective governments.

Altogether, it was an epoch-making dispensation which integrated the declared basic tenets of political Zionism into the framework of modern international law and completely revolutionized the international position of the Jewish people. One has to go back to the years 1917-1922—the former being the year of the initiation of this policy by Great Britain, and the latter the year of its formal ratification by the League of Nations—and from that point of departure look back on the previous state of affairs, in order fully to realize its tremendous import. Everlasting credit for this historic achievement is due to the inspiration, initiative and drive of Dr. Chaim Weizmann who, assisted by his colleagues, was its prime mover, as well as to the imaginative statesmanship of a group of British leaders, headed by David Lloyd George and consisting of James Balfour, Field Marshal Smuts and others.

Attention must here be drawn to one fundamental aspect of the new dispensation. Neither the Jewish people nor the country of Palestine was recognised per se, each on its own static merits and regardless of the other. On the contrary, it was only through its historic connection with the Land and for the purpose of rebuilding it that the People achieved its international recognition, just as it was only owing to its nexus with the People, and its assignment to serve as an area of its National Home, that the Land was retrieved from political oblivion and re-established as a separate entity.

About thirty years later Jewish statehood was achieved. It received international approval by the November, 1947 Resolution of the United Nations General Assembly, and in May, 1948 was proclaimed by the Jews themselves. It naturally transformed the entire international framework of the problem now under discussion. Yet the substance of the fundamental Mandatory provisions governing the relationship of the People to the Land must be regarded as having retained its full moral validity. By becoming a State, the Land of Israel has not ceased to be National Home of the Jewish people, and the connection so expressed continues to form part of international realities. At first glance, the fact that this connection has been invested with an international imprimatur need not be assigned special prominence. The attachment of the People to the Land is thousands of years older than its eventual political legitimization. Indeed, had it not

been a paramount fact of Jewish history and of contemporary Jewish life—had it not resulted in the creation of new realities in the Land, born of the will of the Jewish people and arresting universal attention—it would never have been sanctioned by the outer world. Even without being recognized it would have persisted, gathering momentum as the movement of the Return was growing apace and bursting on to the scene of history with all its powerful impact immediately upon the proclamation of Israel's statehood. Yet, on deeper probing, it is highly questionable whether the movement and its concrete achievements would ever have grown to their actual dimensions without the encouragement derived from the world's recognition and the operation of the instruments of action forged as its result. In any case, the fact that the historic tie was once solemnly legalized in the international sense is of outstanding significance. A shield, if available, should never be discarded.

The vigour of the attachment of the Diaspora to Israel—and, correspondingly, the intensity of the gravitation of Israel towards the Diaspora—have their sources in the innermost, interlocked dynamics of Jewish life throughout the world and of the processes of Israel's growth and struggle.

What are the basic aspects of this reciprocal magnetic pull, exercising so powerful an influence both at the centre and along the perimeter and generating at both ends deep satisfaction and crucial responsibilities?

The first aspect of the relationship which it is proposed to examine can be expressed by the question: to whom does Israel belong?

From the standpoints of constitutional law and formal sovereignty Israel does not differ from any normal state in the world. It claims and exacts political loyalty only from its own nationals. Its sovereignty is vested in its own constitutional organs. Only its citizens, through their elected representatives, can make its laws and they alone are called upon to obey them. Yet despite these elementary similarities Israel is different from all other States in one essential respect. In a deep historic sense—which however, is most tangibly expressed in long-term policy as well as in day-to-day life—Israel is a common possession of the entire Jewish people, that is, of all the Jews of the world. Every Jew can claim a share in it. Millions of Jews feel emotionally identified with it. This extraordinary state of things has its compelling reasons. Israel is a product of Jewish history—its creation reflects the historic experience of the entire people—of the miracle of its survival, of

its memories and longings, of its age-long misery and enduring faith, of its awakened determination and its demonstrated capacity for action. It is true that only a fraction of the people—at the outset an insignificantly small one—accomplished the stupendous task of laying the foundations for, and eventually erecting, the structure of statehood. Yet these few acted as emissaries of the many—they drew their inspiration from the heritage of all Jews, and their tenacity and drive were those of a vanguard which realizes that the outcome of its battle will decide the issue for all the host behind. Moreover, practically at every phase of the process the pioneers were assisted from the rear. At the hour of decision in the political struggle for statehood, practically all Jewish circles and organizations, and individual Jews in leading positions, from most countries of the world and of different schools of thought, rallied spontaneously to achieve the historic break-through. In the War of Independence, of which Israel's own youth naturally bore the brunt, nearly all free Jewish communities had their direct share. The massive support mobilized by the Jewries of the Dispersion of Israel's titanic effort in coping with mass immigration is a chapter in itself.

Since those heroic days, Israel's continuing ordeals and accomplishments, its brilliant military exploits and the serious political disabilities it still has to endure, above all its isolated territorial position and the implacable hostility of its neighbours, have aroused alternately the joy and the anguish of the Jewish world. This emotional closeness to Israel, this tense following of its fortunes, is a novel and most salient feature of contemporary Jewish life—its central axis, its living inner content, the major theme of its public manifestations. A visit to Israel is the highlight in the life career of countless Jews. A function celebrating the establishment of Israel, or one at which its message is authoritatively delivered, is a central event in the life of a Jewish community, long remembered thereafter. The living legend of new Israel illuminates the education of masses of Jewish children. The presence in the capitals of so many countries of Israel's diplomatic missions is a source of thrill to the individual Jew and a mark of new dignity to his community. In effect, the existence and activities of these concrete embodiments of independent Israel have become an integral part of Jewish life everywhere.

No such centralizing pivot as that represented by Israel had operated within the Jewish people since the Roman Destruction. No such lever for collective action had existed in their midst before. Religion was a most powerful unifying agent but it operated

essentially as a static force. It prescribed and presented an elaborate way of life. It gave infinite moral solace. It afforded deep spiritual experiences and created opportunities for keen intellectual exercise. It kept up the morale of the people and made them emotionally resistant to adversity. Yet it issued no call for action. It helped the people put up with misery and hold out under inhuman conditions. It did not dare to attempt a drastic change. But here there was a cause, an eminently constructive one, a powerful challenge to Jewish idealism and practical devotion, a revelation of what Jews can do if they dare to take time by the forelock and proceed to shape the conditions of their life with their own hands and in their own spirit. What a soul-shaking change-over, what sublime exultation, what a victory over fate!

So it is not merely that the Jews admire Israel for its bravery and creative record. It is not just a matter of moral duty that they feel towards it. Israel is simply *theirs*—their own, most cherished, priceless possession. They can, as Jews, no longer imagine their own existence without it. Association with Israel is their uplifting, ennobling experience. If it came to grief, the light would go out of their lives. Therefore, it must not come to grief. Therefore, they must do everything they can—materially, politically, whatever and whichever way is practical, effective and legitimate—to preserve it, to strengthen it. The knowledge that they had done this, their supreme duty, would then be their highest reward.

Some may argue that this frame of mind, though widespread, is not everywhere shared by the great mass of the Jews of the Diaspora—or is not much in evidence in some of its smaller communities. The justification of such scepticism is open to serious doubt. But if that is the case, then to perpetuate this feeling among those who share it, to widen its scope, to implant it ever deeper in the hearts of the young generation, is the task facing all thinking Jews in the lands of the Dispersion. This is their duty not only for Israel's sake but for the sake of the asset it represents in the general scheme of Jewish life.

A corresponding challenge confronts Israel. It is that it keeps faith with the vision which has brought it into being. If the coming generations of Israelis lose the sense of their country's mission in Jewish history, if they develop an introverted and self-contained mentality—such as much produce an estrangement between them and their Diaspora contemporaries and might eventually result in a complete psychological separation—then not only would they be guilty of betraying a sacred trust, but they would unwittingly be sowing the seed of Israel's own undoing. The

cultivation of Diaspora-mindedness must be an active concern of Israel's political and educational leadership. Only by continuing to serve the cause of the Jewish people as a whole can Israel ensure its own future.

Complications and misunderstandings may arise. Israel's primary concern, must, of course, be its own survival. Since it represents a position of such vital importance for the entire Jewish world, this must, indeed, be the overriding preoccupation of all Jews devoted to Israel. Considerations of Israel's security must therefore rank first not only with its own government and people, but with Jews everywhere in their relation to Israel. There may be other live interests of Israel for which the same priority must be claimed in the thoughts of Diaspora Jewries. But barring such issues of permanent importance, concerning which Israel is entitled to expect the Diaspora unquestioningly to accept its authority in determining its interests and policy, there is a wide margin of points at issue regarding which the Diaspora as a whole, or certain sections of it in particular cases, are in their turn entitled to expect special consideration on Israel's part for their own interests, viewpoints and susceptibilities. Israel can never divest itself of the responsibility entailed by the fact that many of its actions affect Jews everywhere. There can naturally be no hard and fast rule delimiting the areas where such consideration is or is not due, or defining the extent to which it is due. Moreover, on many controversial issues within Jewry at large opinions clash in Israel and the Diaspora alike. The decision as to the mode of behaviour in each particular case must perforce be left to the judgment of those in a position to decide. In any case, there can be no question of any limitations being imposed on Israel's sovereign right to determine its policy or course of action, but sensitivity to Diaspora feelings and the demonstration of such sensitivity are imperative.

On the other hand, a word of caution would here seem to be appropriate against attempts to press too far the idea of partnership between Israel and the Diaspora in the organizational sense. There are functions of Jewish life and items in the programme of Jewish public activity which lie outside the plane of Israel affairs, such as most of the tasks assumed by the World Jewish Congress in defending Jewish rights in the Diaspora and tendering advice and assistance to communities in need thereof. Inasmuch as there are points of contact between the respective spheres of activity of the Israel Government and the World Jewish Congress, co-ordination is perfectly feasible. What is eminently desirable in this regard is the prevention of unnecessary overlapping. Yet, in any case, the

World Jewish Congress remains an independent body, bearing complete and sole responsibility for its work and programme. A far more important problem of co-ordination arises in the case of the World Zionist Organization, which is discharging most vital functions in Israel itself, as well as, in conjunction with it, in the Diaspora. Here a system of closest possible collaboration is indispensable. But there are fields of activity which are the exclusive prerogative of the State of Israel. In these, its Government, as an organ of national sovereignty, must be free to act entirely on its own. What has already been said about the need to maintain contacts and take into account Diaspora viewpoints may apply here, but the setting up of any machinery or organizational framework for obligatory regular consultation or co-ordination in such matters between a government and any outside body is liable to be fraught with complications.

Rather than carry in this respect to undue lengths the concept of partnership between Israel and the Diaspora as between two distinct and separate entities, of which each moves, as it were, within its own closed orbit, it would seem preferable to foster the idea of an over-all Jewish unity, which centres around the State of Israel and takes fully into account the conditions and necessities of Jewish life in the Diaspora. Within the broad framework and in the true spirit of such comprehensive unity Israel must be relied upon to exercise its prerogatives of statehood in a manner best conducive to the integral common good of the Jewish people.

As the second aspect of the Israel-Diaspora relationship it is proposed to set the problem of Israel's concern and responsibility as regards the precarious position of certain Jewish minorities in various parts of the world. It must be, and it is indeed, a cardinal line of Israel's foreign policy not to interfere in the internal affairs of Jewish communities abroad or in the normal relations between the Jewish citizens of various States and their respective governments. Yet the Government of Israel cannot, quite naturally, remain indifferent in the face of deliberate anti-Jewish discrimination, of the denial to Jews of elementary opportunities of communal and cultural life, of the setting up of impenetrable barriers between them and the State of Israel and of the prohibition of their emigration to Israel. Concern for the freedom of contract with the Jewish communities of the Diaspora and insistence on the freedom of settlement in Israel of Jews hailing from anywhere in the world—are among the basic elements of Israel's foreign policy. As regards the ban on emigration alone, some of the Arab countries, recently emancipated, are cases in point. As for the whole gamut of disa-

bilities enumerated, most Communist countries are here under reference.

Israel would wish for nothing better than to remain neutral in regard to international rivalries which are none of its direct concern. But it cannot stay neutral in the face of a menace to the most vital interests of the Jewish people and to the very survival of a Jewish community. Israel scrupulously refrains from any interference in the internal affairs of any State and is anxious to maintain friendly relations with all States regardless of their internal regimes. Yet it cannot help differentiating between regimes which ensure the freedom of Jewish life and those which suppress it. Under free democracy, as a by-product of the fundamental liberties of the individual and the group, which it accords and protects, the Jews are free to organize and express themselves, to foster their religious and cultural values, to maintain contacts with other Jewish communities, to visit and settle in Israel. Democracy does not specifically provide for all these freedoms, but it makes their exercise possible and secure. Above all, though it does not provide, it does afford full scope, for the maintenance of the world unity of the Jewish people. It is up to the Communist regimes, primarily to the Soviet Union, to prove that they can also offer similar freedoms and enable the cultivation of the same values. But the facts show that they are unwilling to do so. It goes without question that Israel cannot expect any regime to adapt itself to the needs of free Jewish life. Yet it cannot but condemn those manifestations of a regime which result in a progressive asphyxiation of Jewish life, in the paralysis and atomization of the Jewish community, and in its complete severance from the main body of the Jewish people—and from Israel. Over the barriers so ruthlessly erected it salutes those masses of Jews who yearn to make Israel their home and who in their cruel isolation and dreary solitude give a living testimony of their Jewish loyalty, of the astonishing vitality and tenacity of their people, of its irrepressible substance, of its ultimate invincibility.

As a third aspect of the problem it is proposed to take up the contemporary significance for the Jews of the world, political and social, of Israel's existence and performance as a State.

On the face of it, Israel is still a mere fraction of the Jewish people. Even after the catastrophic diminution of the total number of Jews by the European holocaust, on the one hand, and the striking increase of Israel's population on the other hand, Israel accounts only for just over 16 per cent. of the present total. Absolute figures have their absolute merit, and the fact that the

number of Jews already settled in Israel is nearing the two-million mark is in itself a tremendous achievement and a revolutionary transformation. But what primarily matters about the Jews of Israel is not only how many they are, but what they represent, in status and in structure.

Here it may be pointed out that the difference between the Jewish people and other peoples who have diasporas of sorts does not merely lie in the fact that in the case of the latter the majority and not the minority live in their mother-country, whereas with the Jews the reverse is the case. The outstanding difference is in the organic compactness of the Jewish people, which, emotionally, welds the mother-country called Israel and the far-flung and far more numerous Diaspora into one whole. The inner cohesion, the sense of "belonging", the feeling of interdependence, in brief the consciousness of identity, are all quite different in the case of the Jewish people, including Israel and in relation to it, than with any other nation more or less similarly placed. The difference is not one of degree but of kind.

So first, Israel is a State. The full measure of the swift transition of Jewish destiny in our time from tragedy to triumph is encompassed in that simple and elementary statement of fact. Through the emergence of independent Israel the Jewish people as a whole has ceased to be a "stateless person". Not the citizenship of the Jewish State, of course, but the dignity of Jewish statehood has been conferred upon all Jews. They themselves and the world around them are now aware that they are sons and daughters of a people capable of leading a State-life, with all its privileges and responsibilities, and, above all, with all its prestige.

Secondly, Israel is the only self-contained all-Jewish society in the world. The fact that it comprises an Arab minority on a footing of complete civic and cultural equality does not in the least detract from its overwhelmingly and emphatically Jewish character. Being only a fraction of the Jewish people—the composition of which, historically speaking, is purely accidental—it is rightly taken as the people's random sample. Consequently, whatever may have been given to the people of Israel to carry through in terms of political statesmanship, economic development, linguistic and cultural creativity, scientific progress and military valour, redounds to the credit of all Jews, for it is supposed to bring forth the capacity latent in them all. Israel's record of creating a State, and of defending and running it against all odds, reveals what Jews as Jews can accomplish by a collective self-reliant effort, if given a chance to pull together and work out their salvation by themselves.

Conversely, Israel's weaknesses, shortcomings and failures are liable in the same manner to be debited to the account of the entire people.

This being so, there arises yet another element of mutual responsibility. It is up to Jews everywhere, for the sake of their own standing, to do everything in their power to help Israel to make good and avert her possible default. Similarly, it is incumbent upon Israel—in this respect, too—to develop and maintain a high degree of Diaspora-awareness by always bearing in mind the implications of what it does or fails to do as far as the Jewish people as a whole is concerned. The reflection of Israel's record on the good name of the Jewish people should never cease to be a vital consideration in its counsels.

The fourth aspect of the relationship arises from Israel's role in resolving the problem—or should one not rather say removing the curse, the scourge and the shame?—of Jewish homelessness. It is an achievement ranking equal, if not actually superior, to the attainment of independence. The change of destiny under this aspect can again be formulated in elementary terms. The question 'Whither?'—that is, where are we to go or where are our brothers to go?—which had overhung the scene of Jewish history with such inexorable fatefulness for so many centuries on end, was with one stroke relegated to the limbo of time. It was completely struck off the Jewish—or, for that matter, the international—agenda. It has simply vanished. Just as the Jewish people as a whole has ceased to be a "stateless person" with no country of its own, so it is no longer a "displaced person" with nowhere to go. The supreme purpose of the struggle for Jewish territorial sovereignty was thereby decisively vindicated. That purpose was to gain power over the one country in the world the Jews could call their own in order to make the rescue of Jews by admission into it depend on no other factor than the will of the Jewish people itself. The tragic lesson of the Mandatory experience was indelibly engraved on the minds of our generation in Israel. Based originally on the full recognition of the Jewish right of entry, the Mandate eventually degenerated into its denial—just at the time when its free exercise became a matter of life and death. The reason of this historic *volte face* was that though the right had been internationally acknowledged, its application was entrusted to a Foreign Power which had its own interests to uphold—interests which in its estimation were overriding, when they clashed with the implementation of the right. It became evident that Jewish rescue could only be assured by becoming a normal function of Jewish national sovereignty. In

that sense, Israel's independence primarily signified that the keys to the country's gates had come into Jewish hands, and the War of Liberation was fought to save those keys from falling into the hands of the Arabs. It is they, the keys, that were the crux of the battle, and it is they that became the prize of victory. Bloodstained, they were placed at the feet of the Jewish people, for to the Jewish people they belonged and on its behalf and for its sake were they to be wielded by Israel redeemed. The most elementary facility enjoyed by any normal nation was at last ours: mastery over a strip of territory, enabling us to admit into it any and all of our brothers who ever reach our shores. That momentous acquisition received its legislative expression in the Law of the Return and found its concrete realization in that tremendous influx of Jews who have flocked to Israel since the opening of the gates, wave after wave, from North, South, East and West. It, too, represents a joint asset and entails a joint responsibility for Israel and the entire Diaspora.

For it not only spells deliverance, present and future, to all Jews who are, or ever will be, driven by want, fear, persecution or spiritual enslavement to seek homes in Israel. While this is its main achievement, its beneficent effects go far beyond. About two-thirds of the Jewish people outside Israel dwell at present in their respective countries in freedom and safety. They have never been indifferent to the lot of less fortunately situated Jewish communities. But what were they in a position to do in the past—what did they in fact do—whenever a Jewish community, stricken by a sudden or by a long maturing adversity, found itself uprooted or had to uproot itself and seek shelter elsewhere? All they were capable of doing was to appeal, to solicit, to protest. Their best chance was to see their fellow-Jews become objects of international compassion which, to say the least, seldom proved effective. They have now been spared, and, let us all hope, spared for ever, the humiliation and torment of helplessness which it seemed their immutable fate to endure. Rescue by admission is now automatically guaranteed—by the very existence of Israel and by its declared policy, which itself conceives, and so do all Jews, as an irrevocable pledge, solemnly assumed by it towards the Jewish people for all its future history.

There is still acute concern about the fate of those Jews who, though extremely anxious to leave their countries of residence and settle in Israel, are prevented from so doing. There is still need for concerted Jewish action for the removal of bans on exit. The World Jewish Congress has indeed exerted its efforts in this

direction as regards certain countries with remarkable perseverance. It did so by way of upholding what it regards as an elementary Jewish right, in fact an elementary human right. But the moment a Jew is free to go, and unless in his wisdom he happens to have other preferences, his country of destination is obvious—and open.

The responsibility of the Diaspora is to vindicate and sustain this yet newly-won Jewish freedom of admission by providing for the integration of Jews admitted. The role played by the free Jewish communities of the Dispersion in helping Israel to cope with the tidal wave of immigration which followed immediately upon the proclamation of independence, was decisive. That effort is still continuing, as immigration and the process of its absorption keep on. It does not always come up to expectations. It sometimes fails to manifest an adequate sense of alertness to an emergency. But its permanence and scale baffle all comparison with anything ever achieved or even attempted in the history of voluntary financial endeavours anywhere in the world. This is no ordinary philanthropy. This is no casual financial aid to a country in need. This is a world-wide demonstration of a scattered people's response to a call to united action issuing from within itself—an epic of its resolve to rebuild its ancient far-off country and save its threatened sons. It is an elemental expression of that sense of purpose with which Israel had endowed Jewish life, one of the results of which is the direct association of Diaspora Jews in the process of the Land's revival and the People's rehabilitation. The consciousness of possession with which the Dispersion is beginning to be seized with regard to the Land of Israel in the spiritual sense, acquires in this context as well-nigh physical significance. For it is the entire Jewish people which, by its united will and common effort, continually transforms the country's appearance, creates its new soil resources, repaints its landscapes, uncovers its hidden treasures, lays the groundwork for harnessing soil, water, mineral wealth, science, capital, labour and enterprise to the creation of its new life.

Apart from Jewry's collective contributions to central funds, the investment of private Jewish capital creates for its sponsors more selective and direct stakes in Israel's economy. There are grounds for hope that this form of individual participation in the process of Israel's development and in the enjoyment of the assets created thereby is now on the threshold of a new phase of expansion.

Taking it all in all, it is a task undertaken for decades to come, in the course of which the people may again and again be called

upon to shoulder increased burdens and cope with sharper emergencies.

The responsibilities resulting for Israel from the mission it has assumed are self-evident. Much as the Diaspora may contribute, its own people will always have to carry a major share of the burden. To grumble and fret against this yoke is to dispute Israel's imperative need of gathering strength. It is the paramount long-term interest of the Israel nation to make sure that the country can sustain a much larger population at a higher level of productivity; that its total defensive potentialities are increased and at the same time the incidence of defence per unit of its financial and manpower resources is reduced; that the base of its cultural progress is widened; and that, by solidifying its position, it hastens the advent of peace with its neighbours.

What has been included in this survey as the fifth aspect of the problem is the direct and persistent appeal which Israel, by its very existence and progress and by its lure of new life, mutely but very eloquently addresses to each individual Jew to make it a permanent home for himself and his children.

That Israel and the Diaspora are by no means two stationary units is patent. Israel is constantly growing by immigrations at the Diaspora's expense. But the Diaspora also seems to be growing by natural increase. Whole sections of the Diaspora have in the last decade or so been completely transplanted to Israel. The communities of Yemen and Iraq on the one hand and of Bulgaria on the other are notable cases in point. Other communities are in the course of such transplantation and yet others await their turn on the doorstep of history. In some countries the exodus process was interrupted by the powers that be, but it may not be unduly sanguine to expect that the forces which had originally impelled the process will eventually prevail against wanton administrative obstruction. In all these cases, powerful larger-scale compulsions, both material and spiritual, have been in operation to produce the phenomenon of a mass exodus or at least to generate the urge towards it.

But trends of this character, sweeping and affecting multitudes, by no means exhaust the problem, nor do they account for all the streams of migration to Israel which are actually in progress. From England and other countries of Western Europe, from America North and South, and more particularly from the southern part of that hemisphere, from South Africa, Australia and New Zealand, immigrants have been arriving and settling, singly and in small groups, driven by no misery, pursued by no menace, oppressed by

no denial of freedom, but drawn by the prospect of a full Jewish life and moved by the desire to take part in what is probably the greatest human adventure of our time—the twin-resurrection of their people and country. The contribution of the settlers of this category to the morale and constructive capacity of Israel in all walks of life has been invaluable, and the question posed is whether and to what extent this movement will continue—whether it will dwindle or grow apace.

Experience has proved—and elementary psychological understanding ought to have demonstrated from the outset—the utter futility of any attempt to stimulate emigration to Israel from these countries by shaming or frightening their Jews into it.

Something has been done and a great deal more could be done to facilitate and encourage that highly idealistic and eminently valuable immigration by creating more propitious conditions for its absorption and removing obstacles which stand in its way. This again is a case of joint responsibility of the authorities in Israel and of Jewish and Zionist organizations in the Diaspora. As far as the latter are concerned, it should become a matter of pride for them to be able to point to an increasing annual rate of migrants to Israel from each given country. Such drive would not only be assisting Israel and helping in many cases people of distinct worth to gratify their hearts' desire, but it would quicken the tempo of Jewish life in those corners of the Diaspora by intensifying their ties with Israel.

Yet primarily and fundamentally it is a question of a spontaneous urge to carry one's Jewishness to its ultimate conclusions by becoming a citizen of Israel. It is a matter of a free, individual decision for which the person concerned alone can and should be responsible. And that decision will not stand the test of earnestness if it is motivated only by the belief that one is needed in Israel for the performance of some useful service. The service capable of being rendered may be of an extremely high degree of usefulness, and the person rendering it would then deserve every blessing, but unless the conviction is formed that one needs Israel more than one is needed by it—that one cannot be happy and contented save in Israel—the determination will be lacking to make good in the new country by overcoming all obstacles, material and psychological, which inevitably stand in the way of any newcomer, and the eventual result may be a perfectly gratuitous personal failure and crisis. But the appeal of the country and nation in the making, the fascination of the chance to heal the schism in the soul of the Jew and make his personality whole, also the lure of his liberation

from the indignities of social ostracism still practised in many a free country against the Jews, will continue to beset Jewish life in what one might call countries of contentment. Many a Jew, particularly of the younger generation, will find himself searching his heart in trying to answer questions such as these: if the essence of his spiritual self is his Jewishness—should this, indeed, be the case—why should he forego the chance of giving it full scope and expression; if the creative processes unfolding in Israel evoke in him so much admiration and enthusiasm, why should he deny himself the privilege of direct participation in them; if Israel reborn is indeed the greatest romance of Jewish history, possibly the most thrilling romance of our time, why should he not be one of its heroes? These queries can well become the subject of organized, purposive education. But even if not deliberately pressed, they will continue to be posed by the force of circumstances and by the call of Jewish consciousness.

The sixth and last aspect of the problem—last in the present analysis—bears on the relationship between Israel and the Diaspora as between two entities of Jewish life developing side by side, particularly in the cultural and spiritual sphere.

The controversy as to whether the Dispersion is an eternal or a transient phenomenon of Jewish history may well, at any rate in the context of this survey, be considered as purely academic and, to all practical purposes, futile. Even the most ardent prophet of the complete ultimate liquidation of the Diaspora will agree that the process must stretch over an incalculable span of time, the termination point of which is not only lost in the mists of a distant and unpredictable future but is constantly further removed as the Diaspora increases in numbers—as we all must hope it will continue to do. On the other hand, even the firmest believer in the eternity of the Dispersion must agree that in the circumstances of the modern world, the continuation of Jewish life is no longer an automatic process, but calls for a conscious effort on the part of each individual Jew and must be the subject of concerted action by every Jewish collectivity. Yet practical policy in human affairs can in any case be conceived and applied only for a period of the foreseeable future. Hence both schools of thought can unite on the assumption of what may be termed the relative permanence of the Diaspora and, on that basis, adopt a programme of action which would aim at the dual purpose of perpetuating and enriching Jewish life in its global scope and of sponsoring Israel's progress and fostering its live contacts with the Dispersion.

Such a programme can spread over a wide field. Elements of

it already represent increasingly salient features of contemporary Jewish life. Some of them are developing spontaneously, while others are the result of institutional action. They include—not Jewishness. A far greater momentum is imperative on the part of the communities to extend and intensify Jewish education, drawing for inspiration and guidance upon Israel and discovering creative educational forces in their own ranks. The study of the Jewish lore of old and of Israel of today must be joined together to complement each other.

A movement must arise in the Diaspora, particularly among young parents, to introduce into their homes religious rites and practices, primarily those connected with the celebration of the Sabbath and the Festivals, without which it is impossible to create in the family that kind of spiritual climate which alone can kindle in children's hearts love and veneration for their people's heritage, worship of its heroes, attachment to its way of life. The saga of the rise of Israel as the universal focus of Jewish pride, the story of Israel's struggles and achievements, as the object of Jewish dedication, must find their due place in this renascent Jewish family culture. And the one imperious historic challenge which is today facing the Jewish Dispersion is the universal re-adoption of the Hebrew language at least as the second cultural language of the Jewish communities in all countries and as the common medium which would unite them with one another and all of them with Israel. It would be easy to dismiss this proposition with the sceptical smile. A forecast may be ventured that this challenge will, as years pass, keep recurring with increasing emphasis, and that it will come to be taken more and more seriously.

For let it not be forgotten that a man's pride is his people, his ethnic origin, and a people's pride is its language, its only historic qualification to be considered a cultured race. Jewish consciousness must remain a fairly slender growth as long as it is not rooted in the knowledge of the only vehicle by which the creative genius of the Jewish people has scaled the heights of mighty and magnificent expression, in prophecy and prayer, in song and story, in poetry and prose, ancient and modern. The revival of Hebrew in Israel is one of the most daring cultural necessities in the order of their importance—the Jewish tourist movement to Israel, which is beginning to assume mass proportions; visits to Israel by Jewish leaders, rabbis, scientists, authors, artists, etc.; rallies in Israel of Jewish scholars, thinkers and members of liberal professions; courses and seminars in Israel for teachers, students, youth instructors, campaign leaders, and Zionist workers

coming from various parts of the Diaspora; the establishment in Israel of Institutes of Rabbinical Colleges in the United States; conventions held in Israel by national and international Jewish organizations—not only those concerned solely or primarily with Israel, like the World Zionist Congress or the Convention of the American United Jewish Appeal, but congresses of international organizations of a general Jewish character, like the World Agudath Israel, the B'nai B'rith, and the World Union of Jewish Youth; the continuous, though not rapid enough, progress of integral Jewish-Hebrew education in the Diaspora, through the widening of the network of Hebrew day schools, the introduction of the teaching of Hebrew into State schools and universities, the establishment of Hebrew teachers' seminars, the organization of Hebrew speaking circles, summer schools, camps, etc.; visits to Diaspora centres by prominent Israelis from various walks of life not only for the purpose of financial campaigning, which in itself can have an important educative effect, but for special lecture tours on Israel's life and culture; the tours abroad of Israel's theatres, dancers' groups, the Philharmonic Orchestra; and last but not least, the manifold liaison and educational activities carried on within the Jewish communities by Israel embassies and consulates abroad.

All these are beginnings—some are still gropings—which call for extension and systematization. The Diaspora is yet at the threshold of a new epoch—one in which it is challenged to embark upon an all-round effort for the preservation and development of achievements of man. In our own annals it stands out as an epoch-making conquest, of the same order of magnitude as the conversion of the Yishuv into a working community in the bodily sense of the term, the re-establishment of Jewish statehood and the Messianic sweep of the ingathering of the exiles. Is it conceivable that this miracle of cultural rebirth should not decisively affect the spiritual physiognomy of the Diaspora? If it is given to Israel to realize its most cherished ambition of generating a new efflorescence of literature and art, thought and science, of what value will it be to Jews of the Dispersion if they default in their elementary duty to learn and master the language of their people?

Whether indeed it will be vouchsafed to Israel to radiate such inspiration is one of the mysteries of the future. It is true that if the performance of the Jewish State in all fields of national action and human endeavour is summed up, it may well claim to have fulfilled considerably more than it had ever promised and therefore to be now promising far more than it had already fulfilled. Yet spiritual creativity is a gift of heaven which is either bestowed or

withheld. It cannot be evoked at will. It is one of those enigmatic issues about which it is more profitable to ponder what immediate action they entail rather than what their ultimate fulfilment is likely to be.

As to action, one notable contribution made by the Diaspora to the promotion of Israel's creative opportunities takes the form of the voluntary coming forward of Jewish scientists, technicians, social workers, economists and artists, to place their knowledge and experience at Israel's disposal. This spontaneous mobilization of Jewish talent and know-how on behalf of Israel represents an investment of unique value for its future. Systematic action is called for to tap further such resources and render their assistance more and more effective.

The tasks facing Israel in this entire context are most exacting—particularly if all its other burdens and liabilities are fully taken into account. Education must be improved and extended, talents stimulated, science and arts promoted, the value of the things of the spirit enhanced. Above all it is imperative to deepen Jewish consciousness, to sharpen the sense of association and identity with the Jewish people, to inculcate in the hearts of the young—apart from national pride, veneration of the glorious past and hero-worship—the love of the Jew of today, the Jew of every day, the Jew as he is and wherever he might be.

On this last score exaggerated apprehensions are often expressed and rash verdicts pronounced. The record of our young generation is replete with shining manifestations of its elemental sense of kinship with the ordinary Diaspora Jew. Among them, to mention just a few telling instances, are the epic of Haapalah—the so-called illegal immigration—in which our boys moved tens of thousands of their fellow-Jews from the slaughterhouse and shambles of Europe to the Land of Israel; the glorious exploits of the soldiers of the Jewish Brigade Group and of other Palestinian-Jewish units in World War II in rescuing, collecting, assisting and organizing Jewish survivors, strengthening their spirit and sending them to the Land; the sublime heroism of our parachutists who, dropped behind enemy lines, risked and laid down their lives for the sake of their doomed brothers; the dedicated spirit of scores of young Israelis who went to serve at the Geulim Camp of Yemenite Jews in Aden during the Magic Carpet operation; the zeal and enthusiasm with which hundreds of the younger generation of our settlers volunteered to assist and guide the newcomers by living and working with them; the services performed by the Defence Army of Israel in the new zones of

settlement; the deep emotion and exultation felt by groups of our youth when it was given to them to bring the message of Israel to Soviet Jews at festivals and sporting contests. All these and many other events bear a most convincing testimony to the live connection with Diaspora, athrob in the hearts of our youth. Yet for all that, a spiritual value cannot be relied upon to preserve itself automatically, without a conscious effort being applied to its cultivation. Hence no opportunity should be neglected to deepen that feeling and make it a cardinal feature of the mentality and consciousness of the young Israelis.

All these are thoughts and suggestions which probably do not provide an adequate answer to the searching questions raised by the subject. A new situation has arisen in Jewish history which calls for a many-sided reappraisal and re-orientation. As compared with the tasks ahead—called upon as we are to resist the inroads of assimilation, burdened with deep anxiety for the fate of the millions completely cut off from us, faced with the tremendous opportunities unfolding in so many countries for the free self-assertion of the Jewish personality—what has so far been attempted, both in Israel and in the Diaspora, outlines the challenge more than it records the achievement. Yet a generation which has witnessed so dramatic a swing of the pendulum of history from doom to deliverance is entitled to draw courage from the events of the past in bracing itself for the ordeals of the future.

PROFESSOR SALO W. BARON, *Professor of Jewish History Literature and Institutions Director, Center of Israeli Studies, New York*:

Ever since the rise of the State of Israel, in fact already during the preceding quarter century of the Mandate, the most important single question confronting the Jewish people has been the evolving relationship between the new Jewish commonwealth and the countries of the dispersion. Many answers have been expounded, many wishes expressed, many hopes formulated. But the span of time was much too short to furnish even tentative replies to this all-embracing problem. One must go back to the long stretches of Jewish history and view in particular the somewhat parallel experiences of the Second Jewish Commonwealth and its relations with the Jews outside its boundaries in order to detect at least a few guideposts for the future. Not that history has always proved to be a reliable *magistra vitae*. A wit once contended that the only thing we can reliably learn from history is that no generation has ever learned from history. However, in the ever hazardous crystal gazing into the future, the experiences of the past may at

least offer certain lessons which, if intelligently and moderately employed, might help us steer clear of dangerous pitfalls in reasoning and action.

I

Our entire historic experience bears out the assumption that both the State of Israel and the Jewish dispersion are here to stay. For any foreseeable future we have to reckon with the continuation of the perennial dialogue between a far-flung Diaspora and ever-growing Jewish home country.

The record of twenty-five hundred years indicates that there always were Jewish communities living outside of Palestine, many of them persisting in the same geographic area. There have been Jews in Egypt even before the first fall of Jerusalem and the great prophet Jeremiah could join established communities there. In fact, one could even make a case for a certain continuity of Jewish settlement in the Nile Valley from the days of Jacob and Joseph. Egyptian papyri speak of Hebrews in the twelfth and eleventh centuries B.C.E., which is long after the latest date any scholar has yet suggested for the Exodus. There still are Jews in Egypt today despite Nasser and the Sinai campaign. In between, as far as we can judge, Jews, in larger or smaller numbers were always to be found in that country. Even the tragic Jewish uprising against Emperor Trajan early in the second century when, nurtured by their messianic dreams, the Jewish "rebels" took upon themselves the impossible task of fighting simultaneously the Roman rulers and the anti-Roman majority of the native population did not uproot completely the Jewish settlements. Nor did the so-called expulsion of the Jews from Alexandria in 415, a wholly illegal mob action inspired by a religious fanatic, really end the historic career of that renowned Jewish community. Two centuries later upon entering Alexandria the Arab conquerors allegedly found there a thriving community of some 40,000 Jews. With all their ups and downs, and occasional intolerant outbursts by such Muslim rulers as the Fatimid Al-Hakim, the Jews maintained themselves in Egypt's great emporia of culture and trade.

Similarly uninterrupted has been the Jewish settlement in Iraq, formerly Babylonia. That great country, which during the Babylonian Exile, and again after the second fall of Jerusalem for nearly a millennium, maintained the intellectual hegemony over the entire Jewish people, has never been without Jews since the days of Nebuchadnezzar; possibly since the fall of Samaria a century and a half earlier. It was a Palestinian sage, Simon b. Laqish, who

gratefully acknowledged the overwhelming role played in Jewish history by Babylonian Jewry by declaring that the Torah had been in danger of being forgotten in the Holy Land when Ezra came from Babylonia and restored it; it was again in danger of being forgotten when Hillel came from Babylonia and restored it; for the third time this danger had been averted by Rabbi Hiyya's arrival from the Euphrates Valley. Nor must we ever forget that the very leadership of Palestinian Jewry, namely the ancient *nesi'im* or patriarchs, acknowledged the geneological superiority of their Babylonian counterparts, the exilarchs, as genuine descendants in the male line from King David. If the exilarchic claim to direct continuity in leadership from the last exiled kings of Judah is correct, as it well may be, then this dynasty exercising dominion over the Jews of Palestine and Babylonia from the tenth century B.C.E. to the thirteenth century C.E. and beyond, probably is the longest lived dynasty in history. Should Jews for the first time completely disappear from Iraq today, this would be the result of certain international developments rather than that of either an inner Jewish weakness or of the onslaught of the usual type of anti-Semitism.

This is not to deny the incontrovertible historic fact that Jew-baiting has put an end to many Jewish settlements, including some of the great centres of Jewish life. Our generation which has witnessed the wholesale destruction of Jewish communities requires no further corroboration. Viewing the dismal record of Jewish life in Europe, many observers were led to the conclusion that anti-Semitism *must* put an end to Jewish life everywhere sooner or later. Of course, no careful student of history would venture to predict that a repetition of the Nazi experience would be impossible anywhere else. But for that very reason he would also be wary of predicting that such a repetition *must* necessarily occur. One could make an equally good case for contending that the concatenation of historic circumstances which had brought a Hitler to power (extreme German nationalism, confrontation with a world communist movement, rancour over a defeat in a world war of a formerly leading militaristic nation, the effects of a world-wide economic crisis resulting in a permanently 'superfluous generation', the uninterrupted heritage of a medieval Jew-hatred, and so forth) was quite unique and might never be repeated. In any case, the same factors which have enabled the Jews of Egypt or Babylonia to maintain their historic continuity also under monotheistic Islam may well help the Jewish dispersion to weather the storms of the new secularist age in predominantly Christian lands as well.

Certainly, wherever the democratic ideal is dominant the recognition that any violent onslaught on Jews is but a preliminary phase of an attack on the very democratic foundations of society has been gaining ground and has helped marshal all progressive forces on the side of equality.

Democracy, to be sure, has created another danger to Jewish survival by raising the spectre of total assimilation. No longer do Jews have to give up their faith in order to be wholly integrated into the majority nations. Hence their complete loss of identity has become a real possibility. I, for one, do not consider this danger imminent for any foreseeable future. In fact, the record of the entire Jewish experience under both Christendom and Islam indicates that, while individual Jews still can more or less easily disappear, a mass of Jewry could not obliterate its existence even if it took the fatal step of conversion to the dominant faiths. This happened, to mention merely the best-known historical instances, to the forced converts in Spain under the Christian Visigoths and the Muslim Almchades, the *Neofiti* of southern Italy, the *Marranos* of fifteenth-century Spain and Portugal, and the *Donmeh* of seventeenth-century Turkey. Four and a quarter centuries after the so-called expulsion of Jews from Portugal in 1496 thousands of their descendants were found in the mountain areas around Oporto to have maintained dim recollections of their Jewish ancestry. Many of them actually reverted to Judaism in the 1920s and even joined the Zionist movement.

In the light of that historic experience I have often allowed myself graphically to describe the situation through a paradox, which bears repetition: if, for the sake of argument, all the twelve million Jews now living in the world, or the ten million residing outside Israel, should go through a plebiscite and unanimously—imagine, unanimity among Jews!—adopt a resolution that they wished to disappear as Jews, they would be unable to do so. Let us assume that, in order to achieve this aim, they would do, what in the case of individuals still leads to their or their descendants' ultimate disappearance even in our more racially and less religiously conscious age, namely, join the dominant religion of their environment, become Catholics in Catholic countries, Protestants in Protestant countries, Muslim in Muslim lands, and so forth. Even then they would fail to achieve their objective. Before very long we could witness the emergence of a new Catholic-Hebrew Church, a Protestant-Hebrew Church, a Greek-Hebrew Church, even a Muslim-Hebrew Mosque, and the Jewish question would return to what it had been except that the Jewish heritage, the only element

making survival worthwhile, would have been completely destroyed. In short, the Jewish dispersion would continue for a long time even if all Jews decided to abandon Judaism. But fortunately this is a far-fetched paradox designed to underscore the permanent *Schicksalsgemeinschaft* of the Jewish people. In reality the vast majority of Jews, young and old, wish to preserve their identity forever and are trying in the best way they know, to instil in their children a pride in their millennial heritage.

I realize, of course, that I am thus speaking against the negation of the Galut. Let me assure you, that confirmed Zionist that I have been since my adolescence, I have never been convinced of the validity of this argument, and am still less convinced of it today. Two years ago I had the honour of addressing the Ideological Conference in Jerusalem convoked for the purpose of rethinking the basic ingredients of Zionist ideology. On that occasion I had pointed out that the doctrine of the speedy disappearance of the Jewish dispersion as a result of anti-Semitic attacks not only fails to carry conviction with the majority of younger Jews today, but that it has largely lost its propagandistic value. At one time when East and Central European Jewry lived under anti-Semitic regimes and among indubitably hostile neighbours, such a line was apt to persuade some young Jews to join the Halutz movement and proceed to Palestine, although here, too, the local political and economic pressures of a Czarist or a Grabski regime, a Hitlerite movement, and the like, were far more decisive. That line was also very helpful in persuading Western Jews, not themselves immediately threatened by anti-Semitic attacks, to strain their economic and political resources to help other Jews to settle in the homeland. Today the only areas where such an argumentation might still prove effective are the countries behind the Iron Curtain or the Arab lands. But for obvious reasons Zionists are not allowed to develop it there. Elsewhere it can only serve to undermine the confidence in the future of the Jewish masses and the perseverance of their leaders in building those permanent cultural and religious values and institutions which might counteract the overwhelming assimilatory forces.

There certainly is little chance of persuading, let us say, young American Jews to leave their country and settle in Israel because of the fear that a new Hitler might come to the United States and do to them what Adolf had done to their European coreligionists. Even the few who might take such a threat seriously would consider its imminence far less immediate than, for example, the danger of hydrogen bombs falling upon their cities. Although the

conviction that a Third World War might break out at any time had dominated many minds in America and western Europe, especially in periods of acute tension between East and West, I have yet to find the evidence of any mass movement of threatened populations out of the great metropolitan areas and industrial centres to remote rural districts where they would be relatively safe from falling bombs and spreading radiation.

The spectre of annihilation ought, therefore, now to be replaced by the genuine appeal exercised upon all thinking Jews by the growingly satisfying, beautiful life in Israel resurrected. There will be young Jews, I hope in ever increasing numbers, who will leave their respective abodes not because of any fear of sudden attack, but rather in search of the greater intellectual freedom and the opportunity for spiritual self-realization as Jews in the creative atmosphere of free Israel.

II

Israel, too, is here to stay. Arab nationalists, to be sure, cherish the hope that, like the first Jewish commonwealth, the Third Commonwealth will be destroyed, sooner or later. They cite, in particular, the example of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem which, begun by a similar idealistic move from the West, gradually petered out and, after about two centuries of existence, disappeared from the scene. This calculation is obviously misleading. The first two Jewish commonwealths were destroyed by the overwhelming powers of Babylonia and Rome, respectively. Here were world forces at work which far transcended the local developments. In fact, Babylonia was soon replaced by Achaemenid Persia, whose area was larger than even that of the Roman Empire at its grandeur. For Rome, Palestine was but a minor strip of land which it incorporated in its larger province of Syria. Only the heroism of the Jewish fighters for independence made this large Empire strain its resources to a much greater extent than it had in conquering much larger nations. The outcome was hardly ever subject to doubt. Palestine, like the rest of the Near East, became a part of that world empire just as did the whole Mediterranean area and western Europe. The Arab nations by themselves even if they succeeded in uniting their various states from the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf—at this time a rather remote possibility—would not represent that overwhelming power, resistance against which would be foredoomed in advance.

More comparable is the Latin Kingdom's example: it finally yielded to the persevering attacks of its Muslim neighbours.

However, here, too, the differences exceed the similarities. Most significantly, the Latin conquerors remained a permanent minority in the country. Despite their barbarous methods of conquest and the wholesale destruction of life at their first entry, they represented a thin layer of Christian knights and their servants surrounded by a sea of Muslim fellaheen and urbanites. This numerical preponderance of the conquered populations would have brought about the speedy assimilation of the conquering minority, were it not for the recurrent influx of Crusaders in the following generations. But this influx was not only sporadic but, with the religious enthusiasm giving way more and more to imperialistic power politics, it diminished to a trickle and could not stem the tide of internal amalgamation and external pressures. In contrast thereto the overwhelming majority of Israel's population is Jewish and whatever assimilatory forces exist in the country run in the direction of the absorption of the Arab minority. Yet, the Latin Kingdom's example should nevertheless help underscore the intimate relationships between Israel and the Diaspora and Israel's continued needs for many decades to come to strengthen its human and economic resources by additions from the dispersion.

So long as the deadlock between East and West continues, and it may continue for many decades to come, there is much room left for the national sovereignty of each small state including Israel. For a time it looked as if national sovereignty which had dominated world history during the last two or three centuries were drawing to an end. The Second World War had demonstrated how little even powerful smaller countries were in the absolute control of their destiny, that is, were truly sovereign. During the war a large country like Holland, at that time still in possession of a vast colonial empire, was overrun by the German armies within four days. Other important countries like Denmark or Czechoslovakia surrendered without firing a shot. Today, too, the sovereign decisions of even great powers can be nullified by the *fiat* of the two giants, the United States and the U.S.S.R., acting in unison. A classic example is the Suez campaign. Nonetheless, the area of disagreement between these two giants being so wide, there is much room left for manoeuvring by the smaller states, which gives them, at least, some opportunity for sovereign self-determination. In any case, Israel is in no different a position than comparable other nations. In crucial moments, nevertheless, the country has received considerable support from world Jewry, and is likely to receive and need such support also in some future crises. Even in the unlikely case that, owing to the tremendous technological

advances of an atomic and space age, there should soon grow up a real world community which would pave the way for a genuine world government, the integration of the State of Israel into some such world system would in fact not diminish its self-determination but probably, by removing the urgency of its external menace, strengthen its constructive forces. At the same time, such a world community would help remove the obstacles in the co-operation of Israel with the Jewries behind the Iron Curtain and thus re-establish an even fuller unity of the Jewish people.

III

Such unity and co-operation is, indeed, the most urgent postulate of our age. Historic experience has shown that lack of such co-operation engendered tragic consequences for both the Second Jewish Commonwealth and the dispersion. If my estimates are at all correct, more than two-thirds of world Jewry resided outside the boundaries of that Commonwealth in an area extending from Iran to Italy and beyond long before the second fall of Jerusalem. And yet that vast Diaspora took little part in shaping the destinies of either world Jewry or the mother country. Jewish history was made almost exclusively in Palestine. Even Egypt, which had in its Alexandrian community a Jewish centre numerically larger than that of Jerusalem and which maintained cultural and economic relations with the Graeco-Roman civilization of great significance for world history, contributed but little to the making of Jewish history of that period. The very Temple of Onias, where a legitimate Palestinian priesthood performed a sacrificial worship quite similar to that in Jerusalem, had but a minor impact upon even Egyptian Jewish history. If one peruses the contemporary sources, such as the writings of the greatest Egyptian Jew, Philo Judaeus, one notices very little of that impact. The Egyptian Jewish pilgrim, like that of any other country, seems to have bypassed his own sanctuary on his way to Jerusalem. If in that messianically surcharged era, Egyptian and other Diaspora Jews often reacted violently to the Roman oppression of their Palestinian brethren and in the aftermath of Palestinian upheavals staged revolts of their own under Vespasian and Trajan, these desperate moves only underscored the utter historic dependence of these Jewries on developments in the homeland.

This fact that the Diaspora delegated to Palestinian Jewry alone the entire responsibility for making Jewish history was catastrophic to both and should serve as a serious warning for our own time. It was quite natural for the Palestinian leadership,

primarily Sadducean in allegiance, to react to the innumerable difficulties besetting it by short-range policies and palliative actions. Under Roman domination, especially, there was the marked contrast within the imperial policy which favoured Jews outside of Palestine and severely oppressed them in their home country. Roman oppression and fiscal exploitation were universal. But following the old dictum of *divide et impera*, the Roman administrators found it to their advantage to protect the rights of the Jewish minorities, which sometimes approximated full equality with the other inhabitants of the respective provinces or cities, as a counterpoise to the irridentist movements of the local majorities. In Palestine, on the other hand, where Jews were in the majority, the Roman procurators usually sided with the "Greek" minority, the better to exploit the country as a whole. Occasionally, to be sure, the Palestinian rulers made use of their political influence to protect the rights of the dispersed Jews, as when Herod sent his trusted non-Jewish adviser, Nicolaus of Damascus, to plead the cause of certain Jewish communities in Asia Minor. On the other hand, in his well-known letter to Emperor Gaius Caligula, Agrippa I tried to stave off an intolerable interference of the Roman administration in the religious affairs of the Holy Land by pointing out that an attack on Jerusalem, a 'metropolis' of many far-flung 'colonies', would embroil the Empire in a struggle with that vast dispersion. Yet in moments of crisis the responsible Sadducean leaders and still more the irresponsible Zealots were prone to forget the effects of their actions on Jewry abroad and concerned themselves only with their own immediate needs and interests. Perhaps only the Pharisaic leaders remained cognizant of these intimate ties between the various segments of their people. But in their generally nonpolitical and overwhelmingly spiritual approach to life, they were often induced to acts against their own state, which almost bore the earmarks of high treason.

Such pitfalls must be avoided today. Of course, there is a difference between the present wholly sovereign Third Commonwealth facing Jewries incorporated into other sovereign states and a commonwealth which shared with the overwhelming majority of Diaspora Jewry the same political allegiance to the Roman Empire. Nonetheless the Jewish people finds itself nowadays, too, confronted at times by inner dichotomies between what are purported to be the interests of the countries of their settlement and those of Israel. No greater inner conflict need be cited than that which faced British Jewry during the declining years of the

Mandate when the Haganah and the Irgun fought the British army in Palestine and when British imperial interests allegedly demanded the closing of the gate to Jewish immigration and ultimately the handing over of the country to the Arabs. Of course, the British Jews could legitimately argue that the policies of their government were mistaken even from the standpoint of Britain's national interests. Similarly, the policies of the American government during the Suez crisis could be rejected by pro-Israeli or pro-British Americans on the basis of their interpretation of the genuine national interests of the United States. However, such inner conflicts, which are by no means limited to Jews, will always require considerable tact and mutual understanding. They merely point up the need of an active and intelligent partnership between Israel and the dispersion in the shaping of the Jewish people's historic destiny during the present era.

A co-operation of this kind is indicated in the case of Jews even more than between other ethnic groups and the countries inhabited by their kinsmen in speech and culture. Many Italians, Germans, or Irish in the United States have a deep emotional attachment to Italy, Germany and the Irish Free State. The Irish Diaspora is particularly akin to the Jewish dispersion, inasmuch as it easily outnumbers the population of Ireland itself. It was estimated, at one time, that more Irish served in the civil service in London alone than lived altogether in the Irish capital of Dublin. Yet the connection between Israel and the rest of Jewry has even deeper and more enduring historic and religious roots. I recall that in my youth many objectors to the Zionist ideal were forever stressing its 'utopian' character. There has been no historic precedent, they argued, for colonies to be successfully founded without the aid of a mother country, without the support of its organized military forces, fiscal powers, and other resources. If the British, the Dutch, or the French had founded colonies in the Western Hemisphere, the colonists had over them the protective shield of their respective home countries. How could the Jews dream, these opponents contended, of reversing the course of history and making dispersed 'colonies' create for themselves a mother country? To which the Zionists, including myself, could only respond by showing that the Jews had already proved to be an exception from that historic norm in ancient times, and could become such an exception again. Just as the refugees from Egyptian Goshen could under the leadership of Moses and Joshua establish their First Commonwealth, and just as the Babylonian exiles through their own manpower, economic resources and political

connections were able to erect the Second Commonwealth, so would the dispersion of the twentieth century create its mother country by its own 'bootstraps'. We have seen that it has accomplished just that.

In this way, the Diaspora is simultaneously Israel's daughter and Israel's mother. As a daughter it is going to receive much of its spiritual sustenance from that mainspring of Jewish creativity on the soil of its forefathers. As a mother it has been, and will be, lavishing of its own bounty and tenderness on this cherished offspring. Throughout their historic career Jews have been accustomed to set extraordinary precedents. This exceptional nexus between worldwide Jewish settlements and the newly created Jewish state will, in many ways, likewise, run counter to the widely excepted nationalist preconceptions and ordinary norms. I realize that there are problems of national sovereignty involved on both sides. However, life is richer than all theories and, just as in the perennial query as to whether Jews are a nationality, a race, or merely a religion, the reality is much stronger than any theoretical preconceptions. If any accepted terminology and juridical doctrine does not fit any existing historic reality, we must change our terminology and adjust our doctrine rather than endeavour to improve upon that reality through some futile verbal shackles. This may require much concentrated effort, on the part of all thinking Jews and their non-Jewish friends. It will certainly cause much questioning by Jew-baiters and extreme nationalists everywhere. But such a precedent-setting reformulation of ideologies borrowed from other areas of public life, once it meets deeply understood and incontrovertible needs, must ultimately prevail.

More, I believe that we have entered a stage in the history of human society where national sovereignty, the Shibboleth of all politically-minded persons during the last two or three centuries, is going to play less and less of a role in human affairs. In many earlier periods of history there existed a moral order above the national state. In most periods of antiquity and the Middle Ages the king was *under* some moral restraints, be it of religion, custom, or natural law. Only in modern times did the doctrine of national sovereignty assume its extreme form, it became absolute. Sovereignty thus understood meant that the state was the absolute source of power, and that it recognized nothing superior unto itself. The logical consequence of this doctrine, we learned to our chagrin, has been the near-deification of the state in Fascism and Nazism, whose totalitarianism was but national sovereignty run amuck. Mankind has learned through bitter experience that it cannot get

along without some superior moral order towering above these national rivalries. If the idea of a United Nations means anything at all—I am speaking of the underlying idea, not of the present reality which is still in its early formative stages—it means that all member states must voluntarily give up certain parts of their untrammelled self-determination and forego parts of their extreme sovereignty for the sake of mutual co-operation and peace. In our atomic and space age the undisciplined operation of national sovereignties could only mean mass suicide of our civilization.

Therefore, if the Jewish people, courageously meeting its newly evolving need for permanent exchange and consultation between the leaders of the sovereign State of Israel and those of the dispersion living under different national sovereignties, should, develop from its own experience certain new forms combining sovereignty with co-operation, it might be in a position to pioneer once again along uncharted paths, as it has often done in the past, and contribute some new ingredients to human peace and security.

IV

Such a defiance of accepted patterns is not always welcomed by the Jews themselves. The prevailing mood of the younger generation today, whether in Israel or the dispersion, is a striving toward 'normalcy'. In Israel normalcy means primarily living like most other nations; elsewhere, it is an attempt to live like other individuals in the same country. Here Zionist ideology and the deeply rooted forces of amalgamation of the Jews with their Gentile neighbours meet halfway, both evincing a certain impatience with the exceptional character of Jewish life. However, these exceptional features are based upon profound history-made and, if one is a believer, also God-willed realities which, as a rule, prove stronger than any such private preferences. Whether or not one believes in the 'chosenness' of the Jewish people, the fact remains that like the history of every great people, only more so, that of the Jewish people, has many extraordinary, indeed, unique features which set it aside from the 'usual' national developments. Any policy which does not reckon with this exceptional reality is doomed to failure.

One of these exceptional features, which sooner or later the Jews as well as the nations will have to accept, is the permanent dialogue between Israel and the dispersion. Apart from its political aspects, this dialogue has been conducted and doubtless will long continue to be conducted along psychological, economic, and cultural-religious lines. The psychological impact of the rise of the

new state upon Jews everywhere has been both profound and immediate. Israel's heroic struggle for liberation, as well as the epic saga of Halutz pioneering before and after 1948, have greatly contributed to the stiffening of the backbone of the whole Jewish people. Even anti-Semitism, more or less universal though it be, has lost much of its deleterious effects upon the Jewish psyche as a result of this valiant experience. True, this impact has not sufficed to induce a great many western Jews to leave their homes and settle in Israel. Human migrations have always been much more deeply affected by economic than by purely psychological or even political factors, except in so far as the latter had deeply aggravated an economic crisis. Nor is this a new phenomenon in Jewish history. As far back as Hellenistic Egypt, many Jews envisaged their entire future as linked to the Nile Valley. It was against such staunch Egyptian patriots that, for instance, the anonymous author of the Third Book of Maccabees had to harp on the theme that Egyptian Jewry lived in 'Exile' and faced an insecure future because of recurrent manifestations of Jew-hatred. Soon after the expulsion from Spain, Solomon ibn Verga tried to explain this tragic event in part by the repudiation of the messianic hope on the part of some Spanish Jews. Satiated with their materialistic well-being these men allegedly argued that, after the advent of the Redeemer, they would have to continue paying taxes to their own government in the Holy Land while being unable to charge interest to their fellow Jews. They would, moreover, have to offer sacrifices at the reconstructed Temple and thus assume new financial burdens. Such expressions of smug acceptance of existing conditions were not lacking in any other quiescent period of Jewish history, including the age of Enlightenment. They swelled into a chorus during the Emancipation era. Nonetheless, they could never silence the deep yearnings of the masses for messianic redemption. Nor could such newer strivings for normalcy put an end to the irresistible postulates of a millennial heritage of exceptionality.

Under contemporary conditions the Israel-Diaspora dialogue has often assumed a primarily fund-raising character. Older historic precedents are not lacking. For many centuries past Palestine relief has played a great role in focusing the interests of the dispersed Jewries upon the Holy Land and in cementing their own unity. Yet fund raising for Israel's benefit has in recent years assumed a grandeur beyond the most optimistic expectations of our ancestors. Nor is its function as a survivalist force in Jewry to be underestimated.

True, like many others, I have often slightly spoken of the

'pocketbook Judaism' which allows thousands upon thousands to express their allegiance to the Jewish people solely in terms of their financial contributions to the various campaigns, international as well as domestic. However, one must not overlook the deeper aspects of these campaigns as such. If I may be allowed another paradox I might compare modern fund raising with that oldest form of religious worship which consisted in offering sacrifices to the Deity. What animals were to ancient nomads and farmers, namely their most precious possessions which they were willing to offer to their gods, the almighty dollar, pound or franc means to recent generations reared under a capitalistic economy. In fact, one might even speak of a new ritual being formed in connection with the fund-raising dinners, the lyrical outpourings of speakers, and the almost liturgical repetitions of the same calls to self-sacrifice 'until it hurts'. Perhaps it is not so outrageously far-fetched to view the new class of professional fund raisers and communal executives as a sort of emergent new priesthood catering to these novel ritualistic needs. Nor is that ultimate religious means of enforcement, the *anathema*, completely absent from the pressures frequently exerted by industry-wide campaigns, fund-raising testimonial dinners and the like. Much beyond their direct financial effects, their contributions to the resettlement of Jewish immigrants in Israel, their helping to raise the country's health standards and their promotion of cultural undertakings of all kinds, these campaigns and allied endeavours have been a major force for Jewish survival everywhere. They have forged new links between the individuals in various Jewish communities, between these communities and others in the same lands, between the various countries of Jewish settlement, and between all of them and Israel which have gone a long way toward overcoming the forces of disintegration created by the assimilatory trends, modern secularization, and religious divisions. One dreads to think what is going to happen, for example, to American Jewish community life once Israel will become fully self-sufficient, and the communities of the dispersion will cease to require further support from their wealthier brethren.

Far more complex are the cultural and religious interrelations between Israel and the dispersion. Here the Diaspora has in recent years been largely on the receiving end. Partially, this is accounted for by the destruction of the older centres of Jewish culture in Europe shortly before the rise of the new state. Prior to that time east-central Europe had, of course, been bestowing of its spiritual bounty on the Yishuv much more than the other way around. The

United States, the British Empire countries, and Latin America had, before the Second World War, been accustomed to receive strong religious and cultural stimuli and to recruit much of their intellectual manpower from the Old World. It was but natural for them to continue receiving such intellectual support from Israel, where alone Jews are enabled to develop a modern Jewish culture without the assimilatory pressures of a powerful non-Jewish environment.

In the long run, to be sure, these dispersed communities face challenges and needs of so different an order than those confronting Israel that sooner or later they will have to develop comprehensive cultural answers of their own. The fact that their cultural attainments in the Jewish sphere are still relatively modest need not instil in us, as it often does, the feeling of hopelessness in the ultimate cultural creativity of these newer centres of Jewish life. In another context I have pointed out that it took five or six centuries at least before the great Jewish centres of Babylonia, Spain, Germany, or Poland started making those signal contributions to Jewish culture which made them the foci of Jewish creativity in the last two thousand years. None of the major Jewish communities of our time is more than three centuries old and, if one considers a certain minimum numerical strength as a prerequisite for significant cultural endeavours, more than a century and a half old. In time, I feel confident, the pioneering spirit which has so greatly determined the course of New World Jewish history even in the area of community life, will also rise to the cultural demands and challenges of our era.

In any case, while retaining their basic unity, the autochthonous cultural forms gradually developing in Israel and those slowly unfolding in the communities of the dispersion in constant adjustment to their varying cultural environments, will doubtless reveal considerable differences. But it is precisely those differences which will enrich the total fabric of Jewish spirituality in the generations to come. In a constant exchange Israel will bestow of the fruits of its newly won independent creativity upon the dispersed communities, while receiving in return innumerable stimuli from those Jewish responses to the world's cultural challenges which will be developed by the differently creative intellectual leaders of the dispersion.

Of course, this type of cultural coexistence will generate some unprecedented difficulties of its own kind. We shall have to learn more and more to live as Jews, too, with a cultural pluralism of our own, instead of enjoying the relative quiescence of established

homogeneous religio-cultural patterns as did our ancestors in the old ghetto. We shall have to learn to be more tolerant of cultural and even religious diversity in our midst and not measure all our achievements against a single standard of either a romantically coloured Jewish civilization of the pre-Emancipation era or of the newly emergent civilization of the Jewish State. It may not be adventuresome to suggest that by meeting in this area, too, its own needs, both internal in relation to fellow Jews of other lands or ideological outlooks, and external with respect to the varying cultures of their non-Jewish neighbours, the Jewish people might again perform a pioneering service on behalf of cultural pluralism as such and thus help remove a further major obstacle to peaceful human co-operation.

This, is indeed, one of the greatest postulates of our age. For the last several centuries mankind has been enthralled by the idea of national homogeneity in culture as it has been by that of national sovereignty in politics. Cultural exclusivity became an extreme and intolerant as religious exclusivity used to be. The Thirty Years War in the seventeenth century was fought, as we all know, because of the impossible principle of *cujus regio ejus religio*, that each state ought to be religiously homogeneous and that hence the king or the state has the right to determine the faith of its citizens. The deadlock of that War established liberty of conscience as an indispensable prerequisite for the peaceful coexistence of different religious groups. But soon thereafter a new equally intolerant principle arose which might be called *cujus regio ejus natio* and which demanded national homogeneity within the boundary of each state. The rivaling nationalisms have led to many wars, culminating in the new Thirty Years War of 1914-45. We are still in the throes of that pernicious principle which is only gradually giving way in the great multinational conglomeration of the U.S.A., U.S.S.R., and the British Commonwealth and in the emergent economic combines of the Common Market and so forth. Any contribution the Jewish people will make, therefore, to cultural pluralism, out of its own necessity, will thus directly contribute to the welfare of humanity at large.

In short, as I see the shape of things to come, Israel will continue its 'ingathering of exiles' not only in the physical sense but also in that of absorbing the fruits of world cultures, partly channelized through the Jewish adjustment to those cultures by the various segments of the Jewish people directly exposed to them. At the same time, Israel will help the communities of the dispersion to maintain their historic progression toward ever-richer combina-

tions of human and Jewish values. In such constant interchange Israel and the dispersion are likely to open up a new 'golden age' of Jewish culture, more 'golden' than that ever achieved by the Hellenistic or Spanish Jews.

EIGHTH SESSION

August 5, 1959 (Morning)

In the Chair: DR. ABRAHAM MIBASHAN (Argentina)

1. REPORT OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

DR. DAVID FAIGENBERG (*Israel*): The Credentials Committee consisted of:

Dr. David Faigenberg, *Israel*,
Mr. Jacob Joslow, *United States*,
Mr. Yechiel Leszcz, *Uruguay*,
Dr. E. A. Matison, *Australia*,
M. Jean Nordmann, *Switzerland*.

Dr. Faigenberg was elected as Chairman of the Committee, Dr. I. Schwarzbart participated *ex officio* and Dr. S. J. Roth acted as the Committee's rapporteur. The Committee unanimously approved the following delegations:

	<i>Executive Members</i>	<i>Delegates</i>	<i>Alternate Delegates</i>
Officers and Executive Members			
<i>ex officio</i> , not delegated by countries	6		
Algeria	2	4	2
Argentina		12	
Australia		4	2
Austria	1	2	1
Belgium		3	
Bolivia		1	
Brazil	3	5	
Canada		8	
Chile		2	
Colombia		1	1
Costa Rica		1	
Cyprus		1	
Denmark		2	
Dominican Republic		1	
El Salvador		1	
Ethiopia		1	1
Finland		1	1

France	4	10	10
Germany		3	
Greece		2	
Great Britain	7	12	11
India		4	
Indonesia		1	
Iran		3	
Ireland		1	
Israel	1	25	1
Italy	1	3	
Luxembourg		1	
Mexico		3	
Morocco		3	
Netherlands		3	
Norway		1	1
Paraguay		1	
Peru		1	1
Portugal		1	
Rhodesia		1	1
Sweden	1	3	6
Switzerland		2	
Tunisia		3	
United States		50	18
Uruguay		3	
Venezuela		1	
Yugoslavia		2	1
<i>Associate Member Organisations</i>						
World Union OSE		2	3
World Union of Jewish Students		2	
Scandinavian Jewish Youth Federation		2	1
				26	199	62

This gives a total of 26 Executive members with full delegates' rights, without the right to vote, 199 voting delegates, 62 alternate delegates; in all, 287 delegates representing 43 countries and 3 international organisations. In addition, Poland and South Africa are represented by Observers or Fraternal delegates respectively, giving a total of 45 countries and 3 international organisations represented. 29 Fraternal delegates and Observers representing 13 organisations also participate in the Plenary Assembly.

The Credentials Committee will submit a supplementary

report on the status of the representatives of the Sephardi Federation of Israel as well as on such other changes as may arise in the course of the session.

I ask the Assembly to adopt this report.

The report was adopted.

2. GENERAL DEBATE (concluded)

MR. ISRAEL POLLAK (*Chile*): I bring you the greetings of the Jewish community in Chile, who number about 35,000, of whom 40% immigrated during the Hitler era and after the war. Two years ago our Yishuv celebrated its fiftieth anniversary. We are very much Israel-oriented, as 39 years ago some newcomers founded the United Zionist Federation, of which I am the chairman. All our organisations, those of East Europeans and West Europeans, the foreign-born and native-born, all work together, and are devoted to Zionist work, political and economic. We have also sent Halutzim to Israel.

We recently built a Spanish-Hebrew Day School for 1,000 children from kindergarten through high school, but no more than 20-25 per cent. of our children receive a Jewish education.

Our young generation is exposed to the dangers of assimilation and we cannot supply the intellectual and spiritual food they need. Israel helps partially by sending teachers and we are trying to create a central Kehillah to take care of our needs in the fields of culture and education. I welcome the statement by Dr. Goldmann that the World Jewish Congress must concentrate on cultural work.

DR. WALTER ABELES (*Israel*): The Israel Delegation is a united delegation and comes here to pledge solidarity between the people who are in Zion and the Jewish people still living in the Tefuzoth. Israel must fulfil its obligation towards the whole of the Jewish people, including those in Russia, Poland, Hungary, etc. When you come to Israel, we see in each of you not casual tourists, but partners dedicated to the upbuilding of our people and our country. It is no accident that the President of the World Jewish Congress is also President of the World Zionist Organisation.

I wish to place before this Assembly the painful problem of the tragedy of the Aliyah of the Jews of Rumania. I speak not as a member of a political party, but in the name of the broken-hearted mothers, living in Israel, waiting for their sons and daughters to get permission to leave Rumania to join them. There are also grief-stricken mothers in Rumania who cannot join their

children who preceded them to Israel. During the years 1949 and 1955, about 120,000 Rumanian Jews arrived in Israel, and in no other Aliyah were so many families separated. From the time that the gates of Rumania were closed in 1952, families did not cease from beating on the doors of the Rumanian Government to obtain exit permits and in August 1958 when permission was granted, 150,000 were registered to leave, but Aliyah was almost completely stopped. And again, more families found themselves cut in half, some left in Rumania, and some members in Israel. But those who were registered and forced to remain, found themselves in veritable despair, with no means of a livelihood and with no roof over their head.

I demand that above all this Assembly insists on the elementary human right of a man to be together with his family. There should be a loud outcry in the name of those mothers, who with no political overtones, want to embrace their sons and daughters in reunion.

MR. M. ERTESCHIK (*Denmark*): I bring you greetings from the Danish Section of the World Jewish Congress, recently founded, which eight organisations have joined. The organised community sent an observer to this Assembly.

There are 7,000 Jews in Denmark, most of whom are in Copenhagen, and it is said that there might be between 50,000 and 100,000 people of Jewish descent. The Jews participate in every form of economic life, as workers, merchants, industrialists, professionals, university professors and are also government officials. Labour, the middle class, and even high society, are free from discriminatory anti-Semitism.

I would like to say that while listening to the Polish delegate's speech, I had the impression that a representative of the Polish Government was speaking. It is true that the present Polish Government is, of all the previous governments since Poland's independence, the best for the Jews. But the 200,000 Jews who emigrated to Israel deserve some compensation for the possessions they had to leave behind. The arguments the Polish delegate used against their claim would not be used by any fair-minded non-Jewish citizen of Poland.

MR. YITZHAK GROSS (*Israel*): Dr. Goldmann pointed out the tremendous difference in the Jewish situation 27 years ago and today. The two characteristics of our age are: the establishment of the State and the almost complete disappearance of anti-Semitism. With the self-sacrifice of our people, Jewish sovereignty was renewed, ambassadors speak in the name of an independent

Israel, soldiers guard her borders and her citizens travel with Israel passports. Little by little, these historic events become everyday occurrences, and the establishment of the State no longer serves as an educational stimulant for Jewish youth. With anti-Semitism diminished, complacency sets in, and with nothing to attract and refresh the Jewish scene in the Diaspora, the danger of assimilation is present. In the days of Rome and Spain and during pogroms, Jewish unity saved us, and without this factor, there would be no Jewish people today, so Dr Goldmann defined it. Is it unity which saved us? The faithfulness of this people to the Torah received on Mount Sinai is what brought us through 2,000 years and will watch over us in the future.

And to the delegates of Polish Jewry, a few words. We are happy that you are successful in developing a spiritual life; we ask you to do everything to revive religious life in the Jewish community of Poland, to open Jewish kindergartens, Talmud Torahs and Yeshivas. We demand that the Congress request Soviet Russia to permit the renewal of Jewish life, the opening of Jewish schools, the appointment of rabbis, the publication of the Bible, the Talmud and prayer books and Yiddish and Hebrew newspapers. We demand that Jews be permitted to leave Russia if they desire, to emigrate anywhere and especially to Israel.

There is one thing more. We demand that Congress does everything in its power to prevent the exhuming of the Jewish martyrs of the Nazis, buried at Bergen-Belsen and elsewhere for the purpose of moving their bones to other graves.

The World Jewish Congress must fulfil its role of guarding the existence of the Jewish people, of broadening Jewish education, which will unite and guarantee its continuation as the people of the Torah.

ME. ABRAM DOMB (*Belgium*): I am a delegate from Belgium, but having been a partisan during the war, I wish to speak against the sale of arms to Germany by Israel. I agree with Moshe Sharett that there are some matters of Israel policy about which no non-citizens should interfere, but this is a very sensitive matter arousing the Jews of the Diaspora. We can say to the State of Israel that we are equal partners in the loss of six million Jews. We must all remember what was enjoined upon us by the ghetto fighters and our martyrs who left us a legacy we should not forget. A resolution must be adopted and addressed to Israel calling on her not to sell arms to Germany.

MR. HEINZ GALINSKI (*Germany*): I come from Berlin, a city where there is now a grave crisis, a city which was the gate-

way for the Jews behind the Iron Curtain who needed help. Thousands of refugees passed through our community on their way to Israel and other countries. Since we deem it our task to keep in touch with all Jewish communities, I hold that Mr. Smoliar's words should not be dramatised but we should be happy to have Jews here from other countries.

I have been among the first to stigmatise anti-Semitism in Germany and I have not survived Auschwitz and Bergen-Belsen to be silent about a new injustice. But there are also democratic forces in Germany. The World Jewish Congress policy should be to cooperate with democratic forces everywhere for this is the only way we can fight the enemies of democracy and of the Jews. But the World Jewish Congress should not forget its own limitations created by today's world political situation. The whole Jewish community, in spite of differences of opinion, should always be ready to help Jews in need.

MR. BEZALEL C. SHERMAN (*United States*): Dr. Goldmann oversimplified matters; he developed clearly the new problems of today, but underestimated the dangers of several old problems. We are confronted by the new world dangers while still weakened by the old. There is no justification for Dr. Goldmann to minimise anti-Semitism; the religious, social and political factors which over the centuries gave rise to hatred for the Jews, have not disappeared. On the contrary, anti-Semitism has been appearing additionally where it has never appeared before, and we must strengthen our spiritual and moral resources to resist this social disease of which we are the victims.

Nor have our economic problems been solved although our financial situation has improved. Poverty is only one facet of the problem, the second and more dangerous facet is the legend of our wealth. Many Americans believe that Jews possess too much economic and political power.

Dr. Goldmann rightly stressed the necessity for Jewish unity; but despite the unifying force of the State of Israel, we have retrogressed even in this respect. Most Jews now live in new countries and because of local conditions, each Jewish community is separated from the other. While the world calls for international cooperation, growing nationalism lacks the liberating and democratic principles of the 19th century. These contradictions work against Jewish unity. Professor Baron's statement that it took Jewish communities 600 to 1,000 years to create cultural works, offers small comfort. The Jews previously had time to develop culturally and parents took the time to hand down the Torah

to their children. But today nobody has time. Today Jewish parents learn rock and roll from their children. At the beginning of the century the young generation were the revolutionaries, but today they live in middle class respectability in suburbia.

MR. RAFFAELE CANTONI (*Italy*): The Italian Delegation has asked me to take the floor and I wish to give you the opinion of Italian Jewry about certain situations and to express my view on the reports of President Dr. Nahum Goldmann.

We still recall that the Italian Jews in 1936 publicly participated in the establishment of the World Jewish Congress and thus even under Fascism they furthered Jewish unity. Why should it be necessary to lecture for hours on the fact that there are ties between the Yishuv and the Diaspora? A person who could not, in some way, participate in the difficulties of the State of Israel and its life, would no longer be a Jew. My most tender memory is of those young men and women who died in Israel's war of liberation.

We are of the same flesh and blood as our brothers in Israel. This is the way the 30,000 Jews in Italy feel; even though there are no great religious leaders among them, they are all with Israel, all for the upbuilding of the State.

M. Blumel, you were right in saying that one must do nothing to hurt the susceptibilities of our friends from the East. You know that I am your comrade, but let us not follow only the clouds. You have heard about the problems of Rumania, the separation of families. Here there is a reason for following 'Realpolitik' and one must conclude that Dr. Goldmann and others pursue 'Realpolitik', especially after one becomes the President of the Jewish Agency and has to solve the day-by-day problems. One of these problems is now on the agenda in Israel. I consider it an honour to have been the only one who opposed the establishment of the Sephardi Federation, because we understood that from the moment the Sephardi Federation was established in 1952, it would set up a schism, at the moment when there were so many schisms among the Jews in Israel; instead they should rather all consider themselves as a large family of Jewish people in Israel, no longer Sephardim or Ashkenazim. Addressing myself to the President of the Jewish Agency, this is a very difficult problem with which I am sure you will deal.

ME. PIERRE DREYFUS-SCHMIDT (*France*): Some of us were a little worried yesterday because our meeting of the French Delegation had an excited appearance. We thought that it would be difficult to present the different tendencies which exist in our

delegation, that perhaps it would not be possible to synthesize a joint position. However, after listening to our speakers, I saw that we were never so close to agreement, we have never been so close to understanding each other, even within the Congress as a whole.

There is always some verbal conflict in such an Assembly, the echo of world political and ideological struggles. To my Polish friends I wish to say that one does not catch flies with vinegar and that it is not good to present any cause with over-emphasis. Perhaps if they had been with us during these last years, we could have avoided some of the mistakes of which they complain. But all those who are here rejoice at their presence and wish that other delegations such as the present delegation would come here.

I want to ask those of our colleagues who believed it necessary to make certain violent statements, whether they think that such portentous declarations will change anything. Is it not the main thing to make sure that the lot of certain communities which are still separated from us, should improve? It seems to me that the best means to arrive at this goal is not to make such declarations but that we should, in a word, re-establish contact by using more diplomatic language. In the area of this East-West question, in the struggle which we have undertaken to insure for our brethren that collective freedom, not only of religion but of culture and tradition, to prevent forced assimilation, it will not be by means of declarations of war that we shall reach our goals.

Besides, I think that at the moment when the great antagonists of the world continue to make efforts toward peace, the World Jewish Congress and its President should make every effort to attain the reunion of all the Jewish communities of the world.

Regarding the issue of North Africa. I think we are in agreement about the desirable position of certain Jewish communities in this territory, despite certain difficulties arising mostly from political divergences.

The same is true with regard to the reconciliation between Israel and the Arab countries. And certainly we are in agreement when we endeavour to ensure that those of our brethren who live in countries with a Moslem majority should be granted collective and individual liberties, should be citizens with equal rights and be permitted to leave their countries if they so desire. Not every effort in the diplomatic or political field can be crowned with success, but the position taken by the Congress has undoubtedly

made it possible to save human lives.

We likewise are all agreed with regard to relations between Israel and the Diaspora, that Israel is not only a refuge but also the citadel of Jewish culture. As we feel we have a duty to Israel, Israel has the duty to be on guard that nothing it does should damage the interests of the different Jewish communities all over the world. The controversial questions which in the past have provoked incidents of violence are of a secondary nature and can be resolved. My conclusion is one of true optimism, the survival of Judaism will result not only from the hate of our enemies nourished by our sufferings, but it will be the result of the determination of the Jewish people to continue the culture and the tradition of its ancestors.

M. MARC ANISFELD (*Belgium*): As the head of the delegation from Belgium, I wish to state that my friend Me. Domb, in speaking about arms sold by Israel to Germany, spoke only for himself. The Belgium Delegation and the Belgium Section of the World Jewish Congress have taken no position in the matter.

Another point: Dr. Goldmann said that the World Jewish Congress can intervene on behalf of a country only if the Jewish Community of that country agrees. I hold that this principle should also be applied to Israel, and no intervention should be made on her behalf except in agreement with the Jewish Agency for Israel.

MR. MICHEL MIRSKI (*Observer, Social and Cultural Association of Jews in Poland*): I would gladly accept Dr. Goldmann's address which the Assembly liked very much, if it had been delivered at a meeting of the World Zionist Organisation, not at a World Jewish Congress Assembly. I could discuss all the problems from a different point of view, but this would result in a dispute between the Zionist and Communist ideologies, from which no one would profit. The President's paper cannot create unity because its ideological foundation separates us.

Certain political elements of the paper please the Polish representatives and tend to mutual cooperation, that is, the attitude against atomic armament and against the cold war. Why was Dr. Goldmann silent on the struggle against arming the German Bundeswehr, which concerns the Jews everywhere? Neo-Nazism is directed against the religious Mr. Mintz, the Mapai follower Mr. Reiss, and the Communist Mr. Smoliar. All of us, aided by non-Jews must strive to stop neo-Nazism.

Dr. Goldmann's evaluation of anti-Semitism is correct in stating that in its classical form it has disappeared, but only

seemingly. Hitler was guilty of more than anti-Semitism; it was total annihilation. If SS generals build up an army, there is danger of repetition.

Dr. Goldmann said that Israel must give priority to the Jewish people in a conflict between herself and the Jewish people. The arming of Germany is directed both against the people of Israel and the Jewish people outside Israel.

With some of the speakers, with Tabenkin, with Arzi, there is political agreement, though not ideological. We agree with Blumel, who himself is a Zionist, especially with his remark that anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism are arms from the cold war arsenal.

Some speakers simplify the economic, political and cultural religious situation of the Jews in the USSR by using old standards. To declare that Jewish Communists are not Jews is not new. It is beneath our dignity to engage in polemics with people who so lower the level of discussion.

To sum up: it is possible to have a platform of political problems bringing together Zionist-democrats, Zionist socialists and religious Jews who want no fascism, and Communists, because all of us want no war. If the World Jewish Congress is ready to accept such a principle as its basis, then there could be a foundation for a World Jewish Congress in the true sense of the word, not just another Zionist organisation, as the World Jewish Congress is now. If you want to cooperate with us, you must take us as we are, not as joiners in Zionist parades and Zionist demonstrations. In view of the struggle going on in America and other Western countries between the war protagonists and the supporters of co-existence, the World Jewish Congress must support the latter and its basis must be the political problems that unite us, not the ideological attitudes that divide us.

MR. BENJAMIN WEST (*Israel*): I came from Soviet Russia. The Jews there have not had any contact with us for 42 years but not because they wanted it that way. There has been no Aliyah nor a uniting of families. The Hebrew language, that unites the whole Jewish people, including the Jews of Poland, is prohibited. Yiddish is prohibited as a literary language and there is not a single Yiddish newspaper and sometimes only a concert of Yiddish songs is permitted for the millions of Soviet Jews. Lately the authorities have made the prayer houses their target for restrictions.

Very young people want to be united with their people in Israel, although they are faithful citizens of the Soviet Union.

Is it not ridiculous that Jews are accused of being enemies of the Soviet Union because they pray to see the Lord return to Zion? And now Jews are accused of being drunkards because after prayers they drink a LeChayim. I have never heard that Jewish drunkards were found in the streets of Moscow, but prayer houses are closed down because Jews are drunkards! The World Jewish Congress and Dr. Goldmann have been dealing with the problem of Russian Jewry for the 25 years the Congress is in existence, and rather than progressing, things are getting worse.

I submit that this Assembly call on the Soviet Government to let the Jews live as a people as other peoples live. The Soviet Government should allow the Jews to become reunited with their families in Israel. The World Jewish Congress should also put the problem of Soviet Jewry before other organisations and the general public.

RABBI MAX NUSSBAUM (*United States*): I wish to refer for a moment to what Mr. Mirski said and to inform him that though some of us are part of the United States Delegation, we too lost part or the whole of our families in the holocaust. And as a member of one of those families, if I were the Prime Minister of Israel today, taking into consideration Israel's security, its position and its future in the Western world, I would have done exactly the same as Ben Gurion did the other day. If some people were not motivated by a totalitarian philosophy, they would come to this same conclusion. There is no reason why Mr. Mirski should lecture to me and others about what one ought or ought not to remember about the Germans, for some of us loathe them as much as he does. It comes from rather ill grace from a representative of an ideological camp which did not hesitate at one time to make a pact with Hitler.

Regarding the debate between Professor Baron and Mr. Sharett last night, each has his own viewpoint about the two historic terms Galuth and Eretz Israel. In Talmudic literature these two words were actually endowed with specific meanings. In Talmudic and post-Biblical literature there has always been a third term between the two extremes, quite often called Chutz laAretz, referring mostly to Babylon and used only when meaning a community which lives in freedom and is culturally productive. When the word Galuth which implies persecution, physical and spiritual extinction, was not wanted, Chutz laAretz was used. Chutz laAretz is not Eretz Israel and not political independence, but it is not Galuth. If you look upon the world today with the

eyes of Jewish tradition, you would have Eretz Israel, the Galuth as we have suffered under Hitler, as you have Galuth in the totalitarian countries and you have in between, a Jewish community of the west for which the only term, fairly used, historically speaking, would be Chutz laAretz. Israel surely knows that the Galuth has to be liquidated but ought to know also that Chutz laAretz is here to stay for a very long time, parallel to Israel. It is important for the World Jewish Congress to see to it that the Galuth is liquidated by incorporation into Israel and that Chutz laAretz is strengthened by what Professor Baron calls 'the eternal dialogue' between a free society which does not deserve the name Galuth and Eretz Israel which is the independent State and glory of our generation.

MR. HILLEL STORCH (*Sweden*): I speak to you in the name of the Swedish and Norwegian delegations. I hope we can deal with the problem of organisation, for if the World Jewish Congress were not in existence today, we would have to create it.

There is a close friendship between me and our Polish friends, who are deeply interested in Jewish problems. The Ghetto Monument in Warsaw was built of granite which Hitler had ordered from Sweden for a victory monument. The granite was bought by the Swedish Section of the World Jewish Congress and shipped to Warsaw. There was harmonious cooperation between us and our Polish friends. Thanks are also due to the Polish Government for its help.

Today, the press reported that Vice-President Richard Nixon was enthusiastically received in Warsaw and placed a wreath on the Ghetto Monument. Much has changed in Russia and I hope that it will be possible to be in touch with Russian Jewry and that human rights will be established there.

We are happy that the Scandinavian Governments have understanding for our demands and hope that they will continue to give us moral support.

JUDGE JUSTINE WISE POLIER (*United States*): This session of the World Jewish Congress in its promise of a maturing wisdom, has been concerned not only with the threat to the immediate security of Jews, but is ready to explore the wider world in which Jewish people must live and to which it has so much to contribute. Dr. Baron showed us the importance of cultural pluralism in societies where Jews are a minority and also the need for developing cultural pluralism within the Jewish Community.

From its beginning, the World Jewish Congress sought not

only to create a democratic movement in Jewish life and support for a Jewish State, but to find a way through which Jews as Jews could contribute to the extension of democracy in America until it should embrace all citizens. There has been frequent criticism of the American Jewish Congress' concern with civil rights instead of concentrating on what seemed to some people to be more strictly Jewish problems. However, we in the American Jewish Congress have continued because of our deep commitment to a principle expressed by Stephen Wise that no people, no man, can be free who seeks freedom for itself alone. A fellowship of mutual respect and cooperation has grown between ourselves and our fellow Americans in our determination to do away with injustice to the American Negro.

As a result, only recently the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People and the National Urban League, which are the two great organisations teaching justice for the American Negroes, joined the American Jewish Congress in demanding that the Arabian-American Oil Company should not be permitted to question applicants for employment as to their religion and thus exclude all Jews at the behest of Saudi Arabia. Two weeks ago the Supreme Court of New York, approved the contention of the American Jewish Congress that this exclusion would not be tolerated in the State of New York, and it also noted that the two Negro organisations joined with us in our complaint against discrimination against Jewish citizens. I cite this case to show that a community of interest or common ideals does bring people together. In many lands where Jews live today, injustice towards groups is beginning to trouble the minds of men concerned with human justice. Indifference too, closing our eyes to injustice in our community, a procedure practised so widely by Germans towards Jews during the Nazi period, is inconsistent with the ideals of Judaism. As we continue to struggle for freedom for all Jews, whether they live in Israel or in the Diaspora, we must as a people play our part in the struggle for freedom for all men. I hope that none of us will make the mistake of demanding that Jews in some other land should do justice. I think that no part of the Jewish people can do justice vicariously for another part or through the sacrifice of Jews in another land.

Through the vision and skill of the leaders of the World Jewish Congress today and in years past, this great organisation has given leadership in a struggle for human rights on a wider stage. It is my hope that the World Jewish Congress will assume

leadership in achieving that stage when no continent will remain dark and also that every Jewish community represented here will face the challenge of its own community, with courage, in accordance with the prophetic vision it has for centuries inspired the best in humankind.

MR. SYDNEY S. SILVERMAN, M.P. (*Great Britain*): The overwhelming problem of mankind and of this Congress is not so much the survival of the Jewish people, as the survival of humanity. Either civilisation goes on to new achievements or men's minds are insufficient to deal with the exigencies of affairs and conflict develops in which mankind may very well cease to exist at all. If peace is preserved and life goes on our problems will be made a lot easier than they are now; if problems are not solved, our problems, like other human problems, will cease to matter. With human survival, there is at least the hope of Jewish survival. It is against this background that we must approach the questions with which we are concerned. The questions we are concerned with are not to be settled by mutual recriminations, self-righteousness, with great willingness to see the faults in others and a blindness to your own.

We have two main problems, the Jews in North Africa and the Jews in the Soviet Union. We must approach these problems with the desire to see what are the difficulties of the Government with which you deal. This is what A. L. Easterman had in mind when he gave us advice about Morocco, because he said the good will of the Moroccan Government was beyond question, that they had performed their agreement with us in everything but one thing. That one thing was emigration to Israel and we had to be patient with them on that question because of the special circumstances in which they were placed. The point has been made during this debate, in reference to Soviet Russia, that, if what we have to deal with is anti-Semitism or not does not matter, if the result is anti-Semitic, that is all that counts. That point of view seems to me to be profoundly mistaken. It is impossible to say that motives or intentions do not count. It makes all the difference whether you are dealing with someone who is your active friend or your malicious enemy, or neither the one nor the other; or someone concerned with his own interest first, but with a desire to be as just and civilized as he can manage.

I gathered from Dr. Goldmann and from other speeches, and particularly from Moshe Sharett, what we would like a Russian Jewish community to be. It should have a national central

organization, full Jewish education and its own culture in the interest of adding to Jewish culture generally and of enriching the culture of the Soviet Union, a community of individuals with complete loyalty to their own government and country and an association of quasi-unity with Israel, as part of the unity of the Jewish people. But is there any Jewish community in the world that fulfils all these conditions? No, there is not. Although there are communities free to strive for it, I do not know of any community in which it has been achieved, not even Great Britain. I concede, for the sake of argument, that other communities are not free to achieve it, and I will concede that this makes a great difference. Furthermore, either the Jews in Russia are free, or if they are not, they ought to be. But I ask Congress to realise that this is a difficult conception which involves contradictions and since the creation of Israel, the difficulties are greater.

Whether Israel ought to be neutral in the cold war or not must be the responsibility of the Israel Government itself. The decision to sell arms to West Germany, too, is the sole responsibility of the Israel Government. But there is the other, the Russian viewpoint: One of the two great protagonists in the world is faced with a demand that three million of its citizens scattered throughout its area, not concentrated any more, shall have a second loyalty to a country which would be on the other side if the attempt to achieve peace broke down.

DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN: In the Diaspora, great questions, causing dispute, have been lacking in recent years and Jewish life there has become rather uniform and if you will forgive me, somewhat dull. Just for that reason it would have been useful to have East European Jewry and Jewish communists as participants here. On two or three questions I wish to make my standpoint clear, and as long as I represent the World Jewish Congress, I hope it is also its standpoint.

First a word about Mr. Mirski's criticism that my opening session speech was based on Zionist ideology. Do you expect that one who delivered his first Zionist speech when he was thirteen-and-a-half years old, would, in analyzing the Jewish situation abandon his ideology? But I have never assumed that Mr. Mirski or Mr. Smoliar, or other people, have to accept my analysis of the Jewish situation. It is not my analysis or ideology that has to be accepted. The programme of the Congress, its resolutions, its constitution committing us, must be accepted by those who join the Congress or who want to co-operate with it.

Mr. Smoliar is correct when he says that there is a cold

war among Jews, because Jews everywhere are integrated in the life of the majority population. 'Es jüdeln sich wie es christelt sich.' There are Jewish organisations which participate in the cold war and there have been Jewish articles in the press on the subject. If Jews on the other side shout about America's imperialism or the clerical press, it is also part of the cold war. Smoliar and Mirski cannot take on oath that they never said such things. But they maintained what they say is not part of the cold war; however, if Polier or someone else says anything from the American standpoint, it is part of the cold war. I believe Smoliar, or perhaps Mirski, is not right. I should call on him to prove that the Congress itself has never participated in the cold war. The 60 to 70 organizations and Jewish communities affiliated with the World Jewish Congress receive no orders on what to say or how to say it. They run their own life and take their own position on the problems of their countries. The Congress is not responsible for each word used by an affiliate. If the Kulturförderung in Poland becomes an affiliate, I shall explicitly demand that the Congress is not to be responsible for each word spoken in Warsaw by Smoliar or Mirski in the name of their Kulturförderung. We are not responsible for their opinions and what they say or for what someone in a Western country says.

We are responsible for what we as the Congress say and do. My colleagues and I in the Political and International Affairs Department have always seen to it that the World Jewish Congress takes no position in what is called the cold war. It was not the first time that I said this in my opening address and I have repeated it many times for many years. I agree that the Congress is not anti-Communist. It is not the business of the Congress. The Congress does not pass judgment as to whether the capitalist, socialist or communist system is the best. Every Jew and every Jewish group have their own opinions. The Congress defends only Jewish rights. By abandoning this principle, the Congress gives up its *raison d'être*. Within the framework of the Congress, there must be a place for every Jewish group that acknowledges the oneness of the Jewish people and is ready to co-operate with other Jewish groups. This is the basis of the Congress and of its right to exist.

Sydney Silverman said, in speaking about Jewish survival, that we must never forget mankind's number one problem: human survival. I agree one hundred per cent. Nothing should ever be done that could cause real atomic war. At our meeting in Geneva last year, we therefore expressed an opinion about the desirability

of atomic disarmament. As I said to various delegates, I hold that this Assembly should speak out in this matter. Needless to say that all Jewish problems cease to exist if mankind is destroyed. Not only as human beings, but especially as Jews are we deeply interested in everything that can lead to a relaxation of the tensions in the world, to a lessening of conflicts, to disarmament, to co-operation and peaceful negotiation. I hold that we, the Assembly, should say to the world that what I said is in our interest.

Now about Germany. I do not regret the discussion about the German problem. I could not conceive of a Jewish conference without such a discussion even ten years and more after the war. I somewhat regret the tone of the speaker of Herut from Israel, because even in speaking about Germany one should be polite. This is, however, not too important. We have been friendly for years. I was for a long time in the centre of a Jewish debate about Germany.

I made no proposal that the Jewish people should forget what Germany had done. I hope not only our generation, but also many future generations will not. However, I must say, in recent years when we arranged in America, even in New York, with its more than two million Jews, a public meeting in memory of the Ghetto Uprising and of the annihilation of the Jews, I was ashamed to see only 200-300 people. I wish they would be less forgetful of facts.

What I proposed concerns this: a people cannot go on living on emotions, even noble emotions, certainly not a people that no longer lives in the ghetto, but wants to be an active element in the world and to master its own destiny. Jews in the ghetto were unable to master their own destiny and had to take passively what the non-Jews did to them. The Jewish mentality of the time was understandable, it was one of hate, anger, and so their being on bad terms with others, with outsiders, was part of that mentality. Such a mentality was the only psychological reaction that could sustain the Jews.

But now there are: a Jewish State—I do not compare the Congress with the Jewish State—and an organization that wants to act in the name of the Jewish people and to exert some influence on deciding its fate, so that this people should, instead of being an object of history, become a subject. This means the old mentality must go: you cannot just sit in a corner and be mad and angry. You just cannot have everything at one and the same time.

Of course I understand these emotions. If a Jew like Nurock

had not protested when I proposed negotiations with Germany and if all the Jews had said yes, I would have been ashamed of the Jews. We are happy that many Jews said no. We had great debates with them. I well understood my late friend Sprinzak. I would have had regrets if the Jewish people had consented right away and shouted 'hurrah'. But there are times when the interests of the people are more important than emotions. The Jewish people of today has a Jewish State and army and is a factor in the world. It has a Congress and other great Jewish organizations which can approach governments and be listened to, but of course, organizations cannot be compared with the State of Israel. Such a people must not indulge their emotions when specific interests are at stake.

There are many problems about Germany on which I as an individual named Nahum Goldmann, take a specific attitude. However, this is not relevant if I speak for the Jewish people. Then its interests, as they are interpreted by the majority of the people on the basis of reasonable considerations, are decisive. It is now many years since the large majority of the Jewish people accepted my advice to conquer their emotions and start negotiations with the Germans. I said then and repeat today that the decision was statesmanlike and a great manifestation of Jewish maturity.

We called together 21 of the largest Jewish organizations and 19 agreed to negotiate; Israel voted for it by a majority although there was great opposition. I believe that now, after years have gone by, many of those who then followed their emotions rather than a balanced judgment, will admit that the policy adopted was right.

We do not know yet what we have obtained by the negotiations. Israel receives more dollars from Germany now than from all the Jews everywhere. Many Jews do not like to listen, but a fact is a fact. Israel's leaders rack their brains over what is going to happen about four years from now when Germany stops paying.

The negotiations in Luxembourg are likely to bring to the Jewish people, through payments to Israel and to individuals, about three billion dollars. I do not know what our situation both in and outside of Israel would have looked like without the German contribution's being at the disposal of Jewish institutions and communities. Suffice it to look at the new Jewish centres in France and elsewhere, not to speak about what Israel received. There may sometimes have been mistakes or weaknesses, but Germany has kept her promise. I am in constant touch with her to achieve improvements. Many of us believed that the whole matter was an

empty gesture, but Germany has been doing more than she was formally obligated to do.

When we started negotiating, the Germans asked what the costs would amount to; luckily, neither they nor we were well informed. The amounts are at least twice or perhaps three times as high as we and they estimated. 'All right, we have signed, we will follow through, though the calculations were wrong,' they said.

I want to be clearly understood. I do not pity Germany. She is well off and can afford to carry through the agreement. I need not give reasons to prove our moral right. Erem need not teach me that it is Jewish money. I said so from the beginning. I did not say that they did us a favour, nor did I ask you to send a cable of thanks. What is being discussed? They could have refused to pay back—what would you have done? Raised a hue and cry and adopted resolutions of protest? Is there a precedent for a nation that killed Jews and later paid? If they had paid five times as much, it would still be their moral duty. You need not tell me this. Do all the nations meet their moral obligations? To Israel? To Jews? All the nations in the East, in the West? All except Germany? This is the first precedent in history that a thing like this has happened. The Germans have been continuing to pay year after year. And if all is not well and I ask the Chancellor to call the ministers to consult with us, he calls them—what other nation would do the same? And in the meantime Germany has become a strong nation running after nobody; all are running after her.

Now after we decided on a policy, we cannot indulge in being cross. You cannot behave as if nothing had happened. Can you slap someone's face and then ask him to pay—can this go on? If there are among us such splendid statesmen who can do this, it is up to them to take over the Claims Conference, if they can slap and spit on Monday and ask for another 200 hundred million on Tuesday.

On the one hand everyone in Israel enjoys what Germany pays, on the other hand they are all great defenders of Jewish honour. I understand the standpoint that money should not be taken, that it should not be talked about, and that is all. But then do not send delegations from all the Kibbutzim asking for money. I can understand the attitude not to take any money. I would call it quixotic and I have great respect for quixotic people but a Don Quixote should not be elected as Prime Minister or representative of the World Jewish Congress. But a Jew who is a Don Quixote is wonderful, and I hope we will always have many—we will not

be able to lead the Jewish people only through shrewdness. However, to be both quixotic and realistic, clamouring for more money, is too convenient and too cheap.

As to Katzenellenbogen: If he says that Germany today and the Nazi murderers are one and the same, why should I not say that Soviet Russia is the continuance of the Czarist murderers? It is the same people is it not? But are there no changes in history? Revolutions and other changes? Could I say Gomulka continues the anti-Semitism of former years? Such an assertion would be unjust and false. Could I, though we have complaints about Russia, say that Russia represents Pobedonostsev and the pogroms of Kishinev? Has nothing changed? Is Adenauer responsible since he succeeds Hitler?

It is possible to argue whether or not Jews should return to Germany. It is an individual matter. The Jewish people has recognized the Jewish community in Germany. This community is in the World Jewish Congress, having equal rights with other members. It is also in the World Zionist Organization and in the Claims Conference. The B'nai B'rith is about to open branches in Germany and so on. I wish only that Jews everywhere were as free and received as much support from governments to develop Jewish institutions as is the case in Germany. Our situation would be much better.

I do not understand the excitement about the German flag. I want to mention what is no longer a state secret. Israel's Prime Minister spoke about it several times; Israel communicated with Germany saying she was ready to have diplomatic relations. If Germany had said yes, the German flag would have flown in Tel Aviv and Jerusalem. It is not Israel which is hindering it. I am not in the thick of the negotiations, though I sometimes help a little. But I think it will not take too long a time and then what will it be like?

Now, should the World Jewish Congress, when it invites all diplomats, exclude the Germans? And the day after tomorrow, when I go to Bonn, I am sure to receive telegrams from Mirski and tens of thousands of Polish Jews who in recent years left Poland, asking me to get for them money from Germany that, according to the agreement, Germany is not obliged to pay. One of my principal tasks now is to negotiate with Germany about the claims of Rumanian, Polish and Hungarian Jews who left their countries after a certain cut-off date and according to the law, are not eligible to make a claim. I do not want to make a promise, but I have some hope. Should I say to the German Ambassador:

'Your flag won't fly here' and the day after that, the German flag will fly in Jerusalem? As to the question about who decided on the shame of exhibiting the German flag—the Congress leadership did, I and my colleagues decided on the so-called shame.

In high school I had no understanding of natural science. Because I was otherwise a rather good student, I could afford to take this subject lightly and played truant from this course. When the principal called me to his office, I told him that I profited nothing from this subject because I forgot everything the following day. The principal replied that there are things that one must study though he might forget them later, but first he must learn them.

The emotions are needed. But the leaders of the people must not be guided only by them. The leaders bear the responsibility. They cannot have it as easy as those who do not bear responsibility.

I shall not deal with Israel's sale of arms to Germany. Rabbi Nussbaum said that he would have done what Israel's Prime Minister did, if he were in his stead. I need not rack my brains. I do not see a chance of my becoming the Prime Minister, so I do not express an opinion. I do not know the situation, especially with regard to security, which involves many delicate elements.

When Israel asked me if she should open diplomatic relations with Germany, I said yes. Israel's initiative came rather late, just because of the opposition; otherwise relations would already have been established. But this is not a Congress matter.

I do not hold that the World Jewish Congress and the Jewish people are prohibited from saying anything about what Israel does. Among the finest things Professor Baron said last night was his opinion that sovereignty becomes more and more a ridiculous idea. It is gratifying that he said this as a historian. A few years from now enthusiasm for sovereignty in Israel will cool off. It takes time. A people having had no sovereignty for 2,000 years is enthusiastic. With regard to matters concerning the Jewish people, I have never stressed Israel's sovereignty. I do not want to enter into a discussion of Israel and the Diaspora. Now and then there might arise a question where great Jewish interests are at stake that should prompt us to say a word or two in a brotherly way, not as a protest. But the foreign policy and more than anything else, the security policy of Israel, are specific matters of Israel's sovereignty. I should like to advise my friends not to engage in these matters. You do not have the information, you do not know the situation, these matters are not within our jurisdiction.

One word to our friends of Herut. They have, as a party, been in the opposition for decades and they therefore can reconcile everything to their own satisfaction. There are for them no contradictions. We have just learned of their attitude towards Germany. In Israel Herut strongly supports an official alliance between Israel and France. Now Germany's number one ally today is de Gaulle's France. There has never been in history such a close economic, political and military alliance, as that between France and Germany. Herut's desire for an alliance between Israel and France means that Israel, directly or indirectly, also becomes an ally of Germany. Is this consistent? They want an alliance with France, they talk about the shame of flying the German flag and Germany's crimes. Some consistency is needed even by those in the opposition, perhaps less consistency than those in the government need, but at least a tiny bit of consistency.

I am also against a resolution demanding the disarmament of Germany. Such a resolution would be quixotic, but that would not be decisive for me. As to the situation today, I would rather see the arms industry of other countries destroyed, than that of Germany—the arms industries that feed the aggressions of Arabs against Israel, as Reiss correctly said. Should we demand that Czechoslovakia not be permitted to export arms? This would be much more in the Jewish interest than the disarmament of Germany.

I express no opinion about the policies pursued by Germany or world policies with regard to Germany, nor do I say whether it is good or bad to neutralize Germany. I speak having in mind only Jewish policies.

How can one with axiomatic certainty say that arms in the hands of Adenauer's Germany are arms against Jews? By the same logic it could be said that the armament of Poland means the armament of Russia. It is another Germany, different from Hitler's and Israel has close relations with her. Again, I express no opinion on Israel's policies. But why is it axiomatic that a German army must in the future be an army against Jews? I therefore say it is not our business. Such a resolution would immediately have catastrophical consequences, perhaps not only for the Luxembourg Agreement. The Germans would continue to carry through the Luxembourg Agreement in spite of such a resolution. But to make new claims and obtain additional indemnification, beyond the provisions of the agreement, is impossible if resolutions are adopted that run counter to what Germany considers the most important principles of her policy.

During the last few weeks I met the Prime Ministers of the German Laender and the Federal Minister of Finance on the matter of the new claims, but I do not want to deal with this here.

And now I come to Russia. First of all, with regard to the state of affairs in Russia, the Russian situation and the Jewish facts, there were not too many differences in the debate. Even our friends from Poland, and I do not say it to make their life more difficult, say that facilities for Jewish life in Russia do not exist.

My old and good dear friend Sydney Silverman, who is a brilliant debater and, whatever you may think about him, has a very clear and cogent mind, said that because in all countries of the world there is not such an ideal situation that the Jews can manifest what he calls their second loyalty, their affection for or attachment to Israel, therefore there is no difference in principle between the situation in Russia and in other countries.

I want to be very frank. If he were to stress only the right of the Jews in Russia to manifest their attachment to Israel, it would be a debatable point. But my friends, this is not the main point. The main point at this stage is—I want to put it at the moment very mildly, I do not say that it is the maximum of our demands—the main point is that Jews in the Soviet Union be allowed to do what Jews in Poland do. It would be a very happy day if we could come and say the Soviet Government has announced that the Jews may form an organization like the Kulturfarband of the Jews in Poland; that they may publish Jewish literature and papers and have theatres; that those who want to go to Israel may go—you could not imagine the applause that there would be here for the Soviet Union. Thus, Poland certainly serve as an example, and even other Communist countries where emigration is not permitted. From the point of view of certain forms of Jewish self-expression, there is no comparison between the Soviet Union, and Hungary and Rumania, I mean very strictly orthodox Communist countries. I say it in order to show, which in my opinion nobody can deny, that this is a specific Soviet characteristic, not a Communist one.

Fighting this Soviet characteristic, the lack of facilities for Jewish life in Russia, and saying that the lack is an injustice, you do not say anything against Communism, because there are Communist countries which give such rights, to a certain extent, one more, one less, which I once discussed with a Soviet diplomat, a very important ambassador. I argued the same thing and he

became embarrassed when the discussion took the following turn. He said : 'You know the reason for the lack of a central Jewish organization is historical. In Czarist Russia the Jews also did not have a central Jewish organization.' I replied : 'Mr. Ambassador, you mean to say that your regime has not made any changes since the Czarist regime, you have taken over everything?' He smiled and said : 'It is a silly argument, isn't it?' He was fair enough to admit it. If the Soviet Union had told the Jews : 'You can form such a central organization,' it would have been formed. Not all the Jews would join, I am sure; a large part of the Jews in Russia are no longer Jewish-minded, are indifferent. But we do not ask, as I said in my speech, to force every Jew, we do not ask for a compulsory organization. We say : 'Allow those who want to do it, to do it.' There may be Jews in Poland who are not in the Kulturfarband. I am sure there are Jews in Budapest who are not in the Jewish Community. We do not ask to force them. So I say it is undeniable, let us face the facts, that in this respect discrimination exists in Russia, discrimination as compared with all other minorities. As to giving the reason that the Jews are not territorially concentrated—I do not say there is nothing in it; that is not a pure invention. It makes matters more complicated, I admit. It is easier to give national autonomy to a group in one territory than to a dispersed group, but it is not an argument strong enough to justify the condemnation of the Jewish community in Russia to their disappearing in the course of time, as Jews, so to speak.

As to Me. Blumel, he is not absolutely suspect of being a violent enemy of the Soviet Union. I agree with him that we should not exaggerate and I have always been against such slogans as 'brutal anti-Semitism'. There is probably economic discrimination in Russia. In other countries there is also economic discrimination against Jews. But Jews in Russia are not persecuted, or expelled, or sent to camps, or starving. This is not the point.

I also want to say to my friend Prinz, who has made a very good speech as usual, that I would not use the word Marranos for the Jews in Russia. It has not reached that point. A Jew does not have to be afraid to say that he is a Jew—that would be being a Marrano, if this word has a meaning. They lack facilities to express their Jewishness, but a Jew does not have to hide it; he cannot hide it. How can you speak of Marranos if your passport says you are a Jew? It is a recognised nationality. So we should be careful. First of all if you do not stick to the facts, the true facts, it boomerangs. I give you just this example—

we had this experience recently: certain synagogues in various cities in Russia have lately been closed down. This is a disquieting phenomenon; it was never done before, as far as we know, but it may stop. Certain papers got the information and published it. There was one wrong fact, Kiev was among the cities named. Thereupon the whole Russian propaganda pounced on that mistake: 'You have told a lie!' and supported their accusation by photographs from Kiev, statements by Jews in Kiev that it did not happen there. We have to be very careful. They do not deny that synagogues have been closed, but picked out the exaggeration, so it is even tactically silly. We must be as careful as possible.

Secondly, I agree also with Blumel that it best to have very careful and reasonable propaganda. There are two or two-and-a-half million Jews in the Soviet Union and although the Soviet Union of Khrushchev is not the Soviet Union of the late years of Stalin, there is no question that there is a lot of liberalization, there is no terror as there was previously, there are no concentration camps and labour camps as there were previously, but still it is a very strong regime, to use an English understatement, which is not afraid of very strong measures if it deems them to be necessary. And we have two or two-and-a-half million Jews in Russia and whatever we do, we have always to consider how it will reflect on their position, which is tolerable in many respects, and bad in this one primary respect of there being no central organization, no real Jewish life, no right to emigrate. Therefore, I agree with these warnings, but having said this, I say we cannot stop speaking about it and I am glad that I did not hear anyone saying 'forget about it' because my feeling is—and with this I come to the end of my remarks—my feeling is that although this situation is difficult, it is not hopeless.

I do not say that the treatment of Jews in Russia and the denial of facilities for contact with other Jewish bodies for their own religions, full religious and cultural life, are only a function of the cold war. This would be exaggerating. But that the cold war plays an enormous role, of this I have no doubt. The colder the cold war becomes the worse it will become, and the more world tension relaxes, the better it will be for arguing from this specific point of view.

Now Eisenhower invites Khrushchev and I need not tell you what this means. We certainly should not be the ones who speak out of tune. We have to speak, but speak with all moderation, especially in a situation in which there are very small but still certain beginnings of signs on the horizon, that a system of

co-existence will be worked out which would be of inestimable value for us, also of inestimable value for Israel. If some armistice or agreement between the two blocs is worked out, it certainly will have to include the Middle East. I do not want to go into this aspect of the situation, I avoided it at this session and therefore whatever we say about it, and say something we must, we must bear in mind the general situation because we are not operating in a Jewish ghetto where we complain and the more we complain the more internal satisfaction we get. This was Jewish politics—if you can call it politics—in the past. Today, we want to influence the situation and have a voice which should be heard, and if you pass a resolution we expect even Soviet statesmen to take note of it. I do not think it is immediately discussed in the Politbureau or the Praesidium, but I am sure they will take note of it. They have a very large file on the World Jewish Congress. They know much more of what we decide and do and discuss than many of us think, and therefore we should, in this respect, too, act with the responsibility of a group which wants to influence Jewish affairs and, as far as possible, world affairs for the cause of peace and understanding. Even in this very tragic question which, as I always say, is the number one problem of Jewish life, just as in the German question, our acts should not primarily be based on emotions. That is the easiest, simplest and cheapest way, but the most ineffective and damaging way. We should act rather on the basis of a responsible estimate of what the interests of the people demand and live up to our great task of trying to be the spokesman of the Jewish people.

MR. MOSHE SHARRETT (*Israel*): I wish to define my attitude to a certain point at issue and to express my admiration for Mr. Silverman's debating skill. I have deep respect for his judgment but I fear that sometimes his skill gets the better of his judgment, and then he is not just to himself. He has made his point—the question of the relationship of the Jewish people and Soviet Jewry or the place of Soviet Jewry within the Jewish people by rather unduly emphasizing the Israeli aspect of the problem. He said, 'Even we do not feel so completely identified with Israel. So why expect Soviet Jewry to be so completely identified?' And then he said 'Israel has, quite justifiably, her foreign policy and certain aspects of it sometimes bring Israel into collision with the Soviet Union; and that, of course, rebounds unfavourably on the problem of allowing Soviet Jewry to be in touch with Israel'. I am not now disputing the logic of those remarks—if we were to discuss the problem on its merits, I would have had something

to say—but that's not the point at present. All I say is that it makes a little too easy the task of tackling the root problem. What is the root problem? Supposing Israel did not exist, or supposing Israel's policies would have been quite different. The root problem is this: Is Soviet Jewry to be a part of the Jewish people or is it not? Or is it a part of the Jewish people only in its innermost consciousness which it dare not express? Or is it a part of the Jewish people actively and legitimately? Supposing Soviet Jews were here and they would have joined issue with other delegates on the question of Israel's policy. That would have been their perfectly legitimate right. But they would have been here. That is the whole problem.

Now the position today is that democracy—not because it is organically pro-Jewish, but just as a by-product of its principles and trends of thought—does not impose, does not make obligatory the unity of the Jewish people, it just facilitates it, democracy just does not interfere with it, does not obstruct it, that is all that democracy does. But it makes it possible for Jews to be articulate and to maintain and foster their world unity. And that is the basic thing. Is the Jewish people a world Jewry or is it not? Communism is 'on the spot' in this regard, to use an American expression. We expect a reply. Is it possible for Soviet Jewry to form an active part of the Jewish people or is it not? Does Communism accept the basic premise of the world unity of the Jewish people, or does it set its face against it? To this question we expect a reply, and a reply not in words, not in formulae, but a reply in deeds, in actual facts and we shall all be extremely overjoyed if that reply is given and proves affirmative.

NINTH SESSION

August 5, 1959 (Afternoon)

In the Chair: MR. MONROE ABBEY (*Canada*)

1. SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT OF CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

DR. DAVID FAIGENBERG (*Israel*): I am happy to inform the Assembly, in the name of the Credentials Committee, that a solution has been found to the problem of the five-man Sephardi Delegation from Israel. The Credentials Committee recommends unanimously to permit this Delegation to take part in the deliberations of this Assembly. The Presidium added two mandates to the Israel Delegation, and three members of the Executive of the Israel Delegation, having been also elected as delegates, resigned from their elected mandates in favour of the Sephardi Delegation. In this manner, all the members of the Sephardi Delegation were accepted as delegates with equal rights and especially having the right to vote in this Assembly. This procedure sets no precedent for the future and does not alter the constitutional structure of the Congress. I ask that my proposal be accepted by a vote of the Assembly.

There was no opposition and the proposal was adopted.

2 DEBATE ON ORGANISATIONAL PROBLEMS

DR. I. S. SCHWARZBART (*Director, Organisation Department*): The Organisation Department has submitted a report which I regard as an integral part of my address. Those who read it will be aware that all the problems have been broken down to three main questions: first, the relations of the head office in New York with the affiliates; second, inter-relations between the affiliates; third, the role of the World Jewish Congress through the Organisation Department, to strengthen relations between the Golah and Israel.

Here I wish to deal with some matters in a different way. In 1953 at the time of the Third Assembly, we had 64 affiliates. Today, we have affiliated organisations and communities in 67

countries. Entire Jewish communities, represented by a more or less democratically elected representative body, are affiliated to the Congress in 52 countries. I stress this figure because the Congress is sometimes challenged as not being representative.

Out of these 52 countries, where the entire Jewish community is affiliated to the Congress, there are 22 in the Western Hemisphere, 14 in Europe, 6 in Africa, 7 in Asia, Australia and in New Zealand. Israel is a special case since the Executive in Israel is composed of all parties, except for the Communist and Agudah, so it is authorised to speak on behalf of almost the entire Jewish people in Israel.

Furthermore, we have considerable sections in ten countries, but seven of these do not have a central representative body. In the other three, where there is a central representative body, we did not succeed in getting the affiliation of the entire community.

Let me now speak about the problem of Ashkenazim and Sephardim. There are today about two million Sephardim in the world—oriental Jews, real Sephardic Jews and North African Sephardic Jews. For a number of years the World Jewish Congress has been striving to heal the rift between the Ashkenazim and Sephardim. I would like to see the time when both the names of Ashkenazi and Sephardi will disappear and will be only names in history, and there will be just communities of Jews. I claim for the Congress no small part of the credit for having paved the way towards this goal. Ashkenazim and Sephardim attend common schools, their children take part in common sports' events as in Mexico and Argentina, but there still remains the broad field of ritual and tradition and the complex of past aristocracy combined with present inferiority. Time will do away with this problem and in conclusion I say that the next Executive and this Assembly, by a resolution which I shall propose, should ask for a joint conference of representatives of Sephardim and Ashkenazim, including the World Sephardi Executive and the World Executive of the World Jewish Congress in order to promote, step by step, the complete merger between these two great parts of our people.

As to the relations of affiliates with Congress headquarters: how can we create conditions which will result in this situation: if 100 Jews were asked, let me say, in Bogotá, London or Buenos Aires, "What is the World Jewish Congress", that not five but 50 would answer affirmatively, "Yes, I know what the World Jewish Congress does". This is not the case at present. It is true what Mr. Sieff says in his report, that the governing bodies of our affiliates are fully aware of what the Congress does, but not the Jewish

people at large. In my report, I propose the means to attain our goal in this respect.

I now come to what we have achieved in the way of new affiliates in the period of the last six years since the Third Assembly. The Hungarian Jewish Community of 80,000 re-affiliated; we obtained a new foothold in Cuba, where the former affiliate completely disintegrated because of Gabbayut problems (controversy over leadership); the Netherland affiliation has been enlarged and represents 19,000 of 28,000 Jews and we have recently set up a section of the Congress in Denmark and I greet here, for the first time, the representatives of this section.

I shall, of course, be glad, and I think all here share my view, if, before the next Assembly, we will see the Jewry of Russia affiliated and Polish, Rumanian, Bulgarian and Czechoslovakian Jewry who disaffiliated more than a decade ago, re-affiliated with the World Jewish Congress. I do not think this is an impossibility.

I now turn to the question of relations between the affiliates themselves. First, I would like to express a word of thanks to all those who are responsible for our success in this field: in the Western Hemisphere, Mr. Marc Turkow, Dr. V. Winterstein and Dr. Nella Rost-Hollander; in Europe Dr. S. J. Roth, who is responsible for the European Executive organisation and also the indefatigable M. Armand Kaplan; in Africa, M. Jacques Lazarus; in Israel, Dr. Leon Bernstein and in addition to the individual branches, the secretaries of the affiliated organisations who work day after day for the Congress.

Regarding relations between the affiliates: There are not only lines of communication from the affiliates to headquarters, but also lines of communication between the affiliates themselves. Sitting here in front of me is Dr. Kubovy who is responsible for the slogan "Unity in Dispersion" and for the book with this title. This inter-relation between the affiliates must be put into daily practice and the question is how. There are more than 60 countries in five separate parts of the world and although we have the means, they were only partly implemented. I request the Assembly to continue with the implementation of this inter-relation exchange between our affiliates. During the last four years, the Organisation Department prepared 14 papers on the current state of Jewish life in Australia, Bolivia, Belgian Congo, the Caribbean Islands, China, Cuba, Cyprus, France, Germany, Kenya, Morocco, Rhodesia, Tunisia and Uganda. These papers are not compiled for purposes of research but to let the governing bodies of each affiliate know how the others manage their affairs, so that one can profit from the

experience of the others, although what may be workable for the Executive Council of Australian Jews may not be good for the DAIA.

Another matter is the exchange of visitors. The Jewish people is a travelling people, but representatives of the Jewish community from one affiliate seldom go to the headquarters of the Jewish community of the country they are visiting in order to exchange experiences and information and to create something of an intimate relationship between the affiliates.

Another means to achieve our common goal was the effort put into the yearly commemoration of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising throughout the world. Each year, months of preparation were needed but the result is that we now have about 50 countries where this yearly observance is arranged by our affiliates and in 35 countries they declare this to be a permanent obligation which the community has taken upon itself. This yearly commemoration is just one means of keeping the dispersed Jewish people together in a common sublime allegiance to the memory of the six million.

The questionnaire which the Organisation Department prepared periodically, is a further excellent medium for creating better relations between the affiliates. We have already had 47 replies, and this material, after being arranged and classified, will be sent to our affiliates, departments and executive branches so that all may know how the Congress aroused Jewish communities throughout the world, to rebuild spiritually what was destroyed during the catastrophe.

I should like to say a few words about relations between Israel and the Diaspora, not ideologically, but organisationally. Much has been undertaken lately in Israel to further their interest in Diaspora Jewry. For example, the municipalities spread information about Congress, and also the Hebrew language journal, *Gesher*, issued by the Israel Branch of Congress; the projected Goldmann Institute for the study of Diaspora problems and the establishment of a chair at the Hebrew University in the Contemporary History of the Diaspora will do likewise.

In the Diaspora, there is great understanding for events in Israel as most of the news in the Jewish papers concerns Israel. To further deepen this understanding, I propose to set up in New York an academy devoted to the history and problems of Israel. If the proposal is adopted, it will be up to the new Executive to carry out the idea within the next few years.

I further propose to prepare a four year plan to be carried through by the Organisation Department; to call a conference of

Ashkenazim and Sephardim to discuss ways and means for co-operation with a view to complete unification; and to establish the Nahum Goldmann Institute in Israel.

I do not regard the World Jewish Congress as merely the sum of its affiliates, but next to the Zionist Organisation, as the greatest unifying force in Jewish life. This Assembly is the real expression of Jewish Unity in Dispersion.

DR. GERHART M. RIEGNER (*Director of Co-ordination*): I would like to analyse the state of the union of the World Jewish Congress. Dr. Goldmann in his opening address recalled the speech he made in 1932 at the first conference to create the Congress and compared the position of the Jewish people then and today. I am tempted to make a comparison of the status of the Congress when I joined it in 1936 and today. And if I remember those first hectic days in Geneva, when we set up the World Jewish Congress as a real organisation and started with representations from about 30 countries, with hardly anyone representing a full community, and compare it with what we have just heard from Dr. Schwartzbart, we see what enormous progress we have made in this process of unifying the Jewish people.

I believe the representative character of our organisation is today greater than that of any other organisation of the Jewish people. But to achieve our goal of being the *World Jewish Congress*, we must reach out into Eastern Europe and get the Jews from Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and Soviet Russia into our common Jewish organisation.

But together with progress already achieved, we have attained a remarkable standard of recognition for Congress by the non-Jewish world. If you listened to the speeches of the Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs, the second highest official of the United Nations, and to the representatives of the ILO and UNESCO and if you saw in the audience representatives of more than 20 governments, you can measure the standing which the World Jewish Congress has achieved within the non-Jewish world. We have achieved this standing not only because of the contributions we have made in the political field and in our dealings with governments, but because of our independence from governmental influence, our criticism of governments, whether in the Western or Eastern world, and because we took a stand only where Jewish interests were involved; our independence and our objectivity have been recognised and have given us the standard we have achieved.

I am of the opinion that there are few movements of a non-governmental character which can show a record comparable to

ours. Of the many efforts in our struggle to rescue Jews, I wish to mention only the breaking of the conspiracy of silence in the fight against Germany and the breaking of the financial and food blockade against Nazi victims.

In the post-war period, we played our part in the restoration of Jewish rights, especially through the Atlantic City Conference in 1944, which so successfully achieved its goals. I also want to mention our part in the German reparations agreement, in which Dr. Goldmann with a Congress team, headed by our unforgettable friend Dr. Noah Barou, played an outstanding role. I would like to add the part we played in the framing of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in the United Nations, and in this connection Dr. Rudolf Bienenfeld with his team gave an example of vision and imaginary policy and has made a contribution from which not only the Jewish people but all other peoples will benefit. Finally, there is our contribution to the Jews of North Africa during the last five years, when we helped them to come through one of the most difficult political and revolutionary periods of their history without any harm and in full peace and harmony with their surrounding populations.

But the Congress is not only an organisation which has achieved concrete objectives, it has built up a loyalty amongst a group of devoted civil servants, a team of experts who for 20 years has learned to mature and to apply newer and more modern methods in our work. This loyalty to our President and to our group as such is a loyalty unknown in many organisations. This loyalty has not been compensated as it should have been; many of us have been working without any security, with nothing but their daily devotion, year in and year out, and this is the greatest asset which we have. We have not only built up a team of devoted people, we have also built up a loyalty of organisation and when I recently had the privilege of visiting the South American continent, I was impressed by this loyalty towards the Congress which I found in nearly every place I visited. And in other parts of the world, too, when we have a problem of political character or otherwise, our affiliated bodies always gladly respond and we appreciate their help.

Our work is divided into three major parts—our political work, our relationship to the organisations and our cultural work. I have given you some examples of our achievements in our political work and I would like to stress again that in these 20 years we have learned to tackle these problems in a mature way. We cannot continue politically by only protesting, we must not only

react to what has happened, we have to foresee things and prepare our own future. When the Congress was created our major activity was one of defending, and it could not have been otherwise because this was the period of Nazism. We must, however, now lay the accent on planning and shaping our future. For this reason we have to strengthen considerably our Political Department, and one of our first acts should be to establish an office in Washington. Two facts must be taken into consideration: we have to penetrate the Afro-Asian continents with which we have to re-establish contacts if we want to survive in the world of tomorrow and we cannot survive if half of humanity does not know us and nobody interprets us to them. In our political work we will have to take into consideration the supranational entities already in existence, the Council of Europe, the Organisation of American States and others which are taking shape.

As to the second part, our organisation activities: the Congress was created to bring about a process of unification and to combat the isolationism in Jewish life on the part of the Jewish community. In this we have made considerable progress, but we have not succeeded in the United States which today embraces half of world Jewry and if, within the next five years, we do not make a new effort towards the unification of the Jewish community in America, we will have failed the sacred tradition handed down to us by Stephen Wise and the other founders of Congress.

We have not succeeded in becoming a mass movement but we have become a political instrument for the Jewish people. This is because of the specific tasks which the Congress has to fulfil, given to it by the various representative bodies and therefore it is difficult to penetrate through each organisation to the individual Jew. We should find ways to make the man in the street feel that the representative body speaks for him so that he realises the existence of the Congress in his daily life. We have not succeeded everywhere to make the central bodies of our affiliated organisations strong enough to play their full role.

Speaking of our organisational set-up, on the basis of my South American trip, I strongly recommend that this Assembly gives to the South American continent the equality of treatment it deserves. There are 750,000 Jews in South America, one of the liveliest communities of the Jewish world, and I strongly recommend that the South American Council be transformed into a South American Branch of the Executive and that the South American Executive participate in the Co-ordinating Committee and other organisational organs, as every other branch.

A few words about our cultural work. We have not only built up our status at UNESCO and given them really imaginative ideas with all that this means, but we have created there a Jewish cultural foreign policy, which is a new concept and which to a great extent is due to Dr. Steinberg's personal contribution. Because of lack of money we have not been able to embark in the field of education, but there have been dozens and dozens of initiatives which deserve appreciation. Israel has made a real contribution in the cultural field, but I am not satisfied with our cultural work and neither is Dr. Steinberg, nor am I satisfied with the interest that the Executive displays in Dr. Steinberg's work. We might have a kind of permanent cultural commission where a certain number of us should take joint responsibility together with Dr. Steinberg. I am not going to speak about the Institute because Dr. Robinson is not here for health reasons, and we send him our very best wishes. I would like to pay tribute to the new Congress publication 'World Jewry'. I think for the first time, the Congress has an organ of which it can be proud; it is not a house organ but is representative of the organisation; it will have to be improved and enlarged to be our visiting card to the non-Jewish world and to be to the Jewish world the voice of one of the representative organisations of world Jewry.

I want to say a word about finances. Our budget, as compared with that of other Jewish organisations, is very limited. It is scandalous that we do not get, especially from our friends in America, the budgets that we need. Two or three people have to worry all the time about this question. This has to be remedied by creating a group which will be responsible for financial questions and I am in favour of electing at this Assembly a Treasurer or a co-Treasurer. This matter should be taken more seriously than in the past. It is possible to find a solution to the problem, at a cost of a few hundred thousand dollars, for the people who have been working for the past 20 years without security.

The strength of the Congress has been its dynamic force, the vision and imagination which has always come from this responsible group of Congress officers. If we are to continue to have such issues as the punishment of war criminals, the reparations agreement with Germany (a precedent in history), the Human Rights Covenants and Declarations and others which I mentioned, then we must bring in new and young forces into our organisation. We have to prepare those who will succeed us to give status to those who have given 10 or 15 years of service to us, I plead they should be recognised and they should be raised from employee status to

higher status. In general we have to prepare our future and bring in new forces, because only if we have fresh blood the generation which feels the pulse of the new world shaping under our feet—will we be able to render to the Jewish people the services which the Jewish people expect from us.

MR. ISRAEL SIEFF (*Chairman, Special Study Commission on Re-organisation*): The report I shall give to you stems from a Congress World Executive in London, which decided that a committee be formed to study and report on the functioning of the Congress, including its relations with affiliates. It is no easy matter to hold together an institution like ours, which is far flung and has its constituent bodies practically over the whole world. Small and large communities, however vast the distance from the centre of activity, like to feel that they are a living part of Congress. The structure of Congress has grown during the 23 years of its existence without any preconceived blueprint or overall plan. Like Jewish life itself, it has had to meet new challenges and emergencies which demanded rapid changes in its structure.

There are about five main aspects of the problem of organisation. First there must be a clear definition of the aims of the institution; second, the structure which holds the organisation together must be understood by those who are operating it and the systems of work must be logically planned. Thirdly, the functions of the individual members of the staff operating the organisation must be definitely fixed as well as their authority defined. Fourthly, it is essential that the flow of communications between each head of department and executive, as well as between the different levels should be smooth and easy. Fifthly, a study of organisation must be practical, for it deals with systems which are controlled by human beings who need guidance and direction.

These considerations lead us to ask the following questions: firstly, what are the main lines of overall policy of Congress in relation to a new task, a new expansion, a great concentration for instance, on cultural and educational activities on our political work? Secondly, how can the organisation best adapt itself to the new proposals, and thirdly, are the new proposals feasible in view of the limits set by our finances? And although I have a great deal of experience and sympathy with the expansion of work by increasing annual deficits, I do not think we can ignore the limit set by our annual income. If our proposals are accepted, we shall increase our current available budget by proposals leading to greater efficiency of system.

Our staff, and particularly our executives and heads of de-

partments, are dedicated people. They make every effort to attain the highest standards of work and achievement. Since its foundation, the functions of the Congress have undergone changes in emphasis, changes due to the historical circumstances which form the background of our work. When the Nazi persecution was our overwhelming problem, our task was to rescue what we could of German Jewry and to protect the rest of European Jewry from Nazi influence. This was the period of political organisation, of defence. During the second period we combined rescue and relief work and at this time we planned what to do during the post-war period. The third period came after the war and the establishment of the State of Israel when we believed that anti-Semitism was no longer the main and overwhelming problem. The new State had given certain groups of the Diaspora and Israel a sense of fulfilment and the possibility of releasing the tension which hitherto had maintained the unity of the Jewish people. Although international in its objectives, the Congress had remained a European organisation with its headquarters and its main constituents in Europe. As a result of the Second World War, the headquarters of Congress were transferred to New York and in addition in 1948 in Montreux, three territorial executives were inaugurated, thus stressing still further the international character of Congress. All these changes were made without adequately providing the machinery in advance to cope with them.

Dr. Schwarzbart has informed us that we have 67 affiliates altogether, as against 27 in 1936. The World Executive Committee consists of 75 members, 60 appointed by the larger constituent communities, 15 ex-officio members and 30 associate members whose rights are not quite clear. The Executive is divided into three territorial branches with a Co-ordinating Committee and a Director of Co-ordination whose report you have just heard. Our study shows that there is some lack of cohesion between the three territorial Executives, divided as they are by great distances. Occasionally there are problems created by delays in reception and difficulties of exact interpretation of communications. The Jewish situation is not static; changing conditions in the political and social fields demand a constant discussion between the leaders and members of the territorial Executives to enable them to unify their action. Methods of planning and implementation should assure unity of approach to all problems.

Those of us who are heads of organisations know that any structure which has been in operation for some time needs review. I would like to make a few general observations on the more im-

portant problems and to suggest how we can probably get more for our annual expenditure. Since the World Executive inaugurated our Study Committee, we are asking the Executive to study the detailed proposals before we give them to any other body. We propose to put our study before the Organisation Commission, on which will be representatives of all the delegations here, and which will make recommendations to the Executive, which will meet immediately after this Assembly for approval and implementation.

Enough has been said about the philosophical background of our activities, and while political problems are our main concern, we believe that Congress should place greater emphasis on the intensification of Jewish consciousness in the communities. It is incontestable that the dangers to survival have switched over to those fields of work where we have done least. In our view there has not been sufficient intimate association between the centre and the affiliated bodies, although we are aware of the contact which Dr. Schwarzbart has had with the communities and the difficulties which have faced him in his endeavours to bring them closer to us. He has lacked the directives to a new policy for the affiliates and the machinery and means to carry out such a policy. The Study Committee regards the constituent bodies as an important part of the Congress structure in activating the communities which they represent in the political field and in the sphere of education and culture. We conceive of the functions of the Organisation Department in a new way: organisation *qua* organisation has no longer any meaning for us; organisation which brings life through definite tasks and objectives to our constituents is the only kind of organisation which will fit into the suggested revised philosophy of Congress. We should help the communities to plan a definite programme of political, educational and cultural activities based upon a knowledge of our needs and their capacity for activity. The first phase of building up the relationship between the constituent bodies and the centre has been carried out successfully, we have the representatives, thinly though they may be represented, in certain communities, from most of the Jewish communities of the world. We must approach the second phase, the planning of their activity, with an understanding of the machinery required to bring it to a successful issue.

Each community approaches its educational and cultural problems differently. Each community can make a significant contribution of its own to the solution of its problems as well as to the problems of other communities. Our task is to make each consti-

tuent body aware of our willingness to help it, to give direction as to the type of institutions our experience believe will be suitable. These are the tasks of a department with greater power than the present Organisation Department and one which should be in continuous liaison with both the political and cultural sections. We can overcome many of the complexities of organisation by bringing the source of authority nearer to the major field of operation. The problems which face us are to be found mainly in Europe, Africa, Israel and Asia and there is no compelling reason for the Congress head office to be in the United States. But for the war it would have remained in Europe, close to the field of its main activities.

Now the principal reason given for making no change is that it is desirable to be close to $5\frac{1}{2}$ million Jews in the United States, although we have found scarcely an instance where the Congress has made any direct contact with this Jewish community. This activity is carried on by the American Jewish Congress, whose task it is. We are of the view that the activities of the American Jewish Congress are of a diversified nature, some of which do not come directly within the scope of the Congress. I understand that the President and Executive of the American Jewish Congress are reviewing their activity in the light of the needs of the World Jewish Congress in the United States, from which I think our activities will greatly benefit.

The argument is also used that the United States is a political centre of the world powers and it is proper that the Congress should be partly represented there. We believe that the political office under Dr. Perlzweig has operated effectively and would continue to do so if the centre of the Congress were in Europe. At the Executive meeting in Geneva last July, the Israel Executive proposed that a permanent Executive be set up in Europe to carry on the work of the Congress with a President and a Director-General in charge. Whilst this would be ideal, it would not be feasible. But what is practicable and can be achieved is a committee of implementation composed of heads of departments which will meet more frequently than the Co-ordinating Committee under the chairmanship of either the President, if he is available, or one of the territorial chairmen, to discuss and review the manner in which the decisions of the Executive and the Co-ordinating Committee are being carried out. This will give us the advantage of more effective control of implementation and change of approach of method, whenever necessary. It will also raise new matters which will be able to be dealt with forthwith without waiting for

a Co-ordinating Committee or Executive meeting.

We realise that this proposal will lead to some misinterpretation; our view is that the need for strong and decisive action from time to time is so telling that once having accepted the first stage of this idea, the Co-ordinating Committee, the Committee for Implementation is a logical step. The Committee of Implementation will not be policy making, it will deal solely with action and will have the advantages of frequent contact with heads of departments. The action of each department will also be under constant review. The present system as I have seen it, occasions delays, misunderstandings and at times ineffective effort.

Of first importance are our relations with our affiliates and there are practical suggestions how they can be brought closer to our Executive. Each community should be visited at least bi-annually by an important authority from the Executive and we should hold regional conferences from time to time, for example, in Europe and Latin-America. Since in today's world, political considerations influence one's policy, we are of the view that the expansion of our political department is of supreme importance. Research, planning and action demand a certain specialisation. It is proposed that special desks be established for specific areas of problems—we want to introduce systematic collation of information and therefrom to organise our overall strategy. Our suggestions are an East European desk, an Arab desk, one for the Asian and African area and lastly the American desk. In this way we shall perhaps be able to foresee events which would otherwise take us by surprise.

If our affiliates were better acquainted with the importance of our task in the political and cultural fields, I am sure they would take over some of the items of our budget, the costs of which could then be expended on other productive planning and action. We have got into the bad habit of expecting that all expenditure, some of which should be borne by the affiliates, for example, delegations to the plenary and executive meetings, costs of visits to affiliates, and so on, that they all must come from the central budget. There should be a revenue-seeking member of the Finance Committee. I hope that the Organisation Commission will pronounce itself clearly on the matter of the re-organisation of our finances—we shall call upon the affiliates to play their part in finding funds for certain aspects of our work. Finally, re-organisation is bound to necessitate certain changes, particularly if we move our centre to Europe. These changes can only be introduced on the basis of causing the minimum of hardship to the devoted men

and women of our staff who have made possible the achievements which stand to our credit today.

We have in the past not been able to set up a pension scheme and this lack has been one of the main causes for the delay in re-organisation. Until a pension scheme is brought into being, pensions should be fixed on a certain basis that we shall agree upon. What I have said implies no reproach or criticism of a negative nature of the work as it has been carried on. Our executives are worthy of all our gratitude, they are dedicated and in many cases have made considerable self-sacrifice in their devotion to our work. I have tried to give you the background only of the Study Committee's recommendations. I have suggested how we approach the problem and the general principles that we adopted and have not made any serious attempt to argue out the basis of our suggestions. This will be done in the Organisation Commission. This report has been the result of a study within the three Executives. The recommendations may not reduce the annual expenditure but they will help our organisation to expand its work and work in the direction of greater effectiveness.

THE MARCHIONESS OF READING (*Great Britain*): I am speaking as one of the Executive and also as one of the rank and file, to call your attention to further consideration of the organisation matters that are put before you. The result, after all, depends on yourselves, and there are some very big questions to be considered. I wish to pay tribute to my dear friend Dr. Schwarzbart. It seems to me that in his person he unites the Jewish people. he writes to them, he keeps in touch with them, he brings the human touch which is so absolutely essential, and in any form of re-organisation, we must be very sure that we do not lose the human touch.

About two years ago the Executive set up this Organisation Commission for this study and we now have the report which I know you will study with great interest. The most important thing for us to discuss is if we should shift the focus of our work. We are a world organisation, therefore there is no geographic reason for us to be in one or another part of the world. What is essential is that we should be based where we can accomplish work and where it is economical. We are always saying that we have not sufficient money. In a democratic body like this, its affiliated organisations should contribute towards the maintenance of its headquarters. I say you can economise, if you streamline your work. We should all of us welcome a Latin-American Branch of the Executive. We need to have worked out proper channels of

communication, a little more order, and protocol, because in the end these make for smooth running.

I would like to pay tribute to the members who carry the burden, and to our really remarkable staff our grateful thanks for their work.

MR. J. ELZAS (*Netherlands*): I ask myself: is it really that we speak here of the terrible fact that large and important parts of Jewry are not able to join our forces and to express their opinion on things that really affect the Jewish people? I am aware, too, of the fact that the delegations who are here can speak at best, for only part of the Jews in their homeland. In the Jewish community in Holland, for example, the orthodox group, and many Jews who are not orthodox joined this group, is as such, the representative of Congress in our country. This means that about half the Jews living in Holland can play no part in Congress unless they join the orthodox group. I, as the president of the Zionist Federation of Holland am here only by the grace of the orthodox community. Non-orthodox groups, therefore, have no possibility of joining Congress. If this Congress is really to be the address of the Jews, it should be possible in each country, that every Jew who wishes to join the Congress can do so, thus making his influence felt on the delegation to such an Assembly.

I am not speaking here for the community but for the Board of the Zionist Federation of Holland, which thinks that if this is not made possible, the Congress cannot claim to speak in the name of the Jews, but only for some Jews, because we noted that this situation exists elsewhere, not only in my country. We therefore ask that the Congress make it possible for overall organisation to be set up in each country, in which it is represented.

MR. JACOBO FRUMIN (*Mexico*): I represent the Jewish community in Mexico of 25,000 to 26,000 Jews, which is about 35 years old. We are an active community with about 85% of our children attending four Jewish Day Schools. We also have a Jewish Teachers Seminary. There are three Yiddish newspapers which appear once a week or more frequently in addition to Spanish-Jewish periodicals.

Our Zionist movement is rather strong and seven Kehilloth have been organised into a Central Committee as a Vaad Hakehilloth which acts as the representative Jewish body. Needless to say we support Israel wholeheartedly, we speak Yiddish and live as Jews.

We have built a wonderful Sports Centre for our youth and as Dr. Nahum Goldmann on a visit to Mexico City said, if it is

invested with Jewish content, it will have been worth the energy and money invested; otherwise one might well ask if the old Cheder, with its broken chairs, was not better.

We are facing a danger indeed: the new immigrants have not managed to create new cadres among the young people of the second generation who are willing to take over the burdens of the Jewish community. We do not understand each other; the danger of assimilation is very great.

It is the task of the World Jewish Congress to do whatever is possible on the local scene, particularly among those communities who are weak. We, as the strongest community in Central America, are ready to increase our burden and assist the smaller communities who need our help. I suggest that a Council for Central American Jewries be established in Mexico.

MR. HARRY RAJAK (*South Africa*): South Africa is not an affiliate of Congress and our association with you is a tenuous one. But we are very much aware of the work done by Congress and of the organisation built up to carry out that work. Whatever our method of association, we feel free to approach Congress on any problems which confront us. We have been in constant contact on the matter of the annual commemoration of the Jewish Day of Remembrance in honour of the heroes of the Warsaw Ghetto, and value the reports which have been exchanged. Although there is sometimes a difference of opinion as to the date, we as the co-ordinating body follow the decision of the Israel Knesset and observe the 27th of Nissan and despite other views as to the date, all participate in such events as synagogue services, large public meetings addressed in Yiddish and English, with appropriate Ghetto songs, readings, etc. We arranged for the date of the 27th of Nissan to appear in every *Luach* which is published, and we go so far as to have publishers of daily diaries, whether Jewish or not, enter this date. We would strongly recommend that Congress should see to it that this is done in each country where it has any influence.

This year in Johannesburg, instead of a mass meeting, we erected a beautiful monument which was unveiled by Rabbi Dr. Nurock on the day of commemoration. But one of our problems is that we find it so difficult to get our youth really interested in this commemoration.

It is also in the cultural field that co-ordination of various organisations is possible. We are, e.g., having a Book Month in South Africa and will provide Congress with reports which may be a guide for other countries. This same co-ordination can apply to other cultural projects like exhibitions of Jewish art, music, and

so on, and guidance in building up lending or reference libraries. We also distribute lists of dates for a few years ahead, indicating anniversaries and important dates which could be celebrated. In this way we provide the community with some indication how to prepare these events and also how to build up lecture series. In this manner, particularly in the cultural field, we make use of the opportunities provided by Congress. We in South Africa very much appreciate the assistance that we receive so consistently from Congress in building up our cultural activities.

TENTH SESSION

August 9, 1959 (Morning)

In the Chair: DR. MOYZES KAUFMANN (*Brazil*)

1. TELEGRAM FROM KING GUSTAV ADOLPH OF SWEDEN

The following telegram was read :

WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS, STOCKHOLM. PLEASE ACCEPT MY WARMEST THANKS FOR YOUR MOST KIND MESSAGE. WE IN THIS COUNTRY ARE HAPPY TO KNOW THAT WE WERE ABLE TO LEND A HELPING HAND TO MEMBERS OF JEWISH COMMUNITIES ABROAD. I EXPRESS MY BEST WISHES FOR THE SUCCESS OF YOUR ENDEAVOURS.

GUSTAV ADOLPH
KING OF SWEDEN

2. REPORT ON THE NAHUM GOLDMANN HOUSE PROJECT IN TEL-AVIV

DR. MICHAEL LANDAU (*Israel*): More than five years ago plans for the erection of the Dr. Nahum Goldmann Diaspora House in Tel Aviv were started and the Co-ordinating Committee of the World Jewish Congress and the Israel Executive have adopted a positive attitude, but progress has been infinitely slow. Last year, a plot of 5,000 square metres in the Manshieh Quarter, between Jaffa and Tel Aviv, was acquired. Adjacent to the site is a park, and opposite it is the Abrams Institute, which cares for child victims of poliomyelitis; it is some 300 metres from Allenby Road and even closer to Nahalat Benyamin and Hayarkon Streets. There are prospects of obtaining four or five additional dunams of land bordering on this plot, which was bought for IL.90,000; it has now been fenced in and there are preparations for the planting of trees.

It is generally understood, with no decision having yet been taken, that the building will house libraries in various languages to be used as a research centre in connection with the development of communities in the Diaspora where Jewish life has been, or is now being liquidated. It is also to concentrate within its walls all the treasures of folklore which are now dispersed, and in private custody. The initiators of this project plan to gather Jewish tradi-

tional objects, ritual articles, songs and related material from Bulgaria, Egypt, Greece, Hungary, Iraq, Latvia, North Africa, Poland, Rumania, and Yemen. Since there is great doubt that in another generation there will remain any trace of the history of these and other Jewish communities now being liquidated. It would be an irreparable loss and the present generation could be blamed for criminal negligence. Newspapers, periodicals, books and community records, works of Jewish authors and those treating of Jewish subjects can still be gathered together today and be prepared for future research. In another generation these priceless collections will have vanished and with them all evidence of these Jewish communities, their way of life, their customs, achievements, aspirations and sufferings.

The House is to be divided into wings, each to be devoted to a special language, including English, French, German, Spanish and Yiddish, and each floor is to contain one subject, thus concentrating communities with a common language.

The Organising Committee requests that it be recommended to the Assembly that a drive for the erection of the Dr. Nahum Goldmann Diaspora House be announced. The several branches of the Congress should undertake fund-raising campaigns among a limited number of people, which would ensure the collection of \$500,000 within a few months. The Committee also proposes that a curatorium be appointed, composed of two representatives each from North America, Europe and Israel, and one each from South Africa, South America, and Australia, together with a number of prominent donors. The curatorium will empower the Israel representative who will consult with the Israel Executive and with Dr. Goldmann to put the project into effect.

3. DEBATE ON ORGANISATIONAL PROBLEMS (*continued*)

DR. GEORG GUGGENHEIM (*Switzerland*): I regret that there is little interest in the re-organisation of Congress but I am grateful for the reports made by Dr. Schwarzbart, Dr. Riegner and Mr. Israel Sieff. It is necessary that we get a clear picture of the financial foundation of our organisation. A truly democratic organisation should be financed by its members in proportion to their financial ability, whether much or little. Thus only can we attain equality which is also financially guaranteed. Another reason for this principle is that organisations which are not tied to Congress financially may not take Congress as seriously as they should.

It is necessary to get information on what, if anything, has

happened regarding co-operation with the six or seven international organisations, as discussed two years ago.

Considerable groups of Jews in Western Europe use German, and that is the language in which we shall have to approach them. The idea of Congress is still not popular in the German-speaking part of Switzerland. Should we not add a summary in German in the new Congress journal issued in London? The question is worth studying.

DR. JOSEPH REICH (*France*): After two days of impassioned discussion on politics we heard reports on organisational problems delivered by Chairman Israel Sieff, Dr. Riegner and Dr. Schwarzbart. Unfortunately, the room was not as well filled as it should have been or was during the political debate, and yet the organisational problems of the future are at least as important as certain political speeches.

If the World Jewish Congress exists in France and if it has achieved its present important position, it is due to the man who has given his knowledge, strength and health to this task, M. Armand Kaplan. Before the Congress came, Jewish life in France had begun to decline, at least in the French provinces. Thanks to the Central Committee, Congress was able to penetrate into all social classes and to become known to every Jew in France. *La Vie Juive* is published, and in the provinces local journals carry news of the Jewish world received through Congress. We do not need a study on the need for existence of Congress; we have only to look at the number of delegates, the number of countries which are represented here to realise the interest with which the entire world watches the World Jewish Congress.

The Congress can be especially proud that it was successful in bringing to this Assembly delegates from behind the Iron Curtain, even if it was unable to bring delegates from all countries. It is its political maturity and its vast experience in the political field which have enabled Congress to become today the unique world organisation to guide Jewish affairs. Should the Congress stop midway? There are still tasks to be accomplished. First of all, it must completely fulfil its concept of the unity of the Jewish people by achieving unity of political action and, above all, of cultural action. It is incomprehensible that certain Jewish leaders do not understand that Jewish success on the international level is absolutely dependent on the unity of the Jewish people. It is inconceivable that today, after the tragedy through which the Jewish people went, there are still leaders of certain Jewish organisations who deny even the existence of a Jewish people. There has been

talk today about relations within the Congress, between its branches and affiliates; but another much more important problem has not been touched upon, and that is the relations between Congress and other powerful international organisations such as the B'nai B'rith. I know it is still extremely difficult to find identical platforms in the area of politics, but unity can be achieved in the area of cultural life. And I think for the near future, this area is even more important than politics. For if Jewish cultural life disappears, if this tie of culture does not exist among Jews, for whom would politics be necessary? Again, it was the Congress which suggested the creation of a super-Congress with a superior common platform, but unfortunately we do not know what the results of this suggestion are. I hope we shall hear explanations on this subject during this Assembly, because it is an extremely important problem and even though the difficulties are vast, I believe that Congress, because of its structure, power and influence, is the only organisation capable today to lead us toward the fulfilment of this task.

MR. YITZHAK HARKAVI (*Israel*): Organisational problems must firstly be considered from the political point of view, which is the decisive one for this organisation. There are three general issues: the function of Congress as a Jewish representative body; its universality in structure and activity; its influence on the Yishuvim that the Congress represents. Let us consider first the Congress in its role as the representative Jewish body, which was the principal question of its founders, although forgotten by our Assembly. While Congress has obtained recognition from governments and international bodies, it would be difficult to assert that it has been recognised as the sole representative of the Jewish people in the non-Jewish world. At the time of important decisions there has often appeared a split, and at best there was united action on the part of only several Jewish organisations.

Responsible for this state of affairs to a great extent is the fact that the American Jewish Congress cannot pretend to be the sole representative of this community of millions, a situation which exists in some smaller countries as well. Congress has been fighting to make its structure such that representationally its role will be unquestionable. It also strives towards an alliance with other large Jewish organisations active in the international field, who are prepared to recognise it as a central Jewish body but not as the only representative, and not as their representative for historical and ideological reasons. We believe that Israel has contributed a great deal to bringing closer to one another Jewish groups formerly distant, and has to a great extent created a basis for common work.

The pro-Israel faction is today the largest segment in Jewish life and is working towards consolidation in many areas. To what extent does the Conference of Jewish Organisations solve the question of Jewish representation? If the attempts at alliance fail, Congress will have to fight to be recognised as the exclusive representative of the Jewish people.

As to its universality, Congress is striving to comprise all parts of the Jewish people geographically as well as politically and has obtained the affiliation of many smaller Yishuvim. It was said here that the lack of affiliation of some of the Yishuvim is our fault and not theirs, since not much fighting spirit was displayed at headquarters. The opportunity, forged by the rise of the State of Israel, was not sufficiently used by Congress in order to take in new groups.

Regarding its influence in the Yishuvim, the Congress is connected with them in one of the following three ways: (1) by the official expression of the Yishuv's representative body; (2) by the expression of several institutions in the community, whether a representative body exists or not; (3) by a Congress Section. It is not good that Congress made a permanent form out of what was intended to be a provisional one. A section should exist in a country until it becomes the local representative body or a federation of societies, or until the existing Kehillah is induced to become representative of the Congress.

Congress has certain duties towards the Yishuvim: to stimulate them to lead a Jewish life, to foster their organisations, and to emphasise the communal and democratic structure of the Yishuvim.

DR. SAUL SOKAL (*United States*): I wish to deal only with one item of the organisational report, the proposal to transfer the centre and the headquarters of Congress from New York to Europe. As the first argument, the fact was given that Congress was founded in Europe, had its organisational centre there, and 'only due to the war' transferred its headquarters to America. 'Only due to the war,' as if the war were just a trifle. 'Only due to the war' were six million Jews murdered. 'Only due to the war' there is no longer a European Jewry. 'Only due to the war' has American Jewry become the main body of the Jewish people in the Diaspora. I therefore think the argument is wrong; it is wrong to treat the matter, so to say, as a technical one, that only due to the war was the centre transferred to New York and should now, after the war, be transferred back to Europe.

A second argument was used: if the centre is in Great

Britain, it will be near Europe. But all of us know that officials alone can do nothing, even if they are close by. Did we achieve much in Belgium and Sweden? No land is nearer than Belgium to London. In technical and business matters, distance is important, but for Congress, social, political, economic and cultural conditions are what matters. From this point of view, there is, outside of Israel, only the United States, with its five million Jews, which has influence and power. Public opinion in the United States also counts. In 1936, when Congress was founded, the United States was not involved in world politics; today it is in the forefront. In 1936, the American Jewish public was not internationally minded, from a Jewish standpoint, but today it is.

Furthermore, in the United States, the Yishuv has Yiddish newspapers and writers and there is an informed Jewish opinion. Whatever the future has in store, there is no doubt that New York is the centre of Diaspora Jewry at the present time.

We are not facing the issue whether to establish the centre of the World Jewish Congress in New York, London or Geneva. The issue is rather: should an already existing centre be abandoned, moved from America to Europe? Would you in earnest contemplate giving up New York, vibrating with Jewish life, and take instead London, Paris or Geneva, from which, in comparison, Jewish life has unfortunately been drained?

I have in mind not the American Jewish Congress, the American Section of Congress, but the World Jewish Congress itself. Its roots would be weakened by removal from the source of Jewish life. The centre of the World Jewish Congress should be where the centre of Jewish life is, and outside Israel, that centre is in the United States.

ME. DAVID LAMBERT (*France*): I will restrict my suggestions to four points of the organisational problem: Congress leadership, the organisation of the Executive, the problem of the seat of the Congress and the problem of the organisation of world Jewry. We are assured of leadership of the Congress through our president, Dr. Nahum Goldmann and the officers, but there should be meetings of the nucleus of the Executive several times a year to control the work of the staff. This has been done most recently by the Co-ordinating Committee, which should transform itself into a bureau, as we say in France. I believe it does not make much sense to increase the number of Executive members since the Executive at present is a rather heavy apparatus.

Mr. Sieff gave a brilliant exposition of why the headquarters of the Congress should be moved to Europe. Undoubtedly one would

be glad to see the headquarters of the organisation of world Jewry transferred closer to certain countries and Jewish communities with which we would like to have contact. A neutral city like Geneva might be a good choice but there are good arguments for keeping the headquarters in New York; somewhat ironically, I wish we could transfer the seat of Congress to Moscow, for that would show that many things have changed. But this we will have to leave to a rather remote future. I suggest that the Executive examine the merit of all the arguments and decide, for the good of world Jewry, to move our headquarters, if necessary.

Finally, there is the last point, on which we can talk least definitely, but which is the most important one, the main plan of Dr. Goldmann—the rallying of all Jewries of the Diaspora, whatever their political inclinations, under the banner of Congress. We know how the Congress has grown; we know the esteem in which it is held by governments; we can say that if Congress had the authority in 1939-40 which it has today, we would probably not have had to witness the horrible events of 1940-45.

In order to maintain Congress, to make it into a more authentically representative organ of world Jewry, we will have to agree to sacrifices. Congress is needed on the one hand as a defence against anti-Semitism and also to make sure that Judaism can progress and develop in the cultural field, without which Judaism faces extinction. Let us therefore do all in our power to rally under our flag, the flag of the World Jewish Congress, all those throughout the world who remain attached to Judaism.

DR. A. LEON KUBOVY (*Israel*): I listened with interest to the debates and to the Symposium on Cultural Pluralism, but why did the rapporteurs on organisation not mention organisational pluralism in Jewish life, since it was mentioned here that Congress was founded to put an end to this problem? Dr. Goldmann and Mr. Sieff reminded us that the rise of Hitler prompted the founding of Congress, but 1936 also meant the call to realise the dream of world Jewish unity through a single instrument. We should give the Jewish people in the Diaspora the possibility to take care of its own affairs by supplying it with authorised leadership, with an address which can always be used. Those who did Congress work in 1940-45 knew how tragic it was that a single authorised leadership did not exist, for the Jewish people were not ready to recognise such a leadership. When I hear the continual quoting of 'Remember what Amalek hath done unto you,' I always want to add 'Remember what you have done to yourself,' when you lacked a leadership and were not prepared.

However optimistic our evaluation of the Diaspora is, we must raise the question whether the Jewish people in the Diaspora have created an instrument more effective than that of 1940. To be sure, the miracle of Israel has happened since, being not only a home, not only a haven, but a force equipped with so many attributes of sovereignty. The establishment of Israel has been a tower of respect and honour for the Jews everywhere and thus contains in itself an element of protection for them. But except for the State of Israel, did we create the necessary instrument?

Mr. Sieff's proposals attest to his concern for preparedness. But as he well knows, technical perfection is not enough. What good is the best machine if we do not have the key? Perhaps we have made no headway because the Jewish people does not speak with a single authorised voice, but with hundreds of voices and even if all say the same thing, the effect is weakness, not strength. Circumstances are now worse than in the days of the Shtadlan, because he was recognised as the spokesman for all. We must carry out a Cheshbon Hanefesh (soul searching) and find out if the World Jewish Congress has decided to abandon its ambition to create a unitary representation and a single instrument for Diaspora Jewry. I have never been against committees for co-operation for specific purposes; we always considered them as transitory palliatives. I should like to ask Dr. Goldmann to think again before he gives his permission for a new External Jewish Affairs Commission that is about to be created by another large Jewish organisation, because I consider organisational pluralism to be a source of impotence and atomisation in times of peril.

I know it can be said that the very idea of the Congress has from the beginning been utopian in this respect. But I have been convinced in Israel and at this Assembly that we are nearer the realisation of our goal.

It matters much in Congress history that reputable labour leaders of Israel, and also Sephardi leaders, find it necessary to attend this Assembly. A twofold process is going on in Israel: the desire to be reconciled with the Golah and the desire to see the Yishuv in Israel as a part of the Jewish people. In 1936 Dr. Tartakower and myself were almost excommunicated when we acknowledged the relative permanence of the Golah. The acceptance of this idea today, accompanied by the desire of the Yishuv of Israel to be a part of world Jewry which numbers 12 million, is the beginning of a great revolution.

In the light of that twofold process, a new importance accrues to the Chesbon Hanefesh that is going on in the World

Zionist Organisation which was expressed at the last meeting of the Zionist Actions Committee. My friends from South Africa know that I always tried to strengthen the influence and authority of the Zionist leadership, but the government of Israel, in the eyes of the Diaspora, is the highest authority, if not the only one, in matters of Israel and Zion.

But Israel and the Golah are ready, I think, to recognise the authority of a single overall organisation concerned with strengthening Israel and with continuity in the Golah. I am grateful that Dr. Goldmann spoke of an 'overall organisation' although his phrasing may have been nebulous and purposely cautious, but the idea is clear. In time to come there will be, instead of the World Jewish Congress and the World Zionist Organisation, a single, world-wide organisation for all Jewish problems.

But time alone, without earnest discussion, without an ideological struggle in our political parties and organisations, and without new tools and forms, will not bring about new ways to develop Israel and make it secure and guarantee our continuity everywhere. Therefore I believe that any plan for the complete re-organisation of Congress, excepting partial corrections, is at present premature.

MR. SHAD POLIER (*United States*): Some of the proposals made by Mr. Sieff are of a technical nature which will have to be dealt with by the Executive Committee. I wish to single out for my comments the proposal that the headquarters of Congress should be moved from New York to some place in Europe. Mr. Sieff said that but for the war the headquarters would have remained in Europe, close to the field of our main activities. To brush aside the events of these unhappy 25 years or so on the ground that they are merely accidents or events of history, is to miss the entire point. These same events of history involved the destruction of six million Jews and changed the centre of gravity of Jewry to the United States—and this is true not only of Jewish politics but of non-Jewish politics. How then is it conceivable that the headquarters shall be elsewhere than in the United States? It has been said with a great deal of truth that the World Jewish Congress has not achieved the desired impact upon the American Jewish community, which is all the more reason that the headquarters must remain in the United States for it is by our success in interesting and involving American Jewry that the fate of the Jewish people will be largely influenced. Everyone in this hall is aware of the value of the participation of American Jewry when issues arise involving Israel—one has to think back only to the Sinai campaign. Let us think how much more influential with the

American government and with other forces in America we in the Congress could be if we could carry our message more effectively to American Jewry. The Zionist movement started in America in 1896 and not in 1936 and an enormous amount of the devotion of Jewish leaders in America still continues to be involved in the future of Israel.

American Jewry, in terms of international political affairs, is about 25 years behind the times. It is only in the past two or three decades that America as a nation has emerged from an isolationist mentality. American Jewry so far has not yet emerged. One has only to work with organisations as the B'nai B'rith and the Jewish Labour Committee to realise that for them it is a matter of the utmost delicacy to gather even for the purpose of consultations, much less participation in this or any other body in which politics are carried on 365 days of the year. These people with whom we have been working in association for these past two years, are, in a sense, the most advanced of the most backward.

This is the great challenge in Jewish political life: how shall we bring American Jewry into involvement in international affairs? The last way in the world to do it is to move from the United States the headquarters of Congress. That would leave on the American scene, the American Jewish Congress (as the mailing address of the World Jewish Congress), the American Jewish Committee with its new international department, and the B'nai B'rith. The World Jewish Congress must remain in the American view as the important international organisation. Failure in the past to achieve this, apart from the fact that it is an enormously difficult problem, is due to the shortcomings of the American Jewish Congress and also to the shortcomings of the World Jewish Congress, which has not thought of its own responsibility, before carrying on political activity within the American Jewish community, of having its spokesmen involving the American Jewish community. It would be foolhardy and dangerous to move the headquarters from the United States. I do not deal with the matter of whether this or that particular operation may be moved to Europe for reasons of economy or other such reasons, but on the basic issues, it would be most unwise to envisage such a move.

I would like to comment on one or two other points. One of the things that it is necessary that we do at this Plenum or within the next year is to establish a branch of the Executive in South America. I would like to comment on the whole concept of branches of the Executive. A branch is not a country, even though for practical and other reasons there is now an Israeli Branch. A

branch is an opportunity for the members of the Executive of one or a dozen countries conveniently to meet together more frequently than the annual meetings and to carry out these particular tasks that may be assigned to them by the entire Executive. It would indeed be a dangerous thing to think of the Executive as something of three parts or four parts, there is only one Executive. These are parts of the Executive and should take council with each other, not develop their own particular pride of being a separate Executive.

I am very glad that the time has come that it is necessary to have not merely a Western Hemisphere Branch, but to have a Latin American, or South American or Central American Branch. It is a testimony to our success that this has come about. Latin America became important in the United Nations ten years before Latin American Jewry realised its importance in world Jewry. It is not an accident that one follows after the other, because basically we are concerned, in Congress, with politics, and if Latin American Jews today were not concerned with world politics, and continued to be concerned only with South American politics, world Jewry would be in a bad way.

Finally, changes have to be made and will have to be discussed here and in the Executive Committee. We must all of us ever be aware of the fact that a very small number of underpaid and very overworked members of our staff at the Executive and all levels, have carried on a great tradition in magnificent work for all these eleven years since Montreux. What we owe to them cannot be repaid, certainly not out of our poor resources, but must be repaid many times over out of our hearts.

MR. ISRAEL OVSEJEVICH (*Argentina*): All of us recognise the need to organise Jewish life in the Diaspora, whether we are inclined toward Zionism or not. Congress has always known how to adapt its activities to the needs of the time, when it was necessary to counteract persecution, to do rescue work or to aid Israel.

Now Congress faces new tasks. A new Yishuv is growing in the Diaspora, a new generation living in a free world which does not know the tradition of European Jewry of the pre-war era. It is the task of Congress to help fight the danger of assimilation. Work among youth must be stressed, firstly in student clubs, where they exist, and where there are none, they should be started. We believe that in the universities in Argentina there are 12,000 Jewish students who are our future doctors, lawyers and engineers. They will no doubt make good professional men and we have to see to it that they do not lack a Jewish education.

It is not true that there are no Jewish labourers in the Americas. There is a large percentage of them in the larger Yishuvim, but they are hardly in evidence in Jewish organisations. A Congress journal in Spanish is needed, similar to Gesher in Hebrew, or the English language journal.

There is anti-Semitism in both the Americas. The Jews in North America act as if it does not exist, although some residential quarters and hotels are "restricted" and sometimes windows are smashed. In many Latin American countries the governments are not stable, the economy is plagued by inflation and there is political chaos, all of which creates fertile soil for anti-Semitism. Fortunately our youth knows that Jewish blood cannot be shed with impunity, but there are organisational means to channel this knowledge.

The time has come for Congress to set up sections or departments in all fields of activity. I welcome the proposal to establish an Executive for South America. The Yishuvim there have grown up economically, socially and politically. It was said here that there is lack of co-ordination among the three Executive Branches, the problem will not be aggravated by the creation of a fourth; on the contrary, the South Americans, thanks to their character, will perhaps instil a new breath of life in Congress. The new Executive Branch should be broad in order to give democratic representation to all groups and factors.

It is no secret that Congress in North America has not succeeded in becoming a popular movement. The fact of the headquarters being in New York has not made it possible for the Yishuv in South America to organise itself on its own. We therefore support transferring the headquarters of Congress to a European country. Without reporting in full about the DAIA, I only want to say that the DAIA stood the test by resisting identification with the various regimes in spite of strong pressure by the rulers. The World Jewish Congress should stimulate the creation of central bodies in all countries like the DAIA where there are none. Such central, democratic organisations are the true representatives of the Yishuvim.

DR. S. A. MILLER (*Great Britain*): When presenting his report from the Special Study Committee, Mr. Sieff said that this Committee was proposing far-reaching changes. We expected the Special Committee to be bold and we expect the Executive to be bold in dealing with its recommendations.

Congress had to be organisationally bold in the past. It had to re-organise itself completely owing to the exigencies of war and we all know how successfully it did so. As time evolves, further re-

organisation is necessary and must be dealt with as the need arises. We are faced in our own lifetime with the fragmentation of Jewish life. In a world in which the general conditions of life, especially amongst the so-called 'have' countries, are tending to become more and more similar; Jewish life is becoming differentiated in different parts of the world. The Congress has to draw together these different Jewish lives and to give all the communities a sense of membership in a world organisation. This contact between the Executive and the affiliates is still tenuous, and in improving it we should be careful that when the Co-ordinating Committee sets up a body, it should not only have full time Executive members but have full representation from each of the affiliates or from groups of affiliates.

Although the Committee worked in London, we in the British Section had no share in its deliberations and have learned of its recommendations only here at this Plenum. We have not ourselves completely studied the full implications of the controversial suggestion that the headquarters should be moved back to Europe, but we do see many cogent arguments in its favour. The largest section of Jewish population is in the United States, but the centre of gravity of Jewish life is not in the United States. The World Jewish Congress has to find the centre of gravity between the main poles of Jewish life in the United States, in Israel and in Soviet Russia. Geographically and mechanically that centre of gravity is more likely to be in Europe than in the United States. Some of our friends from the United States seem to treat it as a suggestion to shut up shop in America and this is very far from the intention of the Special Study Committee. This is a technical matter, not a matter of emotion, but if there is still an isolationist mentality among American Jewry, it would seem to be a good thing to have headquarters moved for that reason also. The suggestion to set up a fourth South American Branch seems to be an excellent one. If the Executive brings the headquarters of Congress back to Europe, we can pledge the moral support of the British section and the sympathetic opinion of the great majority of Anglo-Jewry.

We would have liked to have seen many of the details which were omitted from these recommendations. We would have liked to have seen some study of the relationship between Congress and the other bodies with which we have to become tied to, because we have not become all-embracing. I hope that the Organisation Commission will be really constructive. We know that the underlying important factors are the emotional approach, Jewish feeling, and so on, but without a healthy organisation, emotional and political ideas cannot find their proper expression. Whatever the organi-

sation has been in the past, however well it has been served, if the time has come to make changes we must be bold enough to agree to make such changes.

MR. GREGORIO FAINGUERSCH (*Argentina*): Our fellow delegate from Argentina, in giving his opinion about the transfer of headquarters from New York, spoke for himself, not for the delegation.

Anti-Semitism today is not the principal danger for the Jewish people in the Diaspora, nor is it physical annihilation; the main danger now is assimilation. Large parts of many Yishuvim have been eaten into because of assimilation, and many of our youth are being assimilated and are lost to us. It is therefore our task in the future to concentrate on organising the Yishuvim in order to have Congress represented not through a committee or some groups, but through a traditional Kehillah—which should be created in each Yishuv—adapted to modern times. Congress has to build a Kehillah in each Yishuv and the Kehillah should build Jewish life, always oriented toward Israel.

The Kehillah should first of all organise Jewish education and cultural work; help meet religious needs; do modern social work; give their attention to the youth, especially the chalutzim among them; in short, it should be modelled on the Buenos Aires Kehillah and should stimulate the organisation of an institution like the DAIA. Only a Kehillah can deter assimilation, the greatest danger today.

We can proudly say that we are the only ones who represent the whole Argentine Yishuv. Because of our experience, we offer our aid to the Congress to organise the Yishuvim and even in smaller Yishuvim we offer material help.

MRS. CHAYA SURCHIN (*United States*): Congress organisational problems are very important because by solving them it is possible to go on to work in the political and cultural areas. I welcome the fact that the Latin-American Jewish communities desire to become the fourth Congress section.

It is impossible to transfer the Congress centre from America to Europe. There is a pulsating, vibrating Jewish life in America. The influence of Congress on American Jewry, will grow, if its leadership becomes more dynamic and if a strong American Section is created. I am a member of the American Delegation but I also express the viewpoint of the Labour Zionist movement. The Congress has to take care of the needs of the Golah and the Golah and Israel must help each other.

If we are to make American Jewry conscious of the existence

and the needs of the Jewish people, we must do some propaganda work among the youth.

I wish to congratulate Dr. Schwarzbart and Dr. Riegner on their careful and honest reports. They reported on what has been achieved and what has not; the reports gave us insight into each Yishuv, and since the small Yishuvim look to the large American Jewish community, it is up to the American Jews to support them.

Congress faces a great task; it is perhaps the government of the Golah and should, together with Israel be concerned with the continuity of the Jewish people.

MR. MORDECHAI OREN (*Israel*): The organisational problems of the Congress necessarily should reflect its special roles which are: to foster the oneness of the Jewish people, to defend their rights everywhere they are infringed upon, to work for the continuity of the Jewish people in its struggle against assimilation and disintegration, to strengthen the unification of the people in the State of Israel with the people in the Diaspora by guaranteeing that the State of Israel fills a special place in the life of the Jewish people.

One of the organisation problems of Congress springs from its global structure. For the Congress to be able to fulfil its great tasks, it must be completely global not only in name, but also in the political reality of the life of the people. It is true that Congress is accepted both by the Jewish people and also in the international political arena, like the United Nations, as the most representative body of the Jewish people. But it is a fact that there exists a whole series of Jewish organisations, local, regional and even international, who compete with Congress in various areas of activity and who impair not a little the blessed work.

We must say, to our regret, that these organisations do not display any willingness to overcome their long-time practice of professional dilettantism and to respond to our initiative that there be established one overall Jewish organisation authorised to speak in the name of the Jewish people. We must be grateful for the present co-operation with the rest of the Jewish organisations in various fields. Although the hour demands urgently the establishment of a single Jewish representation, I am not one of those who wishes to rush the attainment of the ultimate. We have to go step by step in patience toward general unity within the framework of Congress. Towards this end our role is to enlarge the possibilities of Congress in all the fields of activity.

Another problem is the tie of the Jewish groups in the socialist countries with the Jewish people and, from an organisation point of view, with the Congress. Dr. Goldmann was right in his declaring

on the opening night that Congress takes the line of absolute neutrality in the international arena, and that the Jewish people is not capitalist, socialist or communist. But I want to add that in the framework of Congress there is room for all ideological and political groups and for the many points of view looking at the world, on condition that they are united in two things: recognition of the existence and oneness of the Jewish people, and the desire to encourage our people in its struggle for its existence. Not alone as a faithful Jew, but also as a Marxist and a faithful Socialist, I demand the right of existence of the Jewish community in the USSR and the right to declare themselves a national group, as this right is given to other nationalities, the right of contact with its people, of a communal, cultural and national life and of emigration to Israel. In relation to this last point, this can be said not only of the USSR.

This demand must be proclaimed, not as one delegate here declared, threateningly, and not out of hate for the powerful socialistic structure, but on the basis of human justice, and on the basis also of the elementary right of our people to a national existence and renaissance. Just as I believe in the realisation of socialism in the Soviet Union, so I also believe that the day will come when the right of the Jewish community there to declare themselves as a national entity and the right to national existence will be recognised. In order to bring this day nearer, we must do everything in our power that our just demand is not adulterated by incitement against the very system of these lands, and that our demands should not be a part of the cold war. I am sure that absolute failure awaits those who wish to overthrow socialist regimes, but I believe deeply in the success of our struggle for the national existence of the Jewish community and for the right of emigration to Israel under the socialist regime. We are all happy that our friends from Poland came, although we cannot agree with much that they said here.

If indeed you, the delegates from Poland, want to strengthen the progressive character of Congress and guarantee the existence of the Jewish people on the basis of democracy and world peace, and if you want to strengthen the power of the Socialist camp and the Jewish people and its world organisation, then please come to the Congress as full members and not only as observers but with united forces, and we will work for the good of Congress and of the people.

We agree that the Congress centre be transferred to the main regions of its activity. The contact must be strengthened between the administration and the country-wide branches. Congress should

support all who fight against assimilation and especially help the chalutzim youth organisation who are also a shield against assimilation.

To conclude: I wish to express on behalf of the entire Israeli Delegation, and I hope not only on behalf of the Israeli Delegation, our deep disappointment in the curtailment of the Hebrew language in the work of the Congress. Hebrew is assigned the task of strengthening the national unity of the State of Israel and the people in the Diaspora. We demand that this wrong be righted in the future.

DR. HENDRIK VAN DAM (*Germany*): On behalf of the German Delegation I would like to make a few remarks on the question of organisation, and the Congress being in the United States and widely considered as an American organisation. We are in favour of Congress remaining where it is, in Stephen Wise House. If the Congress joins a new body of international organisations, it is very important for us, as for other European delegations, that we be on the Committee that deals with the matters of this international organisation, because I think there is a danger that, by establishing this new international organisation, Europe may become second-rate. This is more important for us than the question of Congress moving from the United States to Europe.

This is a personal remark. Tributes have been paid here to the people working in Congress. I especially wish to pay tribute to Nehemiah Robinson, who is not here, as one of the most sincere and finest officers in Jewish life and to mention the special esteem in which he is held by the German Delegation.

MRS. DORA GOLDSTEIN (*Great Britain*): I speak only on a very specific question. I wish to refer to Dr. Riegner's remarks when he criticised the delegates present for lack of financial support. At an international session such as this, there should be a budget for the affiliates and what they may do for the head office. I do not consider that you have a right to expect any responsible feeling, either from your affiliates or from the communities where you operate, if you do not take them into your confidence. I know that until now the affiliates were not asked to contribute. I hope to see the principle of budgets enforced, budgets for the affiliates, for their own expenses and their contribution to the head office. Then, such budgets and financial reports will be presented to our Assemblies and while trying to raise these budgets they will constantly have to extend their efforts in order to get more and more supporters. The biggest stimulus comes from knowing that you have to raise your funds. I hope that for organisational, financial

and democratic reasons, a system of budgets will be introduced.

MR. DONALD SILK (*Great Britain*): I wish to speak on one aspect of the organisation problem which is tended to be ignored in most Jewish communities throughout the world. The vast majority of our membership belong to the above-45 year age group. But there is the lost generation, the young married people from 20 to 45 years of age, who are building their careers and raising their families. The future of our people is vested in this age group and if we can get them they will send their children to Jewish Day Schools, and they and their children will be persuaded to ally themselves with the Jewish people. We think that because we have Jewish youth clubs that we have captured the Jewish youth. We must realise that you do not build Judaism on tennis and ballroom dancing. We all know the difficulties this generation is faced with—there are children to look after, there are domestic responsibilities. But if we seriously want them, we must gather them together. We must not be ashamed to speak to meetings of six young couples meeting in a private home, if we want to give them our message. We must get away from the idea that a mass meeting is the only way of addressing people. All over the world we cannot get people to public meetings, but we can get them in private homes and we must make up a special programme for this generation which is missing from our movement—otherwise in 30 years' time it is a question if we shall have an assembly like this, for the Jewish people will have disintegrated.

MR. MICHAEL RADZINSKI (*Peru*): The Jewish community in Peru, organised under the auspices of Congress as a Kehillah, comprises all the Jews of the country. We have a school for 600 boys. Our youth already participates in our work and 60 per cent of them are represented in our institutions. Our youth also administers the school so it cannot be said that they do not want to cooperate. It is up to the older people to invite the youth to participate with them—every community can do what we did. Now is the time to create a single framework under one leadership.

ELEVENTH SESSION

August 6, 1959 (Afternoon)

In the Chair: PROFESSOR YITZHAK SCIACY (*Israel*):

1. DEBATE ON ORGANIZATIONAL PROBLEMS

DR. NELLA ROST-HOLLANDER (*Uruguay*): The Congress is still remote from the ordinary man. The fact that the central bodies of the communities have been activated has little bearing on the mass of the people. We have many suggestions for the Organization Commission to find ways and means for increasing the popularity of Congress and reaching the ordinary man.

We wish to ask the Assembly to see to it that knowledge of Congress penetrates into the masses of the Jewish people and that it does not remain an organization of an exclusive group of the community. This is the ambition of our Yishuv in Uruguay and I hope also of other Yishuvim so that the Congress should grow and expand.

MR. ZVI BERNSTEIN (*Israel*): This Assembly lacks the forcefulness of a conference of representatives of the people. Its participants lack the sense of importance such an Assembly should have. I read in Dr. Schwarzbart's report his great longing and feeling of anxiety; to my sorrow I do not find it here. It seems to me that the handling of organizational matters is responsible for this. I do not mean to find fault with our organizers.

Congress more resembles an umbrella organization and is less the expression of a mass movement. It seems to me that the Congress does not draw its inspiration and authority from close ties with the various strata of the people. However, I do not ignore the fact that the work of the Congress cannot compare with the Israel Zionist activity which overshadows our work and presents dangerous competition in attracting the masses to Congress. On the basis of the short experience of a number of years, I can state there are two reasons for this situation: one is that Congress does not attempt to make contact with the people. I am sure that if they were approached we would be more successful in getting them to join. The other reason is that Congress is not a democrati-

cally organized body. Only the Israel Executive is democratically constituted.

The Israel Executive is democratic since it is made up of the parties according to the strength they achieve in the elections to the Knesset every four years. I do not know of the democratic structure of any other bodies of Congress, national or international. This important Assembly also is not organized democratically. In this way the institutions of the Congress become estranged from the people. The Co-ordinating Committee, which is actually the highest authority, is not successive in its operation nor does the Executive meet for lack of funds.

The religious representatives must express astonishment at the minuteness of the part of religious Jews in the Congress; and if we reconciled ourselves with this situation up until now with difficulty, now that there is talk on all sides of the new programme which will be started in Congress, in view of the aim to put the emphasis on spiritual and educational work, it is necessary to found institutions in Congress which will reflect the cultural trends of the masses.

DR. DAVID FAIGENBERG (*Israel*): I want first of all to protest against the appearance of my friend from the Israel Delegation, Mr. Oren, who found it necessary this morning to inject into the organizational discussion an outspoken political declaration. The political debate finished yesterday and it is impossible to force us to answer him today.

One more thing. Mr. Oren blessed the Polish Delegation; he blessed them in his name. This was not the decision of the Israel Delegation; there were those of the Israel Delegation in Tel-Aviv who opposed inviting the Polish Delegation because it is not representative. I think the words of Smoliar justified the opposition to the invitation. I am sure that Smoliar does not represent the Jewish community in Poland in what he said about the State of Israel.

In Israel a new generation is growing up, a generation which 'does not know Joseph', a generation which does not know and does not understand the Golah. This generation is the essence of the problem of the future of the Jewish people. This generation has ceased to feel its common destiny with the Jewish people dispersed throughout the world. This generation does not understand the language of the Jews dispersed throughout the world and I see in this the main danger to the wholeness of the Jewish people and its future. If a Sabra were to listen to the hair-splitting on Golah, Tfutzah, and Chutz laAretz, he would not understand

what was being said. If a Sabra were to hear the symposium on cultural pluralism, he would oppose it. Because we in Israel demand not cultural pluralism, but cultural uniformity. We in Israel have not yet passed the stage of the melting pot. We cannot permit ourselves the luxury of an orchestra; this would not be an orchestra—in Israel it would be cacophony. And, therefore, from this situation I draw one conclusion, an organizational conclusion. The Congress must regard its primary role to approach the young generation in Israel and to guarantee a common language between it and world Jewry. All organizational decisions must take into consideration three measures. First, to strengthen the Israel Executive of the Congress and to give it the possibility to operate not only as an administrative body but also to institute educational work among the Israel youth; second, to set up for the Israel Executive a suitable budget to carry out these activities; and third, to set up, in conjunction with the Israel Executive, a Youth Department, because on this department and not on other means, will the success of the work of the Congress depend in the future.

MR. MOSHE EREM (*Israel*): Three central problems have come before this Fourth Plenary Assembly: the political, the cultural-educational and the organizational problem. The political and cultural problems are clearly defined but there is a dense fog around the question of organization, and even the printed report of the Organization Department does not make it less dense.

To be sure, this is an imposing Assembly, but what is there to tie the delegates to the Congress after they have left here, just as we may ask what ties the Yishuvim to the Congress. What organizational basis is there, outside of the Congress apparatus? Israel is the only exception. Five and a half million Jews live in the United States but how many of them does the Congress represent? True, there may be Kehilloth which are affiliated with Congress, but what is its influence in their daily life, in their cultural and social work? Hundreds of various Jewish organizations are connected with Israel, but does Congress act as co-ordinator for their various activities? Does the Congress mean something to all these organizations? No. Is Congress at least an efficient factor in the cultural and social areas? Far from it, regrettably.

Congress becomes more and more a representative institution. Not having individual membership, it lacks a feeling of comradeship. Each political body must be built either on individual

membership or political, consolidated groups whose delegates are responsible for their groups. I am told that individual membership is a party matter, but B'nai B'rith is composed of millions of individual members. Congress is mainly an apparatus, perhaps a good apparatus, but no more than an apparatus.

It is now controversial if Israel and its Torah are one and the same. It is not controversial that Congress and its apparatus are one and the same. There is no mass of active volunteer workers, there is no youth who must be accounted to. Due to the structure of the apparatus, the pyramid is upside down; everything is based on the top, the President—a President, perhaps, with all the possible virtues, but with one fault; everything hinges on him. Take him away and everything collapses. And he knows it full well.

Here is the paradox: in Israel the apparatus is nothing but an apparatus. It neither decides nor dictates, but only executes what has been worked out by others. This is so because in Israel Congress is built on political bodies. We do not war on one another, we try to co-operate and it seems, not unsuccessfully. We meet regularly, take counsel with one another and make our decisions.

The time has come to deal with the organizational problem as a central question. We must have a true organization, democratic, built on a social basis; if not on mass membership, it should be built on the basis of active volunteer workers or local, national councils, to whom the apparatus is responsible. The time has come to draw our youth into Congress. The time has come to tie together all the executives and to organize a central secretariat in a political centre. Then will the instrument known as Congress, be ready to go to work.

M. JACQUES JAKOUBOWICZ (*France*): In France, around Paris and in the West, Congress is about to develop into a mass movement. It is the ambition of the major part of the French Section to take in the whole of French Jewry. To do this we must establish public relations with the non-Jewish press, with the Jewish press, with radio, and, if necessary, with television. Then we shall have to distribute a short, attractive, convincing booklet, giving a historical resumé of Congress, its present importance, its affiliations its goals. Then we will have to study the possibility of a propaganda film, which, for reasons of economy, will be put together from parts of existing suitable films. It would be preferable to create a wholly new, original film which would show the multiple activities of Congress, to be exhibited in the various communities

together with explanatory addresses as part of membership drives.

Congress publications such as 'World Jewry' and 'La Vie Juive' together with American, Israeli, German and other Jewish periodicals could be pooled to create a central means for commercial publicity paid for by Jews as well as non-Jews. Finally, we could publish annually, like other international organizations, the Congress annual, in which advertising could be an important source of revenue. This annual would contain a list of affiliated communities and the addresses of all correspondents or delegates of Congress throughout the world. This would, for instance, enable a Jew in Paraguay to contact a Jewish attorney in New York or Paris. Payment of membership fee to Congress would permit each member to insert an advertisement in the annual, which would thus pay for itself.

Finally, as to the daily work of organization: a four-year propaganda and membership drive campaign, depending on the number of Jews residing in every country, should be planned. Thanks to the new blood which in this way would be brought into Congress, we would have reservoirs from which to choose new young leaders. In order to eliminate possible antagonisms locally, it will be necessary completely to unify the Sephardim and Ashkenazim. We can imbue our campaign with the modern spirit, use modern methods of publicity in order to obtain results for Congress and for this I shall put myself enthusiastically at the disposal of Congress. I also wish to mention possible co-operation with other organizations.

MR. LEO FINK (*Australia*): Although many responsible Australian Jewish leaders had at one time or another felt that we should join the World Jewish Congress, there was the fear that affiliation means surrender of sovereignty, which means a great deal to a young state. I was therefore very pleased to read in Dr. Schwarzbart's report that Congress first obtained the consent of the affiliated community for any proposed action. That clear statement by Dr. Schwarzbart should do away with any such fear which may exist in communities not yet affiliated with Congress. It should be made clear that at no time will Congress endanger the autonomy of its affiliates. The Executive Council of Australian Jewry, which is the roof organization of Australian Jewry, is completely independent on issues concerning Australia. They have never failed to consult Congress before taking decisions in matters regarding world Jewry. They are grateful to the Congress for the wealth of material with which they have been supplied.

The Warsaw Ghetto Commemoration is observed with great

solemnity in every Australian state. Over 3,000 people, out of a Jewish population of 32,000, fill the halls of Melbourne on this occasion. The people who attend such meetings are in the majority new arrivals, the real victims and survivors of Nazism. Unless the Congress continues its policy to remind the Jewish community of our greatest tragedy, the young generation is liable to forget. This date, like that of Tisha B'Av, should appear on every Jewish calendar and it might also be good to create a symbol of remembrance depicting the Warsaw Ghetto heroes and the lost six million, for every Jewish home.

The visits of Congress leaders to Australia are of great benefit, for they help to stimulate Jewish consciousness. I am looking forward to the day when our President, Dr. Nahum Goldmann, will honour us with a visit. When Jews of great prominence visit us, they give us a feeling of equality with the larger Jewish communities, they bring to us, the remotest settlers of the Dispersion, inspiration and joy. Our contacts with the Congress, the centre, are sound. However, our relations with the periphery, the affiliates, are lacking in strength.

Organized visits by prominent leaders of other Jewish communities can greatly benefit Australia and the affiliates. I was happy to hear of the so-called cultural foreign policy, the idea of Dr. Steinberg, of selling the Diaspora to Israel; it is a policy of give and take and one which, I am sure, will give especially to the Sabras of Israel, a much better understanding of the Diaspora.

I also wish to propose to the Organization Commission, that in case a regional organization for Far Eastern and South Asian countries is created, Australia should be its seat. Regarding the question of Congress headquarters, we favour a policy of status quo; a change may upset the work of drawing into the orbit of Congress countries which are not yet affiliated; New York for the time being is the best address.

DR. LIONEL KOPELOWITZ (*Great Britain*): Yesterday we heard, among others, Mr. Israel Sieff, who is particularly to be congratulated on the results of his two years' work as chairman of the Study Committee. He is boldly attempting to streamline this organization, which was built up piecemeal as new departments had to be created. I share Dr. Goldmann's optimism that if the situation in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe would be eased, there will be increasing immigration to Israel and the likelihood of large anti-Semitic outbreaks fairly remote. Therefore, it is all the more important that the headquarters of Congress be moved to the nerve centre of the Jewish world, which is bound to be Europe.

Thus it will be near Russia and the Eastern European countries and the countries in Africa which have achieved independence. Therefore, I cannot accept the thesis elaborated by Dr. Schwarzbart and Mr. Shad Polier, that it is necessary for the headquarters to remain in the United States. They maintain that if the headquarters are moved, it will weaken the American Jewish Congress; on the contrary, I believe that the American Jewish Congress, which functions at the same address, would be stronger if it were allowed to develop along its own lines.

This has not been referred to in the report, but Dr. Goldmann himself envisages a much larger world Jewish organization. It may be five years before this Plenum comes together again. During that time this body may be dissolved or it may be permanently established as a large world organization for the Jewish people. We ought to know what the position of Congress will be in relation to a large functioning Congress or a Conference of Jewish Organizations.

MR. J. KORMAN (*Observer, Social and Cultural Association of Jews in Poland*): We take the floor in an organizational debate, even though we are observers, in view of the fact that many of you expressed the desire to see us here as full members. We followed attentively the discussion on the organizational structure of Congress which went on in part of the Jewish press in America, Israel and elsewhere. We also read the published reports of the Organization Department and followed the speeches delivered yesterday. Regrettably no essential changes have been proposed.

Dr. Schwarzbart takes comfort in the fact that the Yishuv in New Zealand numbering 4,000 joined Congress during the six-year period after the Third Assembly. He also speaks of the efforts made to win over the Yishuv of Singapore, which numbers 800 Jews and the Yishuv in Jamaica of 1,500. We do not want to belittle the importance of these small Yishuvim. But why is it that in almost all the large Yishuvim in which Congress has affiliates, active, cultured groups are excluded? This is the case in the United States, Argentina and other countries where the progressive Jewish organizations are kept away from the fold, so to speak, by the local leaders of Congress, for purely political reasons. A great deal has been said here about the unity to be created with Congress as the centre but such unity should not be only quantitative, counting the Yishuvim which are formally affiliated, but the unity should be qualitative, comprising all political groups. The groups in question are culturally and socially no less active than the organizations which are affiliated.

I speak of this matter because a few days ago a delegate from England wished that we, the Polish Delegation, could work as equal members in Congress. Our friend Orfus also wished we could remain, although he does not tolerate the mentioning of the Union, where I was an active member. As a representative of the Union in France, I would not be permitted to speak here but just because I now live in Poland, I have become more welcome. There are differences of opinion between the Congress and the workers of the Union or the IKUF organizations in various countries. These political differences of opinion also exist between you and us of the Polish People's Democracy.

We categorically reject what Dr. Goldmann said yesterday on Germany. The man who is now speaking to you was unfortunately in Auschwitz and escaped the Birkenau Crematorium. We, too, can approach the question of Germany as a matter of Realpolitik. From this standpoint, we hold that to give atomic arms to an army commanded by Generals Heusinger and Speidel, who share the responsibility for the death of 120,000 Jews in France, is a real danger for the Jews everywhere and for peace in general. The fight against this danger is, from the viewpoint of Realpolitik, of greater importance than the dollars Dr. Goldmann talked about yesterday.

Although there are serious differences of opinion between us, you are nevertheless ready to co-operate with us. How can such an organizational structure be continued which permits discrimination against the progressive Jewish people's organizations in other countries? You will reply that it depends on the section of the country in question. Some will justify the system on the basis that each section has the freedom to discriminate politically within its Yishuv.

The present organizational structure is plainly anti-democratic, contrary to the will and aspirations of the Jewish masses, which makes it impossible to carry out the resolutions of the Assemblies or the Executive meetings. Under such circumstances it makes no sense to talk about the expansion of Congress. In order to achieve expansion, a radical, democratic change of the whole conception of the organizational structure is necessary.

DR. S. J. ROTH (*Executive Secretary, European Branch*): What I heard of the organizational debate disturbed me because the question discussed here was directed towards the re-organization of the machinery of Congress, as if this were the only problem in the field of organization. I do not wish to touch on the problem whether Congress is a movement or an instrument, for that would

require a definition of what a movement is. But whatever the answer to that question is, Congress can be successful in its aims only if it has much closer contact with the Jews, not with the communities, but with what we call Jewish industry, the Jewish masses. It is a great thing that the great majority of the communities of the world give us a mandate to speak in their name. I do not think that is enough. Part of our organizational work is uniting communities, which we did successfully in a number of countries such as Brazil, Tunisia and others. The greatest part of our organizational work aims at enabling the Congress to carry out successfully its political and cultural work. In the case of Jewish culture, it is obvious, such cultural work is of value only if it reaches the Jews. We may publish the best publications and the best books, arrange the best seminars, if they do not reach the Jews who must benefit from them, then they have no value.

But this is also true of political work. Our greatest political weapon is public opinion. Congress problems and reports reach a thin layer of the community leadership and there is no machinery in the community for these matters to reach the Jewish public at large. This is something which the Executive and officers of Congress cannot establish; each community must work out the machinery by which these matters reach the public, and if communities have wonderful departments to look after religious, social and other communal problems, they should establish departments to deal with Jewish international affairs. Whether the need for united Jewish action on an international scale has gained general recognition with organizations not affiliated with us may be doubtful, but sometimes I doubt whether there is full recognition even within the communities which are affiliated with us of the need for united international action. If there were, I think that the communities would have established far stronger machinery to bring our problems to the Jewish masses. I can refer to a number of instances. A journal which we are now publishing was praised. What have the English-speaking communities done, with the notable exception of the American Jewish Congress, to propagate this journal, not as a house organ, but as the organ which brings the Congress and the international Jewish problems to the masses? So far we have looked only at one angle of re-organization, but there is the re-organization of the machinery within the community, because we must be clear on one thing: the Executive which we discuss is not Congress. You, fellow delegates and your communities are the World Jewish Congress.

MR. B. ARDITI (*Israel*): As I came from Bulgaria, I first wish to express gratitude to the Swedish people for helping to save the Bulgarian Jews. In 1943, the situation of the Bulgarian Jews was impossible; there was no contact with America, and at the suggestion of Dr. Marcus Ehrenpreis, contact was made with the Swedish Foreign Office and Sofia by cable. In this way Bulgarian Jewry was saved.

The World Jewish Congress is a historic necessity; if it did not exist, it would have to be created. The State of Israel has its mission, as has the World Zionist Organization, but some problems can be solved only by Congress. It is a democratic institution. A gentleman a few moments ago spoke in the name of democracy. Where is there democracy in Russia, Bulgaria, Poland? Do they have a Zionist Organization, freedom of speech, the possibility to propagandize, to be free Jews, to pray in freedom? You speak about Soviet democracy; if the Congress were invited to Russia, and if we had a guarantee that we would be able to speak freely there as we do here, then you would have the right to speak about democracy. We know what 'people's democracy' means—it means tyranny against the freedom of the spirit. The gentleman who spoke of democracy added 'not quantitative representation but qualitative', but in a democracy there is no qualitative majority, but only a quantitative one.

Being democratic, Congress must make it possible for all Jews to come to the Assembly. Why were the representatives of the Sephardim kept waiting for three days? This should not happen again. I am in favour of the proposal made by Dr. Schwarzbart to call a congress of Sephardim and Ashkenazim.

M. GEORGE FAHL (*Algeria*): I speak on behalf of the Algerian Section of Congress, with which the Federation of Jewish Communities of Algeria is affiliated. There are 70 Jewish communities in the Federation. In accord with the Federation and all social classes with the idea of Jewish consciousness, we have started a campaign to make Congress and the idea of Congress known to everybody and has already enlarged our contacts with the Jewish masses. To cite an example, the last meeting in Constantine was attended by 1,500 people. At the meeting in Sidi-Bel-Abbès, great numbers of legionnaires attended. The meetings in Bône and Philippeville were organized under the auspices of the civil and military authorities, and through these meetings the idea of Congress was brought not only before the Jewish masses but also before non-Jewish participants. In Constantine, the civil and military prefects asked to be permitted

to attend our meetings. We show films at these meetings, often films of the tragedy, to refresh our memory. Among them was the famous film *Nuit et Brouillard* by Alain Resnais, the film which makes it impossible for Jews ever to forget the Nazi atrocities.

Thanks to these Congress meetings, Algeria, which is not exactly a philo-Semitic country, has become more and more acquainted with Congress ideas. We can say that we have today 2,000 members who sympathize with Congress. We have to some extent succeeded in inculcating the Jewish youth of Algeria of all social classes, with the idea of Jewish consciousness and of Jewish unity. Our main purpose is to assure that the Algerian Section really represents the Jews of Algeria.

MR. ISAAC TOUBIN (*United States*): Since we have been listening for the past five hours to reactions to Mr. Sieff's report, I think the delegates should hear from the director of the American Jewish Congress, who has for a number of years been responsible for the administration of the largest single constituent unit of the Congress, about the misconceptions from which all of us seem to be suffering concerning the operations of the American and the World Jewish Congress. Personally and on behalf of my delegation, I want to express deep gratitude to Mr. Sieff not only for his splendid report but for the perspicacity he has demonstrated in understanding the dilemma which confronts Congress on the American-Jewish scene. The American Jewish Congress represents a unique phenomenon in the Congress movement. It is, as it were, the child which helped to give birth to its own parents; in the second place it was for many years the main financial resource of Congress and thirdly, the American Jewish Congress is the only constituent unit of Congress whose major strength derives from individual membership.

This last factor, while it is presently being imitated in the French Jewish community with salutary results, is representative, I believe, of the dilemma in which a world Jewish movement finds itself. Shall it be representative of Jewish communities, which is the case in most of the world, or shall it be representative of however small a portion of a Jewish community, whose ideological opinion it reflects? Insofar as the American Jewish community is concerned, the World Jewish Congress is representative of that portion of the Jewish community which supports its aims. Once you accept this condition concerning the relationship of the World Jewish Congress to the American Jewish community, it becomes fatuous to speak in terms of impact or to flagellate the American Jewish Congress for its inadequate efforts to promote the World

Jewish Congress or to say of the American Jewish community that the World Jewish Congress has had less of an impact there than in any other place in the world.

Nowhere else in the world does Congress have as firm support, or as great an impact on the thinking of the community, than in the American Jewish community itself. Nowhere else does it derive financial support directly from the community; in the course of the past 13 years, the American Jewish Congress, however inadequate, has raised on behalf of the World Jewish Congress in excess of 2½ million dollars. It is the one community in the world which goes to its federations and welfare funds and individuals and asks for money for the World Jewish Congress. It is the one community in the world where the name American Jewish Congress is identified in the public eye with the name of the World Jewish Congress. It is the one community in the world where the activities of the Congress, American or World, are thought of as identical. Why should we create the artificial division between the political activities of the World Jewish Congress and the American Jewish Congress? Why is an intervention in Morocco, however capably carried out by Mr. Easterman or Dr. Perlzweig, a political activity of the World Jewish Congress, but an intervention in governmental matters by Mr. Will Maslow, an activity of the American Jewish Congress? Why is the publication *World Jewry* an activity of the World Jewish Congress, but the publication *Congress Weekly*, an activity of the American Jewish Congress? I contend that these together are the activities of the Congress movement as one whole, because in the United States the Congress is not the same as anywhere else in the world, and it represents adherence to the movement.

I look forward to whatever the genius of Dr. Nahum Goldmann may create, either the strengthening of this Congress or the creation of a new world organization. But until now, the only movement upon which the World Jewish Congress could have counted was the American Jewish Congress. And if Dr. Goldmann has found fertile ground on the American Jewish scene for the creation of new co-operative bodies, it is in large measure due to the propaganda and the educational activities of the American Jewish Congress in American Jewish life.

It was the American Jewish Congress, more than any other agency, which was responsible for the creation of democratic community councils in the major Jewish communities of America. And if there is any hope for the creation of a new vital section of the World Jewish Congress or a world Jewish movement in

America, it is because of the activities of the American Jewish Congress itself.

One word regarding the re-organization plans of Mr. Sieff. I feel that the World Jewish Congress cannot be only a political movement, any more than the American Jewish Congress can be only a civil rights movement in America. A Jewish agency must not merely look after the physical and political security of the Jews but must make it possible for the Jew to live as a Jew.

I do not think it matters very much where the mailing address of the World Jewish Congress is, so long as it does not have a central administrative headquarters to run its affairs. I regard the steps proposed in Mr. Sieff's report as only the first steps, looking forward to that ideal day when Congress will be organized in an efficient manner to enable it to discharge its responsibilities.

2. EULOGIES OF THE DECEASED

DR. MORDECHAI NUROCK (*Israel*): A shining figure was taken from us, Chief Rabbi of Israel, RABBI YITZHAK HALEVI HERZOG, may the memory of a righteous man be blessed! He was a rare Torah scholar of high moral stature and of deep faith. He was at home with both the Babylonian and Jerusalem Talmud, with all commentaries, he was a man of rare sagacity and logic and of untiring industry. From the four corners of the world he was approached for written opinions, and he was the author of important books on Talmudic law.

He was the first Chief Rabbi of the sovereign State of Israel and this position attained honour through him. There was a difference of opinion among our sages as to whether the position honours the man or the man the position. He raised the prestige of the office of the Chief Rabbi both in the country and throughout the world. He endeavoured to strengthen Jewish law in Israel and he was actually the spiritual head of the whole Jewish people.

During World War II, when the Nazis with their slogan "Come and let us cut them off from being a nation that the name of Israel may be no more in remembrance", approached our region, Rabbi Herzog announced "Out of deep faith do I say that the enemy will not reach the gates of Jerusalem; there will be no third destruction". He saw the clear will of the Almighty in the rebuilding of the State of Israel.

Rabbi Herzog came from abroad during the time of the Mandate as the spiritual leader of the ancient Jewish people. He

worked to strengthen the contact between the Yishuv in Palestine, later Israel, and the Jews everywhere. He had participated as a delegate from England in Zionist Congresses. At the time of the catastrophe he travelled through European countries to save those who were still there and to free those who had rescued themselves. He called on the rulers, the kings and princes of the Church, to liberate the rescued. Thanks to him, thousands of Jews came to Israel and thousands of Jewish children, particularly orphans, were released from monasteries and churches. They were called the "children of Rabbi Herzog". He was a model educator striving to deepen faith in Torah and tradition and love for the Jewish people and Israel, and was beloved by all. He represented his people with national pride and dignity and when he appeared before the rulers of the world, equipped with universal scientific knowledge, he was admirably eloquent in his demands for justice for the people of the Bible.

Rabbi Herzog was a princely figure possessed of love for the Jewish people, a love that always burned in his heart. He was an enthusiastic admirer of our heroic Army, the protector of widows and the father of orphans. He was a distinguished scholar who earned degrees and won titles in England and France. His eminence in knowledge of Torah and secular literature made him a world figure. Non-Jewish scholars considered him a great Jewish personality and diplomats were fascinated by him.

The Talmud tells us that when the Holy Temple existed in all its splendour, the High Priest, on the Day of Atonement, used to read a chapter from the Torah. He then rolled up the Scroll and addressed the people with the words: "More is written here than I have read to you." The Jewish people, now in deep sorrow, know more is written in the glorious chapters of Rabbi Herzog's biography than has been said. He was the honour and pride of our people.

Decades and centuries will pass and Rabbi Herzog will forever be a shining figure and have an honoured place in our history. We use Jonathan's words to David: "Thou wilt be missed because thy seat will be empty." We shall not nor can we forget you, because your place will remain vacant. Blessed be his memory!

DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN: It is impossible that at an international Jewish conference the hundreds of thousands and millions who died should not be remembered; those who died, not since the last Assembly, but the victims of the terrible Nazi epoch, the eternal martyrs and heroes, who will be remembered at fitting

moments, certainly by our generation, but I hope also by future generations. We have not begun to realize what their loss means not only for our generation but for the whole Jewish future. We shall need decades or maybe centuries of work and development in order to make good the loss the catastrophe caused in Jewish life.

Before eulogizing the friends who left us since the last Assembly, I wish to remember STEPHEN S. WISE, the great founder and leader of the World Jewish Congress, without whom Congress perhaps would not have come into existence.

During the 40 years of my work in Jewish life, I probably have known all the important Jewish leaders—each has his motivations, certain spiritual and psychological forces that drive him to action and to a position of leadership. One has ambition, another a desire for power; one gives expression to his inborn talents and the fourth wants to do his duty to his people. There is a type of leader, perhaps the rarest of all, that in my opinion is represented by Stephen Wise more than by anyone else of his generation—whose motivation was love for his people. I have never known a Jewish personality who to such an extent loved Jews with all their faults, shortcomings and weaknesses. It is not always easy to love Jews. It is easy to respect them. He loved Jews, not the abstract idea of a Jewish people. This was Stephen S. Wise's greatest and perhaps most characteristic quality. He is one of the very few Jews of the last two generations who became a legend in his own lifetime.

A people sometimes feels, through a strong instinct, a leader's relationship to it. The great love of the masses was just the reaction to the legend and the image of Stephen Wise, their response to the inexhaustible love he had for the Jewish people.

Eulogizing NOAH BAROU after his death, I said that I knew no other Jew who took to heart so much Jewish sorrow as he did—there was no Jewish problem which did not cause him sleepless nights. I remember frequent discussions when he demanded action on some matter, and when I told him that it was none of our business, he insisted that it was a Jewish problem. Despite his poor health, Barou intensely engaged himself in every cause that related to Jews. The burden he had undertaken grew and soon he broke down under it.

I do not have the time to speak of his accomplishments. I wish to mention only one thing; if there is one man to whom credit is due for what was achieved in the negotiations with Germany, it is Barou. When I was in great doubt whether or not to undertake

the task, it was he who urged me into it. He strongly believed that a part of what we were robbed of must be returned. He believed this when there was no prospect of this happening. He gave me no peace; he made the first contacts; the first talks took place in his home in London. If, as most of us believe, something important has been achieved, apart from relations with Germany, then it is Barou who deserves the credit, in addition to his other accomplishments. He was among the leading five or ten figures in Congress and until now, he has not been fully replaced. We are soon to issue a book about Barou which will shed light on him from various viewpoints. Here, it is necessary to remember him as a pillar for many years of the World Jewish Congress.

We lost another important member of our Executive in Europe. ISRAEL YEFROYKIN was one of the founders of Congress, who, together with Leo Motzkin, was active in the Comité des Délégations Juives, which preceded Congress. It is now the 40th anniversary of the creation of the Comité and at the end of the Assembly we shall ask our friend Joseph Tenenbaum, its only active member still with us, to say a few words about it.

Israel Yefroykin was a colourful figure, highly gifted, many-sided, an unusual synthesis of a thinker and a man of action, a former revolutionary in Russia. As an intellectual he absorbed the values of various parts of the world, but was always rooted in the Jewish tradition. During his last years, he returned more and more frequently to the sources of the Jewish past, in their religious forms and became what we may call almost a devout Jew. He was at the same time a successful businessman, making his career in Paris. Day and night, he was interested in Jewish problems. He looked at every problem of Zionism and the Diaspora from the point of view of all Jewish history and, thinking about the re-organization of Jewish life, returned to the classical form of Diaspora organization, and founded a Kehillah in Paris. However, as he was already a sick man, the Kehillah in Paris did not succeed. In his last years, he was one of our elder statesmen in the best sense of the word and was elected as an honorary member of our Executive. I was lucky to be close to him for years, to take counsel with him and to enrich myself with his insight, appreciating his historical approach to Jewish problems.

DAVID PETEGORSKY was the Executive Director of the American Jewish Congress and his tragic death at an early age was a great loss. American Jewry suffers from too much money and too few leaders.

Petegorsky was a young man, not just talented but brilliant in

every sense. He had some faults incidental to superiority: quick judgments, radical opinions. Often not easy to co-operate with, he was highly educated, original, intellectually courageous and able to persuade people. Had he lived he would undoubtedly have grown into a leading figure in American Jewry. I worked with him in Zionist and Congress activities and his death was the tragedy of a young man who had a wife and children, struck down by a mysterious disease. He bore his suffering with great heroism. His passing was a great loss for the American Jewish Congress and also for the World Jewish Congress, as he interested himself more and more in our work during the last years of his life.

We lost a good friend in France when SYLVAN CAHN-DEBRE died suddenly. First, he was employed as an official and then became a member of the Congress Executive. Different from the other two Jewish leaders of whom I have just spoken, he came from the Western world, a French-Jewish intellectual, one of the first to be brought into Congress, steeped in French rather than Jewish culture. While engaged in our work, he became familiar with Jewish problems. Out of solidarity with the Jewish people he actively took up Jewish work, drawing with him others of the French intelligentsia, some simultaneously engaging in French political life. The death of Sylvan Cahn-Debré is a loss for us, particularly for our work in France.

I would like to mention two more losses, of comrades here in Stockholm, of AKIM SPIVAK, for years Chairman of our Swedish Section and LEON LAPIDUS, also a member of the Section. Both were particularly active when the Swedish Section was unique in its rescue work during the catastrophe. Both co-operated energetically with Hillel Storch, and since this Section was in a neutral country, with the proper connections with East and West, it was able to do what it did.

I wish to remember two members of the Executive in Israel who passed away during the last few years. YOSEF HEFTMAN was one of the leading writers and editors in Israel, who played an important role, first as a Yiddish newspaperman, then in the Hebrew press. He was esteemed and loved by everyone, including opponents of his party, as a brilliant, witty and spirited journalist. For many years he was Chairman of the Association of Newspapermen in Israel but morally had much greater authority. He had been previously active in Congress in Poland and continued his work in Israel. His passing is a great loss for the Israel Executive and for all of us.

Also in Israel was DR. EDWARD PACHTMAN who died at our

Executive Meeting last year. From the moment Dr. Pachtman started interesting himself in Congress work, he became an industrious and loyal member of the Executive and we will remember him in honour.

I should like to remember four comrades in South and Central America.

JULIO GLASMAN, who died in Buenos Aires, was an extraordinary man, a writer, thinker, party man and a great believer in Congress. For many years, he was very ill and remained a pathetic figure, completely paralyzed. He could not move any part of his body; he could do nothing but think. Julio Glasman personified radicalism in Jewish problems; he remained loyal to the end, to his ideals, his interest in Zionism, in Poale Zionism and Congress. Although not active, he remained a moral and intellectual power, seen only by a few friends, but he was a power behind the scenes. He was esteemed by all for his character, evidenced in his spirit and heroism during his great physical suffering.

AHARON LEIB SCHUSSHEIM also died in Buenos Aires. He was a veteran journalist, highly esteemed for his writings and influence in general. He was a faithful follower and co-worker of Congress in Argentina.

I want to say a word about a dear friend, ISIDORO DIAMANT, president of the Comité Representativo de la Colectividad Israelita de Chile for many years. A public spirited man, generous, well liked and since the unforgettable Jacob Hellman established the World Jewish Congress in South America, one of our most active workers in Chile. His passing is a great loss for Chilean Jewry and for Congress in South America.

ARTURO WOLFOWITZ, of Mexico, who similarly liked Jewish communal work, witty, the only Jew known to be proud of coming from Chelm. Actually he was far from being a Chelmer, according to the traditional Jewish meaning of the word. For many years, he was President of the Comité Central Israelita de Mexico and its permanent representative at Congress meetings. His passing is a loss for the Yishuv in Mexico and for Congress in general.

I wish to close with a few words about a friend: there are some public figures whose formal title and position are of no consequence. This man was a co-founder of Congress who participated in the earliest Assemblies, a leader in Zionism and in Israel, Speaker of the First Knesset who continued to be Speaker—YOSEF SPRINZAK. He was a wonderful type of Jewish leader. In Jewish history, there are two types of leader. One who fights for

ideas; he is a fanatic, for whom men count for little but for whom the principle is everything. The other I should like to call the Tsadik, who loves people and for whom people are perhaps more important than ideas. Today, we have more zealots among the great figures than Tsadikim. There is a great need for Jewish leaders who are not too arrogant to believe that they have the whole truth and do not want to impose their authority on people by force. There is need for the modest, Tsadik-like type of leader who loves the people, who sometimes wonders if he is right, who tries to inspire unity, who does not use moral and political terror, but persuasion and compromise.

Sprinzak was the finest, most distinctive embodiment of this second type. Like Stephen S. Wise, whom I mentioned earlier, Sprinzak loved Jews. During his last years, when he was already ill, I once asked him why he attended all the meetings and receptions. He told me that at the meetings he imbibed health and power by being with Jews. All loved his simplicity; he was a Jew among Jews, although he had understanding for the forms of protocol and order, and was the natural chairman of every organization or institution to which he belonged. His popularity was the response of the masses both in the Diaspora and in Israel to everything he stood for.

Sprinzak was one of the few leaders in Israel who understood that the people are more important than the country; this fact was self-evident to him. Because the State is for the Jews, he was a Zionist, an ardent Zionist. He went to Israel early on as a Chalmutz and I need not repeat here his contribution to the Histadrut or the upbuilding of Israel, but he never lost interest in Jewish daily life, in the Zionist movement and in the World Jewish Congress outside Israel. Rarely did we meet in later years without discussing Congress problems, even when he was Chairman of the Zionist Actions Committee, and there were enough Israel and Zionist problems to argue about. He was a true friend of Congress, a true believer in our work who was always ready to serve by wise counsel and deed.

I felt the desire to remember the friends and comrades we have lost, for we are a people whose greater quality is perhaps its historical memory. If we begin to lose this, it will be the end of the Jewish people in the world, certainly in the Diaspora. The different types of Jewish leadership I characterized included assimilated Jews from France, Jews from the Shtetl, Jews who personified modern American civilization, Jews who united the East and the West. As part of this historical memory, we have the

duty to remember not only tragic and heroic events of history, but also the great figures of our own lifetime, who contributed to making the Jewish people, despite everything, the great, unique people we are.

TWELFTH SESSION

August 6, 1959 (Evening)

In the Chair: PROFESSOR ARIEH TARTAKOWER, *Chairman, Israel Executive, World Jewish Congress:*

SYMPOSIUM ON CO-OPERATION IN JEWISH EDUCATION

PROFESSOR ARIEH TARTAKOWER: This session is one of those occasions when we want to give vent to our feeling and at the same time give precise expression to our thoughts. This can only be done in one's native tongue. This consideration prompts me to continue in Hebrew and Yiddish, though a number of delegates, especially among my friends from the United States and Great Britain may have difficulty in understanding what I say.

I am approaching my theme with some apprehension for I am not a teacher. My work lay in the field of inquiry into social phenomena. There is of course a connection between inquiry into basic problems, known as fundamental research, and the education of man. At any rate one must approach the problem we are discussing today in a spirit of dedication. This problem is not peculiar to Jews. It is a universal problem and it profoundly influences the fate of all human beings. At the same time, the existence of the Jewish people as a nation depends on the successful solution of this problem. Our moral stature among the nations of the world, too, depends to a large extent on the solution to this problem.

We are all agreed about the role of education in shaping the future of human society. We all know the historical truth that after the first and second World Wars the responsibility for this can squarely be placed as much on the shoulders of the German teachers as on those of the High Command. It was the German teacher who instilled into the German child a sense of superiority, of *Deutschland ueber Alles* and gave the child the false idea of *Herrenrasse*. It was he who mobilized the German child against the rest of the world. On the other hand, if we have a look at this orderly, just and democratic country where our Conference takes

place, we find that its system of education, based on the idea of justice and peace, has exerted a profound moral influence on its people in addition to imparting knowledge. It is not by accident that the great man who organized the action to rescue Denmark's Jews in the last war was a professional teacher. This is an occasion to express our gratitude to him and his people and also to Sweden.

We keep on saying that there will be no Jewish survival in the United States and in other countries, unless we can overcome the chaos of assimilation which is engulfing us. It is also assumed by all that we shall not get rid of this curse unless we can manage to build up a system of Jewish education which embraces the whole or at least the great majority of Jewish youth and guides them towards our traditional teachings, love of the Jewish people and love of Zion.

At the same time the advance towards this aim is rather slow and doubts creep in whether we shall ever attain our aim of national redemption or even to escape the catastrophe that is upon us. I am not referring to the organization-aspect alone in this instance. True, we have built up a number of institutions in various countries and have succeeded in mobilizing funds for them. But it is equally true that the percentage of Jewish children who receive a reasonably Jewish education is far below what is needed. We are also labouring under the difficulty of working or trying to work without a thought-out system. If we do not succeed in overcoming the present state of affairs by mounting a common effort towards a spiritual and physical framework in education our future will be bleak indeed.

This is the diagnosis which we must not shirk. It calls for a great national effort. The problem of Jewish education in the dispersion is both a unique national problem and a unique cultural one. If you will, a moral problem.

The effort to save the young Jew, and with him the whole of the Jewish people from a mechanical and humdrum assimilation is at the same time an effort to save him from the danger of becoming a marginal man, which in the American terminology means a man who has contracted out of one culture and cannot find his way into a new one.

Of course we have a great cultural problem in Israel too, but it is of an entirely different making. There, it is not the danger of assimilation or spiritual decline generally that is exercising our mind, but away of combining the eternal values of the Jewish tradition with the revolutionary impetus of a new society, while

at the same time preserving intact the reality of one Jewish nation despite its dispersion all over the globe and the fact that one part of it is leading a natural existence on its own soil within the framework of its own sovereign state while other parts live as minorities among other nations.

In Israel we are striving to implement a system of education based on the great values of solidarity among the nations, while elsewhere we are striving towards a cultural pluralism, which has already been discussed at this Conference in both its general and Jewish aspects.

In order to be able to achieve these aims, especially in the sphere of education in the dispersion, there must be a common effort of all our spiritual forces and a common drive on the level of implementation. As of today, almost every Jewish community is treading a lone path and encountering great difficulties which it is trying to resolve according to its own lights—with varying success. The justification of the methods, objectively speaking, depends on local conditions. Yet an attempt to co-ordinate activity must be made. This Symposium ought to be a step forward in the direction of new thinking and the practical implementation that must follow.

I am happy to welcome the participants in this Symposium on behalf of the World Jewish Congress Executive and I do hope that eventually we shall find the way to assure the continuity of the Jewish people as a nation. The World Jewish Congress had from the outset a keen appreciation of the place of culture and education in our midst. We realize that within the framework of a national policy that must assure the existence and the future of the Jewish people, education and culture must find a prominent place. Alas, in the turmoil and tragedy of years gone by when we had to struggle for bare physical survival and to defend our basic rights, it has not been possible to give attention to matters of culture and education. Now we have reached the stage when we can do so and make it one of the major tasks of Jewish policy. I am sure that the Cultural Department of the World Jewish Congress, whose pioneering work has already been mentioned at this Conference, will know how to weave the thread of co-operation in the spiritual field. A beginning, a first step can be made right here by looking into the matter.

Let us be thankful for the beginning that will be made here and let us hope that this will be a good omen for further effort and achievement. May this work be blessed for it is aiming at nothing less than the survival of the Jewish people.

DR. JUDAH PILCH, *Executive Director, American Association for Jewish Education*: We are convinced that the children and youth who occupy the Jewish school benches today, will determine the character of the Jewish community of tomorrow. This conviction prompts us to ask the question: How are the personalities of the Jews of tomorrow being moulded today? How are they being equipped for Jewish adult life 20 and 30 years hence?

The *National Study of Jewish Education*, sponsored by the American Association for Jewish Education, is the first major attempt to shed light on this question. We maintain that the situation in Canada, South Africa and Western Europe, is very similar in nature to that of the U.S. For Jewish education, in most of these countries, is primarily supplementary to the general education that our children receive in the government public school or in private educational institutions. Hence our contention that the American Study is of interest to all segments of World Jewry concerned with the Jewish educational enterprise.

Outlining the national image of American Jewish education, the Study's findings confirm the general opinion that much progress has been made in past decades. There is no community, sub-community or suburb of considerable Jewish population that does not have at least one Jewish school for its children. As a matter of fact, there are more than 3,300 *of them in the country, with a total enrolment of almost 550,000*. The growth of Jewish schools and enrolment is unquestionably an indicator of vigour. It reveals a wide-spread and continuing concern with Jewish education. As the Study points out, Jewish education is *wanted*. The children approve of it, the parents accept it and the community leaders are interested in it. All of them view the Jewish schools in a generalized social setting as an essential institution in American Jewish life. Moreover, many school workers, parents and community leaders maintain that Jewish education is indispensable to group survival.

The Study further reveals that the American Jewish Community spends annually more than \$60,000,000 on Jewish education and that of this sum more than half is derived from tuition fees. This is another important indication of the favourable attitude to the Jewish school among parents, congregational and community leaders.

Another major finding of the Study is "the community of basic ideas and principles upon which the various Jewish educational forms are founded". A comparison of the educational objectives in the official school curricula of the Reform, Conservative and Orthodox groups indicated a striking similarity. All three official

curricula stress the teaching of Jewish knowledge as the *sine qua non* for achieving the other desired values. "The differentiations in educational spirit and reality seem to be due at least as much to the intensiveness of the schooling as to its stated objectives." This is a significant finding, for it points to the possibility of working together. The community as a whole and the different school systems can and should work together to intensify and improve Jewish education for all children.

And finally the Study reveals that the pupils in the Day Schools score very much better than those in other types of schooling, in the fundamentals of Hebrew language, Jewish history, Holidays and Customs, and Bible. This points to the fact that the Day Schools in the country (whose number has grown from 78 units in 1945 to 214 in 1958, with an enrolment of 42,651) offer a partial solution of the need for intensive Jewish education.

On the other hand, the Study calls our attention to the fact that despite the great strides made in education in recent years, little has been accomplished toward "teaching our children the literary-historic culture of their people". This is a very serious indictment.

In studying the findings of the Report, one comes to the conclusion that there is no room for complacency; that we need not take things for granted; that the deficiencies in American Jewish education point to a very inadequate preparation for intelligent Jewish living, and that, as the Report indicates, "Jewish education is like a shallow river, a mile wide and an inch deep".

What are the deficiencies in American Jewish Education?

1. Jewish education is overwhelmingly confined to the elementary level, whose holding power is very poor, since the average pupil attends from 3 to 4 years in the Hebrew school, conducting classes in the afternoon, and from 4 to 6 years in the Sunday school, operating a programme only once a week. The total hours of instruction during the school year of 32 to 34 weeks is so limited as to be inadequate. It should be quite apparent that 3, 4 or 5 years of Jewish education with an aggregate of 400 to 600 hours of study during the pupil's entire school career do not suffice for the acquisition of even a smattering of knowledge of the Jewish heritage, let alone the development of positive attitudes which will make identification with the Jewish people meaningful and durable.

2. As a consequence, the scholastic attainments are very low. There is very little knowledge of the Book of Books;

"probably no more than 25% of our children learn enough Hebrew to be able to begin the study of the Hebrew Bible, even in simplified text; and probably less than half of these can read the simplest Hebrew Bible text without considerable assistance. Since most Sunday schools do not teach much of Bible text even in English, the likelihood is that the vast majority of our children grow up without any knowledge of the Bible, either in Hebrew or in English". As for Hebrew, the Report states "the teaching of Hebrew suffers from lack of time and confusion of purpose". Hence, little, if any, "progression in the knowledge of the language". Reading of prayers is mechanical, hence "wasteful and ineffective". The same is true with regard to attainments in other areas of study.

3. This brings us to a related problem—the need for continuity. Precisely at a time in the adolescent's life when he reaches that state of intellectual development when he is ready to orient himself to Judaic concepts and values, he is no longer to be found in a Jewish institution of learning.

The Study therefore places a great deal of stress on the problem of education beyond Bar Mitzvah and confirmation and points to the danger that most of our adolescents do not merely take a vacation from Judaism, but usually cross the point of no return. Only 7.7% attend Jewish high schools. Thus the little bit of information acquired on the elementary level is soon forgotten, and hundreds of thousands of young Jews enter the threshold of adult Jewish life with little knowledge and less understanding of their heritage.

4. Allied with this problem of continuity is that of the Jewish home. The Study points out that while the parents want Jewish education for their children, most of them "do not know what their children are learning". For, as we know, many of the homes are devoid of Jewish cultural content.

5. The shortage of qualified and competent educational personnel is appalling. It plays havoc with the possibility for any real success in our educational endeavours. Jewish teaching, according to the Study, is a part-time occupation, not only in the one-day-a-week schools, but to a large extent also in the week-day schools. Only 25% earn their livelihood by teaching in one school; the others need to teach in more than one school or to supplement their income with earnings from work in other occupations.

6. Finally, the small size of the schools affect negatively

every aspect of school management. The great majority of the schools are small, with enrolment smaller than needed for effective teaching. Only 30% of 3,367 schools have enrolment of 200 pupils or more.

Thus, we may conclude that much of what passes for Jewish education is too little for too short a time, under the direction of teachers who do not know what is to be taught and how best it can be learned.

Now, what are the basic recommendations of the Study?

In pin-pointing both the assets and the liabilities in American Jewish education, the Study illuminates the major problems that require solution. Its recommendations can be summed up as follows:

1. To strengthen the elementary school by viewing it not only as a separate institution, but also as the first rung in the educational ladder, which should extend through high school education. This calls for a concerted effort to achieve a greater measure of intensification in Jewish education, first in the elementary school, by extending the programme to 6 years in the Hebrew school and to 8 in the Sunday school; second, *in motivating larger proportions of children to continue their studies in Junior and Senior High school for Jewish studies.*

2. To engage in recruitment and training of a substantial number of teachers in order to staff the schools with competent personnel and to make Jewish teaching a real profession.

3. To improve the quality of education through the pooling of resources for experimentation and research in all areas of Jewish study and, in all school systems, to ascertain the validity and relevance of the ongoing processes, and to seek ways to make the Jewish school *as strong qualitatively as it is today quantitatively.*

4. To establish a closer relationship between school and home, with a view to the home's restoration as a focal point in Jewish cultural life.

5. To establish in each community social planning committees which will pass on the establishment of new schools and check the fragmentation of educational resources, be their finances, leadership, personnel or facilities.

6. And finally, to intensify the educational process in all schools *by adding not only years of study but also hours of instruction per week.*

I should like to point to another problem which has been

plaguing Jewish education in recent years and which, in my opinion, was only partially treated in the *National Survey*. I have reference to the question of the Jewish school curriculum. The Study revealed that all parties concerned with Jewish education lay stress on *knowledge*. Knowledge of our heritage, according to parents, lay leaders and teachers alike, is the *raison d'être* for our schools. But knowledge of what? How much of it? What are the components of our heritage? Is it religion? Is it ethical behaviour? Is it Hebrew or is it the totality of all of these elements? If so, what are we to emphasize, what should be discarded, reckoning with the fact that so little time is available to Jewish studies? Then, too, the question is not only knowledge of *what*, but knowledge *for what*. To what degree and in what way should the school reckon with the needs of the child in our day and age, his home, his Jewish group life, his daily environment? There are some of us who argue that the limited achievement of the Jewish school can be traced to an overcrowded and unbalanced curriculum. Others maintain that our curriculum is a race of studies, as the Latin has it, rather than a course of studies, as the English phrases it, a course in life for life, leading to definite goals. The Study emphasizes the need for improving the quality of Jewish education. There is general agreement on this score. But we must remember that this calls for a revised programme which would be a synthesis of the child's interests and the minimal skills and knowledge which he must acquire during his school career. This necessitates formulation or reformulation of goals in education and a careful selection of the essential cultural values and traditions that should be inculcated in the child—values which have stood the test of time and are still relevant to present-day life. This in turn calls for a philosophic inquiry into the nature of Judaism in the atomic age, and the deeper challenge confronting Judaism's education in our days. Are we ready to face this challenge?

The Study's recommendations are based on a major premise that our school programmes which are designed to transmit knowledge are fairly good. What we ought to do is to *improve the quality*, i.e., *to do what we do better, give it more time and do it with better teachers*. It is my contention, however, that our goals in Jewish education are subject to reformulation and that our curriculum is in need of reconstruction. Perhaps, something is wrong with our present-day programme. To achieve this end required first and foremost an over-all fundamental curriculum, and a variety of secondary ones, designing courses of study by means of which the Jewish heritage of culture and ideals may be pro-

gressively learned, enjoyed and freely developed, in harmony with the prepotent forces of modern life, and with the different schools of thought in Jewish life.

Since the Jewish school is the paramount agency for transmitting the Jewish past and assuring that there shall be a Jewish future, the materials, tools and personnel with which it exercises its functions play the critical role in its effectiveness. We must assure therefore, that this effectiveness shall be optimal by means of the scientific study and testing of what is currently in use and of the personnel that uses it; by revising old materials and methods and working out new ones; by designing more effective methods of teacher-training, and by experiments to check on their reliability.

I believe that all who are concerned with Jewish education in all segments of the world Jewish community should be motivated by this *National Study* to accept the challenge to rethink their educational problems and to formulate a long-range bold programme of action. It is because of my deep conviction that the time for a critical evaluation and examination of our educational goals and the means for their attainment is at hand, and that unless we do it, we may miss the boat, that I attach so much importance to the establishment of a Jewish Education information Centre on a global scale for effective international co-operation in all areas of our common educational endeavour. While our views on Jewish education differ, we hold in common three basic ideas: (1) that the primary task of the Jewish educational enterprise is to replace ignorance by knowledge of our past and be developing the feelings of brotherhood and inclusion supported by this knowledge; (2) that Jewish education ought to reinforce the doctrine of "*Kol Yisrael Haverim*" and teach our children to respect differences between Jew and Jew; and (3) that the more time we give to education the greater the opportunity for the acquisition of information, skills, etc.

We need international co-operation in Jewish education to study and explore other areas of common interest. For there are many common elements in Jewish education. We could work together on curricular problems which would emphasize the facts and forces that unite us over against those that divide us. A Jewish child in Chicago or in London must learn that he has a responsibility for his brother in Haifa or in Teheran, and conversely.

It is important that all workers in the field of Jewish education meet periodically to re-appraise existing conditions, to look for ways in which the content of Jewish study, in each school system, can become more relevant to the lives of the pupils, create greater

Jewish vitality and can integrate the school programme with Jewish life the world over and the spiritual resources of Israel.

I believe that in order to insure future progress and to pursue the goal of adequate, relevant, significant, and constantly improving Jewish educational goals, it is necessary to establish a kind of a Jewish UNESCO. The international information centre would serve as the clearing house for the ongoing programmes of Jewish education. The Jewish UNESCO (with the help of this centre) among other things would seek answers to the following questions:

1. What fundamental changes in modern life are altering the structure and role of our Jewish communities the world over, and how can a programme of Jewish education best take account of them?

2. Do the changed conditions indicate a shift of the centre of Jewish interest? How is this to be defined, and what sort of ideas and activities can be developed with respect to it, so that they will strengthen the survival power of the Jewish communities?

3. Many assume that regardless of all differences in belief in creed and code, all Jews are equally Jews and that the common life of the Jewish community is shaped by this likeness; what, then, does the likeness or equality consist of? What are the foundations and the components of Jewishness—that is, where lies the Jewish meaning of membership in a Jewish community?

4. How do the different denominations, parties and classes making up the Jewish community regard this common life? What is their role in it? How do non-Jews, regard it?

5. How, finally, in the light of what we learn, can today's Jewish child be inducted into progressively fuller and more varied participation in the common life of the Jewish community? What should he know? What should he do? How?

The very process of studying these questions will benefit Jewish education everywhere. For it will bring together all workers in Jewish education to find ways for improving standards and for seeking better methods to attain desired goals. What the World Jewish Congress can do for Jewish creative survival is to set up a Jewish UNESCO.

DR. ERNST SIMON, Professor of Education, Hebrew University, *Jerusalem*: Mr. Israel Sieff gave me the cue for my address today in his concluding words after the important symposium about the

Jewish State and the Jewish People. He said that the provocative thoughts which were uttered by the two speakers, Mr. Sharett and Professor Baron, have to be followed up in the educational debate. That should be so indeed, if this educational discussion is really to get down to the fundamentals of the question of remaining in the realm of technicalities.

Both Mr. Sharett and Professor Baron came to the same conclusion although each of them on his own. Both of them described our Jewish people as a peculiar people, very difficult to compare with other nations and their problems. If we translate this general statement into the language of education, the problem puts itself as follows: *what is and what should be the contribution of Israeli education to the necessary measure of normalization of the Jewish situation and the Jewish soul on the one side, and to the maintenance and the development of the specific character of the Jewish people and its youth on the other side?* This is a double task, and it has its dialectical tensions. I will come back to them in my conclusions, but before this I shall deal separately with each of the different elements.

Firstly, we shall ask what Jewish education has done and should do in the direction of normalization, and secondly, what it has done and what it should do for the affirmation of the peculiarity of our people. We shall sum up by confronting both of these aims with each other.

When we talk of the "task of normalization", we make the supposition that we still live in a situation which is not normal.

The Jewish national movement at large, and the Zionist movement especially, have come to normalize three abnormal relationships: first, that between the Jewish people and their old-new country; second, that between the people of Israel and the nations of the world, by bringing the people of Israel again into the family of the nations; third, that between the Jewish people and itself, its tradition and its destiny. Now, in the light of this threefold demand, what are the achievements and what are the shortcomings of Jewish education in Israel? The relationship between the people of Israel and the land of Israel has been normalized to a very large extent for that part of the Jewish people which lives in Israel, especially for those who were born there, or came with their parents from one of the European countries. However, the problem has yet to be solved for many children of the Oriental newcomers. We should not forget that the recent riots in Haifa, Beer Sheva and other places indicate, *inter alia*, an anomaly from an educational point of view, in addition to their political and economic reasons

and significance. The children and youth among these newcomers have not yet been fully integrated into Hebrew education in Israel so that all of them should feel really at home. Thus the problem of the relationship between people and country does still exist for many of them. The responsibility for this unhappy situation is much more that of the old *Yishuv*, and especially of the Ashkenazi intelligentsia, than it is theirs.

It has always been very difficult for new immigrants to become integrated in Israel. Even my own *Landsleute* (and you may have a guess that I am not very far from the proud *Yekkish* tribe) had their difficulties at the beginning. We were not received with all too open arms, and some of us got then our inferiority complexes, but thank God, we brought our own superiority complexes with us too, as all of you will all too readily admit. Gradually things became even. That was the case with all the *Aliyoth*. They knew, in spite of their initial suffering, that they had brought with them something very important. In this "battle of the *Aliyoth*", the *Yishuv* as a whole was always the victor.

But now for the first time we have an *Aliyah* which has been robbed of the feeling that it too, has to give something. That is very bad policy and even worse education. There cannot be proper education, let alone modern education, if one side is altogether at the giving end and the other side exclusively in the receiving end. It is a fundamental principle of modern education that the teacher should be at the receiving end too, and *vice versa*, the student also at the giving end, though not in equal proportion. To give a concrete example: we did nothing, or next to nothing, to adapt our curriculum to the potentialities of these newcomers. The only foreign language taught to all the children in the elementary school is still English, but many children from North Africa know French very well. Now they have to forget their French in order to learn English, and the one single subject in which they could have been good students from the very beginning does not appear in their curriculum. The problem boils down to a question which was very heatedly debated in the Educational Council of the Ministry of Education and Culture of which I have the honour to be a member. My revered friend, Professor Ben Zion Dinur, the then Minister of Education who laid the foundations of Israel's educational system, was of the opinion that there must be only one unified curriculum in order not to create different levels of instruction. That sounds very well, but holds water only in theory. In practice there are different levels, and everybody knows it. All of us have to think again very hard about the problem of the

curriculum. Our new Minister of Education, Mr. Zalman Aranne, made an important further step forward. He introduced the system of "graduated school fees". Each moderately talented student who finished eight classes in an elementary school can enter a secondary school at a very small fee, if any. Children of newcomers and from the Arab minority can qualify for scholarships even with less assets.

This generous policy, however, does not solve the whole problem. The children have to be tested, and we have all kinds of tests: achievement tests, personality tests, etc. As far as my very limited knowledge goes, these tests are not always what American testology calls "culturally fair", even if they are non-verbal. Let's take a simple play test. It may be assumed that every child knows how to play. But a Yemenite boy may *not* know how to play! For him, *playing* as such may be a *Bittul Torah*—a simple waste of time that should have been dedicated to learning. He may prefer to study and be reluctant to take any time from the study of the holy Torah. The test itself is then making him play at all, rather than performing that particular game. Thus the test begins—and is possibly finished!—long before its solution is even attempted. The consequence of these deliberations is that we have to learn how these people feel and think before we try to test them. We have to study a new differential psychology of thinking. In our Jerusalem School of Education, the chairman of which is my colleague, Dr. Zvi Adar, we make now a special effort in order to train a selected group of elementary teachers in the specific Oriental forms of thinking. But we have only made a very modest beginning.

As to the second question, that of the relationship between the Jewish people and the family of nations, we have achieved something important, but, I believe, politically rather than educationally. We live in warlike conditions all the time. I wonder whether all of you realize what it means to educate youth who never saw peace; just do not remember what it is. These young boys and girls have grown up in the period of the second world war, of pogroms, of emigration (voluntary and enforced), of expulsion, of our national catastrophe—the *Shoah*, and they must think and feel that war and warlike situations are the very rule of life rather than a terrible exception. I believe that this problem of the first order has not yet been faced by all of our educators. Facing it is indeed very difficult. If you stress, as *it seems* we should, the point of view of *security*, and see it as the most important thing, you prepare a psychological orientation towards *insecurity*. I shall illustrate that by an anecdote. A friend of mine, a physicist, was permitted in the

time of the British Mandate to use an R.A.F. plane for certain scientific investigations of climatic changes. When the officer in charge prepared the parachute as a security measure, my friend began to feel very insecure and dared to ask how often this sort of thing does not work. The lieutenant looked straight into his eyes and replied: "In your life only once, Sir". And the moral: all of us have only one life to lose, and therefore the feeling of insecurity is not a matter of statistics but makes a deep impact on each single individual.

The military or pre-military training of our adolescents cannot but shape their minds and hearts much more forcefully than all the fine speeches which their teachers may make or not make. I am not an expert on military education. However, not all the experts are of the same opinion as to its practicability at school age. Some of them believe that a more general physical training of youngsters between, say, fifteen to eighteen is a more effective preparation for future active service than a too specialised direct training. I sympathize very strongly with this opinion, but I may be politically biased. One thing is certain. Our military education should be put into a new moral and conceptual framework which indicates its limitations from the very outset. I sometimes have the opportunity to address officers of the Israeli Army. They form one of the less militaristic audiences you can reach, for they know what war is; they are much less militaristic than some audiences which I happened to meet with in North and South America. Talking to these officers who are responsible for the education of their soldiers I tried to bring home to them a humanitarian approach to education at large, military education included. The young soldier, and for that matter the student in the secondary school, should realize how tragic the fact is that we still cannot exclude the possibility of future wars and have to be prepared for them. He should be trained to fulfil his task without any unnecessary transgression over "the line of demarcation" (a term of Buber's) between duty and sin. The one unnecessary shot after the end of the battle, the one cruelty to the prisoner—with them begins the mortal sin. If military education is a tragic necessity in a country like ours, it has to be limited from the very beginning in the light of its ultimate aim: peace.

I wish to say here a word about the relationship of our youth to the Arabs, an issue in which I am very much involved. In the tradition of my great master, Dr. Yehuda Leib Magnes of blessed memory, I have given my life in Israel *equally* to constructive work and to the fight for peace between Jews and Arabs. I still hope.

against very heavy odds, that it has not been a losing battle. This problem is an even less exclusively educational one than that of the Jewish Oriental immigrants. All of us are all too much aware of its political complications. But it has its educational side, too, and a much neglected one. Now in our own State, it depends on us, and on nobody else, how we treat a minority, those 200,000 Arabs in Israel, and how we educate our youth by their present treatment of potential brothers; to understand the difficult situation of people who yesterday were the majority and today are the minority in a country which they rightly believe to be their homeland—is an attitude not easily achieved but demands a well-planned educational effort. Here I can only indicate its necessity, but I feel obliged to give you just one practical example how, perhaps, something could be accomplished. One of the seminars I conduct in our School of Education is dedicated to the pedagogical problems in Teachers' Training Colleges. Its participants—most of them are already teachers in such colleges—made, under my guidance, a study-tour to similar institutions which included the Government's Teachers' Training College for Arabs in Jaffa. This visit was a real experience for all of us. After listening to some lessons I talked to the young boys of 20 to 22 or so. I spoke of Pestalozzi: I happened to write a Hebrew book about him and thought, as most authors do, that they should know my book. They knew indeed something about Pestalozzi, e.g. of his relationship to Rousseau. I then asked them a provocative question: "What do you think: was Pestalozzi a rich man or a poor man?" "A poor man." "Why do you think so?" "Because he cared so much for the poor." "Well, it's not quite so simple. He was not rich, but he was of a very noble family which became poor. You certainly know an Arab figure, a very great Arab figure, who was in the same position and drew similar consequences from it." Then one boy excitedly cried: "The Prophet!" He did not say "Mohammed", he said "The Prophet". This little battle for reaching common ground was won because an honest attempt had been tried to make these Arab youths feel at home within the comprehensive Israeli scene by becoming able to make to it a contribution derived from their own cherished heritage. This approach is the right one towards the Oriental Jews too, and in this case less controversial and more prone to early success.

But there is another essential point to be mentioned. Almost every responsible statesman in Israel and in world Jewry knows and admits that the ultimate relationship between Israel and her neighbours cannot be settled by arms but by negotiations. Meanwhile, we prepare our youth for the possibility of war which, most

unfortunately, may not be excluded. But what do we do in order to prepare this same youth psychologically for peace which still is to be hoped for and is to be actively pursued?

The third task, the relationship between the Jewish people and itself, its tradition and destiny, may be the most difficult to be mastered. It has many facets. As to Hebrew—we have made exciting progress. We talk it at all events, at all opportunities. However, its quality may not always be of the first order, because it begins to run short of its classical elements, and here a problem which has to be tackled presents itself to education. As to *Bible*, our assets are remarkable but less conspicuous and still less legitimate. In most of our schools, even in some of our religious schools, Bible-instruction has become unduly nationalized. To give first one example: Jeremiah's attitude is very difficult to bring home to our young people. They may ask, and they do ask: was he not a real traitor when he advised the people in besieged Jerusalem to give way to the Babylonian aggressor in order to save the City and the Temple? The better the teacher is, the livelier he makes the situation, the more urgent the question becomes and the more eagerly he will be pressed by his pupils. There is a danger that the Bible is interpreted in our schools, as it readily had been by Berdichevsky or by Tchernichovsky as a kind of a Jewish *Nibelungenlied*, God forbid, instead as the Chronicle of God's wrestling with His people and the people's wrestling with their God. Only this or a similar approach make the great phenomenon of Prophecy understandable, for the prophets weighed and judged secular Jewish history by using the yardstick of eternity; of God's demands from His people.

That brings us to another element of our heritage, to Jewish history. The relation of our youth to it is, as a rule, rather problematic. Our younger people do *not* understand either the Talmudic period or the Middle Ages. They have no real access to the Talmid Chacham the "Disciple of the Wise" or, for that matter, to the *suffering* Ghetto. They do admire the *fighting* Ghetto but passive heroism is not to their taste. This attitude tinges also the relation to modern Hebrew literature as far as it deals with the Jewish Shtetl "in the old country". I think I was the first to question, many years ago, whether we should teach in our schools even so great a writer as Mendeleyev Mocher Seforim. When his novels and short stories are read by our children, they really may think that our sacred fathers and mothers were *such* as described by Mendeleyev in his "Kissalon und Bittalon". We, the old generation, know very well that Mendeleyev's and others, biting criticism was

nothing but self-criticism, and when he indulged in flagellantism, he included himself and scourged himself. But our youth cannot learn from him the true image of a now destroyed part of Jewish history and Jewish life. The pictures derived from Mendele's satiric descriptions could make for a sort of Zionist or Israeli anti-Semitism. God forbid! For a sound interrelation between Israeli education and Jewish life in the Diaspora that would be the worst thing to happen.

A similar balance-sheet has to be presented as to *Jewish living tradition* from which the majority of our youth is thoroughly estranged. Again, there is now an effort going on to improve the situation. I refer to the so-called "Todaa Israelith Yehudith" (Israeli-Jewish consciousness) which Dr. Judah Pilch has already mentioned. It was a necessary step and it came, perhaps in the last possible moment. Its intention is twofold: to strengthen the links between the young Israelis with the past of our people, and with its present. Any religious indoctrination should be avoided, but there may be a certain "risk" of "religious contagion" when the germs of tradition and custom are duly spread. I for one would bravely and lovingly bear with this danger.

Now we can face the paradox of Jewish education in Israel which leads to the question: to which degree can we become a normal people without ceasing to be the Jewish people? Professor Baron spoke of one permanent dialogue which stems from the special status of the Jewish people; the dialogue between the Jews concentrated in Israel and building it, and those in the Diaspora. I fully agree with this formula, but I should like to add to it two more dialogues: that between the Jewish present and the Jewish past, and that between the individual Jew and his God. These three dialogues make for legitimate Jewish education. They will not be acceptable but for the adherents of a very distinctive philosophy of Jewish nationalism. Here too, as in other cases, the direction of educational theory and practice depends on decisions which transcend the realm of education itself.

As to Jewish nationalism, there are three main attitudes in existence. The first one is that of extreme individual assimilation, represented today only by the American Council for Judaism which holds that we are *less* than a people. The second attitude still is I believe, the domineering philosophy of Jewish nationalism: it holds that we are just a nation like all the other nations, and as far as we have not yet reached fully fledged normalcy, it certainly must be our goal. We may call this attitude "collective assimilation". The third attitude with which I wish to identify myself, holds that

we are *more* than a people. If this is correct, then normalization has to be understood as a necessary, but not as a sufficient precondition for the fulfilment of our destiny. We should try to reach normal conditions of life in order to realize within this framework a religious-national content which demands more from us than becoming just another nation. True, it is much too easy to preach about the "chosen people" under the abnormal conditions of the Diaspora where the highest ideals may be suspected as "ideological superstructures" serving the interests of the Jewish minority all too well. But living up to these ideals under own responsibility and in normal political and economic conditions, would prove their intrinsic value and power.

We should examine our assets and our shortcomings in the light of these aims. As to the dialogue between Israel and the Diaspora, I think we have not reached far enough. True, Israeli youth is ready to die for the right of Aliyah. But people are ready to die for ideals for which they no longer are ready to live. And the real proof is life and not death. Israeli students who come to the Diaspora and do not move in religious circles, join foreign students from other countries rather than their brethren of the local Jewish communities. This fact, which can hardly be disproved, tells us that we have not succeeded in the very difficult task of which Mr. Sharett so movingly spoke: "To love every Jew, wherever he may live". If Zionism in the Diaspora is love for the Jewish country, Zionism in the Jewish country must be love for the Jewish people. As to the dialogue between the Jewish present and the Jewish past, it has been proved that our high-school students like general history much better than Jewish history. The reason for this is that we are now about to realize this dream of normalcy to a point of fetish. If a normal history is the only aim, then that of the Gentiles, Germans included, with its wars, revolutions and heroes, is indeed much more attractive than ours. Why study Jewish history, therefore, which cannot be changed altogether into the history of an altogether "normal" people without falsifying it? Teachers sometimes try to do this job of heroising Jewish history by exorcizing its true spirit, but youth, with their sense for the authentic, rejects these stillborn attempts. Thus a dangerous split of the intellectual personality is created. Nationalistic, even chauvinistic consciousness often goes hand in hand with very little Jewish knowledge and an altogether un-Jewish way of life. It is one of the acknowledged sources or symptoms of neuroses when the very existence of a human being is alienated from his consciousness. As William H. Whyte, Jr. in his excellent book "The Organization Man", put it:

"The quest for normalcy . . . is one of the great breeders of neuroses". He wrote that for Gentiles. It holds good for Jews, too.

The third dialogue, that between the individual Jew and his God, has again to be initiated in Israel. No great fight against religion is now going on in Israel. Israel today is not only the great centre of Jewish secular learning, especially at the Hebrew University, but the greatest centre of Torah study, in the exact and exclusive sense of the word. I have made a point to see Yeshivoth in some countries, e.g. in Williamsburg, New York, and in Gateshead, England. I think that important things are done there, I do not belittle them. But Israel's Bnei-Berak does more. He who once was in Bnei-Brak and has seen this city of Yeshivoth, these hundreds and perhaps thousands of young people who dedicate all their time to the study of Torah, knows that I am right. The trouble is, however, that a process of polarization either to the extreme right or to the extreme left is going on in Israel, leaving little room for the middle of the way. This holds good even for the development within orthodoxy itself. Religious secondary schools which were patterned more or less according to Samson Raphael Hirsch's synthesis between Torah and Derech-Eretz (general knowledge) are now on the retreat. The *Horeb* school in Jerusalem, an educational institution of Agudath-Israel could scarcely maintain its secondary classes for boys, not because the students became Apikorsim, but because practically all of them went to Yeshivoth of one or the other type. We now have a number of "modern" Yeshivoth. They too, teach general subjects up to university level, but the accent is on Torah, and not on secular culture.

On the other hand, the majority of our youth is either non-religious or altogether indifferent. True, aggressive atheism died from religious indifference, and that is a pity, for it was one of the forces which kept Jewish religion alive.

We cannot make this balance without saying a word about Jewish orthodoxy in Israel, to which I am very near but to which I do not belong. And for very good reasons. Religion must be a dynamic power, and not merely a static one, but it is not so for the majority of Israelis. The Yarmulka has become a sort of a uniform. It may be a top value, but it is certainly not a basic value. The basic values have been neglected in favour of the Yarmulka and its function as a symbol of differentiation. Since the death of Rabbenu Abraham Isaac Ha-Kohen Kook of blessed memory, orthodox Judaism in Israel has not produced any deep thinker who would dare to put the basic questions, let alone to try to answer them. This does not add to its power of attraction. We

cannot go forward with tradition alone. I am all for tradition, I try to live up to tradition, I have been able to bring up my children in Jewish tradition and, thank God, they stick to it. But tradition by itself is not enough at a time when the very foundations of faith are in danger of being shattered. There is one Mitzva to which all of us should attend. It is not written in the Shulchan Aruch, because it is a new Mitzva, so to speak. It may be named Mitzvath Hahafgasha, the Mitzva of confrontation. We have to confront each young generation with the eternal Torah. Some representatives of secular education may fight that as an attempt to religious coercion, but there are two kinds of coercion. If and where there is religious coercion, it should be rejected. But there is another form of coercion, too. I was brought up by my good parents in a home void of all Judaism. They thought themselves extremely liberal, but was it not coercion to deny a Jewish child the opportunity of making his own choice about Judaism based on knowledge? All of our school should give this opportunity to every Jewish child. Then everyone may choose his own way without interference of the Chief Rabbinate and of other religious bodies. The religious dialogue is an affair for the individual, but only for the well-informed individual.

I visualize our educational aim in the simile of a strong tree with deep roots and a broad top. We have not had this type of tree too often. Either our people have deep roots but then they are narrow-minded and do not see the world around them. Or they do see the world and are swallowed up by it. The new type of a Jew in Israel should be deeply rooted in the country, in its tradition, in the past history and the present of the Jewish people and, if possible, in our faith, but reaching with his broad top God's free world which belongs to all of his creatures. That was the way of the prophets. There had never been human creatures more deeply rooted in Judaism who have made a greater and more lasting impact on the whole of humanity. That is the Jewish tree of life, we are happy that we cling to it. Etz Haim Hi Lamahazikim Bah, Vetomecheha Meushar!

DR. AARON STEINBERG, *Director, World Jewish Congress Cultural Department*: Jewish education has a long history. Throughout this history it never betrayed its main purpose—to carry forward, from generation to generation, the inherited knowledge of "What is good" (*Ma tov*—Micah, 6.8) and thus to safeguard the continuity of Israel's meaningful existence. As the Psalmist has it—"The Lord established a testimony in Jacob, and

appointed a law in Israel, which he commanded our fathers, that they should make them known to their children: that the generation to come might know them, even the children which should be born, who should arise and tell them to their children" . . . (Ps. 78, 5-6). In a word—education in the House of Israel is a sacred duty. However, irrevocable as this duty remained, in its scope and content Jewish education followed the general line of the people's destinies and faithfully reflected the successive phases of its evolution. From age to age, the emphasis in the interpretation of the central idea of Jewish education changed, and so did the dividing line between the substance of the matter and the accidental by-ways to be used in the practical educational effort. Is it, then, not justified to assume that in our own age which is so different from all preceding epochs of human history, we have to face up once again to the vital problem, how the Jewish idea of education might be brought into correlation with the exigencies of the present time?

Our time: We live in an age which carries us at an ever-quickenening pace towards the consummation of world history. Our dwelling place lies open from pole to pole, and continents and oceans are but islands and lakes on its surface. From outer space, Man is about to get sight of the whole globe as of one visible object. In spite of all international divisions and tensions, East is West and West is East, since our essentially technological civilization is common to both. The entire human race is engaged in a frantic competition for the attainment of identical scientific goals. Who will deny that the next generations are chosen to live, to work and to co-operate in one world, under the same roof, as it were?

Simultaneously with the geographical shrinking of the Earth, the physical basis of Man's historical evolution, History itself assumes that image of unity which was preconceived at its very beginning, in its *Bereshith*. For this is fundamental to the traditional Jewish conception of the historical process: similarly as mankind first appeared on the earthly scene as a single family, so the human race will in the end, *becharith ha'yomim*, re-create and restore itself once again as one family with the nations of the world as its members. True, we are in the wake of terrible decades of cruelty and bloodshed, but ever more clearly it is realized from one end of the world to the other that what had happened was fratricide, a crime against humanity. Neither wars, nor revolutions, nor volcanic eruptions of hatred have the power any more to obstruct the great converging movement of our age which brings into interplay the most disparate historical traditions of the past. We are

confronted with a mighty confluence of formerly isolated streams of cultural energy. Originally a mere idea, World History is about to become real.

The internationalism, characteristic of our age, the democratization of modern society, the rapidly growing weight of the masses—of mass production, mass communication, and mass reproduction—in every sphere of human activity, they all represent various aspects of one and the same process of universal coalescence. Humanity is in search of some common level of civilized existence and is groping towards the best possible average. The word of the Prophet: "Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low" (Isaiah, 40, 4), seems to come true, and whether one rejoices at the prospect of its fulfilment or deplors it, the fact remains that it is fraught with far-reaching consequences both for the human race as a whole and for our own people in particular.

The common standard of civilization looming ahead implies the levelling down of earlier outstanding standards of collective cultural achievements not less than the levelling up of the ways of life of the so-called "backward" peoples. Universal equalization and assimilation must needs work both ways. In all circumstances the single human being will be exposed to the danger of losing his individuality and, in the last resort, of becoming a mass product. Even in our day the effacement of personality is a striking drawback within the general advancement of scientific knowledge and rational organization of social life. The sense of individual responsibility is on the decline. The highly complicated machinery of modern civilized life serves as an excuse for passing the burden of decision to the expert, whilst the experts themselves are confined each to his special compartment. Recent experience demonstrates to what disastrous consequences this human condition may lead when a whole people entrusts its destiny to a single expert in making history—to the dictator. And yet, the more the technological civilization of our age expands, the heavier becomes its pressure on personal conscience, on personal feeling and on personal taste.

It is obvious that the Jewish population of the world cannot escape the impact of the new age. The process of Jewish assimilation released and stimulated by the emancipation of the Jews, first in the West and since 1917 also in the East, is now overtaken by an even mightier process of universal cultural equalization and is being superimposed by it. To resist this redoubled pressure in order to secure our meaningful existence as a separate entity we have at our disposal outside Israel's borders nothing more, but

also nothing less, than the idea of Jewish education. In Israel the position is, of course, basically different: there, Jewish life is a natural produce of the land; there, in the words of the old adage, "the air itself" educates. But what about the people in dispersion? Are we still able to ward off the concentric onslaught of the forces threatening to efface the differences between human groups moulded by past history, and incessantly working for their mutual adjustment and integration into a world-wide homogeneous society? —No doubt, thanks to its technological achievements, the new age has brought closer the various parts of the Diaspora and provided all of them with an easy access to Israel, their natural centre. None the less, the chances of the Diaspora's survival would be slender indeed, were it not for that hope which is the soul of the Jewish idea of education.

When we turn our attention to the present state of Jewish education in the Diaspora, we are inclined to take its idea for granted. It very often seems to us that, having defined Jewish education as the principal means for our collective survival, we have disposed of all the problems related to the deeper meaning of our educational endeavours. In assessing the educational position in this or that country we look in the first place for figures; we count the Jewish schools in operation, we try to ascertain the total number of children attending them and the number of hours dedicated to Jewish subjects. This is certainly very important and entirely in line with the statistical obsession of our age. But statistics is even in our time not enough. We may, for instance, discover that what Jewish education in the U.S.A. is gaining in extension, it is losing in depth, and that with its "shallowness" the self-identification as Jews is of vanishing consequence for the new generation. Is this the effect of the irresistible attraction of the specifically American way of life or of the universal tendency towards uniformity, or the result of both intertwined? Be it as it may, the phenomenon is not restricted to the U.S.A. alone. We can also observe it in Latin-America and in Western Europe, not to speak of the East where facilities for Jewish education hardly exist and conformity is the order of the day.

Apart from the external factors impeding Jewish education in our time, we have to take into account the fact that we are, amongst ourselves, deeply divided as to the exact meaning of the very term "survival", though it is meant to indicate the ultimate aim of Jewish education. What should "survive" and how? To the truly faithful the answer to this question presents no difficulty: the Lord's chosen people is in duty bound to persevere in its progress

along the traditional ways as the custodian of Eternal Truth. But the great majority of those who nowadays identify themselves as Jews by the token of the Jewish faith do not hesitate to pour water into the old wine of our religious traditions and to mould their various educational systems in a modernized style. Opposed to all of them is that worldly conception according to which the Jewish people is not a religious community but, even in dispersion, a nation among nations engaged, as any other, in a struggle for collective existence; hence the network of secular Jewish schools. Yet another bone of contention is the language of tuition, and although Hebrew has driven Yiddish into the background, the Yiddish trend is still far from unconditional surrender. Can there be any doubt that this fight of all against all in the fields and gardens of Jewish education is one of the main obstacles on the way to its consolidation? Surely, the growing confusion weakens the interest in Jewish education amongst the uncommitted and thus imperils from within its avowed end, the survival of the Diaspora, whatever this may mean to our various spiritual and temporal schools of thought.

Is there a way out of this confusion? Can we devise a rational plan by which a turn towards a reversal in our deteriorating educational position could be stimulated?—This indeed is what I dare to believe and what I shall try to explain first on the theoretical and then on the practical level.

Our first and foremost task in the present circumstances is to reanimate the Jewish idea of education in an open-minded and frank confrontation with the tendencies and propensities of our age. In the introductory remark to this exposition the Psalmist's voice reminded us that it was the "Testimony established in Jacob" and the "Law appointed in Israel" which were at the basis of our original educational system. Is this Testimony and this Law still valid in our age? We all agree, I presume, that the survival of our people as a self-centred cultural entity, since the year 70 of the Christian era, is mainly due to the unrelentless educational effort inspired by Faith. But this source of inspiration, we are advised on all sides, has now dried up; under the intense radiation of the Sun of Science and Reason the old fountain-head of our creative energy was condemned to evaporation. We had, therefore, either to look for other sources of inspiration or to try and do without it. Is it really so? Is such an approach realistic at all? I beg to doubt and to differ.

Jewish education stands and falls with the conviction that practical commonsense is by no means the only criterion of rational

human endeavour. From the purely practical point of view, the Jewish school in the Diaspora has but little to offer either to the pupils in training or to their parents, if their common interest is concentrated on the things of this world, i.e. the greatest possible chance of achieving success within the surrounding non-Jewish community. It is often stressed that a timely training in the skill of Jewish self-identification helps to keep the balance of one's mind and emotions, particularly in situations of social conflict in a world not altogether friendly to individuals of Jewish origin. In other words, Jewish schooling appears to be the safest antidote against the effects of anti-Semitic poison. However, one may despair of the future of Jewish education in the Diaspora, if it is to live by this poison only. We are looking to a better future for the whole of mankind and not to the perpetuation of the evils of our day. Making our younger generation immune against the psychological dangers of the anti-Semitic disease has practical importance, but it does not appear very likely that the great mass of Jewish parents would be persuaded to give their children a Jewish education out of fear—not fear of God, but of the Satanic nature of man.

Certainly, we have educational institutions which, in the practical sense, offer much more than the usual type of Sunday or Supplementary School. Leaving aside the higher schools devoted to the professional training of Rabbis and teachers, we have to take into consideration, in the first place, the existing Day-Schools. Their number is increasing as if in response to the challenge of our age. Their overall purpose is to train our young in their formative years to live a full life within the confines of the Jewish community. It may be anticipated that from amongst the graduates of these schools will emerge the bulk of our social workers and creative personalities in the generation to come: they will not only live as Jews, but also make a living as Jews. But will they stay on in the Diaspora? Is Israel not created for them and they for Israel? Why should they wish to be exposed to all the inevitable inner conflicts and temptations of Diaspora life, when before them the gates to Israel stand wide open? We have to face the fact that, with the exception of a part of our orthodox Day-Schools, the rest are preparatory schools for *Aliyah*, and the training received in them—a thorough-going *Hachsharah* for the absorption in Israel. And so we have to ask again: but what about the Diaspora? How can we provide here for a change of guard?

Let us then take recourse to the Jewish idea of education and let us see what may be its specific message in our age.

The emphasis in our age is on conformity and its universalization. Against this there is the fact that the Jewish people has, through the ages, strongly adhered to the principle of nonconformity and has contrived a system of education by virtue of which it maintained itself in historical existence as one indivisible entity. In a general way traditional Jewish education could, therefore, be described as training for an existence not conforming to the predominant historical forces. The school was only one of the many classrooms in that all-embracing educational establishment called Jewish life. Education had precedence even before the natural order of things: "He who teaches his friend's son Torah"—says the Talmud—"is, as it were, his begetter" (Sanhedrin, 19b) because one's son is but a vehicle for carrying on Israel's nonconformist Law and the Testimony of nonconformism "established in Jacob".

The principle of nonconformism which animates the idea of Jewish education assumes tremendous significance in our age. At a time which is dominated by the tendency to flatten out differences between cultural traditions of the past, it becomes vitally important to counter-balance the drift towards dull equalization by a forceful re-assertion of the human value of nonconformity. In continuity with our education tradition we may be preordained to cultivate in our home and school the type of human being soon most urgently to be needed by humanity, if its degeneration into a state of amorphous homogeneity is to be avoided. The idea of a united humanity deriving from our idea of education is modelled not on the image of a heap of sand, but on that of the symphonic harmony of the celestial spheres, each within its own orbit contributing to the miraculous consonance of the cosmic whole. If for no other reason, let us in our age, for its own sake, reassert the value of nonconformity.

However, the principle of nonconformity deriving from the Jewish idea of education has a double meaning. No less than to Israel and Jacob as a collective entity, it applies to every one of Israel's children. It demands from everyone within the House of Israel not conformity with the general rule of the law, as is often presumed, but its free acceptance by way of a constantly renewed and reaffirmed covenant. No one can remove from one's shoulders the burden of responsibility which one imposes on one's self. The children of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are meant to be "like the stars in the sky" each one radiating its own light, the light of personal conscience. It is most important to put this specific aspect of our educational idea into the right perspective. Jewish self-identification should above all include the identification of the

Jew as a self, as a free human being fully responsible for all his or her doings. In an age when human personality is in jeopardy, Jewish education is charged with the task of mobilizing the younger generation in the struggle for the independence and the uniqueness of every human being. For this, too, is inherent in the Jewish idea of education. In the light of this idea the discovery was made that human individuality is comparable with the universe and, that it thus presents within the framework of the macrocosm a microcosm, as unique as the universe and its Creator. A direct way leads from the Proverbial advice to "train the child according to his ways" (Proverbs 22.6) to the Mishna in Sanhedrin where the uniqueness of every human being is explicitly emphasized (Chapter IV, 5). If Jewish education in the Diaspora has a future—and it is up to us that it should have a future—Jewish personalism will have a say not only within our own house, but also far beyond.

All this is closely related to the vision of "the time to come", *Le-aitid lavo*, inherent in our idea of education. Without this vision of the Messianic age, in which human history should attain its glorious consummation, our strenuous efforts to keep our people in being by a steady current of educational effort would be meaningless. We need our "generation to come" for the promised "time to come", the *dor acharon* for the *acharit ha'yomim*. In a general way, the Messianic idea is incorporated in all our educational systems, not excluding the worldly ones in which the Messianic hope is represented by the socialist ideal. However, in most of the modern conceptions of Messianism its very core, the Messiah himself is missing, that concrete image of the "Higher Man" who might at any moment appear in our own midst and, remaining a plain human being, reveal himself as the perfect embodiment of virtue and wisdom. There is nothing in modern science which contradicts such a hopeful expectation. And yet, just in this technological age of ours, the vision of the beautiful image of spiritual perfection invoked for the eye of the young is likely to produce an ineffaceable impression. In fact, all of us, old and young, have constantly to train ourselves in the Jewish art of looking for human perfection. This, incidentally, is the educational significance of the fundamental Jewish conception of the God-likeness of Man which is, therefore, inseparable from the Jewish idea of education. In the quest for perfection incarnate, our young will not easily succumb to the temptation of the time, to the idolization of the favourites of the fleeting hour. In substance, this is implied in the Jewish principle of non-conformism which teaches us in anticipation of "the time to come" to keep a distance in

regard to all things of this world, the *olam ha'zeh*.

The confrontation of the Jewish idea of education with the tendencies of our age thus suggests more concentration of our educational effort on training of character, on hardening of the will, on cultivation of genuinely Jewish virtues, than on the purely intellectual aspect of instruction and tuition. The emphasis today should be on morals, rather than on study. Vital as the conveying and acquisition of Jewish knowledge remains, our time demands that the strengthening of the character of our children and grandchildren should become the main object of a truly modern Jewish education.

The concrete practical conclusions to be drawn from the foregoing theoretical assessment of our crucial problem are manifold.

First of all, in view of the general character of the problem, which in substance is identical throughout the Diaspora, it would appear that any approach to its solution should be undertaken on an international scale. Although the specific conditions of Jewish life outside Israel vary from country to country, all our communities in dispersion are subject, more or less directly, to the impact of the spirit of the age. This, as I have tried to show, is heading in the direction of equalization and assimilation. To inaugurate a vigorous resistance against the universally felt pressure, we have to undertake an effective concentration of all forces active in the sphere of Jewish education wherever they may be found in order to safeguard our inherited human values. Within the structure of the House of Israel no stone should be left unturned. The response to the universal challenge must equally be universal.

The visualized concentration might find its first expression in a Conference on Jewish Education at which all our communities, not to forget the smaller and smallest, should be adequately represented. World Jewry is not without experience as to the international aspect of co-operation in the field of education. The Department of Education and Culture of the Jewish Agency, together with its Department for Religious Education, have accumulated a great deal of such experience; it relates mainly to the adjustment of Jewish education in the Diaspora, through the medium of Hebrew, to the educational and cultural achievements in Israel. In a practical way, the problem of international co-operation in the sphere of Jewish education has been actively faced by the Claims Conference. The cultural policy pursued by the World Jewish Congress in the last ten years or so is a further instance of the consideration given to the international character

of Jewish culture in general. Other pertinent illustrations could easily be added. In short, it is being realized far and wide that our educational position cannot be properly evaluated and dealt with other than in a world-wide perspective. The awareness of this fact is the common ground of all our educational trends, from the extreme orthodox to the extreme worldly. In consequence, Jewish opinion seems to be well prepared for the idea of a World Conference on Education now envisaged.

Plausible as the idea of such a Conference may appear, it should be borne in mind that it might defeat its own main purpose, i.e. the concentration of our educational efforts on a world-wide scale, if its composition were not to reflect the diversity of our educational trends. The goal before the Conference should be of a two-fold character; on the one hand, the integration of our geographically separated communities in a common effort and, on the other, the proclamation of a truce—a “Truce of God” in the medieval phrase—amongst our educational parties. Odd as it may sound, I venture to state that our age demands from us all a new *cheshebon ha'nefesh*, the redressing of the balance of our souls, as it were. Far be it from me to suggest that we should strike a bargain or make concessions in things spiritual. But why not follow the precept of our sages and judge the endeavours of all our educational trends *le'kaf z'chut*, according to their intrinsic value? Should we agree that in our age it is imperative to accentuate the ethical aspect in Jewish education, we may discover that the common ground of our various educational trends is wider than we are usually inclined to presume. It would be an event of greatest moment were it possible, prior to the Conference, to delineate the extent of our consensus on educational matters.

In all circumstances, the World Conference on Jewish Education should not disperse without leaving behind some tangible results. In the first place, it must lead to the establishment of a permanent central agency for Jewish education, and devise methods of financing the new institution. This should function: (a) as a world centre for the collection and distribution of every kind of information relevant to Jewish education; (b) as a clearing-house for Jewish schools in need of teaching personnel and for candidates aspiring to join the teaching profession; (c) as an institute stimulating research into specific educational problems. One of the most urgent problems is the improvement of the status of the Jewish teacher in the community. Provision should be made for a gradual expansion of the new central institution to enable it to extend its special care to the educational needs of the smaller communities

which, owing to lack of support from outside, are in danger of disintegration. Furthermore, the central educational agency will have to take the initiative, perhaps in collaboration with the Jewish Agency, in putting the training of teachers for the Diaspora on solid foundations, and in stimulating the production of textbooks and other teaching materials. Obviously, the tasks of the envisaged educational agency would be immense and could be accomplished only over a long period. This being so, the first step in the right direction should be made by the Conference itself.

The creation of the central institution may at first have merely symbolical significance. But symbols sometimes possess a reality of their own. As the outward expression of the determination of the Diaspora to transform itself into a world-wide union for mutual educational assistance, the new agency is likely to ignite sparks of active educational energy where it is now dormant. This applies particularly to those among our adults who have unwittingly deprived their children of Jewish education. It is unavoidable that in the years to come the problem of adult education will gain in importance and occupy its deserved place within the working plan of the central educational agency. Simultaneously, the intimate correlation between Jewish education and cultural creativeness in the Diaspora will be thrown into relief, with the consequence that, along with Jewish education, the new agency will also include Jewish culture within its purview.

If the proposed World Conference will prove a successful experiment in our international co-operation and bring forth results on the envisaged lines, the hour may be auspicious for looking even further ahead. What we actually need is a total mobilization of Diaspora Jewry for a fundamental reversal in our educational position. A mobilization plan of such scope cannot be improvised. Much careful thought must be given to it before it will become mature and suitable for translation into a blueprint. However, it is perhaps not unlikely that a central agency for Diaspora education with a research institute attached to it may decide to treat the mobilization plan as a matter of urgency and give it high priority on the list of its research projects.

All the practical propositions here touched upon are conceived in the light of the Jewish idea of education. It is my firm conviction that only in this light, in the perspective of our traditional non-conformism, can we—as the biblical phrase goes—“see light” in the maze of our present educational position. Looking back to our historical past, we find that in spite of all its singular characteristics the present position is not without analogy in relation to epochs

gone by. The closest similarity to our time presents the great age of Hellenism. Then, too, the Jewish idea was in danger to be overwhelmed and absorbed by the Greek Paideia, the Hellenistic ideal of human education. And yet, the Jewish resistance movement conquered. Let us, then, in our opposition against the dangers of the modern diluted "Hellenism" draw inspiration also from the days of old. The last word should be ours.

A most welcome coincidence enables me to conclude by citing one of Sweden's foremost writers, August Strindberg. In his "Historical Miniatures", a volume that begins with antiquity and leads through history up to modern times, there appears everywhere and at any period the lonely figure of a Jew who utters his stalwart "No" in the face of the splendors of contemporary civilization, be it in Athens of the time of Socrates or in the reign of the Queen of Sweden, Christina. In many guises he refuses to conform to the spirit of any of the successive ages, all for the sake of the Le'atid La-vo, of that Messianic age which is still to come. Thus, the Jewish tradition of nonconformity is revealed by the Swedish genius as the leaven of world history. I believe, this conception is valid even today.

THIRTEENTH SESSION

August 7, 1959 (Morning)

In the Chair: DR. SERGIO PIPERNO (*Italy*);
later DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN:

1. DEBATE ON CULTURAL PROBLEMS

DR. ELIAS BARUEL (*Portugal*): The Jewish Community of Lisbon is composed of about 650 souls and is under the leadership of Professor Moise Amzalak whose duties as the President of the Technical University of Lisbon prevented his coming. So I am doubly gratified to be the only Portuguese delegate here. I bring the problems of our community before Congress and we make our specific contribution to the work done by this Assembly.

In Portugal, there is no political problem for the Jews: the government is stable, Christian, but with equal rights for all. The small Jewish community is officially recognized but there is great need to defend itself against assimilation. There are services daily, morning and evening, in a beautiful synagogue, but with few young people attending. The traditional ritual is Sephardic, with some Ashkenazic customs and melodies. Every week kosher food is distributed to about 100 people. We have, for financial reasons, never succeeded in having a rabbi to serve as spiritual leader.

As a national Jewish culture, important anniversaries such as the establishment of the State of Israel, the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising, Herzl and Bialik commemorations as well as the Magbit campaigns are occasions for stressing Jewish culture. Delegates from the Keren Hayesod address our community at the Jewish Centre of Lisbon; WIZO and ORT are active, and instruction is given in modern Hebrew. Several months ago, an Israel Consulate was set up in Lisbon.

Jewish education is very much below the desired level, mostly for lack of funds for the upkeep of a Jewish elementary school. We have a kindergarten headed by a non-Jewish professor, where one of our clergymen gives instruction three times a week. He also prepares boys for barmitzvah, conducts Hebrew classes twice a week for Jewish pupils from the French High School in Lisbon

and gives classes in history, religion and Hebrew on Saturday afternoons and Sunday mornings. Another clergyman teaches prayers and gives private lessons. Unfortunately, this is not conducted in the Jewish milieu which a Jewish school would provide. We also lack the atmosphere of Jewish culture to attract children, young people and parents. A young rabbi to act as director would be the solution.

The Jewish community runs a soup kitchen and a hospital which, during the war, rendered important services, mainly to Jewish refugees. The hospital had to close its doors for lack of funds. A devoted Chevra Kadisha—a real army of charitable people who observe all the religious traditions—bring consolation to mourners and maintain the private Jewish cemetery. Here too, the lack of a young rabbi is most keenly felt.

This, in short, is the life of the small group of Jews who live in Lisbon and have a deep desire to maintain the high standard of their ancestors who made extraordinary contributions to world civilization in the Jewish field, in religion, in philosophy and in the nautical sciences. We feel deeply responsible for our heritage and our small community rescued tens of thousands of Jews during the war who found in Portugal a chance to survive, thanks to the good will of the Portuguese Government. We have gained the respect of many international service organizations because of our successful rescue efforts.

In our search to avert the great danger of Jewish disintegration with which we are constantly faced, we need a rabbi, a school and a young couple to act as Madrichim. I trust that this search will find some responses in this Congress whose essence is Jewish continuity.

We wish to thank King Gustav and his Government, for the welcome we have received, and to members of the Executive and Congress we bring most ardent wishes for a solution of problems which are not only the concern of some of us, but which affect us all.

MR. ABRAHAM SCHWARTZMAN (*Finland*): I bring you the greetings of the very small Yishuv in Finland which faces two cardinal, permanent problems: our numbers have always been small, now 1,800 persons (1 in 2,000 of the population). We are on the periphery, far from the Jewish centre.

The greatest effort is needed for the Jewish community in Helsinki to maintain its Jewish school, which has elementary and secondary classes. Hebrew and other Jewish subjects are taught. Since the end of World War II, assimilation has, most

regrettably, been developing. Strides in the field of Jewish culture in the world at large do not reach us; we lack Hebrew textbooks, and Hebrew teachers who come from Israel leave us after two years.

As chairman of the Book Council, I order books from England, the United States, Mexico and other countries, but what is good for these countries is not suitable for Finland and unqualified people had to compile books for us. Congress should set up a commission to issue textbooks for teaching Hebrew in all countries and a European teachers' seminary should be established to train Jewish students to teach in their own community.

MR. ISODORO BEREICHEZ (*Mexico*): Although the Department for Cultural Affairs, in its report for the years 1953-1959, gives an account of its aid to Latin American countries, our Mexican Yishuv had to rely on its own resources; we did not get anything from the Claims Conference either.

There are 25,000 Jews in Mexico, divided into seven sectors, according to place of origin, 60 per cent. of whom are Ashkenazim. The sectors are: two Arabic-speaking, Spanish-speaking Sephardim, German-speaking, Hungarian-speaking, English-speaking, and Ashkenazic Jews from Eastern Europe. Each of these has its own Kehillah; there are 12 synagogues; the Sephardim, comprising the Arabic and Spanish-speaking sectors, have their own schools, and the Ashkenazim are very proud of their own four wonderful schools.

The Ashkenazic Kehillah held democratic elections in July and 45 councillors were chosen. The Jewish Central Committee is the representative body of the Jews of all sectors. Eighty per cent. of our children receive a Jewish education in our schools, which are recognized by the authorities and where general instruction is in Spanish. After spending 12 years in our institutions, made up of one year in kindergarten, six in the Folkschule (elementary school), three in the Mittelschule (secondary school) and two in the Preparatory (for college) School, the student is ready to enter the state university. In the Ashkenazic schools, he has studied Yiddish and Hebrew in addition to general subjects. We have a Teachers' Seminary to train tutors for the Folkschule.

We have a large sports centre of 85,000 square meters which contains many cultural facilities for lectures, meetings, art exhibitions, performances and concerts; as well as a library. Due to the sports centre, the problem of mixed marriages has all but disappeared. Hundreds of men and women engage in the work of the Ashkenazi Kehillah, in the administration of the schools

and in Zionist work. Yiddish is the language used at meetings. The Cultural Department has also organized a large choir.

There are three Yiddish newspapers which appear weekly, and twice or thrice weekly; we have also a Spanish language paper. The Zionist groups, as well as the Bund, have their own Yiddish publications. About ten textbooks are issued annually, as well as some literary works: the Zvi Kessel Prize is given each year for three books. Last year, this prize was awarded to a book from Denmark. For the 100th anniversary celebration of Sholem Aleichem our Yishuv arranged a grand celebration and our largest school (1,200 children) issued a special Silver Medal.

We have our full complement of Jewish organizations and use both Yiddish and Hebrew, but we lack teachers for the Mittelschule, the Seminary and the provinces. We need chalutzim in the cultural area. We look anxiously to the future. Will the new generation be able to defend what we have built? Economically, we have no complaints.

Our immigrant generation is very active—we have no hall large enough for all who wish to participate in the Warsaw Ghetto commemoration. The Ashkenazic Kehillah is about to erect new community buildings. We also face the problem of cultural work among the non-Yiddish speaking sectors. Culturally, a schism is developing between the Ashkenazim and the others. The State of Israel is remote and the only bridge for our youth is the year or two they spend in Ulpanim.

MR. IDY BORNSTEIN (*Scandinavian Jewish Youth Federation*): I wish to thank Dr. A. Steinberg and the Congress Cultural Department for helping us, and particularly for making possible the translation into Swedish of the English language book 'Jewish History', which was mailed to 3,500 private persons in Sweden, Denmark, Norway and Finland. The Scandinavian Jewish Youth Federation also circulated copies of '500 Words in Hebrew' on the 10th anniversary of Israel's independence.

The Jewish communities in our countries live in widely dispersed communities; for example, in Sweden there are 26 small villages, some 24 hours and some 48 hours distant from each other. We need teachers and youth leaders. A teacher from Israel stays only two years; it would help a great deal if he could stay five years. In remote places in Finland and Norway, there is no teacher, shochet or cantor; we hope that the World Jewish Congress, bearing in mind the excellence of our fathers (Zchut Avot) and the part Sweden played in the history of Congress, will help us keep in contact with our far distant brethren.

MR. E. J. DE KADT (*World Union of Jewish Students*): I should like to see the whole problem of Jewish education and of activation of Jewish youth in the Diaspora in a larger context. The delegates must be reminded of the terrible problems besetting the generation which attained maturity in the postwar years; all complain about the apathy among the young people, not only among Jewish youth, in the countries of western civilization.

In Great Britain, and in most countries where a dedicated and active student Zionist movement exists, real living Zionism, which could mean something to the young people, hardly exists. Young people need advice and leadership, especially in those fields where they lack experience. They need an example to follow, some kind of stimulus, positive or negative. I strongly suspect that if my generation had not been in the general grip of apathy, the negative example set by some of the community leaders would long ago have driven some of the young people to rebellion, and possibly to new and better achievements. At every gathering of Jewish representatives that I have been to, I have heard the cry: "Where is the youth?" But nobody lends an understanding ear to the admittedly very few young people who are willing to sacrifice a considerable part of their time to the work of Jewish students. The task of these Jewish student leaders is made considerably more difficult by the immense turnover inherent in any student movement. I have been speaking of certain tendencies in the Jewish community leadership.

The situation is completely different in respect to established international Jewish organizations. The World Union of Jewish Students would not exist today were it not for the unflinching encouragement and financial support of Congress. Dr. Riegner for many years has taken personal responsibility for "his students". The Cultural Department has helped us in the organization of some very successful seminars and is about to initiate a fortnight of intensive Jewish leadership study in South America, where the majority of the student community is in danger of losing all touch with Judaism. Social functions, fund raising and a general feeling of self-satisfaction in delegates have never produced anything of great importance and have never raised anybody to great heights.

I am far from believing that I know the answer to these problems, but perhaps I may make some suggestions which may be of practical value. I should like to ask the older generation for more tolerance in its approach to us and to each other's ideas, beliefs and ideologies. Do not try to make us believe that there

exists only one way to be a good Jew, either in a political, religious or cultural sense. I found a paper on my desk saying that a certain religious group here is going to oppose the cultural work of this Congress—this to me is the height of intolerance.

I feel that part of the problem would be solved if the Congress succeeded in penetrating more to the individual members of the community. We should mobilize those Jewish teachers who teach in non-Jewish schools to arouse interest in particular aspects of Jewish history and culture. A teacher in a general history class could give the Jewish student an acute sense of awareness of his Jewishness and the heritage of his people. The stimulation of interest in Jewish topics, particularly in the university, is not beyond our power. We must not be one-sided Jewish specialists, but neither can we sit idly by while hundreds of Jewish lawyers, economists, sociologists and psychologists pursue their careers without ever taking an interest in Jewish sociology, Jewish law or psychology.

Let me close by thanking Congress for its great help and by expressing the hope that there will gradually ensue a better relationship between the younger and older generation so that we may together form a real partnership.

DR. A. STEINBERG (*Director, Cultural Department*): Last evening, I had an opportunity to start developing some ideas of a general character concerning the present situation of Jewish education throughout the world, but there was not sufficient time. This morning I listened with the greatest attention to the speakers from some small countries and to my good young friend, De Kadt. You will hear that many things could be done to improve the situation if more care would be given to the many-sided aspects of the problem. You have heard from practically all the Scandinavian countries, from Portugal and even from Mexico; a small community of only 25,000 which has developed activity of really exceptional dimensions. That shows that where the will is, the way can be found.

Lack of teachers for Jewish schools on all levels is a problem throughout the world and some say it has not even been solved in Israel. That leads us to the view that in the field of Jewish education we need firmly established, international co-operation. Something is already being prepared; those who read the report of the Cultural Department have seen the concluding paragraph, where I stressed that our Cultural Department was accumulating experience as a model of an international Jewish cultural and educational authority. We wanted to experiment to discover

whether such an idea was just a fantasy or whether it had some relation to the realities of Jewish cultural life; and our experience teaches us that the time has come to establish in all seriousness such an international authority for education on a world-wide scale. We cannot do it unless in the spirit of absolute tolerance, in our terminology, of "inner-Jewish universalism". There is a diversity of cultures within the Jewish people, as Professor Baron said: we are not eliminating anyone who is interested in the preservation of Jewish collective cultural identity; we cannot go in the way of Shammai, we have to go in the way of Hillel.

Like my young friend De Kadt, I found amongst the releases put out by this Assembly, a resolution adopted at a meeting of 36 delegates from religious parties, expressing opposition to a participation by Congress in educational work. In the translation of the resolution from Hebrew to English, the term "educational" work was used, but I hope this was a mistake for "cultural" work.

I was not invited to this meeting. It is true I do not belong to a political religious party, because it is my conviction that politics should be kept out of religion. Religion deals with eternal problems, not with problems of the day. We should keep the main direction of Jewish life in the spirit of the Jewish religion.

Allow me to speak also for religious Jews. After all, my brother was a religious Jew; my father, mother and grandfathers were religious Jews; I speak for my family and my family is the family of Am Yisrael. I am trying to present Jewishness as I understand it, and I think I understand it in the spirit of Jewish tradition. Not only should we know how to answer the unbeliever, the heretic, we should also know how to ask him, not waiting for him to ask us; we should convert potential Jews to absolute Jews.

One of the greatest difficulties in our educational position is that we have a great mass of uncommitted Jews, Jewish parents who do not care. But if you ask them, they say one doesn't know what Jewish education is. To some Zionists Yiddish is treif; and as for Hebrew, many do not want their children to leave them and go off to Israel, so they keep them out of Hebrew school. Let us tell these people that there is meaning in Jewish education. I tried to indicate there are great human values of an eternal character which should be brought home to Jewish families throughout the Diaspora. It is a great task of immense magnitude, but we have to start it. Therefore, as the World Jewish Congress, we have to join forces with other factors in Jewish life which are prepared to call a world Jewish conference on education. I am in favour of a resolution of this kind being adopted by this Assembly.

One of the great problems is, as I said, lack of teachers. There is already a project envisaged by Rabbi Israel Goldstein, to establish four Jewish training colleges in different areas of the world. They should be organized on a uniform basis so that they can interchange post-graduate students—the new type of Jewish teacher should be able to help in any part of the world, outside Israel. Training this kind of teacher is in itself a great problem, therefore we cannot do without a Research Institute, perhaps in co-operation with the Hebrew University. Such a world conference should be able to leave behind a permanent institution, a body of world-wide importance for dealing with problems of education.

There are so many special problems. Professor Horace M. Kallen has ideas about bringing out some sensible correlation between the exigences of the technological age and Jewish education of any description. You heard today that there is a need for a scheme for writing textbooks for Jewish schools. The conference should make provision for financing its work, it should work out a ten or fifteen year plan, with all stages and priorities taken into account. The time will come when it will deal not only with the training of children up to the higher school level, but also with adult education, which is perhaps more important.

It has become a kind of habit for us to deal with education always in close conjunction with culture. My very dear friend Zalman Shazar, who was Minister for Education and Culture in Israel and is now the Head of the Department for Education and Culture of the Jewish Agency, is present here. The Russian Ministry for Education was also the ministry for music, the theatre and what is called "culture" today. We in the World Jewish Congress are in this sense a kind of exception. We have only a Cultural Department; we do not have an education department. We never wanted the latter, being well aware what it implies in money. But the combination of education and culture is justified, especially in our time. You cannot have a dynamic system of education without active, cultural creativeness. Therefore, it is very important that we should support Jewish creativeness in Yiddish. In the Diaspora, there is no more single creative factor than the activities by Yiddish scholars, writers and poets. That has nothing to do with opposition to Hebrew (Yiddishists may be Yiddishists, but they should be Jews!) and Yiddish culture should also be taken care of by the new authority.

Now a last word about this whole matter—we have to revise where to put the emphasis in Jewish education in a general way. There was a time when the emphasis could be put on bringing

knowledge to the coming generation. In our time, with its tendency to efface the differences between cultural systems of the past, it is a matter of training the will, the character. Acquiring and conveying knowledge is vital, but the emphasis should be put on strengthening the Jewish will—the will of the Jewish personality. Even Proverbs mentions individual education and the Mishna expressly said that every human being is unique. This may animate the Jewish educational ideal in our time and work as an antidote to the poison of homogeneity spreading throughout the world. Of course, one has to think about the means of implementation. This new institution, according to my own plan, should come out with the idea of a general mobilization of the Jewish people for the sake of education and with special taxation—a “holy shekel for education”.

MRS. MATHILDA GUEZ (*Israel*): I have the honour to appear as an Israeli for the first time, as I left Tunisia three years ago, and I wish to say a few words about the absorption of the thousands who have come to Israel from North Africa.

It was not always the wealthy or the intellectuals who left Arab countries for Israel. The wealthy would have had no absorption problem; for the masses, the beginnings were difficult, both for themselves and for the State of Israel. But these same people have turned out to be very constructive elements. They have distinguished themselves in agriculture, in construction work, and in industry. These same people are in the moshavim, kibbutzim and in the development centres where they work with love and pride. The women know how to be farmers and housewives in the morning and well-groomed ladies in the afternoon. They have turned their backs on idleness and gossip in which they were specialists. They bring up their children with love of the country they again discovered, and the children have found security in Israel. In the kindergartens and in the schools, one can no longer recognize the origin of the children. They are all handsome and proud. In the Army they have also distinguished themselves. The Government and the Histadruth do everything possible for newcomers in all fields by organizing seminars, trips and conferences in all languages in order to acquaint them with their new country and to further their participation in its destiny. Hebrew classes for adults are being given in every corner of the land and it is often touching to see men and women of more than 60 years of age studying and trying to find words of the same root as in the Arabic which is still their language. We must fight against illiteracy, for there is a small percentage of the Jewish population of Israel,

originating from Arab countries, which signs their name by making a thumbprint. There are also a few who cannot adjust and some who lack good will. The North African population in Israel disapproves of them completely.

MR. S. H. HARVEY (*Canada*): It is good that the question of international co-operation in the field of Jewish education was put on the agenda. Jewish continuity is dear to us and nothing can contribute to it as much as Jewish education. The problem of Jewish education was clearly stated at the symposium but directives for co-operation were not given. Dr. A. Steinberg tried today to do this and plans should be submitted to the Cultural Commission.

In Canada there are Jewish educational institutions which were founded as long as fifty years ago. We have Talmud Torahs and Progressive Schools privately financed. On the North American continent, Canada was the first (25 years ago) to build full Day Schools in which children receive both their English and Jewish education. For those children attending general schools in the morning, we tried at the same time to maintain the Afternoon School, but since the All Day Schools have become popular, the Afternoon Schools have become a problem. But it is difficult even for Canadian Jewry to have All Day Schools for all the children, furthermore they are elementary only, up to the age of 13. In Montreal there are Jewish secondary schools, but the number of students is relatively small, although some students continue their Jewish education and even go on to rabbinic schools.

There are some Yeshivoth and a Jewish Teachers' Seminary in Montreal, founded about ten years ago and maintained by the Canadian Jewish Congress. Branches of this and other seminaries were opened in Toronto and Winnipeg. Montreal, Toronto and Winnipeg have each a Yiddish daily. The Jews living remote from the large centres present a problem, but we hope that our modest achievements will stimulate other yishuvim to do likewise.

M. LEON ALGAZI (*France*): A scholar said to me once that if an enemy of Israel gave him the choice between instruction in the Hebrew language, in the history of Judaism and in the Tanach, or on the other hand in traditional Jewish music, he would choose music. For, he said, history, Hebrew, the Tanach—one can forget them. But a song learned in childhood accompanies one to the grave. I say this in order to ask you to join me in evoking the memory of two great servants of Jewish music, Ernest Bloch and Lazar Saminsky. Ernest Bloch was born in Switzerland and lived in the United States where he carved out a dazzling career

for himself; he is the first Jewish musician who brought Jewish music to the great international concert stages. We owe him much gratitude and we bless his memory. As to Saminsky, he belonged to that group of young Jewish musicians of Russia who, under the influence of Rimsky-Korsakoff, their master, for the first time turned to the popular and traditional Jewish musical heritage and gathered together the melodies which we now cherish. May his memory be blessed.

Music plays a great role within Congress, and I insist on expressing here my gratitude both as a musician and as a Jew to the Congress which has enabled us for the first time in our history to organize an international Jewish music congress. I include in this expression of gratitude the name of our great friend Edmond Fleg, president of the Cultural Commission of the Congress, who is with us in his thoughts and in the passionate interest which he brings to all our problems.

I now refer to problems which arise only in the Diaspora. We Jews of the Galuth live in a Christian society and we must not forget that for a single moment. Since this is so, every cultural, educational effort that we undertake, must bear this situation in mind. We must not only defend Israel against certain influences, but we must at the same time achieve a life as harmonious and as friendly as possible with our non-Jewish fellow-citizens. These problems do not arise with the same sharpness in Israel and they never arose in the former shtetls where the Jews lived among themselves. Our youth must know what religious thought is in order to turn away from it or to adhere to it. If we keep them in ignorance of religious thinking, they cannot choose what we possess, but they risk following alien religious thinking. If we do not give our children a religious education, let us be very careful that others do not give them such an education, one that we would wish them not to have. We run the risk of finding ourselves tomorrow with many young meshumadim (apostates), just as there are today many old meshumadim.

Thus, let us abandon our anti-religious prejudices. Let us admit that when we talk about Jewish culture, we cannot talk solely of Sholem Aleichem, Peretz and Bialik. Whatever the admiration which I, as a Sephardi, feel for Sholem Aleichem, Peretz and Bialik, we must not forget the sources which enabled Bialik to exist, which gave rise to a Sholem Aleichem and a Peretz. Jewish intellectuals of my country talk of Kafka and Proust, and when I say to them, "Why do you not also speak of the Prophets of Israel?" they answer, "We do not know them."

Well, this is disastrous. It is necessary to reverse the trend. It is necessary to begin with the Aleph Beth, which is the Tanach. The Talmudic tradition and the Midrashic tradition, are great treasures of which many Jews know nothing, and today it is the non-Jews who come to search for them. If we understand all this we shall also understand that it is our duty not to keep ourselves separate from the religious community, whether we ourselves are observant or not. Let us remain on the inside! If we have something to criticize regarding the religious activities of our community, let us criticize from the inside. Every Jew who calls himself a Jew and who wants to remain a Jew, who wants his children to remain Jews, must remain inside the community to realize that idea.

I also ask my religious brothers to show respect and love. Yes, our religious brothers also must show understanding between Sephardic and Ashkenazim; between Europeans and Americans there must be established that cultural plurality which was mentioned at the beginning, for we have a plurality of cultures and when the cultures of every Jewish group are understood, unity will be realized.

MR. MEYER BROWN (*United States*): Education is, apart from the State of Israel, the central question of Jewish life. Congress has neither the apparatus nor the financial means to deal with it. Congress can at best be an instrument for propaganda and information and should cater mainly to the smaller yishuvim. (The State of Israel and the yishuvim in the United States, Canada and South Africa, and in some other countries can help themselves and can get along without outside aid.) It is important to provide information to smaller yishuvim, to help them understand the meaning of present Jewish life and Jewish continuity, and to make possible an exchange of teachers between countries.

We speak of 2-2½ million Jews in the Soviet Union. When I was there, I heard from authoritative sources that the number was 3,500,000 to 3,750,000. On the one hand, the greater number is inspiring; on the other, what kind of Jewish life is there? I am an admirer of Nahum Goldmann, but I was surprised that in his masterful reply he made some unfortunate remarks that play into the hands of Soviet propagandists. If a Jew in Russia is caught reading a Yiddish or Hebrew paper, he is imprisoned for many years. If nowhere in Russia there is a cheder or Yiddish school, if there is no Yiddish theatre, does this mean discrimination or not?

The Jews in Russia who try to maintain their Jewishness through religion are Marranos, in spite of Dr. Nahum Goldmann's opinion to the contrary. The situation of the Kulturfarband in

Poland is better—but woe unto us for that sort of Jewishness.

MR. WOOLF PERRY (*Great Britain*): Contemporary Jewish society has engendered a nation of diagnosticians, a nation of prognosticators who have all examined Jewish life and arrived at more or less the same conclusions. But we have not produced a form of practical therapeutics. There will never be any identity of view in world Jewish society with its complex of opinions. We must recognize that we should act now even though complex action is required. One of the deficiencies of the Congress has been that we have indulged, almost to the point of ecstatic display, our assessment of the problems which face us. I think that one of the positive results of this conference will be the acceptance of the basic underlying philosophy of the desire to re-orientate the machinery of this Congress to cope with this problem. Congress must understand that not only it needs to take its part in frustrating the atrophy of our cultural content, but to play its part for the development of the new educational undertones, which are essential if we are to achieve cultural unity. All of us will accept the differentiation which Dr. Steinberg enunciated as between culture and education. While these terms should not be confused they are interdependent and we should not aim at achieving the optimum expression of our desire in the first place, otherwise our therapeutics will go the way of our diagnoses and prognoses. Congress has the responsibility to impress upon the communities amongst which it works, that they must, as quickly as is expedient, implement the end result of their investigations.

DR. SIMON FEDERBUSH (*United States*): Lately, opinions have been expressed among the Congress leadership that political work has lost its central importance and we should therefore concentrate on work in the field of education. It is worth remembering that Congress was founded as a national political movement, and this united all of us, the religious Jews and the non-religious. The political work has had to its credit many fine achievements in recent years. Now there is uneasiness among the religious Jews about the fact that Congress wanted to exchange political work for educational work. There are, among Jews different opinions about education, and we of the religious party hold that disunity will be created, while we wish unity to continue.

A group of religious delegates has been formed from among Congress delegates—an expression of this uneasiness. Proof of it is the fact that three very interesting papers on education were read here last night. We regret that Professor Ernst Simon, in his wonderful lecture, could not restrain himself from some sort of

an attack, let us call it a kind of critique of orthodoxy. Regrettably, we the orthodox, were not given the possibility to reply in detail or seriously.

Due to the limitation of time, I wish to say only this: Professor Simon excludes himself from the orthodoxy because he says it lacks dynamism. But he will admit that creativity has never ceased in religious Judaism, in Halacha (Talmudic law). A great personality in Israel, though not in Jerusalem, the Chazon Ish, has set forth a new approach to the relations of the religious Jews to the non-religious. The basis has to be, in his conception, Ahavat Yisrael, love for the Jews and the Jewish people. This was the point of view of an extremist in religious Jewry.

A dynamic quality characterized Rabbi Herzog and his decisions in Halacha. There was creativity, too. As our sages said, the Halacha has continued to create on the authority of the Torah. And we think that orthodoxy and Talmudic Judaism have not been static. The Chazon Ish holds that the Halacha has been and continue to be dynamic. To be sure, what Martin Buber sees in a dynamic religion is different, as different as the views of Rabbi Herzog and Professor Simon.

It is, however, not right that one stands up and proclaims he cannot go with orthodoxy, because it is petrified and cannot be dynamic. Education has proven that we can work with others. But a certain division of work is necessary. In the State of Israel, there are government religious schools and government non-religious schools. In the Zionist movement there exist a department for religious education and a department for non-religious education. It is, therefore, impossible to ask that religious Jewry agree that the Congress take up education.

As to cultural work, conducted successfully by Dr. A. Steinberg in recent years, I think it should be continued and expanded. Aid for the small communities is necessary, perhaps also educational aid if the Congress encourages Day Schools. But religious education under one roof is impossible.

One word only about education in Israel. There is light and shadow. Professor Simon exposed the latter. It would be a mistake to draw an analogy between Israel and the Diaspora. In the former there are a State, a language, and all the attributes of a State. In the Diaspora, there is no other Jewish life but the religious. Only religion ties us together. I regret that Congress leaders publicly declare that religion tied us together once, but does not any longer. I do not think this is correct. The great Jewish masses in the Diaspora are tied together only by religion, by our faith.

I also regret that Dr. Y. Pilch did not mention that more than ninety per cent. of the schools in the Diaspora were built as religious schools. The Congress has a great future, but must to a larger extent, take account of orthodox Jewry which has been the backbone of the Jewish people and will continue to be.

DR. DAVID SFARD (*Observer, Social and Cultural Association of Jews in Poland*): While formally the debate on cultural and educational problems started today, they in fact were the core of the President's address and of the political debate.

Without underestimating the importance of the cultural problems, we were sure that at least in the political debate those questions which are decisive for the fate of the Jewish people and which were dealt with by comrade Smoliar, would be foremost. These questions, however, were avoided by the Congress leadership and by the majority of the delegates, who deliberately switched their criticism to the cultural field. True, Dr. Goldmann in his reply expressed his attitude on several political questions as clearly as possible. His attitude disappointed us deeply. We have always seen a contrast in the President's policies—between his attitude towards the cold war and co-existence, and Israel's neutrality on the one hand, and his relation to the Adenauer regime and its Hitlerite administration on the other hand.

It is irrelevant that the Yishuv in Poland is small. Its cultural productivity is large: a permanent theatre, a publishing house that put out 230 books in a total of one million copies, a network of amateur dramatic groups, etc. Our cultural work bears the marks of Jewish tradition. We published many classical books of Yiddish literature as well as of writers who perished in the catastrophe whose manuscripts we found in the Ringelblum Archives. The Jewish Historical Institute explored with great devotion the period of our latest catastrophe, whose martyrs are holy for all Jews. Through our dramatic groups we acquaint our audience with the Jewish progressive work of all periods.

Now a critical remark on the Symposium on Cultural Pluralism. The problems were treated too abstractly. The strictly objective scientific method was missing, also a concrete analysis of recent experiences.

The Congress leadership was right to have the problem treated from an international aspect. While I cannot, due to the limitation of time, speak on the cultural development in the socialist world in general, I want to say that Jewish cultural life in Poland is not only legally possible, but also stimulated by the government financially, and otherwise.

Dr. Nahum Goldmann rightly said that cultural creativity of a minority depends not only on external factors, but also on the minority's inner conduct.

Secondly, let me remark on the cold war and the Congress in the cultural field. Here is one fact more. In the Cultural Bulletin, Volume 10, 1959, there is an article that speaks about a new type of an American communist whose language is English, who, however, also takes an interest in Jewishness, who is progressive and active in the communist movement . . . but participates and is interested in Jewish social and cultural matters. This communist uses Sholem Aleichem as a symbol of his Jewishness. Why Sholem Aleichem has become the symbol of the communist everywhere, is still to be explored.

As to the English language and Jewishness on the one hand, and Yiddish on the other, Congress leaders at this Assembly have pleaded for Jewish culture. The fact that the Jewish communists are interested in Sholem Aleichem arouses suspicions, indeed.

Now, let me ask, is this the language of co-existence and of ending the cold war on the Jewish scene, a subject the President spoke about with such conviction? Is this in the spirit of great consideration for Jewish culture expressed here?

MR. J. BENZION (*Sweden*): What does the leadership plan to do in the cultural field and what in the educational? I hold we should start with the children, perhaps also with their parents. A great deal has been neglected in the last three generations, when the catastrophe came, most did not know why they died. Now we want to know why we live. The Commissions must give unambiguous answers and express plainly their ideas and terms.

We protest against the five minutes allocated to the Swedish Delegation; no one can make an analysis in this short time.

DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN: In reply to the last speaker: the Swedish Delegation was not discriminated against: due to lack of time, thirty delegates each received five minutes debating time.

2. COMMEMORATION OF THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF CHAIM NACHMAN BIALIK

DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN: We are going to celebrate two of the greatest representative figures of Jewish culture in the 19th and 20th centuries, Bialik and Sholem Aleichem. Bialik, who is our most impressive poet in Hebrew literature in our generation and the generation before us; Sholem Aleichem is the most

popular of the Yiddish writers the centenary of whose birth was celebrated by the Jewish people this year.

The Congress Executive felt we had to take time for an evaluation of these two great figures who perhaps contributed more than all our organizations and political undertakings to maintaining and developing Jewish life in their time and for the future, for they achieved what will forever remain in Jewish cultural history.

It is one of the very fortunate events of my life that for many years I was close to Chaim Nachman Bialik who, after leaving Russia, lived in Western Europe and then in Palestine. We are fortunate that our speaker on Bialik is a friend and colleague of mine and a friend of many of you, one of the most interesting representatives of Jewish culture in our time: Zalman Shazar, the chairman of the Jewish Agency in Jerusalem. I am pleased that he, in spite of his many commitments, has come here and I am happy that he attended our consultations.

MR. ZALMAN SHAZAR (*Chairman, Jewish Agency, Israel*): A congress of delegates of the Jewish people from all parts of the world is not a literary club, and I certainly am not a literary critic by profession. However, the greatest poet of the Jewish people in our age, Chaim Nachman Bialik, is not a miraculous phenomenon in literary history alone. Anxiety about the future of our nation has brought you all here. I come from a country where the essence of this anxiety was concentrated and prepared the revolution in the nation's lot. Bialik's poetry nursed and accompanied this anxiety at the climax of its manifestation; it celebrated the revolution itself and its architects at the most decisive moment of its turning point, and the blessing of its vision still peeps out from every blossoming bud in the garden of our rebirth. Therefore the Bialik anniversary, in its very essence, is something more than and different from a mere literary event; and when proclaimed from so venerable a tribunal, with the approval of the scattered members of our nation and in the presence of delegates from all Jewish communities of the Diaspora, their centres, remnants, and the beginnings of their new offshoots, ten years after the renewal of the nation's independence in the Homeland, it must in itself necessarily embody—if only by implication—a kind of silent communion between an ancient, scattered people and the essence of the poetry of its revival.

It has been said—and rightly so—that what Pushkin was to the entire Russian people, what Goethe was to the whole of Germany and Mickiewicz to the rebirth of Poland, Bialik was and is

to the Jewish people in our time. Moreover, Bialik's poetry is distinguished in that it appeared at the very moment that the nation stood at the crossroads, and the generation on which was bestowed the boon of his poetry is the very generation that was entrusted with the responsibility for the change itself and for the success of its implementation. Who will ever be able to determine who drew more from whom and in what measure one nurtured and was nurtured by the other; our literary renaissance in all its languages and manifestations, or that great national and social revolution which took place in all phases of our stormy life in those fate-changing generations?

"The morning chill, the raven's shriek
Aroused me and I awoke,
And I know not why suddenly
Festive joy came over me."

There was something at the turn of our century, just when the sun of the vision of independence shone in the mouth of its great dreamer, Dr. Theodor Herzl, just when the dawn rose on the beginning of the revolutionary movement in Russia, just when the Jewish Labour Movement came into being, just when a keen desire awakened in the Jewish masses to arise from their places of poverty and oppression and flee like ants wherever the spirit of thirst might carry them to a new life—there was something in the air of those days which inspired longing for lofty creativity and creative manifestations undreamt of. And this blessed meeting of the revolutionary forces in the nation and the blooming spring of its literary expression was a source of blessing to both, and Bialik's poetry was the culmination of the vernal meeting. This true, refined, and most fruitful expression of all in that wonderful year 1897, a year unequalled in our age, came when Bialik sang his first great songs ("Songs of Summer", "The Last Dead of the Wilderness", "Just a Little Note She Wrote Me", "Songs of Wrath", "Surely the People is Grass"); and he sang his songs of praise to the Zionist Congress, to every Jewish congress thereafter ("Woes of your people have summoned you from the far corners of the earth"). It was as if he had been created to be "only" a refined lyric poet, whose senses are open to absorb light, sun, wild flowers, and the charm of spring; and, like an ancient pagan, to be enraptured by the morning breezes and darting sunbeams, thirsting for life and endowed with an enormous capacity for enjoying life in all the abundance of its splendours ("The wine of spring has intoxicated me"). But the

fate of his people turned him into a public spokesman to voice the fears of his people in a manner previously unknown to recent generations. In spite of himself, he took upon himself the burden of voicing his people's woes. Since Jeremiah, no one has lamented our bitter lot as he did. He was created to be "a violin for his unique song", and history forced him to be "the bewailer of his people's affliction". In this dramatic tension between the two contrasts, the strength of his utterance matured still more; and if it is true that there is "a redeeming expression", then he was the instrument for the release of all the pain, wrath, hope, and thirst for life which had accumulated in the hearts of generations without finding expression and without relief.

Who in our day can properly understand and believe what the Kishinev Pogrom meant to that generation? What are the forty victims of Kishinev compared with the hundreds of thousands of Petliura's victims, with the millions slain by Hitler? But being the first, it was the mother of catastrophe which did not cease from then on until the end of the holocaust in our day. It was a miracle of miracles that the mother of the catastrophe was privileged to receive at once its poetic and most poignant expression in the "Song of Wrath" (*Fun Tsar und Tsorn*) of Bialik. That pain—when the acacia bloomed, the sun shone, and the slaughterer slaughtered—could have been only very shocking, very stupefying, and even more destructive than the enemy, and that's all. Indeed, "the blow was enough to kill, but the pain was refined by Bialik's burning songs, and in "a second offering", poetic à la Bialik, it turned into a life-giving balm and command for revival and a signal "to the volunteers of the people" to bring about the revolution.

His was the mystery of "the redeeming despair". He was placed like a sentinel on guard, and with fiery words he kept guard like a knight, lest the pain be profaned either by false illusions or by deceitful counsel, or by vain comforts. "And if your roar should burst forth, I shall stifle it between your teeth"—for it is apt only to lessen the pain without curing it; the wrath must be kept holy, as it was created for redeeming deeds.

Indeed, never had anything like this happened in our young literature. The word became an arrow; it descended like a wondrous balm.

Bialik himself wrote as far back as 1894:

"What is the song of Israel? The Diaspora is a withered flower,

An open flower whose petals are not moistened by the dew
of light,
A seed that has fallen into the mud and grown mouldy,
A gourd that has fallen down and dried up in the cellar".

Then, in 1903, there appeared his poem "In the City of Slaughter", filled with wrath at the "mice hiding behind the cask". And only a year passed when, in the Homel riots, there already stood up a group of defenders who turned the shame of despair into the strength of valour—the grandfathers of those who rose up in the ghettos of Poland and the defenders of Tel-Hai. Those Homel defenders later became the fathers of the Second Aliyah in the fields of Judea and Galilee, and there is a manifest fraternal bond between the defenders of Tel-Hai and the insurgents of the ghettos.

Do not think that there is no connection between this thirst for spring and "the light of life" and the community of individuals who went forth by the hundreds of thousands to grope in the darkness of distant lands and, seemingly without a preliminary plan and knowledge of what they were doing, established for us all the new large Jewish centres in the Diaspora, from which you have all gathered here today.

With "Des Letzte Wort" ("The Last Word") in their valise, with "On the Slaughter" in their heart, and with "Strong be the Hands of all our Brethren Who Love and Favour the Soil of our Country", each of them went his way—and this was the beginning of the new history.

Was Bialik the first? No, certainly not. Even in our modern literature he was preceded by generations of creators, thinkers, poets, and fiction writers in Hebrew, Yiddish, and even in non-Jewish tongues. He himself considered Ahad Ha'am and Mendele his masters and made no decision without consulting them.

Was Bialik the only one? Most certainly not. All his power lay in this, that he was a talent that gave birth to talents around him, and a chorus formed spontaneously which he tended and nursed. It was he who proclaimed the greatness of "Samson's seven locks of hair" on the head of his favourite disciple, Zalman Shnour, of whom we were bereaved this very year. It was he who said jokingly, "Are you looking for a rhyme to go with Bialik? Come, I'll tell you: it is Tchernichovsky". He was also the one who honoured Jacob Kahan, greatly befriended Bergelson, listened attentively to Liessin, esteemed Yeheash, pampered Fichman, praised the poems of Rachel, and delighted in the magic of Shlensky.

With each and every poem of his, whether it was a song of nature, a love song, or the song of a people crushed by grief, or the song of a generation yearning for the light—with every song that ascended one rung higher in his work, the entire literature went up with it, and along with literature the whole generation was uplifted.

For the rendezvous never ended as long as the light of his song burned.

And with both his wings—the singing wing of the solitary poet, and the broken wing of the nation's Shekinah—he sheltered this unfortunate generation that has had its fill of suffering and adversity; this happy generation that breaks the nation's fetters, sowing and ploughing, ingathering the exiles, conquering freedom and defending it.

And with both his wings he elevated the generation's vast new literature and glorified its position in the web of a nation's generations.

For until Bialik there lurked the danger to our entire modern literature, in all its manifestations and forms, that it might turn into a passing episode in the spiritual history of our nation.

The excessive secularism of the entire Haskalah literature—without which it could perhaps not have come into being—seemed to have placed it with its back to the nation's literature which had preceded it. The mordant satire, fraught with strife, with all the corruption and weakness of a collapsing reality, turned it into a bitter adversary of the struggling generation. It even hid from it all that was excellent, tragic and noble in the last generations. In spite of all its eminence in every sphere, there lurked the danger of its not being woven into the eternal web of the nation.

Bialik, both as poet and thinker, as a man of the book and a promoter of the book, gained for our new literature the entrance through the gate of honour of the works of generations forever and ever.

It was as though he provided the new literature with a book of genealogy as a certificate of equal rights, legitimately representing the nation's creative efforts in our generation. The enrootment already began in his letter from Volozhin. With Hamatmid ("The Diligent Student") on the one hand, and with Yehi Holki Imakhom ("May my portion be with you") on the other, the score of the new literature changed with the generation. His Sefer Ha'Agada ("Book of Legends"), his commentary on Mishnayet, his critical study of Gabriel, his "Songs of the People", and his Ha-Kinus project (for the collection and publication of old literary treasures),

all these built paths from the literature of our generation to that of the past generations. A bridge inheriting from generations, a bridge bequeathing to generations. His poem "Beside the Bookcase" is both separated and joined as a son of the world.

I remember how he used to say: "Moses received the Torah from Sinai and handed it down to Joshua; Joshua to the elders; the elders to the prophets, and the prophets to the men of the Great Synagogue, and they used to say".

And I recall Bialik saying: "Without its being received enthusiastically anew in its entirety by each generation, there is no possibility of handing it down to the next generation. And without handing it down in a manner suitable to the new generation, there is no point in its acceptance. A necessary condition for this is also that 'they used to say'—and even if only three things—for there can be no handing down and no true acceptance without the recipient generation adding something of its own".

What was further from the Haskalah generation than the creation of legends? In the synagogue, too, En Jacob was the possession of the simple folk sitting around the broken-legged table there. And in modern literary circles there were only the idle exaggerations of Rabba-Bar-Chana. With what a mighty hand Bialik turned the reader's eye to this ancient treasure of the nation's wisdom and the sacredness of its values! In it there is the exegesis and from it flows the soulful exposition of all the religious and human lyricism.

Once Bialik gave me as a gift the Book of Legends. It was a moment of compassion. Suddenly he said to me: "My name is Ch. N. Bialik". There is no Bialik in this book, but his Ch. N (initials of Chokhma Nistora—hidden wisdom) is there. A profound remark. But the truth came out when he said that. The selection, editing, classification, arrangement, the charm inherent in the creations of bygone generations, restored the grace of these works so that they might abide with the present generation.

The Book of Legends was privileged to go through many editions comprising hundreds of thousands of copies, and to exert a great influence on the language of creative writing and on the style of creative writers to this day.

And even more revolutionary than the change of attitude toward legend was the change which it began to produce in the attitude toward Halakha. He proclaimed this, as if in a cultural manifesto, in his wonderful essay, Halakha Ve-Agada (Law and Legend); he applied himself to this task in his commentary to Mishnayot, which he did not live to complete. However, as if he

had crashed through a locked gate, he delved into the hidden treasures of Hebrew poetry in Spain, and revealed the splendour of Solomon ibn Gabirol; he also refined the bow of the "nation's violin", from which he drew lively folksongs full of charm. He did not manage to do everything. Even his gifts and accomplishments were not equal to everything. He, too, had his limitations. He left a good deal for others to distinguish themselves by setting it in order.

But it was he who crashed through the gate. The contemporary literature emerged from its solitude; the creative work of the past generations, which appeared to have been blotted out forever, was revived in him and by him, and he commanded it to live.

And not only did the "new" begin to find once more its way to the old, but he himself, with all his images, similes, and values, renewed his face, as it were, and began to discover new paths to a struggling generation, paths never seen before.

As if there were no "atheism" in Hebrew poetry, such as those lines which were thrown into the void of our world on a day of wrath and calamity: "Behold, I have become impoverished. God is as poor as you". In reality, there was no atheistic uprooting in the new literature such as in this stirring defiance which boasted of overthrowing God's own Throne of Glory.

The litigant's own testimony is worth a hundred witnesses. Shneur wrote in his memoirs: "If it is possible to rebel thus against heaven, it is a sign that there is a heaven".

And this Shekinah, which had been driven out of every corner while he, Bialik, was left alone "like a tender young dove", forgotten "under its broken wing", this Shekinah did not find its way in the course of generations to "all" who had been swept off their feet by the light, as is evident from the following poem by himself and others by him and by his disciples and his disciples' disciples:

"There was a different spirit all around".

Repentance? Return to the place from which they had come? Such things do not happen in history. None among the adversaries erred in the interpretation. However, the spirit of song descended upon the adversaries, and with it the grand spirit of conciliation. And there was a different spirit.

On the appearance of his poem "Heaven, Beg Mercy for Me", for all the absence of a path to God therein, the heart turned to heaven and all that there is in it. With Hamatmid began the reconciliation between the generations. Poetic kindness came down, swept away the barren spirit of hatred, and the contemporary generation began to find its place among the generations.

"The Shekinah rose from the dust", as was prophesied by the Cabalists about the beginning of the growth of redemption.

And something came to pass that had never happened before. Bialik sang his song in Odessa in a tongue understood only by a few, and immediately, as in our ancient legend, the words exploded into all the languages employed by the nation, and it may be said that all the people heard his message wherever they were and in every language they used. He sang in Hebrew — and what Hebrew! — which had renewed its youth and enriched its contents with all its layers and treasures, and his interpreters and admirers answered him in chorus: V. Jabotinsky and Leib Yaffe in Russian; Berthold Feiwel, Mueller, and Ludwig Strauss in German; Snowman, Frank, Samuel and Syrkin in English; Sireni and Lattes in Italian; Jerospason in Swedish; Philip Eichel in Danish; Kirszros and Hirszhorn in Polish; Edmond Fleg in French; and Aaron Zakai in Arabic. In Yiddish he sang himself; he also translated some of his own verse into the vernacular, and I. J. Schwartz and many others completed the task. There was not a Jewish tribe that did not gather at the foot of his mountain. Some came early, some late; some were eloquent, others stammered, but all Israel assembled and hearkened, as if the curse of a linguistic and territorial division did not exist, and as if we had all become a single auditorium in which the poet's voice resounded and thrilled.

And around Bialik a band of prophets and disciples of prophets rose in chorus — jointly and singly, with the current and against the current, and vis-a-vis them, Yiddish literature: thinkers poets, novelists, critics, and artists. And around the two of them myriads of readers, listeners, and spectators, teachers and students, old and young, adversaries and adherents, the firmament of literature illuminated by stars like sapphires!

And with these starry skies stretching overhead the generation ventured into the web of the practical, social, national, and humane revolution which was taking place on the earth below.

They walked about like the twins of a female gazelle. They beckoned, called, and said to one another: "It is a match which will never be sundered."

Can our renaissance be envisaged without Peretz, Sholem Aleichem, without the young who rose up and rebelled, without Liessin then and Leivick today? Without them and without their readers and admirers?

With the blessing of the star-studded literary skies above came the revolutionary revival below.

And if you wish to know what happens to the hammer of

song when it finds the anvil it has lost, let me take you to the city of Tel-Aviv. When Bialik built his home in its vicinity, at the end of World War I, when he established his abode among his readers and brethren, adults and young ones, school children flocked to and crowded around him. Without any official standing, without any political office, without a party of his own and without a sect around him, without even a literary organ under his editorship, he became the spiritual father, the big brother to the whole generation, which was confused and divided in all its ways but united in its inner nature. By his very existence, Bialik seemed to be the well-spring of all this cohesive inwardness.

Can a Tel-Aviv resident forget the people's visits to Bialik's house on every holiday? His appearances at our meetings? His talks at an Oneg Shabbat? His outcry at our backsliding, his pitiless denunciation of our philanthropy and lack of generosity and the babble of the profaners of our holiness, and his comforting words in time of calamity? His missions abroad on behalf of his people, his returns laden with impressions at once furious and encouraging? His comments to teachers, his compassion for the world's ills which he encountered in various communities, his walks with us on summer evenings along the seashore, and under the trees in his garden?

And toward the end of his days, he was sated with admiration, rich in plans like a man who took all culture for his domain, active and activating others, collecting his own works and those of others. He stood on the threshold as if about to depart, clasping, like a new Samson, the pillars of his poetic temple — if only once more — and singing again his incomparable songs. Once again he recalled his distant fatherless childhood, the pure skull floating in the impure smoke of the alien Diaspora, the widowhood of his poor, wretched mother, the orphanhood robbing him of his youth, and he bequeathed to us classical poems, pearls of world literature, for the generations to come—a precious monument to the orphanhood of a people, to man's loneliness on earth.

He sang as he had never sung before — and then he fell into silence.

And though he departed, he did not leave altogether. Witness the myriads of copies of his works sold and being sold, the tens of thousands of articles about him, the endless critical studies, and the living Hebrew poetry in which his heritage is embodied. Like obedient and diligent students, all drink from his wellspring and seek shelter in his shade.

This is also evidenced by the tremendous preparations,

charged with genuine emotion, now being made to observe the twenty-fifth anniversary of his untimely passing.

However, before the revolution in our life had managed to encompass the entire nation, the holocaust came and overthrew everything before our eyes; and by the time we managed to arise from our mourning, recover from the shock, and observe closely the new life in our new Diasporas, which rose, as it were, like replacements for our destroyed centres — behold, something was lacking, or beginning to be increasingly so; the root of the book! The book!

Not, God forbid, that vision has ceased. The poet, the novelist, and the critic are still busy at the potter's wheel.

I will not speak about the great and rich Diaspora — mother of the Diasporas — where Jewish literature has been silenced by force. The blood freezes in our veins when we remember this. And whose heart will not cry out in silence, proud in its suppressed groan?

But in the free and rich Diaspora communities, where we were thrown island by island, it is as though the great resonance has been cut off and hearing is at an end. Solitary writers are struggling heroically, but the echo is faint and muffled. The number of readers is constantly dwindling. The linguistic split is causing havoc. The younger generation is slipping away from the fold. The bookcases in private homes are devoid of Jewish works in any language. The creative work in Israel extends to the border of the Homeland, and only a few chance isolated voices reach across its narrow boundaries; the echo is faint, and the literature of the Diaspora, struggling desperately in the face of public indifference, is declining.

Where is there a writer in the Diaspora today who could sing in a single corner and the entire nation, in all its tongues and tribes, would listen to him and be thrilled as it was but recently by a Bialik song?

And let no one who seeks solace be comforted because throughout the world "the glorious days of literature" seem to have passed. On the contrary just now there are rows of "best sellers", general education, and millions of newspaper readers. The printed word is invaluable to education, and from all sides they predict a new spring for truly creative literary works.

However, even assuming that there is truth in that "soothing" statement, what comfort is that to us? The other nations have solid ground under their feet, even though the literary skies above their heads are not studded with stars. But we still have six parts of our

people widely scattered, and the seventh part in the Homeland is still at the beginning of the struggle to entrench itself. We in the Homeland and in the Diaspora truly have no other reserve than those literary skies; and if, God forbid, it be decreed that these withhold their light, how will a Jew find his way to himself, from one brother to another, from brothers to fathers, from fathers to sons and daughters, and by all of them together to the nation's rendezvous with destiny in the Homeland?

Two months ago we proclaimed the hundredth anniversary celebration of the greatest of our fiction writers, Sholom Aleichem. Today we are proclaiming the twenty-fifth anniversary of our finest poet, Bialik. Both anniversary celebrations are not intended merely to pay a debt of gratitude to the great spiritual figures whose fruits have nurtured us and in whose shade we take shelter. Both the anniversary celebrations of Bialik and that of Sholem Aleichem throughout the world, and especially when observed from this distinguished tribunal, have not come to arouse shouts of jubilation, but to deepen the anxiety, to turn the nation's attention to the renewal of its spiritual ties with its creative literature.

Throughout the Jewish islands there are scattered those who struggle against the current of assimilation and submergence. There is hardly a corner without a struggle for the renewal of Jewish education; also scattered are creative writers in various nooks of our far-flung world. At times voices break through reminding us of our finest creativity. However, the fire is extinguished, the resonance of the nation is silenced. The Hebrew and Yiddish bookcases have disappeared from Jewish homes in the Diaspora countries; the writers are sometimes abandoned to their loneliness, among the handful of their admirers.

It is incumbent upon this Congress to issue a great warning about the nation's future; and added to this warning should be concern over the future of our living literature.

From this Congress there should go forth to the whole Diaspora this message, which is an exhortation:

Bialik's poetry is still alive! Sholem Aleichem's disciples have not ceased to exist, and the disciples of their disciples are still at the potter's wheel.

Let the candle of the spirit be lit in order to light the way for the dispersed to the Shekinah of Israel which has risen from the dust!

FOURTEENTH SESSION

August 7, 1959 (Afternoon)

In the Chair: MR. ISRAEL YESHAYAHU (*Israel*); later DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN:

1. DEBATE ON CULTURAL PROBLEMS (*continued*)

MR. BERNARDO BORUCHOWICZ (*Costa Rica*): I am deliberately speaking in Spanish as a protest although I think that Yiddish should be the language to be used at a Jewish congress. If on-the-spot translations into English and French were provided for, the same should have been done for Spanish. If, because of their upbringing, some of our fellow Jews have spoken neither in Yiddish nor Hebrew, we still appreciate what they have said.

We must return to the old sources, to our old but always new Torah that teaches us to be human beings, individually and as a people.

Yiddish is very important if the Jews of the Diaspora are to communicate with Israelis. Jewish youngsters in the Diaspora, who learn Hebrew, must use their country's native language to talk to their Yiddish-speaking parents, and unless the Congress supports Yiddish, a generation of confusion will arise. This Assembly should adopt a resolution that Yiddish and Hebrew be recognized as our languages.

MR. ISRAEL POLLAK (*Chile*): We must concentrate on the struggle for spiritual continuity because the Jews are not endangered physically today and we are happy that the World Jewish Congress is taking the initiative in the fight for Jewish education. Soviet Jewry is at present struggling for its cultural survival and although there is a difference between the annihilation of Jewish culture by force and Jewish voluntary assimilation, the result is the same.

While the bulk of the Jewish people is united on the question of Israel, I do not see how the Congress plan for education is to be carried out—in conjunction with Israel, with the Jewish Agency, or alone? Is Congress to work where the Agency has no access?

MR. ALTER HIRZ (*Argentina*): If the older people and youth have no culture, there can be no true education for the children. This problem was not discussed, and if the cause was lack of time, another session or two for the discussion of culture and education should have been added.

Dr. Yehuda Pilch reported only on Jewish education in the United States—let me tell you something about Argentina. Because of the climate, our cultural activities are limited to seven months of the year and are discontinued during the five months when people are not in the large cities. The meeting halls in Buenos Aires have been too small in recent years for the crowds who attended the meetings which opened our cultural season; we had Mordecai Strigler two years ago and Jacob Glatstein last year. Every Sunday morning we arrange cultural affairs in 18 districts of Buenos Aires, which are attended by many hundreds of people. We subsidize the Yiddish theatre, and we end the season with a book exhibition, reducing the price of books by half, in order to stimulate their sale. The Kehillah also supports the camps of the youth organizations, and we have sent chalutzim to the Negev.

Until two decades ago, our school system bore the marks of our immigrant population, but the first generation born in our country was lost. The children of this first generation born in Argentina are more fortunate with regard to Jewish education. While the results of our present schools could be better, they are satisfactory. We assume that 30 per cent. of the children in Buenos Aires attend Jewish schools and we know that in the last 25 years their numbers increased from 2,000 to 12,000. There are also Jewish schools in the provinces. We have kindergartens, elementary schools, secondary schools, the seminary of the Kehillah, the Machon, as well as secondary school departments in the Sholem Aleichem, Bialik and Peretz Schools. We have so far trained 500 of our own native people as Jewish teachers.

Among the members of our delegation there are two young lawyers who speak Yiddish and use it in their communal work, just as Dr. Moises Goldman does.

MR. ABA BORNSTEIN (*Great Britain*): Jewish education is a most controversial issue. There would be no harm in passing a resolution in favour of more intensive Jewish education, but to go further would make it impossible for orthodox Jewry to continue association with Congress. Today, the political aspect of Congress is its main *raison d'être* and the state of our manpower and finances is not such that we can afford to divert our attention to

spheres in which many others are active. Congress must be fully geared for its main task of safeguarding the rights of all Jewish communities and should utilize any quiet spell for research and for extending the representative character of the organization.

It is, therefore, to be regretted that Congress agreed to a world conference on Jewish education and is to be responsible for its practical arrangements. The London Board of Jewish Religious Education will not participate in any such conference, nor will the Jewish Secondary School Movement, nor the large number of independent schools.

Congress can do no more than pinpoint weaknesses in Jewish life; it can encourage cultural activities. In the larger Jewish communities, our intervention is not welcome and the smaller communities will only be misled if they are made to look to Congress for the solution of their religious and educational problems. Congress, composed as it is, unable to further the Jewish traditional way of life, should leave such work to others. A research and information bureau, by all means—any direct intervention in education, by no means. Congress must do everything to unite, and nothing which will divide.

MR. GUSTAV LEITNER (*Austria*): Of the 11-12,00 Jews in Austria today, 800 live in the provinces and the rest in Vienna. This is what remains of the Yishuv of 180,000, and the average age is 48, higher than in any other Yishuv.

Anti-Semitism exists but is of no special significance; it is sometimes expressed in camouflaged Nazi newspapers. Our government is democratic, composed of two big parties, the Social Democratic and the People's Party, and seeks to repress anti-Semitism in government offices and public places.

We hope that the Austrian Government will meet claims for compensation, making it possible for us to work adequately in the fields of education and culture. We want to erect a temple and schools. Austrian Jewry is menaced by assimilation caused by disinterestedness, convenience and the inclination to live well, and resulting in refusal to make sacrifices for the Jewish people, the State of Israel or the local Kehillah.

Pupils in school receive two hours weekly of religious instruction. We have no trained Jewish teachers, Religious instruction is given by Israelis who study in Vienna, but they are not really teachers. There are youth movements, but because of their party character, their influence is limited. We started building a youth centre, but stopped because of lack of proper personnel. Our library does not function because there are no librarians in

the whole of Europe. It is the task of Congress to train teachers and youth leaders and despatch them to large and small Yishuvim to do general educational work to fight assimilation.

M. RENE ROUBACHE (*Algeria*): On behalf of the Jewish communities of Algeria, I have come to make an appeal to save our Yishuv of 150,000, living in large and small communities, from extinction. Thanks to the combined efforts of the Federation of Congregations and of the North African office of Congress, some progress has been made—the Ecole Maimonides has been built in Algiers. From this school must come the leaders, but it is not functioning, it has neither teachers nor students. We shall recruit the students, for young people want to learn the glorious history of their people; they want to acquire real Jewish culture. The need is for libraries, teachers and speakers. The Director of the Congress office in Algiers has been operating some cultural centres on a shoestring.

We turn to those responsible in the Congress to set up an emergency programme which would permit Dr. Steinberg's Department to set up action in keeping with the needs of the hour. I also add my voice to a suggestion made earlier, that a permanent cultural commission be set up within the Congress Executive which would be immediately informed of the needs of every community.

DR. NATAN LERNER (*Argentina*): There has been general agreement on the great dangers that threaten Jewish life from within. A war on anti-Semitism is more dramatic than the continuous, undermining forces in Jewish life that push the individual to yield to the pressure of the outside world. The process is not the same in the various Yishuvim. Cultural pluralism offers a certain amount of help, but the only effective means to counteract outside pressure is for the modern Jew to acquire his own authentic personality. It is the obligation of the Congress and the Jewish Agency for Israel to support cultural and educational activities.

In Argentina, as in other Latin American countries, the Jewish population lives under the powerful pressure of a monolithic society whose majority think in terms of the Catholic-Spanish tradition and to whom the idea of cultural dualism is alien and strange. This society recognizes our rights as individuals, but asks our cultural dissolution and calls on us to integrate into the population around us. This is not anti-Semitism, nor does it mean intolerance for the stranger; it is their interpretation of the melting pot philosophy as it is understood in such countries, where

the large majority of the people is of one ethnic origin, speaks one language and is of one religion.

Although the right of each minority to live according to its own religion is recognized, the Catholic Church wages a continual offensive against the general public school. This offensive is resisted by liberal groups who defend the existence of the secular school.

Our Yishuv succeeded in building a large network of schools in which a considerable part of the children obtain an elementary Jewish education, supplementary to their general education. We also succeeded in creating a cadre of native-born teachers educated in Argentina. We have not succeeded in developing a local serious minded Jewish intelligentsia, which would be involved in Jewish problems—here too we need the help of world Jewish organizations. It is necessary, for example, that Congress issue in Spanish the same material that is published in English, such as “Judaism” and “World Jewry”; we need higher academic Jewish education; we need seminaries and professors of high academic standing. These will help us to increase our educational and cultural achievements.

MRS. ISRAEL GOLDSTEIN (*United States*): The question as to what extent we can be a normal people without ceasing to be a Jewish people is an intelligent and disturbing question. Having given us food for thought, how does this symposium help us to develop a cultural programme for Congress?

Does it challenge us to think about what that programme should be? Perhaps it provokes us into thinking what it should not be; if that was its purpose, then it was eminently successful. We are not a missionary people; our decision in ancient days not to proselytize was perhaps born out of a liberal attitude which indeed we still maintain for every man may worship God as he likes, but we have failed to impress our ethical and moral values upon the world. Our ancestors permitted paganism and barbarism whether under the banner of Christianity or other cults, to pervade the new civilizations emerging out of a polytheistic world and kept to themselves the teachings of the Torah, Pirkei Avoth and our concept of the one God and above all our interpretation of the idea of salvation. All this boomeranged against us leading to the persecution, the torture and the slaughter of millions of our brethren. In our travels around the world, we have visited many communities, Jewish and non-Jewish; we were confronted by appalling ignorance of Judaism.

We found next to nothing in some of the university libraries of the very new countries where students are beginning to learn

of new religions, civilizations and cultures. Why should not the opportunity be given them for the dissemination of our ideas and cultural values? There ought to be no library anywhere that does not have books, pamphlets, magazines on Jewish history, religion, ethics and so forth; the Old Testament and not the King James version ought to have its place on the shelves. That should, I contend, be an important part of the programme of the World Jewish Congress. Further to draw attention to this field, scholarships should be created for special studies. I was impressed by what the representative of the students said, and our own Jewish students should concentrate on Jewish studies. How much more they would be encouraged if non-Jews, too, thought well enough of the Jewish field of studies to engage in it as well. Besides there are new populations that are to occupy the world's arena in the near future. It is almost virgin territory and we should be sure that they will find the Jew and his philosophy there. Lastly the field of education and culture is large and we should be able to find a programme not identical with that of the Jewish Agency. Duplication is the most expensive item in organizational work. This is an area of activity to which there can be no resistance and it will depend upon us to see to it that the knowledge of Judaism should be part of the upsurging culture and civilizations of the world.

MR. JEAN NORDMANN (*Switzerland*): In the masterful expose which Professor Simon offered us last night, he asked the President whether he could have five minutes more to speak, and when the answer was affirmative, he declared that he was going to talk about the attitude of Israel toward its God. I consider this significant because in this Congress and in our debates and even in our communities, it is always these five extra minutes that are missing to talk of God, to talk of the duties of the Jews toward their Creator, toward their Torah, toward our sacred rites and traditions, toward everything which is really the deep root, trunk and the whole tree of our culture. It is the synagogue from which emanates important cultural work and in which Jewish culture has its source. Let us watch out that all our plans about policies, social institutions, organizations, nationalism, be not built on sand and constructed around nothingness. I refuse to consider my Judaism as Heine did, as a misfortune, for in that case it would have no spiritual meaning and would only be defined by exterior circumstances such as anti-Semitism.

How should we keep alive the small communities to do useful work in the cultural area? We have heard people talking here

with legitimate pride of the great Jewish communities of North and South America where there are large Jewish concentrations and where it is comparatively easy to do cultural work. But in Switzerland we have many small communities and also a number of Jewish families who live scattered over the country and who have rarely, if ever, occasion to participate in any kind of manifestation of Jewish life. This problem becomes more complicated and also more important when you add the problem of youth, the problem of that part of our Jewish generation which does not ask for anything better than to remain faithful to our traditions, if we have something to transmit to them. These young people will be approached, unfortunately, by an alien ideology if we do not make great efforts to guard them. In Switzerland we have begun to deal with this problem by organizing annual meetings and semi-annual Jewish vacation camps which are used mostly by Jewish children from the small communities. However, it is very difficult to find counsellors and teachers.

We were able to engage two madrichim from Israel who constitute a live contact between our young generation and Israel. But the question of Jewish cultural life in the small communities remains without solution. That is why I welcomed the suggestion for a continued and lively exchange among the different centres, in order that those who are better off materially and richer in personnel, could help those who are less fortunate. I think that radio, phonograph records and films are not sufficiently employed for our purposes. Certainly there is the weekly broadcast "Ecoute Israel" directed for 30 years by our friend Leon Algazi, whom you applauded this morning, which the French-speaking public could not do without.

In short, those responsible should study the possibility of developing cultural exchanges and of extending such activities across the frontiers of countries.

PROF. YITZHAK SCIAKY (*Israel*): In Israel every immigrant should be allowed to speak in his own language, the language of the Dispersion, so that he may be understood. The Hebrew language is being rooted and developed in such a manner that there is no danger that it will not succeed in integrating all of us into a people of one language. The existence of the State guarantees that it will be so. Abroad, the situation is different. No matter what the aim of conferences like this one is, their importance is that one meets the Jews of the Dispersion and one brother talks to another, out of feelings which rise above the differences of opinion. It would be desirable that we understand one another

insofar as outlook is concerned, and even more vital, we should feel the voice of everyone of us as the voice of a brother.

I think that the only way of imposing the use of the Hebrew language in our conferences is that anyone who can speak Hebrew, should do so. Just as everyone who wants his people to be great must be the one to begin; for every citizen who wants the army of his state to be victorious, is obliged to start by being a good soldier.

The problem of culture is a problem of organization and the organizational problem particularly concerns Congress so that there is a great task imposed upon it. Wherever there lives a Jew, there cultural activity should reach, for cultural activity is educational. Congress cannot differentiate between educational and cultural activity, or between religious and secular education, or between traditional and modern education. Inasmuch as cultural tasks are imposed on Congress it has to see to the integration of various cultural activities in order to increase their usefulness and to aid in their execution. This is a particularly appropriate activity for Congress, since the nations are apt to accept more readily the concept of a cultural people than a sovereign people. We will not enter here into the old problem whether there are cultural nations or political nations. It is clear that the state is a historical concept for cultural, national and human development.

There has been talk about the spiritual aspiration for plurality of cultures. In the light of the speech made by the representative of Black Africa, I felt in my heart a profound feeling of pride at the conviction that there is one humanity in the world, thanks to the culture which is common to all peoples. The Senegal speaker who was our guest was decisive proof that the efficiency of that culture, which was developed from a philosophical viewpoint of the Jewish spirit, is the culture in which he was brought up. The problem of the oneness of our people will not be solved anew except by national achievement and renewed cultural development, and the adoption of human values, possible only in Israel, which alone has the power to overcome assimilation into a non-Jewish culture. Israel is the country where cultural weakness will be reflected as historic weakness in the process of national integration.

Israel looks to a new vitality of Jewish, humane culture which should embrace the spiritual world, a culture which by the wealth of its many nationalities, would be fundamental to the establishment of the solidarity of all mankind. And if there is solidarity, there can be human culture based on the realization, in a national

form, of the foundation of historic values and the Hebrew tradition. Jewish national culture, which is being renewed in Israel, should once again deepen in the fields of art and science as in the fields of religion and philosophy, without reservation—so that Israel may be a blessing to itself and to the world.

M. ISAAC POUATCH (*France*): There is perhaps more activity on the Jewish scene in France than in any other European country. We have several dailies, we publish books and our newspaper for Jewish children is the only one of its kind in Europe. We have several day schools, supplementary schools and yeshivoth and a weekly radio broadcast directed by M. Leon Algazi. We have sent hundreds of children to Israel for the summer and our aliyah is perhaps proportionately the largest. On the other hand, because we lack Jewish educators, we have non-Jews educating our children in children's homes.

All of you are for culture and education but you content yourselves with words and leave action to us, the educators. We lack manpower, and how can it be otherwise if you do not let your sons and daughters become educators, and we must have recourse to non-Jews. There are countries where culture is just a subject for discussion, while the homes are emptied of Jewishness. While we are discussing cultural problems, our political leaders are not in the hall, but there will be no Jewish life without culture. We use fine words, Hemshech, continuity, for whom? We speak of youth and we have one student in our delegation, and he cannot speak because there is no time. He should be here in my place. We should train our youth to be our successors, otherwise Congress will fail.

Culture and education are not items for export or for the museum, they are alive and need daily tending. Our fathers realized this and therefore we are here; we have to do the same if there are to be Jews after us.

PROF. BARUCH GRAUBART (*Germany*): East European Jewry no longer exists, but there are 45 new communities represented here, each looking for an explanation of its existence as Jews.

We have talked here about cultural pluralism. Jewish culture is also pluralistic and is made up of the writings of the prophets in Hebrew, of eschatology and mystic literature in Aramaic, of the philosophy of religion in Arabic, and of the great Yiddish literature.

Providence has created a great monument that reflects in all colours Jewish history. We do not know its exact meaning but we sense it and we try to discover a definition of ourselves as Jews,

as to the purpose for which we are here today. The revival of Hebrew is included and we must live in the Hebrew language, but we must also not desert the graves of Jewish history, nor can we imagine that we are the immediate followers of Joshua ben Nun—these are not the days of the First Temple.

MR. ZVI BERNSTEIN (*Israel*): I must express my astonishment that the discussion of culture is divided according to country, while at the same time it is known that the cultural attitude does not differ according to country.

I also want to express my astonishment at the speech of one important speaker, with all due respect to him, Professor Ernst Simon, a speech which contained a gratuitous hurt, unnecessary for the content of the speech, on the religious parties in Israel. I am amazed that this platform, to which we too are responsible, was exploited for such an attack, to which we are accustomed in Israel. All the implications the honoured speaker wanted to make would not have suffered if this part were not included. All of the speakers, and among them also Professor Simon, spoke on the need for the extensive use of religious values in education. All of them stressed the importance of education which is rooted in religious values and in ancestral tradition, but at the same time they speak negatively of those who practice this kind of education. Professor Simon also spoke in this vein and he undoubtedly knows what the Gemara says about those who stand up before the Torah and do not stand up before a scholar. A scholar, says the Gemara, who embodies and in his own life attains what is stated in the Torah, is preferable to the Torah.

If all religious people were of one opinion with our honoured speaker, there would be no trace of religious education, because it is maintained only by the religious parties. What was the reason for the anger of the lecturer against the youth who wear the yarmulkah (skull-cap)? He did not ridicule the mode of dress of others that we see in Israel, and which perhaps should be censured. This youth created a new-type Yeshivah student and they established many Yeshivot in Israel. I hope that many of you know that the B'nei Akibah, for example and not only the youth of Mizrachi or Hapoel Hamizrachi—there are also other religious youth—have put up ten Yeshivot. They established the glorious religious colonisation. This skull-cap is only the outward expression of the revolution which is now taking place in Israel, and which, through the creative and dynamic strength of the Jewish religion, will destroy division between the people and its heritage.

A word about Congress taking up education. Many wondered

why do we oppose Congress, as a world institution, dealing with the educational problems in the various countries which need our help so very much. It is necessary to be concerned with education and to increase religious education, and where there already is religious education, then national education should be increased. There are many places where even national education is worth while, for without it there would be nothing. But we know that where the task of education is taken over by unreligious hands, we cannot undertake responsibility for it. We had such an experience working together with the Jewish Agency, when they began to be interested in education in various countries, and established schools which were not religious schools, and this proved to be to the detriment and at the expense of religious schools. Therefore, we say if Congress wants to help in education, it should help the institutions who are already working in the field. Additionally, Congress as a voluntary institution which cannot obligate its members to undertake responsibility for everything it does, should not undertake to work in education.

PROF. J. D. ARON (*India*): I bring you greetings from the nearly 20,000 Jews of India, where there is no anti-Semitism, no persecution. The B'nei Israel group live in Bombay where they maintain a school started in 1853. With the help of the Anglo-Jewish Association of London we were able to raise the standard of this school until it met with the matriculation standard of London. The Anglo-Jewish Association also provided £600 a year for the teaching of Hebrew and the Jewish religion. When the building was old, Sir Eric Kadoorie, of Shanghai, helped us with a donation, so today we have a beautiful building, but we have no endowment.

Instruction is given in Mahrati and English and Hebrew; Jewish history and religion are included in the curriculum. As soon as the school started (charging small fees), there was immediate competition by a Christian conversion movement which sought to attract students by offering free instruction and even transportation. However, only one male Jew was converted.

There is also the Jacob Sassoon School for 400 students. A chair for Hebrew was established 30 years ago in the Catholic college, St. Xavier College of Bombay, which I hold without remuneration. Our youth has a great desire to learn about their religion—will not Congress help to satisfy this desire?

MR. YITZIAK EISENBERG (*Israel*): I bring you greetings from the World Maccabi Union. I regret that education in Israel was harshly criticised and no mention made of its good points. Of all

the countries in the Diaspora, Mexico is the only one where Jewish education is satisfactory because 80 per cent of the children attend Jewish schools. A world body for education and culture should be created by the Jewish Agency, Congress and the State of Israel. It is not enough for "World Jewry" to be published in English only, it should appear in Hebrew and Yiddish. There should be a publication to deal with Congress and world Jewry problems.

MR. BENJAMIN MINTZ (*Israel*): I have listened to the lecture at the symposium, but I very much disagree that Congress should engage in educational and cultural work. Dr. Nahum Goldmann warned of the great danger of assimilation and offers the solution of unity and cultural work. But this is an illusion—cultural work will lead only to quarrels. The split among us is deeper than among other peoples. There is a chasm separating those who believe in the Torah and the other Jews.

Congress is the political representative of the Jewish people and it should not undertake education. There is no substitute for the Torah and we are not ready for any compromise. Only the Torah can unite, strengthen and maintain us, while mere talk about continuity and Hemshech, cannot. The Torah is the Jewish people's highest ideal.

DR. HARDI SWARSENKY (*Argentina*): Despite Dr. Nahum Goldmann's warning that we should conduct political discussions on the basis of Realpolitik, the concepts expressed at this Assembly are based on sentiment and emotion and not on any deep Jewish idea. Dr. Goldmann attends summit conferences, but sometimes the statesmen at these conferences do not see what happens in the compensation offices and courts of Germany.

This Assembly has transformed itself into a university seminar by introducing the Symposium on Education. But the papers which were read did not propose action—we should have practical proposals. It is not true that the danger of anti-Semitism is not great—it has not been possible to check the activities of one individual in this country where this Assembly is taking place, who pours his venom into many countries.

It is a surprise to us that there is no youth here. The Assembly is not dynamic; we are contented. During the discussion on the transfer of our headquarters, it was said that geographically our centre is Geneva—but we have only one centre, Jerusalem, the centre of our life.

DR. JOSEPH TENENBAUM (*United States*): Congress has been fighting anti-Semitism, although it realises that the great danger is assimilation, for assimilation has succeeded where anti-Semitism has

failed. We must build up our inner ramparts and this is the answer to those who oppose the entrance of Congress into the field of education.

We must have both culture and education and do what is being done in Israel, where they teach *Todaa Yehudit* (Jewish Consciousness). We have to fight anti-Semitism and assimilation. No people can get stronger through making compromises with an unfavourable environment, but from building a spiritual strength within. All those who believe in Torah must also believe in education. Dr. Goldmann is thinking of calling an educational conference and I think it would be a shame if the so-called orthodox sabotaged it, for this would hurt the interest of the Jewish people.

I wish to say a few words about Hebrew. Hebrew education is most neglected in all countries and especially in the United States. Hebrew is the soul of Jewish education; it is the most important language in Israel and it must become the second language in the Diaspora, and this is how to unite spiritually the Diaspora with Israel. There is no survival without spiritual revival. We have to teach our children the history of 2,000 years of Galut and what a pageant of marvels this history reveals. We have heard much about philosophy here and so little about philo-Semitism. It makes little difference if you call it *Golah* or *Chutz LaAretz*. Give me old-fashioned Zionism: one people, one land, one language.

DR. CHAIM PEARL (*Great Britain*): I wish to contest the view that Congress should under no circumstances occupy itself in the cultural field. I believe I speak for the greater part of the British delegation when I say that this is a false, narrow and even an extremely dangerous viewpoint to maintain. Far more people have been lost to us by the processes of assimilation than even by anti-Semitism. Congress must equally concern itself with saving the Jewish soul and heart as well as the Jewish body. Some are opposed to the modest but very useful work of the Cultural Department of the British Section. What possible motives can anyone have for arguing against the comparatively simple but extremely effective Jewish history pamphlets translated in several European countries? The Scandinavian delegate has told us how the same history pamphlet, translated in his country, has helped hundreds of his children; we have heard appeals from Algeria and Argentine to send them literature and educational material in the language of their own people.

Congress must have a realistic programme but not take over the function of the synagogue or even of the Hebrew School. The Congress programme must be modelled out of its own basic philo-

sophy and it must avoid drifting into the large area of Jewish educational and cultural fields without a specific programme. It should work out its own clear terms of reference. Its primary programme should be concerned with adult education and the translation of useful publications into all languages possible to reach the scattered communities of Jews wherever they may be, and it must build up its programme on the widest possible platform. I do not subscribe to the point of view that it is politics and even anti-Semitism that can unite world Jewry, but that it is specifically the cultural area that divides them. I think that this is a shocking point of view to maintain. I believe there is an area of cultural values which are in fact the strongest uniting factor for the Jewish people. It must be a very wide programme, nothing Jewish shall be alien to us, whether of orthodoxy or secular Jewish life, Hebrew or Yiddish, our history, music or literature, the entire civilisational scope of Jewish life and thought should be embraced by this realistic programme. Whatever differences we may have in the political affiliations of our people, the Jews must find a common spiritual home which I believe can be expressed and translated through a proper cultural programme sponsored by Congress.

MR. YITZHAK TABENKIN (*Israel*): The State of Israel has been built up by the education of hundreds of thousands in Jewish schools, whether Yiddish or Hebrew, in connection with the various youth movements. Thus Jewish farmers, workers and educators were produced with devotion to country, labour and community. Educationally, the Congress has no effect, primarily because its language is neither Yiddish nor Hebrew, but English. Language is important, and although most of the speakers at this Assembly can speak either Yiddish or Hebrew, they did not do so. The use of English or French will not educate Jews to Jewishness. I am amazed and even repelled by the fact that Hebrew is not even recognised at the Congress.

Some people plead for religious education according to the Shulchan Aruch, but there is also the ideal of general Jewish education and of labour which stood the test of Jewishness in self-defence, in the ghetto, in the Haganah and in the Israel Army. Jewish education must be centred on Israel, Hebrew, Yiddish, Labour and the ideal of equality.

There were three lecturers, but not one from religious Jewry, nor was there one from my religion, the religion of labour and chaluziut. I want to say to the religious Jew and to the Jew who is not religious, that we must resist assimilation and we must fight it by education. There must be equality for each type of Jew; there

is a chalutzic future. It is not correct that there is a chasm between the religious and non-religious Jew; the religious Jews who live in kibbutzim and the liberal Jews who are active for our cause are heirs to the future of our people.

PROF. ERNST J. COHN (*Great Britain*): I want to put before you three proposals that are simple and practical. First of all, Congress should do the work it started. There are pamphlets and books that British and French Sections have published and there is the wonderful quarterly "Judaism" put out by our American friends. Some people ask how many tens of thousands of these publications have already been distributed, but no such quantities have been distributed, only a few hundred. Before Congress embarks on big new and unknown tasks it should execute the work it has begun.

My second proposal is: let us carry out only that work for which we are qualified. We are not qualified to enter the field of Jewish education because in that field we could not speak for the entire Jewish people. You have heard from my friend Bornstein, whose religious viewpoint is miles away from mine, that he and his friends would leave Congress if we entered that field. I do not want my children to be brought up in their tradition. My tradition is that of our leader Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, of blessed memory. But I say in the same way as they are entitled to say, "We remain particular in this field," so every other group has the right to remain particular in that field, and that particularity is only a mirror of the situation within the Jewish people. The Jewish people too are a pluralistic society; in this field they must remain pluralistic; we cannot speak with one voice.

My last proposition is this: let us qualify ourselves for the work that we wish to do. I would have far less misgivings about Congress entering the field of education, if I did not feel that the spirit of Congress is not the spirit that can really advance the cause of Jewish education. When we assembled here on August 2, Jews from all regions of the world, we thanked those who had allowed us to assemble here, we thanked those who had worked to bring about this conference, we thanked all and sundry, but unlike that first inaugural meeting in 1936, nobody said a Shehecheyanu, thanking God, who brought us together here. Therefore, the spirit of this body is not yet that spirit in which we can be called qualified to enter the field of education. Let us qualify ourselves for Jewish culture, before we try to bring Jewish culture to the Jewish people.

RABBI S. JOSHUA KOHN (*United States*): The political debates, the symposium on cultural pluralism, the special session on the Jewish State and the Jewish people, climaxed by the symposium on

Jewish education, point unmistakably to the fact that we are vitally interested and dedicated to the preservation of our Jewish people and to its continued life in all lands. The wise and decisive evaluation of the Jew in the various countries of the world, their political, economic and social situations, clearly demonstrates that these forces alone, no matter how salutary they are, cannot always make for the survival of our people.

May I express my keen disappointment in the analysis of Jewish education, with particular reference to its condition in the United States. I am afraid from the bare statistics which we have heard we saw a dark forest and not the beauty and symmetry of the individual tree. Jewry in America is comparatively young and in accordance with the brilliant analysis of Prof. Baron, it takes several hundred years for a Jewish community to develop its full potentialities. In this atomic age we have to do it a little faster.

The first institution to train Jewish teachers was organised in 1900, the Graetz College in Philadelphia; the second in 1909 in New York City, the Teachers Institute of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. Then followed the rapid development of such institutions in every major city in America, beginning with 1917: Boston, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Chicago, Baltimore, Los Angeles, etc. While this was going on, the breakdown of Jewish life was continuing in another direction because of the difficulty of adjustment of the immigrant parents to the new environment and the cleavage between the parents of an old civilisation and the children of a new civilisation.

We are developing fast growing youth movements in our synagogues, we have summer camps, Hebrew in spirit and youths studying the whole scale of our literature. We are today, instead of importing rabbis and teachers, beginning to export them, even though we have a shortage of rabbis and teachers. Jews will survive, witness the testimony of the Jews of India and Iraq—and of all of us who are here today—survival is a merely biological process; we should be talking of revival, not physical survival but spiritual revival. The brilliant address of Dr. Simon should be taken seriously. We talk of culture and under this title we subsume everything Jewish, even religion. The Congress still needs, as a unit, personal identification, and it would have come with a very good grace and respect for cultural pluralism if this august body, more amenable to the traditions of our past, would have opened this Assembly with a prayer by the Chief Rabbi of Sweden, Dr. Kurt Wilhelm, who combines three great traditions: that of Europe, of a graduate of the Seminary in America and of one who has lived

and practised in Israel; or a prayer should have been said for those dedicated souls who have gone to their eternal rest.

American Jewry is going forward: not survival, but revitalisation of Jewish religious and cultural life, will bring us and all Israel, a new and glorious epoch.

2. COMMEMORATION OF THE CENTENARY OF THE BIRTH OF SHOLEM ALEICHEM

DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN: We listened this morning to an address on Bialik, the greatest poet of Jewish heroism, of the pathos of the Jewish fate, and now we are going to hear an evaluation of perhaps the greatest poet of everyday life, idyllic Jewish life and its humour. In Sholem Aleichem's figures: the coachman, the Batlan, the tailor and shoemaker and Melamed, there is as much heroism as in the pathetic heroism and pain depicted by Bialik.

It would probably have been impossible for us to endure so much pain and suffering in our long history, had we not been possessed of the humour and those qualities that are personified in the seemingly comical but rather pathetic figures of Sholem Aleichem. It is therefore a good thing that we commemorate on one and the same day the two great representatives of the two different forms in which Jewish life and Jewish genius expressed themselves.

DR. SHLOMO BICKEL (*United States*): This year, on the 16th of Adar, a day after Shushan Purim, it was one hundred years since a child was born to the dry goods man Nahum Rabinowitz and his wife Chaye Esther in the South Ukrainian town of Pereyaslav—their third child, Solomon, who under the pen name of Sholem Aleichem became, by the grace of God, one of the greatest Jewish writers of all time.

In the century since then, the creator of Tevia and Menachem Mendel passed only 57 years here on earth. But in the 43 years since Sholem Aleichem died and hundreds of thousands of Jews in New York City accompanied him to his eternal repose in the Mount Carmel Cemetery of the Workmen's Circle, in these 43 years the name of Sholem Aleichem has become an increasingly vital influence in the minds of Yiddish and Hebrew reading Jews, as well as in the minds of millions of Jewish and non-Jewish readers who have read his work in translation in various languages.

In the more than 40 years since Sholem Aleichem's untimely death, his work has risen higher and higher and become a power in Jewish life. The names of Sholem Aleichem's characters have passed into the language of the people and become household words.

Nay, more, his characters have become symbols of our national psychological self-knowledge, have become the measure of our moral and philosophical view of life and fate.

In the more than 40 years since Sholem Aleichem's premature demise, we have perceived more deeply and intimately his great literary achievement. More deeply and intimately because during these two score years Jewish life has gone through a radical change such as never before in our history even in ten times 40 years.

Our people has passed through such a horrible catastrophe as was unknown even in our darkest days; and at the same time such a glorious rebirth as scores of Jewish generations dreamed of only in their prayers. The destroyer exterminated a third of our people, wiped out hundreds, nay, thousands of Jewish communities. The silence of death hovers over our holy, desolate Kasrilevka in Eastern Europe.

In this period, when the enemy's death camps, gas chambers, and crematoria snuffed out the lives of millions of our brothers and sisters and when, after the liberation, so much involuntary silence spread over wide areas of Jewish habitation, it is now a special privilege and profound experience to celebrate from this platform at a world Jewish conclave the feast of Jewish articulateness. For our genial writer Sholem Aleichem was, first of all, the great artistic organiser of Yiddish speech and Yiddish speakers. Before him, the Jews of Kasrilevka and Yehupetz, of Mazepevka and Berdichev virtually did not speak in literature. They merely let others tell about them, and now and then interjected a word a sentence, a page. It was only in Sholem Aleichem that the Tevias, Menachem Mendels, and Motel Peise dem Chazans thrust aside, as it were, the narrators and began themselves to pour out an endless stream of words which had weighed as heavily upon their hearts. And when the tongues of these Sholem Aleichem speakers began to move, Yiddish words, charged with the experience and wisdom of generations with the suffering and sorrow of whole Jewish communities, with the hope and resignation of those well on in years, with the longing and freshness of the young, and with the disquiet and dream of the elect, began to pour forth. A whole people rose to speak, and in the very forefront three chosen ones: Tevia of Boiberik, Menachem Mendel of Yehupetz, and Motel, the orphan son of Peise dem Chazan.

Tevia could have supplied a whole world with love of mankind and with his faith in the supremacy of good, which will and must triumph over evil. In this, Tevia does not display naiveté or unfamiliarity with the ways of the world, but quite the contrary:

he shows long experience of events and deep understanding of people. Tevia is always ready to overlook an injustice, but he understands better than others the fate of man. From this understanding of the insignificance and transitoriness of the blows of fate and human malice springs Tevia's love, as well as his humour. This understanding gives Tevia the strength to transcend misfortune with a witticism, with a humorous remark. Tevia's humour is not the humour of a contented man; it is the laughter mingled with tears of a man steeped in a sea of troubles, of a man who possesses enough vision to see the little bit of joy in the sorrow and a little bit of good in the evil. With this philosophy of life Sholem Aleichem raised Tevia to a national symbol of his people; of the people who by its existence has divided so many seas of troubles and thereby saved itself from becoming embittered and losing the eternal hope of the good to come.

Tevia thus represents what might be called optimistic pessimism in the humanistic verve of the Jewish people.

Menachem Mendel, Sholem Aleichem's second major literary character, is the stormy knight of agility and dream. He detests the static, the numb. A deep spiritual unrest impels him to fly above the reality, not in order to attain something. Menachem Mendel is not a practical man. The mere flight, the dream fills him with enthusiasm. He is therefore ready to sacrifice what people call "life". It was fashionable among us and, it would seem, still is, to interpret Menachem Mendel in economic terms: to point out that Menachem Mendel is the product of Jewish rootlessness, the expression of economic and hence also spiritual abnormality. Let those be satisfied with this interpretation who have never perceived in themselves and in others something of the Menachem-Mendelian, the eternal Menachem-Mendelian. For me and for thousands of other Jews with a spark of Menachem-Mendelism in the heart, Sholem Aleichem's hero is the symbol of that very normal Jewish-spiritual restlessness which strained to break out of the miserable reality and tried to find out how, by means of a flash of mind, a spark of the imagination, and an effort of the will, to attain the absolute in morality, the utmost in intellectuality, and the most perfect in economic enterprise. The last not, heaven forbid, in order to get rich, since rich and poor alike crawl upon the earth like worms, but to rise above them to that height where the material become spiritual and the figures of the stock exchange become mystic numbers.

Along the line of Menachem Mendel and on the area of his grotesque rushing about in a world which fetters the spirit with

practical advice, with the advice of Sheina Sheindel and her mother, move those countless Jews who in the course of the centuries disturbed the world with their ideals and did not cease to trouble the mediocre, the smug, either in morality, politics, or art. Menachem Mendel is thus merely the Kasrilevka mask for the genuine, so genuine Jewish dreamer, who has dreamt his own restless dreams of world history for thousands of years, to the annoyance of so many tyrants and the alarm of so many slaves.

In Motel Peise dem Chazan there is again revealed the wonderful Jewish tenacity of life. A grain here and a grain there, a smile from one quarter and a gentle glance from another, and an orphan boy like Motel can find his place in life. Not in affluence and honour, but in poverty and with a poke in the side, but that does not matter, because the main thing is life itself. And if you please, every Jewish generation is an orphan somewhere, which has a brother named Elia as provider, and a woman neighbour symbolising our reliance on the world's mite of benevolence, and every Jewish generation manages somehow to get along.

I mention here only these three Sholem Aleichem characters because they enjoy the privilege of immortal life in our role of morality. Great literary creators succeed in having at least some of their created characters eat of the fruit of the Tree of Life and thus prevail over death. They become immortal literary characters which survive from generation to generation and in each generation engage in a new fateful dialogue with their people. Among these great characters belong Sholem Aleichem's Tevia the Dairyman, Menachem Mendel, and to a certain extent also Motel Peise dem Chazan.

When Sholem Aleichem created his literary characters, it is possible that he did not think of them in terms of a national category, but had in mind only his heroes as individuals. But Sholem Aleichem's greatness lies precisely in this, that his characters are not intentionally imbued with national symbolism. Around the great monumental figures Sholem Aleichem let scores of minor characters move, each with his small woes and joys, each with his great Yiddish language. Great Yiddish language because in the mouths of his characters Sholem Aleichem carried out a general mobilisation of Yiddish words, of all folk sayings and expressions, of all proverbs and idioms. He unfolded for us the whole scroll of the Yiddish language and brought us the whole treasure amassed in the course of generations.

It must be a perennial source of wonder that one man could harbour so much language, could manifest himself artistically from

under so many layers of folk speech. There can be only one answer: Sholem Aleichem was a uniquely great natural phenomenon in the Yiddish language.

Whoever tries to imitate him literarily merely displays his incapacity and is guilty of sacrilege. For Sholem Aleichem can only be enjoyed and admired. And from him, from his Tevia, one should learn faith; from his Menachem Mendel, dreaming; from Motel Peise, tenacity of life. Jews are now in need of these three things, now more than ever.

Our generation is learning this, and generations after us will remain in the cheder of faith, dream and tenacity of life taught by Sholem Aleichem's heroes. And from generation to generation, the Jewish people will nostalgically glorify its genial writer, Sholem Aleichem.

DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN: We will now hear from the second speaker, whom we purposely chose from the other part of the world because Sholem Aleichem certainly belongs to the whole Jewish people wherever it lives.

MR. DAVID SFARD (*Observer, Cultural and Social Association of Jews in Poland*): The Jewish masses throughout the world have proudly welcomed the fact that just the peace movement, which embodies at the present moment the humanitarian idea and aspiration of all mankind bearing the great name of our national writer, was the first to proclaim the celebration of the centenary of his birth, thereby underscoring the universally human significance of his writings. This is sure to bring it about that other peoples, too, will become better and more closely acquainted with his works, and through them with the great spiritual values of his beloved heroes, the simple and sincere Jewish folk with their heavy trials and power of endurance. UNESCO, too, has decided to honour the memory of our great writer.

As is well known, the celebration has assumed large proportions in the Jewish communities the world over. In our country, besides the Jewish community, the memory of Sholem Aleichem is being honoured in every city and town, with the participation of the non-Jewish population also. The anniversary is being observed by the Yiddish Schools and the Yiddish State Theatre, by the publishing house, and especially by circles of readers. The Ministry of Culture and Art has allocated a special fund for an exhibition dedicated to Sholem Aleichem, recommended that a play by him be produced in the Polish language, and sent to all urban and rural clubs a report and material on Sholem Aleichem.

Nevertheless, it is our opinion that if the leadership of the

World Jewish Congress had accepted our proposal at the last meeting of the Executive in Geneva which aimed to unite all Jewish cultural forces for these celebrations, they would have proved even more impressive, raised still higher the honour of Yiddish literature, represented more widely and deeply the democratic traditions of the Jewish masses and, consequently, also stimulated all Jewish cultural groups more effectively to further creativity, a problem about which so much has been said of late at the gatherings of Congress.

We believed that our great national writer possessed the wonderful power of mitigating the differences of opinion, partly real but partly also artificial, in order to find the way to honour him in an all-national manner.

For, do not his writings belong to the overwhelming majority of the Jewish people with their touching love for the common Jew and for man in general, with their deep faith and optimism, their unshakable belief in the existence and development of the Jewish masses, wherever they are? Has not the deeply democratic school of the Jewish tradition, with its great and noble slogan of a better world, become the foundation of the whole progressive and modern Yiddish literature?

All the three classic authors of Yiddish literature have reared vast edifices, whose foundations are deeply imbedded in the Jewish tradition, although in different strata of this tradition and in different ways. And in every story of these structures shines the picture of their time.

It is no accident that Mendel Mocher Sforim combined in his writings the traditional strict moralistic style of the patriarchal Jewish milieu with the mordant satire of the common people on the same milieu, because it was precisely this milieu in its decline that was his exclusive theme.

The Jewish garb for the humanitarian and libertarian ideas which at that time pervaded the Jewish as well as the non-Jewish world, I. L. Peretz could find only in that traditional Jewish creation which did not reduce the ethical values to a particular pattern of living but raised them to the universally human. And this virtue was possessed by the Jewish folk story in all its forms. Mendele Mocher Sforim was the first to tread a highway in the Jewish Pale of Settlement, a highway without which any further journey in this region would have been wholly unthinkable.

Peretz dug tunnels through the old "mountains of darkness" which obscured the bright light on the way, extracting from there

many precious stones and diamonds, which he was able to polish so masterfully.

However, the surrounding landscape remained the same. Its colours did not change. The outward form of their word was not only reminiscent of but often deliberately bound to the old formulae in order to make it intelligible so that it might be grasped, in order, by means of the old skin bottles, to reach the Jewish public with new wine.

In this respect Sholem Aleichem is an exception, a qualitatively new phenomenon, a fresh spring which burst forth from under the freshly ploughed Yiddish ground and imbued it with new lights and colours.

This is the spring of laughter, which contains within itself the power of at once irritating and soothing, the ability to expose one's own weaknesses, faults, and deformities, and at the same time the guilt of those who caused them; the ability to assume, in spite of the whole world, an air of gaiety when the heart is heavy with sorrow and humiliation.

This laughter of Sholem Aleichem's is full of the joy of living, of love for man and nature, of great affection and tenderness toward every living thing, and at the same time is deeply conscious of the wrong done to the oppressed and the tragedy of continual dying—at once the Song of Songs and Job! Sholem Aleichem brought it forth from the depths of the masses. Through him it gushed forth like lava in a rushing torrent of folk speech which for years had meandered unnoticed in the depths of such strata as were oppressed and rejected by their own and others.

In the ice of patriarchal congealment, the sharp, spare, and polished word of the Grandfather (i.e. Mendeleyevich Sforim) succeeded in hewing out ice holes through which the Grandfather's stern bespectacled gaze was able to discern and also to show us the straining of new streams to come to the surface. But the river as a whole as yet stood still and under its ice cover the boldest irony still had to take on the exotic coloration of Travels of Benjamin the Third, and the very boldest protests had to disguise themselves, in the manner of an allegory, as the observation of a mare signifying the Jewish people.

In Sholem Aleichem's time, the river already moved of itself. Those who only a short time before had been sitting behind the oven in the synagogue of Kabtzansk and refreshing their hungry stomachs with the delicacies of Leviathan and the Wild Ox, were now strolling around in tilted hats on the stock exchanges of Odessa and Yehupetz. The waters intermingled. The Menachem-

Mendels were not only themselves confused by the fast pace, but they carried the confusion over into Kasrilevka itself.

The poisoned air of belated capitalism in the Jewish community, with all its evils of envy and hatred, with its pursuit of easy profits, aroused wild dreams of trees bearing gold coins also in the common man, Shimele Soroker, and like a blaze engulfed the toiling Tevias, leading them to ruin. The people of the Pale of Settlement stirred from their lethargy, boarded trains, sped past cities, were in constant motion.

Sholem Aleichem not only was able to observe this stream of people, watch their gestures, listen to their remarks, realise their feelings, but was himself part of this stream, himself participated in this mad rush. For all the outward comedy which arises when people suddenly fall into a new situation without managing to shake off the old habits, gestures, and expressions, there was deep tragedy in this fever which gripped everyone, because it was conditioned primarily by the urge to break loose from the vise into which millions of Jews had been thrust, robbing them of every human right, Comic situations, arising in consequence of certain tragic developments, accentuate the latter still more, making them more salient and at the same time more universal.

In Sholem Aleichem's humour, the people saw more clearly and distinctly their own dismal situation at that time, not merely in its purely Jewish aspect, but more broadly and deeply, because in its universally human aspect.

This is what Tevia is talking about in his monologue, 'What is a Jew and what is not a Jew.' This also comes to expression in Menachem Mendel who, for all his characteristic national outwardness, expresses the tragedy of a man who has become entangled in circumstances like a fly in a spider's web.

Achieving perfection in the description of this situation, mostly by the characters themselves, through their exhaustive and peculiarly individual manner of setting forth all their experiences and actions. Sholem Aleichem also artistically transcended the border of the purely Jewish into the universally human. In this way he fortified not only the general truth that the genuinely national is to be found in the sphere of the universally human, but also the purely artistic truth that the more deeply and universally this value is brought out, the more it approaches the universally human, the thinner the partition between the two.

Sholem Aleichem's characters are not comic, nor do they arouse pity. In their usual loquacity, their complaints and charges against the world are balanced by their deep self-irony. The first

comes out with special clarity, while the second is artfully disguised in the manner of speaking, in the way of telling, as is the case in *Tevia the Dairyman* and in a whole series of shorter stories. At another time the self-irony supplies the main climate of Menachem Mendel. But always in the works of Sholem Aleichem, there is this duality, the protest against the existing deformed reality and the failure to perceive one's own deformity because of that very reality, like a man struggling with the turbulent, raging waves of a river, at the same time seeing in them the distorted reflection of his own figure. Menachem Mendel is not only a small-town Jew who is the product of the collapse of the feudal situation in the Jewish small town, but the result of the rise of new capitalist conditions, forced out of his old world and plunged into a new, alien world where his whole behaviour and speech seemed strange and ridiculous. Nor is he an inwardly torn petty bourgeois without feeling the strength who wanders about in the world of chaos in pursuit of the golden calf. He symbolises the lot of the Jewish common man of that time in general, whose home was the air and whose occupation was the wind, and whose word was the only weapon with which he could defend himself from every attacking enemy. He thus rises above the level of his class nature to a broader conception of his national significance. This is also the cause of the profound inner tragedy of Menachem Mendel, notwithstanding his outward comicality. Similarly, the story of *Tevia* is not merely the practical philosophy of life of a hard-working Jew based on the neutrality of sacred verses into which *Tevia* breathes a new, vital breath by secularising, humanising their import and subordinating them to the common sense of the ordinary man; it is also the story of the Jewish way and Jewish economics, of deep psychological experiences and spiritual struggles, of bitter disappointments and also young hopes. The new way of *Hodl* and *Fefferl*, the ordinary sad story of *Tzeitl* and *Motl Kamzoil*, the tragedy of *Eva*, the *Lech-l'cho* episode, the lucky match of *Beika*, how deeply and comprehensively all these events reveal to us the pattern of life and the problems of Jews of that day! And how great is the strength of their artistic truth if their influence lasts to this day! And all these characters, independent of changing times, still live among us with a life of their own—symbols of broad social and artistic concepts.

In addition, *Tevia* with his perpetual propensity to philosophical reflections and natural optimism, with his discreet, constant scepticism and also great faith, with his quiet, wise irony and mild, naive geniality, with his endless complaints and demands for justice

and enduring patience — in a word, with all his contrary traits, appeared as a result of the painful experiences of generations, a profound characteristic embodiment of a peculiar, national expression.

The self-ironical climate of the basically true Sholem Aleichem creations, together with their elevation through a concretely national garb to a profoundly human generalisation, produces the specific Sholem Aleichem dynamic reality, which goes so far in its authenticity that it rises above itself to some new conditioned world. The Sholem Aleichem hero expresses himself so incessantly, relates so completely, with such haste, all his thoughts, hopes, and fancies, all his weaknesses and faults, that in this turbulent stream reality begins to lose all its steadfastness, becomes mobile, like some world which is suspended between dream and reality, a kind of world of wandering ghosts.

Such a world between dream and reality particularly corresponded to the Jewish life of that time. In the crush in which one crowded the other, stepped on the other's foot for lack of air, for lack of land, for lack of rights, because of the darkness and pain—besides the ability to laugh at oneself, at one's own troubles, besides the smile which was full of pain and protest—besides this, only one other mood could save the Jew from discouragement, despair, from final resignation: the flight from reality, though partially, though at times into the realm of dreams.

Naturally, Sholem Aleichem was too great a realist not to see this dream differentiated according to each person's concepts, his degree of intelligence, his social position. Menachem Mendel's dream was different from Tevya's. In the dream of each of his characters there was not only the continuation of his real life, but also its basis. But in all of them he, by his very existence, infused with a lyrical glow their dark, strange, and distorted life, imparting a kind of solemn and tragic nobility and undermining their realness and temporariness, as though this was a hurried journey to a new, beautiful world.

These two basic characteristics which run like a red thread through all of Sholem Aleichem's creations—the ability of the common Jew to laugh at himself and his everlasting dream—were not invented by Sholem Aleichem. Sholem Aleichem's genius was not that of a Jules Verne, but that of a Columbus who discovered the America that existed. But by the very act of discovering the Jewish people, he raised them from their mere objective existence to a subjective, conscious force, to an active means of national self-defence and militant protest, to a proud demonstration of human

dignity in the face of all enemies and oppressors. For only a people that does not yield to inner paralysis can laugh at itself, and only one that does not surrender to external force is capable of dreaming.

The same elements also became the essence of all Sholem Aleichem's work. They became what we call and understand by the generic term "Sholem Aleichem" which is much more than any literary school, much more than literature itself. For, just as a wave surges over the shore and returns to the sea, so the creative work of Sholem Aleichem came from the people and returned to the people.

In his work, the Jewish people beheld and recognised itself in its everyday and Sabbath attire, in its tragic content and comic form, in its deformed reality and beautiful dream, and it made this work its own possession, integrated into the treasury of those of its values over which time has no sway.

FIFTEENTH SESSION

August 11, 1959 (Morning)

In the Chair: DR. GEORG GUGGENHEIM (*Switzerland*)

1. THE SITUATION OF SEPHARDIM IN ISRAEL

MR. ELIAHU ELIASHAR (*Israel*): Permit me, as an Israeli to hope that our Hebrew language will be recognised to such an extent that it will loom more important than other languages. Hebrew will bind our people together, it is a holy language, and to my mind it is not possible that Congress will not give Hebrew its just place, since this is the language which brings together our people from the four corners of the world. I will continue to speak in English because I want my message to be understood by the majority of the delegates.

I speak on behalf of the Israeli Branch of the World Sephardi Federation and thank the Presidium for permitting us to present the Sephardi case. Two thousand years of life under totally different cultures and regimes and speaking various languages have left deep impressions upon Jews living in different continents. This atmosphere of separatism between Ashkenazim and Sephardim exists everywhere. Whilst we are one people, serving under God, equally devoted to Israel, these differences create misunderstandings and under given circumstances, give rise to bitterness.

We do not wish to eliminate traditions or cultural differences; it is such differences which make for our spiritual strength. The "grandeur" of the Jews has moved in accordance with the freedom and prosperity that prevailed in the countries where they lived: it shifted from country to country.

Fifty per cent of Israel's population today is of Sephardic and Oriental origin. You will find that Sephardic and Oriental Jews populate the Negev, part of Galilee and practically all our borders. Our boys and girls are en masse joining Zahal, our Army of Defence, and have shared in its heroic deeds. It is binding on all of us to do all in our power to destroy the growing atmosphere of separatism. Mr. Easterman's report is most welcome and we want to share with you in the work of and for Golat Ishmael. The World

Sephardi Federation was elected by two World Congresses to represent the Sephardim and must share with you the burden of solving these difficult questions.

After leaving the ghettos of the Occident, Jews found themselves in highly cultured, dynamic and scientifically developed surroundings where they were made aware of the civic rights and duties of the individual. The Ashkenazim soon took on the characteristics of their surroundings.

In the Middle East and in the East, these characteristics did not and even now, do not exist, and the majority of the Jews from Oriental ghettos descended to the level of their backward surroundings. They came to Israel usually without their leaders and upper classes; the majority of them were forced to leave behind their possessions. These immigrants, with their large families, created problems in Israel in the fields of housing, education and productive employment as well as sociological difficulties which can no longer be ignored.

We must express our grateful appreciation for Jewish fraternity as a whole and for the share taken by our brethren in America and everywhere, in providing the necessary tools and means for this unique experiment in history. In point of fact there still remains a lot to be achieved to eliminate bitterness and existing sufferings if we want to prevent conditions growing worse.

We pray that those of our brethren behind the Iron Curtain who wish to come to Israel may be free to do so, and for those in the Arab and Moslem countries to find a haven of refuge in Israel, too. We, who have the understanding, ability and means, Ashkenazim and Sephardim alike, must level in many instances the abysmal differences to achieve cohesion and unity. We appeal for due and proper consideration by all Jewish authorities. We ask the Presidium that our report on facts and figures on the communal problem in Israel be incorporated as part of the reports of this Congress.

We appeal to World Jewry to assist the Jewish Agency and the State of Israel to solve the following problems:

- (a) Higher education and vocational education;
- (b) Abolition of slums whether in Galut or in Israel;
- (c) Creation of greater facilities for productive and constructive employment;
- (d) Assisting large families;
- (e) Calling of the conference suggested by Dr. Schwarzbart to

be held jointly with the World Sephardi Federation at as early a date as possible;

- (f) Assistance to establish seminaries and to develop our Post-Graduate College in Jerusalem because we lack rabbis, teachers, social workers and madrichim. Working together, we may yet see the prophecy of Ezekiel come true: "And they shall live to be one great people in the land".

DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN: I wish to express to the Sephardi Delegation our appreciation for their restraint and moderation in presenting their issue here. On behalf of the Congress I wish to tell the Sephardi delegates that we were always interested in having the full co-operation of the Sephardi community all over the world. I am always in touch with the Sephardi community in Latin America and elsewhere and Congress will do everything possible to include as many Sephardi Jewish communities of the world within the framework of the Congress. I am very glad that Mr. Eliashar expressed their desire to be included in our work.

I wish to make a few pertinent remarks on the problem of new Olim (immigrants) in Israel—it would be irresponsible to say that the Ashkenazic and especially the Sephardic Jews are fully absorbed in Israel. As to Mizug Hagaluyoth, the merging of the different tribes of parts of the Jewish people in Israel, a few years ago, Mrs. Margaret Mead, a non-Jew, perhaps the greatest living anthropologist, said there does not exist in the whole world a problem like this, because Israel is a very small territory, which has more than doubled its population in less than a decade—there is no parallel for it in modern history. Immigrants have come from 30 countries and from many centuries in human history: Yemenite Jews from the 12th century, Moroccan Jews from the 16th century and western European Jews from the 19th century, and as I once said jokingly, some Jews who, already here, want to live in the 21st century. It is a tremendous problem to bridge their differences of language, cultural approach, their most elementary habits and customs of life and their whole concepts of community life and of a nation.

This problem expresses itself in two forms: one, that the newcomers (and Ashkenazim can be included) do not play the role they should in the life of Israel. But politics, especially party politics, means fighting for positions of leadership and since people already holding positions do not readily give up their places, it is a hard fight. Even newcomers who are European Jews have not been able to attain leadership positions during the past five or six years. It is a matter of time. Although I admit that enough attention has not

been paid to this problem, I am sure that in the future it will be better.

But the more difficult problem is social and economic integration. This is a problem which has faced the Agency and the Government for the past ten years; with limited means at our disposal the question has always been, what should get priority? To bring in as many new immigrants as you can or to consolidate those already brought in? We have always decided to bring in as many as we can, especially from Eastern Europe. But even if we had decided otherwise, Oriental Jews would be the first to protest. They want their relatives brought in from Morocco and other parts of the world because families are separated. We felt that if an Eastern European country permitted Jews to leave, it would be a crime to postpone it because we needed the money to consolidate the position of those already in the country. You saw what happened with Rumania. They came for a while; they stopped and they came again. The Rumanian Government does not work out a plan of emigration and they do not even tell us if and how many Jews they will send out.

A large part of the Oriental immigrants have colonised and have done a historic job. If they had not, we probably would never have been able to establish the 3-400 new settlements which the Jewish Agency established in the first ten years of Israel's existence. But most of these new settlements are not consolidated. We signed contracts with them that in six or seven years they will receive all the necessary money for their equipment so they can become self-supporting. We did not have the money because we had to spend so much on newcomers. So these immigrants are waiting longer than they should for more equipment, more land, more water or a second cow in order to make a real living. But the permanently tragic problem for Israel is whether to spend millions on bringing people in, or to consolidate them once they are here.

Another problem is the liquidation of the Maabaroth (transit camps), where people have been living for five or six years and although it is no worse than their previous condition in the Mellahs of North Africa, they did not come to Israel to continue their former miserable existence. No Polish or Rumanian Jew would have come into a Maabara; we had to provide housing, and many of them left better houses than they get from us in Israel. This creates bitterness, for here is an Iraqi who has lived in a Maabara for six years, and next to him houses are going up which are given to newcomers.

There is a further problem: many of the Oriental Olim do not want the houses we give them because they are more expensive. Another reason is that although they live in miserable huts in the Maabaroth, they are near the cities where they work—and we cannot build the new houses all round the cities. Firstly, it would be too expensive and secondly the population must be dispersed for strategic, security, social and economic reasons. So there are thousands of Olim who remain near Haifa rather than go to a settlement somewhere in the hills of Galilee. They are afraid that if they move elsewhere they will not earn a living, although they are told that they will get help.

I wished to give those who are not familiar with it, a glimpse of the tremendous difficulty of the problems: the individual's fight for position, and the displacement of one group by another—problems which do not always depend on money. Problems of employment, work, decent living and consolidation of the settlements are all problems relating to money. The serious problem of education was mentioned. Hundreds of thousands of pounds have been spent by the Jewish Agency on special scholarships to enable Oriental Jews to go to secondary schools, and much more could be spent. The whole problem of integration, colonisation and absorption will receive more attention in the future. We of the Agency have already had a special meeting and I have written to several of my colleagues in Jerusalem conveying some of the suggestions made here. I think the slogan for the next world campaign for Israel should be to consolidate those still not fully integrated in Israel. I think Jews will understand that it is just as important for an Oleh in the country to have decent living conditions as it is to give money to a new Oleh. I think the time has come for a totality of the Jewish people to realise the importance of the problem. You cannot have two groups of people in Israel with different standards of life, although naturally we will always have richer people and poorer people. You cannot have a group, collectively on a lower level than another group, at least without the hope that within the next few years this will be equalised. If you take this message back to your communities and if they make a tremendous effort and at least provide the means—for this is not just a question of goodwill—we may, within the next few years make great progress and satisfy the demands of the Oriental Jews and of the Sephardic community, which are legitimate, even if we deplore some of the forms in which they express their demands in Israel. All of us Jews outside of Israel and those of us responsible in Israel will have to find a way as quickly as possible to satisfy these legitimate demands.

25. REPORTS OF COMMISSIONS

DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN: The Commissions having ended and being ready to report, the Assembly will be able to close today. In case a votum separatum has been reserved in a Commission, it will be, according to our established procedure, possible for one delegate to speak for and another to speak against, but no general discussion will take place. The Cultural Commission is to report first, the Commission on Organisation next, and finally the Political Commission.

REPORT AND RESOLUTIONS OF THE CULTURAL COMMISSION

MRS. THELMA RICHMAN (*Chairman of the Cultural Commission*): I would like to share with you the mood of the Cultural Commission during the five sessions of deliberations for I think it is against that background that we must look at the resolutions, which seem to be rather formal, short and without nuances. One of the things that struck us all was that there are entirely too many languages for a group that calls itself one people. There are some who hold fast to the notion that somehow, if by dictum and ukaze we could all use one language, we would become one people. But our history over the last centuries has been a much stronger dictum, for what we see today when we look at ourselves in this Assembly is a Jewish people, fragmentized, and pluralistic. The organic unity which was ours for centuries, a unity based on one language for the most part, one faith, one system of belief and one system of education and social configuration, is no longer ours. We have in the Diaspora no real mechanics of cohesion and of genuine organic functioning as a whole. What we were seized with in the Cultural Commission was the search for some instrument which this particular international Jewish body could forge. We are all here together and so we reflect together the character of the Jewish communities of the world. This is to me the meaning of the debate that went on for five sessions in the Cultural Commission. Dr. Nahum Goldmann has declared, as I put it in my own words, that a people who has succeeded in forging instruments of foreign policy is now seeking to forge the instruments of domestic policy. A people cannot live on foreign policy alone but must face the much more difficult tasks of everyday existence and therefore must be concerned with domestic policy, and the internal policy of the Jewish people is the forging of the instruments of its continuity.

Of all the problems which face us, the question of Jewish edu-

cation is the instrument for carrying on the past into the future. There is scarcely a people who have survived without an educational policy, programme and structure. The first resolution that the Cultural Commission wants me to present to you is

RESOLUTION ON THE WORLD CONFERENCE OF JEWISH EDUCATION

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress welcomes the initiative taken by the Conference of Jewish Organisations to convene a World Conference on Jewish Education and expresses the readiness of the World Jewish Congress to give full support to make every effort to secure its success.

The resolution was unanimously adopted in Commission, but there was a votum separatum concurred in by Rabbi Federbush, Rabbi Berlinger, Mr. Aba Bornstein and Rabbi Itzhak Gross. When it was presented to the Commission, the four gentlemen asked for a vote, a re-consideration of this separate vote by the body, because one of its paragraphs was one which they felt certain the entire Commission would agree. I ruled, and Dr. Riegner upheld my ruling, that only paragraph 3 of this votum separatum is in effect the votum separatum. They therefore presented paragraphs 1 and 2 at a later point in the debate as an additional resolution. We did not accept these two points, but tabled them. It was my ruling that paragraph 3 is the actual votum separatum. I will now read you the three paragraphs.

Votum Separatum

1. *Since the existence of the people of Israel is based on faithful adherence to the Torah, the World Jewish Congress appeals to all communities in the Diaspora to work for the deepening of the religious education and spreading the language of the Bible among the people.*
2. *Since matters of child education are being taken care of by the communities and Jewish organisations in all countries, the World Jewish Congress should not work in the field of child education.*
3. *Since it is the duty of the World Jewish Congress to safeguard the unity of all trends represented in it, which is the basis of its existence, and since the problems of education are apt to bring about a fundamental split, the World Jewish Congress should not participate in the World Conference on Jewish Education.*

DR. SIMON FEDERBUSH (*United States*): The religious Jews have become and have remained a part of Congress because Congress was established for the purpose of defending Jewish rights and organising the Jewish communities everywhere.

Now Congress wants to deal with the education of Jewish children. You well know that it does not have the means. To found secular Jewish schools everywhere, hundreds of millions would be necessary; our budget for culture and education amounts to about \$30,000. Besides, opinions differ on all questions of culture and education. Both in the State of Israel and in the Jewish Agency there are two departments: for general education and for religious education, because education cannot be performed by one administering body, Congress too would have to be divided in taking up the education of children. Congress could, however, do cultural work by assisting the small communities.

Participation in a World Conference on Education by Congress is not desirable because you do not even know the terms of reference. When they will be known and religious Jewry will be assured in all matters of conscience, it will be possible to consider the question of participation. All this is premature.

DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN: There are two misunderstandings on the part of the Mizrachi. Congress does not think of engaging in the education of children because we do not have the money. If we were thinking of doing so, we would consult the religious groups. We would reach an agreement, as was the case with the Zionist Organisation before it took up education. It is obvious that Congress could not, by a mere resolution, open a new field of activity before reaching unity among all elements vitally interested in the new activity.

What we call our Cultural Department is an innocent matter and our friend Dr. Federbush could be a co-director of such a department. It has one task, to strengthen the sentiment among the Jews that culture and education should be nurtured. The Department co-operates with international institutions. It tries to encourage the Jewish communities to do cultural work and gives to some of them Torah scrolls, prayer books and similar things. As matters are today we cannot engage in large cultural work, certainly not in education work. There is no reason for the Mizrachi to worry. If the time ever comes, then we will sit down with Mizrachi to look for a *modus vivendi*. When I introduced the idea of a Conference on Jewish Education at the Conference of Jewish Organisations I did not expect to meet with opposition on the part of the Mizrachi. Besides, within the Jewish Agency which participates in the

project, there was no opposition. When orthodox groups suggested that religious education be dealt with on an equal footing with secular education, I agreed, as did other organisations.

There are two members on the Preparatory Committee who will see to it that religious education will occupy the important place it deserves in our work. The Conference on Jewish education will not take a stand as to what form of Jewish education is to be adopted, whether orthodox or not, or what form of orthodox education. This Conference will draw the attention of Jewish public opinion to the fact that this is one of our central problems; this will be the first time when all factors in Jewish education will come together and exchange views. We have heard about the United States and Argentina, but we have no overall view of the whole situation. We might agree to some kind of a central instrument to carry out certain concrete projects. This Conference will not act by majority decisions as it does not have the right to do so; its main task is to present the problem of Jewish education to the communities with more emphasis than is the case today. I can say this not only in the name of Congress which along with other organisations participates in the Conference of Jewish Organisations, but also in the name of the Jewish Agency which is also a partner and plays a greater role in this field than Congress because the Agency really does something and has something to report. But I can say this in the name of all other organisations who do not even think about the things on which you expressed fears. I do not want to criticise your fears. I understand your fears, but I do not think they are justified. You do not have to rely on my statements alone, you will sit on the Preparatory Committee.

DR. SIMON FEDERBUSH: As we are satisfied with Dr. Goldmann's declaration that the World Jewish Congress will not engage in the education of children and that there will be no majority decision in the World Conference on Education, in such questions as religious education, we withdraw the votum separatum.

MRS. RICHMAN again read the resolution adopted by the Commission.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

MRS. RICHMAN submitted the

RESOLUTION ON BUDGETARY PROVISIONS

The Fourth Plenary of the World Jewish Congress, conscious of the immediate and continuing need for an intensification and widening of the influence of the cultural activities of the World

Jewish Congress in initiating, assisting and implementing specific and general activities in the sphere of culture, maintains that a complete re-orientation is needed in the attitude towards the financial provisions made for this sphere of World Jewish Congress activities. It urges that a first priority should be given in budgetary allocation for the work of the Cultural Department and that a minimum of 20% of the overall budget of Congress should be allocated for this work.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

MRS. RICHMAN read the

RESOLUTION ON CULTURAL WORK

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress urges that Cultural Committees be established under the guidance of qualified personnel in all affiliated communities, where they do not already exist, and recommends that the Cultural Department encourages the closest co-operation between the various affiliated communities and national sections.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

RESOLUTION ON REGIONAL CULTURAL CONFERENCES

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress takes note of the successful regional conferences already held in South America and in Europe and believes that it is in the best interests of the expeditious implementation of our cultural programme that within the possibilities of budgetary provision and in the spirit of the resolution adopted in Geneva in 1958, similar regional conferences should be held prior to future sessions of the Plenary Assembly.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

RESOLUTION ON JEWISH MUSIC

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress urges the support for the International Association for Jewish Music.

The Resolution was adopted unanimously.

RESOLUTION ON CO-OPERATION WITH UNESCO

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress takes note, with great satisfaction, of the further development of the co-operation between the United Nations Educational Scientific

and Cultural Organisation and the World Jewish Congress in the period 1953-1959 and expresses the hope that this co-operation will be deepened and intensified for the benefit of both the Congress and UNESCO in consonance with the basic concept of the value of diversity in human culture which is a cornerstone of UNESCO's Constitution.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

MRS. RICHMAN read the

RESOLUTION ON JEWISH DAY SCHOOLS

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress regards Jewish schools as the fundamental instrument for Jewish survival in the Diaspora and therefore calls upon Jewish communities everywhere to provide sufficient financial means for their establishment, maintenance and development. The Assembly also notes with satisfaction the increase since the previous Plenary Assembly in the number of Jewish Day Schools and in the number of pupils receiving full-time Jewish education including modern Hebrew.

MR. HARRY L. WOLL (United States): While the English text says that the Assembly "regards Jewish Schools as the fundamental instrument for Jewish survival", the Yiddish version speaks of *Jewish Day Schools*. We have to adopt the English text and see to it that the translation into Yiddish is accurate.

MRS. RICHMAN and DR. GUGGENHEIM, as the chairman, stated that the translation into Yiddish would be corrected.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

MRS. RICHMAN submitted the

RESOLUTION ON THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress welcomes the publication of The Jewish Journal of Sociology and requests that the field of research dealing with sociological problems be enlarged.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

MRS. RICHMAN submitted the

RESOLUTION ON JEWISH STUDENTS AND YOUTH

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress

conscious of the ever-pressing needs for extending and intensifying specific work among Jewish students and youth, reaffirms its belief that the fullest assistance should be provided for all forms of endeavour carried on by Jewish students and youth in order to facilitate their work on all levels and to render possible a deeper understanding and a closer co-operation between World Jewish organisations and students.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

MRS. RICHMAN: It is with a great feeling of joy that the Cultural Commissions asks you to approve this

RESOLUTION ON APPRECIATION OF PAST ACTIVITIES

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress has noted with satisfaction the consolidation and extension of the work of its Cultural Department under the devoted and inspired direction of Dr. A. Steinberg and believes that within the limited budgetary possibilities, a real contribution has been made to the vital spheres of Jewish culture.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

MRS. RICHMAN: Some two dozen or more resolutions were presented to the Cultural Committee from countries, groups and individuals so that a sub-committee had to cull from them what was incorporated in the resolutions just presented to you. Other proposals discussed we have formulated as recommendations to the Executive :

- (1) Publications in Spanish for our South American and Central American communities;
- (2) Cultural activities in India;
- (3) World conference of Jewish journalists and writers;
- (4) Establishment of a Higher School for Jewish Studies to be centred in Europe to train Jewish teachers;
- (5) A World Conference on Jewish Education which incorporated the concept of co-operation of Jews of all religious, political, social and philosophical ideologies. This recommendation also goes to the Executive since it refers to the Conference a resolution which was here submitted and adopted.
- (6) On school textbooks;
- (7) On a Central Institute in the Golah or in Israel to parallel

the institute envisioned in the Goldmann House in Israel;

(8) On a Teachers Seminary.

DR. GUGGENHEIM stated that the applause indicated the agreement of the Assembly to the transmission of the recommendations to the Executive.

M. SALOMON SCHWEIZER (*France*): I submitted a draft resolution to the Commission which was adopted and which I understood would become part of a general resolution. However, it was omitted. I proposed not a recommendation, but an essential principle, demanding the recognition of the fundamental importance of Jewish education, be it secular, general, labour, or religious; likewise the importance of all national youth movements, general as well as chalutzic.

MRS. RICHMAN: The spirit of the resolution presented by Mr. Schweizer was, we feel, incorporated, as were the actual words or spirit of many other resolutions which were presented to us.

PROF. YITZHAK SCIAKY (*Israel*): It seems that, due to some technical error, my suggestions pertaining to cultural activity were not brought before the formulating committee. I therefore now submit them:

The Fourth Plenary Session of the World Jewish Congress resolves that :

- (a) *Any cultural effort, in any language and direction, able to safeguard the Jewishness of Jews wherever they are, and to strengthen their tie with the Jewish people, is worthy of encouragement and support.*
- (b) *It is incumbent upon the World Jewish Congress to see to the co-ordination of all Jewish cultural and educational activities, as well as the institutions engaged in such activities, in order to increase their efficiency.*
- (c) *Along with educational and cultural activities to safeguard the Jewishness of Jews and to strengthen their tie with the Jewish people, action should be taken to ensure Hebrew education by relying on the creative power of living culture.*
- (d) *We must guarantee the knowledge of the Hebrew language as the language of cultural Jews wherever they are.*

Education must take account of common sentiments and aspirations—feelings concerning the Nazi holocaust; its commemoration and the memory of its victims should be remembered for genera-

tions, with no connection with political deeds. We must remember what the Amalekites did. We must also act to maintain groups of high education, nurtured by the living culture which is growing in Israel. In all countries of the dispersion they would serve as an impetus to disseminate living Hebrew culture among dispersed Jewry.

DR. GUGGENHEIM pointed out that according to the Rules of Procedure for the Plenary Assembly (Article 21) a discussion on Prof. Sciaky's motion was impossible. Only resolutions adopted by the Commission or resolutions rejected by the Commission, if a proviso for a *votum separatum* was expressly made, could come before the Assembly. This was not the case here and therefore Mr. Schweizer's and Prof. Sciaky's resolutions could not be discussed or voted on. The resolutions not voted upon here would be sent to the Executive.

This was approved by the Assembly.

MR. J. BENZIAN (*Sweden*): suggested that the various Jewish communities should try to arrive at agreement about the establishment of Jewish elementary and higher schools. DR. GUGGENHEIM remarked that this was not a resolution but a recommendation and as such would be sent to the Executive. DR. GUGGENHEIM then thanked the chairman of the Cultural Commission, Mrs. Thelma Richman, for her work.

REPORT AND RESOLUTIONS OF THE ORGANISATION COMMISSION

MR. YITZHAK RAFAEL (*Chairman of the Organisation Commission*): A few words about an article on this Assembly by Mr. Abba Eban which appeared in the Israeli paper *Maariv* on August 7, 1959. Mr. Eban holds that the Shechinah, the Divine Presence, has departed from the international Jewish congresses. But wherever a group of Jews are, there is the Shechinah. If this is true for a group of ten Jews, it certainly applies to 300 Jews here representing forty Jewish Kibbutzim and millions of Jews.

The Organisation Commission has looked for means to democratise Jewish life, to get world Jewish organisations and national organisations closer to one another, and to create a united representation of the Jewish people.

We are submitting small changes in our constitution and one important change is due to the rise of the Yishuvim on the South American continent: we propose the establishment of a Branch of the Congress Executive in South America. We suggest changing the Committee on Co-ordination into an Administrative Commit-

tee; a change of name is in itself often important. We hope the Administrative Committee will be a good beginning towards centralisation.

We further discussed the necessity of publishing in various languages a central organ, viewing *World Jewry* as such an attempt.

Aware of the importance of different organisations, although we do not submit a specific resolution, we were most favourably impressed by the work that OSE, affiliated with Congress, has been doing in the area of health.

As to the Sieff Plan, it has come as a great surprise and discussion has been concentrated on it. A new idea has been presented, and it shows the vitality of Congress as an organisation. We also listened to the opinions expressed by Dr. Schwarzbart and we arrived at the conclusion that we should not make revolutionary changes. Mr. Sieff gave his consent. We resolved not to rush; we agreed to propose that all the material, including the remarks made by the various speakers during the Plenary Meetings, should be submitted to the Executive for decision.

Having in mind that small Kehilloth often disappeared, not because Hitler destroyed them, but because they disintegrated, we appealed for help in a resolution.

I wish to single out the resolution on the establishment of the Goldmann Institute in Israel, honouring the devoted President of Congress, who is also the driving power of other world Jewish organisations.

SIXTEENTH SESSION

August 11, 1959 (Afternoon)

In the Chair: PROFESSOR ARIEH TARTAKOWER (Israel);
later, DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN

1. REPORT AND RESOLUTIONS OF THE ORGANIZATION COMMISSION

MR. YITZHAK RAFAEL (*Chairman of the Organization Commission*) read the following resolutions:

RESOLUTION ON ACHIEVEMENT OF JEWISH UNITY

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress notes with satisfaction the efforts made by the Executive to implement the resolution on Achievement of Jewish Unity adopted by the Third Plenary Assembly and the successful beginning made in this direction through the establishment of the Conference of Jewish Organizations between major Jewish organizations; reiterates its previous stand that any new permanent organization must be based on the following fundamental requirements:

- 1. A democratic organization based on representation of such Jewish communities and organizations throughout the world as will accept the principle of the oneness of the Jewish people;*
- 2. Executive organs authorized and equipped to speak and act on matters of common concern to the Jewish people throughout the world;*
- 3. Participation in the organization in no way to affect the autonomy of participants in regard to the internal and religious affairs of their respective communities nor to imply any authorization to the organization to interfere in the domestic political affairs of the country.*

The Assembly also urges the Executive to continue its efforts to bring into the World Jewish Congress communities and organizations not yet affiliated to it.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

RESOLUTION ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE BODIES

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress calls upon the Executive Committee to continue its efforts to assist Jewish communities to establish central representative bodies in countries where no such institutions at present exist.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

RESOLUTION ON SEPHARDI AND ASHKENAZI JEWS

(adopted by the majority of the Commission)

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress expresses its appreciation of the constructive efforts already made by the organization in establishing closer ties between the Ashkenazim and the Sephardim, and calls upon the Executive Committee to persevere in these efforts.

A draft resolution proposed by MR. BENJAMIN ARDITTI (*Israel*) and not adopted by the Commission read:

The Assembly expresses its appreciation for the constructive efforts made by the World Jewish Congress and the Organization Department to achieve a full amalgamation of the Sephardi and Ashkenazi groups. The Assembly calls upon the leadership to arrange in the coming year a meeting of Congress with the World Federation of Sephardim to take further steps towards the amalgamation of Sephardi and Ashkenazi Jews. The meeting should be called by both organizations.

The Chairman, Prof. Tartakower, called on Mr. Arditti, who was not present.

The majority resolution was adopted.

MR. RAFAEL continued:

RESOLUTION ON THE FOURTH BRANCH OF THE EXECUTIVE IN SOUTH AMERICA

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress resolves to establish a Fourth Branch of the Executive Committee in South America.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

RESOLUTION ON THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress

resolves that the present Co-ordinating Committee shall be called "Administrative Committee" until further notice and that its composition shall be determined by the Executive Committee.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

RESOLUTION ON THE FOUR YEAR PLAN

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress expresses its appreciation to the Organization Department for its strenuous work and calls upon the Executive Committee to draw up, in the near future, a Four Year Plan on organizational activities for the World Jewish Congress designed to expand its membership and to introduce new elements from the younger generations into its leadership.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

RESOLUTION ON RE-ORGANIZATION

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress expresses its appreciation to Mr. Israel M. Sieff for his earnest and strenuous efforts in preparing a re-organization plan for the World Jewish Congress and consider this work a significant contribution to the future activities of the Congress.

Having closely examined the details of Mr. Sieff's proposal and listened to various views on the report, the Assembly resolves that the material shall be transmitted to the Executive for further consideration and decision.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

RESOLUTION ON REPRESENTATION OF REFUGEE ORGANISATIONS AT THE CLAIMS CONFERENCE

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress asks the Executive Committee to obtain adequate representation on the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany for the organizations representing Jewish victims of Nazi persecution who have emigrated from Poland, Rumania, Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

MR. RAFAEL: Now, a controversial item: I wish to submit a resolution that was proposed by me in the Organization Commission but rejected. The draft read:

The Assembly welcomes the close co-operation and co-

ordination of the World Jewish Congress and the World Zionist Organization and stresses the necessity to strengthen and expand the co-operation in all areas of common activity.

Let me say that the degree of co-operation is to many of us not satisfactory. An example is the Symposium on Jewish Education. We listened to Dr. A. Steinberg and to Professor E. Simon but Jews coming from Israel were not satisfied. The huge historical experiment of Jewish education in Israel involves more than half a million Jewish children in the elementary schools; there are the network of Hebrew secondary schools, numerous Yeshivoth, vocational and agricultural schools and the problems of integrating a new generation. The central facts were almost not touched upon and instead, minor facts were discussed. We heard nothing from Mr. Zalman Shazar, the former Minister of Education in Israel and present head of the Education Department of the World Zionist Organization. This is not co-operation as it should be.

When the draft just read was proposed, opponents thought that we should not identify our Assembly with the Zionist movement. But is not the fact that Dr. Nahum Goldmann is both president of Congress and the World Zionist Organization, the greatest identification? Besides, you cannot get a Minyan of non-Zionists in this Assembly. I therefore ask the Assembly to adopt the resolution submitted by the Commission's minority.

MR. ISRAEL SIEFF, *for the majority of the Commission*: Mr. Rafael wishes to make a public declaration on the subject of co-operation between the Jewish Agency and Congress. This particular resolution, which I do not think will help towards any greater co-operation, has got to be put into practice. This means that the Jewish Agency and Congress have got to come together to discuss their joint problems to harmonize and co-ordinate their actions. I discussed this with Dr. Goldmann and it is his view that instead of bringing this resolution before the Plenum, it should be brought before the Executive where it can be dealt with in a practical way.

DR. TARTAKOWER: I have just received word that Dr. Goldmann asks to postpone the vote so that it may be possible for him to express his opinion. Are there any further resolutions?

MR. RAFAEL: Some, mostly technical, changes in the Constitution are necessary, which I am now submitting for your approval. Article 5, para. 3 is to read:

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.

The proposal was adopted unanimously.

MR. RAFAEL. Article 9, para. 2, introductory sentence and 2a are to read:

Full members of the Executive Committee shall be :

- (a) *Holders of the offices of President, Chairman and Co-Chairman of the Executive Committee, Chairman of the Budget Committee, Treasurer and Co-Treasurer;*

The proposal was adopted unanimously.

MR. RAFAEL: Article 11, para. 2 is to read:

The officers other than the Co-Chairman of a Branch of the Executive Committee shall be elected at the Plenary Assembly. Upon the nomination of a Branch of the Executive Committee, the Executive Committee may elect a Co-Chairman of a Branch.

The proposal was adopted unanimously.

MR. RAFAEL: Article 13 is to read:

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.

The proposal was adopted unanimously.

MR. RAFAEL: Article 9, para. 4 is to read:

Honorary officers and honorary members of the Executive Committee shall be such persons as may be elected by the Plenary Assembly.

The proposal was adopted unanimously.

MR. RAFAEL: Now as to other resolutions: The initiative concerning the Goldmann Institute was taken by groups from Great Britain and Canada and Mr. Halévy who was the chairman of the sub-Committee in question will submit the resolution.

I wish to say a word about a letter in the (London) *Times* by the Honorary Secretary of Agudah Israel (Mr. Springer) who thinks fit to point out that there are in existence five world Jewish organizations and that Congress represents only a small part of the Jewish people. Needless to say that representatives of 40 communities in various countries are gathered here. Besides, Poale

Agudat Israel is affiliated with Congress.

DR. TARTAKOWER pointed out that the speaker's last remark, although outside the report of the Organization Commission, expressed the sentiment of all present.

DR. SCHWARZBART: Concerning Mr. Rafael's last remark, I hold that a reply in the *Times* is in order and the matter should be referred to the Political Department in London.

DR. TARTAKOWER agreed.

MR. JACOB HALEVY (*Great Britain*): I now have the pleasure to introduce one of the most significant resolutions—it deals with an honour to our great President, Dr. Nahum Goldmann. It is no accident that Nahum Goldmann has many responsibilities in Jewish life: the presidency of Congress, the Zionist Organization, the Claims Conference and others. To these three presidencies he gives his time, energy and health. Whether you are of the opinion that great periods of history beget great leaders or that great leaders create great periods, it is perfectly clear that great men contribute to a large extent to the development of great events in history. Dr. Goldmann has said that no one is indispensable, but in the absence of a certain force, although life will still go on, it will go on at a much slower tempo. We know that in the absence of Dr. Goldmann, none of the activities in which he works would have reached the success that it has, or would have made the contribution to Jewish life, which it has. He realizes that an entire people is made up of individuals, and that there must be flexibility and he manifests a true understanding of the psychology of the individual and shows much magnanimity in his treatment not only of his friends, but of his antagonists. He has great courage and manifests great powers of persuasion, due to the inexorable force of his logic, coupled with understanding for human frailty. He has love for his people—his whole being and his every action expresses it—and he often acknowledges the love of other leaders for the Jewish people.

But true love includes rebuke: his rebuke is tempered with affection and his warning with encouragement and he is always ready to sacrifice. I take the liberty of calling you the greatest Jew of our generation—your position is unique in a unique people. This resolution is only a small effort to perpetuate the respect of the World Jewish Congress.

RESOLUTION ON THE NAHUM GOLDMANN INSTITUTE

In recognition of the distinguished life-long leadership of Dr. Nahum Goldmann, President of the World Jewish Congress, in

contemporary Jewish life, and in particular appreciation of his statesmanlike contribution to the unity of World Jewry, the preservation of its cultural heritage, the protection of its rights and the strengthening of its links with Zion and Israel,

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress resolves that institution bearing his name be established in Israel, to serve as a living expression of the cultural and spiritual bonds which link Jewish communities in the Diaspora to Israel.

For the implementation of this decision, and to determine the form and extent of this project, the Assembly establishes a special Committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. Samuel Bronfman.

The following persons are elected as members of the Committee with power to co-opt:

*Professor Fritz Feigl (Brazil)
Mrs. Regina Feigl (Brazil)
Dr. Moises Goldman (Argentina)
Mr. Ira Guilden (U.S.A.)
Mr. Sol Kanee (Canada)
Dr. Arie Leon Kubovy (Israel)
Dr. Michael Landau (Israel)
Mr. Jacob Leichtman (U.S.A.)
Mr. Israel Pollak (Chile)
Dr. Joachim Prinz (U.S.A.)
The Marchioness of Reading (Great Britain)
Mr. Josef Rosensaft (Switzerland)
Mme. Marcelle Roubach (France)
Mr. Abel Shaban (South Africa)
Mr. Israel M. Sieff (Great Britain)
Dr. Arie Tartakower (Israel)
Mr. Michael Wix (Great Britain)*

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

DR. TARTAKOWER: We have not yet settled Mr. Rafael's proposal regarding the Congress and the World Zionist Organization.

DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN: As President of Congress and of the Jewish Agency, I wish to say that these two bodies co-operate pretty well. It has been a tradition that Congress does not undertake anything in matters relating to Israel without an understanding with the Agency. This practice prevailed when the Agency represented the State-to-be and it has remained unchanged since the establishment of Israel. This has been valid in the area of

Aliyah as well as in any other area. Suffice it to point out the co-operation of our Cultural Department and Dr. Steinberg on the one hand and the Agency's Cultural Department and Zalman Shazar on the other.

The prerogatives of the Agency sanctioned in an Israel law, are recognized by Congress and for that matter by each Jewish organization that engages in Israel affairs.

A resolution such as that proposed by Mr. Rafael would only give rise to rumours that something was not in order between the Congress and the Agency. I therefore ask that my presidential statement be considered as sufficient and that the Assembly refrain from a resolution that might cause misunderstandings.

MR. RAFAEL agreed with Dr. Goldmann.

2. REPORT AND RESOLUTIONS OF THE POLITICAL COMMISSION

DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN: I call on the chairman of the Political Commission:

DR. S. LEVENBERG (*Chairman, Political Commission*): We had seven sessions and had to set up a number of sub-committees to reach agreement on a number of controversial issues. We were constantly advised by Mr. Easterman and Dr. Perlzweig and the President gave us a comprehensive survey of world affairs from the Jewish point of view.

The first resolution deals with the desire for peace and international understanding as we of the Congress welcome every attempt at the relaxation of international tension. We as Jews are unable to overlook the fact that there are Jewish communities on both sides of the Iron Curtain. While welcoming the forthcoming Eisenhower-Khrushchev talks, we wish to warn against exaggerated hopes and delusions. If the talks should fail, the international situation may deteriorate further. Moreover Great Powers agreement on certain issues does not mean necessarily normalization of the position in the Middle East and peace between the Arab States and Israel. A more liberal trend in the U.S.S.R., which could come about, does not mean the religious and cultural self-expression for the Jews in the Soviet Union and the right of emigration.

We, in the Political Commission, could not accept the recommendations of one of our Congress participants that the Congress co-operate with certain peace movements. In accordance with well-established Congress policy, we must adhere to the principle that Congress is not a part of the world conflict and therefore cannot join organizations of a partisan character. I am now going to read

a resolution on the subject of peace and international understanding, which the Political Commission adopted unanimously, but we do have a votum separatum by Mr. Erem of Achdut Haavodah of Israel. There is also a special resolution on a similar subject dealing with peace submitted by the British Section. This is the text of the resolution:

RESOLUTION ON THE QUEST FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE

The Plenary Assembly warmly welcomes the initiative of the heads of the Governments of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. in inaugurating what the Congress profoundly hopes will prove to be a series of discussions with the participation of the leaders of the other Great Powers which will pave the way to the establishment of a new structure of international relations; expresses its hope that these statesmen, conscious of the yearning of their peoples for a just and enduring peace, will spare no effort to achieve agreements which will at once safeguard the security of the nations and relieve mankind of the state of nuclear warfare and the crushing burdens of armaments; urges that in due course the United Nations may be associated with the maintenance and development of these agreements so that they may be firmly based on the support of the international community.

As the heirs of the prophetic tradition which through all the changes of history has remained faithful to the vision of a world united in the service of justice and peace, and as the successors of the Jewish generations which endured the unspeakable horrors of war and international conflict, Jewish communities everywhere will take their place in the forefront of the struggle for a peace founded on mutual understanding and the reign of law.

The Plenary Assembly requests the Executive to take the necessary steps to implement this resolution and in doing so authorises it to consult with other appropriate organizations pursuing the same ends.

As I mentioned before the large majority of the Commission was in agreement with this resolution but we have before us a special amendment by our friend Mr. Erem.

Mr. Erem was called, but in his absence, DR. LEVENBERG read his amendment:

The World Jewish Congress welcomes the efforts now being made to put an end to the tension of war throughout the world. These efforts may eventually abolish the partitions between the

peoples and be conducive to closer co-operation between the countries on the basis of mutual respect.

2. The Jewish people dispersed all over the world and traditionally the first victim of international conflict and war tension considers the liquidation of the Cold War in the consolidation of world peace a fundamental condition to its physical existence and of national development.

3. The World Jewish Congress calls upon all peoples and governments to make an active contribution to the endeavours to end the fear of Cold War and to safeguard world peace. Thus the wonderful prophetic vision shall come true "And no nation shall bear arms against another nation and they shall not learn warfare".

DR. LEVENBERG: We, the large majority of the Political Commission, felt that our resolution, read a minute or two ago, expresses our feelings regarding the problems of peace and international understanding. For this reason, we wish to say that while we are not against Mr. Erem's amendment, we feel that our phrasing is better.

DR. GOLDMANN ruled that the resolution of the majority of the Commission had priority and put it to the vote. It was adopted.

MR. MAURICE ORBACH (*Great Britain*): A resolution like the following certainly needs no long reasoning to make it acceptable. All of us are well aware of the terrible consequences that nuclear warfare might have for all of us. I would like you to accept this

RESOLUTION ON NUCLEAR TESTS AND DISARMAMENT

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress holds it to be a solemn obligation to call upon the Great Powers to take steps to halt the armaments race and to concert measures which by a controlled and progressive scheme of disarmament will deliver mankind from the burden of fear.

The World Jewish Congress representing Jewish Communities and organizations in more than 60 countries with the most varied social economic systems, shares to the full the deep anxiety with which all mankind is afflicted in the knowledge that nuclear armament is capable of destroying humanity.

It urges that decisions be taken under conditions which will safeguard the security of all nations, to bring about the cessation of nuclear tests.

It sees in the cessation of tests an important first step in an international effort to secure the halting of the manufacture of nuclear arms, and thereafter their abolition within the framework of a balanced and massive disarmament, on which a new structure of international relations can be built.

The resolution was adopted.

DR. LEVENBERG: The work of the Congress at the United Nations is one of the most important fields of Congress activity. Congress was the first Jewish body to be granted consultative status under Article 71 of the Charter. Congress was represented at all the meetings of the Economic and Social Council, the Commission of Human Rights, the Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities. It also took an active part in the meetings of the High Commission for Refugees, UNICEF and the International Labour Organization, not to mention the prominent part played by our Cultural Department in the work of UNESCO.

RESOLUTION ON THE UNITED NATIONS

The World Jewish Congress takes the opportunity of its Fourth Plenary Assembly to reaffirm its wholehearted support of the United Nations and of the principles and purposes embodied in its Charter.

The Jewish people, committed by an immemorial tradition to the service of the causes of peace and humanity, and instructed by the lessons of a long and tragic experience, sees in the United Nations the principal secular instrument of mankind in the struggle for the establishment of an international community of sovereign and independent states based on the rule of law.

Accordingly, the Congress calls on all its affiliated communities and organizations throughout the world to mobilize every moral resource in support of the United Nations and to co-operate actively with all other like-minded groups in the struggle for the implementation of the principles and purposes of the United Nations throughout the whole field of international relations.

The Plenary Assembly records its warm appreciation of the unflinching understanding and help received by representatives of the Congress at the United Nations from members of the Secretariat. It desires at the same time to pay tribute to the devotion and integrity with which the Secretariat, under the distinguished

leadership of the Secretary-General, has served the interests of the international community. Not the least of its services has been to give visible expression to the ideal of a united humanity through an international civil service which, rising above national and partisan interests, serves the common cause of all mankind.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

DR. LEVENBERG then read the
**RESOLUTION ON THE 40th ANNIVERSARY OF THE
FOUNDING OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR
ORGANIZATION**

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress desires to express to the governing bodies of the International Labour Organization, to its distinguished Director-General and to its Secretariat, its warm congratulations on the occasion of the 40th Anniversary of the Founding of the International Labour Organization.

The International Labour Organization has not only made a massive and historic contribution to the development of progressive legislation in relation to standards of employment, labour relations, the elimination of discrimination and allied fields, but it has also rendered an outstanding service to the international community in maintaining in the teeth of difficulties created by wars and revolutionary changes, the belief in an international community of interests in the social field.

The Plenary Assembly recalls that the International Labour Organization was founded as part of the effort to create a new structure of international relations following the First World War, and that it is the only inter-governmental organization which survived the ordeals of the Second World War and its aftermath. The Plenary Assembly sees in the continued vitality and effectiveness of the ILO a symbol of the resolve of enlightened men everywhere to secure the victory of the ideal of creative international co-operation over war and international conflict. The Congress pledges its utmost support to the ILO in the fulfilment of its high aims.

It regards it as a high privilege to have been given the opportunity to make, within the limits of its capacity, its contribution to the work of the ILO, and it authorizes and instructs the Executive to spare no effort to continue to develop this co-operative relationship.

The resolution was adopted.

DR. LEVENBERG: I now read the

**RESOLUTION ON INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON
DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT**

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress warmly welcomes the adoption, at the annual meeting in 1958 of the International Labour Organization, of a Convention and Recommendations on the elimination of discrimination in employment; considers that these important additions to international legislation constitute major instruments in the struggle against discrimination, and it calls upon all its affiliated communities and organizations to make every effort to secure the ratification of the Convention and the adoption of the Recommendations by the governments of their countries, in accordance with their constitutional processes.

It records its gratification that Israel was the first country to ratify the Convention, and it expresses the hope that this example will be widely followed, so that the standards established by the International Labour Organization in this field may become recognized as the basis for legislative and administrative action everywhere in the civilized world.

MR. MOSHE EREM: I submit the following amendment: *The World Jewish Congress appreciates the work of the ILO in obtaining the ratification of the Convention on Elimination of Discrimination in Employment.*

However, national discrimination is in practice continued in employment and in the social field.

The World Jewish Congress recommends that the ILO control the states that have ratified the above convention in order to make sure that it is carried out in practice.

DR. LEVENBERG: There is really no difference of opinion between the view of the majority of the Commission and the amendment introduced by Mr. Erem. As far as the first two paragraphs of this amendment are concerned, they are really contained in the general resolution. In his third paragraph Mr. Erem suggests that the International Labour Office should have the power of control. The ILO would also have the right to control whether conventions are implemented or not. Our experts were of the opinion that this is not realistic at the present moment because the ILO has the right to recommend conventions only. I would urge Mr. Erem to allow this amendment to be sent to the Executive for further study of the whole problem.

Mr. Erem withdrew his amendment. The resolution of the majority of the Commission, as read by Dr. Levenberg was there-upon adopted.

DR. LEVENBERG: I now read the

RESOLUTION ON RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress regards racial discrimination in whatever form as one of the greatest obstacles to a satisfactory settlement of basic international conflicts and peaceful co-operation among peoples.

It condemns the policies aiming at suppressing and foiling the legitimate claims of subject racial groups for political and social emancipation.

It expresses its conviction that such attempts hold up progress, increase bitterness in human and international relations and delay full equality of all without racial discrimination.

The Plenary Assembly reminds Jews everywhere that Jewish ethical teachings, as well as the long history of their persecution, place upon Jews a special responsibility to work for the recognition of the dignity and equal rights of all human beings.

The resolution was adopted.

DR. LEVENBERG: I now read the

RESOLUTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF STATELESSNESS

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress profoundly regrets the failure of the Geneva Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Elimination of Statelessness to arrive at an agreement.

This failure leaves multitudes of persons, innocent of any offence, subject to the disabilities of statelessness, many of them in the countries of their residence, with virtually no hope of achieving the protection of nationality.

The Plenary Assembly recalls that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights affirms that everyone has a right to a nationality.

Accordingly, an obligation rests on the international community to ensure that this right may be exercised by those to whom it is now denied.

The Plenary Assembly urges that the United Nations should,

with as little delay as possible, take the necessary steps to ensure the holding of an inter-governmental conference which, on the basis of further studies of the problem, will formulate and achieve agreement on a convention on the elimination of statelessness.

The resolution was adopted.

DR. LEVENBERG: I now read the

RESOLUTION ON REFUGEE YEAR

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress records its wholehearted support of the objectives of the Refugee Year proclaimed by the United Nations and regards it as a solemn obligation to render any service in its power to help in the effort to ensure their achievement; calls upon all its affiliated communities and organizations to co-operate with their governments and national organizations in support of the international effort.

MR. EREM: The resolution as far as it goes is all right. However, there are Arab refugees also. We may be asked what we are doing to solve their problem. I think we should say openly what Israel has done for the Arab refugees and state the situation as it is. I therefore propose that in addition to adopting the resolution of the Commission, we should also adopt the following:

RESOLUTION ON THE ARAB REFUGEES

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress notes with satisfaction the understanding for the grave plight of the Arab refugees shown from the beginning by the Government of Israel, although the Arab refugees left the country of their own accord or under pressure of the Arab leadership. The Israel Government has repeatedly declared itself ready to extend its effective help in the resettlement of the Arab refugees in the countries to which they have fled and to assist them in their constructive rehabilitation. During recent years the Israel Government has readmitted tens of thousands of Arab refugees within the framework of the scheme for the reunification of families.

The Congress invites the attention of international institutions to the fact that the miserable plight of the Arab refugees is being exploited deliberately so as to keep alive the hate campaign against the State of Israel and to maintain the atmosphere of war in the Middle East.

DR. LEVENBERG: I personally have no objection against the

supplementary resolution on Arab refugees as submitted by Mr. Erem.

There being no opposition, the resolutions on World Refugee Year and on the Arab Refugees were adopted.

DR. R. MARKMAN (*Brazil*): I want to submit, in the name of the Brazilian delegation, a proposal to express thanks to the President of Brazil, Dr. Juscelino Kubitschek for admitting into Brazil, during the last two years, more than 5,000 Jews from Egypt, Morocco, India and some from Poland and Rumania.

DR. GOLDMANN: We should not take a vote on that resolution. This is our practice, otherwise we would have to adopt many resolutions. However, the facts that our friend Markman stated are correct. All Latin American countries helped, but Brazil was the most liberal in admitting Jews in recent years, particularly Jews from Egypt.

There were other countries in other parts of the world that also helped, in particular Australia and Canada. They were liberal in their immigration also towards Jews who needed countries to emigrate to, who did not go to Israel. Such countries deserve our thanks. I therefore express our thanks, *ex presidio*, to Brazil and our friends from that country are empowered and requested to transmit, without a formal resolution, our appreciation to the Brazilian Government and President Kubitschek, for their liberal policy. Thus the desire of our friends from Brazil is satisfied and we do not need a formal resolution.

DR. LEVENBERG: The next resolution deals with the problem of Jewish refugees from Egypt. This ancient and once large Jewish community now has a population of not more than 10 to 15 thousand. The British and French Governments have signed agreements regarding the property of their citizens but the Jewish citizens of Britain and France are still experiencing tremendous difficulties in getting back their property. Of special gravity is the position of the stateless Jews from Egypt who are unable to get their property after they were compelled to flee.

RESOLUTION ON JEWISH REFUGEES FROM EGYPT

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress expresses to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees its appreciation of his sympathetic interest and assistance to the Jewish refugees who became victims of the confiscatory measures of the Egyptian Government in 1956 and 1957. It is confident

that, with the possible co-operation of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, he will continue his assistance in order to obtain full and appropriate compensation for those who suffered from these measures, points out that, on the other hand, the confiscatory measures inflicted in 1956 and 1957 upon citizens of different nationality were the subject of agreements between Egypt and their Governments but Jews have so far been practically unable to benefit by these agreements through being denied the right to return to Egypt in order effectively to protect their interests. This constitutes an inadmissible act of racial persecution in violation of the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to which Egypt has acceded, and calls urgently upon the United Nations and all governments to impress the Egyptian Government on the need for ending this discrimination.

The resolution was adopted.

DR. LEVENBERG: I am now going to read a resolution dealing with the compensation for victims of Nazism of Rumanian, Polish and Hungarian origin.

COMPENSATION CLAIMS—VICTIMS OF NAZISM

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress takes note of the report on the steps taken by the World Jewish Congress to obtain compensation for the Jewish victims of Nazi persecution in Rumania and for the other Rumanian, Polish and Hungarian Jews who left their countries after 1st October, 1953, and who therefore, were unable to claim compensation and urges the Executive to continue with the utmost energy its efforts to assure the satisfaction of the just claims of these victims.

The resolution was adopted.

DR. LEVENBERG: I now read the

RESOLUTION ON JEWISH WAR GRAVES AND CEMETERIES

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress calls for proper measures to be taken for the protection of the mass graves of Jewish martyrs who perished during the Nazi holocaust in Europe, and for the restoration and maintenance of the cemeteries of destroyed Jewish communities.

The resolution was adopted.

DR. LEVENBERG: I come to the resolution dealing with Austria, which is in two parts:

RESOLUTION ON AUSTRIA

1. *Indemnification for Jewish Nazi Victims in and from Austria :*

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress deplores the fact that both Austria and Germany have not, so far, accepted their responsibility to pay Austrian victims of Nazi persecution adequate compensation for their losses and sufferings.

It calls on the Governments of Austria and the German Federal Republic to recognize their responsibility to redress the wrongs inflicted upon these victims and to satisfy without delay their legitimate claims.

2. *Anti-Semitism and Neo-Nazism in Austria :*

The Plenary Assembly protests strongly against the reprieve of Austrian Nazi criminals who were justly convicted and sentenced to long terms of imprisonment for the mass murder of Jews. This unwarranted mitigation diminishes confidence in the sense of justice of the competent Austrian authorities.

The Plenary Assembly calls for a speedy and thorough investigation by the Austrian authorities into the grave crimes committed in and outside Austria by Austrian Nazis against Jews which to a considerable extent have gone unpunished, so far.

DR. HANS TAUBER (Great Britain): Austrian responsibility is based on her criminal behaviour towards the Jews after Austria was occupied by Germany and the place of Jews in the Austrian economy was taken over by other sectors of the community, who still benefit from this take-over. German responsibility is based on the German occupation of Austria. There was anti-Semitism in Austria and the German occupation triggered off the subsequent persecutions. Thus, both Austria and Germany are responsible. The economic situation of the Jewish Nazi victims in and from Austria amply justifies full compensation.

The resolution was adopted.

DR. LEVENBERG: The next resolution deals with the Federal German Republic.

RESOLUTION ON THE FEDERAL GERMAN REPUBLIC

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress recognizes that the Government of the Federal German Republic, under the Chancellorship of Dr. Konrad Adenauer and with the

full support of the Bundestag, is fulfilling its obligation under the Luxembourg Agreements of 1952 designed to meet collective Jewish material claims.

The Federal German Republic has also enacted legislation designed to indemnify individual Jewish victims for personal losses and injury inflicted on them through Nazi persecution. The World Jewish Congress points out, however, that there are deficiencies in the scope of this legislation and defects in its application, which cause hardship and delay in payment. The Congress urges the German authorities to remedy these defects.

The Plenary Assembly views with deep concern the reappearance of former Nazis in key positions in the administrative and judicial services of the Federal Republic as well as the re-emergence and activity of former Nazis and of neo-Nazi elements which seek to revive Hitlerite doctrines and to incite the German people to hatred against the Jews.

The Congress has consistently urged the leaders of post-war Germany to initiate and to carry out, by legislation and otherwise, a comprehensive programme of social and political education, especially of German youth, designed to eliminate Nazi influences from German public life, to cause the German people to comprehend the enormity of the Nazi crimes, and to prevent any anti-Semitic revival.

The German authorities themselves concede that the measures taken so far have proved inadequate, as demonstrated by recent anti-Semitic publications and incidents.

The Congress expects that the German authorities will take effective measures, legal and education, to combat neo-Nazi tendencies and activities.

DR. LEVENBERG: Two friends, Mr. Benari and Mr. Erem, have each introduced a special votum separatum.

MR. YEHUDA BENARI (Israel): In my submission, relations between nations cannot be based exclusively on "Realpolitik" approaches. Relations between nations must remain based on certain moral issues and especially small nations must always remember that the day will come when they too will be faced with the problem of "Realpolitik" approach from their opponents. The day will come when they too must appeal to the nations of the world for the same moral and ethical values which they are today inclined to disregard. We are told that Germany today is not the main political factor as it used to be in Europe, consequently there is no danger of German appearance as a military factor. This is, in our submission, a wrong approach.

All of us recognize the sovereignty of the State of Israel, but there are problems which not even Israel can take upon herself without consulting the opinion of other nations. Israel is a sovereign state, but the Jewish community of Israel is only a part of world Jewry. The quarrel between us and the German nation is a quarrel between the Jewish people and the German nation, and no part of Jewry, even the most holy part for us, the sovereign State of Israel, can take upon herself to solve the problem of relations between us and Germany.

Consequently I am submitting a resolution against German rearmament.

MR. MOSHE EREM: The votum separatum is being made by myself and Mr. Arzi. I want to say that in various matters our resolutions may or may not meet with a proper response from the world at large. But on the question of Germany, a resolution by Congress will certainly meet with a response, because the world remembers what Germany did to the Jewish people. My resolution reads:

The World Jewish Congress notes with uneasiness the tendency to make peace with the rearmament of Germany, which has caused the destruction of a third of the Jewish people. It appeals to all the nations to remember what an armed Germany has caused to the whole world as well as to the Jewish people. It speaks out against the rearmament of West Germany and of East Germany and against the repetition of a danger of a new catastrophe.

DR. LEVENBERG: First let me say that Mr. Benari was supported by no one in the Commission. The proposal made by Mr. Erem had only the support of Mr. Arzi.

The majority of the Commission does not differ with the sentiments, but differs with the style of the wording. Furthermore, the Jewish people has not been silent on the question of German rearmament. The Knesset unanimously adopted a resolution against the rearmament several years ago. The previous Assembly of the World Jewish Congress did likewise. The expressions of Jewish sentiment were unsuccessful. In all political matters the question of timing is relevant. The large majority of the Commission is of the opinion that it is neither politically nor diplomatically advisable just now to adopt another resolution. The large majority of the Commission hold that this Assembly should not adopt a resolution pro or con.

DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN: We are not going to vote for or against on the two vota separata because voting against could be

interpreted that we are for German rearmament. This is not the case. Therefore I rule that we should table the *vota separata* and ask for a vote on whether the proposals should be tabled.

The resolution of the majority of the Commission as read by Dr. Levenberg was adopted.

DR. LEVENBERG: I now read the

RESOLUTION ON THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress notes with regret that the German Democratic Republic (East Germany) has shown no sign of readiness to meet Jewish material claims arising out of Nazi persecution and hopes that this attitude will be changed in the light of future developments.

The Assembly notes with concern that former Nazis are occupying important positions in the public life of the German Democratic Republic.

The resolution was adopted.

DR. LEVENBERG: I am now going to deal with the problem of freedom of emigration. About four million Jews are deprived today of the right of emigration and this is the text adopted unanimously by the Political Commission:

RESOLUTION ON FREEDOM OF EMIGRATION

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress calls the attention of Member States of the United Nations to the fact that freedom of emigration is one of the fundamental rights internationally recognized in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which stipulates:

"Everyone has the right to leave any country including his own, and to return to his country."

It deplores that the exercise of this freedom has been impeded by certain States which approved the Universal Declaration and solemnly declared their intention of respecting and implementing its provisions.

The Assembly charges its Executive to continue by all available means to ensure that the Jews of all lands shall be able to avail themselves of the right of freedom of emigration, if they desire to do so.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

DR. LEVENBERG: I next read the

RESOLUTION ON EMIGRATION FROM RUMANIA

In view of the tragic situation of many thousands of Jews, both in Rumania and Israel, who have been separated for years from their nearest relatives and dependents, because of their inability to obtain the Rumanian Government's permission to leave the country, and recalling with satisfaction that, in 1958, the Rumanian Government took measures to relieve the sufferings of the unhappy families concerned, by granting exit permits to those Jews who sought to rejoin their kinsfolk in Israel :

the Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress, while expressing to the Rumanian authorities appreciation of their understanding of the problem and their desire to meet it, appeals to the Rumanian Government to resume its humanitarian action, unfortunately interrupted during recent months, and to relieve a sad situation by granting facilities to enable broken families to be brought together again.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

DR. LEVENBERG: The next resolution is on Soviet Jewry. This question was considered with the utmost seriousness. We had special sub-committees and this resolution is an expression of opinion shared by a very large majority of the Political Commission

RESOLUTION ON SOVIET JEWRY

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress has concerned itself with the political, economic and human rights of Jews in all lands. As it faces the problems of Jewry of today, it is inevitably concerned with the great segment that lives in the Soviet Union. The absence of representatives of our fellow Jews from the Soviet Union to express their views and participate in our deliberations has been a cause for deep regret on the part of this Assembly.

The Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress holds it to be the inalienable right of Jewish communities everywhere, irrespective of the political and social regimes under which they live, to establish and maintain representative organizations and religious, cultural and social institutions designed to maintain the identity and continuity of Jewish life, to preserve its traditions, spiritual and cultural values, and to enable Jewish citizens to make

their distinctive contribution to the life of the countries of their citizenship.

The Congress regards this as an integral part of the right of Jews to live as free citizens with full participation in the educational, social economic and political life of their countries and without discrimination because of their faith or their identification as part of the Jewish people.

Accordingly, the Congress respectfully urges all governments to secure to every citizen full opportunity for collective religious or cultural self-expression, to take the necessary legislative and administrative measures to facilitate and safeguard the exercise of this fundamental right.

The Plenary Assembly deems it its duty to draw the attention of the Soviet authorities to the fact that the Jews of the Soviet Union do not have the necessary means, such as are available to other nationalities and ethnic groups in the form of publishing houses, periodicals, theatres and other cultural and educational institutions, to maintain and develop their spiritual heritage in Hebrew and Yiddish.

The Assembly declares that, unlike other religious communities, Jewish religious congregations in the Soviet Union have no central organization to serve common objectives and to take care of ritual services and similar activities indispensable to the maintenance of religious life. The sacred right and opportunity to worship in accordance with their faith, openly and with dignity, is essential to the religious freedom of Jews as of all men.

The Congress regrets the fact that Soviet Jewry is denied the opportunity to participate in Jewish life as a whole and to co-operate with other Jewish communities. This state of affairs has caused concern throughout Jewish communities and beyond; and this has been deepened through the recent closing of a number of synagogues and prayer houses.

It urges the Soviet Union and its leaders to assure to the Jewry of the U.S.S.R. the exercise of all these rights. We appeal, too, to the Soviet Government to give the opportunity to those who desire it to join their families and fellow-Jews in Israel.

At this moment in world history, when men seek to remove misunderstandings and to promote an international climate in which new forms of co-operation and co-existence may be developed, we urge the Soviet Union and all other countries to translate the ideals of human rights into a living reality for all men.

MR. ARZI (Israel): Mr. Erem and myself made a proposal in the Political Commission and in connection with it, we want to

declare as follows: the Jewish problem in the Soviet Union is painful and complicated. The Assembly must speak out. The two and a half million Jews in the U.S.S.R. have national rights. Such rights should apply to the Jewish people also. It is not correct to say that the Jewish people does not need such rights. The Sholem Aleichem celebrations prove that the Jewish people in the U.S.S.R. wants to have its own national cultural life. We have respect for the religious feelings of the Soviet Jews, knowing full well that in such religious feelings, national feelings also are expressed. However, Jews in the U.S.S.R. are not only a religious group. The problem has broader range. We are categorically against forced assimilation as a solution of the Jewish problem. We demand national, cultural and religious rights. The Soviet Jewish population must be permitted to maintain its ties with the Jewish people, and those who want to go to Israel must have the right to do so. Congress, whose main task it is to safeguard the rights of the Jewish communities everywhere, will, we believe, find the right way to express the positive demands with regard to the Jewish community in the U.S.S.R., aiming to maintain peaceful relations with all nations and all regimes everywhere, and avoiding anything that could be interpreted as an expression of a hostile attitude toward the Socialist countries. We believe that the just demands will in time be recognized by the Soviet authorities.

Having seen in the Political Commission all variations of the resolutions, some items of which are, in our opinion, harmful; seeing in the majority resolution just now proposed here an expression of moderation; and desiring to facilitate a united vote, we declare that maintaining our opinions in principle, we do not wish to have a vote on our proposal but join in the general resolution.

DR. YEHUDA BENARI (*Israel*): The resolution which I submitted in the Commission had another approach to the problem before us. Naturally it had other conclusions. However, in view of the hostile Soviet attitude towards Jewry, we must present a united resolution and I hereby withdraw my resolution.

DR. LEVENBERG: As the chairman of the Political Commission, I want to say that like our friend Mr. Arzi, we welcome any improvement in the cultural area. In that respect there is no difference of opinion among us.

The majority resolution was adopted.

DR. GOLDMANN: I wish to express my appreciation to all friends, not only to those who have just spoken here, but also to the members of the U.S. delegation and to other members who had

a somewhat different approach but did not insist on expressing all their nuances. Thus a united resolution has become possible, and it will be more impressive than a split into a majority and minority would have been. I myself am convinced that the adopted resolution is statesmanlike. The tone is such that it makes possible talking to Soviet leaders without arousing the suspicion that we want to do harm to them. The Assembly by voting unanimously has acted wisely.

DR. LEVENBERG: I now read the

**RESOLUTION ON THE 2500th ANNIVERSARY OF THE
ESTABLISHMENT OF THE IRANIAN EMPIRE BY
CYRUS THE GREAT**

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress takes note of the information conveyed by the Delegation to the Assembly from Iran, that His Imperial Majesty the Shah and the Iranian Government are planning to celebrate in 1961 the 2500th Anniversary of the establishment of the Iranian Empire by Cyrus the Great.

Recognizing the outstanding importance of the place occupied by Cyrus the Great in the history of the Jewish people, the Plenary Assembly requests the Executive to associate the Congress with the international aspects of the celebrations; and it calls on all Jewish communities and congregations to commemorate in appropriate ways: the memory of a great and historic figure whose friendship for the Jewish people is enshrined in the Biblical record.

The Plenary Assembly takes the opportunity to express the warm congratulations of the Congress to His Imperial Majesty and his Government and people on this historic commemoration.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

DR. LEVENBERG: Dr. Moises Goldmann in the name of the delegations from Latin America and our friend Benjamin West have each made proposals on Jewish unity. Because such proposals should be more specific we have decided that these proposals should be handed over to the Executive Committee. The proponents, Dr. Moises Goldman and Mr. Benjamin West, have agreed.

Because it is of great importance for the representatives of the Jewish people to establish contact with the new peoples in Africa and Asia; which as you know is wisely being done by Israel, the Commission submits the following resolution:

RESOLUTION ON ASIA AND AFRICA

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress draws attention to the importance of imparting reliable information about the Jewish people to public opinion in Asia and Africa. It urges the Executive to establish suitable machinery for this purpose.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

DR. LEVENBERG read the

DECLARATION ON ISRAEL

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress salutes in the State of Israel not only the fulfilment of an immemorial Jewish hope, but one of the greatest creative achievements in the history of the contemporary world.

In the course of a decade it has received and absorbed a million immigrants, who have found not only a refuge but a national home. Through the development of industry, the multiplication of agricultural settlements and the establishment and extension of great institutions of religion and learning, Israel has built a society which has given a new quality to Jewish life everywhere and created a new public image of the Jews;

The Plenary Assembly expresses the sentiment of all Jewish communities in pledging its utmost support to Israel in the task of consolidating its economy and in its resolve to affirm and enjoy the rights and status of an independent sovereign state in its relations with other states in the international community, on the seas and in inland waterways, in accordance with the principles of international law;

records with sorrow the refusal of the Arab States to negotiate peace with Israel. The sustained and artificially stimulated hostility of certain Arab groups will only evoke from friends of Israel a strengthened resolve to sustain Israel in its affirmation of its rights; sends its warm fraternal greetings to the leaders and people of Israel: Be strong and of good courage.

The declaration was unanimously adopted.

DR. LEVENBERG: Mr. Erem proposed a resolution of his own on arms delivered to the Arab States by some Great Powers.

MR. EREM: My draft has at the last minute somehow disappeared. What I propose is a statement that even after a hoped for rapprochement between Eisenhower and Khrushchev, Israel

will not be safe if the flow of arms to the Arab States, who want to destroy Israel, is not stopped.

The Assembly should issue an appeal to all who have influence in international life to see to it that offensive weapons should not be delivered to the enemies of Israel.

DR. GOLDMANN: A resolution must be written down. Please do so.

DR. LEVENBERG: The majority of the Commission having just adopted the resolution or declaration on Israel, does not want to enter into a discussion of Mr. Erem's proposal and does not deal with it.

DR. LEVENBERG read the

**RESOLUTION ON FREEDOM OF NAVIGATION
—SUEZ CANAL**

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress declares that freedom of navigation is a vital interest of the international community. It urges that free passage of Israeli ships through the Suez Canal be effectively secured and guaranteed by the United Nations.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

DR. LEVENBERG read the

**RESOLUTION ON ISRAEL:
CO-OPERATION OF COMMUNITIES**

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress asserts that the fusion of immigrants from different communities is a basic aim of the creation of the State of Israel; calls upon the Jewish people and all its organizations to lend their wholehearted support to the efforts of the Government of Israel and the Jewish Agency in carrying out, as soon as possible, comprehensive schemes in the fields of education, culture, spiritual and material absorption; to assist in the liquidation of slums and temporary immigrant camps, in order to help the masses of immigrants and the poorer elements of the population to acclimatize themselves to conditions of life in Israel and to take their proper place in the public life of their country.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

DR. GOLDMANN expressed thanks to Dr. Levenberg, Chairman of the Political Commission.

CLOSING SESSION

August 11 1959 (Evening)

In the Chair: DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN

1. TRIBUTES

DR. GOLDMANN: Before we come to the business of the evening I wish to say a few words about two distinguished Jewish personalities who have passed away in the last few days. One is Zalman Schocken, for many years one of the leaders of German Zionism, collector of one of the greatest Jewish libraries, a man to whom I was close for some thirty years. His whole family is in Israel, where his sons are distinguished citizens. He was once governor of the Hebrew University and this is a great loss to Jewish culture.

Today I heard that one of the most lovable Yiddish poets has passed away: David Pinski, who died at the age of 88 in Israel. He moved to Israel in his old age and lived in Haifa. I believe he was connected with Congress, that he participated in the founding session in 1936. A poet and dramatist of talent he loved the Jewish masses and gave expression to their feelings.

The meeting rose in memory of these two illustrious Jewish personalities.

DR. GOLDMANN: We wish to congratulate Horace Kallen on his 77th birthday, a man who helped found the American Jewish Congress and a co-founder of Congress. He is one of the most brilliant figures in American Jewry, a thinker, philosopher and great teacher, one of the founders of the New School for Social Research and if I am not mistaken, he formulated the term *Cultural Pluralism*, which has been discussed here. Horace Kallen, despite his success and recognition in American general life, has stood courageously, with great loyalty and unique integrity, for every great Jewish idea.

PROFESSOR HORACE KALLEN (*United States*): I speak in Yiddish although it is not my mother tongue; it is perhaps my father's tongue. I learned Yiddish when I was twenty years old because I was converted to the Jewish idea. The language of American

Jews is not Yiddish, nor is it Hebrew. It is English. For the majority of today's Jewry in the United States, English is the language in which they read the Bible and other religious books.

The professional Jews who make a living out of being Jews and who believe that the every day life of the Jew is Jewish, are mistaken. The usual Jew does not make a living out of being a Jew, he is a worker or is in a liberal profession—or however he earns a living—and the language he uses in his occupation is not related to Judaism, to the Jewish language or to the Jewish religion. The question of language matters only to those who are rabbis, social workers dealing with Jews, or those in professions having to do with Jews.

Things are different when night comes. At night we spend or waste what we have earned during the day. We have a day life of work and a night life of leisure, of freedom from work. Judaism and Jewish interests are for most Jews something to be experienced at night, during the Sabbath and during the hours when they are not at work. The division between work hours and leisure hours creates the problem of how to harmonize our life of work during the day and our life of leisure at night, during the Sabbath and holidays.

There is also the problem of Cultural Pluralism which we must face. Not only we, but all men in today's world. We must work, on the basis of co-operative friendship, to overcome existing differences. We must respect one another. Today the technique of this co-operation is the main Jewish question to be solved.

2. NOMINATIONS

DR. GOLDMANN: We proceed with the nominations. The Presidium was also asked to act as Steering Committee, which they did. For those who do not know it, Congress is unique as far as the Executive is concerned. We do not elect persons here, we elect countries and allocate each country a number of seats, and we elect holders of certain jobs who are ex-officio members of the Executive. We will elect by name, only a limited number of officers. The countries later inform us how they fill the seats on the Executive. Because the real Executive will not be known for a few weeks, until all the countries have sent in their nominations, the old Executive continues until the new one is nominated de facto by the countries.

MR. ISRAEL SIEFF, *Chairman, European Executive*: We have had ten days of discussion, there have been conflicts of mind, of

view and of reason but we all aspire to attain the objectives. Resolutions have been passed by you and we have agreed to dedicate ourselves to the work which will help our people eventually to secure their survival.

Now we have come to the election of the men and women whom we desire to act for us in the work of Congress until we meet again, and I have the honour of proposing that Dr. Nahum Goldmann should again be elected President of Congress. It is agreeable for me and must be for you, to contemplate the type and quality of the man who has led us for so many years and I hope will guide us for many years more. This man, despite the heavy burdens which he shoulders, maintains not only his vitality but a flexibility and a depth of mind and spirit as well as tremendous poise and harmony.

I think you will all agree that we Jews have been fortunate in our leaders in modern Jewish history. We remember the magnetic Herzl, who created the will to achieve out of the dreams of millennia; then Chaim Weizmann translated this will into the creation of the modern Zionist movement and made it a reality; then Stephen Wise, with the burning zeal of a prophet, inspired for us the World Jewish Congress because he wanted for the Jews of the Diaspora, an instrument whereby world Jewry could be united if it wanted to secure its survival. Now in our time we have Nahum Goldmann, our eternally youthful leader, who has the courage and vision to assume responsibilities of those movements which were created by these three great leaders. The burdens since the war have been multiplied both in their importance and in their complexity. Our beloved President Nahum Goldmann steers his path guided by common sense, vision, courage, a sense of proportion and a great feeling for humanity. Of course, he has great teachers in the past, particularly in his early days—Chaim Weizmann and Stephen Wise. I have known our President for more than a generation, I have listened to his wonderful oratory and I have learned much when we sat together quietly and talked without inhibitions; he is a human being aware that he is human and that he is capable of erring. He is modest and is ever ready to listen to ideas but he knows what he wants and where he is going. We are fortunate in having a great leader, and I have the utmost pleasure to propose that Dr. Nahum Goldmann be confirmed in his office as President.

DR. GOLDMANN: I want to say a few words of thanks to the Assembly for what it has done. As far as the Institute is concerned, I thank you for the resolution and Mr. Bronfman, who agreed to

accept the chairmanship. I do not wish the House to be called Beth Goldmann, it should be called Beth HaCongress or Beth HaTefutzoth, or some name which indicates its purpose to be a geographical centre, the linking up of Israel with the Diaspora, which is one of the basic ideas for which we work.

I have a second wish, best expressed by a famous story. A schnorrer, coming hungry to a town, ordered a good meal at the best restaurant. At the end of the meal he said to the restaurant owner: "I have no money to pay you." When the restaurateur said he would call the police, the schnorrer answered: "That won't get your bill paid. You can do one of three things: (a) you can let me go schnorring and then trust me to pay you; (b) you can schnorr with me and take your share immediately; or (c) you schnorr yourself." I see you get the point, I shudder to think of the day when you come to me to request that I raise the money. I want to inform you that this is one of the burdens I will not take upon myself.

As to the nomination, I want to thank you and also my friend Israel Sieff. The fact that this Assembly did not discuss "who else" is not very healthy for the Congress. I never believed the indispensability of the man is good for the movement, nor is it good for him. It is not good for the movement if too much depends on one man, I said it frankly to the Organization Committee and I say it more cautiously to this Plenary Assembly. I am at an age and state of mind when I am beginning to retreat from many positions. One of the reasons why I did not hesitate to accept the nomination for another term is that we are lucky in bringing in new friends into the leadership of the movement, people like Israel Sieff who will open up for us groups and spheres of Jewish life to which we have not so much access. The leadership is too narrow for a movement of this character, there should always be a choice.

I hope that with the help of my colleagues elected tonight and others who will be nominated by their various countries, we will succeed in creating, during the next few years, a situation of leadership where I will stop being the natural choice. In the future we must begin to think of other possibilities. Having said this, I thank you for your confidence and promise you that if health and age permit me, I will try as best I can to discharge my obligations. I want to thank my colleagues who have allowed me to go on presiding while giving the Congress the little time that I give it because of many other responsibilities.

MR. SIEFF (in the chair): The nomination is carried unanimously.

DR. GOLDMANN: I call on Israel Goldstein who is not able to continue in the position he now holds and who will explain to you his reasons.

DR. ISRAEL GOLDSTEIN, *Chairman Western Hemisphere Executive*: It was a great opportunity for me to serve under the leadership of our President, and I want to thank you for the privilege of having served as chairman of the Western Hemisphere Executive for eight years. For personal reasons I shall not be in a position to give a long range commitment for active service on the American scene.

And while I am on my feet I wish to pay a debt of gratitude to the small Jewish communities which my wife and I were privileged to visit during the past seven months, on our travels around the world. The World Jewish Congress is unique in its concern with the small Jewish communities, the remote outposts of Jewish life, and for many years I personally have had a special feeling of responsibility for them. We went out of our way to bring a message of Jewish fellowship on behalf of the Congress to these small outposts, numbering in some cases 35 Jews, in other cases hundreds of Jews. Kampala in Uganda, Tokyo in Japan, Bangkok in Thailand, Rangoon in Burma, Karachi in Pakistan, Leopoldville in the Belgian Congo, Nairobi in Kenya and so on. During our travels we found very little anti-Semitism in Asia and Africa, the number of Jews being small, anti-Semitism springing from economic competition did not exist. In civilizations where Buddhism, Shintoism, Hinduism and simple paganism are the prevailing religions, the kind of anti-Semitism which sometimes stems from certain types of Christian indoctrination, does not exist. Jews face uncertainty, they do not expect to remain permanently in these small outposts. Even where there are Zionism, a synagogue and widely distributed JNF boxes, Jewish education is superficial. It consists mostly of Sunday Schools, even where the synagogue is orthodox. This is due mostly to the shortage of teachers; around the world, the most serious shortage of spiritual life is the lack of rabbis and teachers. There is a challenge to establish Jewish teacher training schools in central places which can supply teachers. For example in Melbourne they have a splendid Jewish Day School. It can easily add a Jewish teachers training school which could supply the needs of smaller towns in Australia and New Zealand and also to India and Singapore and all the English speaking communities of that part of the world.

The second half of this century I believe will be marked by the political, economic, social and cultural emancipation of the African peoples—we have a resolution indicating our interest in that field. Thanks to the fact that Israel has overthrown the yoke of colonialism, that Israel has abolished the colour line, thanks to Israel's co-operative institutions, there is a feeling of good will towards Israel which rubs off on the Jewish communities that live in their midst. It is important for the World Jewish Congress to encourage cultural exchanges between the African peoples and Israel, to introduce Jewish bookshelves into their libraries and universities. To help the survival of a single Jewish community is a matter of concern to the entire Jewish world.

DR. JOACHIM PRINZ (*U.S.A.*): Dr. Israel Goldstein has made it very easy for me to present his name to this Assembly. Since for personal reasons he cannot accept the position of Chairman of the Western Hemisphere Executive, and we want to assure ourselves of his service and of his wisdom, we submit his name—Dr. Israel Goldstein—to serve as the honorary Vice-President of the World Jewish Congress.

The name of the man to serve as Chairman of the European Executive, a post he has occupied for the last three years, is Mr. Israel Sieff, a man who in the last few years has become a member of our family.

To serve as the chairman of an executive branch which will become known as the North American Branch including the Jewish community of Mexico, the Presidium submits the name of a man who for decades has been active in Jewish life, the President of the Canadian Jewish Congress, a leader in his industry, a Zionist of old standing, Mr. Samuel Bronfman of Canada.

The South American Executive is a new branch, the fourth branch of our Executive. It is only natural that as leader for this Executive Branch there should be chosen a man who has served his community nobly as President of the DAIA of Argentina and who has now placed himself at the disposal of our movement, Dr. Moises Goldman.

I submit that the Israel Executive again be headed by a man who for many decades represents for us, who have been Zionists for many years, the creative contribution to Jewish life and to Israel, as he had in his European life, Professor Arie Tartakower.

I propose as Treasurer a man now serving as the national Chairman of the Commission on International Affairs of the American Jewish Congress; he is the founder of a settlement

called Boys Town in the State of Israel, who I am sure will serve us with devotion, Mr. Ira Guilden.

The last name is that of a man in the habit of speaking bluntly and directly, known to this movement for many years whose integrity we have never doubted, as Chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. Shad Polier.

I move that these persons be elected by this Assembly to the positions indicated.

DR. GOLDMANN: I assume from your applause that there is no opposition. I want to say a few words about the colleagues who assumed new offices—I am delighted that Israel Sieff's coming into the Congress has now been re-confirmed by this highest body. It is a great asset for us to have Sam Bronfman, not only because of his powerful position in the economic and industrial life of America, but because of his tremendous devotion—he has for many years been a member of our Executive. I want to say a word of welcome to Moises Goldman who is certainly not a newcomer to Congress, but who is new in this top responsibility in the Latin American Branch. Lastly a word to Ira Guilden, who is really a newcomer, but I know his activities in Jewish life and I think we should be delighted to have him here, and accept the responsibility of Treasurer, for he is a very serious worker and he knows that this is not an honorary position.

DR. PRINZ: I propose, in accordance with our constitution, that the holders of the following positions should be designated ex-officio members of the Executive by this Plenary Assembly: the Director of the Political Department in London, the Director of the International Affairs Department in New York, the Director of the Organization Department, the Director of the Cultural Department, the Director of the Institute of Jewish Affairs in New York, the Director of Co-Ordination, the Director of Organization in Israel, the Executive Secretary of the European Branch and the Director of our Paris office. In addition to these names, the Presidium recommends that the holders of the following offices should have a seat and voting rights in the Executive in all questions which concern their regions: the Director of the North African office, the Director of the Buenos Aires office, the Director of the Montevideo office, the Director of the Rio de Janeiro office and the Director of the Israel office.

DR. GOLDMANN: The Assembly only decides if the holders of these offices, whoever they may be during the coming period will be ex-officio members of the Executive. The first business of the Executive tomorrow will be to name the holders of these offices

so that they can immediately take their positions in the Executive.

DR. PRINZ: I propose in the name of the Presidium the following as honorary members of the Executive: Mrs. Rebecca Sieff and M. Edmond Fleg, M. Marc Jarblum, the symbol of Jewish life in France; Dr. M. Nurock, who participates to such an extent in the creative life of Israel, Dr. Arie Kubovy, formerly secretary-general of Congress, Ambassador of the State of Israel to the Republic of Argentina and now President of the Yad Vashem; Mr. Baruch Zuckerman, long time Zionist and founder of our movement, Dr. F. R. Bienenfeld, not merely a Jewish student of note but one who continues to contribute by his writing and his thinking to our work, Professor Fritz Feigl of Brazil, an outstanding Jewish leader of this community and an outstanding world renowned chemist, and Professor Horace Kallen, one of the great creative thinkers of America and dean of American philosophers.

DR. GOLDMANN: From your reaction, I take it they are elected.

DR. PRINZ: I present to you on behalf of the Presidium its proposals for 25 countries to be represented by full members and 10 additional countries to be represented by associated members. This is the key for the composition of the Executive Committee:

COUNTRY	FULL MEMBERS	ASSOCIATE MEMBERS
Algeria	2	—
Argentina	5	4
Australia	2	—
Austria	1	—
Belgium	1	1
Bolivia	—	1
Brazil	3	—
Canada	3	—
Chile	1	1
Colombia	1	—
Cuba	—	1
Denmark	—	1
Eire	—	1
France	4	3
Germany	1	—
Great Britain	5	4
Greece	—	1
Hungary	2	—
India	1	1

Iran	2	-
Israel	15	-
Italy	1	1
Mexico	1	-
Morocco	2	-
Netherlands	1	-
New Zealand	-	1
Peru	-	1
Rhodesia	-	1
Sweden	1	-
Switzerland	1	-
Tunisia	2	-
United States of America	16	6
Uruguay	1	1
Venezuela	-	1
Yugoslavia	-	1
TOTAL					75	32

DR. GOLDMANN: I assume that this key is approved. I want to add that South Africa has a special agreement with Congress and has the right to send a member to the Executive. South Africa is not included in the list because they are not fully associated. We have two associate organizations on the same basis, the World Union of OSE and the other the World Union of Jewish Students. They have no right to vote.

DR. PRINZ: The Presidium proposes the establishment of a permanent Budget Committee which should be composed of the Chairman of the Budget Committee, the Treasurer and one member of the Executive of the following countries: U.S.A., Great Britain, France, Argentina, Israel and Canada and the Director of Co-Ordination are to serve on this Committee ex-officio.

The Presidium proposes the establishment of a permanent Finance Committee composed of the Treasurer, the Co-Treasurer(s) and those members who will be invited to join this Committee.

3. CLOSURE OF SESSION

DR. GOLDMANN: I take it that these last two proposals are also accepted. Before closing, I would ask one of the few veterans of our movement, a co-founder of the Committee of Jewish Delegations, which played a historical role in securing Jewish rights in

the Peace Conference after the First World War, and without which probably the World Jewish Congress movement would not have been started, Dr. Joseph Tenenbaum, to make a few remarks.

DR. JOSEPH TENENBAUM (U.S.A.): I hope that what I have prepared will go into the record so that I do not have to read it here. This is an anniversary of Congress since we are celebrating the 40th anniversary of the Comité des Délégations Juives (its parent organisation). It all began in the Scandinavian countries with the appeal issued by the World Zionist Bureau in Copenhagen, with the support of the Poale Zion world representatives in Stockholm, to all the communities met together in Paris for the Peace Conference, in 1919. After this early beginning the 1st World Jewish Congress was held in 1936. As an historian of our great catastrophe, I want to mention that now in 1959, we return to Stockholm, the city of the great King Gustav V who so courageously intervened with Admiral Horthy to halt the slaughter of the Jews in Hungary, and the home towns of Raoul Wallenberg, the hero martyr of the Jewish cause. The World Jewish Congress is freedom's faithful guardian, freedom of Jewish life, the right of Jewish self determination as a people, as a religion or in the cause of human dignity.

DR. GOLDMANN: Again I wish to thank the Swedish Government and the Swedish Parliament for their gracious hospitality in putting at our disposal this wonderful building. I also want to express hope, on this occasion, that this great Swedish hero, Raoul Wallenberg, who saved thousands of Jews, may still be alive. I want to thank the Municipality of Stockholm for their hospitality. I want to thank the Swedish Section, the Jewish community of Stockholm and its President, the Israel Legation, and the members of the press for their hospitality, hard work and attention to this event, and those members of our staff who made all the local arrangements.

And now I want to say a few words in evaluating this session—I think all of us will agree on the whole it was a useful and good assembly. It was good because we had a large participation both in the number of countries and in the number of delegates, which was larger than we anticipated. The Assembly was dominated by a spirit of unity and I think the principle that Congress is based on territorial organizations and not on parties has once again proved to be a good basis for its functioning. This Assembly is characterized by a number of new aspects: it has brought something new into the routine and tradition of Congress. We have enlarged the Executive and created a new branch in Latin

America, which is quite a change in our structure. We have brought in new personalities. For the first time non-Jews appeared on the platform of Congress: representatives of the black people of Africa, a Catholic thinker and philosopher. In answer to those voices raised in Israel lately doubting if the time for international bodies had not passed, or if the Zionist movement is not sufficient, I think these voices are mistaken, for if Jewish global action and unity were necessary before, they are more than ever necessary today. It is plainly a lack of understanding for the problems of Jewish Galuth life, to think that every country could act on its own and that the only rallying point between them will be Israel. All our specific Jewish problems finally will depend on what will happen in the world at large. If there is peace and understanding, then Israel will have peace with the Arab world. The next four or five years will be crucial ones in Israel's economic development, for during this period the German payments will end, Israel will have lost one of its main sources of income in foreign currency and the Jewish people will have to fill the vacuum which will have been created.

From the point of view of Jewish life in the Diaspora, the next four or five years will also be crucial and we shall continue to try to breach the gap between the East and West. Although our friends from Poland are not satisfied with many of our resolutions, nevertheless I hope that we will continue to see them with us. We have not seen our Hungarian friends though they indicated that they want to be with us in principle.

There are not many organizations in Jewish life, except the Zionist Organization, which could have brought together 400 or 500 Jewish leaders from 45 countries—in itself a great thing. This too helps to cement Jewish unity. I hope all of you will have the feeling that somehow we all collectively and everyone of you individually have made a small contribution to the solution of our problems and that you will help create better conditions of life for our people, a life worthy of the dignity of man and of the unique destiny of our people.

RESOLUTIONS AND DECISIONS

A. POLITICAL RESOLUTIONS

1. THE QUEST FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress warmly welcomes the initiative of the heads of the Governments of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. in inaugurating what the Congress profoundly hopes will prove to be a series of discussions, with the participation of the leaders of the other great powers, which will pave the way to the establishment of a new structure of international relations;

expresses its hope that these statesmen, conscious of the yearning of their peoples for a just and enduring peace, will spare no effort to achieve agreements which will at once safeguard the security of all nations and relieve mankind of the threat of nuclear war and the crushing burden of armaments;

urges that in due course the United Nations may be associated with the maintenance and development of these agreements so that they may be firmly based on the support of the international community.

As the heirs of the prophetic tradition which through all the changes of history has remained faithful to the vision of a world united in the service of justice and peace, and as the successors of the Jewish generations which endured the unspeakable horrors of wars and international conflict, Jewish communities everywhere will take their place in the forefront of the struggle for a peace founded on mutual understanding and the reign of law.

The Plenary Assembly requests the Executive to take the necessary steps to implement this resolution and in doing so authorises it to consult with other appropriate organisations pursuing the same ends.

2. NUCLEAR TESTS AND DISARMAMENT

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress holds it to be a solemn obligation to call upon the Great Powers to take steps to halt the armaments race and to concert measures which by a controlled and progressive scheme of dis-

armament will deliver mankind from the burden of fear.

The World Jewish Congress, representing Jewish Communities and organisations in more than 60 countries with the most varied social economic systems, shares to the full the deep anxiety with which all mankind is afflicted in the knowledge that nuclear armament is capable of destroying humanity.

It urges that decisions be taken under conditions which will safeguard the security of all nations, to bring about the cessation of nuclear tests.

It sees in the cessation of tests an important first step in an international effort to secure the halting of the manufacture of nuclear arms, and thereafter their abolition within the framework of a balanced and massive disarmament, on which a new structure of international relations can be built.

In the name alike of our common humanity and of our Jewish heritage, it calls upon all those organised within our ranks to redouble their efforts in the struggle for a peace based on freedom and security for all nations.

3. THE UNITED NATIONS

The World Jewish Congress takes the opportunity of its Fourth Plenary Assembly to reaffirm its wholehearted support of the United Nations and of the principles and purposes embodied in its Charter.

The Jewish people, committed by an immemorial tradition to the service of the causes of peace and humanity, and instructed by the lessons of a long and tragic experience, sees in the United Nations the principal secular instrument of mankind in the struggle for the establishment of an international community of sovereign and independent states based on the rule of law.

Accordingly, the Congress calls on all its affiliated communities and organisations throughout the world to mobilise every moral resource in support of the United Nations, and to co-operate actively with all other like-minded groups in the struggle for the implementation of the principles and purposes of the United Nations throughout the whole field of international relations.

The Plenary Assembly records its warm appreciation of the unflinching understanding and help received by representatives of the Congress at the United Nations from members of the Secretariat. It desires at the same time to pay tribute to the devotion and integrity with which the Secretariat, under the distinguished leadership of the Secretary-General, has served the interests of the international community. Not the least of its services has been to give visible expression to the ideal of a united humanity through an international civil service which, rising above national and partisan interests, serves the common cause of all mankind.

4. 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress desires to express to the governing bodies of the International Labour Organisation, to its distinguished Director-General and to its Secretariat, its warm congratulations on the occasion of the 40th Anniversary of the founding of the International Labour Organisation.

The International Labour Organisation has not only made a massive and historic contribution to the development of progressive legislation in relation to standards of employment, labour relations, the elimination of discrimination and allied fields, but it has also rendered an outstanding service to the international community in maintaining in the teeth of difficulties created by wars and revolutionary changes, the belief in an international community of interests in the social field.

The Plenary Assembly recalls that the International Labour Organisation was founded as part of the effort to create a new structure of international relations following the first World War, and that is the only inter-governmental organisation which survived the ordeals of the second World War and its aftermath. The Plenary Assembly sees in the continued vitality and effectiveness of the I.L.O. a symbol of the resolve of enlightened men everywhere to secure the victory of the ideal of creative international co-operation over war and international conflict. The Congress pledges its utmost support to the I.L.O. in the fulfilment of its high aims.

It regards it as a high privilege to have been given the opportunity to make, within the limits of its capacity, its contribution to the work of the I.L.O., and it authorises and instructs the Executive to spare no effort to continue to develop this co-operative relationship.

5. INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress warmly welcomes the adoption, at the annual meeting in 1958 of the International Labour Organisation, of a Convention and Recommendations on the elimination of discrimination in employment;

considers that these important additions to international legislation constitute major instruments in the struggle against discrimination, and it calls upon all its affiliated communities and organisations to make every effort to secure the ratification of the Convention and the adoption of the Recommendations by the

governments and their countries, in accordance with their constitutional process;

records its gratification that Israel was the first country to ratify the Convention, and it expresses the hope that this example will be widely followed, so that the standards established by the International Labour Organisation in this field may become recognised as the basis for legislative and administrative action everywhere in the civilised world.

6. WORLD REFUGEE YEAR

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress

records its wholehearted support of the objectives of the Refugee Year proclaimed by the U.N. and regards it as a solemn obligation to render any service in its power to help in the effort to ensure their achievement;

calls upon all its affiliated communities and organisations to cooperate with their governments and national organisations in support of the international effort.

7. THE ELIMINATION OF STATELESSNESS

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress

profoundly regrets the failure of the Geneva Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Elimination of Statelessness to arrive at an agreement.

This failure leaves multitudes of persons, innocent of any offence, subject to the disabilities of statelessness, many of them in the countries of their residence, with virtually no hope of achieving the protection of nationality.

The Plenary Assembly recalls that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights affirms that everyone has a right to a nationality.

Accordingly, an obligation rests on the international community to ensure that this right may be exercised by those to whom it is now denied.

The Plenary Assembly urges that the U.N. should, with as little delay as possible, take the necessary steps to ensure the holding of an inter-governmental conference which, on the basis of further studies of the problem, will formulate and achieve agreement on a convention on the elimination of statelessness.

8. RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress

regards racial discrimination in whatever form as one of the greatest obstacles to a satisfactory settlement of basic international conflicts and peaceful co-operation among peoples;

It condemns the policies aiming at suppressing and foiling the legitimate claims of subject racial groups for political and social emancipation.

It expresses its conviction that such attempts hold up progress, increase bitterness in human and international relations and delay full equality of all without racial discrimination.

The Plenary Assembly reminds Jews everywhere that Jewish ethical teachings, as well as the long history of their persecution, place upon Jews a special responsibility to work for the recognition of the dignity and equal rights of all human beings.

9. ISRAEL

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress salutes in the State of Israel not only the fulfilment of an immemorial Jewish hope, but one of the greatest creative achievements in the history of the contemporary world.

In the course of a decade it has received and absorbed a million immigrants, who have found not only a refuge but a national home. Through the development of industry, the multiplication of agricultural settlements and the establishment and extension of great institutions of religion and learning, Israel has built a society which has given a new quality to Jewish life everywhere and created a new public image of the Jews;

The Plenary Assembly expresses the sentiment of all Jewish communities in pledging its utmost support to Israel in the task of consolidating its economy and in its resolve to affirm and enjoy the rights and status of an independent sovereign state in its relations with other states in the international community, on the seas and in inland waterways, in accordance with the principles of international law;

records with sorrow the refusal of the Arab States to negotiate peace with Israel. The sustained and artificially stimulated hostility of certain Arab groups will only evoke from friends of Israel a strengthened resolve to sustain Israel in its affirmation of its rights;

sends it warm fraternal greetings to the leaders and people of Israel: Be strong and of good courage.

10. ISRAEL: CO-OPERATION OF COMMUNITIES

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress asserts that the fusion of immigrants from different communities is a basic aim of the creation of the State of Israel;

calls upon the Jewish people and all its organisations to lend their whole-hearted support to the efforts of the Government of Israel and the Jewish Agency in carrying out, as soon as possible,

comprehensive schemes in the fields of education, culture, spiritual and material absorption; to assist in the liquidation of slums and temporary immigrant camps, in order to help the masses of immigrants and the poorer elements of the population to acclimatise themselves to conditions of life in Israel and to take their proper place in the public life of their country.

11. ARAB REFUGEES

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress notes with satisfaction the understanding for the grave plight of the Arab refugees shown from the beginning by the Government of Israel, although the Arab refugees left the country of their own accord or under pressure of the Arab leadership. The Israel Government has repeatedly declared itself ready to extend its effective help in the resettlement of the Arab refugees in the countries to which they have fled and to assist them in their constructive rehabilitation. During recent years the Israel Government has readmitted tens of thousands of Arab refugees within the framework of the scheme for the reunification of families.

The Congress invites the attention of international institutions to the fact that the miserable plight of the Arab refugees is being exploited deliberately so as to keep alive the hate campaign against the State of Israel and to maintain the atmosphere of war in the Middle East.

12. SOVIET JEWRY

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress has concerned itself with the political, economic and human rights of Jews in all lands. As it faces the problems of Jewry of today, is inevitably concerned with the great segment that lives in the Soviet Union. The absence of representatives of our fellow Jews from the Soviet Union to express their views and participate in our deliberations has been a cause for deep regret on the part of this Assembly.

The Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress holds it to be the inalienable right of Jewish communities everywhere, irrespective of the political and social regimes under which they live, to establish and maintain representative organisations and religious, cultural and social institutions designed to maintain the identity and continuity of Jewish life, to preserve its traditions, spiritual and cultural values, and to enable Jewish citizens to make their distinctive contribution to the life of the countries of their citizenship.

The Congress regards this as an integral part of the right of Jews to live as free citizens with full participation in the edu-

cational, social, economic and political life of their countries and without discrimination because of their faith or their identification as part of the Jewish people.

Accordingly, the Congress respectfully urges all governments to secure to every citizen full opportunity for collective religious or cultural self-expression, to take the necessary legislative and administrative measures to facilitate and safeguard the exercise of this fundamental right.

The Plenary Assembly deems it its duty to draw the attention of the Soviet authorities to the fact that the Jews of the Soviet Union do not have the necessary means, such as are available to other nationalities and ethnic groups in the form of publishing houses, periodicals, theatres and other cultural and educational institutions, to maintain and develop their spiritual heritage in Hebrew and Yiddish.

The Assembly declares that, unlike other religious communities, Jewish religious congregations in the Soviet Union have no central organisation to serve common objectives and to take care of ritual services and similar activities indispensable to the maintenance of religious life. The sacred right and opportunity to worship in accordance with their faith, openly and with dignity, is essential to the religious freedom of Jews as of all men.

The Congress regrets the fact that Soviet Jewry is denied the opportunity to participate in Jewish life as a whole and to co-operate with other Jewish communities. This state of affairs has caused concern throughout Jewish communities and beyond; and this has been deepened through the recent closing of a number of synagogues and prayer houses.

It urges the Soviet Union and its leaders to assure to the Jewry of the U.S.S.R. the exercise of all these rights. We appeal, too, to the Soviet Government to give the opportunity to those who desire it to join their families and fellow-Jews in Israel.

At this moment in world history, when men seek to remove misunderstandings and to promote an international climate in which new forms of co-operation and co-existence may be developed, we urge the Soviet Union and all other countries to translate the ideals of human rights into a living reality for all men.

13. FEDERAL GERMAN REPUBLIC

I

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress recognises that the Government of the Federal German Republic, under the Chancellorship of Dr. Konrad Adenauer and with the full support of the Bundestag, is fulfilling its obligations under the Luxembourg Agreements of 1952 designed to meet collective Jewish material claims.

against the Jews.

The Congress has consistently urged the leaders of post-war Germany to initiate and to carry out, by legislation and otherwise, a comprehensive programme of social and political education, especially of German youth, designed to eliminate Nazi influences from German public life, to cause the German people to comprehend the enormity of the Nazi crimes, and to prevent any anti-Semitic revival.

The German authorities themselves concede that the measures taken so far have proved inadequate, as demonstrated by recent anti-Semitic publications and incidents.

The Congress expects that the German authorities will take effective measures, legal and educational, to combat neo-Nazi tendencies and activities.

14. GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

The Federal German Republic has also enacted legislation designed to indemnify individual Jewish victims for personal losses and injury inflicted on them through Nazi persecution. The World Jewish Congress points out, however, that there are deficiencies in the scope of this legislation and defects in its application, which cause hardship and delay in payment. The Congress urges the German authorities to remedy these defects.

II

The Plenary Assembly views with deep concern the reappearance of former Nazis in key positions in the administrative and judicial services of the Federal Republic as well as the re-emergence and activity of former Nazis and of neo-Nazi elements which seek to revive Hitlerite doctrines and to incite the German people to hatred

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress notes with regret that the German Democratic Republic (East Germany) has shown no sign of readiness to meet Jewish material claims arising out of Nazi persecution and hopes that this attitude will be changed in the light of future developments.

The Assembly notes with concern that former Nazis are occupying important positions in the public life of the German Democratic Republic.

15. COMPENSATION CLAIMS—VICTIMS OF NAZISM

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress takes note of the report on the steps taken by the World Jewish Congress to obtain compensation for the Jewish victims

of Nazi persecution in Rumania and for the other Rumanian, Polish and Hungarian Jews who left their countries after 1st October, 1953, and who, therefore, were unable to claim compensation and urges the Executive to continue with the utmost energy its efforts to assure the satisfaction of the just claims of these victims.

16. AUSTRIA

1. *Indemnification for Jewish Nazi Victims in and from Austria*

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress

deplores the fact that both Austria and Germany have not, so far, accepted their responsibility to pay Austrian victims of Nazi persecution adequate compensation for their losses and sufferings.

It calls on the Governments of Austria and the German Federal Republic to recognise their responsibility to redress the wrongs inflicted upon these victims and to satisfy without delay their legitimate claims.

2. *Anti-Semitism and Neo-Nazism in Austria*

The Plenary Assembly protests strongly against the reprieve of Austrian Nazi criminals who were justly convicted and sentenced to long terms of imprisonment for the mass murder of Jews. This unwarranted mitigation diminishes confidence in the sense of justice of the competent Austrian authorities.

The Plenary Assembly calls for a speedy and thorough investigation by the Austrian authorities into the grave crimes committed in and outside Austria by Austrian Nazis against Jews, which to a considerable extent have gone unpunished, so far.

17. EMIGRATION FROM RUMANIA

In view of the tragic situation of many thousands of Jews, both in Rumania and Israel, who have been separated for years from their nearest relatives and dependents, because of their inability to obtain the Rumanian Government's permission to leave the country, and,

recalling with satisfaction that, in 1958, the Rumanian Government took measures to relieve the sufferings of the unhappy families concerned, by granting exit permits to those Jews who sought to rejoin their kinsfolk in Israel;

the Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress, while expressing to the Rumanian authorities appreciation of their understanding of the problem and their desire to meet it,

appeals to the Rumanian Government to resume its humanitarian action, unfortunately interrupted during recent months, and to relieve a sad situation by granting facilities to enable broken families to be brought together again.

18. JEWISH REFUGEES FROM EGYPT

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress

expresses to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees its appreciation of his sympathetic interest and assistance to the Jewish refugees who became victims of the confiscatory measures of the Egyptian Government in 1956 and 1957. It is confident that, with the possible co-operation of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, he will continue his assistance in order to obtain full and appropriate compensation for those who suffered from these measures,

points out that, on the other hand, the confiscatory measures The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress

calls the attention of Member States of the United Nations to the fact that freedom of emigration is one of the fundamental inflicted in 1956 and 1957 upon citizens of different nationality were the subject of agreements between Egypt and their Governments but Jews have so far been practically unable to benefit by these agreements through being denied the right to return to Egypt in order effectively to protect their interests. This constitutes an inadmissible act of racial persecution in violation of the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to which Egypt has acceded,

and calls urgently upon the United Nations and all governments to impress the Egyptian Government the need for ending this discrimination.

19. FREEDOM OF NAVIGATION — SUEZ CANAL

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress

declares that freedom of navigation is a vital interest of the international community. It urges that free passage of Israeli ships through the Suez Canal be effectively secured and guaranteed by the United Nations.

20. FREEDOM OF EMIGRATION

rights internationally recognised in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which stipulates:

“Everyone has the right to leave any country including his own, and to return to his country”.

It deplores that the exercise of this freedom has been impeded by certain States which approved the Universal Declaration and solemnly declared their intention of respecting and implementing its provisions.

The Assembly charges its Executive to continue by all available means to ensure that the Jews of all lands shall be able to avail

themselves of the right of freedom of emigration, if they desire to do so.

21. JEWISH WAR GRAVES AND CEMETERIES

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress calls for proper measures to be taken for the protection of the mass graves of Jewish martyrs who perished during the Nazi holocaust in Europe, and for the resolution and maintenance of the cemeteries of destroyed Jewish communities.

22. THE 2500TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE IRANIAN EMPIRE BY CYRUS THE GREAT

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress takes note of the information conveyed by the Delegation to the Assembly from Iran, that His Imperial Majesty the Shah and the Iranian Government are planning to celebrate in 1961 the 2500th Anniversary of the establishment of the Iranian Empire by Cyrus the Great.

Recognising the outstanding importance of the place occupied by Cyrus the Great in the history of the Jewish people, the Plenary Assembly requests the Executive to associate the Congress with the international aspects of the celebrations; and it calls on all Jewish communities and congregations to commemorate in appropriate ways the memory of a great and historic figure whose friendship for the Jewish people is enshrined in the biblical record.

The Plenary Assembly takes the opportunity to express the warm congratulations of the Congress to His Imperial Majesty and his Government and people on this historic commemoration.

23. ASIA AND AFRICA

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress draws attention to the importance of imparting reliable information about the Jewish people to public opinion in Asia and Africa. It urges the Executive to establish suitable machinery for this purpose.

B. CULTURAL RESOLUTIONS

24. CO-OPERATION WITH UNESCO

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress takes note, with great satisfaction, of the further development

of the co-operation between the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation and the World Jewish Congress in the period 1953-1959 and expresses the hope that this co-operation will be deepened and intensified for the benefit both of the Congress and UNESCO in consonance with the basic concept of the value of diversity in human culture which is a corner-stone of UNESCO's Constitution.

25. WORLD CONFERENCE ON JEWISH EDUCATION

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress welcomes the initiative taken by the Conference of Jewish Organisations to convene a World Conference on Jewish Education and expresses the readiness of the World Jewish Congress to give full support to such a Conference and to make every effort to secure its success.

26. JEWISH DAY SCHOOLS

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress regards Jewish schools as the fundamental instrument for Jewish survival in the Diaspora, and therefore calls upon Jewish communities everywhere to provide sufficient financial means for their establishment, maintenance and development,

notes with satisfaction the increase since the previous Plenary Assembly in the number of Jewish Day Schools and in the number of pupils receiving full-time Jewish education, including modern Hebrew.

27. JEWISH STUDENTS AND YOUTH

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress conscious of the ever-pressing needs for extending and intensifying specific work among Jewish students and youth, reaffirms its belief that the fullest assistance should be provided for all forms of endeavour carried on by Jewish students and youth in order to facilitate their work at all levels and to render possible a deeper understanding and closer co-operation between world Jewish organisations and students.

28. REGIONAL CULTURAL CONFERENCES

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress takes note of the successful regional conferences already held in South America and in Europe and believes that it is in the best interest of the expeditious implementation of its Cultural Programme that, subject to adequate budgetary provisions and

in the spirit of the resolution adopted by the World Executive in Geneva in 1958, similar regional conferences should be held prior to future sessions of the Plenary Assembly.

29. INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR JEWISH MUSIC

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress urges further support for the International Association for Jewish Music.

30. CULTURAL WORK

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress urges that Cultural Committees be established under the guidance of qualified personnel in all affiliated communities where these do not already exist;

recommends that the Cultural Department should encourage the closest co-operation between the various affiliated communities and national sections.

31. THE JEWISH JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress welcomes the publication of The Jewish Journal of Sociology and requests that the field of research dealing with sociological problems of the Jews be enlarged.

32. APPRECIATION OF PAST ACTIVITIES

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress has noted with satisfaction the consolidation and extension of the work of its Cultural Department under the devoted and inspired direction of Dr. A. Steinberg and believes that within the limited financial possibilities a real contribution has been made to vital spheres of Jewish culture.

33. BUDGETARY PROVISIONS

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress conscious of the immediate and continuing need for an intensification and widening of the influence of the cultural activities of the World Jewish Congress in initiating, assisting and implementing specific and general activities in the sphere of culture, maintains that a complete re-orientation is needed in the attitude towards the financial provisions made for this sphere of the World Jewish Congress activities,

urges that a first priority should be given in budgetary allocation for the work of the Cultural Department, and that a minimum of 20 per cent of the overall budget should be allocated for its work.

C. ORGANIZATIONAL RESOLUTIONS

34. ACHIEVEMENT OF JEWISH UNITY

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress

notes with satisfaction the efforts made by the Executive to implement the Resolution on Achievement of Jewish Unity adopted by the Third Plenary Assembly and the successful beginning made in this direction through the establishment of the Conference of Jewish Organisations between major Jewish organisations;

reiterates its previous stand that any new permanent organisation must be based on the following fundamental requirements:

1. A democratic organisation based on representation of such Jewish communities and organisations throughout the world as will accept the principle of the oneness of the Jewish people.
2. Executive organs authorised and equipped to speak and act on matters of common concern to the Jewish people throughout the world.
3. Participation in the organisation in no way to affect the autonomy of participants in regard to the internal and religious affairs of their respective communities nor to imply any authorisation to the organisation to interfere in the domestic political affairs of the country.

The Assembly also urges the Executive to continue its efforts to bring into the World Jewish Congress communities and organisations not yet affiliated to it.

35. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE BODIES

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress

calls upon the Executive Committee to continue its efforts to assist Jewish communities to establish central representative bodies in countries where no such institutions at present exist.

36. SEPHARDI AND ASHKENAZI JEWS

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress

expresses its appreciation of the constructive efforts already

made by the organisation in establishing closer ties between the Ashkenazim and the Sephardim, and calls upon the Executive Committee to persevere in these efforts.

37. NAHUM GOLDMANN INSTITUTE

In recognition of the distinguished long-life leadership of Dr. Nahum Goldmann, President of the World Jewish Congress, in contemporary Jewish life, and in particular appreciation of his statesmanlike contribution to the unity of World Jewry, the preservation of its cultural heritage, the protection of its rights and the strengthening of its links with Zion and Israel,

the Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress resolves that an institution bearing his name be established in Israel, to serve as a living expression of the cultural and spiritual bonds which link Jewish communities in the Diaspora to Israel.

For the implementation of this decision, and to determine the form and extent of this project, the Assembly establishes a special Committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. Samuel Bronfman.

The following persons are elected as members of the Committee, with power to co-opt:

PROFESSOR FRITZ FEIGL (*Brazil*)
MRS. REGINA FEIGL (*Brazil*)
DR. MOISES GOLDMAN (*Argentina*)
MR. IRA GULDEN (*U.S.A.*)
MR. SOL KANEE (*Canada*)
DR. ARIEH LEON KUBOVY (*Israel*)
DR. MICHAEL LANDAU (*Israel*)
MR. JACOB LEICHTMAN (*U.S.A.*)
MR. ISRAEL POLLAK (*Chile*)
DR. JOACHIM PRINZ (*U.S.A.*)
THE MARCHIONESS OF READING (*Great Britain*)
MR. JOSEF ROSENSAFT (*Switzerland*)
MME. MARCELLE ROUBACH (*France*)
MR. ABEL SHABAN (*South Africa*)
MR. ISRAEL M. SIEFF (*Great Britain*)
DR. ARIEH TARTAKOWER (*Israel*)
MR. MICHAEL WIX (*Great Britain*)

38. FOURTH BRANCH OF THE EXECUTIVE IN SOUTH AMERICA

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress resolves to establish a Fourth Branch of the Executive Committee in South America.

39. ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress resolves that the present Co-ordinating Committee shall be called "Administrative Committee" until further notice and that its composition shall be determined by the Executive Committee.

40. RE-ORGANISATION

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress expresses its appreciation to Mr. Israel M. Sieff for his earnest and strenuous efforts in preparing a re-organisation plan for the World Jewish Congress and considers this work a significant contribution to the future activities of the Congress.

Having closely examined the details of Mr. Sieff's proposal and listened to various views on the report, the Assembly resolves that the material shall be transmitted to the Executive Committee for further consideration and decision.

41. FOUR YEAR PLAN

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress expresses its appreciation to the Organisation Department for its strenuous work and calls upon the Executive Committee to draw up, in the near future, a Four-Year Plan on organisational activities for the World Jewish Congress designed to expand its membership and to introduce new elements from the younger generation into its leadership.

42. REPRESENTATION OF REFUGEE ORGANISATIONS AT THE CLAIMS CONFERENCE

The Fourth Plenary Assembly of the World Jewish Congress asks the Executive Committee to obtain adequate representation on the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany for the organisations representing Jewish victims of Nazi persecution who have emigrated from Poland, Rumania, Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

D. STRUCTURE OF THE EXECUTIVE

1. MEMBERS EX OFFICIO

a. Officers :

The President

The Honorary Vice-President

The Chairmen of the four Branches of the Executive
 The Co-Chairmen of the Branches of the Executive
 The Treasurer
 The Chairman of the Budget Committee.

b. Directors of Departments, Branches or Offices :

The Director of the Political Department (London)
 The Director of the International Affairs Department (New York)
 The Director of the Organisation Department
 The Director of the Cultural Department
 The Director of the Institute of Jewish Affairs
 The Director of Co-Ordination
 The Director of Organisation in Israel
 The Executive Secretary of the European Branch
 The Director of the Paris Office.

**2. DIRECTORS WITH EXECUTIVE STATUS
 IN SPECIAL QUESTIONS:**

The following directors will have a seat and voting rights on the Executive in all questions which concern their region:

The Director of the Algiers Office
 The Director of the Buenos Aires Office
 The Director of the Montevideo Office
 The Director of the Rio de Janeiro Office
 The Director of the Israel Office.

**3. MEMBERS TO BE APPOINTED BY
 CONSTITUENT MEMBER ORGANISATIONS:**

<i>Country</i>	<i>Full Members</i>	<i>Associate Members</i>
Algeria . . .	2	
Argentine . . .	5	4
Australia . . .	2	
Austria . . .	1	
Belgium . . .	1	1
Bolivia . . .		1
Brazil . . .	3	
Canada . . .	3	
Chile . . .	1	1
Colombia . . .	1	
Cuba . . .		1
Denmark . . .		1
Eire . . .		1
France . . .	4	3
Germany . . .	1	
Great Britain . . .	5	4

Greece	.	.	.	1
Hungary	.	.	.	2
India	.	.	.	1
Iran	.	.	.	2
Israel	.	.	.	15
Italy	.	.	.	1
Mexico	.	.	.	1
Morocco	.	.	.	2
Netherlands	.	.	.	1
New Zealand	.	.	.	1
Peru	.	.	.	1
Rhodesia	.	.	.	1
Sweden	.	.	.	1
Switzerland	.	.	.	1
Tunisia	.	.	.	2
United States of America	.	.	.	16
Uruguay	.	.	.	1
Venezuela	.	.	.	1
Yugoslavia	.	.	.	1
Total				75
				32

(25 countries) (10 add. countries)

4. CONSULTATIVE MEMBERS:

To be appointed by associate member organisations according to a key to be decided upon by the Executive Committee.

E. ELECTIONS

a. By the Plenary Assembly

1. Officers:

President	.	.	.	DR. NAHUM GOLDMANN
Honorary Vice-President	.	.	.	DR. ISRAEL GOLDSTEIN
Chairman of the Executive Committee:				
European Executive	.	.	.	MR. ISRAEL M. SIEFF
North American Executive	.	.	.	MR. SAMUEL BRONFMAN
South American Executive	.	.	.	DR. MOISES GOLDMAN
Israel Executive	.	.	.	PROF. ARIEH TARTAKOWER
Treasurer	.	.	.	MR. IRA GULDEN
Chairman of the Budget Committee	.	.	.	MR. SHAD POLIER

2. Honorary Members of the Executive:

MRS. REBECCA SIEFF

MONSIEUR EDMOND FLEG
 MR. MARC JARBLUM
 DR. M. NUROCK
 MR. BARUCH ZUCKERMAN
 DR. F. R. BIENENFELD
 PROFESSOR FRITZ FEIGL
 PROFESSOR HORACE KALLEN.

b. By the Executive Committee

1. Co-Chairman:

Co-Chairman of the European
 Executive . . . THE MARCHIONESS OF READING.

2. DIRECTORS OF DEPARTMENTS, BRANCHES OR OFFICES
 (EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE):

Director of the Political Department (London)	MR. A. L. EASTERMAN.
Director of the International Affairs Department (New York)	DR. M. L. PERLZWEIG.
Director of the Organisation Department	DR. I. SCHWARZBART.
Director of the Cultural Department	DR. A. STEINBERG.
Director of the Institute of Jewish Affairs	DR. NEHEMIAH ROBINSON.
Director of Co-ordination	DR. GERHART M. RIEGNER.
Executive Secretary of the European Branch	DR. S. J. ROTH.
Director of the Paris Office	M. ARMAND KAPLAN.
Director of Organisation in Israel	Name to be submitted by the Israel Executive.

3. DIRECTORS WITH EXECUTIVE STATUS IN SPECIAL QUESTIONS:

Director of the Algiers Office	M. JACQUES LAZARUS.
Director of the Buenos Aires Office	MR. MARC TURKOW.
Director of the Montevideo Office	DR. NELLA ROST HOLLANDER.
Director of the Rio de Janeiro Office	DR. V. WINTERSTEIN.
Director of the Israel Office	DR. L. BERNSTEIN.

F. PERMANENT COMMITTEES

1. ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE:

Composition as decided by the Executive Committee:

a. Permanent Members:

The President.

The Honorary Vice-President.

The Chairman and co-Chairman (—men) of the Branches of
 the Executive.

The Treasurer.
The Chairman of the Budget Committee.
The Director of the Political Department (London).
The Director of International Affairs Department (New York).
The Director of Co-ordination.

- b. Non-Permanent Members to be appointed for each meeting:
- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| European Executive | . 2 members (1 Great Britain, 1 France). |
| North American Executive | . 2 members (1 U.S.A., 2 Canada). |
| South American Executive | . 1 member. |
| Israel Executive | . 2 members. |

2. BUDGET COMMITTEE:

Composition as decided by the Plenary Assembly:

The Chairman of the Budget Committee.
The Treasurer.

One member of the Executive from the following countries:

United States of America
Great Britain
France
Argentina
Israel
Canada

The Director of Co-ordination ex-officio.

3. FINANCE COMMITTEE:

Composition as decided by the Plenary Assembly:

The Treasurer
The Co-treasurer(s)
and co-opted members.

APPENDIX I

CONSTITUTION OF THE WORLD JEWISH CONGRESS

(As amended by the Fourth Plenary Assembly)

Article One

The World Jewish Congress is a voluntary association of representative Jewish bodies, communities and organisations throughout the world, which affiliate under this Constitution.

Article Two

The World Jewish Congress is organised to assure the survival, and to foster the unity of the Jewish people; and to that end:

- (a) to co-ordinate the efforts of its affiliated organisations 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 imperilled;
- (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 affiliated organisations before governmental, inter-governmental and other international authorities with respect to matters which concern the Jewish people as a whole.

The World Jewish Congress strives to co-operate with all peoples on the basis of universal ideals of peace, freedom and justice.

Article Three

Affiliation with the World Jewish Congress shall in no way affect the autonomy of affiliates with regard to the internal and religious affairs of their respective Jewish communities nor imply any authorisation to the World Jewish Congress to intervene in the domestic political affairs of that country.

Article Four

1. Jewish bodies, communities and organisations, formed and

acting in accordance with democratic principles, which subscribe to the purpose of the World Jewish Congress and agree to abide by the provisions of this Constitution may affiliate as 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 organisation in any country.
(b) The constituent member shall be the generally recognised 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 affiliation 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 organisations by a two-thirds vote of the Executive Committee on such terms and conditions as the Executive Committee may find appropriate.

Article Five

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 Six

1. The Plenary Assembly shall consist of delegates elected by member organisations 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 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 Seven

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 Eight

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
3. An extraordinary session of the Executive Committee may annually unless the Plenary Assembly shall meet in such year. 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. For administrative convenience, the Plenary Assembly may authorise parts of the Executive to function as regional branches. Each of these branches shall exercise such responsibilities as may, from time to time, be designated by the Plenary Assembly or the Executive Committee.

Article Nine

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) Holders of the offices of President, Chairman and Co-Chairman of the Executive Committee, Chairman of the Budget Committee, Treasurer and Co-Treasurer;
 - (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 organisation, 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 organisation, 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.
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 organisation shall serve at the pleasure of such constituent organisation but only so long as such member shall be a resident of the country whose Jewish community is represented by such constituent.

Article Ten

1. The key for the election of full and associate members of the Executive Committee by constituent organisations 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 organisations 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 organisations entitled to elect them.

Article Eleven

1. The officers of the World Jewish Congress shall be the President, the Chairman and Co-Chairman of the Branches of the Executive Committee, the Chairman of the Budget Committee, the Treasurer and one or more Co-Treasurers.
2. The officers other than the Co-Chairman of a Branch of the Executive Committee shall be elected at the Plenary Assembly. Upon the nomination of a Branch of the Executive Committee, the Executive Committee may elect a Co-Chairman of a Branch.
3. A vacancy in any office shall be filled by the Executive Committee.

Article Twelve

The revenue of the World Jewish Congress shall consist of:

- (a) Contributions of member organisations 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 organisations or individuals.

Article Thirteen

This constitution may be amended only upon a decision of a Plenary Assembly at which no less than two-thirds of the constituent member organisations are represented. Amendments require a two-thirds majority of delegates present and voting.

Article Fourteen

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 organisation.

Article Fifteen

The present Constitution shall come into force immediately.

APPENDIX II

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE PLENARY ASSEMBLY

Article One

DELEGATES

1. The Plenary Assembly shall consist of delegates elected by member organisations and of the members of the Executive Committee.

2. The number of delegates allotted to each constituent member organisation 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 number of delegates.

3. The number of delegates allotted to each associate member organisation shall be determined by the Executive Committee.

Article Two

ALTERNATE DELEGATES

1. Constituent and associate organisations may designate alternate delegates.

2. In the absence of a delegate an alternate delegate may exercise his right if so designated by the Chairman of the Delegation.

Article Three

FRATERNAL DELEGATES, OBSERVERS

The Executive Committee may invite organisations not affiliated with the organisation to send fraternal delegates or observers to the Plenary Assembly.

Article Four

SUBMISSION OF CREDENTIALS

1. The credentials of delegates, alternate delegates, fraternal delegates and observers shall be submitted to the Secretariat of the

Plenary Assembly if possible not less than one week before the date fixed for the opening of the Assembly.

2. The credentials shall be issued by the responsible officers of the organisation represented.

Article Five

CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

1. A Credentials Committee shall be appointed at the beginning of each Plenary Assembly. It shall consist of 5 members who shall be appointed by the Plenary Assembly on the proposal of the officers of the organisation.

2. The Committee shall examine the credentials of delegates and report to the Plenary Assembly without delay. The final decision about the admission of a delegate rests with the Plenary Assembly.

Article Six

PROVISIONAL ADMISSION OF DELEGATES

Any delegate to whose admission objections have been made shall be seated provisionally with the same rights as other delegations, until the Credentials Committee has reported and the Plenary Assembly has given its decision.

Article Seven

AGENDA

1. The Plenary Assembly shall adopt its agenda at the beginning of its session on the basis of the provisional agenda prepared by the Executive Committee.

2. The inclusion of supplementary items in the agenda may be demanded at the Assembly provided such request has been submitted to the Executive Committee one month in advance of the opening of the Assembly or if the item in question is of an emergency character or for other exceptional reasons could not be submitted earlier. The inclusion of such supplementary items requires a two-thirds majority of the delegates present and voting.

PRESIDIUM

1. The Presidium shall consist of (a) the officers (b) the Chairmen of the principal Commissions who shall be elected by the Plenary Assembly and (c) twenty-five (25) other persons elected by the Plenary Assembly.

2. The Presidium shall draw up the agenda for each plenary

meeting, determine the priority of its items and co-ordinate the proceedings of all Commissions and Committees of the Plenary Assembly. It shall assist the President of the organisation in the general conduct of the work of the Plenary Assembly and shall exercise such other functions as delegated to it by the present rules of procedure.

3. Unless the Plenary Assembly appoints a special committee for this purpose, the Presidium shall act as Nominations Committee for all elections.

Article Nine

PRESIDING OFFICER

1. One member of the Presidium shall act as Presiding Officer of each plenary meeting.

2. The Presiding Officer declares the opening and closing of the meeting, directs the discussion, ensures observance of the Rules, accords the right to speak, puts questions to the vote and announces decisions. He has the power to propose adjournment or closure of the debate or adjournment or suspension of a meeting. He may call a speaker to order if his remarks are not relevant to the subject under discussion.

Article Ten

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE MEETINGS

The meetings of the Plenary Assembly shall be held in public unless the Assembly decides that exceptional circumstances require that the meeting be held in private.

Article Eleven

QUORUM

A majority of the delegates to the Plenary Assembly shall constitute a quorum.

Article Twelve

SPEECHES

1. No delegate may address the Plenary Assembly without having previously obtained the permission of the Presiding Officer. The Presiding Officer shall call upon speakers in the order in which they signify their desire to speak.

2. The Chairman and the rapporteur of a Commission or Committee may be accorded precedence for the purpose of explain-

ing the conclusions arrived at by their Commission or Committee.

3. Officers and Heads of the Departments of the organisation may be accorded precedence in order to make a statement to the Plenary Assembly concerning any question under consideration.

Article Thirteen

APPEALS AGAINST RULINGS

1. A delegate may appeal against the ruling of the Presiding Officer. The appeal shall immediately be put to the vote and the Presiding Officer's ruling shall stand unless over-ruled by a majority of the delegates present and voting.

2. A delegate appealing against a ruling of the Presiding Officer may not speak on the substance of the matter under discussion.

Article Fourteen

TIME LIMIT OF SPEECHES

1. The Plenary Assembly may limit the time to be allowed to delegations or speakers.

2. In regard to certain discussions the Plenary Assembly may, upon recommendation of the Presidium (a) fix the time available and (b) divide the time available among the delegations on the basis of their numerical strength but allowing adequate minimum time for small delegations and allotting time to ex officio members of the Executive Committee.

Article Fifteen

CLOSING OF THE LIST OF SPEAKERS

Except where the time available for debate on the subject has been divided among the delegations, the Presiding Officer may, during the course of a debate, announce the list of speakers and, with the consent of the Plenary Assembly, declare the list closed. He may, however, accord the right of reply to any delegate if a speech delivered after he has declared the list closed makes this appropriate.

Article Sixteen

ADJOURNMENT OF THE DEBATE

During the discussion of any matter, a delegate may move the adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion. In addition to the proposer of the motion, one delegate may speak in favour of, and one against, the motion, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote.

Article Seventeen

CLOSURE OF DEBATE

Except where the time available for debate on the subject has been fixed by the Plenary Assembly and the time has been divided among the delegations, any delegate may, at any time, move the closure of the debate on the item under discussion whether or not any other delegate has signified his wish to speak. Permission to speak on the closure of the debate shall be accorded only to one speaker opposing the closure, after which the motion shall be immediately put to the vote. If the Plenary Assembly is in favour of the closure, the Presiding Officer shall declare the closure of the debate.

Article Eighteen

SUSPENSION OR ADJOURNMENT OF THE MEETING

During the discussion of any matter a delegate may move the suspension or the adjournment of the meeting. Such motions shall not be debated, but shall be immediately put to the vote.

Article Nineteen

ORDER OF PROCEDURAL MOTIONS

Subject to Art. 13 the following motions shall have precedence in the following order over all other proposals or motions before the meeting:

- (a) to suspend the meeting
- (b) to adjourn the meeting
- (c) to adjourn the debate on the items under discussion
- (d) for the closure of the debate on the item under discussion

Article Twenty

PROPOSALS AND AMENDMENTS

Proposals and amendments which are not of a procedural character shall normally be introduced in writing and handed to the Secretariat of the Plenary Assembly who shall circulate copies to the delegates. As a general rule, no proposal shall be discussed or put to the vote at any meeting of the Plenary Assembly unless copies of it have been circulated to all delegates. The Presiding Officer may, however, permit the discussion and consideration of amendments even though these have not been circulated.

Article Twenty-one

PROPOSALS IN PLENARY

1. Proposals or substantive amendments which are not of a procedural character cannot be submitted to the Plenary Assembly if they have not been previously submitted to one of the commissions or committees.

2. A proposal or a substantive amendment which has not been accepted by one of the Commissions or Committees can be introduced in Plenary Session only if the mover has reserved his right, in Commission or Committee Session, to present a minority report to the Plenary.

Article Twenty-two

MOTIONS TO BE SECONDED

Any motion, proposal or amendment made by a delegate must be seconded by another delegate before it can be put to a vote.

Article Twenty-three

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTIONS

A motion may be withdrawn by its proposer at any time before voting on it has commenced, provided the motion has not been amended. A motion which has then been withdrawn may be re-introduced by any delegate.

Article Twenty-four

RECONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS

When a proposal has been adopted or rejected it may not be reconsidered at the same Plenary Assembly unless the Plenary Assembly by a two-thirds majority of the delegates present and voting so decides. Permission to speak on a motion to reconsider shall be accorded only to one speaker opposing the motion, after which it shall be immediately put to the vote.

Article Twenty-five

VOTING RIGHTS

Each delegate shall have one vote.

Article Twenty-six

"DELEGATES PRESENT AND VOTING"

For the purpose of these rules, the phrase "delegates present and voting" means delegates casting an affirmative or negative vote. Delegates who abstain from voting are considered as not voting.

Article Twenty-seven

METHOD OF VOTING

1. The Plenary Assembly shall normally vote by show of hands.
2. A roll call shall be taken if requested by at least one hundred (100) delegates.

Article Twenty-eight

CONDUCT DURING VOTING

After the Presiding Officer has announced the beginning of voting, no delegate shall interrupt the voting except on a point of order in connection with the actual conduct of the voting.

Article Twenty-nine

DIVISION OF PROPOSALS

Parts of a proposal shall be voted on separately if a delegate requests that the proposal be divided. The resulting proposal shall then be put to a final vote in its entirety.

Article Thirty

VOTING ON AMENDMENTS

When an amendment is moved to a proposal the amendment shall be voted on first. When two or more amendments are moved to a proposal the Plenary Assembly shall first vote on the amendment furthest removed in substance from the original proposal and then on the amendment next furthest removed therefrom, and so on, until all the amendments have been put to the vote. If one or more amendments are adopted, the amended proposal shall then be voted upon. A motion is considered an amendment to a proposal if it merely adds to, deletes from or revises part of that proposal.

Article Thirty-one

VOTING ON PROPOSALS

If two or more proposals relate to the same question, the Plenary Assembly shall, unless it decides otherwise, vote on the proposals in the order in which they have been submitted. The Plenary Assembly may, after each vote on a proposal, decide whether to vote on the next proposal.

Article Thirty-two

ELECTIONS

1. Elections shall normally be held by a show of hands.
2. Elections by secret ballot shall take place when requested by at least one hundred (100) delegates.

Article Thirty-three

COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

The Plenary Assembly may set up such Commissions or Committees as it deems necessary for the performance of its functions.

Article Thirty-four

PRINCIPAL COMMISSIONS

The principal Commissions of the Plenary Assembly are:

- (1) the Political Commission
- (2) the Organisation Commission
- (3) the Cultural Commission

Article Thirty-five

COMPOSITION OF PRINCIPAL COMMISSIONS

1. The principal Commissions shall be composed of persons chosen by the delegations in accordance with a key of representation to be fixed by the Presidium and the officers and ex officio members of the Executive Committee.

2. Each delegation of a constituent or associate member organisation shall be entitled to at least one delegate in each of the principal Commissions.

3. Delegations which are not represented at the Plenary Assembly by a sufficient number of delegates to enable them to

participate in all principal Commissions shall be entitled to be represented in such Commission by alternate delegates with full rights.

Article Thirty-six

COMMISSION AND COMMITTEE MEETINGS

The meetings of the Commissions or Committees shall be held in private. The Chairman of the Commission or Committee may, in exceptional cases, authorise persons who are not delegates to attend Commission or Committee meetings if their presence seems to him desirable in the interest of the organisation.

Article Thirty-seven

RULES APPLICABLE

The rules for the conduct of business at meetings of the Plenary Assembly are applicable at meetings of the Commissions or Committees.

Article Thirty-eight

COMMISSION OR COMMITTEE DECISIONS

1. Substantive decisions taken and draft resolutions adopted by a Commission or Committee shall have the nature of a recommendation until confirmed by the Plenary Assembly.

2. Such decisions and resolutions shall be communicated to the Presidium or a Special Committee which the Plenary Assembly may establish for this purpose.

3. The Presidium or Special Committee may revise the decisions or resolutions changing their form but not their substance. Only such changes shall be reported to the Plenary Assembly.

4. If the Presidium or Special Committee wishes to express a serious objection to the substance of a decision taken or draft resolution adopted by a Commission or Committee, it shall refer the decision or draft resolution back to the Commission or Committee and inform it of the nature of its objection.

5. If the Commission or Committee maintains its original position, the Plenary Assembly shall decide.

APPENDIX III

COMPOSITION OF ASSEMBLY

I. OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE MEMBERS EX-OFFICIO

GOLDMANN, DR. NAHUM	. President.
GOLDSTEIN, DR. ISRAEL	. Chairman, Western Hemisphere Branch of the Executive.
SIEFF, ISRAEL M.	. Chairman, European Branch of the Executive.
TARTAKOWER, DR. ARIEH	. Chairman, Israel Branch of the Executive.
POLIER, SHAD	. Chairman, Budget Committee.
EASTERMAN, ALEXANDER L.	. Director, Political Department, London.
PERLZWEIG, DR. MAURICE L.	. Director, Political Department, New York.
REISS, ENGINEER A.	. Organisation Director, Israel.
RIEGNER, DR. GERHART M.	. Director of Co-ordination.
ROTH, DR. S. J.	. Executive Secretary of the European Branch.
SCHWARZBART, DR. I.	. Director, Organisation Department.
STEINBERG, DR. AARON	. Director, Cultural Department.

II. DELEGATES

A. Affiliates

ALGERIA: FEDERATION OF JEWISH COMMUNITIES

Executive members

HELER, BENJAMIN	. President, Federation of Jewish Communities.
LAZARUS, JACQUES	. Director, W.J.C. North African Office

Delegates

AIM JOSEPH	. Sec.-Gen., Consistoire of Relizane.
ASSOUN RAPHAEL	. Vice-Pres., Consistoire of Constantine.
FHAL, GEORGES	. Member, Consistoire of Constantine.
ROUBACHE, RENE	. President, Consistoire of Mostaganem.

Alternates

CHARBIT, JOSEPH	. Member, Consistoire of Tlemcen.
-----------------	-----------------------------------

KALIFA, DAVID . . . Grand Rabbin, Consistoire of Ain-Temouchent.

ARGENTINE: D.A.I.A. (DELEGATION OF JEWISH ASSOCIATIONS OF ARGENTINA)

Delegates

BLANK, M. Member of D.A.I.A., Cordoba.
 FAINGUERSCH, GREGORIO . . . Secretary, Kehilla of Buenos Aires.
 GOLDMAN, DR. MOISES . . . Hon. President, D.A.I.A.
 HIRSCH, DAVID . . . Vice-President, Jewish Bank.
 HIRZ, ALTER . . . Treasurer, Kehilla of Buenos Aires.
 LAPACO, DR. LEON . . . Member, W.J.C. Executive.
 LERNER, DR. NATAN . . . Vice-President, D.A.I.A.
 MIBASHAN, DR. ABRAHAM . . . President, D.A.I.A.
 OVSEJEVICH, ISRAEL . . . Member, Executive of D.A.I.A.
 PODHORZER, DR. LEON . . . Secretary General, D.A.I.A.
 SWARSENSKY, DR. HARDI . . . Editor, *La Semana Israelita*.

AUSTRALIA: EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF AUSTRALIAN JEWRY

Delegates

FINK, LEO Senior Vice-President, Executive Council of Australian Jewry.
 FINK, MRS. L. President, National Council of Jewish Women of Victoria.
 FREILICH, MAX Life Member, Zionist Federation of Australia and New Zealand.
 MATISON, DR. E. A. . . . Vice-President, Executive Council of Australian Jewry; Councillor, South Australian Jewish Board of Deputies, Adelaide.

Alternates

FREILICH, MRS. M. . . .
 MATISON, MRS. E. A. . .

AUSTRIA: FEDERATION OF JEWISH COMMUNITIES

Executive Member

MAURER, DR. EMIL President, Federation of Jewish Communities; President, Jewish Community, Vienna.

Delegates

FELDSBERG, DR. ERNST . . . Vice-President, Jewish Community, Vienna.
 LEITNER, GUSTAV Board Member, Jewish Community, Vienna; President, Zionist Federation of Austria.

Alternate

KREIL, REG. RAT. WILHELM Executive Secretary, Jewish Community, Vienna.

BELGIUM:

W.J.C. BELGIAN SECTION

Delegates

ANISFELD, MARC Executive Member, Zionist Federation of Belgium.

DOMB, ABRAM President, Jewish National Fund, Belgium.

GUTWETER, ME. NATHAN Hon. Secretary, W.J.C., Belgian Section.

BOLIVIA:

JEWISH CENTRAL COMMITTEE

Delegate

HERZBERG, DR. ERNESTO G. Secretary-General, United Zionist Federation.

BRAZIL:

CONFEDERATION OF JEWISH REPRESENTATIVE BODIES

Executive Members:

KAUFFMANN, DR. MOYZES First Vice-President, Confederation of Jewish Representative Bodies.

MARKMAN, DR. RAFAEL President, Jewish Council, Brazil.

STEINBRUCH, DR. A. President, Federationes Israelitas, Rio de Janeiro; Member of Parliament.

Delegates

DRUCKER, RAFAEL President, Independent Zionist Organisation, Executive Member, Zionist Organisation of Brazil, Rio de Janeiro.

FELMANAS, A. President, Association of Naturalised Brazilian Citizens; former President, Zionist Organisation of Brazil; President, Jewish Council, Sao Paulo.

MARKUS, DAVID Executive Member, Zionist Organisation of Brazil

NIGRI, TOFIC President, Sephardi Community of Rio de Janeiro.

WINTERSTEIN, DR. VOJTECH. Executive Member and Executive Director, Confederation of Jewish Representative Bodies.

CANADA:

CANADIAN JEWISH CONGRESS

Delegates

ABBEY, MONROE Chairman, National Executive, C.J.C.

GELBER, EDWARD .	. Hon. President, C.J.C.
HARVEY, S. H. .	. Hon. Vice-President, C.J.C.
HURWICH, DR. S. B. .	. National Secretary, C.J.C., Toronto.
KANEE, SOL .	. Vice-President, C.J.C., Chairman of C.J.C. Western Region, Winnipeg.
LANDOO, E. ESMOND .	. National Vice-President, C.J.C.

CHILE:

JEWISH REPRESENTATIVE COMMITTEE OF CHILE

Delegates

DRAPKIN, ISAAC .	. Hon. President, Zionist Federation of Chile.
POLLAK, ISRAEL .	. President, Zionist Federation of Chile.

COLOMBIA:

HEBREW FEDERAL UNION, CALI

Delegate

LECHTER, MOISES .	. Representative of Hebrew Federal Union.
-------------------	--

Alternate

LEICHTER, JOSE .	. Member of Hebrew Federal Union.
------------------	-----------------------------------

COSTA RICA:

CENTRO ISRAELITA SIONISTA DE COSTA RICA

Delegate

BORUCHOWICZ, BERNARDO .	. Secretary General of Centro Isralita Sionista.
-------------------------	---

CYPRUS:

JEWISH COMMUNITY

Delegate

PERSHITZ, MRS. IDA .	. President, Jewish Community.
----------------------	--------------------------------

DENMARK:

W.J.C. DANISH SECTION

Delegates

ERTESCHIK, M. .	. Executive Member, Denmark Poale Zion.
SIEGEL, N. .	. Chairman, Zionist Federation of Den- mark.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC:

CENTRO ISRAELITA

Delegate

ROSENZWEIG, ALFREDO .	. Vice-President, Centro Israelita.
-----------------------	-------------------------------------

EL SALVADOR:

JEWISH COMMUNITY

Delegate

LIEBES, EUGENIO .	. President, Jewish Community.
-------------------	--------------------------------

ETHIOPIA:

ERITREA JEWISH COMMUNITY

Delegate

JOSEPH, SHOA MENAHEM . President, Jewish Community,
Asmara.

Alternate

CAHAN, A. S. . Member, Board of Jewish Community,
Asmara.

FINLAND:

COUNCIL OF JEWISH COMMUNITIES

Delegate

SCHWARTZMANN, ABRAHAM . Member, Board of Central Council of
Jewish Communities.

Alternate

WEISS, CHIEF RABBI . Chief Rabbi of Finland.
DR. MIKSA .

FRANCE:

W.J.C. FRENCH SECTION

Executive Members

DREYFUS-SCHMIDT, ME ... Vice-President, W.J.C. French Section,
PIERRE . Mayor of Belfort.

KELLER, MOISE . Executive Member, W.J.C. French
Section; Vice-President, Circle
Bernard Lazare.

LAMBERT, ME DAVID . Executive Member, W.J.C. French
Section; Board Member, French
League of the Rights of Man.

ORFUS, JACQUES . President, Jewish War Veterans of
France First Vice-President, Zionist
Federation of France.

Delegates

BLUMEL, ME ANDRE . President, Zionist Federation of
France.

BONEFF, PHILIPPE . President, Jewish Community of
Marseilles.

DEIFT, ADOLPHE . Executive Member, Consistoire,
Nancy.

DEUTSCH, GRAND RABBIN . Chief Rabbi of Bas-Rhin,
ABRAHAM . Strasbourg.

MALKIN, DR. ISAAC . Executive Member, Zionist Federation
of France.

REICH, DR. JOSEPH . Vice-President, Consistoire, Lyon.

ROUBACH, MME. MARCELLE . Vice-President, W.J.C. French Sec-
L. . tion; President, ORT Women's
Division

SCHWEIZER, SALOMON . Director-General of World Union
OSE.

STERN, MME JULIETTE	. President, WIZO, France.
WEILL, PROFESSOR ROBERT	. Vice-President, W.J.C. French Section, Professor at Bordeaux University.

Alternates

ALGAZI, LEON	. Director, "Ecoule Israel" Broadcasts.
DREYFUS, RAOUL	. Vice-President, Jewish Community, Clermont-Ferrand.
ERLICH, MME. SASSIA	. Head of Cultural Department, WIZO, France.
FOLUS, ROBERT	. President, W.J.C. Regional Committee, Toulouse.
GRYNBERG, BARUCH	. President, Keren Hayesod, Roanne.
JAKOUBOWICZ, JACQUES	. President, W.J.C. Committee, Limoges.
KIVELIOVITCH, PROFESSOR MICHAEL	. President, Yiddish Section of W.J.C. Cultural Committee, France; Professor, National Institute of Meteorology, Paris.
NIEDERMAYER, KURT	. Secretary General, Jewish Students' Union, France.
POUGATCH, ISAAC	. Educationalist and author.
RUDEL, MEYER	. Secretary General, Jewish Community of Toulouse.

GERMANY:

ZENTRALRAT DER JUDEN IN DEUTSCHLAND

Executive Member

GALINSKI, HEINZ	. President, Central Council; President, Berlin Jewish Community.
-----------------	---

Delegates

GRAUBART, PROFESSOR BARUCH	. Vice-President, Union of Jewish Communities in Bavaria.
SCHWARZ, S.	. Member of the Central Council.
VAN DAM, DR. HENDRIK	. Secretary-General, Central Council.

GREAT BRITAIN:

W.J.C. BRITISH SECTION

Executive Members

BORNSTEIN, ABA	. President Mizrachi-Hapoel-Hamizrachi Federation, Great Britain: Member, Board of Deputies.
GOLDSTEIN, MRS. DORA	. Member, WIZO World Executive.
HALEVY, JACOB, M.SC.	. Chairman, W.J.C. British Section; Member, Board of Deputies.
LEVENBERG, DR. S.	. Representative of the Jewish Agency; Member, Board of Deputies.

READING, C.B.E., J.P., The Marchioness of	President, W.J.C. British Section.
ROSEN, RABBI, KOPUL	Headmaster, Carmel College; Member, Board of Deputies.
SILVERMAN, M.P., SIDNEY S.	Member of Parliament.
<i>Delegates</i>	
BAKSTANSKY, LAVY	General, Secretary Zionist Federation of Great Britain; Member, Board of Deputies.
CHANAN, ELIJAHU	Vice-President, Federation of Synagogues; Member, Board of Deputies.
COHEN, CLLR., K. C.	Hon. Secretary, Jewish Repr. Council Leeds; Member, Leeds City Council.
COHN, PROF. DR. ERNST J.	Chairman, Society for Jewish Study; Vice-Chairman, W.J.C. British Section.
KOPELOWITZ, DR. LIONEL	Chairman, Newcastle Zionist Association; Member, Board of Deputies.
LEDERMAN, M.	President, Federation of Synagogues; Member, Board of Deputies.
MILLER, DR. S. A.	Vice-Chairman, Poale Zion; Member, Board of Deputies.
MINDEL, BARRY	General Secretary, Mizrahi-Hapoel-Hamizrachi Federation in Great Britain; Member, Board of Deputies.
NAHUM, MRS. MARIE	Chairman, Manchester Women's Zionist Association.
NATHANI, ISAAC	Chairman, Mapam, Great Britain.
PEARL, REV. DR. CHAIM	Chief Minister, Birmingham Congregation; Chairman, Cultural Committee, W.J.C. British Section.
PERRY, WOOLF	Chairman, Zionist Federation of Great Britain; Member, Board of Deputies.

Alternates

FINE, O.B.E., J.P., CLLR. JOSEPH	Vice-President, W.J.C. British Section.
GIAQUINTO, MRS. JUDITH	Vice-President, Jewish National Fund, Great Britain.
LEVENE, MORDECAI	Member, Board of Deputies.
MILLER, CLLR. MRS. S. A.	Executive Member, Zionist Federation; Councillor of the Borough of Hendon.
ORBACH, M.P., MAURICE	General Secretary, Trade Advisory Council; Member of Parliament.
ORBACH, MRS. RUTH	Chairman, Pioneer Women of Great Britain.
SANDLER, ISADORE	President, Representative Council of

- MANCHESTER AND SALFORD JEWS.
- SCHINDLER, JOSEPH . . . Chairman, Federation of Polish Jews in Great Britain.
- SILK, DONALD . . . Hon. Secretary, Zionist Federation of Great Britain, Member of Board of Deputies.
- TAUBER, DR. HANS . . . Chairman, Council of Jews from Austria in Great Britain.
- WEBBER, MRS. CARMEL . . . Executive Member, Federation of Women Zionists in Great Britain.

GREECE: CENTRAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH COMMUNITIES

- Delegates*
- NAHMIA, JACQUES . . . Deputy Secretary General, Central Council; Vice-President OPAIE.
- MAZZA, ROBERT . . . Assistant Secretary, Jewish Community of Athens.

INDIA: CENTRAL JEWISH BOARD OF BOMBAY AND JEWISH ASSOCIATION OF CALCUTTA

- Executive Member*
- CYNOWICZ, HERSH . . . Exec. Member, Central Jewish Board of Bombay.

- Delegates*
- ARON, PROFESSOR J. D. . . Hon. Secretary, Central Jewish Board of Bombay.
- GOURGEY, PERCY S. . . Representative, Jewish Association of Calcutta.
- JHIRAD, M.B.E., E. E. . . Representative, Jewish Community New Delhi.

INDONESIA: JEWISH COMMUNITIES OF SURABAJA AND DJAKARTA

- Delegate*
- EHRENPREIS, J. E. . . Hon. President, Jewish Community, Surabaya.

IRAN: W.J.C. COMMITTEE

- Executive Member*
- KERMANIAN, MOUSSA . . . Secretary, W.J.C. Committee, Teheran.

- Delegates*
- KASHFI, D. . . . Chairman, Jewish Welfare Committee, Teheran.
- KERMANCHANI, DR. M. . . Executive Member, Congress of Iranian Jews

SENEHI, MORTEZA . . . President, W.J.C. Committee;
President, Executive Committee of
Congress of Iranian Jews.

Alternate

KERMANCHANI, MRS. M. . . Representative, W.J.C. Committee.

IRELAND, Republic of:

JEWISH REPRESENTATIVE
COUNCIL OF IRELAND

Delegate

ABELS, PERCY . . . Hon. Secretary, Jewish Representative
Council.

ISRAEL:

W.J.C. ISRAEL SECTION

Executive Members

BERNSTEIN, ZVI . . . General Secretary, National Religious
Party.

EREM, MOSHE, M.K. . . Member of Knesset and Chairman of
its Social Welfare Commission.

FAIGENBERG, DR. DAVID . . . Executive Member, General Zionist
Party.

KATZENELNBOGEN, BENZION . . . Executive Member, Herut Party.

KUBOVY, DR. ARIEH LEON . . . President, Yad Vashem; former
Israel Ambassador to Argentine.

MINTZ, BENJAMIN, M.K. . . President, Poale Agudat Israel;
Deputy Speaker of Knesset.

TARTAKOWER, PROFESSOR DR.
ARIEH . . . Chairman, W.J.C. Israel Executive;
Professor, Hebrew University, Jeru-
salem.

Delegates

ABELES, DR. WALTER . . . Executive Member, Progressive Party

ARDITTI, BENJAMIN . . . Representative, Sephardi Federation

ARZI, REUVEN . . . Executive Member, Mapam Party.

ASSA, YERAMIEL . . . Representative, Sephardi Federation

BEN-ARIE, YEHUDAH . . . Executive Member, Herut Party.

EISENBERG, YITZHAK . . . Executive Member, General Zionist
Party.

ELIACHAR, ELIE . . . Representative, Sephardi Federation

GROSS, YITZHAK . . . Executive Member, Poale Agudat
Israel.

GUEZ, MRS. MATHILDA . . . Executive Member, North African
Immigrants Federation.

HARKAVI, YITZHAK . . . General Secretary, Ichud Olami.

YESHAYAHU, ISRAEL, M.K. . . Deputy Speaker of Knesseth; Presi-
dent, Yemenite Federation of Israel.

KORN, YITZHAK . . . General Secretary, Tnuat Hamo-
shavim Movement.

LANDAU, DR. MICHAEL . . . Executive Member, Progressive Party.

NITSANI, YAKOV . . .	Representative, Sephardi Federation.
NUROCK, DR. MORDECHAI, M.K.	Former Member of Government; Member of Knesset.
OREN, MORDECHAI . . .	Executive Member, Mapam Party.
RAFAEL, YITZHAK, M.K. . .	Member of Knesset.
REISS, ANSELM . . .	Executive Member, Israel Trade Union Federation (Histadrut).
SCIACKY, PROFESSOR YITZHAK	Professor, Hebrew University.
SITTON, DAVID . . .	Representative, Sephardi Federation.
SLUTZKY, MRS. CHAYA . . .	Executive Member, Israel Trade Unions Federation (Histadrut).
TABENKIN, YITZHAK . . .	Executive Member, Achdut Avodah Party; General Secretary, Hakibutz Hameuchad Movement.
WEISL, DR. VON WOLFGANG	Executive Member, General Zionist Party, Vice-President, Israel B'nai Brith.
WEST, BENJAMIN . . .	Executive Member, Federation of Russian Immigrants.

Alternate

LEVHAR, DR. ALFRED DAVID	Sephardic Representative, General Zionist Party.
--------------------------	--

ITALY:

Executive Member

CANTONI, DR. RAFFAELE . . .	Executive Member, President of OSE, Italy.
-----------------------------	--

Delegates

CANTONI, MRS. EMMA . . .	President, Youth Aliyah, Italy.
PIPERNO, DR. SERGIO . . .	President, Union of Italian Jewish Communities.

VITERBO, AVV.

CARLO ALBERTO . . .	President, Zionist Federation of Italy.
---------------------	---

LUXEMBOURG:

CONSISTOIRE ISRAELITE

Delegate

BULZ, DR. EMMANUEL . . .	Chief Rabbi of Luxembourg.
--------------------------	----------------------------

MEXICO:

JEWISH CENTRAL COMMITTEE

Delegates

BEREBICHEZ, ISIDORO . . .	General Secretary, Jewish Central Committee.
FRUMIN, JACOB . . .	Vice-President, Jewish Central Committee.
LASKY, MRS. RUNIA . . .	President, Women's Division, Jewish Central Committee.

MOROCCO: W.J.C. Moroccan Committee.

Observers

BOTBOL, A. Member, W.J.C., Moroccan Committee.
KARCHEN, MAURICE Member, W.J.C. Moroccan Committee.
SCHULMANN, ZEDE Member, W.J.C. Moroccan Committee.

NETHERLANDS: ASHKENAZI JEWISH COMMUNITY OF NETHERLANDS

Delegates

BERLINGER, E. Chief Rabbi.
DASBERG, DR. I. President, Ashkenazi Jewish Community of Netherlands; President, Jewish Community, Amsterdam.
ELZAS, J. President, Zionist Federation of Netherlands.

NORWAY: JEWISH COMMUNITIES OF OSLO AND TRONDHEIM

Delegates

BRAUDE, ISSER Board Member, Jewish Community, Oslo.
Alternating
KORITZINSKY, H. M. President, Jewish Community, Oslo.
Alternates
KAHAM, HERMAN Board Member, Jewish Community, Oslo.
SCHEER, MISS EVA Writer and Journalist, Oslo.

PARAGUAY: CONSEJO REPRESENTATIVO ISRAELITA

Delegate

SCHNEIDERMAN, ISRAEL Vice-President, Union Hebraica of Paraguay.

PERU: ASSOCIATION OF JEWISH SOCIETIES

Delegate

RADZINSKI, MICHEL President, Union Israelita of Peru.
Alternate
BLANC, RAOUL Director, Union Israelita of Peru.

PORTUGAL: JEWISH COMMUNITY, LISBON

Delegate

BARUEL, DR. ELIAS Vice-President, Jewish Community, Lisbon.

RHODESIA: RHODESIAN JEWISH BOARD OF DEPUTIES

Delegate

RABINOWITZ, SAMUEL . Hon. Life President and Executive Member, Rhodesian Zionist Council.

Alternate

RABINOWITZ, MRS. REBECCA . Chairman, Ladies' Communal League

SWEDEN:

W.J.C. SWEDISH SECTION

Executive Member

STORCH, HILLEL . W.J.C. Executive Member.

Delegates

BERMAN, K. . Vice-President, W.J.C. Swedish Section, Mapai Federation of Sweden.

SILBERSKY, ELIAS . President, Jewish Community, Malmoe.

WEGH, L. . Representative of Victims of Nazism in Sweden.

Alternates

BANKIER, J. . President, Association of Polish Jews in Sweden.

BENZIAN, J. . President, Adath Yeshurun Synagogue, Stockholm.

ETTLINGER, MRS. C. . President, WIZO Sweden.

GLUECK, D. . Executive Member, W.J.C. Swedish Section.

KAPLAN, DR. B. . Executive Member, W.J.C. Swedish Section.

ZYLBERBERG, A. . Executive Member, Zionist Federation of Sweden.

SWITZERLAND:

SWISS UNION OF JEWISH COMMUNITIES

Delegates

GUGGENHEIM, DR. GEORG . Executive Member, Swiss Union of Jewish Communities, Zurich.

NORDMANN, JEAN . Executive Member, Swiss Union of Jewish Communities, Fribourg.

TUNISIA:

JEWISH COMMUNITY OF TUNISIA

Delegates

BORGEL, ROBERT . Member, Comité Provisoire de Gestion, Tunis.

MESSIKA, ALFRED F. . Member, Comité Provisoire de Gestion, Tunis.

SAMAMA, SALOMON HENRI . President, Comité Provisoire de Gestion, Tunis.

UNITED STATES:

AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS

Delegates

ABRAMS, FRANK	. Vice-President, A.J.C.
ABRAHAMSEN, DR. SAMUEL	. Author.
ADLER, RABBI MORRIS	. Author.
ANNES, PAUL G.	. Vice-President, A.J.C.
BARAD, FREDERICK H.	. Judge.
BAUM, PHIL	. Director, A.J.C. Committee of International Affairs.
BORENSTEIN, MILTON	. Vice-President, A.J.C., New England Region.
BROWN, MEYER	. President, Farband Labour Zionist Organisation.
CAPLAN, SAMUEL	. Editor, "Congress Bi-Weekly".
DRUCKMAN, ABRAHAM M.	. Executive Member, Federation of Rumanian Jews in U.S.A.
FEDERBUSH, RABBI, DR. SIMON	Member, W.J.C. Executive
FRAM, RABBI, LEON	. Hon President, A.J.C. Michigan Council, Detroit.
GOLDSTEIN, HAROLD K.	. Former President, A.J.C., Cincinnati Chapter.
GOLDSTEIN, DR. ISRAEL	. Chairman, Western Hemisphere, Executive of W.J.C.; Hon. President, A.J.C.; Executive Member Jewish Agency.
GOLDSTEIN, MRS. I.	. Former President, Pioneer Women of America.
GORDON, RABBI, HAROLD	. Executive Director, New York Board of Rabbis.
GUILDEN, IRA	. Chairman, A.J.C. Committee on International Affairs; National Campaign Chairman, Israel Bond Organisation.
KALLEN, PROF. HORACE M.	. Hon. Vice-President, A.J.C.; Professor Emer., New School of Social Research, New York.
KIRSHBLUM, RABBI MAX	. Executive Member Jewish Agency; Hon. Chairman, Hapoel Hamizrahi of America.
KOHN, RABBI, S. JOSHUA	. Vice-President, A.J.C., New Jersey Region.
KUSIEL, MRS. SYLVIA	. Former Chairman. CLSA Women's Division of A.J.C. Staff Member, New York State Committee against Discrimination.
LEICHTMAN, JACOB	. Former Treasurer, A.J.C.
LERNER, LEOPOLD	. Executive Member, A.J.C.

LEVINTHAL, JUDGE, LOUIS E.	Former President, Zionist Organisation of America.
MARROW, DR. ALFRED J.	Chairman, A.J.C. Committee on Inter-group Relations; Chairman, A.J.C. Committee on Community Inter-relations.
<i>Delegates</i>	
MASLOW, WILL	General Counsel, A.J.C.
MAY, MORTIMER	Former President, Zionist Organisation of America.
MICHELSON, MORRIS	President, Jewish Community Council, Boston.
MILLER, RABBI IRVING	Former President A.J.C.; Chairman, American Zionist Council.
MITCHELL, SAMUEL	Vice-President, A.J.C. Business and Professional Associates.
NUSSBAUM, RABBI, MAX	Vice-President, A.J.C.
PERLZWEIG, DR. MAURICE L.	Director, W.J.C. International Affairs Department.
PILCH, DR. JUDAH	Executive Director, American Association for Jewish Education.
POLIER, JUDGE, JUSTINE	Chairman, Executive Committee, A.J.C.; Justice of New York Domestic Relations Court.
POLIER, SHAD	Vice-President, A.J.C.; Chairman A.J.C. Committee on Law and Social Action; Chairman, W.J.C. Budget Committee.
PRINZ, RABBI DR. JOACHIM	President, A.J.C.
RICHMAN, THELMA	President, A.J.C. Women's Division.
SCHAVER, MORRIS L.	President, Morris L. Schaver Foundation, Detroit.
SCHECHTMAN, JOSEPH	Chairman, United Revisionists of America.
SHERMAN, BEZALEL C.	Cultural Director, Labour Zionist Organisation of America.
SCHWARZBART, DR. ISAAC	Director, W.J.C. Organisation Department.
SLOMOVITZ, PHILIP	Editor.
SOKAL, SAUL	Member, W.J.C. Institute of Jewish Affairs.
SOLOMON, JUDGE, GUS	President A.J.C. Pacific Northwest Division; Chief Judge, Federation District Court in Oregon.
TENENBAUM, DR. JOSEPH	Member W.J.C. Executive.
TOUBIN, ISAAC	Executive Director, A.J.C.
WEISS-ROSMARIN, DR. TRUDE	Editor, Jewish Spectator.

SURCHIN, MRS. CHAYA . President, Pioneer Women of America.
 WOLL, HARRY L. . Educator.

Alternates

ALDERSON, MRS. SAMUEL W. Director, Women's Division, A.J.C.,
 New York.

FELDMAN, DR. LEON . Representative, A.J.C.

FOX, NORMAN . Representative, A.J.C.

GARFINKEL, MARVIN . Representative, A.J.C.

HENKIN, DR. A. L. . Representative, A.J.C.

JOSEPH, MRS. JESSIE . Representative, A.J.C.

JOSLOW, JACOB . Executive Director, New England
 Region, A.J.C., Boston.

JOSLOW, MRS. TILLIE . Representative, A.J.C.

KIRSHBLUM, MRS. M. . Representative, A.J.C.

LEVINTHAL, MRS. LOUIS . Representative, A.J.C.

MAY, MRS. MORTIMER . Representative, A.J.C.

MICHELSON, MRS. MORRIS . Representative, A.J.C.

SCHIRN, DR. OTTO . Director, West Coast Region, A.J.C.,
 Los Angeles.

SCHWARTZ, MORRIS . Representative, A.J.C.

SOBELSON, JACOB . Representative, A.J.C.

TOUBIN, MRS. ISAAC . Representative, A.J.C.

VOGEL, RABBI MANFRED H. . Representative, A.J.C.

WISE, JOSEPH . Representative, A.J.C.

URUGUAY:

JEWISH CENTRAL COMMITTEE

Delegates

LESZCZ, YECHIEL . Vice-President, Ashkenazi Kehillah.

ROST-HOLLANDER, DR. NELLA Director, W.J.C. Uruguay Office.

SCHWARZ, ABRAM . Vice-President, Central Committee.

VENEZUELA:

JEWISH COMMUNITY CARACAS

Delegate

MERENFELD, DR. RUBEN . Vice-President, Union Israelita.

YUGOSLAVIA:

FEDERATION OF JEWISH COMMUNITIES

Delegates

GRIN, MRS. ELSA . Executive Member, Federation of
 Jewish Communities.

VAJS, DR. ALBERT . President, Federation of Jewish Com-
 munities.

Alternate Delegate

VAJS, MAX . Executive Member, Federation of
 Jewish Communities.

B. Associated International Organisations

WORLD UNION O.S.E.

Delegates

GURVIC, DR. L.	.	.	Hon. Secretary General, World Union O.S.E.
SHABAN, ABEL	.	.	President, World Union O.S.E.
<i>Alternate Delegates</i>			
LEVINSON, ISAAC	.	.	Executive Member, World Union O.S.E.
LUSTIG, DR SHIMON	.	.	Executive Member, World Union O.S.E.
REZNIK, S.	.	.	Executive Member, World Union O.S.E.
WOLF, DR. N.	.	.	Executive Member, World Union O.S.E.

WORLD UNION OF JEWISH STUDENTS

Delegates

DE KADT, E. J.	.	.	Executive Member, W.U.J.S.
NIEDERMAYER, K	.	.	Secretary-General, W.U.J.S. in France.

SCANDINAVIAN JEWISH YOUTH FEDERATION

Delegates

BORNSTEIN, IDY	.	.	Former President, S.J.U.F.
GOLDMAN, HARALD	.	.	Executive Member, S.J.U.F.
<i>Alternate Delegate</i>			
BERLINGER, SHLOMO	.	.	Executive Member, S.J.U.F.

III. FRATERNAL DELEGATES AND OBSERVERS

JEWISH AGENCY FOR ISRAEL

GROSSMAN, MEIR	.	.	Executive Member, Head of External Affairs Department, Jerusalem.
HALPRIN, MRS. ROSE	.	.	Chairman, American Branch of Executive.
SHAZAR, ZALMAN	.	.	Chairman, Israel Branch of Executive.

ALLIANCE ISRAELITE UNIVERSELLE

WEILL, EUGENE	.	.	General Secretary.
---------------	---	---	--------------------

B'NAI BRITH

MOLVIDSON, HERMANN . . . President, B.B. Fredsloge, Stockholm.

BOARD OF DEPUTIES OF BRITISH JEWS

JANNER, M.P., BARNETT . . . President.

JEWISH COMMUNITY OF COPENHAGEN, DENMARK

ROTHENBERG, FRITZ . . . Secretary, Mosaiske Troessamfund, Copenhagen.

SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ASSOCIATION OF JEWS IN POLAND

KORMAN, J. Member of the Presidium.
MIRSKI, MICHEL Member of the Presidium.
SFARD, DR. DAVID Secretary General.
SMOLIAR, HERSCH President.

MOSAISKA FORSAMLINGEN, STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN

HOLLANDER, FRITZ Member of Board.
JOSEPHSON, GUNNAR President.
KOPNIWSKY, D. Executive Director.
KRONHEIM, EMIL Rabbi.
MALAR, BERTIL Member of Board.
MULLER, IVAR Member of Board.
NISELL, SAM Member of Board.
WILHELM, DR. KURT Chief Rabbi.
WOLFF, PROFESSOR, ERIK Member of Board.

SOUTH AFRICAN JEWISH BOARD OF DEPUTIES

RAJAK, HARRY Executive Member, Board of Deputies ;
President, United Hebrew Congr.,
Johannesburg.

WORLD ORT UNION

JOSEPHSON, GUNNAR Representative of ORT in Sweden.

WORLD SEPHARDI FEDERATION

MOYAL, DR. ISAAC . . . Executive Director.

W.I.Z.O.

ETTLINGER, C. . . President, WIZO Sweden.
 GELBER, HANNAH . . . Member WIZO World Executive.
 GOLDSTEIN, DORA . . . Member WIZO World Executive.
 STERN, J. . . . President, WIZO France.

CHILDREN AND YOUTH ALIYAH

HILB, ELLEN . . . European Director.

IV. SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS

BAUM, K. . . . Director, Information Department,
 London.
 BARNETT, J. H. . . . Organising Secretary, British Section,
 London.
 BECKER, FRITZ . . . Director, Rome Office.
 BECKER, MYRA . . . Secretary, Geneva Office.
 BERNSTEIN, DR. LEO . . . Director, Israel Office.
 BRASSLOFF, DR. F. L. . . . Assistant Director, Legal Department,
 London.
 DREYFUS, ANDRE . . . Administrative Director, French Sec-
 tion.
 EPPLER, DR. ELIZABETH E. . . Archivist, W.J.C. London Office.
 FRAENKEL, JOSEF . . . Information Department, London.
 GLICKSON, PAUL . . . Assistant, Cultural Department, Lon-
 don.
 GOLAN, JOSEPH . . . Assistant, Political Department,
 Geneva.
 JABES, ANDRE . . . Assistant, Political Department, Lon-
 don.
 JACOBS, MONTY . . . Secretary, Western Hemisphere Execu-
 tive, New York.
 JAKOBSON, H. . . . Secretary, Swedish Office.
 KAPLAN, ARMAND . . . General Secretary, French Section.
 KLAUSNER, MRS. A. . . . Assistant Director, Cultural Depart-
 ment, London.
 KRAFSOFF, NORA . . . Secretary, London Office.
 SOUISSA, EDMOND . . . General Secretary, Moroccan Section,
 Casablanca.
 TURKOW, MARC . . . Director, Buenos Aires Office.

V. REPRESENTATIVES OF INTERNATIONAL
ORGANISATIONS, GOVERNMENTS, AND
NON-GOVERNMENTAL BODIES

A. International Organisations

UNITED NATIONS

LEBAR, PIERRE . United Nations' Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs.

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND
CULTURAL ORGANISATION (UNESCO)

DE SEYNES, PHILIPPE Member of the Cabinet of the Director-General of UNESCO.

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION

VON STEDINGK, FRIHERRE Chief of Section, I.L.O.
CHRISTER

B. Governments

The Governments of the following countries were represented by diplomatic observers:

ARGENTINE; AUSTRIA; CANADA; COSTA RICA; DENMARK; ETHIOPIA; FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY; FINLAND; FRANCE; GREAT BRITAIN; ICELAND; ISRAEL; ITALY; MEXICO; NETHERLANDS; NORWAY; PERU; POLAND; SWEDEN; UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA; UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; URUGUAY; VENEZUELA.

C. Non-Governmental Organisations

WORLD FEDERATION OF UNITED NATIONS
ASSOCIATIONS

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF WOMEN

INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE PROTECTION OF
CHILD WELFARE

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND
FREEDOM

INDEX

Abbey, Monroe ...	100	Erteschik, M. ...	168
Abeles, Dr. Walter ...	167	Faigenberg, Dr. David 165, 192, 228	
Algazi, Leon ...	287	Fainguersch, Gregorio ...	222
Anderrson, Carl-Albert ...	18	Federbush, Rabbi Dr. Simon 339	
Anisfeld, Marc ...	173	Fink, Leo ...	115, 231
Aron, Prof. J. D. ...	315	Fhal, Georges ...	236
Arzi, Reuven ...	120, 369	Frumin, Jacobo ...	206
Baron, Dr. Salo W. ...	148	Galinski, Heinz ...	169
Baruel, Dr. Elias ...	278	Ginsberg, Dr. Morris ...	70
Ben-Arie, Yehudah ...	365, 370	Goldmann, Dr. Nahum 5, 20, 37, 40, 96, 179, 240, 293, 321ff, 362ff	
Benzian, J. ...	345	Goldman, Dr. Moises ...	57
Berebichez, Isidoro ...	280	Goldstein, Dr. Israel 67, 378	
Berlinger, Chief Rabbi E. ...	106	Goldstein, Mrs. Dora ...	225
Bernstein, Zvi ...	227, 314	Goldstein, Harold K. ...	47
Bickel, Dr. Shlomo ...	321	Goldstein, Mrs. I. ...	309
Blumel, Me. Andre ...	115	Gourgey, Percy S. ...	114
Bornstein, Aba ...	306	Graubart, Prof. Baruch ...	313
Bornstein, Idy ...	53, 281	Grossmann, Meir ...	37
Boruchowicz, Bernardo 96, 305		Gross, Yithak ...	168
Brown, Meyer ...	289	Guez, Mrs. Mathilda ...	286
Bulz, Dr. Emmanuel ...	123	Guggenheim, Dr. Georg B. 116, 210, 345	
Cantoni, Dr. Raffaele ...	171	Gustav Adolph, H.M. King 209	
Cohn, Prof. Dr. Ernst J. ...	319	Halévy, M.Sc., Jacob 65, 352	
Cynowicz, Hersh ...	101	Harkavi, Yitzhak ...	212
Danielou, S. J., Father Jean 80		Harvey, S. H. ...	287
De Kadt, E. J. ...	282	Heler, Benjamin ...	119
De Seynes, Philippe ...	12	Hirsch, David ...	122
Diop, Thomas ...	78	Hirz, Alter ...	306
Domb, Me. Abram ...	169	Jakoubowicz, Jacques ...	230
Dreyfus-Schmidt, Me. Pierre 171		Janner, M.P., Barnett ...	38
Easterman, A. L. ...	103	Josefsson, Gunnar ...	38
Eisenberg, Yitzhak ...	315	Kallen, Professor Horace M. 374	
Eliashar, Eliyahu ...	332	Kashfi, D. ...	66
Elzas, J. ...	206	Katzenellenbogen, Benzion... 97	
Erem, M.K. Moshe ...	229 359, 365, 372		
Erlander, Prime Minister			
Tage ...	8		

Kauffmann, Dr. Moyzes ...	103	Rafael, M.K. Yitzhak ...	102, 345 ff.
Keller, Moise ...	123	Rajak, Harry ...	98, 207
Kirshblum, Rabbi Max ...	110	Reading, Marchioness of ...	205
Kohn, Rabbi S. Joshua ...	319	Reich, Dr. Joseph ...	211
Kopelowitz, Dr. Lionel ...	232	Reiss, Ing. Anselm ...	58
Korman, J. ...	233	Richman, Mrs. Thelma ...	337 ff.
Korn, Yitzhak ...	124	Riegner, Dr. Gerhart M. ...	53, 96, 196
Kubovy, Dr. A. Leon ...	215	Rosen, Dr. Pinhas ...	9
Lambert, Me. David ...	214	Rost-Hollander, Dr. Nella ...	227
Landau, Dr. Michael ...	209	Roth, Dr. S. J. ...	234
Lebar, Pierre ...	85	Rothenberg, Fritz ...	40
Leitner, Gustav ...	307	Roubache, Rene ...	308
Lerner, Dr. Natan ...	308	Schwarz, Abram ...	119
Leszcz, Yechiel ...	121	Schwarzbart, Dr. I. ...	192, 352
Levenberg, Dr. S. ...	51, 354 ff.	Schwartzmann, Abraham ...	279
Markman, Dr. Rafael ...	361	Schweizer, Salomon ...	122, 344
Maurer, Dr. Emil ...	107	Sciaky, Prof. Yizhak ...	311, 344
Mibashan, Dr. Abraham ...	112	Sfard, Dr. David ...	292, 325
Miller, Dr. S. A. ...	220	Sharett, M.K. Moshe ...	128
Mintz, M.K., Benjamin ...	316	Shazar, Zalman ...	294
Mirski, Michel ...	173	Sherman, Bezalel C. ...	170
Moyal, Dr. Isaac ...	39	Sieff, Israel M. ...	125, 200, 375
Nathani, I. ...	60	Silk, Donald ...	226
Nigri, Tofic ...	120	Silverman, M.P., Sydney S. ...	178
Nordmann, Jean ...	310	Simon, Prof. Ernst ...	256
Nurock, Dr. Mordechai, M.K. ...	99, 239	Smoliar, Hersch ...	54
Nussbaum, Rabbi Max ...	175	Sokal, Dr. Saul ...	213
Oren, Mordechai ...	223	Steinberg, Dr. Aaron ...	266, 283
Orbach, M.P., Maurice ...	112, 356	Storch, Hillel ...	176
Orfus, Jacques ...	109	Surchin, Mrs. Chaya ...	222
Ovsejevich, Israel ...	219	Swarsensky, Dr. Hardi ...	316
Pearl, Rev. Dr. Chaim ...	317	Tabenkin, Yitzhak ...	116, 318
Perlzweig, Dr. Maurice L. ...	47	Tartakower, Dr. Arie ...	247
Perry, Woolf ...	290	Tenenbaum, Dr. Joseph ...	316, 383
Pilch, Dr. Judah ...	250	Vajs, Dr. Albert ...	114
Polier, Shad ...	62, 217	van Dam, Dr. Hendrik ...	108, 225
Pollak, Israel ...	167, 305	von Stedingk, Friherre Christer ...	15
Polier, Judge Justine Wise ...	176	Weill, Eugene ...	39
Pougatch, Isaac ...	313	Weisl, Dr. von Wolfgang ...	113
Prinz, Rabbi Dr. Joachim ...	117, 379 ff.	West, Benjamin ...	174
Radzinski, Michel ...	226	Yeshayahu, M.K. Israel ...	107

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

*This record of the Proceedings
of the Fourth General Assembly
of the World Jewish Congress
was made by Dr. Saul Sokal,
of the Institute of Jewish
Affairs, New York.*